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THE ARCHÆOLOGICAL REMAINS AND EXCAVATIONS AT NAGARI.

NAGARI is eight miles north of Chitorgarh in the Udaipur State, Rajputānā.

The place was first visited in 1872 by A. C. L. Carlleyle, Assistant to Sir Alexander Cunningham, and his account of its antiquities is published in Archæological Survey of India Reports, Vol. VI, pp. 196-226. This is anything but a satisfactory account. Carlleyle failed to notice here the unique structures now called Hāthi-bāḍā and Úbh-dival, though they were then, doubtless, standing as they do now. The loose sculptured pieces, which have been stacked in the heart of the village, and have lain there for at least fifty years, as I was told, did not attract his attention. Being the first antiquarian to visit the place, he was fortunate enough to obtain a large number of old coins; but even of these he was unable to give a correct description, his translations and explanations of the legends being as fantastic and absurd as his readings of them.

Kavi Rāj Shyāmal Dās, a Chāraṇ of high rank and fame in the court of Udaipur, and perhaps the most celebrated antiquarian and historian of his time in Rajputānā, visited Nagār soon after and published an article entitled Anti­quities at Nagāri in the Journal of the Asiatic Society of Bengal, Vol. LVI, Pt. I, p. 74 ff. This is a much more accurate and interesting account than that of Carlleyle. Both the unique structures referred to above have been noticed and described by him, and he has given a short account also of two inscriptions of pre-Christian date, one of which was found at Nagār itself and the other in a well at Ghusūndī, about four miles north-east of it. No other account of Nagār and its remains has been published; at any rate, none such is known till 1904, when I visited the place and gave a brief description of it in my Annual Progress Report. A bare enumeration of the remains, however, is to be found in the List of objects of Antiquarian Interest in the States of Rajputānā (Mewar and Partabgarh), 1904, which the late Sir Alexander Pinhey, then Resident at Udaipur, drew up with the help of Pandit Gaurishankar Ojha. Beyond what Kavi Rāj Shyāmal Dās describes, this “List” takes cognisance of (1) two Buddhist stūpas, and (2) several old capitals of pillars.
At one time Nagari was part of the Jāgīr of the Ṭhākur of Bassī, but it is now included in the estate of the Rao of Bedli, a Chohān Rājpūt and a first class vassal of the Mahaṅānā of Udaipur. It has been in the possession of the Chohān family for the last fifty years, and was so even when Carllyle was there. It is, therefore, inexplicable how he says that in his time it belonged to the Rao of Bhindār, a Sisodia. The village is situated on the right or east bank of the river Bedach, and at present occupies the northern half of what was once a citadel. Carllyle, however, says that the southern half, which is not now inhabited, was the real citadel, and that the present village was a mere outlying town towards the north. This is a mistake, because the ramparts of the former, whose traces he found, enclose the whole of the site, and not merely the southern half, as he imagined. The citadel is uncommonly narrow as compared with its length along the river. Its length from north to south is nearly 3,500 feet, and its breadth from east to west varies from 400 to 700 feet. The ramparts consist of big blocks of greyish laminated limestone such as is found in the neighbouring hills in abundance. On the north, east, and south, are traces of an old moat outside the ramparts, which no doubt was originally connected with the river and filled with its water. Vestiges of an entrance to the citadel are found in the east side of the north half. The site of the citadel consists of an elevated flat-topped ridge, and is much higher in level than even the opposite bank of the Bedach. This has, no doubt, been caused by the accumulation of débris through long-continued habituation. The people of Nagari do not remember who built the citadel. Evidently it was not constructed during the Rājput period; for its ramparts are composed of large massive blocks of stone packed dry, which is a characteristic of pre-Muhammadan construction. It was not possible to ascertain with accuracy the original level of the ground on which they stood. But it appears to have coincided with that of the stūpa excavated near the shrine of Mahādeva in the southern half of the citadel. The citadel may therefore have been of the Gupta period. The old town of Nagari was situated on the east of the citadel, its breadth being nearly equal to the length of the latter and running parallel to it. Its maximum length was at least three-fourths of a mile.

The ancient remains of Nagari fall into four classes, viz., (1) inscribed stones, (2) coins, (3) loose sculptures, and (4) structures. Under the first head have to be noticed no less than five inscriptions, of which two have been described, but imperfectly, by Kavi Rāj Shyāmal Dās in his article. Three are entirely new and were discovered by me. Of the former, one is an inscribed slab originally stuck up in the right hand side of the descent, inside the entrance, towards the water of a step-well in the village of Ghosūndī, nearly four miles north-east of Nagari. From another inscription in the step-well, it appears that it was constructed in V. S. 1556 (= A.D. 1499) by Śringāradevī, wife of the Guhila prince Rājamalla, and daughter of the ruler Yodha, founder of Jodhpur. As almost all the carved stones here are believed to have been brought from Nagari, it was rightly held by the Kavi Rāj that the inscribed slab was originally in Nagari. Reasons will be adduced further on for showing that it was
in Nagarī, and an attempt will be made to determine to which building it originally belonged. The slab has at present been fixed in a wall of the Victoria Museum at Udaipur. The inscription has been broken on both sides and is preserved only in fragments. It runs thus:—

1. ... (Bhāgava) [t]ena Gājāyanena Pārāśarī-putreṇa sa...
2. ... [jī]nā bhagavabhyaṁ Samākrashanā-Vāsudevabhyaṁ
3. ... bhīyāṁ pūjā-śilā-prākāro Nārāyaṇa-vāte kā[rītaḥ]

The inscription records the erection of a worship stone enclosure on a site called Nārāyaṇa-vāṭa by Gājāyanā, son of Pārāśarī in connection with the divinities Samākrashanā and Vāsudeva. The record is important in more than one way. In the first place, its language is undoubtedly Sanskrit, and it is therefore somewhat inexplicable why Professor Lüders called it a 'mixed dialect.' The only word that is not quite Sanskrit is bhagavabhyaṁ, which correctly speaking, should have been bhagavadbhyaṁ. But bhagavabhyaṁ is evidently a mistake of the engraver or the writer for bhagavadbhyaṁ, and such inaccuracies are not infrequently met with in inscriptions, about the Sanskrit language of which no doubt can be entertained. Paleographically, the initial and subscript rs have been clearly differentiated in this record. Thus the initial r in Samākrashanā has been distinguished from the subscript r in ṁputreṇa or ṣprākāro. This is a noteworthy fact, for it is conspicuous by its absence even in Aśoka's inscriptions though the words in which both kinds of rs occur are numerous. Bühler assigns this record along with others to the period between B.C. 350 and 250. The Nagarī inscription, therefore, is the earliest in which the Sanskrit language has been used, and is the only instance of its kind at a period when Sanskrit is supposed by some scholars to have been long since dead and when all the inscriptions so far found are in Prākrit. The Nagarī record, on the contrary, is an indication, in my opinion, of Sanskrit being still, though not widely, spoken along with Prākrit dialects of that period—a conclusion which is perfectly corroborated by what Patañjali says in his Mahābhāṣya. The inscription is important also from the religious point of view. In the first place, this is the earliest epigraphic reference to the worship of the gods Samākrashanā and Vāsudeva. Secondly, Nārāyaṇa-vāṭa appears to be the name of the site on which the temple of these divinities was standing. A similar name, Indra-vāṭa, is mentioned in the Śrīmālā-purāṇa as a tirtha or holy site in Bhīmān in the Jodhpur State, Rajputānā. And the fact that here at Nagarī a similar site is called Nārāyaṇa-vāṭa and that the shrine of Vāsudeva was existing there, clearly suggests that Vāsudeva came to be identified with Nārāyaṇa as early as the fourth century B.C.

The second inscription which has been noticed by Kavi Rāj is a mere fragment. According to his statement it was found on the river bank near Nagarī, but it is now deposited in the Victoria Hall, Udaipur. It consists of

---

1 List of Brāhma Inscriptions, No. 6.
2 The word, as it stands, is a dual, and as there can be no dual in Prākrita, bhagavadbhyaṁ must be taken as a solecism or mistake for bhagavadbhyaṁ.
3 Indian Paleography (English Translation), p. 32.
two lines, in the first of which only seven syllables have been preserved and in the second only two. It runs thus:

1. (sa)[vā]bhūtānāṃ dayathāṁ
2. (kār)[jitā

The inscription is in an old mixed dialect, and the characters appear to be of the second century B.C. The purport of the record is not clear.

Of the three new epigraphs which I found in and near Nagarī, one was discovered on a boundary stone between Ghusūndī and Bassī. Only one line was preserved, and of this only the following words...[te]na Sarvatātēna Āśvamedha. Evidently it records the performance of an Āśvamedha sacrifice by one Sarvatāta. This Sarvatāta is not known from other records, but as he is represented to have performed an Āśvamedha sacrifice, he appears to have been a paramount sovereign inasmuch as such alone can celebrate it. It is very difficult to say what the language of this inscription is, but from what little is preserved it appears to have been Sanskrit. The form of its letters corresponds exactly with that of the Ghusūndī epigraph referred to above, and what is noteworthy here also, is that the initial r has been clearly indicated as in that record.

The second of the new inscriptions is engraved on a stone which was found in the house of a Bania at Nagarī. The stone is broken off at both ends. Parts of two lines are traceable on each side; and the letters inscribed pertain to the 4th century A.D. On one side in the first line are readable the lower portion of the letter ta and the subscript y of a following conjunct letter. It is possible that originally they formed together the word tasya. In the second line the only words preserved are...ṣya yajye Vājapeye yūpo. In the first line on the other side the only letters that can be deciphered are...tasya putra[r]= y[u](po), and, in the second, ...j(ū)ne Vajape[y](e). We thus have here an express mention of the erection of a post for the celebration of a Vājapeya sacrifice by at least three brothers whose names have disappeared. It, therefore, seems that the inscribed stone must have originally been part of a stone pillar similar to that found at Bijayagāth in the Bharatpur State and put up as a sacrificial post at the time of the performance of a Puṇḍarīka sacrifice, as an inscription incised on it tells us.1 This last inscription runs vertically down the pillar, and is read from the top downwards. The same must have been the case with the inscribed lines just considered. The part of the pillar which bore them must have been at least a square, if not an octagon, and they appear to have been engraved on two of its faces.

The third inscription stone was discovered by me in the house of a Regar called Hariyā in Nagarī itself. It was originally found, I was told, about a quarter of a mile on the south of the village, not far from the shrine of Mahādeva where I excavated. The stone, when I saw it, had been broken into four pieces, but excepting a few initial letters of the first four lines, the whole epigraph can be read without any difficulty. At my suggestion the stone has now been deposited in the Rājputānā Museum, Ajmer.

