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Farewell great Worker! Dreamer of great dreams!
Who dared to gaze back in the depths profound
Of India's glorious past; who sought and found,
In our beloved Motherland, the streams
Of Holy Ganga, that, from Siva's hair
Descending, offer'd draughts of Wisdom rare
To thirsting souls of men. Now underground
This Ganga flows: how drag her out once more
To surface, whereby, as in days of yore,
Our land become a place of pilgrimage,—
This was the only thought that did engage
Each moment of thy life. God-giv'n thy store
Of gifts thou didst for India freely pour;
Come back,—for Service greater than before.

* Reproduced with permission from the Calcutta Review,
July, 1924.
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THE LĀKṢMAṆASENA ERA.

HEMCHANDRA RAYCHAUDHURI, M.A.

The universal belief among scholars is that the Lākṣmaṇasaṇa Era originated in the Sena Dynasty of Bengal. According to one group of scholars the era marks the accession of king Lākṣmaṇasaṇa of Bengal, son of Vallālasena (Ballāl Sen), who is represented by Dhoysi as ruling in the city of Vijayapura. Professor Kielhorn has proved that the first day of the era was October 7, A.D. 1119, and the first current year, as reckoned from the era, was A.D. 1119-20. Consequently Lākṣmaṇasaṇa must have ascended the throne in A.D. 1119, and died before 1170, as an inscription of the year 51 of the era speaks of his reign as atīta or past.

According to another group of scholars the era commemorates the accession or coronation of a predecessor of king Lākṣmaṇasaṇa of Bengal who himself ruled in the last quarter of the twelfth century A.D.

Both the views are open to serious objections. The first theory is opposed not only to the evidence of certain passages of the Dānasaṅgara and the Adbhūtasāṅgara, two works attributed to king Vallālasena (Ballāl Sen), the father of Lākṣmaṇasaṇa, but also to the testimony of the Taḥakūt-i-Nāṣirī which was written by Minhāj-i-Sirāj in A.H. 658 (A.D. 1260).

Two manuscripts of the Dānasaṅgara contain the following passage.

nīkhila-cakra-tilaka-śrimad-Ballālasenena pūrṇe
śaśi-navadaśamite śakavarṣe Dānasaṅgaro racitāḥ.

One of these manuscripts is in the India Office collection and in this the date is given in numerical figures also. The other is in the


A 1
possession of Babu Nagendra Nātha Vasu. This manuscript contains two more verses elucidating the date.

A manuscript of the *Adbhūtasāgara* now in the collection of the Bombay Government, contains the following verse:—

śāke khanavakhandvabde ārebhe ādbhūtasāgaram
gauḍendra-kuñjjarālāna-stambha-bāhur mahipatih.

The agreement of the dates from two different works seems to prove beyond doubt that Vallālasena (Ballāl Sen), father of Lākṣmanāsaṇa, was alive in the Śaka years 1090-91, i.e. A.D. 1168-69. Consequently it has to be admitted that Lākṣmanāsaṇa ascended the throne, not in the year A.D. 1119, but after A.D. 1169.

The passages of the *Dānasāgara* and the *Adbhūtasāgara* quoted above have been rejected as late interpolations by Mr. R. D. Banerji.⁴ The evidence of Minhāj-i-Sirāj cannot however be dismissed so summarily. According to the narrative contained in the *Ṭabaḵūt-i-Nāṣirī*, written by Minhāj in A.H. 658 (A.D. 1260), Rāē Lakhmaniya (Rājā Lākṣmaṇa) was ruling in Bengal at the time of the Nūdiah raid of Muhammad bin Bakhtyār, which took place after A.H. 589 and "some years" before A.H. 601, i.e. between A.D. 1193 and 1205.⁵

The second theory seeks to reconcile the dates of Vallālasena (Ballāl Sen) and Lākṣmanāsaṇa given in the *Dānasāgara*, the *Adbhūtasāgara*, and the *Ṭabaḵūt-i-Nāṣirī*, with the initial date of the Lākṣmaṇāsaṇa Era, as determined by Kielhorn, by attributing the establishment of the era to a predecessor of Lākṣmaṇa. But this theory ignores the fact that the era of A.D. 1119 is distinctly called Lākṣmaṇābda and Lākṣmaṇāsaṇa varṣa in several ancient manuscripts discovered by Pāṇḍit Haraprasād Śāstrī.⁶ Again, it does not satisfactorily explain why the word atīta is used in reference to the rājya of Lākṣmaṇāsaṇa in the Bodh-Gayā inscription of the year 51 (A.D. 1170).

There is another important fact which has been ignored by both the groups of scholars mentioned above. The Sena kings of Bengal never use the era which they are said to have established. All the inscriptions of this dynasty hitherto discovered are dated in regnal

---

years. Even the records of Viṣṇavpiṣṭa and Keśavasena, the two sons of Lakṣmīnaśa, form no exception. The copperplate inscription of Vījaysena is dated in the year 31. The Naihāṭi grant of Vallālasena is dated in the year 11. The Tarpanadigī and Anulī grants, and the Dācca Cāṇḍi image inscription of the time of Lakṣmīnaśa, are dated in the year 3. The Madanapāda grant of Viṣṇavpiṣṭa is dated in the year 14. The Edilpur grant of Keśavasena is dated in the year 3. These dates do not suggest a continuous reckoning. A glance at them is sufficient to show that they are the regnal years of the reigning monarchs, and not years of the Lakṣmīnaśa Era.

On the contrary we find that the era is used in Bihār and is associated with a line of Sena kings who are described as lords of Piṭhī. The Jāṇībighā inscription records the grant of a village to the Vaijraśana for the residence of the Ceylonese monk, Maṅgalaśvāmin, by king Jayasena, the lord of Piṭhī, son of Buddhaseva. The inscription bears the date, the year 83 of the Lakṣmīnaśa Era, the 15th day of the bright half of the month of Karštika. Mr. Jayaswal has pointed out that the commentator of the Rāmacarita explains the word Piṭhipati (lord of Piṭhī) by Magadhādhīpa. Consequently Jayasena was a king of South Bihār.

Another epigraph discovered at Bodh-Gayā mentions Buddhaseva, father of Jayasena, describes him as Piṭhipati, and represents him as a contemporary of Asokacalla, king of a Himālayan district, two of whose inscriptions found at Bodh-Gayā bear the dates 51 and 74 of the Lakṣmīnaśa Era.

In his Catalogue of Palm-leaf and selected paper manuscripts belonging to the Darbar Library, Nepal, Paṇḍit Haraprasād Śāstrī notices some fifty-seven manuscripts which contain colophons dated in the

---

7 R. D. Banerji, Bāṅgalōra Itihāsa, pp. 290-91.
9 R. D. Banerji, Bāṅgalōra Itihāsa, pp. 297-98.
13 Indian Antiquary, Vol. XLVIII, 1919, p. 45.
Lakṣmaṇa Samvat, ranging from the year 91 (in the manuscript No. 400, p. 15) to the year 558 (No. 1076 (46), p. 31). Most of these manuscripts are written in Maithila (Northern Bihārī) characters and the earliest dates (91, and 116) are found in the Maithila manuscripts. The evidence of these records and that of the Bodh-Gayā and the Jānībighā inscriptions leaves no room for doubt that the earliest use of the Lakṣmaṇasena Era was confined to the province of Bihār.

In his note on "Trikūṭa and the so-called Kalachuri or Chedi Era," 15 Dr. Fleet observes: "Any era may be introduced into a country in which it was not founded. But no era can have been founded in a country in which it was never used." We have seen that the Lakṣmaṇasena Era was never used in Bengal by its alleged founders, the Sena kings of Vijayapura. The earliest use of it was confined to Bihār where we have epigraphic evidence of the existence of a line of Sena kings who actually used the era. It is fair to conclude from this that the origin of the Lakṣmaṇasena Era is to be sought not in the Sena dynasty of Vijayapura (Bengal) but in the Sena dynasty of Pīṭhī (Bihār). King Jayasena was ruling in the year 83 of this era. His father, king Buddhacena, was a contemporary of Aśokacalla who lived in the years 51 and 74 of this era. The parts of the Bodh-Gayā and Jānībighā inscriptions which contain the dates 51, 74 and 83 run as follows 16:

Śrimal-Lakhvana (kṣmaṇa)-senasy=ātiṭarājye Saṁ 51.
Śrimal-Lakṣmaṇasena-devapādānām=ātiṭarājye Saṁ 74.
Lakṣmaṇasena-sasy=ātiṭarājye Saṁ 83.

The most important point in these dates is the use of the word atiṭa. Professor Kielhorn remarks: "During the reign of Lakṣmaṇasena the years of his reign would be described as Śrimal-Lakṣmaṇasena-devapādānām rājye (or pravardhamāna-vijaya-rājye) Samvat, after his death the phrase would be retained, but atiṭa prefixed to the word rājye, to show that, although the years were still counted from the commencement of the reign of Lakṣmaṇasena, that reign itself was a thing of the past." 17 The founder of the Lakṣmaṇasena Era whose reign was a thing of the past in the year 51 (=A.D. 1170) cannot be identified.

17 Indian Antiquary, Vol. XIX, p. 2.
with Lakṣmaṇasena of Bengal, the son and successor of the author of the Dānasūgara and the Adbhūtasūgara, who was driven out of Nūdīah by Muhammad bin Bakhtyār at some date subsequent to the taking of Delhi by the Muhammadans in A.H. 589, which is practically equivalent to A.D. 1193, and prior to Muhammad’s expedition into the hills of the N.E. frontier, called Tibbat (Tibet) by the author of the Tabaḵāt-i-Nāṣirī, which took place in A.H. 601 (August 1204—August 1205).

If the founder of the Lakṣmaṇasena Era was not identical with king Lakṣmaṇasena of Bengal, he must have been the founder of the Sena dynasty of Piṭhī. This explains why his reckoning is perpetuated by king Jayasena of Piṭhī, but is never used by any Sena king of Bengal, not even by Viśvarūpasena and Keśavasena, the sons and immediate successors of king Lakṣmaṇa of Bengal. This also explains why the era is used in the records of Bodh-Gayā and Mithilā from the first century of its existence, but never appears in a Bengali manuscript till 171 years had elapsed from the time of the founder. The era is not connected with a Gauḍa king till the year 432.
THE ORIGIN AND CHARACTER OF THE PURĀṆA LITERATURE.

B. C. MAZUMDAR, B.A., B.L., Lecturer, University of Calcutta.

The word *purāṇa* indicates ‘old’ in all the Sanskritic languages of India. In its use as a noun, *Purāṇa* signifies the branch of religious literature, which records, or rather once recorded, the deeds of gods and men of very olden days. The name *Purāṇa*, as a special branch of the sacred literature, occurs perhaps first in the Atharva Veda. The very Rks of the Atharvan, in which we meet with the word *Purāṇa*, should be critically considered, to get a clear notion of the character of the Purāṇa literature of the Vedic times. In Prof. Lanman’s translation, the 23rd and the 24th Rks of the 7th Sūkta of the 11th book of the Atharva Veda, stand as follows: “Both what breathes with breath and what sees with sight: from the remnant (ucchīṣṭa) were born all the gods in heaven, heaven-resorters”. “The verses (Rk), the chants (Sāma), the meters, the ancient (purāṇa) together with the formula (Yajus): from the remnant were born, etc., etc.” The learned editor of the Harvard Oriental Series is not correct in his translation of the word Purāṇa, by the phrase “the ancient.” This word, in association with some names, relating to the ancient sacred lore, must signify a specific branch of the holy literature. The 4th Rk of the 6th pāryāya of the 15th kāṇḍa of the Atharva Veda, may be compared to clear up the misconception. The Rk says:

“ He (the Prajāpati) moved out, etc. After him moved out both the Itihāsa (the narrative) and the Purāṇa (the story of eld) and the Gāthās (songs) and the Nārāśaṁsīs (eulogies). Verily both of the Itihāsa and of the Purāṇa and of the Gāthās and of the Nārāśaṁsīs doth he become the dear abode who knoweth thus.”

I have given here as well the translation of Prof. Lanman. The learned professor has translated here the word *Purāṇa* by ‘story of eld’, while the vague phrase ‘ancient’ occurs for it in the translation of other Rks just quoted above. The mysterious origin of the Purāṇa (the story of eld) along with the gods and the mantras as narrated in the verses, points to its hoary antiquity and to its recognised place in the sacred literature of the Ṛṣis. We proceed now to
examine other facts, to establish very clearly and distinctly, that the rank and honour which Purāṇa enjoys, in the Atharvan, is not peculiar to that Veda alone, but that it is in the tradition of all the Vedas, that the Purāṇa is a branch of the Vedic literature, and that it is as old and as sacred as the Vedic mantras themselves.

If we refer to those post-Mantra treatises such as the Brāhmaṇas which were composed with the distinct object of explaining the spiritual significance and utility of the Vedic ritual, we get many practical directions, as to how the sacrificial rites should be performed, in order to secure the highest spiritual benefit. Generally speaking, the Sāma Veda, the Rg Veda, and the Atharva Veda Samhitas are uniform in character, being collections of mantras such as have to be recited at the yajñas; the Yajur Veda Samhitā takes partly the character of a Brāhmaṇa, in that the directions regarding the sacrificial ceremonial have been given in it in some detail. The Brāhmaṇas and similar other works forming the post-Mantra literature, are devoted mainly to furnish explanations and to point out the religious importance of the Vedic mantras; in these works, we get clear ideas as to how and for what object the yajñas should be performed. For example, it has been elaborately given in the Brhaddevatā, how to perform a yajña in an efficacious manner, the sacrificer must know (1) which devatā is to be invoked on what occasions, (2) what mantra has to be uttered to suit the occasion, (3) how the words of the mantras should be correctly pronounced and chanted, (4) the name of the Rṣi who saw or discovered the mantra, (5) the circumstances under which a mantra or a sūkta, having been uttered by a seer, a special object was once secured, and (6) the proper ritualistic method or form to be adopted in the performance of the yajña. The mantras, as compiled in the early Saṁhitās, are therefore of no practical use even to the learned priests, if they fail to know or learn the vidyās just now enumerated. The vidyās of my enumeration are found generally mentioned in three groups, viz. (1) the knowledge of the proper god, (2) the knowledge of the proper mantra, for the special sacrifice, and (3) the knowledge of the details of the rituals, to suit each particular occasion. That the phalaśruti, or the history of the efficacy of the mantras, falls under the third head, will be made clear later on.¹ I need hardly state, that

¹ I am inclined to suppose, that the Brāhmaṇa priests were called trayi or tebiṣja (Pāli form) because they had to learn the three things mentioned above. It is not the
in ritualistic works, there are details under each head of the above knowledge, and there are many practical directions or \textit{vidhi}, regarding the forms of sacrificial ceremonies.

We have seen, that as a part of the ritual, it was absolutely necessary for a priest to know the history of the origin of the \textit{mantra}; we shall presently see that it was necessary for a priest to recite at the \textit{yajñā}, how by the chanting of the \textit{mantra}, its original seer got out of many worldly dangers and difficulties. The readers may refer to the excellent edition of the Artharva Veda Samhita by Prof. Lanman, wherein the special purpose for which a \textit{sūkta} is to be chanted, has been prefixed to each and every \textit{sūkta}. For easy reference, I specially name the Brhaaddevatā, critically edited by Prof. Macdonell, wherein the Purāṇa history and the practical utility or \textit{phalas̄ruti}, relating to various \textit{mantras}, have been severally set out. I cite here just one example, to show the relation of the Purāṇa to the \textit{mantra}; how Dīrghatamā was born blind, has been stated in a story form in the fourth chapter of the Brhaaddevatā (verses 11-15). It has then been stated (verse 16) that some hymns or \textit{mantras} (viz. Rg Veda I, 140-56) were revealed to Dīrghatamā, and he got back the use of his eyes. It has been stated, that knowing this history, the Rks revealed to Dīrghatamā should be recited to regain good eyesight. Thus it is very clear, that at the time of the performance of the \textit{yajñas}, recitation of the history of the \textit{mantras} was an inseparable part of the ceremony, and that the knowledge of the Purāṇa or the origin of the \textit{mantra}, was essential with the Vedic priests. Some more facts will be adduced presently, in support of these two propositions. The stories as constitute the Purāṇa, under the Rg Veda \textit{mantras}, have been related in the Brhaddevatā. There cannot be any doubt that this story-literature, absolutely necessary for the performance of the \textit{yajñas}, was designated as Purāṇa or Purāṇetihāsā.²

To illustrate that many \textit{sūktas} of the Vedic Samhita cannot be place where I can discuss the question, that the appellation \textit{trayi} had originally no reference to the three collections of the Vedic \textit{mantras}, but referred wholly to the three \textit{vidyās} the Brāhmapas had to acquire, to perform a \textit{yajña}, be it according to Sāma or Rk or Yajųh or Atharvan rites.²

² The custom of the present day, that at the time of the \textit{śrāddha} or other such ceremonies, a Paurāṇika has to sit apart to read some Paurāṇika text, is after the oldest tradition of the Vedic ritual. Now the Purāṇas are not read to explain or glorify the \textit{mantras}, but merely because it is a long-standing custom to do so.
properly understood, if the Purāṇa stories relating to them are not referred to and read, I refer the readers to the 95th sūkta of the 10th manḍala of the Rg Veda collection. The sūkta, as it stands, does not inform us who Purūravā is, and under what circumstances he is addressing persuasive words to a nymph; the Purāṇa of Purūravā and Īrvaśī, as narrated in the 7th chapter of the Bṛhaddevatā, or in the Śata-patha Brāhmaṇa (which has been called a sanvād or dialogue by Yāska and itihāsa or story by Śaunaka), must be read for the explanation of the sūkta. No matter whether the stories constituting the Vedic Purāṇa were compiled separately like the mantra Samhitās, or whether they were merely retained in memory by a special class of priests, it is absolutely certain that the Purāṇa literature always existed by the side of the holy mantras.

We get in the introductory chapter of the Mahābhārata, that the custom of reciting Purāṇa to the priests, who were initiated and ready to perform a holy sacrifice, was not forgotten; for, the Paurāṇika Ugraśravā asks the Rṣis in the following words to ascertain whether they were in a fit state to listen to the narration:

"kṛtābhisekāḥ śucayaḥ kṛtajapyaḥ hutāgnayaḥ
bhavantā śāane svasthā bravīmi kim-ahāṃ dvijāḥ?" (15).

As to the fact that the Vedas have to be explained by the Itihāsa and the Purāṇa, a line occurs in the very introductory chapter of the Mahābhārata:

Itihāsa-Purāṇābhyāṃ Vedāṁ samupātryāṃ (267).

The orthodox tradition is, that Vyāsa divided the Veda in the early years of the Kaliyuga, and became the progenitor of the Purāṇa literature. We need not concern ourselves here with the question as to when and under what circumstances the different Vedic Samhitās were compiled; but there can be no doubt, that once it became necessary to divide the Veda, or more properly to classify the Vedic mantras, from the ritualistic point of view. When this division or classification had to be made, Purāṇetihāsa could not but form a separate branch under the Vedas. The account we get by tradition is therefore not wrong, that the Purāṇa, as a literature, arose out of the work of classification or division of the Vedas, no matter whether the author of that work of classification or division be called Vyāsa or not. Since vyās means, in Sanskrit, "to divide into parts" or "to arrange", the sage of the olden times, who was principally instrumental
in bringing about the aforesaid distribution and arrangement, can be safely said to be the progenitor of the Purāṇa, as a special branch of the sacred literature.

That the Purāṇa, as a sacred literature, was both taught and learnt by the Brāhmaṇas, along with the Vedic mantras and the other correlated sciences, is distinctly mentioned in the Satapatha Brāhmaṇa (XI. V. 7, 1; XIV. V. 4–10). There is similar mention also in the Taittirīya Āraṇyaka (II. 9–10). The Upaniṣads have referred to Itiḥāsa-Purāṇam as a subject studied by the orthodox Vedic scholars; the old Chāndogya-Upaniṣad of the Śāma Veda school states that the Itiḥāsa-Purāṇam is the fifth Veda in the division of the Vedas:

Ṛg-vedo Yajurvedaḥ Śāma-veda Atharvaḥ-caturtha Itiḥāsa-Purāṇaḥ pañcamo vedānāṁ vedāḥ " (VII. I. 4).

From the remarks made before, regarding the Purāṇa literature, it is clear beyond any doubt, that the Purāṇa literature was bound to be recognised as the fifth Veda, when the Atharvan collection was recognised as the fourth division of the Veda.

When the Mahābhārata was compiled as a Saṁhitā, with the nucleus of the Bhāratī-kathā, all the stories that existed at the time of the compilation in the name of Purāṇetihāsa, were included in, or intertwined with, the Kuru-Paṇḍava story. It is for that reason that Mahābhārata-Saṁhitā claimed for itself the title ‘the Pañcama Veda,’ and that the people considered that title to be quite legitimate. It is quite wrong to suppose, that the Mahābhārata-Saṁhitā took some time to be recognised as the fifth Veda; the very character of it secured for it this honour, at the very date of its compilation.

We have noticed, that the Purāṇa has been in association with the Itiḥāsa from a remote past. There are many instances in the Mahābhārata, where the Purāṇa has been spoken of as a depository of Vedic śrutī (nānā-śrutī-samāyuktaṁ). We meet also with such passages in the Mahābhārata, where in narrating some legends or vaṁśānuvartaṁ, it has been stated by way of an introductory remark, that “mayā śrutam idam pūrvam Purāṇa puruṣarṣabha”, or “aṭrāpyudāharantīmāṁ Itiḥāsāṁ purātanaṁ”, or “śrūyate hi Purāṇe’pi Jāṭilānāma Gautamī”, etc. These instances show, that the Purāṇa handed down the ‘vaṁśānuvartaṁ’, and other historical accounts, from generation to generation, and its character as the history not only of the gods but also of men, was established at the time of the com-
pilation of the Vedic Samhitās. Being the history of the gods and the Rṣis, the Purāṇa literature had to deal with the original or primary creation, the secondary creation or the creation of the world men were living in, and the Manvantara-revolutions; again, as associated with Itiḥāsa, it had to narrate the stories of the ideal epoch-making rulers, and to maintain the records of many Rāj-families of note. In this combined character, the Purāṇa of the olden times cannot possibly much differ from the modern Purāṇas; for the definition of the Purāṇa, we get in almost all the Purāṇas, that the subject referred to above, must be delineated in a Purāṇa. I quote the definition as it occurs in the Vāyu Purāṇa:

kīrtanaṁ......
sarga-ṣ ca pratisarga-ṣ ca vaṁśo manvantarāṇi ca
vaṁśānucaritam ceti Purāṇam pāṇca lakaṇṇam

(IV. 10-11).

Though I could not cite any direct proof from the oldest Vedic literature, in support of the statement that Purāṇa, associated with Itiḥāsa, had the character of a history, I think the evidence furnished by the post-Mantric literature as well as by the Mahābhārata goes, to some extent, to establish my view. We should not forget, however, that Purāṇa is found mentioned, linked with Itiḥāsa, even in the Atharva Veda. That the history of the mighty kings, from the remotest antiquity, was maintained in the very work, in which the history of the creation was preserved, is pretty clear from the accounts of Megasthenes. We get recorded in the fragments of the accounts of Megasthenes, that when he came to India, the Indians narrated to him their previous history, as well as the history of the creation of the world. Arrian records in his Indica, that Megasthenes reported, that the Hindus reckoned 6042 years from the earliest day to the time of Candragupta. It must also be noticed, that Arrian has remarked in his Indica, that it was a matter of wonder with him how Megasthenes could give an accurate account of 118 tribes and 58 rivers of India, without visiting most parts of that country. This points to the fact, as noticed by the late Mr. A. M. T. Jackson, in his introductory essay, "The Epic and the Paurāṇic Notes" [J. A. S. (Bom.), Extra, 1905, p. 67], that Megasthenes must have got before him a regular catalogue of rivers and tribes. Non-mention of the character of the Purāṇa itself as Itiḥāsa, in any Vedic Samhitā, does not prove that the Purāṇa did not assume the character of a history; we have
mentioned just now, that even in the Vedic references, Purāṇa appears always in the company of Itihāsa. It is curious to note, that though Purāṇa is found mentioned in the Atharva Veda and in the Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa, this word does not occur in any sūtra of Pāṇini, which is certainly a later work. The readers can easily see how unsafe it is to establish any proposition, on the evidence of Pāṇini’s mentioning or not mentioning any word in his work. It may however be mentioned, that the Vārtika and the Mahābhāṣya both mention it in association with the Itihāsa.

