

4. THE BHABRA EDICT.

Würzburg.

May 20, 1901.

DEAR PROFESSOR RHYS DAVIDS, — I am obliged to correct an error which slipped into my letter, "On a Passage in the Bhabra Edict" (J.R.A.S., 1901, pp. 311 et seq.). Already in 1887, in an article published in the *Journal Asiatique* (sér. VIII, t. ix, pp. 498 et seq.), M. Senart had recognized *tavitave*, or, rightly speaking, *taṃ vatave*, as he now reads, to be an infinitive dependent on *alahāmi*. M. Senart was himself so kind as to remind me of this error, regrettable, as I frankly confess. We must, of course, accept *taṃ vatave* (= *taṃ vattum*) as a better reading, and accordingly translate "I venture to adduce this (sc. word of the Buddha)," and so on. The difference in meaning between *tapitave* = *thapetum* and *vatave* = *vattum* is here a very slight one. Since now a correlate to *e* = *yaṃ* at the beginning of the passage is given, viz. *taṃ*, the relative *e* needs not to be taken adverbially, whereas *sadhamme* and NOT *sa dhamme* suits the context, the former standing for *saddhammo*, the latter for *so dhammo*. In this I disagree with M. Senart, and as to the words *hevaṃ . . . hāsati*, the interpretation I proposed is more in harmony with the whole tenour of our edict than Senart's, to judge from his translation in the *Journal Asiatique* (l.c., p. 503): "Je juge utile de dire ces choses (de parler comme je fais dans mes inscriptions), afin que cette loi religieuse soit de longue durée."—Yours truly,

E. HARDY.

5. THE TRANSLATION OF *devānaṃpiyā*.

When pointing out in my article on "The Authorship of the Piyadasi Inscriptions" (*ante*, p. 485) that the predecessors of Aśoka must have borne the title of *devānaṃpiya*, because in Rock Edict VIII the plural *devānaṃpiyā* is used as a synonym of *rājāno*, I unfortunately

overlooked a note published by M. Senart in the *Indian Antiquary* for 1891 (vol. xx, p. 231), which shows that that distinguished scholar had to some extent anticipated my interpretation. M. Senart observes:—"In the first line of this edict at Khâlsî, Dr. Bühler's new materials allow him to read *atikāntam aṁtalam devānāmpiyā vihālayātām nāma nikhamisu*; at Kapur di giri, also, the true reading is *devānāmpriya*, instead of *java jaraya*. It looks as if *devānāmpiyā* corresponded here purely and simply to the *rājāno* of Girnār and Dhauli."

But no room for doubt remains, as the comparison of the texts shows:—

Girnār.—*Atikātam aṁtaram rājāno vihārayātām ṅayāsu*.

Shāhbāzgarhi (Kapur di giri).—*Atikratnam aṁtaram devanam priya viharayatra nama nikramishu*.

Manserā.—*Atikratam aṁtaram devana priya viharayatra nama nikramishu*.

Kālsî (Khâlsî).—*Atikāntam aṁtalam devānāmpiyā vihālayātām nāma nikhamisu*.

Dhauri.—*[Ati]kāntam aṁtalam lājāno vihālayātām nāma khamāsa* (sic, leg. *nikhamisu*).

In each case the nominative plural, *devānāmpiyā* or *rājāno*, as the case may be, is construed with the aorist plural, *ṅayāsu* or the synonymous *nikramishu*.

May 16, 1901.

V. A. SMITH.

6. THE DATE OF KUMĀRADĀSA.

DEAR PROFESSOR RHYS DAVIDS,—In his interesting article on the Jānakiharaṇa of Kumāradāsa in the April number of this Journal, Mr. Thomas alludes to some five facts bearing on the author's date: his identification with Kumāradāsa of Ceylon, A.D. 517–526 (p. 254), his friendship with Kālidāsa (*ibid.*), his probable knowledge of the Kāsikāvṛtti (p. 266), the probable quotation in Vāmana's Kāvya-lāṅkāravṛtti