---

The epigraph commences with a verse, in praise of the god Viṣṇu, which occupies the whole of the first three lines and part of the fourth line. Then is specified the date, both in figures and words. The object of the inscription is to record the erection of a temple to Viṣṇu by the three Baniā brothers, Satyasura, Srugandha and Dāsa. Their mother was Vasī, and of their father’s name the initial letters Jaya only have been preserved. They were the grandsons of Viṣṇuchara and great grandsons of Śraddhibodda.

The real importance of this record consists in the specification of the date and in its telling us what connection the Vikrama era had with the Mālava tribe. The wording used in expressing the date is divided into two parts. The first part speaks of four hundred and eighty-one Kṛta years having expired. From the Mandasor inscriptions of Naravarman discovered by me we learn beyond all doubt that Kṛta was the name of the Vikrama-Saṃvat. In my remarks on this record I have stated that, before it was discovered, the name Kṛta had already been known in two inscriptions to have been applied to the year of this era, but that its full significance had not then been perceived. When, therefore, our inscription uses the same name, we have only to understand thereby that the year 481 was a Vikrama date, and is thus equivalent to A.D. 424. The second part of the date makes mention of the lunar day in the words: 

\[ \text{asyām Mālava-pūrvāyām 481 Kārttiκa-sūkla-paṁchamaye} \], i.e. the 5th of the bright half of Kārttiκa of the year 481. The most interesting expression is Mālava-pūrvāyām, which qualifies paṁchamaye, the word expressing the lunar day. It is not quite easy to understand what the word pūrva in this expression exactly means. At first sight it seems very tempting to take it in the sense in which it is used in such expressions as etasyām…….pūrvāyām which we frequently meet with in the epigraphs of the Kushana period. But evidently this meaning cannot suit here, because this phrase invariably follows the specification of the date and never precedes it as it does in our record. Apte’s dictionary, it is worthy of note, gives “established, customary, of long standing” as one of the many significations of the word pūrva. It is rather unfortunate that the lexicon does not refer us to any Sanskrit work where this word has been employed in this sense. It cannot, however, be denied that the sense suits here excellently, and, what is more important, the expression Mālava-pūrvāyām can thereby be brought to bear precisely the same meaning as similar phrases used in other epigraphs bear, viz., Mālavānām gaṇa-sthityā of the Mandasor inscription of Kumāragupta and Bandhuvarman,¹ Mālava-gaṇa-sthiti-vasūt of another Mandasor inscription but of the time of Yaśodharman,² and Mālava-gaṇ-āmnāte of a third Mandasor inscription referring itself to the reign of Naravarman.³ Mālava-pūrva thus means “established or customary among the Mālavas.” Now, it deserves to be noticed that this expression has been used to qualify paṁchamaye (tīkara) This shows that the connection of the Mālavas with the era was only in regard to the reckoning of the lunar date. We know that the years of the Vikrama

¹ Fleet, Gupta Insers., p. 83.
² Ibid., p. 154.
era found in old inscriptions present different methods of computation. Thus while some of these are Kārtikādi, others are Chaitrādi. Some tithis, again, conform to the Pūrṇimānta, and some to the Amānta, arrangement of the lunar months. The Mālava system may have represented one of these computations or perhaps a combination of both. What this method of reckoning exactly was we do not know, but it will be easily admitted that this must affect the computation not only of tithis but also of years eventually. And this explains why we find the phrases Mālava-gaṇa-sthiti and Mālava-gaṇ-āmnāta used in connection also with the (Vikrama) years as distinguished from the tithis. In the Nagarī epigraph, too, the year 481 has for the same reason been expressly inserted in the wording which specifies the tithi.

It will thus be seen that the Mālava had nothing to do with the foundation of the Vikrama era. The old name of the Vikrama years was Kṛta, whatever that term may mean. The Mālavas were connected with this era only so far as the computation of the tithis primarily and of the years eventually went. In my paper on the Mandasor inscription of Naravarman I had suspected this, but this has now been unmistakably demonstrated, I think, by the expression Mālava-purvavāyām of the Nagarī record employed as an adjective of pañchamyayin (tithau). In regard to the old name Kṛta of the Vikrama year, I have already drawn attention to the fact that the word has in all epigraphs been made to stand in apposition to the phrase expressive of years. It seems as if the years are here intended to be called Kṛta “made, invented,” no doubt, for the purpose of calculating time.

Carlleyle was lucky enough to obtain as many as 145 good coins at Nagari. When I was encamped there last cold season, the people brought several coins to me for purchase, but as almost all of them were too much corroded and defaced, I had to content myself with buying six only. More coins were laid bare during my excavations, but even here some of them were found to be hopelessly corroded and only 18 were in good condition. Of these twenty-four, sixteen are of the ‘punch-marked’ type, four pertain to the Śibi-janapada, one is a Kṣatrapa, and the rest miscellaneous. The Kṣatrapa coin is that of Mahā-kṣatrapa Vijayasena with the date 161 (=239 A.D.). Carlleyle found two Kṣatrapa coins, one of Atri Dama (Bhartridāman) and the other of Asa Dama (Yaśodāman). Of the sixteen Kārshāpāṇa coins I found at Nagari, the obverse seems to have been generally punched with four symbols and the reverse with two, with sometimes the omission of one symbol. What these symbols are have been described on page 148, and they appear to me to be peculiar to the Kārshāpāṇa coinage of Nagari. The most interesting of the coins found here by me or by Carlleyle are the coins of the Śibi-janapada, not because of the symbols on them but because of the legend which they bear. It has not been found in its entirety on any single coin, but a comparison of many enables us to read the whole. The letters of the legend have been correctly read by Carlleyle, but he divides the words curiously and puts a fantastic interpretation on them. Cunningham, however, was the first to divide the words correctly. The legend runs thus: Majhīṃikīya Śibi-janapadasa. Cunningham translates it
by "Coin of the Madhyamikāyas of the country of Śibi."" It is impossible to accept this translation, for, in the first place, the genitive singular of Madhyamikā (Madhyamikā), and, secondly, it is inconceivable how Nagārī and the south-easternmost part of Rājputānā can ever be looked upon as forming part of the Śibi country which was situated far northwards in the Punjāb. Professor Kielhorn was the first to identify Madhyamikā of this legend with Madhyamikā mentioned by Patañjali as having been invested in his time by a Yavana king, and takes it to be the old name of Nagārī.

This identification was a distinct further step towards the correct interpretation of the legend. Taking advantage of this suggestion, Mr. V. A. Smith translated it by "Coin of Majhimikā (Madhyamikā) in the Śibi country." But this rendering is open to the second of the two objections urged against Cunningham’s interpretation, for we have absolutely no evidence that the Śibi country included Nagārī and the surrounding region, and what little evidence there is on this point points to its location in the Punjāb. Besides, no instance of coinage is yet known to have been issued in the name of a place, as Mr. Smith’s interpretation implies. The only correct translation of the legend would in my opinion be ‘Coin of the Śibi janapada of the Madhyamikā [country].’ The word janapada no doubt means ‘an inhabited country’ but it also signifies ‘an autonomous people.’ The latter is the only sense in which the word is to be taken in the interpretation of the legend. This is confirmed by another class of coins, which bear the legend: Rajanya-janapadasa, ‘Coin of the Rājanyas people.’ The term Rājanya is not here the Sanskritised form of the Rājput title Rāṇa, as is supposed by some numismatists and scholars, but is rather the name of a people whose existence is attested by the Rāṇas residing in the hill districts of the Punjāb and Rāṇes of the Goa territory. This tribal signification of the word has been known since the time of Pāṇini, who mentions them in his aphorism, Rājanyādibhyo vun (IV. 2, 53). This sūtra teaches us that if vun is applied to terms such as Rājanya and others, the word so formed becomes expressive of their country. Thus Rājanyaka means the country of the Rājanayas. Evidently by Rājanyas a specific people is meant—a conclusion which is strengthened by the fact that along with Rājanyas are mentioned Udumbaras, Arjunāyanas and others to form the Rājanya-gaṇa. As Udumbaras and Arjunāyanas are well-known tribes referred to in inscriptions and coins, I have no doubt that Rājanya also denotes a tribe or people, and the word janapada occurring in the legends of the Śibi and Rājanya coins must necessarily mean ‘an autonomous people or tribe.’ Instances of coinage struck by the various tribes in India are well known, but coins issued in the name of a country are entirely foreign to Indian numismatics.

It is thus clear that the coins found at Nagārī are those struck by the Śibi tribe. From the references to this people contained in the works of Greek writers such as Strabo and Quintus Curtius, and of Sanskrit literature such as

3 Early History of India (3rd ed.), p. 213.
4 Carmichael Lectures, 1918, pp. 172–4.
5 Jone R. As Soc., 1908, pp. 540–1.
the Manābhārata, Bṛihatasaṁhitā and so forth, the habitat of the Śabis seems to have been in the Punjāb, and, in particular, the central tract between Lāhore and Multān. A vase originally found at Shorkot and now lying in the Lahore Museum makes mention of Śibipura, which may be identical with Shorkot itself. It may be asked how the Śabis, if they were settled in this part of the Punjāb, came so far south as Nagari, which is in the south-easternmost part of Rājputānā. Epigraphic and ethnological evidence is abundant and unmistakable that tribes of various kinds such as the Mallī or Mālavas, Ahirs or Abhiras, Gurjaras, and so forth never stuck to their first settlement in India but freely migrated eastward and southward. Some of the Śabis must have similarly left their original home and made a settlement for themselves in and round about Nagari. And it is, no doubt, to distinguish the Śabis of Nagari from those of the Punjāb that in the coin legend a specific mention seems to have been made of Madhyamikā, which unquestionably was the old name of Nagari and also of the district round about it. It has been stated above that Patañjali (c. 150 B.C.) speaks of Madhyamikā as being besieged by a Yavana king, and refers to it in such a manner as to show that the event took place in his time. This Yavana or Greek king has long ago been identified with Menander, and there is no doubt that the Madhyamikā invested by him is Nagari. From the ruins and inscriptions found here, Nagari appears to have been a place of very great importance. As has already been stated, one of the epigraphs discovered by me here makes mention of an Āsvamedha, and another of a Vājapeya sacrifice, performed here. Though the latter is to be ascribed to the 4th century A.D., i.e. the early Gupta period, the former has certainly to be assigned to the 3rd century B.C., i.e. at least a century prior to the time of Patañjali. The place, where an Āsvamedha sacrifice was celebrated, could not but be the capital of a paramount sovereign, who alone was entitled to perform it. And it is quite natural that the Greek prince, aspiring to the rank of the supreme ruler of India, could not possibly leave the king of Madhyamikā (Nagari) unvanquished. Seeing that Madhyamikā was a place of such consequence, I started finding out whether the country or the people residing in and about it were referred to in works of Sanskrit literature, and I was delighted to find at least two such references. Chapter 8 of the Sabhāparvan of the Mahābhārata, while describing Nakula’s expedition of conquest in West India, informs us that this Pāṇḍava, after subjugating Daśārṇa, i.e. the province with Vidiśā or Besnagar as its capital, turned up northwards and came down southwards conquering the tribes Śabis, Trigartas, Ambashthas, Mālavas, Pañchakarpasas and Māhyamakeyas, after vanquishing whom he again turned back and went north to Pushkara. Mādyamakeyas are evidently the people settled in Madhyamikā country, which is south both of Pushkar and the south-eastern part of the Jaipur State which the Mālavas were occupying from 150 B.C. to 330 A.D. The Bṛihat-saṁhitā also places Mādyamikas in the Madhya-deśa or Middle Country along with Matsyas who were situated round about Bairāṭ in the north-eastern part of the Jaipur State. By Mādyamika Dr. Fleet under-

---

2 Cap. XIV, v. 2.
stands 'people in the middle country,' but it is not clear on what authority he says so. Grammatically speaking, the name must mean only 'a people living in Madhyamikā country.' I have no doubt, therefore, that Madhyamikā continued to flourish till the 7th century A.D. when Varāhamihira, author of the Bṛhat-saṁhitā, lived, and in support of this position it may be mentioned that ruins of the medieval period are by no means few at Nagarī. A reference to Madhyamikā may also be traced in a fragmentary inscription of the second century B.C. found at Barl in the Ajmer district, the last line of which is ...raṁni [Vi]j(e) Mājāmike [y]. So far as these words stand, a king of Madhyamikā called Viṭha seems to be here alluded to.