In what form and state the Puranetihāsa of olden times continued to exist till its complete absorption by the Mahābhārata Saṁhitā, cannot be definitely stated. It appears to me highly probable, that as for each Veda there are Brāhmaṇas, Anukramaṇis, and Upaniṣads, the Purāṇa (the story cum history of eld) for each Vedic school was also separately organized. The Purāṇa given in the Brhaddevātā fails to explain many allusions of the Atharva Veda; and a separate book of allusions for the Atharva Veda as such, must be presumed to have existed. I adduce one fact in support of my supposition.

We get in the Śatapatha and the Aitareya Brāhmaṇas, that the Rg Veda proceeded from Agni, the Śāma Veda from Śūrya, and the Yajur Veda from Vāyu, when Prajāpati performed tapas to get the Vedas (Śat. Brā., XI. 5–8, i; Ait. Brā., V. 32–34). The Chândogya Upaniṣad also gives us the same story:

Prajāpatiḥ lokān abhyastatāḥ; teṣāṁ tasyamānānāṁ rasāṁ prābhritaḥ agniṁ prthivyāṁ, vāyum antarikṣāṁ, adityāṁ divāḥ (1). sa etāṁ tīrto devatāṁ abhyantaritāḥ; tāṁ tasya mānānāṁ rasāṁ prābhritaḥ agnehṁ roo, vāyoḥ yajūṁśi, sāṁśi adityāṁ (2) (IV. 17, 1-2).

The names Vāyu, Agni, and Śūrya for the three extant Purāṇas seem to have their origin from the Vedas, to which their once existing originals belonged. I adduce some internal evidence, from the Vāyu Purāṇa itself, to show that this Purāṇa really belongs to the Yajur Veda which is said to have been breathed out by Vāyu. It is well known to scholars, that a departure from the original Vedic religion was first made by the Yajurveda, by presenting the old gods, in a new or modern form. In the 16th chapter of the Vājasaneyī Saṁhitā of the Yajur Veda, we get those epithets, for the Vedic Rudra, which have become the special names of Śiva; Īśāṇa, Mahādeva, and Saṅkara, are such names as could be given to all the Vedic gods; but the Yajur Veda appropriates them specially for the god Rudra. (I must note, that in
the Rgveda, the epithet Īsāna signifying a leader has been specially applied to Rudra in one Sūkta, II. 33). The Vāyu Purāṇa begins with the śloka which glorifies the characteristic Yajur Vedic names of Śiva:

prapadye devam-Īsānam śāśwatam dhruvam-avyayam,
Mahādevam mahātmānam sarvasya jagataḥ patim.

Despite the fact that the new Vāyu Purāṇa has been said to have originated with a Lomaharṣana, the Yajur-Vedic tradition of the origin of the mantras, etc., has been retained in the 11th verse of the first chapter. I must remind the readers, that according to the Yajuh-account, Brahmā-Prajāpati is the principal deity, from whom everything is considered to have proceeded. In accordance therewith, it has been stated in the Vayu:

Purāṇam sampravakṣyāmi Brahmaktaṃ Veda-sammitāṃ.\(^3\)

It is the Yajur Veda which first declared the land of Kurukṣetra to be specially holy. It is stated in the Vāyu Purāṇa, that Lomaharṣana narrated this Purāṇa to the Ṛṣis at Kurukṣetra:

dharmakṣetre Kurukṣetre dirghasātām tu ijire, etc.

The use of the word Purāṇa in the singular form in the Atharva Veda does not show, as Jackson holds, that originally there was but one collection of the story-literature. The use in the singular may simply point to the reference to a class of literature considered collectively. Similarly the plural form ‘Itihāsapurāṇāni’ in the Taittiriya Āraṇyaka does not also support the view, that there were necessarily many treatises on the subject; this use in the plural may be interpreted as intending to signify many stories, that might have been collected in a single work. The reference to Purāṇa (be it in singular or plural) in a particular Brāhmaṇa, affiliated to a particular Veda, must be presumed to have reference to a special collection of the stories.

It seems almost certain, that the extant Purāṇas did not exist previous to the time of the collection of the Paurānic stories in the Mahābhārata-Samhitā; for the present Purāṇas differ in many essential points from the Paurānic stories given in the Mahābhārata. To explain this situation, the earliest known mention of a Purāṇa by name may be

\(^3\) The Harivaṃśa has for it—‘‘etat te kathayisyāmi Purāṇam brahma-sammitam’’ (III, 33. 5).
discussed. This earliest mention is of a Bhavisyat Purâna in the Āpastamba Dharmasūtra (praśna 2, paṭala 9. khaṇḍa 24, 5 and 6); here on the authority of the above Purâna, the continuation of the seed of the Pîtrṣ has been spoken of. Since the Mahâbhârata-Saṁhitâ clearly declares that it incorporates all the Purâṇas extant at the time of its compilation, and since the extant Bhavisya Purâṇa differs in many points from the Paurânic narration of events disclosed by the Mahâbhârata, the Bhavisyat of Āpastamba's reference cannot be held as identical with our present Bhavisya Purâṇa. I should note, however, that the subject relating to the continuation of the seeds of the Pîtrṣ occurs in the modern Bhavisya Purâṇa. I have thrown out this suggestion, that the pre-Mahâbhârata Purâṇas might have existed with the names of Vâyu, Sûrya and Agni Purâṇas, to signify the Vedas to which they were attached; but by this suggestion, I do not mean, that a Purâṇa, thus affiliated to a Veda, could not possess a name or title other than the name, which would have been directly appropriate. It is true, that references to the Purâṇas in chapter 191 of the Vana Parva and in chapters 5 and 6 of the last Parva of the Mahâbhârata, are to the Purâṇas now extant. But that these chapters are very late additions, can be detected by even a superficial reader. The question however is discussed below. The Mahâbhârata-Saṁhitâ postdates itself, when it refers to the political condition of India, of a time when the name of the Saṁhitâ became widely known (vide Vana Parva, chapter 188, 35–36). Again it may be observed, that though Yudhiṣṭhira had the fullest advantage of hearing from Mârkaṇḍeya what would happen in the Kali Yuga, he asked Mârkaṇḍeya over again the same question regarding the future events of the Kali Yuga, at the commencement of Chapter 190 of the Vana Parva. The facts stated in chapter 190 are mere repetitions of old facts of chapter 188, with additions of things, which make the chapter bad from a chronological point of view. The 'Râśi-cakra' or the Zodiac for instance, unknown to the whole of the Mahâbhârata literature, is mentioned in verse 91. Chapter 191 is, again, a continuation of chapter 190; in this chapter occurs the following verse:

etat te sarvam-ākhyātam-atītāṅgataṁ mayā
Vāyu-proktam-anusāmya purāṇam rṣi-sanśtutam.

It may be, that this reference is to an old Purâṇa of the Yajur Veda school, but as the Mahâbhârata-Saṁhitâ absorbed all the Purâṇas, and assumed the title of "the fifth Veda", it is not likely that,
consistently with its character, it would cite the authority of any other book; in the next place, the quotations made from the Vāyu Purāṇa show, that a careless man inserted some new chapters at a very late date to speak with some vehemence of the evil effects of the time he lived in. For, on the authority of the Vāyu Purāṇa, it has been stated in the 49th verse of the aforesaid chapter 190, that girls will bear children at the age of 5 or 6, while in reality it has been stated in the Vāyu Purāṇa (chapter 58, verse 58) that in the evil days of Kali, girls will bear children before attaining the sixteenth year. There are two different readings of this śloka in the Vayu Purāṇa, and I quote it with both the readings:

prāṇaṣṭa-cetanāḥ pumāso muktakesās-tu cūlikāḥ.
unāṣodāsa-varṣāśa-prajāyaṇe yuga-kṣaye.

In the second reading of the śloka, we get "dharṣayisyaṇti māna-vān" for the words "prajāyaṇe yuga-kṣaye."

The second reading appears to me to be correct, as the last words of this reading are quite in keeping with the meaning of the first portion of the śloka, where capturing of men by female charms has been spoken of. Practically, however, both the readings indicate the same thing, that girls were not considered to be of marriageable age before they became 16 years old, by those who adhered to the ideal rules of the Brāhmaṇas. That this was the custom in olden times, can also be gathered from a passage in the Suśruta, which could not very likely recommend any rule, which was not in accordance with the orthodox Smṛti rules. The śloka runs thus:

unāṣodāsa-varṣāyām-aprāptaḥ paścavirinātām
yadā dhatte pumān garbham kuṣṭiṣṭaḥ sa vipadyate,
jaṭo vā na ciraṃ jivet, jived-va durbalendriyāḥ,
tasmād-atyanta-bālīyāṃ garbhādhānām na kārayet.

(X. 13).

This statement, regarding the evil effects of bearing children before attaining the sixteenth year, shows however, by implication, that deviation from the rule was much noticed by the author in the society of his time.

The mention of the 18 Purāṇas, in the last two chapters of the very last Parva of the Mahābhārata, is quite singular; for the Mahābhārata-Saṁhitā does not disclose this knowledge elsewhere, even where there has been special enumeration of different branches of knowledge and of different Śāstric treatises. The last or the sixth
chapter may be easily disregarded, as the Mahābhārata is said to have ended with the fifth chapter. The fifth chapter also seems to be a late addition; for, in the first place, the Svargārohāṇa concluded with the fourth chapter, and in the second place, the fifth chapter has been improved by quotations, from other previous chapters of the book; for example, the slokas 68 and 69, are the same as 395 and 396 of Chapter II of the Adi Parva. From the very fact that many Purāṇas, including the Vāyu, name the Mahābhārata-Saṃhitā, it is proved conclusively, that neither the group of the 18 modern Purāṇas, nor the Vāyu Purāṇa, could exist at the time of the compilation of the Mahābhārata.

I have shown, that (1) the Purāṇa, as a branch of sacred literature, did exist in the Vedic days, bearing exactly that character which is attributed to it in the extant Purāṇas, and (2) that till the time of the compilation of the Mahābhārata as the fifth Veda-Saṃhitā, the extant Purāṇas were not in existence, at least in their present shape and form. Again, on reference to the mythology of the Hindus, as it was by about 140 B.C., it can be stated, that the modern Purāṇas, with their pantheon of new gods, could not come into existence in the second century B.C. Gods like Durgā, Gaṇeśa, and the Paurāṇika Śiva, were not known to the Mahābhāṣya of 140 B.C., or to the modern Manu-Saṃhitā, which has not got a greater antiquity.

As it is of great importance to know when, because of some tribal influences, non-Aryan gods came to be honoured in the Aryan society, and in consequence thereof, new Purāṇas on the basis of older ones had to be brought out, I discuss below the history of two important deities, viz., Durgā, and Śiva in the form of a 'Phallus'.

**Durgā: Her Origin and History.**

I need hardly point out, that neither the Vedas nor the old Vedic literature knew the name of this mighty goddess. Dr. A. A. Macdonell has shown in his excellent edition of the Brhaddevatā, that one solitary, meaningless mention of her name in that book (II, 77) is an interpolation. Leaving aside the Mahābhārata-Saṃhitā, we do not find any

---

4 My paper on this subject, as was published in *J.R.A.S.*, 1906, is partly reproduced here.
5 The name *Durgā* does not occur either in the Rāmāyaṇa or in Manu.
trace of her in any literature or epigraphic writings, down to at least the second century A.D. It is necessary, therefore, to examine critically the chapters of the Mahābhārata where Durgā appears.

There are two chapters in the Bombay edition of the Mahābhārata-Saṃhitā containing prayers to the goddess Durgā; they are the sixth of the Virāṭa Parvan and the twenty-third of the Bhīṣma Parvan. The Bardwan Rāj family Mahābhārata does not contain any chapter in the Virāṭa Parvan devoted to a prayer to Durgā; a very careful Bengali translation of this Mahābhārata has been published by the proprietor of the journal Baṅgabāsī. It is to be noted, that excepting in these chapters, there is no mention even of her name elsewhere in the Saṃhitā. The goddess, whose mythology is not given at all in the Mahābhārata, either independently or in connection with the worship of Śiva or Skanda, is made the recipient of two stray prayers, very loosely connected with the preceding and subsequent chapters. This circumstance is alone sufficient to throw doubt on the genuineness of these prayer chapters. But I have better proofs to offer to show that they are very late interpolations.

Referring first to the Durgā-stotra in the Virāṭa Parvan, we find the goddess described as daughter of Yaśoda, the wife of Nanda of the Cowherd tribe (iv, 6, 2), sister of Vāsudeva (iv, 6, 4), living permanently on the Vindhya hills (iv, 6, 17), and wearing a peacock's tail for her armlet (iv, 6, 8). She is very dark in colour (iv, 6, 9), and possesses four heads and four arms (iv, 6, 8). She is a maiden, or Kumārī Brahmaeāriṇī (iv, 6, 7), and sways the worlds by remaining a maiden for ever (iv, 6, 14). It is also stated, that it was she who killed the demon Mahiśāsura (iv, 6, 15), and that, as Kāli, is fond of wine, flesh, and animals.

Now, first of all, she is not described as Pārvatī, wife of Mahādeva, in this chapter. To make her a wife of any god, would also have been inconsistent with her character as Kumārī for ever. In the eighth sloka, she is compared to 'Padmā, wife of Nārāyaṇa,' but her own condition is given as that of a Kumārī. This shows clearly, that Durgā had not become Pārvatī, when this chapter was composed. There is no hint thrown out, that she had any relationship with the Himālaya, but, on the other hand, her origin is distinctly given as from the family

6 See Fausböll, Indian Mythology, p. 159.
of the Cowherds, and the Vindhyā is described as her place of abode. She is associated here with the worship of Kṛṣṇa, and is shown rather to be the tribal goddess of the Gopas or Ābhīras. We remind the readers of the birth story of Kṛṣṇa, wherein the birth of a Kātyāyanī has been narrated.

The goddess Durgā of the Purāṇas is ‘tapta-kāñcana-varṇa-bhā’ or Gaurī, and not dark in colour, and she has ten arms and not four. Neither Durgā, nor any other form of Śiva’s Sakti, carries four heads on the shoulder. It is also to be noted, that Durgā is not included in the Daśa-Mahāvidyās, or the ten glorious forms of the Sakti. The assertion in the stotra, that Durgā killed Mahiṣāsura, is false according to the Mahābhārata mythology, for it is distinctly mentioned in the Vana Parvan, that Skanda, son of Agni, whom Mahādeva and Umā worshipped for nascent glory, distinguished himself specially by having killed the demon Mahiṣāsura (iii, 230).

Now I shall consider another important character of Durgā, that she is Vindhyavāsini Kāli, and is very fond of wine and blood. During the early years of the seventh century A.D., we find often mentioned by Bāṇabhaṭṭa and others, that the non-Aryans worshipped horrible goddesses, in the Vindhyā region, by offerings of wine and blood. Till then, it seems, the Vindhyavāsini had not obtained admission into the temples of the Hindus. Either towards the end of the seventh, or by the beginning of the eighth century A.D., the poet Vākpati composed his Gauḍavaho kāvyā. In this book the goddess Vindhyavāsini appears in double character; she is called, in clear terms, non-Aryan Kāli, and at the same time declared to be a form of Pārvatī herself.7 Her worshippers till then are the Koli women and the Śabarās wearing turmeric leaves for their garment. Offerings made to her, are wine and human blood (vide ślokas 270 to 338 in the Bombay Sanskrit Series edition).

This gives us some idea, as to the time when, as a hymn in honour of Durgā as Vindhyavāsini, the sixth chapter of the Virāṭa Parvan was composed. The twenty-third chapter of the Bhīṣma Parvan is hopelessly confused. All that has been said of Durgā in the sixth chapter of the Virāṭa Parvan is fully repeated here, and still she is called the mother of Skanda (vi, 23, 11), which is inconsistent with her character as Kumārī (vi, 23, 4). Though in the seventh śloka she is said to have

7 In the Kādambarī she is mentioned as the wife of Śiva; see Miss Ridding’s translation, pp. 49-50.
her origin in the family of Nanda Gopa, yet Kauśikī, or born in the family of Kuśika, is another adjective given her in the eighth sloka.

It appears that when Durgā was merely a non-Aryan tribal goddess, her non-Sanskritic name was also either Durgā or something which had a similar sound. The reason for this supposition is, that for want of some orthodox grammatical derivation of the word, a new and defective grammatical explanation had to be thought out. Derivation of the name has been given in the following words: “durgā tārayase Durge tat tvam Durgā smṛtā janaiḥ” (IV, 6, 20). An unapproachable goddess, would be the meaning of the term according to Sanskrit grammar.

Whether Durgā had an independent existence, as a tribal goddess and only later became one and the same with Vindhyavāsini, or whether the goddess Vindhyavāsini in the process of evolution at the fusion of tribes became Durgā, is not easy to ascertain. But that there was once a Kumārī Durgā, not belonging to the household of Śiva, is borne out by the interpolated stotras in the Mahābhārata.

I shall now give some account of a hitherto unnoticed Kumārī worship prevalent amongst the non-Aryan Śūdra castes in the Oriya-speaking hill tracts in the district of Sambalpur, lying on the southwestern border of Bengal. In this out-of-the-way place, only recently opened out by a railway line, all the different tribes retain to this day their old manners and customs, unaffected by Brāhmaṇic influence. The place is extremely interesting on that account, for ethnographic researches.

Kultā, Dumāl, and Śūd are the Śūdra castes of Sambalpur, that celebrate the festival of Kumārī-Osā in the lunar month Aśvina, from the eighth day of its dark fortnight to the ninth day of the light fortnight. Though the Brāhmaṇa priests officiate in all the religious and domestic ceremonies of these people, the worship of the goddess Kumārī, during this festival, is wholly and solely performed by the unmarried girls of these Śūdra people. It is a festival of the maidens for a maiden goddess. The word osā is a contraction of the Oriya term upās (Sanskrit upavāsa). On the Kṛṣṇa-Aṣṭamī day the maidens, singing special songs, go out in large companies from the villages in quest of good clay, for making an image of the goddess Kumārī. They them-

---

selves fashion the idol in a rude form and besmear it with vermillion. They sing and dance every day in honour of the goddess, and that is the only thing they do to worship her.

In some villages, owing very likely to the Brāhmaṇic influence, the figures of Hara-Pārvatī and Lakṣmī are painted by the girls on the walls, in addition to the figure of Kumārī. But this shows more unmistakably that this Kumārī is separate from, and has no connection with, the renowned consort of Mahādeva.

Some of the songs chanted for worshipping the goddess are interesting, as giving some clue to the history of the festival. I notice here particularly two lines of one song; they are—

Āśvina Kumārī-janam
Gopini-kule pūjan.

It was in the month Āśvina that the goddess Kumārī was born, and in this month she is worshipped by the females of the tribe of the Cowherds. Is not, then, this Kumārī the same, whom we meet with in the interpolated chapters of the Mahābhārata, as ‘Nanda-gopa-kule jātā’?

Śukla-Aṣṭami is the principal day of the whole festival; and the maidens sing and dance that day almost unceasingly, on the village green, till late at night. It is worth noting, that that is the very day regarded as very important and holy in Bengal during the Durgā-Phūjā; and special fasting is observed by the Bengali Hindus on that day called Mahā-Aṣṭami (great Aṣṭami). I should further notice, that it is even now a custom in many villages in the district of 24-Parganas in Bengal, that on this Mahā-Aṣṭami day, a Brāhmaṇa maiden is to be worshipped by other maidens by offering her new cloth, vermillion, and flowers.

Again, on the day next following, that is, on the Navami day, the non-Aryan maidens of Sambalpur sing some hardly decent songs in honour of their maiden goddess. For this reason, the songs of the girls in general during the Kumārī-Osā (called Dālkhāi songs by many people) are unfortunately believed by outsiders to be wholly indecent. I may draw the attention of readers to the fact, that the custom of singing obscene songs on the Navami day during the Durgā-Phūjā in Bengal was very widely prevalent throughout the lower province of Bengal some twenty years ago, and even now this custom is in full force in many villages far away from civilised centres. The Bengali
phrase "Navamir Kheud" (obscene songs of Navamī day) is well known throughout Bengal proper.

After the completion of worship on the Šukla-Navamī day, the non-Aryan maidens of Sambalpur throw the Kumārī idol into water, singing songs meanwhile. I may state that the goddess Durgā is also immersed in water on the Daśamī day (called Vijayā-Daśami) in Bengal.

As the Brāhmaṇas and other high-caste Hindus of Sambalpur do not take any part in the Kumārī-Osā of the Šūdras, and as the Durgā-Pūjā in Bengal style is wholly unknown to the people of Sambalpur, no one will venture to say, that the lower caste Šūdras in those inaccessible hilly tracts imitated the Durgā-Pūjā of Bengal. Since the Durgā-Pūjā is celebrated in Bengal alone, in a form and style which strongly resemble the Kumārī-Osā of Sambalpur, in many very important particulars, I may venture to think, that it was from some non-Aryan tribes of Bengal (who were once akin to the Šūdras of Sambalpur and had great influence all over the province of Lower Bengal) that the Durgā-Pūja was borrowed by the Hindus.

The influence of Brāhmaṇism is nowadays so very supreme in the province of Bengal, that even those low-caste poeople who allow widows to remarry, eat fowls, and drink wine elsewhere, consider those acts as degrading and defiling. Consequently, it is impossible now to get any evidence in this direction, from the customs of any lower class people in Bengal proper.

I mention another fact in connection with the Durgā-Pūjā rituals in Bengal. A banana plant is covered with a piece of cloth and is posted on the right side of the idol Durgā. This banana plant is regarded as the goddess Vana-Durgā (Durgā who resides in forests), and she is worshipped duly and carefully along with Durgā and other deities associated with her, and represented there in the idol exhibition. As to whence this Vana-Durgā came, the Purāṇas are silent, and the priests offer no satisfactory explanation. That this Vana-Durgā was a goddess of some wild tribes, seems pretty certain in the light of the facts already detailed. That in addition to the image of Durgā, a Vana-Durgā has to be set up and propitiated, shows that there was something in the origin of the Pūjā, which recognized a goddess other than the consort of Śiva.

The reward for which the non-Aryan maidens of Sambalpur hope
by worshipping their Kumārī goddess, is that their brothers may obtain a long life. Hence Kumārī-Osā is known by another name, called Bhāi-Jūṭiā. Bhāi means brother, and Jūṭiā means that which gives long life. There is also a ceremony called Bhāi-Dvītiā in Bengal, which is performed by sisters, for the longevity of their brothers, nearly twenty days after the Durgā Pūjā. I strongly suspect, that it is the Bhāi-Jūṭiā which has been transformed into Bhāi-Dvītiā in Bengal, since the latter, as a Hindu ceremony, does not occur in the old Purāṇas.

As the Kumārī-Pūjā of the Tāntric cult is a medley of many things and requires a separate critical study, I have made no reference to it here.

PHALLUS-WORSHIP IN THE MAHĀBHĀRATA.⁹

For want of a critical edition of the Mahābhārata, such an eminent scholar as Professor Rhys Davids has been led to think that, though there is no mention of the worship of Śiva under the form of the Linga in the old Buddhistic records, “phallus-worship is often mentioned, quite as a matter of course, in the Mahābhārata” (Buddhist India, p. 165). Whatever may be the date of the Mahābhārata-Saṁhitā, it may be successfully shown that the Linga, as a form of Śiva, is not recognised in that great epic.

The only chapters in which the Linga is found mentioned as a form of and name for Śiva, are vii, 200 and 201, and xiii, 14 and 17, which are all palpable interpolations of a very late date. If we leave these chapters out of consideration, there cannot be found a single line in the whole of the Mahābhārata-Saṁhitā, in which the Linga form of Śiva is even remotely hinted at (vide Fausboll’s Indian Mythology under Rudra and Śiva).

