

Nāimā tells us (Stambul edition of A.H. 1281, vol. ii, p. 220, at the end) how the soldiers went to بابا جعفر زندانه and set free the prisoners there. Were a scholar to undertake a learned inquiry as to who this Baba Ja'far was, taking him as the builder of the prison, he would go wrong. It is soldiers' slang. As German soldiers call the place of detention 'Vater Philip' (see my book "Die deutsche Soldaten-sprache," Giessen, 1899, p. 121), so the Turks call it Baba Ja'far. So the Turks call a recruit عجم اوغلان. This also has its analogy in the slang of the Bavarian soldiers, who call a recruit a 'Russian' (loc. cit., p. 36). We should not be surprised that so exclusive a cast as the Janissaries should have developed a jargon of this kind; and no doubt other Orientalists will have come across other instances of this interesting slang in the course of their reading.—Believe me, sincerely yours,

PAUL HORN.

To Professor Rhys Davids.

5. THE PEPPÉ INSCRIPTION.

Asiatic Society of Bengal,


57, Park Street, Calcutta.

Feb. 10, 1899.

SIR,—I have just read Mr. V. A. Smith's note on the Śākya Inscription from Piprāhwā in the last July number of your Journal. Owing to the importance of this document, as also to the fact that I had an opportunity of examining the original urn, which, together with the other relics, is now in the Indian Museum, Calcutta, I beg to ask for your permission to state my opinion on some minor details in regard to the inscription.

(1) Mr. V. A. Smith says that "the final character of *bhagavato* looks like *te*, with a stroke to the left, but must be read either as *to* or *ta*." In my opinion, the word is *bhagavate*, and I do not see any reason for correcting this. For in Māgadhī, Pāli *bhagavato* must become *bhagavate*, as the rule that final *o* changes to *e* holds good throughout.

(2) *sa bhaginīkanam*, if correct, would be very puzzling indeed, for the change of dental *n* to cerebral *ṇ*, though common enough in the literary Prākṛits, is unknown to epigraphical Pāli or Māgadhī. But, from an examination of the original urn, I can confidently assert that what has been taken for the upper cross-bar of *ṇi* (𑀧), is merely a small particle of stone peeled off when the writer engraved the *i-mātrā* of *ni*. Hardly any photograph or impression will show this clearly, but on the original urn there remains no doubt whatever.

(3) I am glad to confirm the correctness of the reading *saputa*, instead of Mr. Smith's *saputra*, pointed out by you in a foot-note. Mr. Smith probably has been misled by the fact that one stroke of *t* is prolonged a little down below the bottom line of the letter, thus . But, if this be *r*, it ought to be a serpentine line, and not a straight down-stroke, as, e.g., we have $\left. \begin{array}{l} \{ \\ \{ \\ \{ \end{array} \right\}$ *dra* in one of the Bharhat Stupa inscriptions.

My reading of the inscription, from the original, accordingly stands thus:—

yanam

iyam salilanidhane budhasa bhagavate saki sukutibhatinam
sabhaginikanam saputadalanam.

This inscription is in one line only, round the hemispherical lid of the urn, with the exception of the two syllables *yanam*, which stand above *suki*.—I have the honour to be, sir, your most obedient servant,

T. BLOCH,
Philol. Secr. A.S.B.

To the Secretary of the Royal Asiatic Society, London.

6. THE GOSINGA KHAROṢṬHI MS.

As our readers are aware, fragments of an old birch bark MS. in Kharoṣṭhi characters found their way in 1896 to Paris and St. Petersburg. The MS. was found about