As I was encamped at Nagarī for more than two months it was possible for me to make a careful search for loose sculptures. These were numerous, but most of them were devoid of any interest. I confine myself here to a description of only those which struck me as important. In the heart of the village is a goddess called Kānkali Mātá, who is worshipped in the open. A small enclosure wall has been put up by the villagers round this deity, consisting of sculptured fragments. Of these two were originally capitals of pillars of the Gupta period. One of them is 2' 6" square and is 1' 9" high. The upper section is ornamented with the high seated lions back to back. Below is shown foliage hanging at each corner and the intervening space has been occupied with foliage and reed ornament. The piece ends with a round abacus 8' in circumference. On the top surface are five socket holes, one in the centre and the remaining four one at each corner. The other Gupta capital is a fragment. Only the upper section of it has been preserved, and that too in half. As it is, it is 1' high, and as the preserved side measures 1' 11½" square, it appears to have been 1' 11½" square. Instead of lions we have here bulls, but with a Kirtimukha between, with a pendant issuing from the mouth (Plate XIV. a). Not far from the open shrine of Kānkali Mātá is a round amalaka piece of the medieval period, 1' 9" high (Plate XIV. b). It is said to have been brought here for tying the Rao of Bedla's elephant.

About two miles south of Nagarī village is a big mound called Kuṇyārdī, half of which belongs to Nagarī and the other half to a neighbouring village. On the top of it has been installed a deity, the name of which the people were not able to tell me. Here also an attempt seems to have been made to raise a tiny enclosure wall mostly of plain stones. The only dressed stones here detected were really parts of a small plain but old railing, and consisted of one coping piece, one rail pillar broken into two, and two rail bars which no doubt belonged to this pillā: as they fitted into its socket holes (Plate XIV. c). Curiously enough, one side of each bar has been carved into a kangurā ornament.

About a mile east of the Kuṇyārdī mound is a place locally known as Sādū Mātā-ki bolavā. The image, which is here worshipped as Sādū Mātā, represents really the god Revanta, a son of Śūrya, the sun (Plate XV. b). He is seated on a horse, his left hand pulling the bridle and right bearing a cup of wine. Behind, is an attendant holding an umbrella over him. The staff of the umbrella alone remains. The top of the umbrella and the head of Revanta.
are gone. In front of the horse is a man playing on a tabor. Between the legs are two attendants and a heifer. Near this image are hosts of others, but these last are mere fragments and are unidentifiable. They have all been placed in a rubble wall enclosure. In the close vicinity of the enclosure begin the low lands of the hills and here are lines of rock of the lamiferous kind—springing out of the earth and running parallel to one another. Evidently we have here a quarry of the Gupta period exploited for the purposes of sculpture (Plate XV. a). I found here one huge block of stone which was being carved into a lion of the Gupta style (Plate XV. c). Only the outline of the animal has been sculptured, the details being left uncarved. Again, I lighted upon two model pillars, of which only one was in good condition. It was only 2'2" high. It is square at the bottom, octagonal in the middle, and round at the top. A large pillar is standing close by it, which was no doubt being cut out after this pattern. Only the square and octagonal sections were sculptured, the round portion being not begun at all. It is this pillar which is supposed to be the rod with which Sādū Mātā churned her milk (bolamā). Two āmalaka pieces were also here seen by me, of which one was unfinished. The model pillars and the other sculptures which are in an unfinished condition leave no doubt in my opinion as to the sculptors of the Gupta period having worked in this quarry and sent their finished products to Madhyamikā to be set up in the structures for which they were destined.

One class of objects which I noticed while surveying the antiquities on the surface of the earth, and which struck me with some astonishment, was the moulded bricks. Only three specimens of this plastic art were found; but they were enough to convince me that this art was practised in olden days at Nagārī,—an inference which was afterwards more than amply corroborated by the find of more moulded bricks in my excavations at the Mahādeva temple mound. These three bricks I found near the open shrine of Kānkali Mātā referred to above (Plate XXI. a). One of them is square, with its border decorated with a ripple ornament and with an erect palm tree standing at one side. The second is a fragment, but enough is preserved to show that it was of a semi-circular shape. The edge is formed by what looks like a lotus nimbus. What the nimbus originally surrounded cannot be made out with certainty, but it appears to be the head-dress of some figures. Of the third brick only the lower portion is preserved, and it shows the lower body of a person seated on a chair. The reason why the discovery of these bricks astonished me was that they should have been found at Nagārī which was situated in a hilly region and where consequently stone was the natural building material. In whichever hilly district we find ancient monuments, we notice that the plastic work is of wrought stone. At Sāfīchī, for example, which is in the midst of hills, we find all sculptures of stone. In Sind or in the plains of the Punjāb and the United Provinces where stone is scarce, the laying of moulded bricks is perfectly normal and intelligible. But it is inexplicable at Nagārī, where one sees nothing but hills all around, and where stone is the natural and cheapest building material. What is still more noteworthy is that the moulded bricks which were unearthed in exca-
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...lations here are terracottas of a high order, and can, in point of texture and artistic merit, bear comparison with those that are found in Gandhāra. Evidently this plastic art seems to have flourished greatly in Madhyamikā, and the question arises: why should it have been in such practice at Nagari where stone mouldings alone would be expected? It is not easy to give a reply, but perhaps the explanation is that it was brought by the Śibis from the Punjāb. It, however, deserves to be noticed that whereas some motifs from Greek art were clearly borrowed in the Gandhāra terracottas, they are conspicuous by their absence in the Madhyamikā specimens. The Śibis migrated into the southern parts of Rājputāna about 150 B.C., at a time when Greek art had not yet exercised any influence over that of Gandhāra, and this seems to be the reason why no Greek influence is traceable in the terracottas found at Nagari.

One other class of objects which I noticed at Nagarī deserves to be described. They are designated ghānīs or oil mills by the people there. But what their exact purpose was is not clear. Six such were found by me, not far from one another, and lying on the east of the southern half of the citadel immediately beyond the moat. Of these, three were laid bare, but only one was found whole and entire (Plate XVI. b). It was 5' 3" high, of which the upper 8" were fairly well dressed. The lower portion was very rough and tapered to the bottom. The top surface has been cut into two concentric rings, of which one is 1' 5" and the other 2' 4" in diameter. The inner ring has been hollowed to a depth of 1' 3½" and is connected with a ladle-shaped slit cut in the vertical face of the ghānī for carrying its contents through a stone channel below into a drain. This drain has an earthen bottom, and its sides are formed of stone chips and brick bats. It was traced over a length of 9', and seems to have been covered with stone slabs. On each side of the ghānī was found a long narrow stone, which no doubt was hammered down to fix the ghānī tight into its position in the hollow in which it was placed.

Of the ancient structures only two are at present standing near Nagarī. The first is that known as Übh-dival or vertical lamp, about a mile north-east and on the outskirts of the village (Plate XVI. a). On its summit, it is said, was placed a huge concave vessel which was filled with cotton seeds soaked in oil. These were lighted and served as a beacon lamp at night to the whole of Akbar's camp when he had come and was settled there for reducing Chitorgarh. It is a pyramidal tower constructed of twenty-one huge square blocks of limestone closely fitted to one another, and is nearly 37' high, including the topmost block which has now fallen down. It is 14' 2" square at the base from outside, and was 2' 6" square at the apex when the fallen block was in position. What its inside is like will be seen from Plate XVII. It will be observed that the structure was solid for 4' from the bottom, then hollow for about 20', and solid again up to the top. The tower has seven small openings which are supposed to be windows for admitting light; but this is very doubtful and the openings seem to have been gaps created by the fractured bits of the stone blocks having disappeared. There are no traces of a staircase inside, and even if there had been any, it could not have led to the summit. Colonel Tod, in his brief
description of this monument, expresses regret that in consequence of an accident he had met he was unable to climb the staircase "trodden no doubt by Akbar's feet." This staircase possibly was an outer one and of wooden construction which has now perished. This monument, like the next to be described, is of such a unique character that it gives rise to several questions such as (1) whether it was really of the time of Akbar, (2) if not, what purpose it originally served, and (3) when it was erected. All these questions will be considered further on.

The other structure is that locally known as Hāthī-bāḍā, about half a mile east of the village. It is an open rectangular enclosure, and is so called because it was used as an elephant stable when Akbar came to invest the fort of Chitorgarh and was encamped near Nagarī. The structure is in a more or less dilapidated condition, but has been sufficiently well preserved to give an idea of what it was originally like (Plates XVI. c. and XVIII). It is 296' long and 151' broad from outside and 290' long and 145' broad from inside. Traces of an entrance are visible in the south wall. Whether there was any similar entrance provided in the north wall, it is now impossible to determine as the greater portion of it has been destroyed. Each wall was originally 9' 6" high, and consisted of five successive layers of heavy massive blocks of laminiferous stone placed one upon the other. The stone was no doubt originally grey in colour, but has now become dark with exposure. The blocks have been well dressed where exposed to view. Of the upper and under surface, only 3" from the edge have been dressed, the remaining portion being left rough but somewhat concave so that only the dressed border of the upper side of one block came in immediate contact with that of the underside of the block upon it, leaving a slight hollow in between. The characteristic feature of the wall is that it is pyramidal in section. Naturally, therefore, not only do blocks vary in thickness in different layers, but no single block has uniform thickness. The thickness of the wall is 3' 6" at the bottom and 1' 3" at the top. Each wall was originally crowned by a coping stone, slightly moulded at the top. The inside of the enclosure was of a fairly uniform level except at the centre where there were traces of a dais said to have been constructed in Akbar's time to feed his elephants.