The sudden appearance of Vyāsā, first before the depressed son of Droṇa, in the middle of vii, 200, and next before the elated Arjuna in vii, 201, is altogether meaningless and irrelevant. Droṇa’s son became very much distressed, when he found that Kṛṣṇa and Arjuna had escaped unhurt. He asked Vyāsā, who came to the spot of his own accord, to preach the Śaiva religion and not to render any help to Aśvatthāman, the reason why Kṛṣṇa and Arjuna could not be killed. Vyāsā informed him in reply that as Kṛṣṇa was a worshipper of the Linga form of Śiva,
the Liṅga god kept him under his protection (vii, 200, 48 to 90). Aśvatthāman is none the wiser; and Vyāsa disappears after preaching his creed that Śiva is superior to Viṣṇu. The chapter then closes with the one short statement that Aśvatthāman retired from the field of battle and Droṇa breathed his last. That this Vyāsa episode portion in this chapter is an interpolation by a Liṅga worshipper, becomes clearer when we read the next following chapter (201), which is altogether an interpolation, as an additional chapter to the Droṇa Parva, by the self-same sectarian hand.

No event of the war is described in vii, 201, for there is really nothing left to tell in connection with the fate of Droṇa. Saṅjaya merely relates to his master that Vyāsa appeared again before Arjuna on his preaching tour. In praise of Śiva a long list of his names is given, and of all names, the Liṅga is specially eulogised. After making this inartistic addition to the Parva at its end, the sectarian interpolator repeats over again, that Droṇa died after fighting for four days more, forgetting altogether that Saṅjaya had communicated that very information in almost identical words to his master, and that chapter 200 ended with those words. The interpolator could not help repeating the words, for otherwise, the new chapter would stand self-condemned by having no connection with the story of Droṇa.

This spurious chapter (201) closes with a stanza composed in faultless ṣālīni. Professor Hopkins has shown in his Great Epic of India (p. 318 ff.) that there are only a very few complete ṣālīni stanzas in the whole of the Mahābhārata. There is no doubt that they all occur in very late chapters only. I am uncertain whether the text Professor Hopkins had before him, contains chapter 201 of the Droṇa Parva, for the ṣālīni stanza, here referred to by me, is not noticed by him in his thorough analysis.

I need hardly point out, that there are several chapters in the Mahābhārata previous to xiii, 14 and 17, devoted to giving the names of Śiva, and composed with the distinct object of edifying Yudhiṣṭhira. It is curious that Yudhiṣṭhira still insists upon getting a fresh list of these names from the lips of the dying Bhīma in xiii, 14. In the whole of the Mahābhārata there are only six āryā stanzas, and they are all found in this fourteenth chapter. There cannot be any doubt that sārdālavikṛidita is a very modern metre. In the Mahābhārata there are only four stanzas and a half in this metre (Hopkins, Great Epic,
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p. 358). Of these four and a half stanzas, two and a half occur in this fourteenth chapter, and the special character and glory of the Liṅga are celebrated in them (229 and 234). This chapter is also adorned with one stanza of puspitāgrā (190) and one of vasantatīlakā. These signs of lateness, coupled with the very character of the chapter itself, lead to the conclusion, that this is a spurious chapter only recently added.

The zealous sectarian and interpolator goes on enumerating the very names of Śiva over again in the seventeenth chapter; and poor Yudhiṣṭhira has been made to listen to the tediously long list with an undesirable sort of coolness of head. In this seventeenth chapter the names merely of Gaṇeśa and Durgā also occur. That Gaṇeśa, regarding whose origin, character, and mythology, the Mahābhārata is entirely silent, and who appears only in the first chapter, which is also spurious, was unknown when the Mahābhārata was compiled, is perhaps admitted on all hands. Regarding the lateness of the goddess Durgā, my discussion has just preceded.

Having thus disposed of the chapters in which the cult of the Liṅga is taught, I may safely conclude, that whatever the origin—whether indigenous or not—and whatever the age of this creed may be, phallus-worship was unknown to the compilers of the Mahābhārata-Saṁhitā. We cannot say definitely, as to when the non-Aryan Śīṣṇa-worshippers mentioned in the Vedas gave their god to the Aryans, but it is certain that this god was not in the Hindu pantheon, at the time of the compilation of the Mahābhārata-Saṁhitā.

That to accommodate new gods, the old Purāṇas had to be recast or re-modelled, and at times new Purāṇas had to be written, may be safely assumed when, by an analysis, we get in with the new gods some elements distinctly non-Vedic. That altogether new Paurāṇic episodes or anecdotes had to be introduced on account of the influence of the people of non-Vedic traditions, can also be easily presumed. It is needless to illustrate this view, by quoting modern Paurāṇic stories and comparing them with the old stories of the Vedic times. It is now admitted on all hands, that many stories of the modern Purāṇas, though founded on a Vedic basis, have not only been changed, but have been given quite new forms, inconsistent with the old Vedic stories.

I may refer the readers however to a class of expansion and modification of the old stories in later works, just to show, how by this sort of critical study, we may be helped in establishing the chronology of
some works. We take, for example, the history of the progeny of Brahmā, as referred to in the Rg Veda (X. 61. 5-9) and detailed in the Brhaddevatā (V. 143–159). In this account, we learn that Kaśyapa, the son of Marīchi and grandson of Brahmā, married all the thirteen daughters of Dakṣa. This very story is no doubt met with in the Ādi Parvan of the Mahābhārata, but for the names Vārīṣṭhā and Surabhi, we get Pradhā and Kapilā, as the names of two wives of Kaśyapa. Then again, we notice in the 35th chapter of the Śalya Parva, that Dakṣa’s daughters were 27 instead of 13 in number; and these girls are all the wives of the moon-god. Later on, in the Mokṣa Dharma section of the Śanti Parva, the number of Dakṣa’s daughters has increased to fifty. Then again in the Āraṇya Kaṇḍa of the Rāmāyaṇa, Dakṣa’s daughters are said to be sixty in number, and only eight of them have been described to be the wives of Kaśyapa. We notice also another fact of chronological interest, in this family history of Brahmā: unlike the Vedic Purāṇa, the Rāmāyaṇa does not acknowledge Surabhi to be a wife of Kaśyapa; Surabhi has been made a regular cow, and from her dung and urine many non-Aryan tribes, including the Śakas, have been made to originate. The Mahābhārata traces the origin of many Indian tribes from the aforesaid excrescences, but the Śakas have not been included in the list. It is interesting to note that the word sakadhumā signifies cowdung in the Vedic language; no doubt taking advantage of this meaning of the word, a pun has been made in the Rāmāyaṇa in speaking of the origin of the foreigners, who by then must have settled in India. Thus we find that even on reference to some slight changes in the Paurānic stories, we can see which work is earlier and which is later in date. The readers bent upon research may easily compare the stories of different books to establish their chronology.

I proceed now to deal with another question, which has also a very great bearing on chronology. I attempt to show below, that the modern Purāṇas received only a little additional matter into them by way of accretion, from the 5th century onward, but they were not so changed as to be transformed into new works. I shall refer here to such additions as the Rājās at different centres effected through the help of their bards, to glorify new kings of their local traditions.

The scope and the character of the Purāṇa or the Purāṇas, made inevitable, that new lists of kings should be introduced with the progress of time. As the Purāṇas had to be recited to the people throughout
all ages to communicate to them the glory of the gods and the noble deeds of the ideal sages and kings, the language of the Purāṇa of one age could not but change at a subsequent time. Again with the expansion of Aryan influence in India, the new geographical names of countries, rivers, and mountains were required to be introduced. When we notice such changes wrought at a particular time, we cannot say that such and such a book containing evidence of such a late time, was really composed at such a late date.

Since the modern Purāṇas radically differ from the Vedic Purāṇas, both in mythology and in the narration of the stories, they may be said to be altogether new in their origin, and compiled long after the second century B.C. But the modern Purāṇas, having once been compiled, do not seem to have much changed in essential matters in subsequent times, for, from the allusions to the Purāṇas during the 5th and 6th centuries, we may conclude that the extant Purāṇas are in the main identical with the Purāṇas of those days. The additions or accretions of subsequent ages are to be regarded merely as additions and accretions. The old lists of kings handed down from the Vedic times must have been preserved in the new Purāṇas. When giving a genealogy of the Īkṣvāku Rājās, the Matsya Purāṇa states:

atrānuvāṃśa-ālokoyam viprair gitaḥ purātanaḥ
Īkṣvākūnām-aṇam vanśaḥ sumitrānto bhaviṣyati.

Similar statements occur in all the Purāṇas, wherein old genealogies have been given. That the Paurāṇika lists of kings of very olden times are not fanciful, and that old chronology can be roughly established with their help, have been very ably shown by F. E. Pargiter in his masterly paper on the Ancient Indian Genealogies and Chronology in J.R.A.S., 1910, pp. 1-56. I cannot resist the temptation of quoting his remark that “these old genealogies, with their incidental stories, are not to be looked upon as legends or fables, devoid of basis or substance, but contain genuine historical tradition and may well be considered and dealt with from a common-sense point of view.”

Those who are in favour of the opinion, that the principal modern Purāṇas were compiled during the time of the Imperial Guptas, because of the fact that the royal genealogies do not go far beyond the limit of their time, ignore the fact that when after the Hūṇa invasion, the Gupta Empire was practically dissolved towards the end of the 5th century
A.D., the bards or chroniclers could not get any particular Royal House which could be designated as Imperial. The downfall of Hindu India commences from this date. Petty kingdoms commenced to grow all over India like mushrooms. In olden days, when the Indian Empire was not established under one overlord, the kingdoms and principalities of Northern India had such inter-relation amongst themselves, that dynastical genealogies and ballads of royal exploits could be inserted in the time-honoured Purāṇetihāsa.

But when, after the fall of the Imperial Guptas, a considerably large number of small kingdoms were established, no unity could be preserved, and no inter-relation could exist. I cannot deal with this political question elaborately here, beyond mentioning what actually took place. Every Rājā had his own bard, and he never failed to keep a fairly accurate genealogical list of his royal master's house, as is known to all scholars who deal with the epigraphic literature.

In this dark period of Hindu India, the Purāṇas, nay even the Mahābhārata-Saṁhitā, received interpolations to record the glory of the new tribal gods and the new local Viṁhas. At different centres of importance, several Purāṇas received additional books of considerable bulk. Thus it was, that the Brahma Purāṇa swelled in bulk in Orissa, and the Agni Purāṇa obtained some new chapters at Gayā.

Beyond noticing these local additions or changes necessitated by the change of time, we cannot say, unless proved otherwise, that the Purāṇas have not retained their general form and character since their compilation. This time must be, as I have already stated, long after the second or even first century B.C.

I have stated above, that the Purāṇas originated when the Vedas were classified or divided to secure ritualistic convenience. This does not imply that Vyāsa was the author of the Purāṇetihāsa-literature. The Mahābhārata also does not assert it. It has been only stated in the Mahābhārata that Vyāsa taught the Purāṇa to some disciples of his, and in the hands of those disciples the Purāṇas were developed. But if we separate the Bhāratī-Kathā from the Purāṇas, we find that the Mahābhārata favours this opinion, that the Purāṇas owed their origin to Lomaharṣaṇa (XII, 319, 21), while the Bhāratī-Kathā was promulgated by the other disciples of Vyāsa (I. 1 et seq.). The name Lomaharṣaṇa is extremely interesting. A very good derivation of this name has been given in the Vāyu Purāṇa (I. 16):
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This shows clearly, that it was not a particular person to whom the authorship of the Purāṇas is to be attributed. Lomaharṣana is a class-name to represent those persons, who by reciting some wonderful and thrilling stories to the people, made the hair to stand on the persons of the audience. That the 18 Purāṇas were composed at different times by different sages, has been clearly stated in many Purāṇas. The order in which the Purāṇas were compiled is also given generally in the Purāṇas. This order is as follows:—(1) Brahma, (2) Padma, (3) Viśṇu, (4) Vāyu, or Śiva, (5) Bhāgavata, (6) Nāradiya, (7) Mārkaṇḍeya, (8) Agni, (9) Bhaviṣya, (10) Brahma-vaivarta, (11) Liṅga, (12) Varāha, (13) Skanda, (14) Vāmana, (15) Kūrma, (16) Matsya, (17) Garuḍa, (18) Brahmāṇḍa. That this list was inserted after the compilation of the Purāṇas is apparent on the face of it, for all the Purāṇas could not manage to copy one another.

The narrators of the Purāṇas have been designated generally by the class-name Sūta. The Sūtas and Māgadhas are held to be of low origin in the modern Smṛtis. (In the Vāyu Purāṇa also (I. 32 et seq.) a Sūta is said to have no right or adhikāra to study the Vedas. Some passages of the Mahābhārata-SAṁhitā also support this view. It is however to be noted, that the solemn introduction of Sauti in the Naimiśāraṇya, as described in the introduction of the Mahābhārata, shows that the narrator of the Purāṇetihāsa was not a member of any degraded caste, but was one who could be honoured by the Brāhmaṇas. Many Purāṇas also show, that venerable munis like Mārkaṇḍeya and Nārada were the narrators of the Purāṇas. That in the Vedic times, very respectable Brāhmaṇas recited the Purāṇas, cannot be doubted. It may be owing to the fact, that the Paurāṇikas commenced to earn money by singing the ballads to the common people, that they lowered themselves in the estimation of others. Another reason for this degradation may be supposed. It may be, when the kings of Magadha became supreme in India, men other than Brāhmaṇas were employed as chroniclers and ballad-singers, and as such the Paurāṇikas were regarded to belong to a non-priestly class, though in reality they discharged some functions of the priests on ceremonial occasions.¹⁰

¹⁰ Nowadays, there are many degraded Brāhmaṇas who have to discharge some important functions in connection with the śrāddha-ceremony of the high-class Hindus.
It is not difficult to understand, how once, long after the Vedic times, and previous to the time of the compilation of the Mahābhārata and the modern Purāṇas, the Purāṇa literature became non-Brāhmaṇical in the strict sense of the word. When the true Vedic priests extolled the Rājās, they chose only the ideal kings from the priestly point of view. For this reason, many Rājās of real note were not included in the old Brāhmaṇical lists of the kings, and many otherwise insignificant rulers were lauded by the Brāhmaṇas. This is what led the powerful kings to employ their own bards to sing their glorious exploits, and to record their family history. This Kṣatriya-Purāṇetihāsa was bound to be incorporated in the modern Brāhmaṇic Purāṇas, when the Brāhmaṇas had to depend upon the favour of the Royal Houses. In his paper referred to above, Mr. Pargiter has made the following remark touching this point:

"This Kṣatriya literature grew up in virtual independence of Brāhmaṇical literature, and only when it had developed into an imposing mass and had attained great popular appreciation, was it taken over by the Brāhmaṇas as a not unworthy branch of knowledge. It was then that it was arranged and augmented with stories and discourses fashioned after Brāhmaṇical ideas."

It must be mentioned, however, that very respectable Brāhmaṇas nowadays recite Purāṇas in India on ceremonial occasions, and no one is degraded because of this profession.
THE DATIVE PLURAL IN PÂLI.

Pândit Surendranath Majumdar, Sastri, M.A.

The sūtra of Vararuci says caturthyāḥ śaśṭhi, which means that the genitive case-endings regularly take the place of dative case-endings which do not occur in the Prâkrits. That is also the case with Pâli which, however, retains a few dative singulars used to denote intention. Why has the Sanskrit dative disappeared in the Prakritic dialects which have retained all the other cases? Why has the dative plural disappeared first and the singular afterwards? Is there no trace left of the dative plural form in Pâli which has preserved even a few duals? These are questions which have not yet been answered.

In the first place what would be the form of the dative plural suffix in Pâli and Prâkrit? The Sanskrit dative and ablative plural suffix is bhyaḥ. As bhyaḥ is not added to the weak base of a changeable stem, it is not an accented suffix. Its ya being not accented is susceptible of being changed into i as is the case in Pâli nigrodha (निग्रोध), majjhima (मध्यम), etc. and Prâkrit abbhintara (अभिन्तर), iāna (इण) tircchī (तिच्चक), etc. Then the final s disappears. Thus the Skt. dative and ablative plural suffix bhyaḥ will be bhi or hi in Pâli and Prâkrit. That the ablative plural suffix is bhi or hi in Pâli is known to all students. The theoretical dative form will also be the same. As the instrumental, dative and ablative plural suffixes thus became, thanks to the operation of the usual laws of "phonetic decay," identical in form, much confusion was certainly caused. This difficulty was obviated by restricting bhi or hi for the purposes of the instrumental and the ablative only, the function of the dative being transferred to the genitive. Even the same form for the instrumental and ablative caused confusion, and hence the speakers of Prâkrit introduced a new device. To the old ablative suffix hi or hīm (which was formed by adding a nasal in order to compensate for the loss of the final s), they

1 For traces of duals in Pâli, see Müller, Pâli Grammar, p. 65.
2 Victor Henry's Précis de Grammaire Pâlié, § 110.
3 Ibid., § 49.
added the \textit{tadddhita}-suffix to (Skt. \textit{tas} which expresses the idea of ablative) and formed the new Prakrit ablative suffix \textit{hiinto}. So much for the origin of the Pali and Prakrit instrumental, dative and ablative suffixes. Let us now search for Pali forms ending in \textit{hi} or \textit{bhi} the meanings of which conclusively show that they are datives and not instrumentals or ablatives.

From the inscriptions of Asoka I quote the following passages to show that dative plural existed in epigraphic Pali.

(1) Barabar cave inscription No. A incised in the thirteenth year after Asoka’s coronation runs thus:\ldots \textit{lajinā Piyadasinā dudvādasa (vasābhi \ldots)} (ya)m (nigo)hakubhā dinā ā(jivikehi).\textsuperscript{4} dinā ājivikehi (द्वारा तत्र विद्युतिकिम) means ‘given to the ājivikas’. M. Senart takes ājivikehi as an instrumental in form but a locative in meaning.\textsuperscript{5} But my remarks on the change of \textit{bhyaś} into \textit{bhi} or \textit{hi} will suffice to convince one that it is a dative in form. That it is a dative in meaning requires no proof.

(2) Barabar cave inscription No. B also uses the identical expression \textit{lajinā Piyadasinā dudvādasavasābhisitenā ijam kubhā khalatika-pavatasi dinā ā(jivikehi)}.

(3 & 4) In the third Rock Edict of Asoka\textsuperscript{4} we find the following extracts:

\begin{itemize}
  \item Girnar (l. 4–5) \textit{bāmbhāṇa-samanānāṃ sādhū dānāṃ}.
  \item Kalsi (l. 7) \textit{bambhāṇa-samanānāṃ-ca sādhū dānē}.
  \item Dhauli (l. 11) \textit{bambhāṇa-samanēhi sādhū dānē}.
  \item Jaugada (l. 13) \textit{bambhāṇa-samanēhi sādhū dānē}.
  \item Shahbazgarhi (l. 7) \textit{bramaṇa-(ṣra)maṇa(naṁ)sa} \ldots
  \item Mansera (l. 11) \textit{bramaṇa-bramananaṁ sādhū dānē}.
\end{itemize}

[Skt. translation \textit{बाल्य-अस्त्रसमस्या: शास्त्रदानन]}

The text means ‘Liberality to Brahmans and ascetics is meritorious.’ The Dhauli and Jaugada versions contain the dative form

\textsuperscript{4} Bühler’s text in \textit{Ind. Ant. XX}, p. 361.
\textsuperscript{5} ‘I take it,—not as an ablative, which would be unintelligible both here and in the other places where the word occurs,—not as representing a dative, we should in that case rather expect ājivikānāṁ,—but as an instrumental, in the sense of the locatives. In dealing with the \textit{Mahāvastu}, I have had occasion to quote numerous instances of this peculiarity in the syntax of Buddhist Sanskrit (\textit{Mahāvastu}, I, 387, etc.).’ Dr. Grierson’s translation of Senart’s \textit{Inscriptions of Piyadasi}, Vol. II, p. 71 of reprint.
ending in *hi*, whereas the other versions use the genitive. It we take the *hi* as an instrumental or ablative suffix, there will neither be any good sense, nor shall we be able to explain the use of the genitive (of the other versions) instead of the instrumental or ablative.

(5-7) In Rock Edict XII we read:—
G. (l. 8) ye ca tatā tata prasamnā tehi vatavām.
K. (l. 34) e-vā-tata-tata pashāmnā te(hi).
S. (l. 7-8) ye ca tatā tata prasana teshām vatavo.
M. (l. 7) e ca tatā tata prasana tehi vataviye.

[Skt. स च तत्र तत्र प्रसन्नं तेहि वतायम्]

Here also the genitive of the Shahbazgarhi version shows, and the meaning requires, that *tehi* should be taken as standing for the Skt. dative form *tebhyaḥ*. *Tebhyaḥ vaktavyam* means 'to them this is to be said.'

(8-10) The cave inscriptions of Daśaratha, the grandson of Aśoka, in the Nāgārjuni hills are identical in form and purpose with the Barābar cave inscriptions. Here also grants of caves to the ājīvikas are recorded with *dative forms in hi*:—bhadantehi ājīvikehi, 'to the venerable ājīvikas.'

We thus see that there are in the inscriptions of Aśoka and of his grandson ten instances of the use of dative plural in 'Epigraphic Pāli.' These occur not only in one version or at one place, but at such distant places as Dhaulī, Jaugada, Barābar hills, Nāgārjuni hills, Kalsi, Mansāra and Gīnar. In Barābar and Nāgārjuni cave inscriptions the dative is the only form in use showing that the old form was better preserved in the Māgadhī. As for the Rock edicts (which were doubtless drafted at Pātaliputra in the Māgadhī and were re-written in the provincial dialects at the provincial headquarters), some versions use the dative and some the genitive. The Shahbazgarhi text is the only version which has not used even once the dative form.

To sum up: The dative plural suffix *bhyaḥ* became *bhi* or *hi* in Prākritic dialects. As *bhi* or *hi* is the instrumental suffix also, much confusion was caused. Hence the genitive came to be used instead of the dative. We find promiscuous use of the dative and genitive plurals in 'Epigraphic Pāli.' If the old Buddhist and Jaina texts be carefully examined in this light, some instances of the dative plural
will be found in 'Literary Pāli' and Prākrit also. When the origin of the dative plural suffix *hi* or *bhī* was forgotten, it disappeared completely; for it was then an error of grammar to use the instrumental suffix *hi* as a dative suffix. When the genitive plural began to be used for the dative plural, their singular forms also came to be confused in use. This confusion in the singular was also helped by the fact that in the language of the later Vedic texts the dative singular of feminine nouns was used for the genitive. But as the dative singular Prākritic form had not, like its plural, been confused in shape with any other form, it lingered longer than the dative plural. Dative singular is almost as common in Aśokan dialects as in Sanskrit. It lingered in literary Pāli but died out in the Prākritis of the Dramas.
BODHĀYANA'S PRĀYĀŚCITTĀ FOR SEA-VOYAGE.

MAHĀMĀHOPĀDHYA YĀ Dr. GANGANATH JHA, M.A., PH.D.,
Principal, Sanskrit College, Benares.

Bodhāyana in his Dharmasūtra (II. 1. 41) says—samudrasaṁyānam
..... eṣāmanyatamat kṛtvā caturthakālāmitabhojinaḥ syuḥ apo'bhya-
peyuh savanānukalpaṃ sthānāsanābhhyām viharanta ete tribhirvarṣaista-
dapahanti pāpam. Translated literally, this means—‘Sea-voyage (and
a few other acts enumerated) ..... , having done any one of these acts,
people should eat sparsely at the fourth part of the day, should enter
water in the morning, at midday and in the evening; amusing them-
selves by sitting and standing, they destroy that sin after three years.’

The exact meaning of the expiatory rite here prescribed has never
been understood. Whenever the question of sea-voyage has come up
for discussion, the antagonists of the voyage have held that by the last
clause Bodhāyana clearly meant that the voyager should have to com-
mit suicide; to spend three years ‘standing and sitting’, i.e. without
any sleep—would be nothing short of self-immolation. The protagonists
of sea-voyage felt all along that the passage could not mean this; though
they were unable to suggest any other plausible explanation. They
thought that even if suicide were actually meant, there were more
effective means available of doing that; and in fact the ordinance that
‘the man shall not sleep for three years’ looked absurd on the face of it.

In course of my study of the Dharmasāstra texts, I have met with
the phrase ‘sthānāsanābhhyām viharet’ in more than one place.

