

as much as any in Ireland or Scotland, and as complete. To me they seem to be as clearly Christian crosses as these; and I think that there is one thing *primâ facie* more improbable than their erection by Christians, *videlicet*, their erection by any one else.

Again, in the same work (p. 56), I find Captain Conder stating that "Solomon's seal" and "David's shield" (the 5 and 6-pointed stars formed by combinations of triangles) are "Indian caste-marks." What evidence is there of this? Setting aside the common error of calling those devices "caste-marks," which are used by Hindus to indicate *sect*, and *not* caste, I think that there is a mistake in fact. I have never seen, nor heard of, the use of either of these patterns as a brow-mark or tattoo by any Hindus. And although they do occur as *mason's* marks in India, I think that they are confined to Musalman buildings, and are, in short, a comparatively modern imported luxury.

I should be glad if any member could give me any further light on either subject. Captain Conder, rather provokingly, quotes no authority, nor am I aware of his having any Indian experience such as would enable me to accept his own as conclusive.

In another passage he mentions the *swastika* as "a caste-mark amongst Vaishnavas." Setting apart, again, the incorrect term "caste-mark," and the more readily as the following term "Vaishnavas" implies some idea of the real use of the brow-marks, the thing seems likely enough. But where and who are those Vaishnavas who so use it?

W. F. SINCLAIR.

*The Secretary of the Royal Asiatic Society.*

2.

London, 1888.

DEAR MR. RHYS DAVIDS,—Looking over your two little Buddhist books, the following notes occur; and, if new, may perhaps be worth putting on paper. In the animal-stories there are clearly two or three animals classed as "deer."

In the Banyan-Deer Jataka they are probably black antelopes, still called Mriga, though the word is not in common use. The only other deer likely to occur near Benares is the hog-deer (*Axis porcinus*).

The story of the impounding of the deer would be quite within the range of modern practice in several places, and especially in Sind, where I have myself shot hog-deer and gazelles in such enclosures as the "Deer Park." They are called "Muháris."

The deer that went to and from the mountains are marked by that habit as belonging to some other species. It is most characteristic of the Sambar (*Rusa Aristotelis*), but also, to some extent, of the Chital (spotted deer, *Axis major*) and Nilghai (*Portax pictus*).

There is no creature at all like a roe in India that has it; the small barking deer (*Cervulus aureus*), the four-horned antelope, and musk-deer, do not visit the open country.

I thought at first that the "roe" whom the stag loved must have been a doe misprinted, until I found the word repeated.

I do not think that the difference of *kind* affects the story; as in another Jataka the Hansa loves a Peacock, and in a very good modern child's story the king of the Cranes marries a Pelican.

In the folk-lore of the Gonds the Nilghai is *the* beast of legend, and gets into trouble in spite of counsel, by stealing standing crops. The Nilghai and Sambar would be quite in place near Rajagriha, though not at Benares.

The Hansa is, I suppose, the still sacred (and very handsome) "Brahminy Duck" (*Casarca rutila*), which does breed in the Himalaya, or rather in the uplands of Thibet. The Flamingo is called Raj-Hansa, but I cannot find that it is sacred. Good Rajputs will not eat *any* duck, because they are all akin to Hansas. I should have said above that the incident of the stag being caught while following the female is true to nature, and the same is the case even with *the fish*. The more wary hind's escaping is also true. I have often witnessed it.

The term *Aswattha* for a pipal-tree (*Ficus religiosa*) survives in the language of survivals, Maratha, in the form "Ashte." It is a species or variety of pipal peculiar to forest countries, and distinguishable by extremely bright red leaf buds.

I do not of course want to dethrone the common pipal from its "bo"-ship; although I doubt if any botanist will ever allow its claim to any more than a descent from the original plant.

I am glad that you identify "Gotami" with Yasodhara, she taking her husband's clan-name. I knew a Yasodhara (a princess too) who did so. The exception is when a man wants, in somewhat ambitious phrase, to refer to a lady of high birth, as a bard talking of the several queens of a Raja, then he will sometimes name her by her father's kingdom or clan; as "the Jodhpuri" or "the Solankin," pretty much as a man might to-day refer to the Empress Dowager Victoria as "a daughter of England," or "a Guelph princess"; though her proper style is taken from her husband's house. As for the other wives, I do not believe that Gautama, or any other Rajput, ever married a lady of his own tribal name. The Gautamas are good Rajput stock to this day. The surname Sakya is, I believe, extinct; I suppose it was that of a family amongst the Gautama clan, such as you might find a dozen of to-day with little looking for them.

The solar myth, as applied to Gautama, reminds one of that Irish parodist (in "Kottabos,"?) who proved *Max Müller* to be a solar myth, partly by the traditions that he had been known to get up in the morning, wash and brush himself, dress for dinner, and go to bed at night, after struggles with demons in the form of critics, and lighter and more transitory annoyances in the shape of undergraduates.

I remain, yours truly,

W. F. SINCLAIR.

*The Secretary of the Royal Asiatic Society.*