When I first carefully examined this Hāthī-bāḍā in November last, the first question that occurred to me was: What could have been the purpose of this structure? While I was pondering over this question, I was reminded of the Ghosūndī well inscription summarised above, because the stone on which it was engraved was not only of the same laminiferous variety as that the Hāthī-bāḍā stone, but originally formed part of a massive block similar to those used in that structure. As the stones employed in the construction of the Ghosūndī well are believed to have been taken from Nagarī, it but confirmed my hypothesis. But did the contents of the inscription support it? It spoke of the erection of a pūjā-silā-prākāra by Gājāyana, son of Pārāśārī, for the gods Saṃkarsana and Vāsudeva. Now, what did the Sanskrit expression mean? Obviously it meant a worship stone enclosure, i.e. a stone enclosure round an object of worship to distinguish it from enclosures surrounding, e.g., palatial
buildings. The epigraph was thus found to give confirmation to my hypothesis, because Hāthī-bāḍā was a stone enclosure, and further, if my hypothesis was in any way correct, the inscription told us that the building originally enclosed a shrine of the gods Sānkarshaṇa and Vāsudeva. But it remained to be seen whether any independent testimony could be found to support the inference that the structure was connected with Vāsudeva worship? Accordingly I made a very careful inspection of the stones composing the enclosure walls with a view to see whether there were any inscriptions anywhere engraved. One such record was found. Though it was somewhat weathered, there was no doubt that the letters were to be read Śrī-Viṣṇupādābhyaṁ, and were in characters of the 7th century A.D. Taken by itself, this short record, though it showed that a temple of Viṣṇu was standing here in the 7th century A.D., did not necessarily prove that it was in existence in the 3rd or 4th century B.C., to which period the Ghosāṇḍī inscription had been ascribed. If, however, it was taken in conjunction with and not in isolation from the facts stated above, they all agreed with one another in such a manner as to leave no doubt in my mind that the Hāthī-bāḍā was originally an enclosure round a shrine of Vāsudeva who continued to be worshipped there till 700 A.D. Granting that this conclusion was correct, was there evidence to show that objects of worship were surrounded by stone walls, especially at that early period? Without being dogmatic on the point, I must say that I could not help thinking that what we now called railings round stūpaś were really pūjā-śilā-prākāras, though they were round and ours was rectangular. It is true that no inscription on their railings had yet come to light which told us how they were originally styled. It must, however, be stated in this connection that a similar expression was not unknown to me from an Aśoka inscription. I refer here to silāvigaṇaṁbhichā occurring in the Pañārāyā or Rummindei pillar inscription.¹ Scholars previously divided these letters differently into most embarrassing words, but Sir Ramkrishna Bhandarkar was the first to show that this was really one phrase, meaning “an enclosure or railing made of stone.”² I was glad to find that Dr. Fleet substantially agreed with him.³ Personally I would understand the phrase to mean śilā-vigaṇabhichā, i.e., a huge stone wall. What Aśoka wanted to tell us was that he constructed this wall round the spot of Buddha’s birth, which was already an object of worship and where he actually worshipped. The word vigaṇa in the phrase, which corresponds to the Sanskrit vikāra (huge, stupendous) is noteworthy, and is no doubt significant of the huge massive blocks which must have composed this wall like Hāthī-bāḍā. I could, therefore, safely take it that Hāthī-bāḍā as pūjā-śilā-prākāra was not of a unique character and could very well be supposed to have enclosed an object of worship, which in the present case was the divinities Sānkarshaṇa and Vāsudeva, especially as an exact instance in point was provided by the railing which surrounded the shrine of the latter god unearthed by me near Khām Bābā at Besnagar two years ago. This
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railing, the Hāthī-bāḍā enclosure, and the railings of the stūpas were all pūjā-
śīla-prākāra, though they were of different types. It was now necessary to-
decide whether this was an early structure and especially whether it could have-
existed during the 3rd or 4th century B.C., to which period the inscription has-
been assigned. The mere architectural style of the building did not give us-
much help in fixing its age. It, no doubt, told us that it was a pre-Muham-
madan structure, and its stupendous lithic components indicated that it was to-
be ascribed to a very early period. But what this early period was, the archi-
tectural style was unable to tell. Accordingly I sunk several trenches here, and
also with the object of determining whether any other buildings stood inside or
outside the enclosure. Unfortunately for me I experienced great difficulties in
obtaining an adequate supply of coolies, and though the first and main object
was fulfilled, the second was but very partially realised. The places where the
trenches were cut have all been shown in Plate XVIII.

The ground round the Hāthī-bāḍā was highly undulating, but in a trench at
the south-east corner where there was the maximum accumulation of débris,
coins of Śibi-janapada referred to above were found at a level of about six feet
above the original ground of the Hāthī-bāḍā. I have stated above that these
coins have to be assigned to the middle of the 2nd century B.C. If they are
of such an early period and were found at a much higher level than that of the
original ground of the structure, the latter can easily be assigned to 300 or 250
B.C., to which period the Ghosūṇḍī inscription has to be attributed. Nothing,
therefore, precludes us from supposing that the stone on which this inscription
is engraved was originally part of this enclosure, and that consequently it en-
closed a shrine of Saṅkarshaṇa and Vāsudeva of 300 or 250 B.C. at the latest.
This is, therefore, the earliest trace of a Vāsudeva temple discovered, the next
earliest being that at Besnagar (ancient Vidiśā) which I laid bare near Khām
Bābā two years ago, and which belonged to about 200 B.C.

Very little of the Hāthī-bāḍā shrine has survived. In the west half of the
enclosure were found remains of a brick platform, which originally ran east to
west. It is 34' broad on the east side, the west being untraceable. Of its
length only 15' could be traced on the north, and 12' on the south side. It
seems to have been constructed of three courses of bricks only. The platform
stands on a floor which appears to have spread over the whole ground inside the
enclosure. The floor seems to have been composed of different materials at
different places. In front of the platform it consisted of a course of concrete
upon that of pulverised bricks. In another place it was composed of stone chips
and brickbats well rammed down. As the level of the floor almost coincides
with the top of the foundations of Hāthī-bāḍā walls, it is highly probable that
we have here the ground level of the temple of Saṅkarshaṇa and Vāsudeva
referred to in the Ghosūṇḍī inscription. Possibly the temple stood on the brick
platform. But it is not clear whether the latter was of the time of this inscrip-
tion or of a later period, for we know that it was a place of Vaishnava worship
till the 7th century A.D. It is, however, certain that the platform was con-
nected with one or the other Vaishnava temples here, because the sides of the-
former are parallel to the walls of the Hāthī-bāḍā, and it is equidistantly situated from the north and south walls of the latter. Originally the shrine of Saṅkarṣaṇa and Vāsudeva may have been a wooden construction, and we cannot, therefore, reasonably expect any of its remains to survive to the present day. But its successor, the temple of Vīṣṇu which was standing on this site till 700 A.D., must certainly have been built of stone, and it may perhaps look strange that hardly any of its vestiges should have remained. But this need not be wondered at, because all ancient sites have proved mines for exploitation to the people of the surrounding villages and are made to yield materials to build their dwellings with. In the case of Nagari we know that the stone of its ancient magnificent structures has been carried to all the neighbouring villages up to a distance of 10 miles, and was transported in large quantities even to Chitorgarh, where almost all the old buildings are believed to have been constructed of materials brought from Nagari. An exactly analogous case is furnished by the shrine of Vāsudeva which was in existence near Khām Bābā alluded to above. Though parts of the railing which surrounded it were unearthed, no trace of the shrine itself was found.

With the hope of tracing, as far as possible, the length of the brick platform, I extended my excavations over nearly 130' from its east edge. The failure to trace it beyond 15' did not daunt me, and I now decided to dig deeper than the floor level. I had gone little deeper than 2' when I lighted upon some curious remains whose purpose I have not been able to unravel. Here were exposed the traces of two walls, elliptical in plan and one falling within the other (Plate XVII). The central part of the structure formed by the inner ellipses was 33' long and 11' broad. The circumambulatatory part comprised by the outer ellipses was 46' long and allowed a passage 6' wide all round. The floor of this structure consisted of a layer of surkhi and kankar sandwiched between layers of chunam and kankar and was coated with plaster. The floor was traceable even outside up to 7' 4" on the west. The wall of the circumambulatory passage was composed of plastered mud and its maximum height preserved was 1' 5". The wall of the central part does not appear to have been of uniform construction. Its eastern half was of greater height than the western and was like the wall of the circumambulatory passage formed of plastered mud. The western half consisted of a single horizontal brick course laid on the floor and was coated with plaster, showing that no further masonry course came upon it. How the two parts were joined one to the other is not clear. It is possible that the superstructure here was a wooden erection which has now been all destroyed. Again, we should have normally expected it to be apsidal in plan, as shown by the ancient caves heretofore found. But as we have an instance of a circular cave, there is nothing strange in finding an old structure which is elliptical in plan. As stated above, these remains were found a little more than 2' below the original ground of the Hāthī-bāḍā, and it was, therefore, doubtless older than the temple of Saṅkarṣaṇa and Vāsudeva which this enclosed. If the latter has to be attributed to 300 or 250 B.C., the former may safely be assigned to 350 or 300 B.C. It is not, however, clear whether the
earlier structure was a religious edifice, and, in particular, a temple dedicated to these gods, that is, the predecessor of the one for which the Hāthi-bāḍā enclosure was put up. The fact that the walls of the former are not parallel to those of the enclosure is rather unfavourable to that inference. But it must also be borne in mind that when an old temple falls into ruins and a new one is constructed on its site, they need not necessarily be coincident or their walls parallel to one another. And it is not impossible that the elliptical edifice may be the immediate predecessor of the temple for which the pūjā-sīlā-prākāra was erected.

In this connection it seems very tempting to consider whether the structure Úbh-diival described above was in any way connected with Hāthi-bāḍā. It is impossible not to perceive the points of similarity between the two monuments. Both are composed of huge blocks of laminiferous limestone, piled one upon the other, and are pyramidal in section. This made me wonder whether the Úbh-diival did not originally lie near the Hāthi-bāḍā. Accordingly I began to study the former structure very minutely and carefully. One interesting feature that I now noticed was that the Úbh-diival had no foundations. Evidently, therefore, it must have been brought from elsewhere. This inference was strengthened by the fact that all the stone layers bore holes, which in the case of the larger blocks were to be seen inside also corresponding to the outer ones. The holes appear to me to have been intended for lifting up the stones. It seems that the Úbh-diival did originally stand near the Hāthi-bāḍā. When Akbar came and was encamped near Nagari, his men who turned the Hāthi-bāḍā into an elephant stable must have noticed the other structure, which, just because it could easily be taken to pieces and re-adjusted, was shifted to its present site and made to serve the purpose of a beacon light. And it was for easy conveyance of the stone blocks that the holes referred to above were bored. Originally these must have been cut in the blocks on one of the two pairs of faces opposite of the structure, but they were not reset precisely in their original position so that the majority of these apertures are found on one pair of opposite sides, some are to be seen in the other pair also. There is, therefore, nothing impossible in our supposing that Úbh-diival was originally connected with the temple of Saṅkarshaṇa and Vāsudeva, most probably as a Garuḍa-ākṣaja. The uppermost layer which has now fallen down shows an aperture in the centre of the top, indicating that one more course came upon it, and this may have consisted of an image of Garuḍa.