(1) In the Padmapurāṇa (Ādi-khaṇḍa, 58. 26) we read in course
of the description of the duties of the Vānaprastha, the man in the
third stage of life—sthānāsanābhhyām viharet na kvacid dhairyamutsṛjet,
‘he shall divert himself with sitting and standing, and shall not
renounce his steadiness on any point.’

The committing of suicide certainly could not form a duty of the
ordinary Vānaprastha, the hermit retiring from active life to a life of
meditation and worship.
(2) In Yājñavalkya (III. 51) we read—sthānāsanavihāraivā yogā-bhyāsena vā tathā (dinam nayet), where the Mitākṣarā adds the explanation—kañcit kālam sthānam kañcit copaveśanam, ‘for some time he shall sit, and for some time he shall stand’—in this manner he shall spend the day.

(3) Manu, dealing with the life-long religious student, says (II. 248) that when his Ācārya is dead, and neither the preceptor’s son, nor his wife, nor his sapinda happen to be living,—sthānāsanavihāravān . . . . prayuñjáno’gnīṣūṛōgam ādyahyād-dehamūtmanāḥ, on which Medhātithi says, kadācit tiṣṭhet kadācid āśita evam viharet, at times he shall stand, and at times sit down, in this manner he shall divert himself.

But he goes on to add another explanation offered “by others” —anye tu manyante sthānāya, svastikādinā yad āsanam dhyānakāle tat sthānāsanam’, ‘vihāro’ bhikṣācaranādi. By this the passage would mean that ‘the man shall practise the postures prescribed in connection with yogic practices and live on alms.’

But Sarvajña-Nārāyaṇa explains the text to mean a particular form of austerity consisting in ‘standing, sitting and wandering.’

(4) Again, Manu (VI. 22) says, sthānāsanāabhyaṃ viharet’ where Medhātithi says, ‘sthānāsanābhyaṃ dine, rātrau tu kevala sthānālāshyitām vakṣyatī’; by which also the text means—‘he shall spend the day in standing and sitting.’

(5) Lastly in Manu (XI. 224) we meet with the same expression; and here it forms part of the krochra—penance.

From all this it is clear that the phrase could never have been intended to lay down anything so physically impossible as passing three years ‘without sleep.’ In fact a careful study of all the above texts leads us to the conclusion that what is meant by the words ‘sthānāsanā-bhyām viharet’ is exactly what is expressed by the Hindi idiom ‘uṭha bāīṭha kara samaya bitānā’; and the sense would appear to be that the man shall have recourse no other diversion or amusement, save what may be obtained by ‘standing or sitting.’
A Sanskrit Version of Yasna IX.

IRACH J. S. TARaporewala, B.A., Ph.D., BAR.-AT-LAW.
Professor of Comparative Philology in the University of Calcutta.

Avesta and Sanskrit have always been cited as examples of two closely allied languages. These two ancient tongues have now been recognised as the most closely knit group in the Indo-European family of languages. The ancient name Āryan has now been definitely assigned only to this group, for these were the two peoples of antiquity—the Iranian and the Indian—who called themselves by that proud name of अर्य or आर्य. And this fact also emphasises the next point of resemblance between the two languages—a point of far greater importance than the mere formal similarity in words—the close accord, namely, that exists in spirit between these two. It is not the object of this paper to set out at great length the numerous points of resemblance in the religion and culture of these two peoples. What is sought here is to bring home to the reader by means of a concrete example this similarity between these two.

I have therefore attempted to make a new Sanskrit version of the ninth chapter of the Yasna popularly known as the first part of the Haoma Yašt. I have chosen this particular piece for several reasons. In the first place, it is a hymn of the Avesta with which I am most familiar and at which I have worked the longest. Secondly, the subject-matter itself is interesting and would naturally attract the Vedic student. And lastly, it has already been twice rendered into Sanskrit. The first rendering was by the great Zoroastrian Priest, Dastur Nairyosang Dhaval.¹ This rendering dates about the year 1200 A.D.² This version is based more upon the Pahlavi rendering rather than on

The following are the principal abbreviations used in the notes. Barth(olomae’s Altiranisches Wörterbuch) (uch), Grass(mann’s) Wörterbuch zum Rigveda; Jack(son’s Avesta Grammar); Kan(ga’s Khordah Avesta-bha Maññi); Modi(’s) Dictionary of Proper names in the Avesta; Whit(ney’s Sanskrit Grammar). The others are self-evident.

¹ The Collected Sanskrit Writings of the Parsees; Pts. I-IV (Bombay, 1906) edited by Ervad Sheriarji Dadabhaji Bharucha.
² Grundriss des iran. Phil., II, p. 50.
the original Avesta. And, moreover, it has got special peculiarities of language, which may bring a smile on the face of a Sanskrit Pandit. The work however was evidently meant for the use of the Hindus in order to give them some idea of the religion of the Parsis. The later Gujarātī translations of the Indian Zoroastrians are based on this Sanskrit version. Bharuch enumerate some of the special peculiarities of the Sanskrit of Nairyosang. Among them the most notable are the use of Gujarātī and Pahlavi words in the Sanskrit. But even with all his peculiarities the work of Nairyosang is a most remarkable attempt; and inasmuch as he represents the unbroken Pahlavi tradition—Inherited from a long चुकप्रत्मया—he is invaluable for every Sanskrit knowing student of Avesta.

The second attempt is a most remarkable one. It is the translation made into Sanskrit and Bengali by Pandit Vidhuśekhara Bhāṭṭāchāryya, Śāstri, of Śāntiniketan, Bolpur. A portion of it (verses 1-16) was published in the Bengali Magazine Prabāsī for Āśād and Bhādra, Bengal Samvat 1327. It is a very accurate piece of work and the learned Pandit has fully realised the identity of the languages and hence has also caught the true spirit of Avesta. I have had the pleasure of personal acquaintance with Pandit Vidhuśekhara and he very generously put his manuscript notes for the remaining verses (17-32) entirely at my disposal for the purpose of this article. For this I have to make to him my grateful acknowledgments. In fact this essay is to all intents our joint work even though it appears under one name only.

As to the plan of this translation I have attempted, I must begin by saying that I intend it primarily for the Hindu Pandit. The time has now come when the orthodox type of Vedic students must enlarge their horizon, and if the Pandits take kindly to Avesta they would find a deal of new light thrown on many an obscure question of Vedic interpretation. In the second place I intend this attempt also for my own co-religionists. Our Parsi scholars (with a few exceptions) are sadly lacking in the knowledge of Sanskrit, and especially of Vedic Sanskrit. And for us too the time has come to enlarge the range of our vision and to supplement our traditions with Vedic lore. Hence I have adopted a system of transliteration of Avesta into Sanskrit (Devanāgari) charac-

—— 4 ib.
—— 5 Especially for those who are not conversant with Pahlavi in the original.
ters, so that the similarity may be apparent to the reader. I have translated the verses line by line and have not changed the word-order in the least, so as to give an idea of the metre and rhythm of the original. I have freely "coined" new words and forms, but I have tried to give reasons for my new creations in the notes immediately following each verse. As for proper names and for words denoting special Avestic ideas I have retained them in their original shapes, but they are printed with the initial letter in bolder type. Explanatory notes are added wherever necessary. I have also given extracts from Nairyosang's version and from the published portion of Pandit Vidhuṣekhara's translation.

This is the first attempt of a Parsi student, whose knowledge of Sanskrit and Avesta is like the "little Latin and less Greek" mentioned of a far greater person. However, I make this attempt for what it is worth and I would beg for patience from my scholarly readers in the words (with slight changes) of Kālidāsa:—

\[ \text{क स्वर्गभरे भाषे क चाल्यविषया मति:।} \\
\text{तितीष्ठुसमं मोहादुरुपेनालिक सागरस।} \\
\text{वायु जतवर्धारे शास्त्रेसिंहस्तलिपदर्शिम्व।} \\
\text{भयो वचसमुखोऽसुधाकृतिसे गति।।} \]

In the system of transliteration here adopted I have used Bengali letters for the affricate sounds and the other special sounds of Avesta which differ from the Sanskrit.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Roman.</th>
<th>Devanāgari</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a</td>
<td>अ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>á</td>
<td>आ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i</td>
<td>इ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>í</td>
<td>ई</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>u</td>
<td>उ</td>
<td>With Bengali letters this appears as ु</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ú</td>
<td>ऊ</td>
<td>With Bengali letters this appears as ू</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6 These new creations are indicated by an asterisk (*) preceding that word. Even in cases where a Sanskrit word is used in a special sense I have used the asterisk. In two or three cases I have had to substitute an entirely different word in order to keep closer to the sense of the original.

7 The Roman transliteration is adapted from Bartholomae’s *Altiranisches Wörterbuch* (Strassburg, 1904).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sanskrit Letter</th>
<th>Pronunciation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ए (ए)</td>
<td>Pron. like ए in Ben. एक.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ओ (ो)</td>
<td>Like the above but <em>slightly</em> longer, say, 2½ <em>mātras</em>. <em>Not</em> like Ben. ओ.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ख (ख)</td>
<td>Like ख but 2½ <em>mātras</em> long. <em>Not</em> like ख.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ओ (ो)</td>
<td>Almost like ो in <em>not</em>.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ङ (ङ)</td>
<td>Pronounced ङङङङङ, <em>like</em> the French an.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>न (न)</td>
<td>Nasalized न, <em>like</em> the French an.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

[N.B.—The combination ए (एर) is generally *written* for Sanskrit ए, and I have used the ordinary Sanskrit ए to transcribe this combination in all places except where the metre would be spoilt.]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sanskrit Letter</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>क</td>
<td>This is a <em>Spirant</em>, like Pers. jsonp, or <em>ch</em> in <em>loch</em>. (The combination ळ + ळ has been transcribed ळ.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ख</td>
<td><em>Spirant</em> like Pers. jsonp.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ग</td>
<td>This is a कङ्ठलापु-sound used only with the ताल्लु vowels ळ and ळ.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ज, झ, ञ</td>
<td>Mostly final in a word or syllable.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ध</td>
<td><em>Spirant</em>, like <em>th</em> in <em>thin</em>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>न</td>
<td><em>Spirant</em>, like <em>th</em> in <em>thine</em>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>प</td>
<td>Corresponds to the चाब्धार and is used before च- and त- classes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>प</td>
<td><em>Spirant</em>, like Pers. jsonp, Eng. <em>f</em>.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3 The Sanskritist must note that every vowel is pronounced *separately* in Avesta.
Spirant; this comes nearest the Marathi or Bengali representation of the Eng. v. 9

Used only before य.

This is not exactly the सूप्रन्य, but comes very near it.

Spirant, just like the Eng. z.

Spirant, like z in azure.

Spirant conjunct like the Pers. و.

Spirant, used only before य.

As already mentioned above, this chapter of the Yasna is metrical. I have followed Geldner's text with but slight variations. 11 In some places I have scanned those passages which Geldner has printed in prose. Those words which I regard as later interpolations and therefore interfering with the metre (or sense) I have enclosed in brackets ( ). I have tried to follow the metre in Sanskrit too, but it is obviously defective there. The main reason for this seems to be the essential difference between the accent systems of the two languages—in the Veda the accent is musical, while in Avesta it is a strong stress, mostly on the penult. I have had to insert particles occasionally in the Sanskrit version which do not occur in the original for the sake of पादपूर्ति, and these are enclosed in square brackets [ ].

1.

चावनिस्वार्तूमव्या ्व(विनिस्वार्तूमव्या ्व
चत्तमो उपासकं कर्मःक्रमम्। नोम उपैतु जिगथःम्।

9 e.g. Mar. क्रिक्ट्टरीय, and Ben. क्रिक्ट्टरीय for Victoria.

10 These two are really conjuncts corresponding to Sanskrit श and घ respectively. The first part in each is a strong spirant pronounced almost like the x (st). It will be noted that the second letter has not been used at all in this piece.

11 I have followed the text and metrical arrangement adopted by me in my Selections from Avesta and Old Persian (Cal. Uni., 1921).
At the hour (of) early morning Haoma came up to Zarasuṣṭra, (who was) cleaning (the altar) for the fire and (was) chanting the Gaṇās. Unto him asked Zarasuṣṭra: "Who, O Hero, art thou, whom I see the noblest of all material creation, shining with (thine) own eternal light?"

The pādas in the Sanskrit are to be pronounced according to the rules of Vedic metre to get the verse correct. Thus in the first pāda the second या is to be pronounced या.

वायुः is here used as synonymous with यायुः. This epithet is used for यायु in RV., II. 8. 5, यायुम् यायुःस्मिन्मयायुः वायुः, where Śāyāṇa explains the word as "the devourer of oblation"—from यायु + वित्त.

*परियोगं-द🏓—I have made a comp. verb here after the manner of Av. योगं is found in RV. in the sense of "health" or "well being" especially united with शम् (Grass., Wb. 1125). And it is found five times in the RV. with चा (as here) and once in White Yajurveda. The meaning here is "cleaning (the altar) all round" for receiving the fire.

गायक—here mean the sacred hymns of the Av

काव्रुः—The word बाह्रु (Skt. बाह्रु) is used in Av. to mean all life whatever and it is mentioned as being twofold in character बाह्रुवत् (Skt. *बाह्रुवतुः), i.e. corporeal and मन्त्र (spiritual).

दर्शण—The tense value is present here. The sense of the first per. of the perf. of Skt. is not to be read into the Av.

गायक—The Av. गायक (Skt. गायक) means to live. The Gr. βίος (life) is also from the same root. The word गाय occurs in RV., VII.

13 Compound words are indicated thus with hyphens between the components. This is also done with the enclitic particles like या which are always added on to the preceding word.
14 See also Whit., § 1185g.
15 See below verse 31 and Kan.'s Av. Gram., § 535; also Whit. §§ 1090-95.
16 I. 93. 7, VI. 50. 7, VIII. 39. 4, X. 15. 4 and X. 37. 11.
17 Whit., § 823.
19. In the sense "goods" or "wealth". But in the Brhad. Up., V. 14. 4, the word is also found in the sense of "vital breath" or "life"—वेद्य गर्भाक्षे प्राणा वेद्य...

*खन्तः—I have made up this form from Skt. खन्त. In Av. the खन्त means to shine or to flash forth. It seems to be the same as the Skt. खन्त to sound. The latter is used in the Veda for flickering fire or flash lighting and the transference of meaning from the flicker to the crackling, and from the flash to the thunder-clap, is not at all unnatural. It would be hard to say, however, which of the two was the more ancient meaning. Passages like RV., I. 94. 11 (अभ्यासः खन्ताद्विभा पतिचिसा); RV., II. 4. 6 (आ यो वरी दाटायो न भाति वाण युथा रशीव खन्ते); and others, where it is used of खन्त, show the transition stage. The close connection of thunder and lightning is, of course, obvious: as for instance, RV., V. 87. 5 (खन्ते न बोधस्वायायुक्त्यद्वृत्यो विस्तिरस्वरूपं ध्वनयंस्त); and RV., X. 75. 3 (दिव खन्ते वहिये भुवोरह नस्थुं भुधुस्विक्षितम प्रभुसान). The Maitri Up., VI. 5, seems to use the word खन्त्ये in the Av. sense—खन्त्ये दश्य सन्तवाय योगिता.

It may be noted in passing that in "classical" Skt. we should say खन गणेन खन्तम्.

_Nairysang:_

... अभिष् परिधत पावर्यम् | (किल भिधिस्यान पावर्युपुव्यं भापितुं भूष्योपनाम्) ।

_गायाः समुद्रद्रोहम्...निन्यास जीवन संदर्भां वासरागा | (किल वेन निनो जीवः सदापरत्ववा अभ्यासः खन्त...).

_Pandit Vidhuśekhara:_

सन्तुम् खा खन्तम् खा (सवनसम्बन्धे)...ज्ञायनमय परियंतम् (संस्कुरंतम्...)

यम् ब्रह्म विनास्य अस्योः (भुवस्य) वास्य्यन्ति (वष्माद: भूतसम्बन्धः)...सखः गवस्य (जीवस्य) उज्जवलस्य अभ्यस्य.

2. खन्त् में प्रचं प्रवर्भचत

सोमो क्षतावम दुर्गोऽ|
वस्म वाक्य दानाधीर नस मैं वाचव दूरोधस्ती ।
बा मों यासुइ स्थितम
वा मों जनवध व्यारेवं ।
वा समुि सुरूह अग्रवे ।
बभु माणा सोमि संहि ।
वा मा (व्यारेवति) सोिशना: संवर् ।
यथा मा (व्यारेवति) सोिशना: संवर् ।

Thereupon this Haoma, the righteous, hard to overcome, replied unto me: "I am, O Zarāṣṭra, Haoma, the righteous, hard to overcome. Fix (thy) desires earnestly upon me, O Spitama, worship me (in order) to enjoy (of me), hymn me in hymn(s) of praise, as the other Sāosyaṇts have praised me."
स्मितम is the name of one of the ancestors of Zaraṣṭru and is used here as a patronymic. The word is philologically स्मितम (स्मितम?) in Skt. See also सायन below, in verse 22.

चारिवे is not the philological equivalent of चारिवेतर but it expresses the meaning exactly ("for enjoyment"). The Skt. root corresponding is चर which has not the same sense. For the form चारिव see Jack, §§ 806-807 and Whit. §§ 1162 and 1194.

स्मितम on the analogy of चारिव.

सोमनात (plu.) are the great spiritual leaders, who appear into the world from time to time to lead mankind to better ways and to re-establish the Law of चर (चरत) in this corporeal world. This is in form the fut. part. paras. of चर (चर?) to strive, to serve.

स्मितम is a form made irregularly after the analogy of चारिव.

Nairyosang:

...चारिव मुनिमातु चारिवु: (चारिवु चारिवुता च इत्य वत् महु मातमो मनुष्यागां चारिवु द्याति...।)।...चारिव मात परिसंधारां कुर्ष खादनाय (चारिवारां सेनाग्राह)।...

Pandit Vidhushkhrana:

...चारिव मात (चारिवा: (चारिवुः)।...मात सुखु माताय...सम्योमान:

(उपरेश्त्र:)

3.

वायू मनों चरितं चेरहुः (नमो चेरहुः)। ब्राह ब्राह्मणं ज्ञेयं ग्रहुः (नमः सोमाय)।

कान्त-वनम् प्रकाशेऽर्जु चरितं मन्यो मनःः

वायूवच्छायां ज्ञेयं सुतम ् गरिंशवाद ।

का चरितं ब्राह्मणं च्युष्मं च्युष्माविव

चिदं चरितं जसदेव चामुन्ते ।

Thereupon said Zaraṣṭru: "Salutation unto Haoma! Which mortal, O Haoma, (was) the first (who) worshipped thee for (the sake of) the material world? What blessing unto him was granted? What profit to him accrued?"

गरेर—The word गरेर in Av. means the world of life and is cognate

19 Cf. चोम (Av. चोम), see below verse 31.
20 Whit., § 590c.
21 Explained further in a footnote as: यिनि ब्रह्मकु द्वारू चारेन।
with गय in verse 1 above. The later Pahlavi form is गौति (Pers. गौति gōti) world, and so I have made Skt. गौति. The form is from गौ to live (see गय above) + चा (Whit., § 1163a), the guna being irregularly taken to be nearer the Av. form (Jack. § 793). Pronounce here गौति.

*वहितुय受到—I have made this irregular form on analogy of the Av., using the base वहि instead of बहितु. The form बहितु is found in RV., I. 164.4 (को दर्शं प्रवधं जायमान्मस्यन्नं यद्वधिका विभालि) and here the meaning is exactly that of the Avesta word. I have chosen this irregular form for metrical reasons. It should be read बहितुय.

केशावि—I have made a passive aorist in इ from a root केश. This root is mentioned in the गाय़डङ्गय as belonging to the नु- (8th-) class and meaning गति or प्रास. The form has been explained by Jackson as being irregular in keeping on the विकरण.

किम्—The Av. form किं is not used as a pron. in Skt.

आस्म—The word means profit or advantage (from आ + शाप). Cf. कामस्य व्यस्तः: कामालस्य मानसतः चर्चीन्द्रने परि स्व RV., IX. 113. 11. Pronounce as आस्म to get the metre right.

_Nairyosang:_

…कन्यां पूर्वं ज्ञाम मनुषयं चर्चीतति संस्कृतवान् जगति। कां तक्षे उपयोगित चक्ष्ये।

…किं तक्षे संग्राह सामस्यत।

_Pandit Vidhushekhara:_

का त्यां पौरे: (प्रथम)।...सति: आस्माय (==आस्मायी = भूतमायी) (ब्ल-)सुभूत जगाये। का अस्ते वापशी: अर्पिता? किम् ब्लस्ते (ब्ल-)चक्ष्यत् आस्माय

4.

आचार्ये रे आस्मम प्रहखुर्त
जस्मो अवव दूरूर्वोऽऽ
वीवड़ुलो मासम पानधिर्मिम्नयो
अष्टविश्वास्य जन्तु गरेश्वाद ल
उष्ड वच्छास्य वागिस्कण्यावि
तद वच्छास्य जस्मो आस्मः

आत् भेष्य प्रवधोश्चत
सोमो चतर्वा दूरः:।
विवायाः मां पूर्वः मन्यः
*वहितुय सुनुत गोठाये।
सा ब्रह्मा वापशी: *केशावि
तद्भक्त चक्षुस्त्य आस्माय

22 Jack., § 668, note.
Thereupon this Haoma, the righteous, hard to overcome, replied unto me: "Vivavāhvāt (was) the first mortal (who) worshipped me for (the sake of) the material world. This blessing unto him was granted, this profit to him accrued: namely, to him a son was born, who (was) Yima the King, the magnificent, the most resplendent of (all) created beings, (who shone forth) among mortals like unto the sun in appearance: who made during his rule both animals and human beings undying, (and) waters and vegetation ever fresh; (there was) inexhaustible food for feeding (his subjects)".

उज्जायत—I have followed in Skt. the Av. practice of dropping the augment. The Vedic language often drops the augment as in RV. IV. 2. 7 (अविन्यमानवीरत्) and other places, but not to such an extent as the Av.

*चत्—Ruler; from व्यतिरेत to rule. The form विन्यमत is found in Skt. as in विन्यमित (विन्यासमासमंविन्यासितां सौभाष्यवृत्तमांविहितसि), RV., X. 92. 14 and in compound words like विन्यमितविन्यमितविन्यमितविन्यमित. The name विन्यमित also seems to belong to the same formation.

सुवन्ता—This seems the nearest in meaning to the Av. The original word in Av. is from वन with suffix व्यतिरेत, which suffix in Av. forms nouns also while in Skt. it forms only gerundives.33 For बल in the Veda, cf. RV., III. 30. 18 (राजो बलारथ बलः सम्) and RV., VII. 8. 3. (राजा बलेम प्रवहः सुदृढः राज्यो वन्यारो दुहर्मेस्त।)।

*सरशावशमसिद्धाितज्ञानम्—The word सरशाह्वत occurs in RV., I. 18. 1 (सौभाष्यस्मात्सरशाह्वत) in the sense of brilliant or resplendent.

33 Jack., § 792; Whit., § 966a.
*कर्मणः I have made the word ending in यन्त्र, to fully represent the Av. original. In Veda कर्मणः occurs very often.  

**मघ्ननमः pronounce मतिमनन्वाम्**

यथा—In Av. the neut. form is used often for any gender or number. Kan. calls it a "relative particle".  

चतुर्दशय—The abl. case may be taken here as (1) referring to space—"in his kingdom", or (2) referring to time—"during his reign", or (3) in a causal sense—"owing to his rule".  

ब्रम्हिर्यान् प्रभुवरा—Vedic duals. The second word is a द्वि comp. Pronounce ब्रह्मिर्यान.

ब्रम्हिर्यानान्—Pronounce in four syllables ब्रम्हिर्यान.

*यापोवे—उवंगः* is used here in the special Av. sense of vegetation. The Skt. word is connected in sense, for उवंगः means "arable soil" or "cultivated land" in the Veda.  

अभिनियः अष्टमः अल्पमयः—The verb अपि is understood here. The first two words are translated according to sense. For the construction see Reichelt, *Awest. Elementarbuch*, § 690. अल्पमयः is from √अल्प, to diminish (in Skt. to overcome), which is the root of अल्प also.

