Buddhist literature he seems to be unknown. It would be interesting to know what M. Barth means by ‘early’ when he says that we meet with Gaṇēśa "early as the god of arts and letters."

However, I should certainly not venture to banish Gaṇēśa from the epic pantheon, if it were not for the omission of the Gaṇēśa legend in the South Indian recension. This shows, at any rate, how closely even questions of mythology and worship are interwoven with the hard and dry facts of textual criticism.

M. WINTERNITZ.

Oxford, March 1, 1898.

11. A NOTE ON THE KINGS OF PRĀGJYOTISA.

Göttingen, 4 March, 1898.

Dear Professor Rhys Davids,—I have studied with great interest Dr. Hoernle's paper on the Gauhati plates of Indrapālavarman of Prāgjyotiśa (Journ. As. Soc. Bengal, vol. lxvi, pt. 1, p. 113 ff.), and hope that Dr. Hoernle will soon give us the other grants of the same family, of which hitherto we have known so little. In the meantime, I would propose two alterations in the text of the inscription already published by him.

In line 4, instead of Bhagadatta-vatsa-mātā, the Earth, "the mother of him (i.e. Naraka), whose son is Bhagadatta," I take the reading of the photo-etching to be Bhagadatta-vansa-mātā (Bhagadatta-vatsa-mātā), the Earth, "the mother of Bhagadatta's family." Vamsa is spelt vansa also in other inscriptions. The circumstance that the family of the kings of Prāgjyotiśa is thus called the Bhagadatta-vamsa is of some importance. It shows that

1 [He is not mentioned in the Piṭakas, nor (so far as is known) in the commentaries on them, by any of his names. He may be in the later Pāli books written in Ceylon after the revival of Sanskrit studies in the twelfth century. But very little is known of them, and he is not in the Abhidāna Padipkā, 1150 A.D.—Rh. D.]

2 "The Religions of India," p. 197.
that Hārṣa of Gauḍa, Uḍra, Kaliṅga, etc., whose daughter Rājyamatī, “born in the Bhagadatta-rājakula,” was married by Jayadeva-Paracakrākāma of Nepāl (Ind. Ant., vol. ix, p. 179), was almost certainly a king of Prāgjyotiṣa. In fact, he most probably was the Hārṣa (or Hārṣa) of the Tejpur grant (Journ. As. Soc. Bengal, vol. ix, p. 767), who would be thus placed in the first half of the eighth century A.D.¹

Besides, in line 13, instead of Kaumrāṇavaya, the photo-etching suggests the reading Bhaumāṇavaya. Kaumra is an impossible word, which could not be derived from Kumāra. On the other hand, as the family derived its origin from Viṣṇu and the Earth, it may well have been called the Bhauma-vamsa, either after the Earth herself or after her and Viṣṇu’s son Naraka (Bhauma), the father of Bhagadatta, just as in the Harṣa-carita it is called the Vaiṣṇava-vamsa after Viṣṇu.²

In the admirable English translation of the Harṣa-carita, the prince of Prāgjyotiṣa who sends a messenger to Harṣa is called “Bhūskaradyuti, otherwise named Bhūskaravarman,” and is described as heir-apparent (kumāra). But I still believe that Kumāra was the prince’s name, and that he was surnamed Bhūskaravarman, because, as the poet says, he possessed the sun’s splendour (bhūskara-dyuti).

F. KIELHORN.

12. TATHĀGATA.

Wakefield.
March 7, 1898.

DEAR SIR,—In connection with Mr. Chalmers’ article on the term ‘tathāgata,’ in the January number of the Journal, the Tibetan rendering of the title may be noticed. It is

¹ Jayadeva-Paracakrākāma’s inscription is dated in (Harṣa)-saṁvat 153, i.e. about A.D. 758. The known inscriptions of the kings of Prāgjyotiṣa are not dated, except in regnal years.

² The Pāla dynasty belonged to the solar, the Sena dynasty to the lunar race.