The ground round the Hāthi-bāḍā is of a highly undulating nature. Thus whereas at the south-east corner the débris has accumulated to half the height of the fourth course of its wall from the bottom, the ground on the west is so low that its foundations have been exposed. This uneveness is, in the main, due to the rain water coming in torrents from a neighbouring hill and scouring its way through the various places round this structure. I had a mind to clear away the whole accumulation up to a distance of at least 75 feet all around. This was no doubt a stupendous task, but it was certainly one which could have been accomplished if I had been able to obtain the requisite number of coolies. The
excavation, again, if it had been carried out, would, I am sure, have told an
interesting story of the Nārāyaṇa-vāta where the temple of Saṅkarshaṇa and
Vāsudeva stood. As it was, I had to be content with sinking a few trenches.
One was cut near the south-west corner of the Hāthī-bāda. We had dug hardly
one foot when the rubble foundations of an old residence were exposed. They
were about 30' distant from the south wall, and were traced over a space of
50' × 32'. On the west they were found to extend still farther, but were not
laid bare. The top of these foundations was found to be on the same level as
the original ground of the Hāthī-bāda, and it is possible that we have here the
house of the Pujārīs who were in charge of the temple. But the temple, as
we have seen, was in existence from 250 B.C. to 700 A.D., and we cannot
expect one and the same house to serve as a dwelling for the Pujārīs throughout
this long period. It may, therefore, be naturally asked: to what period did the house belong? Slightly above the foundations was picked up a
terracotta seal-die bearing the name Datilasya in reversed characters of the 5th
century A.D. (Plate XXIV, No. 90). On the other hand, a coin of the Śibi tribe
(150 B.C.) was found here on a level slightly lower than the top of the
foundations. It thus appears that the house was in the occupation of the Pujārīs
perhaps from about 50 B.C. to 500 A.D. and that Datila might be one of them.

Immediately below the foundations of the Pujārīs' house were found the
traces of a plastered floor almost exactly similar to that of the elliptical
structure described above. The levels of both are very nearly the same, and they
may consequently be of the same period. The chunam floor indicates that there
was here a dwelling house of an earlier period upon which the later one was
constructed. The former may have been occupied by the Pujārīs of the elliptical
shrine which was the predecessor of that of Saṅkarshaṇa and Vāsudeva.

In front of the Pujārīs' house, but leaving its foundations undisturbed, we
dug still deeper until we lighted upon a number of earthen pots. There were as
many as 215 of these in a space of 15' 6" long and 8'' broad. They were all
kept upside down and were filled either with ashes or with sand. These were
not all that were so arranged here. Their rows must have spread farther southwards. But these were not exposed as it would have involved the demolition
of the south-east corner of the house. They were lying nearly 2' below the
chunam floor just alluded to. Earthen pots were found also at the south-east
corner of the Hāthī-bāda where, too, a little excavation work was done. The
earthen pots here were laid bare in two groups at two different places, and were
also found filled with either ashes or sand. Curiously enough, the eastern of
these groups was here too found in the immediate vicinity of and only two feet
below a chunam plastered floor. This was a noteworthy fact. For there were
here two instances of a chunam floor being found nearly two feet above earthen
pots. Now two questions arise: (1) Why were the floors plastered not only
at the south-west and south-east corners of the Hāthī-bāda but also in the
elliptical structure inside? (2) Why were earthen pots, filled with ashes or sand,
deposited? I confess I cannot give any satisfactory replies, but it is possible
that the chunam plastering was done to safeguard the place against the depre-
dations of white ants and the pots were laid to keep away damp from the dwelling houses.

The plastered floor unearthed at the south-east corner seems to have been flanked by wallings on two sides at least, showing the existence of a dwelling house here. The floor was nearly 5' 9" higher in level than the ground of the Hāthī-bādā. The floor and the house are no doubt later than the enclosure and much later than the plastered floor exposed at the south-west corner. It must not; however, be supposed that the two were separated by a very long period, as no doubt the accumulation of débris to the height of 6' is apt to lead one to suppose, because close beside the floor and the dwelling house near the south-east corner, but slightly above their level, were brought to light two coins of the Śibi tribe. This shows that they were not much posterior to 150 B.C., to which time the coins have been ascribed.

The second place, where I excavated at Nagari, was a mound in the southern half of the citadel surmounted by a modern shrine of Mahādeva. This was, no doubt, the stūpa mound alluded to by Carleyle. It is true that the illustration he has given of it points rather to the mound locally known as Kunyārḍī, two miles south of Nagari, but, on the other hand, it must be remembered that he distinctly tells us that it was “within the area of the site of the ruined fortress of the ancient city.” This description can apply to the Mahādeva temple mound only, and not to Kunyārḍī, which is two miles away from the citadel. It is true, again, that the “plain, small, modern roofless shrine” which, he says, was perched on its top, indicates the latter rather than the former mound which is surmounted by a domed, and consequently not a roofless, shrine. Again, the architrave of the Buddhist gateway, which, he tells us, was standing on the mound, is lying on the former, and not on the latter. It appears that Carleyle had seen both the mounds, but that when he was writing out his account probably five years after he visited Nagari, he confused them together. But the most decisive marks in the present case are his location of the mound in the citadel and his reference to the architrave, and these unmistakably show that he had the Mahādeva temple mound in view.

Before starting the operations at this place, I made a very careful survey of the mound and was fortunate enough to detect just a trace of a brick walling on the north side. I started excavation here, and as this wall was being cleared, it led to the partial exposure of other walls; when these last were being laid bare, they afforded indications of still more walls so that ere long there was here a regular intricate network of wallings whose purpose I was unable to understand till the extremest walls were exposed. As the outer face of these was decorated with mouldings and no traces of wallings were detected outside them, it convinced me that they were really the extremest walls of a wide brick platform. None of these wallings, it is worthy of note, showed any marks of windows or doors, which they no doubt would have done if they had formed part of dwellings. There can, therefore, be no doubt that these wallings did not represent the remains of any ancient houses, but were intended to form a frame-work for effectively bonding together the moulded walls of the platform,
the intervening spaces in the framework being filled in with earth. A well-known instance of the construction of such a framework is that furnished by a structure called Pakki kuṭi excavated by Dr. Vogel at Saheṭ-Mahet. An idea of the mouldings which adorned the outer face of the platform can be obtained from Plate XIX. b, and its plan understood, from Plate XX. The severity and monotony of the outer moulded wall are relieved by three projections in the centre, one on each of the north, west and south sides, and jutting out 9' 8" from the main line of alignment. It will be seen from the plan that the east side was unlike the other sides of the platform, and shows that it and its superstructure faced that direction. The maximum height preserved of its moulded walls is 4', and is found in the west wall. This seems to be nearly half of the original height of the platform. Though the upper half of its walls has fallen down, it appears from the terracottas picked up from its débris, to have been covered with decorative tiles of at least three types, some of them probably arranged in string courses. One type is represented by what may be styled bird terracottas (Plate XXII. a). These consist of moulded bricks, measuring approximately 13"×9"×2½" each, with the left end raised into a rim 3½"×2, and the border decorated with an incised line, and holding in high relief either a swan or a pigeon. The swan is shown either as stretching its neck to the ground, as in the act of feeding, or as cleaning its plumage. The pigeon has been more or less conventionalised, with its crest flowing loose at the back tail elongated into an intricate but artistic scroll, and breast plumage hanging down heavily. The second type is represented by human heads, which here seem to have been placed in pairs, one male and one female (Plate XXI. b and c). The male is invariably an old face with wonder-struck expression, and the female a young face with either a half smiling or a placid expression. The facial expression and the contour of the head are strikingly naturalistic. The two together have a framing, semi-oval in shape. The specimens found, all except one, face full front. The exception is a female head, which is so turned as to expose only three-fourths of the face. Similar heads forming wall ornamentations but of a later period were recovered by Dr. Spooner during his excavations at Shāh-ji-ki-Dheri, along with floral ornaments, some of which are of lotus design. One kind of these is called by him grinning heads or grotesques, and the other, serious doll-like heads. The third type of decorative tiles consists of bricks, measuring 8"×7½"×2½" and with oblong bottoms and semi-circular tops. They are carved with lotus flowers of various conventional forms (Plate XXII. b). These tiles most probably formed a string course. How the others were arranged on the face of the walls is not clear.

The centre of the platform was originally occupied by a superstructure, very little of which has now survived. It is 43' 6" square at the base. Immediately below each side of this square is a foundation wall, 6' thick. The space enclosed by these foundation walls is filled with a network of wallings similar to that of the platform. The moulded walls of the platform as well as those

1 Arch. Annual, 1907-8, p. 109.
2 Ibid., 1908-9, p. 55 and Fig. 3.
of the frameworks rest on layers of long stones which are oblong and hammer-dressed in the case of the former, but rough and shapeless in the case of the latter. The top level of the platform coincided with the base line of the recesses in the lowermost moulding of the superstructure, because, in the first place, the bricks used in the walls are of an inferior texture and gloss and the joints marked are rough and wide up to the sill level, from where upwards they are of a superior kind and the joints fine. Secondly, the offset referred to is not observable on the east or front side where all the framework walls run straight up to the sill level.