**Nairyosang:**

...यदृश्य पुजो उदाहरितो वो चस्मादृश्यः  

(सकारात्मकः) ... सुर्गस्तिरचित्रात्मकः महायथः।  

(सन्तोषतस्य इत्यादिः) यथास्तिरचित्रात्मकः  

(किंतु यदृश्य पुजोत) तत्त शुक्लम।  

*चुपिचार्यः याको अववसादम्।* (अवि) चं (अवि) याको इतिमभूतः  

(प्रामलोकांशी। चित्र चं
During the rule of the illustrious Yima (there) was neither (excessive) cold nor (excessive) heat, neither was (there) old age nor death, nor (was there) envy created of the Daeva. Father and son moved about, each (seeming) only fifteen (years) in appearance as long as Yima the magnificent, the son of Vivasvat, reigned”.

*विविधायः—I have made a mas. form to correspond to the fem. form उदिभिः found in the Veda. This latter is used mostly as an उपसर्ग with verbs 39 and in one place at least—RV., V. 55. 2 (सूर्यभद्रान उदिभिः वि राज्य)—it is used in exactly the same sense as needed in this passage, viz. that of extensive and glorious sovereignty.

यास—In Av. the व्रष्ण ( = वम) is used only for things of evil, while with the good creation the व्र ( = रूः) is used. See below verse 8, note on निष्कम्भरम्.

*यौद्धम—The sense is “dampness”, hence cold. We have in Hindi the word यौद्ध meaning “damp” or “moist”. Doubtless it is a derivative from उद्र, water.

वर्षम in the sense of heat is frequently found in the Veda, but in mas., cf. RV., X. 181. 3. (या सूर्यादभरणरुषमेति).

*राधकः—Formed from रिधि to hurt with suffix अक. 30 There is a word in Pers. रश्क (rashk) meaning “envy” which may be traced directly from the Av. form. Probably the word राधा is also cognate. The word अर्थो means envy.

*देवधातः—The word देव is used all through the Av. in the sense of a demon and ब्रह्म in the older Vedic sense of God. 31 The form धात is regularly used in Av. for the later Skt. form छिन (p.pt of धा, to create).

39 Grass., Wb. 266.
30 Whit., § 1181.
31 It may be remarked that the Amaraṅkāra gives पूवदेवव as a synonym for अमरुध (I. 1. 12).
The form घिन is found in the compound words दुर्घिन and सुघिन in the Veda.\[34\]

पशुद्रा—Vedic form of dual. The meaning is "aged fifteen years".

पशुद्रा—The form पशुद्रा is found in RV., I.123.7 and III.7.1.

*रोहिम्—The word रोहिम् (neut.) occurs in RV. only once, VI. 71. 5 (द्विने रोहिम्स्यकत्वाविधयः), where the word means "heights". I take the word रोहिम् also from सुस्च (older *सुध्), to mean growth or stature.

कतर्पित—means either of the two, i.e. both of them (the son as well as the father).

अविनेत—Opt. aor. (a-variety); see Whit., § 805.

Nairysang:

चमुडेश्वर रावण उपलब्ध | न मात्रार्वण न च राधा: |...| न च ईश्वर देवदत्ता |
(अहि वर्षमेव अतुतं परं पापकं कालात्मक्ष्या यथा जलाशयं) । पंचदशवत्तिनी कृ.

Pandit Vidhushekharō:

...विनेत (हुलमेस) नेतु उल्लम् (= आश्चर्यम् = श्रीलम्) नेतु घरमस्(ि)...नेतु देश: देवधात: (धात = धाह + त = विह, =विहित: ) पंचदश्री (पंचदशवत्तिनी)\[34\] प्रविशुहातातम् विता पुष्प तमस: कतरो रोहिज (ि = ब्रह्म) यात्रां चित्तेत् (आयता चित्तेत्; चिता)... |

6.

कासा-प्यासै बिश्रो कहम मन्यो

वश्चर्याय जनो गणेश्याय ।

का अस्तान्त्र्य अघिम्स्तन्त्रि

चिं अविधान च तोम चातुरात्म् ||

32 Grass., Wb. 615 and 1337. It may be noted that दुर्घिन is found only once in R.V.—I. 140. 11.

33 Emendation by Bharucha.

34 विहित: is a Sanskritised form of the Guj. विही (couple or pair).

35 The text here is corrupt. For details see note 43 by Bharucha in Part II of the Coll. Skt. Writings of the Parsis.

36 He adds an explanatory footnote:—ज्ञान दोऽक्षरे कृष्ण नूतनत्वक के एकामने ब्रह्म वर्गाय फलीषुद्ध वहीते।
(Zaraṇṇuṭra asked):

"Which mortal, O Haoma (was) the second (who) worshipped thee for (the sake of) the material world? What blessing unto him was granted? What profit to him accrued?"

7.

Thereupon this Haoma, the righteous, hard to overcome, replied unto me: Āśvyā (was) the second mortal (who) worshipped me for (the sake of) the material world. This blessing unto him was granted, this profit to him accrued: namely, unto him a son was born, Grāntaṇa of the valiant race'.

**Agnāy**:—Corresponds to the Av. आग्नेय. This name is associated in Veda with नेिन्त्र (RV., I. 105. 9, etc.).

**वैदम**:—This name occurs only once in RV., I. 158. 5. This name and नेिन्त्र are apparently confused together. This name is found as फरीदन (Farīdan) in the Shāhnāmeh. For further details see Haug, Essays on the Religion of the Parsis, pp. 277f.

**Nairyosang**:

...यदो बुध उष्माजान: वेशसंस्कर्त: प्रृहतः। (यदो वेशसंस्कर्तं इव अभ्युते यत् वेशस्व अन्यायात पिताङ्गम वशीर्थि [शस्त्राचर्या?] आसन्। तस्य यत् दाहास्य [शस्त्राचर्या?] चठे जाग्रा। सम्यगाच्छ च तानि यानि खास्य न प्रकाशीनि आसन्न: अलौ उद्भवे।"

Note:—Does the portion from यस्य... up to the end refer to the same tradition as contained in RV., X. 8. 8? See note on यदो in the next verse.

**Pandit Vidhūṣekhara**:

...विशः (= वेशस्य = मौजस्य) युरायाः: ग्रान्तत्वोऽः (= वैदम):।
8.

यो चन्त्र भाषिम दशाकम्

*विष्णुभागम् *विष्णुदयांगम्

चषम्य सतस्वयमिनौ

वा भोजस्म देवीम हथम्

अभिम ग्राम्या भ्रातसिनौ

याम् ब्रह्म-ब्रह्मसमाम हथम्

स्वयं जनां जनां जानम्

याम् ब्रह्म-ब्रह्मसमाम हथम्

यां ग्राम्या भ्रातसिनौ

स्वयं जनां जनां जानम्

मन्त्रमां अपि ग्राम्यानौ


"Who slew the dragon Dahāka, three-jawed, three-skulled, six-orbed, (and) of a thousand wiles, the very strong devilish Druj, (who was) evil unto living (creatures, and) unbelieving; whom Apro-Mainyu hewed out (as) by far the strongest Druj against this material world, for the destruction of the creations of Aśa ".

अशिम दशाकम्—The name in Av. अशिम दशाकम् has passed on into the proper name of a three-headed demon in the Shāhnhāmeh, where he is called खाङ्क (Zohāk). The name is held by all Zoroastrians in utter scorn. In Pahlavi literature a demon of the name अशिम 53 is mentioned, who is the demon of unchastity, and who is among the most annoying opponents of Ahuramazda and अशिम = दशाक is regarded as an incarnation of that demon.39

*विष्णुभागम्—The Av. word विष्णु means mouth and is used only for evil beings. For the good creation the corresponding word is अभिश्व or लम्न (used only for a dog 49). There is a sharp division between the two sets of words as used in the Av.—the one used only for the creation of the Good Spirit (hence called विष्णु—words) and the other used only for the creation of the Evil-Spirit (hence called दशाक—words).41

37 Hence the Parsi Guj. adj. ओऽरात्स (tyrannous).
38 अजिना, verse 32 below, is said to be from this word, but is evidently a case of "popular etymology ".
39 Bharucha, op. cit., note 44.
40 The dog is a pure creature in the Av.
41 See an essay by Frachtenberg on the subject in the Spiegel Memorial Volume, pp.
The word चव्र—used in the sense of कु (Pān. II. 1. 64). The derivation thus suggested for the Av. word कस्मर is supported by Barth, who says that it originally was a word expressing surprise—“What a head!”—on seeing an uncouth head. Others suggest that the word is connected with Lat. camera and Pers. कम (kamar) cupola, and that it means “an empty skull”. The Av. word is a द्रेव—word, the ब्यस्त—word being ब्रह्म.

यन्म—Av. वचि (du.) is a द्रेव—word, the द्रेव—word is दोर. Pt. Vīḍhuśekhara quotes from Sīt. Br. I. 5. 2. 1.—लदृव दुचि: चिन्नोधाणा। गद्वर गासन तस्य चिन्नोध मुखानि भानि। The RV. also mentions in two places this combat with the three headed-demon, where चिन्न is the conqueror.

स पिन्नाणासुराणि विन्नाणात्रिष्ठयुः भानो चुस्त्योभयुः।
विन्नाणां। समर्पित अण्णानांस्य विन्नित: समाने चिन्तो मा। I. X. 8. 8.

and
स इन्धारो तुरित्वं पतित्वं स्याभानि दमन्तु।
अभ्य विन्तो न्योजसा ब्रह्मणो विधा वर्गरूपमेवांश्य चन्। X. 99. 6.

साक्षायिन्यं—Cf. साक्षायिन्यं (इन्द्र) RV., I.100.12 and साक्षायित: (विन्न: सोम:) RV., IX. 71. 7.

वचि—The Av. prefix वचि is used in the sense of चिन्त.

कुम्भा—I have used it in the fem. as in the Av. The fem. is also found in RV., IV. 23. 7; X. 73. 2; and in RV., III. 31. 19 (कुम्भो विं वचिहः
कुम्भला कुस्तोः) the idea of वचिह: कुम्भ: is exactly that of the Avestic द्रेवनी कुम्भ.

कुक्तम—This is a special name given in the Avesta to the infidel. Kan. (Dict.) explains this epithet as “one who runs away from the Law of ब्रह्म (स्थित)”, hence “unbeliever”. Nairyosang’s rendering द्वृहत्तु supports this view. We Parsis still use the word दोहन्द or दोहन्द in exactly the same sense. Barth. (Wb. 774 ff) derives this word as द्वृहन्तु.

प्राक्क भन्त्रु—कुल is a द्रेव—word, the द्रेव—word is तच्छ (तच्छ). The idea is that the evil-creation is as it were “hewn out” anyhow by Āpiro-Mainyu.
ब्यह्यं-मण्डः is the Evil-Spirit or the Matter-side of creation, as opposed to the Good-Spirit (देश्वनो-महृद्यु: ), the Soul-side of creation. These correspond nearest to प्रकृति and उपाय. They are both created by Ahuramazda and they are both responsible for the rest of the creation. This doctrine is very clearly enunciated in the गाथा अजगरविन्य (Yas. XXVIII–XXXIV), especially Yas. XXX, 3 ff.

यज्ञ is used in the sense of "against".

सत्य—The dat. sg. of विद्य. f. meaning injury or harm. The word is found only once in RV., VIII. 67. 9, मा नै मृणा रिपुराणा रीतिनामा।मिविवकः.

Nairygosang:

यो जानन अर्धशां दशा कर जिल्लते जिमलताम्ब मयूरोत्तरः सबस्त्रास्वार्धिष्टूम्। संस्कर्ते देवं हर्षम्। दुर्भो लोकेषु दुर्गौतिष्मू (चानिकारमिवाय्य।) यं...प्राकारेऽस्वं वायुःम- दर्जितयोऽ (अबुधेनुष्म)॥ \* उपरि विद्यम्न विस्तिरितां जगति मयथे पुस्तोऽयात्।...*

Pandit Vidhushekharo:

...च्ञ्वमयम् (चिन्तुमयम्) चिन्तिभुविष्मस्...दितम् हर्षम् अवम् अगतिभः (संवणेनो वा) (उप-चक्तम्...प्र च व्यक्तत् (चाकारेऽस्वं) ब्रह्मोत्तमः...मकाय अवः जगतीनम्।

9.

कास स्वास्त् श्रविहो चक्तम मर्योऽ
अल्बविराज ज्ञातं सायंग्याद।
का व्यायत्स व्यास्तिः द्वाराविव
चतु व्यायत्स चतु व्यास्तिः॥

(Zara'üstra asked:)

"Which mortal, O Haoma, (was) the third (who) worshipped thee for (the sake of) the material world? What blessing unto him was granted? What profit to him accrued?"

वला:—Metre requires this to be read वला: like the Av. श्रविहोऽ.

10.

वस्यं मै वातं पारेऽवः
श्वं श्रविह दुर्भोऽ
श्रविहो (सावमानो शास्त्रिः) श्रविहो
मृणा मर्योऽ

\* This is the Pahlavi form of the name; this has gone over into Grk. as 'Aperadna'.
A Sanskrit Version of Yasnā IX.

Thereupon this Haoma the righteous, hard to overcome, replied unto me: ērita, the most powerful of the Sāma-family, (was) the third mortal (who) worshipped me for (the sake of) the material world. This blessing unto him was granted, this profit to him accrued: namely, unto him were born two sons, Urvāśaya and Kṛsavaspa; the one a Teacher (and) Lawgiver, and the other a supremely energetic, youthful, curly-haired, mace-wielder.

Sāmanām—This is the name of a famous family of Iran.

Avat—In the Veda the name Avat is used instead of ēreta (earable) as the son of ētra. But the Av. makes a distinction between the two.

*Avat—Vedic dual.

*Avat—The word ēreta in Av. means, among other things, a religious teacher." Kan. (Dict.) derives it from ērēt + ēvā (of), to see, hence the word means "one who has seen beyond (the average mortal)". This reminds one of the traditional derivation given of the word ēvā from ēvā, to see. I have accepted the derivation of Kan. and have made the word *Avat on the analogy of ēvādāvā etc. For the dropping of the initial ē, see Whit. § 1087a.

*Gatavā—The word Gata here has the special sense of law or ēm, hence the compound means lawgiver. The word Gata (n?) meaning probably "rule" or "law" occurs in RV., X. 49. 4. (Grass., Wb. 157).


Nairyosang:

...ṣrit: 45 [ṣrit:]...samanē laṁeṣe...| Nāyādāvā: ēvitaṁśītur (Kim)

45 This form is from the Persianised form Srit which makes the name ērēt (Asrit) in Mod. Pers.
"Who (Kāraśāspa) slew the horned dragon, who (was) horse-devouring (and) man-devouring, who (was) poisonous (and) green, (and) upon whom (all over the body) the poison rose green to the height of a spear; upon whom Kāraśāspa cooked (his) food in an iron (pot) at noon-tide; and that serpent grew hot and began to sweat, (and) forth from (under) the iron (pot) sprang away, (and) upset the boiling water: startled, Kāraśāspa, (even though) of manly heart, fled away in the opposite direction."

प्रायः—Pronounce प्रायः.
A Sanskrit Version of Yasna IX.

अड्डणस्म्—Horse-devouring. On the analogy of अग्नि (lit. goat-swallowing).

*ऋषिवसः* (neu.)—Lit. having the वस्त्र (height) of a श्री (a spear). The compound is formed like अविवचः (n.) in RV., X. 63. 3, meaning strong (tall?) as a mountain.

यज्ञसा—The word is used here for a (cooking) vessel made of iron.

पितुम्य—Food. Used frequently in the Veda. In RV., I. 187 the पितु (the juice extracted for drinking) is addressed as a diety.47

पञ्चन—Note the atmanepada. K. mistook the monster for a green hillock!

रूपिण्यम्—This is the third of the five divisions of the day (beginning with midnight). This extends from midday to about 3 p.m. (till the sun has half finished the downward course). Kan. (Dict.) derives the word from रूपर (day) and श्रीति (middle part, pith). Reichelt (Awest. Elementarbuch, p. 494) takes the श्रीति as meaning "food" (पितु) and explains the name as the time of the day when the (principal) meal is taken.

*बृगाधम्—Av. बृगाधम् means "time". It has been compared to the Grk. ἥμοιος (time).48 The Pers. 𐭧𐭥 (zamān) time, is derived from this through Pahlavi ῥ/wait. I have made this from बी, to go (निघ्रहर II. 14). The word बृगाधम in the sense of "space" (from the same root) is found in the RV. (Grass., Wb. 506).

*तपूम्—3-aor. of तप, irregularly without viiddhi.49

*मर्य—The word does not mean the same as मर्य in the Vedas. Perhaps the मर्य mentioned in Bṛhad. Up., VI. 4. 4. (वह्लो मर्या भाष्मशाणया:....प्रयत्न) is nearer in meaning to the Av. मर्य which is always used in the sense of a "deceiver".50 Kan. translates "serpent". The मर्य of Buddhism is probably the same; also मर्य: मन्नश् (?)

श्रीदात्—Kan. takes श्रीदात as equal to Skt. (ष्ठ)श्रदात and trans. "hissed".

*ब्रह्मस्—In Av. this is also used in sg.

गर्रस्मा—The word गर्र in Av. is used in the sense of विर; गर्रस्मा is later on found as the name as one of the great heroes of the साम- family—जन्म (Narimān) of the Shāhnāmeh.

---

47 Grass. Wb., 812.
48 Barth. (Wb. 1704) notes that only the first two letters correspond.
49 Whit, § 887a.
50 Barth., Wb. 1151; also Grundriss d. iran. Phil., II, p. 53.
Nairyosang:

यो चाण बाहि सुवर्णं यं विस्मितम नरगिलं | दोषितम्। यज्ञपरि विष्णु प्रावशत् सुवंभुसुनीत्तमः प्रातः गः | दोषितम्। यज्ञपरि विष्णु प्रावशत् सुवंभुसुनीत्तमः प्रातः गः।

चा रपिष्यिति कालम्। (चा मथारस्मथाकालम्।) तमशा स नेशास: सुलभः। (विज दिपारो वरभु)।...

मलेवोऽयाप:...चाप सर्वे पौष्ठमानसानि [पौष्ठमानस:]

चाहि पौष्ठमानसानि इदं वर्कूर यदु वास्ते चेतनं खान दृश्)।

N.B.:—The Av. text obviously means that K., though manly-minded, was so startled by what he thought to be a green-hillock rearing itself up, that he ran away. But Yaśt XIX (41-44) mentions that he came back on recovering from his surprise and slew the monster.

Pandit Vidhushakharā:

चाठार्मस (=चाठार्मस) तं अवसितम्...विषममोत्संगुरदनम् (=संगुरदनम्)...अवसा (अवसाषेच्या) पिन्तम् (पिन्तम्) अपनत चा मथारं कालं, तमशा (भविषुमारमतं) स मर्यं अवसात् (संविश्री भविषुमारमत वा)...

(क्षर्णिम् (=क्षर्णिम्) अथापत् (अथ)...

कांतिस-त्राञ्च तिंबाङ्खा च्यस्म मथयो | कांतिस-त्राञ्च तिंबाङ्खा च्यस्म मथयो | का च्यस्म अवसिस्क्षाविवि | का च्यस्म अवसिस्क्षाविवि | कित् च्यस्मांते जने च्यलिभस् | कित् च्यस्मांते जने च्यलिभस् |

(Zaraṣṭra asked:)

"Which mortal, O Haoma (was) the fourth (who) worshipped thee for (the sake of) the material world? What blessing unto him was granted? What profit to him accrued?"

तुर्य: is found in the Upanishads. See also Whit., § 487c.

13.

चायर्ये मे अग्निम प्रायायत श्रायर्यो अयव दूषायो।

The Pahlavi says asp bālāk (the height of a horse) and hence it is surprising why Nair., translates thus. Kan. follows Nair., as do others as well.

52 Guj. कृतः.

53 Stood on his hind legs.

54 Owing to his close and literal adherence to the Pahlavi Nair., makes bad mistakes in Skt. grammar, see Bharucha, op. cit., note 47.

55 खाने दथो is the Guj. दथकाण राष्ट्र, lit. kept his senses in their proper place.
Thereupon this Haoma the righteous, hard to overcome, replied unto me: "Pourusaspa (was) the fourth mortal (who) worshipped me for (the sake of) the material world. This blessing unto him was granted, this profit to him accrued: namely, unto him thou wast born, thou, O righteous Zarasvstra, in the house of Pourusaspa, (thou who art) opposed to the Daevas (and) follower of the Law of Ahura."

पुरुषसपा—The father of Z. According to Av. texts the name implies having many horses—पुरुष (like पुरुष, पुरुषम्, etc. in the RV.).

ऋजय—Vocative. Cf. RV., II. 27. 9 (ऋजये मन्त्रयो) and elsewhere—Barth. takes it as an adv. (originally neu. sg.). This usage is also paralleled in RV. II. 3. 7 (ऋजये चतुरतः) ; V. 46. 1 (ऋसुते नेष्टि) and X. 67. 2 (ऋसुतं प्राणं ऋक्त्वै दौधाय्याना) where the adv. means "in the proper manner".

दमस्य—Of the house (i.e. famiy). The Skt. दम is found in the Gādās as दमाण (=Skt. *द्वाण, धामण) with a strong accent on the second syllable. This leads ultimately to dropping out of the weak vowel अ and the intermediate form धाम passes by regular assimilation to the धाम of younger Avesta.

*विदेश—विति is used in the sense of opposition. Cf. AV. III. 31. 1—11, वै न वै ग्राण दुपिताना.

*द्वरालितिच्छ:—I have attempted to construct this compound for the Av. द्वचर-संघर्षो (see above, verse 10) The second part means here "law" or "religion" and the compound would mean "one who follows the Law of Ahura."

66 Yašt XXIII. 4; but see Barth., Wb. 903. 67 Wb. 355.
Nairyosang:
* ...लं विन्दूः जरायनः मन्दिरे पोषकशिवीः विविधादेवे होम स्कन्दः—नाथे।

Pandit Vidhushakharah:
* ...पौषिधानः...यदस्य लं उद्यायक लं षष्णः (=पुष्यास्मा)...सद्यः...वि-देवः
(=देवनिर्जनः) अअतर-थमार्गङ्कालतः

14.

खतो चाँदे ने-वर्षेंद्रि

tum पौषिधानः जरायनः।

अञ्जन्म वद्रीमः फळ्याथ्यो।

वीर्यन्यासुःन्तमः वाशुरविजसम्

अयम्) श्राववथ्ये कर्कूवित।

[वि] अल आवः-वोजः

लं पौषः जरायनः।

अञ्जनम् वद्रीमः प्राय्यायः।

*विविधादेवे *अअटायसम्

(अयम्) कुङ्कतमः च प्रायस्तित।

Famed through (all) Airyana-Vaējah, thou, O Zara/output. (wast)
the first, (who) recited aloud the Ahuna-Vairya, with the proper divi-
sions (of metre and syllables), four times, (and yet) another (time) with
a louder chant.

आयें-वोजः—The name (meaning "the cradle of the Āryas") was
applied to the ancient land of the Iranian peoples. In later times it
became Īrān or Īrān (Pers., ایران, Iran, or Irān).

अञ्जनम्-वद्रीमः—The hymn beginning with the words यद वह वह वदरीमः.
This is the holiest of the mantras of the Z. religion. It has in our
ritual the same sanctity as the ग्रामी. We get frequently in the Av.
the phrase, अञ्जनम्-वद्रीमः तमूः पारति (the A.-V. protects the body).

*विविधादेवे—From वि and वि to divide into parts: cf. RV., I. 70. 5
(पितृः ज्ञते वेदेिः भरता); X. 1. 2 (अष्टि चाकृतित्वं अष्टि घृः); etc. In
Av. the meaning is specialised and the term is applied to dividing up a
mantra into words and syllables.

*अञ्जनम्—On the analogy of अचान्तम् in RV., X. 114. 6 (हट्टिस्
स दक्षत अचाँतम्). The meaning is that the mantra (अञ्जन-वद्रीमः) is to
be repeated four times. It belongs to a class of chants that has to be
repeated four times (चक्षसः स्मारते).

*कुङ्कतमः—Ins. sg. of a fem. adj., Vedic form. The Av. word is
a compound root, वषुः + रा (कुङ्क + घा) meaning to be angry, hence

58 Ahuramazda. 59 Whit., § 1313b. 60 Vendidad, X. 11. 61 Whit., § 365a.
to be loud. And to this the इङ्ग्स (comparative suffix) is added. As such a formation is impossible in Skt., I have tried to keep the sense (and some of the sound) by using another root altogether. I have used जः to cry out, and I take the word to mean "louder".

Prayâṅgâ—Ins. sg., see Whit., § 341 c; cf. RV., IV. 54. 3 (अचिन्ति
वचनम् देवे जः)

Nairyosang:

विश्वासः ग्रहेण देवे तः पुनः अर्थशत्रो चाङ्गनरः¹⁰⁴ प्रायोः विना कामगोः
(अभागोः च)¹⁰⁵...¹⁰⁶प्रायं गाठतरः प्राइंटररे गा

Pandit Virdhushkhara:

...विवलकात्मकः (=तत्र तत्र सविगमम्) चतुर्विश्वः अपरं तयतरया चस्याः
(=खरे गा) ॥

15.

तूम् केसरसुरः¹⁰⁷वाङ्गनवो
वैस्ये दर्शवं जशुयुल्
वोह धर यायसां वै राजसां
अपलयन्त प्रति आय शेमा
यो वाङ्गमिः यो तृतीयोः
यो पुराक्षोः यो आशिः
यो चांसु-सुश्रुतसमी
वववत् संनितवो दारांग ॥

owego; वशायुः नामः
विश्वान् देवान् जशुयुः
वे परा अम्मात् वैररेखा
(अ)पतयम् प्रति आया नामा
यो आलिङ्गः वस्वरः
वस्ववरः यो आचिः
यो अतिवहस्तसः
अभवत् मनस्वः धारातिः ॥

"Thou O Zarasustra, caused all the demons to hide underneath the earth, who before this (thy coming), ran about upon this earth in human shape, (thou) who (art) the strongest (and) bravest, who (art) the most active (and) the swiftest, (and) who hast become in the highest degree victorious among the creatures of the (two) Spirits.''

¹⁰⁴ The Pahlavi form of चाङ्गन-नद्र्यं.
¹⁰⁵ The Pahlavi version translates the word विश्वव्यस्तुम् as "without interruption"; see Bharuchha, op. cit., note 50.
¹⁰⁶ The version of Nair. seems defective here as a word of the text, बाणेदुरीयम्, is omitted; Bharuchha, loc. cit.
¹⁰⁷ Geld. reads 'वृणि'; I have taken the reading of Kan.
*आगुष्ठः—Acc. plu. of *आगुष्ठ (hidden under the earth). The word आगुष्ठ is found in RV., frequently. For the compound see Whit., § 1269.

*वौरोप्षः—वौर is used in the sense merely of मनुष्य. The meaning is मनुष्यान्तः वौरोप्षः: "having human shape".

अवज्ञः—This and अभवत् below are among the rare examples of an augment being used in Av. with a verbal form. यह when it means "to move" is a द्रव्य-word; the अभवत्-word corresponding is वौरोप्षः.

आ—Ins. sg., cf. RV., II. 24. 1 (आ विधेम गवया मनुष्य गिरा)
आ—Ins. sg.; this form is found only once in RV., VI. 52. 15 (बैौरे च आ वर्णिनो अविस्माय दियो वर्णिनो यथा मनुष्यः) where the word means, just like here, "upon the earth".

य—Refers to Z.

लक्ष्चिह्न—लक्ष्चिह्न is found in the sense of motion. The word means "bravest".

लक्ष्चिह्न—RV., II. 33. 6 has लक्ष्चिह्न भवा ववसा नाग्मानम् and the meaning is much the same as here, differing only in the degree of comparison.

अविवष्ठन्ताः—Cf. RV., VIII. 93. 30 (वर्णिनो बलवन्ताः सुताववसंतो छामाने) and other passages.

मन्वः—The word मन्व is used in the special sense of a deity or a being of the spiritual world. When in the du. the word signifies the two Spirits who have created all this world.

*घामनि—Used in the special sense of "creation". The acc. plu. form 64 is used for loc. plu.

Nairyosang:

लं धातूतैगमान( धातूतैगमान) वौरोप्षः... न...ौरोप्षः अपत्तु... न... यो वज्ञानमः यो दुःखः... यो ब्रजवस्यमः यो वज्ञानमः जातः पर्लोकिनः 67 दुःखः... Pāndita Vidihuśekhara:

लं अग्निदासम (अग्निदासम गदासम) वौरोप्षः (वौरोप्षः) ... यो वजिज्ञः यो वजिज्ञः यो लक्ष्चिह्नः (लक्ष्चिह्नः कमिष्टः ...); यो वजिज्ञः (अग्निदासमः) ... अभवत् मन्वः धातः 65 पान.

64 Jack., § 308.
67 Nair, evidently takes मन्व in the sense of the spirit-world, i.e. पर्लोक. He obviously overlooks the dual.
68 He explains the last word in the Bengali translation thus: शामच आच। सूक्ष्मालैक।
Thereupon Zarathustra said: "Salutation unto Haoma! Haoma (is) excellent, well-created is Haoma, truth-created (as well); created by excellence, (and) health-giver; well-shaped, working for good, (and) victorious; golden-hued (is he) with bending twigs; just as (he is) best for (the body) of the drinker, (so) also (he) best points out the way unto (the) soul.''

वसुः—The epithet is used for सोम in RV., IX. 98. 5 (वसु परसु ।) In Av. the word assumes two forms, वसु and the more regular वस्म, and both forms are found mixed up in the declension. 69

*सुधातः—Cf. सुधि in the Veda (Grass., Wb. 1537).

*क्रियविधातः—This is the nearest equivalent to the Av. क्रिय-दात। I have used the term क्रिय in the sense of क्रिय, 70 and hence the compound means "truth-created". Cf. क्रियते । 71 क्रियवाद विवातिश्च, RV., IX. 108. 8.

*वसुधातः—I have ventured to make this a compound; Gelder prints the words separately.

भेष्यजः—भेष्य in the sense of "healing" (adj.) is found in RV., II. 33. 7 (भेष्यस्य ते शास्त्रायाकार्यता यो ब्राह्मणो भेष्यो इत्यादिः) and in X. 137. 6

(आपोऽस भेष्यो भेष्यो भेष्यो भेष्य भेष्यम्)

सुधातः—The word सुध (f.) is found in RV., to mean "form" or

69 Jack., §§ 108-129 for the representation of Skt. सु in Av. For the declension, see Kan., Av. Gram., §§ 116-118.

70 See my article on क्रिय in this volume.

71 See my article in this volume.
"shape"." 78 Cf. दिविक्षुनयाकरूप परिःरूमनव्य श्रृवा। योऽमवाय: श्रृवा ग्रांविश्रिग:।
RV., IX. 64. 28.

*सुधृः—The form स्वधृः is found in RV., X. 38. 5 (सुधृः विष लामक्ष्मिन्ना पुष्वद्वाय्तः स्वधृः प्रायोदमस्)। The वर्तृ (Skt. वृ) in Av.
means to work; hence this epithet means one who works for good.
The three commandments of the Z. religion are सम, व्रत and व्रतिन.

चरियुगो नवान्वय:—I regard this पदा to be a later interpolation.
For these words could apply only to the लान्स Soma, not to the Deity. 78
The word मुषा: is used here in the sense of colour. Mod. Pers. जुन (gūn)
means "colour." Cf. RV., IX. 65. 8 (यस्य 74 वाम मधुषुतं दरि जुनवय्यमिस्य:).

वसिष्ठ:—The word is found in the sense of "best," used as an epito
dh of इन्द्र in RV., II.36.1; of अंगिन in RV., II. 9. 1 and VII. 1. 8 76; of एक्ष्मस् in RV., X. 95. 17 and probably also adjectivaly in RV., X.
150. 5 (अंगिन वसिष्ठे इन्द्रे पुरोहित:).

उर्घाने—The word उर्घान is used in Av. to mean the soul, the आका.
The derivation given is from स्व, to choose, the soul being regarded as
free to choose the path either of the Good Spirit or of the Evil Spirit. 77
The aorist participle उर्घान is found in the Veda; as in RV., VII. 73. 3
(अन्तः युः पुष्यामुरुः इमां सुधृः मधुषुतं दृष्ट्यः जुनवय्यमस्).

वचवसम:—Best pointing out the way. Cf. RV., IX. 106. 5 (सुधृः यामा
परिःरूमनव्यः).

Nairysang:

उत्तमो ईम: सुधदानम् सुधदानम् [उद्तता:]। (किल संहपायारत्य द्रोणसिः)। ईम: सव-
दान:।।(किल विनित्तिसी लंते बस्त्रके युध्ये दृष्ट्यः)। ...। सुक्किवर्दोरसिः। ...। सु-
कामोऽसि।।सुषविवाओऽसि। सः खादिष्ठां उत्तमसाय भास्तने सचिविद्यमनो-
सक्स।।(किल निदिक आकामो लया उत्तमतरं श्रवके कतुं यत: मरोषमानिसिः 80 लया
भवति।।

78 Found only in ins. sg. धृपा। Grass., Wb. 347.
79 See an article by me in the Guj. monthly चारय (May, 1920).
74 Sc. मोमस।
75 Can it be an intentional play on the word in this last case?
76 Grass., Wb. 1234.
77 Jack., Av. Reader; p. 61.
73 Sc. मोम।
79 Guj. काम = कार्य।
80 मरोषमान = Av. गरी-मान, lit. "the house of Praise", i.e. the highest heaven.
Pandit Vidhuśekhara:

वसस... (उत्तम:) सोम...शुद्धतया (वि-)शित... भैवग्धः ("मु") सुकल्पः सुकम्मा
दनाः (==शाखवाली) चरिषुद्धः...नमःः (==नम्पलवः:) यहा पाणाव वसिष्ठः
(==उत्तमतम:) खााःः प्रयातः: ::

[N.B.—Pandit Vidhuśekhara's published version ends here.]

17.

नी-ति जाद्रे मस्म् स्थि
नी भासम् नी वर्गिष्ठमः |
नी दस्तहिः ॥ नी बसथानमः |
नी दस्तहिः ॥ नी वर्गिष्ठमः |
नी भासम् नी वर्गिष्ठमः |
नी भासम् नी वर्गिष्ठमः |
नी भासम् नी वर्गिष्ठमः |
नी भासम् नी वर्गिष्ठमः |
नी भासम् नी वर्गिष्ठमः |

नि ते स्वरे मस्म् वृजे
नि भासम् नि "हस् प्रम् |
नि दस्तहिः नि भेषजः |
नि "प्रधनम् नि वर्गिष्ठ |
नि धोत्रो विखर्वम् |
नि वतिस्म् विखर्वप्रसादम् |
नि तथः यथा मोहास या |
"वर्गिष्ठ: प्रचाराणी |
विषुवालो हृद्ववन: ::

I ask of thee, O Golden-hued, for fervour, for power (and) for success (as well); for health (and) for the means of gaining health; for advancement (and) for increase; for strength of (this) whole body, (as well as) for wisdom all-embracing;—for (all) this (I ask) so that in (all) lands I may move about free at will, overcoming opposition, (and) conquering evil.

मस्म्—Used very frequently in Veda in connection with सोम-drinking.\[82\]

*हस् प्रम्—This is a compound from the phrase चुन स्त्राभा of RV., III. 49. 1. See also verse 27 below.

*दस्तहिः—The word दस्त (वृद्धि) is found in Veda as well as in Av.\[84\] I have made this word from the same root but with the suffix वर, the noun being neuter as in Av.\[85\] The word दस्तः (or दस्तर) in Av. is always used with बस्देशः and the combination means "health and

\[81\] I have adopted this reading in preference to Goldner's दस्तर.

\[82\] Grass., Wb. 981ff.
\[83\] Whit. § 1166.
\[84\] Barth., Wb. 702.
\[85\] Whit. § 1171; also Jack., § 823.
means of health." In Veda the word दृश्य means "shining," or "possessing extraordinary power," or "wonderful." The word दृश्य, strong is also cognate; cf. RV., I. 116. 16 (कान्ति दृश्यिः) and RV.; VIII. 86. 1 (दृश्य दृश्य दिप्यन)

*प्रजनम्—On the analogy of इत्याधिकम् पाणिनी III. 1. 139.

प्रजनम् is used in the RV., once only in the sense of चित्र, X.12.4 (चित्रित्वा वृत्ताण्वणे शतकः).

विश्वनाम—Of the whole body. It is an adj.

संतिम् विश्वनामाश्च—Cf. RV., I. 61. 16 (संतिम् विश्वनामाश्च धैर्य्य धारा). The Av. word संतिम् is taken by Jack from √मन (मनु) + तिः; Kan. takes it as from मन (मनु) + तिः; and Barth, takes it from the compound root मन्त्र (मन्त्र) + तिः. The word means "wisdom" or "spiritual knowledge" as also in RV., X. 25. 10 (संतिम् विमलं वधव्यतृ) and other passages.

*वेधव्यतृ—Ruling at will, i.e. absolute master. Cf. अनु वः, RV., II. 24. 13.

वेधव्यतृ—Just as in Vedic Skt., the word शियुक्त् (शियु) means both "the hater" and "the hatred." For वेधव्यतृ, cf. the epithet तुर्बसिन्धा applied to हस्त and शियु in the RV.

हस्तम्—Cf. प्रजनम्; in RV., I. 127. 3 (हस्तं प्रकटिया विश्वनाम शस्त्राणि नयिनियमतः परिश्रमेण हङ्क्यतवः).

Nairyoasang:

नितानं ले सुवाणि विद्या ब्राह्मि (विशुलकशिः तमसे विद्याय ब्राह्मि चैतन्य च परिव

ब्राह्मि भवति ... सुवाणि भवति ... चित्रित्वाणि विद्याय ब्राह्मि चैतन्य च ... ब्राह्मि भवति ... ब्राह्मि चैतन्य भवति ... ब्राह्मि भवति ... ब्राह्मि भवति ... ब्राह्मि भवति ... ब्राह्मि भवति ... ब्राह्मि भवति ...

नितानं तस्मात् यथा जगति कामश्राणि: प्रजनमि वार्षयं नितानं श्राणं अपनेनामः:

86 Grass., Wb. 584; see also the words दम्यन्तु and दष्टु (ib., loc. cit.).
87 Sc. दम्यन्ति. The Upan in the next quotation also refers to these two.
88 This is the name of a श्रद्धा mentioned in the Ait. Br. (III. 4. 2) and also in various Sūtras. Cf. also श्रद्धा (Kālikā on Pāṇi, III. 2. 28), श्रद्धा (RV., X. 48. 8). Such compounds are fairly common also in Pāli, e.g. श्रद्धांकण्डे, पक्षाद (पक्षाद), श्रद्धाय (from श्रद्धा, to leave). When the verb is with an उपस्मा the rule is not applied in Skt.
89 Av. Reader, p. 86. 90 In his Dict.
91 Wb. 1155 and also 1136.
92 Skt. धि. See below महत्... दलामंचि (verse 31).
93 Grass., Wb. 653.
94 Ib., 543.
95 Av. खामशि. The other words follow in order with नितानं preceding.
18.

मो तु यथा तद्देवं विद्यां विद्यार्थी ।
देवानाम् मोन्यानाम् च वीर्यानाम् ।
शास्त्रानाम् परिकल्पनानाम् ।
सात्स्रोः कर्मयोः कर्माणाम् ।
महायोः विज्ञायोः ।
वेदयोः विज्ञायोः विज्ञानयोः ।
वायुयोः विज्ञायोः विज्ञानयोः ।
सूर्ययोः विज्ञायोः विज्ञानयोः ।
द्वारकयोः पतिः ।

(And I ask) for (all) this so that I may overcome the enmity of all (my) enemies,—(both) of Daeva and of mortals, of wizards and of witches, of tyrants wilfully blind and wilfully deaf, and of two-legged serpents, and of two-legged distorters of the truth, and of four-legged wolves, also (that I may overcome) the armies (of all such foes) rushing and dashing onwards in a wide battle array.

तुवुष्यायशाः √तुवुष्य, to, overcome.96

*परिकल्पनाम्—In Av. the word is associated with यात्रा. The meaning is "witch". Pers. येर (peri) is from this. The word seems to be from √प्र to seduce, to lead astray, and hence युग्र is an evil spirit who leads astray the followers of the Law of अग्नि. The RV. shows a root पर, to lead across (a stream), and figuratively to lead a person across difficulties. It also means "to overcome".97 It may also mean as here "to lead away from".

शास्त्राः-कर्मः-कर्मणाः—I have made a बन्ध of these three words for metrical reasons. The word सात्स्र (gen. plu. सात्स्रानाम्) has been explained as "a tyrant". A variant is सात्स्र (see verse 31 below) is also found.98 The word is from √सास (शास्), to rule. The word literally means a ruler and then it has come to mean a ruler who abuses his power. The word शास्त्र is found in the sense of a ruler in Maitri Up. VI. 8 (शास्त्र शि

96 Grass., Wb. 543.
97 Ib. 777ff.
98 Barth., Wb. 1570 and 1573.
(of) thee: health for this body (of mine). This (is) the third gift, O Haoma, hard to overcome, (that) I request (of) thee: long continuance of (my) vital powers."

*वानम्—Gift; from व भृत् (वच्छ) to favour, to grant a gift, used often in RV., as in VIII. 30. 4 (अस्मद्व शतम् सप्तधो मयेन्याय वच्छन्); IV. 67.2 (यवं सब्रं रिथादन) ; also VIII. 15. 3 (ैसु जेता आदस्या च यतंते). In Av. वात is also used in the sense of "a possession", "a thing granted". The formation is the same as that of जाना from जन (or जन्नाता from स्त्रे)

गद्याम्—संग, to ask (in Av. of the स्वर्ग or 4th-class). The root is found in Skt. in the sense of to speak or to chant, e.g. Maitri Up., I. 2. रजिमां गायां जगाय.

*वसिष्ठ-वानम्—This is the special conception of the "best-life" (i.e. highest heaven) found in the Av. The word has come down in the Pers. (bīhīsht), paradise.

*विश्वानित्रम्—From शिन, to flash out, to shine. See above, verse 1. The compound means "all glorious". For the formation see Whit., § 1185.

*धृतालिम्—Health: lit., endurance or continuance. For the suffix see Whit., § 1238.

*दीचित्रिम्—संग (Skt. जम्नु, जी, to live). The word means "long life", or "long duration".

उत्पादस्य—The word means almost exactly what is implied by प्राप्त. Jack calls it "the vital power, the physical life inherent in the body and lost at death".

Nairyosang:

इर्द लवण्यं कल्याणं श्रम यानयामसं उल्लिखन्तरं युजनं । सुकाल्यामसं सदृशेनेवं शाश्वसं...

107 Barth., Wb. 1283.
108 RV., I. 95. 3; X. 72. 1.
109 RV., I. 32. 6; also Whit § 1175a.
110 It may be noted that the त्रु हृ has dropped out.
111 Quoted by Barth., Wb. 419.
112 The Pah. word for वीं may be read both as ahu and khūn, and Bharucha (op. cit., note 55) suggests that भवन might have been meant by Nair. as a translation of Pah. khūn (Pers. kīn, khāneh) house.
113 Bharucha suggests उपप्रस्वत्.
20.

This (is) the fourth gift, O Haoma, hard to overcome, (that) I request (of thee): that I, happy (and) powerful, my task accomplished, may progress through the world overcoming opposition, conquering evil. This (is) the fifth gift, O Haoma, hard to overcome, (that) I request (of thee): that I, victorious, (and) battle-winning may progress through the world overcoming opposition, conquering evil.

*हः*:—One who does what he likes. From √हः. In RV., I. 180. 4 (यो न हो देवीयो गोतमेवे) the word means "wish" or "desire". In Brhad. Up., III. 5. 1 (also IV. 4. 22) the word रक्षा occurs in the same sense. Kan. reads यष्ट-यज्ञशो as a compound, in which case we may translate यष्टश् :

हः:—Satisfied, implying the successful accomplishment of his task of saving the world.\textsuperscript{114}

प्रतिद्वानि —The sense here is of setting forth on a triumphal progress through the world. This connotation of प्रक्षा (a successful advance) is paralleled in RV., I. 40. 7 (प्रक्षा दाम्यान्यस्याभिमित्यत्त्वावाहवेव स्यान्य यहे). The same sense might have been implied in Praśna Up., II. 4.

*पञ्चमम—For पञ्चमम.—Cf. the name पञ्चिकल्य used in classical Skt. for द्राक्षर. Cf. RV., I. 40. 3 (अष्टकां वृत्रं तथे पञ्चिकल्यस्य) and X.117.8 (सम्प्राप्यन्ताहृतिन्तिष्ठानां). The form पञ्चय is also found, but very rarely.\textsuperscript{115}

\textsuperscript{114} See यष्टशि अष्टनवर्ति (Yas. XXIX) for the task set before Z.

\textsuperscript{115} Showing an allied suffix-श; see Whit., § 487c.
(of) thee: health for this body (of mine). This (is) the third gift, O Haoma, hard to overcome, (that) I request (of) thee: long continuance of (my) vital powers.'

"वायस्—Gift; from वायस् (वृक्ष) to favour, to grant a gift, used often in RV., as in VIII. 30. 4 (वायसम् श्रद्धाम् सुप्रयोग्य गनेश्वर यथा यथा); IV. 67.2 (यात्रां सर्वं रिज्यान्सा); also VIII. 15. 3 (इन्द्र जीवि अवस्यां न यम्भवे). In Av. यात्र is also used in the sense of "a possession", "a thing granted". The formation is the same as that of ज्ञाय from ज्ञ्109 or स्वामानम् from स्व109.

गाधम्—वायस्, to ask (in Av. of the दित्व- or 4th-class). The root is found in Skt. in the sense of to speak or to chant, e.g. Maitri Up., I. 2. राजेष्व गाधां जगाद.

"विष्णुम्—This is the special conception of the "best-life" (i.e. highest heaven) found in the Av. The word has come down in the Pers. پیش (bihisht), paradise.110

"विश्वकर्मिन्—From वन, to flash out, to shine. See above, verse 1. The compound means "all glorious". For the formation see Whit., § 1185.

"सहातितम्—Health: lit., endurance or continuance. For the suffix see Whit., § 1238.

"दौर्बनितम्—वन (Skt. जीवि, जी, to live). The word means "long life", or "long duration".

उठानस्य—The word means almost exactly what is implied by प्रामा. Jack. calls it "the vital power, the physical life inherent in the body and lost at death".111

Nairyosang:

इदं लक्ष्यं प्रामम् कल्याणां श्रम यावयासी उक्ष्यतरं भुवनं112 सुक्ष्यासां सरेद्योजं समस्युभम् |...सुप्रकृतिः113 एतकै वपुष्यं |...दौर्बनिततं जीवितं ॥

107 Barth., Wb. 1283.
108 RV., I. 95. 3; X. 72. 1.
109 RV., I. 32. 6; also Whit § 1175a.
110 It may be noted that the वन has dropped out.
111 Quoted by Barth., Wb. 419.
112 The Pah. word for वन may be read both as अहु and कहन्, and Bharucha (op. cit., note 55) suggests that भुवन might have been meant by Nair. as a translation of Pah. कहन् (Pars. अहु, कहनें) house.
113 Bharucha suggests उपप्रकृति.
This (is) the fourth gift, O Haoma, hard to overcome, (that) I request (of) thee: that I, happy (and) powerful, my task accomplished, may progress through the world overcoming opposition, conquering evil. This (is) the fifth gift, O Haoma, hard to overcome, (that) I request (of) thee: that I, victorious, (and) battle-winning may progress through the world overcoming opposition, conquering evil.

*usk—One who does what he likes. From $\sqrt{\textit{usk}}$. In RV., I. 180. 4 (षुभो न चौरीक्ष्योतीलमेषे) the word means "wish" or "desire". In Brhad. Up., III. 5. 1 (also IV. 4. 22) the word र्क्षा occurs in the same sense. Kan. reads वश-षुभो as a compound, in which case we may translate वश-षुभो:

*usk—Satisfied, implying the successful accomplishment of his task of saving the world.\textsuperscript{114}

प्रतिहारी—The sense here is of setting forth on a triumphal progress through the world. This connotation of प्रति (a successful advance) is paralleled in RV., I. 40. 7 (प्रति द्रास्तानमिरामित्यतान्तवपवक्ष्यं द्रशे). The same sense might have been implied in Praśna Up., II. 4.