Of the superstructure only the lowermost moulding has been preserved, which is nearly two feet high. Each side seems originally to have been broken up into two recesses, each 6' from the corner, and measuring approximately 6'×2'×2' . Only one recess, however, is well-preserved, and the singular feature of it is that, although it is a recess, it has a small projection in one corner. No special feature of the superstructure was detected and no finds were here made which could prove the religious character of the building. Small pits were, however, sunk on its top without doing any damage to the Mahâdeva shrine which is at present perched on it; and they convinced me that it was one solid mass of well-laid bricks and not of bricks fallen pell-mell. This seems to suggest the idea that the superstructure was a stûpa,—an inference which receives some corroboration from the fact that contiguous with the east wall of the platform, at the place marked B in Plate XX, were found remains which looked like those of a miniature stûpa 11' square and that the ruins of another smaller stûpa containing ashes were noticeable behind the principal monument and shown at C of the same Plate. But here a difficulty arises. The superstructure, as stated above, is a square, and if it was originally a stûpa, it means that it was a square stûpa of which no instance has so far been known. It is true that no square stûpa has so far been found or unearthed. But attention may in this connection be directed to an edifice represented on a rail bar medallion recovered in the excavations of the Jaina stûpa at Mathura.1 It is a structure built in horizontal tiers and must be a stûpa as indicated by the heavy sausage-shaped garlands. It is not impossible that the superstructure on the platform may be a stûpa of similar construction. There was, however, exhumed here absolutely nothing that marked it as a Buddhist or Jaina monument. Is it possible that we have here the remains of a Hindu stûpa? For a long time we were so much accustomed to hearing about and seeing Buddhist stûpas only, that a stûpa pertaining to and worshipped by the Jaina or any religious sect was looked upon as inconceivable. But excavations at Mathurâ and the culling of references to it from their scriptures left no doubt that the stûpa as an object of worship was not unknown to the ancient Jainas. There is nothing, therefore, primâ facie impossible in the ancient Hindus also having constructed stûpas and worshipped them. In fact, Dr. Bühler has adduced cogent reasons for supposing that they were used and worshipped by all Hindus.

1 The Jaina Stûpa and other Antiquities of Mathurâ, Plate LXXII, Fig. 1.
sects that followed the Jñāna and Bhakti-Mārgas. The only antiquity exhumed on this site which bears the marks of any religion is the torana. A description of it will shortly follow, but here it will suffice to state that as its architraves are sculptured with incidents from Śiva's life and its pillars with his door-keepers, it was erected here before the god Śiva. Thus the only significant objects found on this site point to its being devoted to Hindu worship, whereas it is conspicuous for the absence of any antiquities which are characteristically Buddhistic or Jaina. It will not, therefore, be unreason able to infer that the stūpa or funeral monument on this site may belong to a Hindu, possibly Śaiva, sect, if we are right at all in supposing that it existed, on the evidence furnished by the formation of the inner core of the ruined superstructure subsisting on the platform.

As might be expected in the case of such an old monument, additions and alterations were made from time to time. The first period is characterised by the rise of the platform top level by at least 6”. Two new walls, one on each side, were also erected in the east or front part of the platform. But the chief peculiarity of this period is the plaster with which both the stūpa and the platform walls were covered. The second period is marked by the introduction of stone work. The ground floor and the platform top were both paved with stone. The original access to the stūpa, which seems to have been through two wall projections on the east and nearly 13’ apart, appears at this time to have been provided with a stone entrance, of which only the moonstone, the threshold, and the lintel in two fragments were exhumed. No portions of the jambs came to light. The lintel seems to have been ornamented by the models of the chaitya window of the early Gupta style, each containing a Kirtimukha. Curiously enough, the stūpa appears to have been furnished on the north with a stone water channel which was taken through the inner core of the platform and terminated outside in a makara gargoyle. This gargoyle is the only portion of the water channel which is well-dressed and must consequently have been fixed into and exposed to view from the north wall of the platform. The daily ablution waters fell through the makara mouth into a small brick cistern from which they were carried westwards to the river side by means of a drain. The drain consisted of bricks, and was covered also with bricks but set on edge.

The laying bare of the stone water channel here makes it doubtful whether the original edifice was really a stūpa, for I at any rate am not aware of any stūpa being provided with a channel. Such channels have so far been invariably found by me connected with shrines, and hence I tried my very best to find out whether there were any traces of a sanctum of the early Gupta period. But I discovered no signs of it. Of course, as stated above, there is a shrine there

---

2 Or it may be that we have here the double platform of some wooden shrine which has disappeared. But this conjecture appears to me less probable, because, as already stated, the uniform solid formation of the upper structure and the presence of two smaller stūpas, one in front of and the other behind the platform, points to its having been rather a brick stūpa than a wooden shrine on a double platform.
THE ARCHÆOLOGICAL REMAINS AND EXCAVATIONS AT NAGARI.

at present which is dedicated to Mahâdeva. But it is quite a modern erection and was put up about 60 years ago (as I was informed) by a bairâgī collecting subscriptions from the Banias of Nagari and the neighbouring villages. A portion of a water channel projects from its north wall, and hence I at first surmised that it was constructed on the site of an early Gupta shrine. But this was nothing but a surmise. The water channel of the modern shrine is not in the same line with and was therefore in no way connected with the channel described above, which, so far as evidence goes, started from the north wall of the edifice and ended with that of the platform. This whole channel had been buried in earth when I excavated, that of the Mahâdeva shrine alone being visible. Hence it is all but certain that the latter must have been brought from somewhere and stuck into the modern shrine for taking away the ablution waters. As no undoubted trace of an early Gupta sanctum was here discovered, there seems to be no escape from regarding the water channel as having been somehow connected with the stûpa, supposing, of course, that I am correct in inferring that one stood here.

To the second period of additions characterised by the introduction of stone work, or possibly to a period slightly later, belong the remains of a stone torâna exhumed in front of the mound. One whole pillar was found though in five fragments, and of the other a few tiny pieces only were recovered. The pillar is oblong and not square in section. About 1' 10" at the bottom is rough dressed and was no doubt underground when the pillar stood erect. Excepting the plain surface of 6" above the line demarcating the rough from the dressed surface the pillar has been carved on all its four sides. Of the less broad sides the outer or north is sculptured with a long undulating line consisting of a series of lotus stalks inserted one into the other and with their petals occupying the panels formed by the undulation. The inner or south side is divided into three compartments by four lotus medallions, and each compartment is decorated with vertical flutes, the central of which is filled with a spiral leaf ornament. The broader sides of the pillar are each broken up into five panels and surmounted by a Kirtimukha. Each two of the upper four panels are probably intended to represent the front elevation of a two-storeyed mansion of that age, the demarcation of one storey from the other being denoted by a member which looks like an image pedestal and the roof closely resembling the front of that of a Chaitya cave of about the fifth century A.D. and in particular to the pediment of the niches in the second storey of the Viśvakarma Cave at Ellora. The lowermost panel is equal in height to any two of the upper, and represents only a one-storeyed but tall building. This last is occupied by a male on the east, and a female on the west, side. The male has matted hair. His left hand holds a trident standing vertically on the ground, and his right rests on the knot of his dupatâ or shoulder scarf near the waist. He also bears a third eye in the forehead. All these are clear indications of his being an attendant of Śiva. The female in the lowermost panel on the west stands under a tree with the right hand clutching the border of her dupatâ and the left upraised and touching a branch of a tree. Her chignon bears a curious resemblance to-
that of the present Malayalese woman. The upper panels are each occupied by a pair of lovers standing near trees, the female in one being on the left, and in the other immediately adjacent on the right, of the male. The male is shown with hair curls similar to a barrister's wig, on which he bears a helmet adorned with a horn.

About 17’ 6” from where the torana pillar was unearthed, a big rough stone was found, approximately oblong in shape and measuring 4’ 7”×3’ 2”×1’ 6”.

An oblong space, 2’ 4”×1’ 11” was marked on its top surface by three incised lines along with one edge of the stone, and was hammer-dressed. The stone was so lying that its longer sides were parallel to the moulding lines of the east or front wall of the platform. It was, therefore, I thought, somehow connected with it. But its object I was for a long time unable to apprehend. Suddenly, however, the idea occurred to me that possibly the torana pillar rested upon it. So I took the measurements of its lower end, which were 2’ 4”×1’ 9½”, and which no doubt almost coincided with those of the oblong marked on the stone. This was evidently the foundation stone on which the pillar was set up. Close beside this stone were laid bare three pieces of what appeared to be the sides of an image pedestal, each 3’ 4½” high. The height of the stone is 1’ 6”, and that of the rough dressed portion of the pillar 1’ 10¾”.

These give a total of 3’ 4½”—the exact height of the pedestal stones. I have, therefore, no doubt that these last were originally placed round the foundation stone, and the voids between them and the torana pillar were tightly packed with fillings so as to make it firm and stable.

The torana seems to have had only two architraves. At any rate, fragments of only two were exhumed. Of the lower, only three pieces were found; and although they do not make up one complete architrave, enough has been recovered to show that each broader side was originally divided into nine panels. Only one end has been preserved, and contains, on each side in panel, a flying Vidyādhara bearing a garland. The other panels portray scenes from Śiva’s life. One of these is clearly occupied by a nude Bhairava with his vehicle the dog. Another holds Śiva seated on a pedestal and below a tree, like a Buddha or rather a Tirthamkara, with his hands placed one upon the other on the soles of his feet. He bears matted hair and mundras in his ears, and is flanked by four devotees, two on each side. The plastic style of the statuary both on the pillar and the architrave has a great resemblance to that noticeable on the sculptures found at Garhwa. The underside of this architrave bears and continues the carving which adorns the inner side of the torana pillar. Its upper side is not sculptured at all, as might be expected, and supported two stone blocks separating the lower from the upper architrave, as is clearly indicated by two groups of apertures, each comprising four. These show that each block was 1’ 11½” long and 1’ 4½” broad. The upper architrave is decorated on each broader side with a repetition of models of the facade of a chaitya roof and ends with makara mouths. Neither its under nor its upper side is sculptured,

1 Cunningham, Arch. Surv. Rep., Vol. X, Plates VI and VII.
but the mortices in the latter show that the gateway was crowned with pinnacles, two near the ends and one in the centre. Near the north-east corner of the platform was found the head of a fabulous animal—a horned horse, which may possibly have crowned the torana at one end. A rough idea of what the torana as a whole was will be obtained from Plate XXIII.1

Behind the stūpa, excavations were carried right up to the western rampart of the citadel. About 22' from the central projection of the west wall of the stūpa platform were laid bare the remains of what looks a stūpa of the same type as the former but of much smaller dimensions, measuring only 10' 5" × 5' 10" at the base. Very little of it has been preserved, but what has survived shows that like the bigger one it was solidly built of bricks and with a moonstone in front. Beyond ashes nothing was found in it. As both the stūpas are very nearly of the same level, the smaller one seems to have been built at a period not much posterior to that of the larger.

Nearly 25' to the north of the smaller stūpa and contiguous with the brick drain referred to above were brought to light the remains of a long narrow chamber built of bricks (D on Plate XX). In fact, this chamber seems to have fallen into ruins when the drain was laid as it is through these ruins that the way for the drain has been cut. Along its east wall were found seven small stone uprights placed in a row. As human ashes and bones were found here, they appear to have been sepulchral stelae. A small brick water channel was also exposed in parts, and no doubt carried off the ablution waters of the stela.