*प्रक्षाः—For प्रक्षाः. Cf. the name प्रक्षाः used in classical Skt. for दशार्य. Cf. RV., I. 40. 3 (ञ्च्छक्षा वृत्तं नाग) प्रक्षार्धं and X.117.8 (सम्प्रदायांक्षाप्रक्षापिन्दसान). The form प्रक्षाः is also found, but very rarely.\textsuperscript{115}

\textsuperscript{114} See गात्रा चक्रमित्व (Yas. XXIX) for the task set before Z.

\textsuperscript{115} Showing an allied suffix-ष; see Whit., § 487c.
Nairyosang:

...यथा सोऽक्षणः श्रीसोऽक्षणः समर्द्धः प्रवरामो जगवाः उपरि बाधाः निक्रममि
हृतं विषयवामः।।।...यथा विजयिनः टालकिणः [टालकिणः] प्रवरामो।।। (टालकिणः
व्याप्तम्)॥

21.

द्रम म्म तहं वषुः साम्
सोऽम गःधाम दुरोधः।
पुरुः तास्मु पुरुः गःधम्
पुरुः वकस्यक्षे पुरुः गःधम्।
मारकः पुरुः मारकः
विशेष पुरुः बुध्योपि।

This (is) the sixth gift, O Haoma, hard to overcome, (that) I request (of) thee: may we become aware beforehand (of) the robber,
beforehand (of) the murderer, (and) beforehand (of) the wolf. Let
not any (of our foes) become aware beforehand (of) us, (but) may we
become aware beforehand (of) all.

गःधम्—The word means a highwayman or a murderer. The word
विजयिनः occurs in Āp. Śr. Sū., XIX. 26. 4. The word गःधम् (meaning booty)
is found thrice in RV.; IV.16.11, and 16; and IV.38.4. The word
वाजगन्येम् is found in RV., IX.98.12, where Grass. 116 says that गःधम्
means गःध. The गःधम् to injure, is mentioned in गःधपातः. Probably
the words गःधा and अगः are cognates.

बुध्योपि—Note the तत्तम् In Av. the paras. and तत्तम् are used
more often in their original significations than in Skt. The sense is
"may we know" or "may we become aware of". The form उदुध्योपिः
is found in RV., X. 101. 1, in the sense of "wake up".

मारकः—No one. Cf. RV., VIII. 71. 8 (यक्षे मारकिष्ठे देवश्च गःधितमेवो
बुध्योपिः). 117

Nairyosang:

...पुरेभ्यः पुरेभ्यः बुध्योपि अवस्थितः पुरो रााङ्ग्रामिभः प्रवराम।।। (उपायम्)। कवय...
Haoma granteth strength and courage unto those warriors who urge well-trained (pairs of) steeds to victory. Haoma bestoweth upon women (who are) bearing, a brilliant son (and) a righteous progeny as well. Haoma granteth wisdom and fervour unto all those householders who are occupied in teaching scriptures.

अर्जु: is used in the sense of "(swift) warriors" (Barth, Wb. 200 f.). In RV. the word is used as an epithet of अधिन (VI.12.6) and of द्रु (VI.36.2).

सिता—Cf. RV., VI. 6. 4 (विविभिन्न ब्रह्म) and III. 33. 1 (विश्रासि इव विभिन्न चासमाने). This is a Vedic du.

*तद्धीत—The word is used here in the sense of "send forth" or "urge forward". Most of the Vedic commentators take तद्धीत in the sense of "make", "create" or "prepare". But I think in RV., I 130. 6 (इम से वाच वस्त्रण अवयवो रच्य न घौर: खर्चा अवलित्) the word may bear the meaning of "sent forth". So also in RV., I. 163. 2 (गुणन्यं भस्मः राजु मात्र वस्त्रो निरतटं), where I would like to translate the last clause, "O Vasus, from the sun ye led forth the horse".

*अर्जु: is here used in the sense of "battle" or "victory." From अधिन; cf. समर. Kan. translates "race-course". 

---

118 Geld. reads पुत्रीम.  
119 Refers to the अवलित of the hymn.  
120 Was the thinking of arena? But this word is not cognate (see Walde, Lateinisches etymolo. Wb.).
Av. forms a much larger number of neuters with the \textit{रू-}suffix, than is the case in Skt. The word \textit{क्वर्ण} gives the Pers. \\textit{जौर} (\textit{zaor}) strength, from which the word has come into most of our vernaculars as \textit{मेर}.

\textbf{*भाजयतिः—In the sense of भाजयति, in causal (?) form. The \textit{भज्जत्} (to enjoy) is used only once in RV., X. 167. 3. But here the sense is ‘to bestow’. The word has passed on in Pers. बैठशिदन (\textit{bakhshidan}), to grant a favour; hence our word बिल्लिस.}

\textbf{शान्तिजनानम्:—The Av. uses ins. for dat. The form is an intensive participle.}

\textbf{द्धाति—\textit{वा} here means ‘to bestow’ or ‘to grant’, as in RV., X. 79. 5 (से अथि अथि अभि द्धाति) and other passages.}

\textbf{लघुसनम्—I have accepted this reading in preference to Geldner’s घस्तस使命感. Cf. घरबार:-used often for घर and others. The word here means ‘a royal (lit. ruling) son’.

\textbf{ग्राहतिः—Offspring. This word is frequently found in the Upanisads. Pers. फर्झन (\textit{farzend}), offspring.}

\textbf{ि-िसत्—The nom. case used for dat. by attraction of the ि following. Note also the use of ििि with the dem. pron.}

\textbf{कन्या:—The word means a householder. From \textit{कन्या} (Skt. चत्) to dig, to build. Pers. रा (\textit{kad}) means house. The word रा is used in Vendidad (II. 26) in the sense of a house and in V.10 and 11 it is used for a receptacle dug out in the floor to receive a dead body. The Vedic \textit{चत्} is found in several places, e.g. RV., I. 65. 1 (पुष्पा न ताप्यु गुल्ला चतन्तम).}

\textbf{नास्क-प्रशासः:-The Nasks were the original 21 books which contained the whole of the collected writings of the Z. faith. They were mostly destroyed at the time of Alexander’s conquest. प्रशासः in the sense of ‘teacher’ is used twice in RV., I. 94. 6. (लम्बर पुस्त चतातिस पृथः प्रशासः पृतां गुल्या पृशोऽहितः;) and II. 5. 4 (सावक चित्र पश्चिमा पश्चिम: प्रशासः कल्पानजनि). प्रशास (m.) is also found in the sense of ‘master’ or ‘lord’ in RV., X. 152. 1. (पुष्पा द्वारा मान्च चति) and in III.47.5 (दिव्य शास्मिन्थम) See also verse 18 above. The compound means ‘teaching the scripture’.

\textbf{श्रुन्सः—For an obvious reason I have not rendered the Avesta श्रुन्स।}

\textsuperscript{121} The Skt. word means ‘to hide oneself (in a hole)’; Grass., Wb. 432.
(wisdom) letter for letter. Barth. connects this word with स्वेदक (verse 2, above) \(^{122}\) and स्वन्ध (n.) (verse 27, below) and उपस्तत्त. He compares the Lith. word svechelas (holy) and Old Bul. sveču.\(^{123}\) The basic meaning seems to be “wisdom”. There is a root मा in Av. which means “to advance”.\(^{144}\) The corresponding root in Skt. is शु (शा) to grow, to swell, to advance. The word शु (orig. p. pt.) means “blessing”, “good fortune” and occurs in several passages, e.g. RV., X.126.7 (शुसेवितेऽविनिः किः भवेः अयुवम् | शुमि वशकन्ते) and IV.57.8 (शुभं रोऽलाला विकवलुः भूमिः शुभं कौनाराः शुभम् यथू वाचः: | शुभं प्रज्ञो मधुरम् श्रवणैलम् श्रानसीराम् शुभमस्तास्मि शुभस्तम् ||). Also found in words like शुग्रं (RV., VII.70.1) and शुहोच (RV., II.18.6).

Naiyosang:

हमसेवा वे प्रसस्मांत् सच्चयाः\(^{125}\) अध्यवसयाः कुस्ते। (किल अमवान् चारिच- यागांस्) प्राणां अरोऽर वर्धित [वर्धित ?] \ldots \) अतातःस्यों \ldots दौसिमां शुचं \ldots शुचं पुष्पसंगितिं \ldots वे शुच्या गोष्ठश्रीश्च्याय निषिद्धितिः | (किल अन्ययययकतम्) | मधुल्य निवासग्रामान्च वर्धिति।

23.

शृभो तास्विचित यो नकालोगो
अगोंशरे दौरा शष्य सहवही।
शुभीम्स गार्वेन्च बवकदित
(भाकु महक्यो खुचुखुः)

सोम तास्विचितः या: *कनोनाः:
आसिरे दौरा शष्यः अशुः।
सल्सु *रागस्म (ष) *मद्यवतिः
सचु गार्वमानः सकातुः।

Unto all those who have remained virgins for a long time, without husbands, Haoma doth grant faithful and loving (bridegrooms), as soon as the Wise One is entreated.

*कनोनाः—The fem. कनोनाः is not known in Veda, but the mas. is found in four places—RV., I. 117. 18; III. 48. 1; VIII. 69. 14 and X. 99. 10; in the last two cases it is an epithet of Indra. The forms कनोनक कनोनका are both found in RV., once each \(^{145}\), and the latter

\(^{122}\) Which may be rendered into Skt. by चिनम्.

\(^{123}\) Barth., Wb. 1621.

\(^{144}\) Ib., 1616 (2. sPa). Barth. compares the Old High Ger. spuen, to grow.

\(^{125}\) Bharucha explains (op. cit., note 59)—“‘Helpers to those who bear weapons’, i.e. horses, charioteers, etc.”

\(^{145}\) Grass., Wb. 312.
once in Brh. Up., II. 2. 2 (या कमृनका तयारिवः) in the Up. it means however ‘the dark-iris (of the eye)’.

अय्युः—Without a श्रुत (husband). Cf. RV., I. 140. 8 (समुद्रः कौशिन्नीः स नच रामिसः) and I.191.14 (सन्त खसरो भृगुः) in both which cases the word is nom. plu. The word अय्युः is found used in the Veda in mas. also, by an extension of meaning, to mean an unmarried person.

राधा—Lover. The fem. form राधाः is well known. राधा in Veda, however, has the meaning of ‘gift’ or ‘offering’.

नायरोनसोः—Pronounce गद्यकः as in the Av.

Nairysosang:

...या कुमार्यःनिमित्तं दीर्घं गयतःताः (अपरिगुः रूपः….) प्रकटं

दातां व वचन्ति (विशल्के भवोऽष्ट्रकालयति) अथु बाय्यवित्तः सुबद्धसः

(विशल्के भवोऽष्ट्रकालयति) कार्यं संविन्दुभानम्)

24.

हृदयोऽत्रमेव रसवित्वम् विस्मृतमानीः

अय्य ज्ञातः निगरातुः

यो रक्षसस्म नसम् यात्तात्

यो दसत नोऽद्वः

अय्यात्रुः वायवित्वम् ब्रह्मज्ञातिपि

दुःखविछ दुःखश्वरः

शो वैस्से दुःखश्वरः जनात्

श्रो वैस्से दुःखश्वरः जनात्

सोमस्संस्य यम् ज्ञाताः

अय्य चतुः निवासयति

यो अरोहः चुनः कामः

यो पुनः नोऽद्वः

*अय्यम् अथवा अभ्यसिः

दुःखविकटः यस्य

स विन्दुः दुःखान्तम् वनात्

निविन्दुः दुःखान्तम् वनात्

Him indeed, (who) was Kāraśāni, did Haoma cast down from his power, (him) who was swelled up in his pride of sovereignty, (and) who (had) bragged: ‘Never henceforth shall any priest, learned in the Avesta, go about for (the sake of bringing) prosperity into my land; (otherwise) he might overcome the whole of (my) grandeur, (he) might strike down the whole of (my) greatness.

187 S.B.E., XV, p. 106.

188 Grass. (Wb. 11) suggests the derivation from ध + निरे i.e. not betrothed.

189 Nair. evidently means कौमार्यः i.e. बधिवाचनित्सिस्याम्. Bharucha, op. cit., note 60.
In Av. विश is added to all pronouns and also to nouns for either giving an indefinite sense or to be mildly emphatic.  

In the Veda he figures as the guardian of सोम; see RV., IV.27. 3 and IX.77.2, also I.112.21 and I.155.2.

निवादयत—Dethroned. The augment य of the लघु is dropped.

*वर्धन—An aorist form of वर्धन, to grow, to swell up. This root is found in RV., VIII.43.6 (युद्धायगौरविन चर्मित) and in I.67.5. The Av. form रस्त्स is the atm. s-aorist.

चालकाम—Ins. sing. ending in या. Cf. युवायाय्या in RV., I.168.1.

*चुन—I have made up this word from चन्न to sound, to make a noise. In the RV., we find the word चुनि (adj.) meaning loud etc., e.g. VII.5.5 (सतत: सचनि चुनियो चुनियो:). It is also found as the name of a demon overcome by रक्त, RV., VI. 20. 13 (where he is mentioned with another, चुमरि) and elsewhere. The name of the demon probably means "the noise-maker". The Av. चव to speak is a देवौ word, hence I have used the चन्न. The etymology of the चव is not known: It gives th Pahlavi davistan to howl. Could it be connected with the Skt. चव (चर्मि), to shake, and hence mean originally "to stutter"?

में refers to दयास below.

*अपाय—An adverb meaning "henceforth." Adverbs with the acc. sg. termination but in the fem. form are rare in Skt. except with the comparative and superlative forms.

अवाय—The word is found in the sense of a "fire-priest" in the Veda. The word in Skt. is used later as a proper noun. But in the Veda we get the original sense in RV., X.120.9 (वर्धा महानवधिहिवो अवायं भैयं); X. 48. 2 (अवाय भैयो वर्धो अवायवासिताय मा वर्धनमुपरिविचि) and three other places.

*अवायसितः—Pt. Vidhuśekhara has suggested that this word should

---

130 Barth., Wb. 588ff.
131 वर्धन is known in Skt., Whit. §834d and 882a. The guna strengthening is irregular to correspond with the Av. form; see Whit. §887a.
132 Whit. §330a. 
133 Grass., Wb. 687.
134 The corresponding बर्ध—word is बू (वू).
135 Barth., Wb. 688.
136 Whit., §1111e.
137 Grass., Wb. 32-33.
138 VI. 47, 24; VIII. 9. 7; and IX. 11. 2.
be taken as an adj. to the previous word (व्याख्या). The word from \(\sqrt{\text{दन्त} + \text{निं} \text{तिन्द्र}}\) has been always used in Skt, the sense of "reading the Vedas", and so too we should take it mutatis mutandis in the Av. I have made this word with the suffix -ति and used it as an adj.139 Dastur Kaikobad Adarbad Noshervan, the High Priest of the Parsis in the Deccan, in a very illuminating article140 has suggested that the word Avesta itself is from the same root and it thus literally means "Scriptures". Barth. takes अद्विन्तिकेन as gen. sg. and connects it with the दशतिबें following.141

*दशकी—The word दशकी is the exact phonetic equivalent of Av. दशकी (var. दशकी). The meaning is however apparently widely different. But it is not impossible to connect these two. The word in Av. means "country" or "land" and passes in Mod. Pers. to दह (dih), country. From the land to the people the transition of meaning is not at all improbable. In Veda the word is often found to mean the people who are opposed to the देव-worshipping Aryas of India, e.g. RV., II.11. 19 (न में वे ते उत्तिविलंबकः विश्वं सर्वं आर्यं श्वसः दशकी); RV., X.49.3 (न यो रूर आर्यं नाम दशकी). The word in this sense is always used in the Veda in contrast with the word आर्य.142 Here the word means "through (my) land".

The idea in the verse seems to be that if priests were allowed to go about the land they might by their prayers increase the prosperity of the land and thus may injure the prosperity attained by the infidel ruler यशादि

Nairyosang:

कल्पनाभिमुखः अपराध्याय निवादयति। (सबों प्रश्रयः)143 तर्काकस्तीली। वे समुद्धितां राजकामतया। (किल राजकेण उपरि समागतां समिति)। वे प्रलोभिता मा ब्याधां परायणां आयार्यं। अधिकाण्डाभद्रतां संभविता ग्रामेशु प्रवतत्। स विशेषाय दश [दन्तम्?] टालवति।...

139 Whit., § 1157 2f.
140 Cama Memorial Volume, pp. 274ff.
141 I have myself taken it thus in my Selections from Avesta and Old Persian, Part I. But I think Pt. Vidhuśekhara's suggestion embodied here is certainly better.
142 Grass., Wb. 584-585; Barth., Wb. 706ff.
143 Bharucha (op. cit., note 62) explains this as "awakening from ignorance, i.e. preaching belief (in Christ?)".
144 Pers. दिन (tare5), a Christian, and दिन (din) religion.
N.B.—The word कलश्याका is a Pahlavi word which means Christians. The Pahlavi writing is really responsible for this strange anachronism of Nair. The Av. word ज्ञात्रसानि, when transcribed into Pahlavi, may be read either as karsāīk or kalīsāi. The latter term was applied in the Sassanian times (the period of the Pahlavi commentaries) to their contemporary Christian enemies of Byzantium, and in general to all infidels. It seems therefore natural that the same term was also applied to the enemy of भूम. This confusion has apparently led Darmesteter to suggest that the word भूसानि� symbolises the Greek dominion in Persia.

25.

उष्ण—यो विभ्रप्रकाश्च  
सतो-कृष्णो वरिष्ठा वृहम् ।  
उष्ण—वापिनवत्तं  
पादर्वचोच्छ ज्ञुस्त्रयवान् ।  
उष्ण—नोरह पद्मर-क्रास  
ज्ञुस्त्रयवान् एवसहिः  
वाचम् ॥

Hail to thee! O Haoma, who through (thine) own power art thine own master. Hail to thee! who dost understand the truthful word full-spoken. Hail to thee! never dost thou question by cross-questioning the word true uttered.

उष्ण—The Av. उष्ण means “hail”, like Skt. लक्षित्. I have made the Skt. word as a sort of past participle of व्रस्त. This would accord well, as Pt. Vidhuśekhara thinks, with Nairyosang’s गोभम्. Is वष्ट also connected?

क्षा = लेण

उपपिनविष्ट—Note the एत्म. here. The upasarga वापिष्ट is unknown with विश्व in Vedic. The meaning is the same as वि-विश्व in Veda.

पुस्तकसाम्—Full-spoken words, i.e. unequivocal words.

परिप्राणा—I have tried to make this word from व्रस्त + परि (to

145 Pers. लक्षिन kartik, Church. The Pahlavi is a direct borrowing of the Grk. ékalepsía.
146 In one place (Bahman Yasht, III. 3-5) it is even applied to Alexander the Great.
148 Geld. reads एत्म. चे,.
cross-question). The word प्रतिप्रश्न is found in AV., II.27.1\textsuperscript{149} (प्रश्न प्रतिप्रश्नो बली). The idea is that महम does not test the truth of his worshippers by round-about and varied questions, he trusts in their good faith implicitly.

Nairyosang:

श्रीभन्न: ते यो निशोजसमा कामराजार्किसि......। श्रीभन्न: ते मध्ये [यथिकम् ?] जानासि प्रधुज्वसाम् सवोहाकाम् ......। श्रीभन्न: ते न कठोऽत्व प्रधज्वात् सवोहाकाम् प्रक्षसि वाचम्। (किल तिष्ठितं न्याद्रितं स्यद शोभिष्णु'\textsuperscript{150} यथा: प्रगज्वनिवाच)।

26.

कर्त्ते मण्डिर वर्धे पर्वेणीसृ अध्यविष्णुनस्।
सत्तार्याम्बुर्यशसम् मध्यू-तापेमस्।
वच्चविस्तरं देवनाम् माण्डिरविशेषः।
वायुः वाह्यदेव असि विक्ष्रवकोति
वायुः पतिरं गंगर्गिनोः।
हास्यसं हामिहात्तोहिष्णु-च
यवसं वाचश्च।

प्र ते *मण्डिर* [यथा] भर्तः
*पूर्वाम्बर* *अभिवासनम्।
*सत्तार्याम् मध्यू-तापेमस्*
वच्चविस* आमाम् *मण्डिर-वच्चविस्।
वायुः वाह्यदेव असि अविभासः
*वायुः पतिरं गंगर्गिनोम्।
*हास्यसं हामिहात्तोहिष्णु-च
यवसं वाचश्च।

Forth for thee did the Almighty bring the first (sacred) girdle, star-begemmed, woven by the two Spirits—(the girdle which is) the excellent religion of Mazda-worship. Since then, invested with this (girdle), thou hast been (dwelling) upon the mountain heights, through all ages (entrusted with) the words, and meanings too, of the Scriptures.

*मण्डिर—I understand मण्डिर to be made up of मण्ड (=मण्ड), greatness + दा (=धा), to create,\textsuperscript{152} Barth\textsuperscript{153} explains the word as from √म् +√धा and says literally it means “memory” that which notes everything (Memor, der (alles) merkt). Older scholars explained the word as identical with Skt. नेघस।

*पूर्वाम्बर—On the analogy of पूर्वाम्बर।\textsuperscript{154}

\textsuperscript{149} But not from √प्रवह, to ask.
\textsuperscript{150} कर्त्ते मण्डिरः
\textsuperscript{151} Geld. reads "मु".
\textsuperscript{152} So also Kan. Dict., pp. 388 and 390.
\textsuperscript{153} Wb. 1162ff.
\textsuperscript{154} Whit. § 1245f.
*अभिमासनस्—The sacred girdle worn by every Zoroastrian (both men and women) round the waist. From अभि + यास्, to gird round. It may be noted that this girdle (now called kusti) is worn round the waist like the Hindu मेखला.

स्तर्यासम्—The word स्तर् is found in several places in the RV., in the sense of star, e.g. VI. 49. 3 (सत्तर्यासम् 158 पिपिश्).

The star-bejewelled girdle pictured in the sky is the belt of Orion, and probably this is a reference to a very ancient Aryan myth. 155

मन्तू-तःम्—Woven by the two Spirits. Note here again the close association of the two. I have kept the dual in the prior number of the compound on the analogy of द्वृषःकम्. 157

*ध्यानास्—The Av. word द्वेष्ट्र is from यार, (=Skt. द्वृष्) to see, to think. 158 Hence the word means religion (that which enables one to see the right from the wrong). The fem. gender is kept up in the Skt. here, for the Av. word is fem. Pers. دین (dīn) means "religion".

*शोम्—Which worships etc.

आयद—Since then. 159

*वहःसम्—Peak. From वह ह (वधू), to grow, with सु-suffix. 160

*हःस्त:—Adv. (orig. dat. sg.) meaning "for a long time". The वधू is the basis of a number of words indicating length in space or in time. Grass. compares Old Norse. draga, to drag. 161 Cf. RV., III. 62. 17 (हःस्तःसम्, प्रहिम्नत ) where the word हःस्तःसम् is adverbial, meaning "for a long time".

*अभिमासनते—Of the word. The words अभिमासनि and ग्रास्थि are in the gen. to be construed with अभिमासनते above. This latter word has the double meaning of "girded with" and "entrusted with".