It has been stated above that in the list of the antiquarian remains of Mewār compiled by the late Sir Alexander Pinhey with the help of Rai Bahadur Gaurishankar Ojha mention is made of two Buddhist stūpa mounds near Nagārī. On inquiring of the latter I learnt that one of these was Kunyārdi, 2 miles south of Nagārī, and the other was about one mile and a half north-east of it. The latter had been partially dug into at the top by the Rai Bahadur when he was in the service of the Udaipur State. I examined this mound carefully and was convinced that it was not a Buddhist stūpa. There was nothing but kankar and gravel at the base of the mound, and the top opened by him revealed here the existence of a brick platform on a bedding of mortar. This was hardly what might be expected in a stūpa mound. However, I made up my mind to put my inference to test by doing some digging work and with this object in view, selected the other mound, which was much bigger and unopened and, as stated above, was the one confounded by Carliole with the Mahādeva stūpa mound. It was on the top of this mound, again, that the pieces of the rail pillar, bar and coping described above were found, which no doubt raised the presumption of an old railing having stood there. The top and the east and west sides of the mound were excavated. Three trenches were also sunk at three different places at the foot of the mound. The digging operations were conducted for four consecutive days. On the top were exposed the remains of a brick platform on a mortar bedding similar to that in the

---

1 This appears to be only one torana standing in front of the monument, two at the sides and one in the centre. The present one seems to be the one standing on the north side.
other mound. But beyond this absolutely nothing but sand was found here, and no antiquity of any description was brought to light. I have no doubt that these mounds do not represent the ruins of any stūpas. The other mound, viz., that to the north-east of Nagari, is not far from where the Ūbh-dīval stands at present. And as I was surveying the ground round about, five or six more mounds attracted my attention. They were within three-quarters of a mile of the Ūbh-dīval but situated within the boundaries of an adjoining village called Amalheḍā. This was, no doubt, the place from where Akbar’s camp began, which, we are told, extended as far northwards as Pāṇḍoli. Personally I think that the mounds were raised by Akbar’s men for mounting battery, not with a view to shell Chitorgarh which was impossible, as it was at least ten miles from this place, but for the protection of the camp itself to ward off any surprise attacks at night. The fact that the Nagari mounds were topped with brick platforms confirms my inference, for these could have been raised to support a battery. About half a mile to the south of the beacon light is found an earthen embankment, the purpose of which nobody at Nagari was able to explain to me. Not far from the Kunyārdī mound was another similar embankment. In all probability these embankments like the mounds formed part of the scheme of fortification executed by Akbar for the safety of his camp.

D. R. BHANDARKAR.
THE ARCHÄOLOGICAL REMAINS AND EXCAVATIONS AT NAGARĪ.

MAHĀDEVA TEMPLE MOUND.

Terracottas.

(A) ORNAMENTAL BRICKS.

(1) Human heads.

1. Head (ht. 8\(\frac{3}{4}\)"; br. 9\(\frac{3}{4}\); thickness 3" at upper edge and 1\(\frac{3}{4}\)" at lower edge) with a quarter oval frame over it on the left, decorated with a lotus design inside and reaching down to 2" from the lower edge; face aged, with wonder-struck expression; ear-lobes perforated, eye-balls moved towards the left corner; tip of tongue peeping through the lips; chin double; necklace round the neck; wears a close-fitting cap with the top fastened with a band; two ringlets of hair peeping on the forehead from inside the cap border. Light red clay with dark red slip of which slight indications are left.

2. Head (ht. 8\(\frac{3}{4}\); br. 8\(\frac{3}{4}\); thickness at upper edge 3\(\frac{7}{8}\), at lower 1\(\frac{5}{8}\)) bordered on the right with a quarter oval frame reaching to 2\(\frac{7}{8}\) from the lower edge, and decorated with a lotus design as in (1); face, young and laughing; bears ear-rings, and necklace of cable pattern; two folds of the upper garments showing above necklace; hair parted in the middle, and tied into a top knot, with locks on either side, covering up the ears; nose and left cheek damaged. Light red clay with dark red slip of which traces remain.

3. Head (ht. 8\(\frac{1}{4}\); br. 6\(\frac{3}{4}\)) with lotus frame on the right, as in (2) part of which is broken off; face elderly with wonder-struck expression; ear-lobes pierced; tongue tip peeping through the lips; necklace round the neck as in (1); bears three ornaments, one in the centre just above the forehead and one on either side just above the top of the ear; originally with a close-fitting cap, of which the top is now destroyed. Light red clay, with dark red slip of which traces remain.

4. Head with left lotus frame, as in (1) in two pieces; face with placid, serious expression; bears ear-ring in right ear, hair combed backwards and tied into a top knot; tiny pendant let loose on the forehead by means of a string fastened to the top knot; left ear and portion below neck broken off. Light red clay, with dark red slip.

5. Head with the whole background and part of the right side damaged; face with placid expression, with a tinge of smile; bears ear-ring in left ear; hair combed backwards, and tied into a top knot (now lost), with a pendant as in (4).

6. 4 Heads broken in 8, 6, 6 and 3 fragments respectively, with traces of oval frame to the left in the first and to the right in the remaining; face, with placid expression, as in (4); traces of ear-rings in the last three and cable-like necklace in the first two.

(2) Birds.

7. Rectangular brick (12\(\frac{1}{4}\)"×8\(\frac{3}{4}\)"×2\(\frac{3}{4}\)"), holding in high relief the figure of a swan, facing to the left, lengthening its neck low to the ground as in the act
of feeding; border decorated with incised line; to the left, rim raised 3\(\frac{1}{4}\)" high and 1\(\frac{3}{8}\)" broad, with edge decorated with incisions.

8. Rectangular brick (13\(\frac{3}{8}\)"×9"×2\(\frac{1}{2}\)) broken in 6 fragments holding in high relief the figure of a swan, gracefully bending its neck and with the beak touching the breast as in the act of cleaning its plumage; border decorated with incised line; to the left, rim raised 3\(\frac{1}{4}\)" high and 1\(\frac{3}{8}\)" broad, with edge decorated with incisions.

9. Rectangular brick (14\(\frac{1}{2}\)"×9"×2\(\frac{1}{2}\)) broken in four pieces with a fragment at the lower right corner missing; holds in high relief the figure of a pigeon in profile with neck held aloft, crest flowing loose at the back, tail elongated into a conventional scroll and breast plumage hanging loosely and touching the rim; border decorated with incised line; to the left, rim raised as in (8).

10. Brick (9"×2\(\frac{1}{4}\)) with the figure of a pigeon, carved in alto relievo, similar to (9), in the main details, with a slight difference in the treatment of the tail scroll and spotted wings; portion to the left, with the rim destroyed.

11. Brick (8"×7\(\frac{1}{8}\)"×2\(\frac{1}{2}\)) rectangular, with semicircular top; holds, in relief, a four-leaved lotus with an anther (2" in dia.) in the centre.

12. Brick (7\(\frac{1}{8}\)"×7\(\frac{1}{8}\)"×2\(\frac{1}{2}\)) similar in shape to (11) holds six-leaved lotus, with a square anther (2" side) in the centre.

13. Brick, similar in shape and size to (12) but broken, holds six-leaved lotus with a central disc (3" dia.) which itself is a lotus consisting of six leaves and an anther.

14. Brick similar to above, and broken; holds eight-leaved lotus with central disc (3\(\frac{1}{2}\)" dia.), consisting of a six-leaved lotus and an anther.

15. Brick (7\(\frac{1}{8}\)"×8"×2") rectangular, with a square circle top; slightly broken; holds six-leaved lotus with an anther and ovary in the centre.

16. Brick, quadrant shaped, (dia. 7\(\frac{1}{8}\)), perhaps forming one-fourth of a medallion, which consisted of a full blown lotus.

(B) Figurines.

(1) Human.

17. Upper half of female figure, (ht. 2\(\frac{1}{4}\", br. 2\(\frac{1}{4}\") standing, bears ear-rings, necklace and girdle; two streamers at the top, one on either side. Buff clay.

18. Upper half of female figure, (ht. 2\(\frac{1}{4}\", br. 2") similar to above. Dark red clay.

19. Torso of a female figure, in two pieces; feet broken off; right hand resting on belly and left hanging by the side. Buff clay.

20. Lower half of female (?) figure, (ht. 2\(\frac{3}{8}\", br. 2") standing, wears loose garment tied near the waist by means of a string; traces of necklace. Buff clay.

21. Torso of a male figure, (ht. 2\(\frac{1}{2}\", br. 2\(\frac{1}{4}\")); standing, below, to the right, tiny figure, seated cross-legged, perhaps Buddha.

(2) Animals.

22. Upper half of figure of a monkey; (ht. 1\(\frac{1}{4}\") right hand as in the act of eating. Buff red clay, with thin white paint.
23. Elephant (6½" long), feet and trunk broken off. Light red clay.
26. Bull (ht. 1½", length 2½") with horns and two of the feet broken off; mouth perforated sidewise. Slightly baked clay.

(C) Pottery.
28. Jar (ht. 3½") similar to (27). Black clay.
29. Lid of jar (dia. 3¾") with a circular hole in the centre probably for straining ghee. Buff clay.
30. Three pieces of necks of three different Surais. Light red clay with dark red slip and polish.
31. Spout of vessel; (ht. 2½") curiously shaped. Light red clay with dark red slip.
33. Jar (ht. 1¾") with mouth broken. Light red clay.
34. Jar (ht. 2½") of different shape. Buff clay.
36. Tiny lid of jar (dia. 1¾"). Buff clay.
37. Two fragments of a vessel with knobs on the outside.
38. Part of hollow pinnacle (ht. 10½", dia. 6½") in seven pieces; originally consisting of rimmed cylinder broadening towards the bottom, with a ribbed vessel-shaped top piece.

Stone Objects.
39. Image of Mahishāsuramardini (4¾"×3½") in 5 fragments; portions at the top and bottom missing; four handed, holds in upper right hand, triśūla, which is hurled against the Buffalo demon; in lower right, sword; in lower left, the tail of the demon; upper right hand is missing. Greenish slate stone.
40. Head (ht. 10") of a fabulous animal, perhaps a horse with horns; mouth broken off; mane plaited into lattice work. Buff coloured sandstone.
41. Fragment of figure representing a rider; only the right foot and part of trappings of the animal are left; spiral lines. Soft greenish stone.
42. Fragment of figure of a lion (?); only portion of the mane preserved. Sandstone.

 Metallic Objects.
43. Iron arrow head (2½" long) square pyramid shaped.
44. Similar (3¹⁄₄" long).
45. Similar (3³⁄₄" long).
46. Spear head (6" long) with pointed edge.
47. Similar (7½" long, and 1½" broad) with broader blade.
48. Similar (7½" long), but shaped differently, and edge thicker.
49. Reel-shaped hollow copper tube; (ht. 2", dia. 1\frac{1}{8}"") plain surface at top and bottom, decorated with incised concentric circles.

50. Similar (ht. 1\frac{1}{4}"") with upper surface destroyed.

51. Iron bell (ht. 2\frac{1}{4}", dia. 2\frac{1}{4}"") in three pieces.

52. Iron nails of various shapes and sizes.

Beads and Amulets.

53. Round crystal bead (dia. 1/4").

54. Flat round cornelian bead (ht. 1/8", dia. 1/8").

55. Cornelian bead (3/4" long), cut into facets.


57. Globular agate bead (dia. 3/8") of light brown colour.

58. Flat oval-shaped glass bead (3/4" long) of dark green colour; perforated lengthwise.

59. Blue glass bead (dia. 1/4").

60. Terracotta bead (dia. 1\frac{1}{4}"), buff-coloured, double-cone-shaped.

61. Terracotta amulet (ht. 1\frac{3}{4}"") buff-coloured, truncated-cone-shaped; perforated horizontally near the top.

62. Terracotta amulet (ht. 1\frac{1}{4}", dia. 1/4") dark coloured cylindrical; perforated horizontally near the top.

HĀTHĪ-BĀḌĀ.

Terracottas.

(A) Animal Figurines.

63. Upper part of figure of monkey (ht. 3\frac{1}{4}"); right hand as in the act of eating, and left raised to shoulder; eyes represented by two concentric circles in relief. Light red clay.

64. Torso of elephant (3\frac{3}{4}" long). Light red clay.

65. Elephant (2\frac{3}{4}" long); trunk and hinder legs broken off. Buff clay.

66. Elephant (4\frac{3}{4}" long); trunk and legs broken off. Ochre-coloured clay.

67. Torso of uncertain animal (4\frac{1}{4}" long). Light red clay.

68. Torso of uncertain animal (4 1/2" long). Light red clay.

69. Torso of uncertain animal (3\frac{1}{4}" long). Light red clay.

70. Bull (ht. 1"; 1\frac{3}{4}" long), mouth and one of the legs broken off. Black clay.

71. Dog barking (ht. 3/8"; 1\frac{1}{4}" long). Buff clay.

(B) Pottery.

72. Pot (ht. 8", dia. at top 3\frac{3}{4}"") with rounded bottom, and broad mouth. Buff-red clay. Found in the group of pots unearthed near the south-east corner of Hāthī-bāḍā.
73. Pot (ht. 6", dia. 3½") with rounded bottom and broad mouth with brim. Buff clay.
74. Pot (ht. 6½", dia. 3½") similar to (73) but no brim. Buff clay.
75. Pot (ht. 6½", dia. 3½") with rounded bottom and long neck; wider in the centre. Light red clay.
76. Jar (ht. 7½", dia. 3") with flat bottom, and narrow neck; mouth spread out; gradually widening from neck to bottom; neck partly broken. Buff clay.
77. Pot (ht. 6½", dia. 4½"), broad mouth, bulging out in the centre, tapering towards the bottom. Light red clay. Found in the group of pots unearthed near the south-west corner of Hāthī-bāḍā.
78. Jar (ht. 4", dia. 2") with neck broken; flat bottom, bulging centre. Red clay.
79. Jar (ht. 3½", dia. 2") with mouth broken; flat bottom centre bulging out more pointedly than in (78). Light red clay.
80. Pot (ht. 3¼", dia. 3½") with broad mouth and rounded bottom. Red clay.
81. Tiny vase (ht. 3", dia. 1¾") with mouth partly broken. Buff clay.
82. Bowl (ht. 2", dia. 2¾") with thick out-turned lip. Buff clay.
83. Lid (ht. 2½", dia. 4½") narrow at the bottom but widening towards top; in the centre, hollow (2" dia.). Light red clay, with thin wash.
84. Lid (ht. 1", dia. 3½") similar to (83) in the centre, hollow (1½" dia.).
85. Lid (ht. 1¾", dia. 3¾"), Buff clay.
86. Small lamp or chīrāg (2" dia.). Light red clay.
87. Miniature cup (ht. 3¾"), Buff clay.
88. Finial (ht. 16"), top broken, consisting of several horizontal ribs at the top and centre and a cylinder gradually widening at the bottom.
89. Fragment of a ridge tile (9" long).

(C) Seal and Sealing.
90. Circular terracotta seal die, with handle; (dia. 85") ; circular line around the margin; within, inscription, in nail-headed characters (prevalent in Central India about the 5th century A.D.) Datilasya.
91. Terracotta sealing (dia. 65"), half-burnt; with symbol.

(D) Miscellaneous.
92. Terracotta piece (2"×2") with four projecting ends.
93. Terracotta piece (1¾"×2½") with moulding.
94. Terracotta ball, light red clay.
95. Two rectangular brick tablets; (4½"×3½") one side convex and rough, with deep ripple-like incisions, and the other flat. Used for rubbing and cleaning the feet.
96. Similar tablet (4½"×3½") with both sides flat and rough with ripple-like incisions.
Beads and Amulets.

97. Greenish glass bead (\(\frac{3}{4}\)" long) triangular prism shaped.
98. Pale blue glass bead (\(\frac{1}{4}\)" long) half orange-shaped.
99. Flat round banded burnt agate bead, (dia. \(\frac{1}{2}\)") black with white bands.
100. Similar (dia. \(\frac{7}{8}\)") but greyish white with black bands.
101. Glass bead (ht. \(\frac{5}{8}\)", dia. \(\frac{5}{8}\)") cylindrical, with slightly concave sides.
Pale green with light yellow tint.
102. Terracotta amulet (ht. \(1\frac{1}{2}\)") truncated cone shaped, with slight depressions at top and bottom. Perforated sidewise near the top. Buff clay.

D. R. BHANDARKAR.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Metal and Size</th>
<th>Obverse</th>
<th>Reverse</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>AE. 6</td>
<td>Hāthi-bādā</td>
<td>2 symbols punched over the surface—&lt;br&gt;(1) The Solar Symbol.</td>
<td>(1) &quot;Ujjain Symbol.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Punch-marked.</td>
<td>(2) Tree in railing.</td>
<td>(2) Caduceus.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Symbols Nos. 1, 3 and 4.</td>
<td>(3) Another Solar Symbol.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>AE. 7</td>
<td>Hāthi-bādā (T 20).</td>
<td>Do.</td>
<td>Do.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>AE. 6</td>
<td>Hāthi-bādā (T U 10).</td>
<td>Do.</td>
<td>Do.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>AE. 5</td>
<td>Hāthi-bādā (T 2)</td>
<td>Symbols Nos. 1, 3 and 4.</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>AE. 6</td>
<td>M Temple</td>
<td>Traces of symbols, Nos. 1 and 4.</td>
<td>Traces of symbols, Nos. 1 and 2.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>AE. 5</td>
<td>Do.</td>
<td>Symbols Nos. 1, 2, 3, 4.</td>
<td>Do.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>AE. 6</td>
<td>Do.</td>
<td>Symbols Nos. 1, 2, 3, 4.</td>
<td>Do.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>AE. 45</td>
<td>Do.</td>
<td>Traces of symbols 3 and 4.</td>
<td>Do.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>AE. 65</td>
<td>Do.</td>
<td>Symbols Nos. 1, 2, 3, 4.</td>
<td>Symbol No. 2 and traces of symbol No. 1.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>AE. 5</td>
<td>Do.</td>
<td>Symbol 1 and traces of symbol 4.</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>AE. 5</td>
<td>Do.</td>
<td>Symbols Nos. 1, 2 and 3.</td>
<td>Symbol No. 1.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>AE. 6</td>
<td>Purchased</td>
<td>Symbols Nos. 1 and 2.</td>
<td>Do.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13-14</td>
<td>AE. 5</td>
<td>Do.</td>
<td>Traces of symbols 1 and 3.</td>
<td>Traces of symbols 1 and 2.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>AE. 85</td>
<td>Do.</td>
<td>Traces of symbols 1, 2, 3 and some others.</td>
<td>Symbol No. 2 and also symbol No. 3 of obv. and symbol denoting 2, fish and some others.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>AE. 8</td>
<td>Do.</td>
<td>Traces of symbol No. 3.</td>
<td>Symbol No. 2 and another symbol.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Remarks:**

- Thick dumpy piece.
- Irregularly shaped.
- Thin piece.
- Broken and damaged thin piece.
**THE ARCHAEOLOGICAL REMAINS AND EXCAVATIONS AT NAGARI.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>AE. 7</td>
<td>Hāthi-bāḍā</td>
<td>Part of svastika preserved, in centre; around, legend in 2nd century B.C. characters: Majhimik[a]y[a] Sibija.</td>
<td>(Worn out).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>AE. 7</td>
<td>Hāthibāḍā (T 2)</td>
<td>Svastika with branch of tree of thunderbolt; around, legend: S(h)i(b)ijana.</td>
<td>Part of the arches of the chaitya.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>AE. 7</td>
<td>Purchased</td>
<td>Part of arches of a chaitya, and svastika around, legend: *(m)kjajya (S)bijanapa.</td>
<td>Chaitya of many arches (or mountain) and Nandipada symbol.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>AE. 75</td>
<td>Do.</td>
<td>Svastika with taureines on ends; legend: Majhi(m[i]ka.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>AE. 8</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>Svastika with taureines on ends and branch of tree. Legend, around; Sbijanapadosa.</td>
<td>Three arched chaitya with curved line below representing river.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>AE. 6</td>
<td>Hāthi-bāḍā</td>
<td>Bust of Kshatrapa to r. as usual; to l. date 161.</td>
<td>Chaitya, etc.; legend: Rajjo Mahakshatrapasa Dēmasena-putrasa rajjo Mahākshatrapasa Vijayasena.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>AE. 6</td>
<td>Temple M</td>
<td>Blank</td>
<td>Miscellaneous, blank, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>AE. 45</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>AE. 36</td>
<td>Do.</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
EXCAVATIONS AT NAGARI.

(a). Bull capital in village.

(b). Amalaka in village.

(c). Kunyardi, pieces of ballings at the top of the mound.
EXCAVATIONS AT NAGARI.

(a) Sāpe Mātā's Holavna.

(b) Broken sculpture of Kevanta.

(c) Half-finished sculpture of lion.

Photo printed by permission of the Survey of India, Calcutta, 1929.
EXCA\VATIONS AT NAGARI.

(a) CHH.ĐVAL OR AkMAR'S LAMP.

(b) OLD GHANI.

(c) HATHI-BAD, GENERAL VIEW.
EXCAVATION AT HATHIWADA NAGARI.
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PLATE XVIII
Excavations at Nagari.

B. Temple of Mahadeva, general view after excavation.

A. View of platform mouldings.
EXCAVATION AT MAHADVA TEMPLE MOUND AT NAGARI.

PLATE XX
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Excavations at Nagar.

(a) Bricks ornamented with birds.

(b) Bricks ornamented with lotus flowers.

Photos ornamented & printed at the offices of the Survey of India, Calcutta, 8.
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