*एम—Of the meaning. From एम to grasp, to hold. The word एम (f.) in the sense of "holding" or "capturing" occurs twice in RV., VII. 4. 3 (दी यो एम्य पौष्यकायों दुर्रोक्ततिमियावं श्रोत्यो ) and VIII. 17. 15

155 Sc. the Night.
156 The point is very finely discussed by B. G. Tilak in his Orion (ch. VI), where he fully discusses this verse (Yas. IX. 23) and compares it with the corresponding Indian version of the myth.
157 Whit. § 1250g.
158 Kan. Dict., p. 204; Pers. دید (dīdān), to see, is cognate.
159 L. e. since the girdle was bestowed on Haoma by मन्तु.
160 Whit. § 1162 (especially section c).
161 Wb. 646.
(मुखिमयं नच्चुत्रा पुरो मृत्येवं सोमस्य यौतेवं). The last four padās are rendered variously. 161

Nairyosang:

प्रकाशं इदं तुभं हरिम्योऽष्टमं त्राश्चर्मां ब्रह्मविशेषं चाचन्ति 155 सारारितोऽधिकार 164 विश्वाति उस्मां दौनि 166 मान्यदक्षांस्य 150 (अस्म ब्रह्मविशेषं चाचन्ति इदं यथा कुस्वम 147 शमं संस्कृतं राङ्गकोण्ड दौन्तां शमं शमेन राङ्गकोण्डमा। अस्मां राङ्गकोण्डमात्रं इदं यथा वात्तु शमं न खाद्य दौन्त सुगमिततं न महत्तम। शमस्वादनं चांद्रं ब्रह्मदुर्गुर्वं शमां राङ्गकोण्डमा 166 चालो)। तत्तथा ब्रह्म वाक्यम् ब्रह्मांचितः शिक्षेयं उपरः गिरीगाम । दौरी उल्लक्षणां मत्तस्त इक्ष्ठोदिवस्य सामायवाणं। (किलं सम वात्तु बपः प्राक्षा 159 बंतर इश्वर्कार्यं समाविद्रोहिः)।

27.

शस्म
भागो-पंते वैस-पंते
शुद्धि-पंते दाहजज-पंते ।
सुशाङ्कि वर्धयण-पंते ।
अभमाय-च तः तर्थमनाइ-च
सांकूष उप-स्थः ततुये ।
श्रीसमाय-यथा पोषण-वधकुहे ॥

सोम
*दम-पंते विश्व-पंते
*ञंकु-पंते सद्य-पंते ।
*त्तका [च] विधा-पंते ।
बामाय (च) तः *बन्धनाय (च)
*सथमु उपद्रवे तन्ये ।
*निमाय (च) यथा पुष्मोन्त्रे ॥

O Haoma! Lord of the house, Lord of the village, Lord of the province, Lord of the land, (and) through (thy) holiness Lord of (all) Wisdom! Thee I invoke for courage and victory as well, for my ownself, and for strength that bringeth salvation unto many.

*दम-पंते—Veda has दम, used generally of क्रिया, as in RV., I. 127. 8 ('र्वासं लय विश्व पंत ' कथामेव सत्रासं समानं दम्यं इत्येव)।

*विश्व-पंते—विश्व is here used in the sense of 'village'. विश्वपंति is

162 For other renderings see my Selections, Part I, pp. 45f.
163 Nair. merely transcribes the Av. word.
164 मह्सु also means "heavenly" in Av. Hence this rendering of Nair. But this implies the reading मह्सु । see note 151, above.
165 Av. दुष्टस्य religion, Pers. دین (din).
166 The Av. word is transcribed by Nair.
167 The sacred girdle.
168 Ijmsa or Yaṣna (= यश्न). He refers to Chapters X and XI of the Yasna, during the recital of which the Haoma juice is to be drunk.
169 Pahlavi tan-i-pasā (the future body), the time of resurrection (Bharucha, op. cit., note 68).
found in RV. too, but in only two places apparently the word bears a sense similar to that it bears in the Av. The passages are RV., VIII. 60. 19 (धनुः ज्ञातितं गाधयोगाधिकार | अप्राप्त्विनाय गृहचतिमक्ष्मां | अपेक्षवा विवृत्याद्वृत्याय रोधयम् ||) and RV., I. 127. 8, quoted above.

*धनु—The word *धनु in Av. is taken to be "province"—the next higher unit of social life after the house and the village. The word is used in the Veda as a collective in the sg. to mean "mankind".\footnote{Grass., Wb. 476.}

*धनु—I have rendered the Av. word letter for letter. The word is formed by adding *न- to स्व (Skt. श्व, श्य).\footnote{Whit., § 11526.} The Av. word स्वन्धर्थ is found only here. The word means "holiness".\footnote{Barth., Wb. 1612.}

*धन्य—The word would mean "for the sake of victory". In Veda we find the word *धन्य once in this sense. For the formation of the word, cf. यायात्रा used once in RV., X. 48. 8 (यायात्रा उत्त वा कर्णाः प्राप्त स्वेत नावत्वम अनुभवे); सन्यास in RV., VIII. 70. 11 (सन्यास दस्यु पवेन); and यात्रा in RV. VI. 18. 14 (सन्यास बायिक्ष्यु धिन्य देव देवं मद्यपिन्ये कृतन्तरं कावीनाम). See above, verse 17.

*मथस...तन्न्—Cf. RV., I. 165. 11 (इन्द्रयूः *मथस सम्माय मश्वं सध्वं सख्याः सस्त्रः सुत्वतः स्तुः). The Av. मथाय corresponds exactly to *मथस, which is found in the RV. in the broken down form मथ्य.\footnote{RV., I. 179. 5 (इति तु सोमसमाती चुम्बु पौतलमुप्य ब्रह्म) and RV., III. 37. 5 (इति यायात्रा चत्तवे पुष्पस्तुमुप्य ब्रह्म).}

*स्वाभ—Cf. RV., I. 179. 5 (इति तु सोमसमाती चुम्बु पौतलमुप्य ब्रह्म) and RV., III. 37. 5 (इति यायात्रा चत्तवे पुष्पस्तुमुप्य ब्रह्म).

*विश्व—For strength. The word *विश्व I have made from व (in weak grade व) with the suffix-*ऽ.\footnote{Barth., Wb. 1612.} RV., shows the form जामन् (n.) twice (I. 53. 10 and V.46.6) in the sense of "protection".

*पुष्पोजगे—The Av. word is in gen. sg. instead of dat. sg. This is used as an adj. qualifying the previous word. It means "brining salvation to many". Cf. RV., III.34.9 (इति सस्त्राः पुष्पोजगे साम) where it means "nourishing many".

\footnote{Note that the word तन्न् is to be read तन्त्र in RV. here.}
Nairyosang:

वै नो शिवम् श्वेषेद्विक ||
वै मनो वर ग्रामेऽतः ||
यो चिन्ता अविद्व भाने ||
(यो भक्ते वीरी ||
यो आक्ष्यः योः ||
यो भक्ते वरोः ||
चर्मः भक्ति सत्यः ||
गृहङ्गहः पाश्चे जावर ||
प्रदूः ये उद्ध वनवदः ||
सुसुन्दराः भनो भवदरः ||

28.

वि नो नीवता देवेभे ||
वि मनो भर चर्मबलम् ||
य: [क्र] चित् [च] अविद्वः ||
(यो अस्तमः विशि ||
यो अविद्व जानो ||
यो अस्तमः दृश्यो ||
श्रनसानु ज्विति मथः ||
ग्रामाय वस्य पद्धः यां जयः ||
परि वस्य उशि इव द्वादिः ||
विशिष्टः वस्य मनः इव द्वादिः ||

Away from the hatred of enemies and away from the (enmity) of angry foes do thou remove our mind(s): and whosoever the mortal, who in this house, who in this village, who in this province, (or) who in this land is full of evil, from (both) his nether-limbs take (thou) away strength, turn his brains upside-down, (and) reduce to disorder his mind.

चर्मःतमस्—देवेभे: is to be construed again. The heat here is the metaphorical heat of anger. Hence the word means angry foes. 179

श्रनसानु—Used in the sense of "full of evil", here as also in the Veda.

ग्रामाय—Caus. imp. 2nd sg. paras. Cf. RV., VIII. 17. 5 (ग्रामाय विनाशिता मधः).

उशि—Used here in the sense of intellect; cf. Pers. شوض (hōsh) intelligence. It generally means "ear" in the देव-sense, the बाहर-word being कार्य (= कर्म). 180

विशिष्टः—The स्विशिष्ट in Skt. was an older स्विर्क, and that is pro-

178 Pahlavi word. 179 Barth., Wb. 529. 180 Ib. 444. 181 Grass., Wb. 373f.
bably connected with the Av. $\sqrt[182]{त्वन्ति}$. The idea is the same as in RV., VI. 53. 7 (भा रिख दिक्किरा नापा पड़ोगो छुद्या कवे).

Nairiosang:

विना वशमान [वशमान] धाराकराणां धारां विना मन्नां कुष्ठ वासयताम्।

...कसि मनुष्यः। (पापकारी)। मुङ्गान तस्य पाद्यः प्रागासः। प्रक्ष्ठं तस्य चेतवं परिवर्तयः। भावं तस्य मनसः कुष्ठ।...

29.

मा च्वरयंग्यं हस्तुगो
मा गवणयं चद्वित्तुगो
मा जामसु वधनोग्यं चाविय
मा गामसु वधनोग्यं चाविय
वो चिरनहुच्चत्रितं नो मनो
वो बायनहुच्चत्रितं नो कैश्यं पृष्ठं

मा $\sqrt[183]{शताभ्रम} स्तुतुगः
मा $\sqrt[184]{गाम} भभतुगः
मा चामसु $\sqrt[185]{वनात्} चाविहाम
मा गामसु $\sqrt[186]{वनात्} चाविहाम
वो $\sqrt[187]{एष्यति} नो मनो
वो $\sqrt[188]{एष्यति} नो खाप्सम्

Give not strength unto (his two) crooked-shanks, nor power grant unto (his two) grasping-paws; let him not view this earth with (his) eyeballs, let him not behold the creation with (his) eyeballs, who works harm (to) our mind, who does injury (to) our body.

$\sqrt[189]{शताभ्रम}—The Av. word च्वरयं is a दशेव-word and means "leg". The word is really a participle (past) of $\sqrt[190]{च्वर्य्} (च्, चर्), to be crooked. Hence the word may be translated "crooked-shanks".

$\sqrt[191]{गाम}—The word ग्राम is found in Veda in the sense of grasping or snatching as in the compound याक्याम् found in RV., I. 162. 5 in the sense of "he (sc. ग्रोम) who holds the pressing stones". I have taken the word in the दशेव-sense of "grasping-paws", because the word ग्राम is a दशेव-word in Av. The dropping of र् is sometimes found in Av. under certain conditions especially with a long vowel (cf. जर्मका verse 32). Frachtenberg connects this ग्राम with Av. $\sqrt[192]{ग्र} to walk, to hasten, (cf. Skt. जर्म). Hence ग्राम would mean really the foot and is used for "hand" because "only animals walk on their hands".

182 Barth., Wb. 1887.
183 Construe विना...कुष्ठ, render futile.
184 Those who cause us to dwell in misery (Bharucha, op. cit., note 69).
185 Reichelt, Awest. Elementarbuch, § 106.
186 Spiegel Memorial Volume, pp. 279f.
"नायर्योसङ्": यो वै छ नः कलेवरम्।।

30.

प्रिति श्रवणेश जाध्वितिः
सिम्हेश वौधो-वनपक्षे।
केषुपः गायकासाह अधरऽने
चः खाडः वदः जाध्विः।
प्रिति गाष्टेश वौधेनेति
श्रवणेश तः कारणः।
केषुपः गायकासाह अधरऽने
चः खाडः वदः जाध्विः।

प्रिति वृष्टेः: श्रवणे
*प्रिस्मायः विष-वापसः।
कपसः "नगने ज्ञातवः
सोम चः वधः जाधिः।
प्रिति गधश्य विषस्वः
*श्रवणः: "श्रवणःः[ः]।
कपसः "नगने ज्ञातवः
सोम चः वधः जाधिः।

Against the serpent, green, dreadful (and) poison-breathing, smite, O golden Haoma, (thy) weapon for protecting the body of the righteous. Against the murderer, acting contrary (to the Law), blood-thirsty (and) fuming, smite, O golden Haoma, (thy) weapon for protecting the body of the righteous.

प्रिति—In the Veda it takes the ablative when it means “against”.131

*प्रिस्मायः—The word in Av. means “horrible” or “dreadful.” The word by itself is not known in Veda but we have प्रिस्मावत् (powerful) e.g. RV., X. 38. 1 (श्रवण इत्य प्रत्यायेत यथास्वत् प्रिस्मावते वस्ति कर्मगतः प्राव सातये) where the word might also mean “dreadful” or “awe-inspiring”. The name प्रिमिस्मा is found in AV., IV. 25. 4, as that of a wicked woman. प्रिस्मायः is also found in the sense of “wicked” or “inimical” RV., I.100.18 (दस्याकिषय स...कुला) and RV., VII. 18. 5 (प्रायः नो प्रिस्मायः). We also find the adj. अप्रिशिमित (not inimical, non-destructive) in RV., VII. 50. 4 (सवः नो अप्रिशिमित भवन!)

*नगने—For the protection of. √नग्य (to attain)138 + म् suffix.139

131 Grass., Wb. 808. 138 Also Vedic, see Grass., Wb. 718f. 139 Whit. § 1168.
The dat. instead of gen. by case-attraction.

The word is used in the sense of a weapon in the Veda, e.g. RV., VIII. 24. 27 (वधुःस्य तु वधुराग्नि नोभम्)

*अधि = अधिः.

विकृत:—In Skt. "abandoned". The Av. meaning is perhaps connected "acting against (the Law)". Both are from वि + √ढ़नः.

*कविवाच:—Blood-thirsty. The word कविवाच is found in RV., X, 87. 5 (कथाकलिनवाचविविगमतु घेस्वाम्).

*चाहुःगम्य:—On the analogy of चाहुःगम्य (intensive participle) which is found in RV., I. 101. 2 (चाहुःगम्ये मनुः).

Nairyosang:

उपरि चस्श्वः साप्तिः चार्णिः चविवाचविना विधाते। कलेवरं विकविवाचितं पुश्याओ नममुर्घात्म प्रकाशः विधातस्म। (किल उपायं कथय)। उपरि बश्वे स्विच्छिन्नकर्मिना केहकतिरं पोष्याधितिरः।...

31.

प्रति सम्बन्धः दृढःतः।
प्रति विकविवाच कक्षमः।
कृष्णपूम नाशस्य अवस्यन्ते।
स्वयं अधिः किल विधि।
प्रति चस्याँ सोमः अधिः।
कृष्णपूमस्तः सोमः देशः।
मौनः अवस्यन्ति।
कृष्णपूम नाशस्य अवस्यन्ति।
श्रीमद्याजः साप्तिः।
अधिः।

Against the unbelieving mortal, the oppressor (proudly) raising up (his) wicked head, smite, O golden Haoma, (thy) weapon for protecting the body of the righteous. Against the unrighteous distoriter of Truth, the soul-destroyer, (who though) bearing in mind the commandments of this (true) religion, (still) never applies (them) in his actions, (against
such an one) smite, O golden Haoma, (thy) weapon for protecting the body of the righteous.

शास्त्र—Used in a bad sense; cf. verse 18 above.

*अभिवेचयत—The Av. word occurs only here. Barth. takes it as a pres. participle of योगर्द्ध (to smite, to lift up) with योगिता, taking कमरवत्स as its object, and translates "(proudly) holding up his (wicked) head". The compound root योगर्द्ध is from योग (विष्णु, वेषो) + द (चा). The Vedic word योगवर्द्ध in RV., X. 27. 1 is also a connected word.

*असुभूषक—Soul-destroyer.

*दिग्रास्य—Bearing in mind. The Av. word is from the compound root मन्यता (= मन् + द) and I have ventured to make a compound verb *मन्येया, though such a form as a verb is not used in Sanskrit. But we get the form मन्येय in RV., III. 38. 2 (द्वगोत प्रचु जनिता कावर्वा मन्यिधा: सुकुटस्ततु यास्). The separation of the component parts of such a compound form is paralleled in Skt. in RV., II.12.5 (द्वादशी घन्त).

चौकी—The word is found in the sense of "strong action" of gods, men or demons, e.g. RV., VIII. 16. 6 (तमिद्रु गङ्ग निव तं कुतभिलयावर!).

अन्वयस्त—Present participle of the causal of अन्वय, to reach, to obtain. The meaning is "applying", lit. "causing to attain to (the perfection of the Law)"

Nairynosang:

उपरि मन्येया दुर्गुणितम् अन्वयिन्त: अथवानिधि नाडुदात्तर्मस्तको ।...। उपरि अन्वयिनी । अमुलाभनि शुनविना अस्या: दानी: मनोवितोदातः ।... । न कर्मणा परियासे । (किल मन्येये यद्य प्रवृतमि कारोमि वा न कारोमि) ।...
32.

प्रति अविकाय यातुमक्षात  
मृदुक-कन्यार उपशान-वायुः।  
वैद्यः नरस्वानं मनोर  
यथा अधिकस्म वालो-सुलेख॥

केस्ञ्येम सागरसाग प्रक्षणे  
हस्य आहरे दवद जारिन्।  
( यदनुः) केस्न्येम सागरसाग प्रक्षणे  
हस्य आहरे दवद जारिन्॥

Against the wicked woman, full of wiles, voluptuous (and) lustful, 
whose mind tosses about like a wind-driven cloud, smite, O golden 
Haoma, (thy) weapon for protecting the body of the righteous; indeed 
(against) her do thou smite, O golden Haoma, (thy) weapon for 
protecting the body of the righteous.

*कस्न्ये — Barth. connects this with the Vedic कः used in 
RV., I. 124. 7 (काचिति पव उपशान नवापयम् अति दुहेर नि 
रिगित्ये वचोः), where the word means "smiling". The Av. word is degraded in sense to mean 
"smiling wantonly", hence a विशिष्ठ. The corresponding good word is 
नार्धि (नार्धि). For the dropping of the r, see above शङ्ख in verse 29. 
Pt. Vidhūṣekhara suggests the rendering जस्ति from नार्धि to go  
and compares the word इत्वे:  

यातुमक्षात — The word is used in RV., I. 133. 2 and 3.  
मृदुकः नरस्वानं मनोर — Dat. sg. of कर्ति. Used in a bad sense here.  
उपशानं — Dat. sg. of भारि. Cf. साक्षरित (strength-bringing) in RV.,  
V. 44. 3 (साक्षरित, साक्षरित). Barth. for an unknown reason translates this 
word, "—?— bringing",  

प्रक्षणि — Intensive of वर्तने.  
वालसुलेख् — From वर्तने, to set in motion. Cf. RV., X. 68. 5 
(वालसुलेख्य वलसुलेख्य वलसुलेख्य वलसुलेख्य वल), वलसुलेख्य वल.

Note the repetition of the last two pādas to mark the close of a 
hymn.

Nairyosang:

उपरि वेश्यायो श्राकिन्यां मंदलं कुवागायाम्।...। प्रतिपचारे विभागायाम्।
(किल रत्ना पापकस्मिः गुष्टे)। यस्या व्रतस्य रत्नं यष्ट्र वादं वातीर्यार्थि।...।

204 This strange rendering of Nair is due to misreading the Pahlavi, which (as Barth. notes, loc. cit.), may be read upast-i-burtār or panāhīh-i-burtār (giving protection).
ORIGINS OF INDIAN CIVILISATION.

Dr. Gilbert Slater, M.A., D.Sc., Professor of Indian Economics, University of Madras.

It appears to be popularly believed that India owes its civilization to a body of invaders, termed Aryans, who brought the Sanskrit language and the earliest Vedic hymns into India from some country to the north-west. This theory appears to have originated from the deep impression made upon western students by the discovery of Sanskrit literature when they first came into contact with it. There has followed the curious theory which Max Müller did so much to popularise, although he finally recanted it, that the kinship between the various Indo-Germanic languages indicated a common racial origin among the people who speak such languages, and that there was an ancient Aryan race which spread from some centre either in Western Asia or in Europe, over a vast area reaching from the shores of the Atlantic to those of the Bay of Bengal, and in more recent years, through European emigration, to all parts of the world. It is now universally recognised among scholars that language is no test of race, that there never was an Aryan race in the extended significance in which that term was used, and, more particularly, that the Nordic race which predominates in North-Western Europe originated in the area where it is still dominant, i.e., round the shores of the North Sea. It is also extremely probable that the Indo-Germanic languages which the people of the Nordic race now speak were borrowed by them at some ancient period from peoples living further to the east, and that their original languages have disappeared without trace.

Nevertheless that part of the theory which attributes Indian civilisation to the Sanskrit-speaking immigrants still holds its place in practically all books dealing with early Indian History, with a resulting tendency to regard Dravidian peoples as an inferior race. So far as race is concerned, there is, I believe, a practical unanimity among anthropologists to the effect that the Tamils, Telugus, Malayalis and Canarese are a branch of the great Mediterranean race, marked by slight build, orthognathous faces, black hair, dark eyes, and narrow
skulls; the race which gave the world Egyptian and Cretan culture, which was probably responsible mainly for Babylonian culture also and which to-day contributes the largest element to the population of Italy, Spain, and France, and enters very largely into the racial make-up of the British Isles. There, however, remains the question, a most interesting question which appears to me to have practically escaped attention, to what extent this Dravidian or Mediterranean race which laid the foundations of European civilisation, also contributed to the ancient civilization of India.

My first suspicions with regard to the theory of the Aryan origin of Indian culture were roused by a cursory study of Tamil grammar. We have here a language-system structurally entirely alien from the Indo-Germanic languages, one which belongs to a more ancient type of language, for the study of inflections in the Indo-Germanic languages shows that these are the degenerate remains of separable additions to roots or stems, and in Tamil such linguistic decay has not taken place. The fact that present day spoken and literary Tamil perpetuates a much more ancient stage in the evolution of language than that represented by even the most ancient Sanskrit seems to suggest that the Tamil language became fixed in its literary character at an extraordinarily ancient date, and points to an extraordinarily ancient Dravidic civilisation. Then again the wonderfully logical and subtle character of the language is such as to arouse the admiration of any student. Thus, for example, I do not suppose any other language could be found with so complete and scientific a system for expressing all the possible shades of meaning which can be given to a statement when turned into the interrogative or negative form. This indicates that the ancient Dravidic culture was of a very advanced character.

When I first arrived in Madras I put my suspicions to a test on meeting the architect, Mr. H. V. Lanchester. I asked him how the native architecture of South India compared with that of North India, and he replied that South Indian architecture was vastly superior. I asked him whether South Indian architecture appeared to him to be to have been evolved locally, or to be the result of the action of foreign influences; and he replied that he was confident that it was a local evolution. I asked him if this was consistent with the theory that civilisation entered India from the north and he answered that it was difficult to reconcile the facts with such a theory.
From time to time I have discovered other indications suggesting that South Indian Dravidian civilisation is of independent growth, or at least that it owed little or nothing to the Sanskrit-speaking conquerors from the north. It would seem indeed as though the people who chanted the Rg Veda were only in a pastoral stage of civilisation, which itself indicates a borrowed and not an evolved culture, so that they probably had acquired what culture they possessed by direct or indirect contact with Babylonia; but that the Dravidian population they found established in India had developed agriculture, trade, manufacture, and a philosophy of religion, and even very ancient contact by sea with other pioneers of civilisation. Thus, for example, we have the wonderful discovery in the Hyderabad urns of pottery with inscriptions similar to those used by the ancient Cretans in that period of pre-Homerian civilisation, which Sir Arthur Evans has termed "Minoan." Then Logan in his Malabar mentions the existence of a little island of the West Coast, which has its own numerical system and counts not by tens but by twelves. This appears to me to be one of the most curious anthropological facts ever discovered, for counting in twelves, if we could attain it now, would represent a tremendous triumph of reason and science over ancient habit and tradition. The people who originated a duodecimal system must have been people of very high culture, and though the duodecimal system merely lingers on in this isolated spot as a historical survival it points to a very ancient connection by sea with some foreign centre of civilisation; and to be in contact with other countries by sea is itself an indication of culture. A somewhat similar indication is to be found in the megalithic remains in Cochin and other places recalling similar remains found in many other parts of Europe and Asia, the work of a long vanished race, but everywhere associated with sea-travelling and extraction of minerals.

But perhaps the most convincing and striking evidences of the antiquity of South Indian civilisation are comprised in the remains found in great burial urns of rough pottery in Tinnevelly, and now stored in the Madras museum. These include ornaments of gold beaten out into very thin films and evidently intended to be worn by a priesthood upon the forehead. These are exactly similar to priestly gold ornaments discovered in Crete. There are a great number of votive offerings in bronze, which I presume must have been an imported metal. These reproduce the forms of various domestic animals, by far
the most common being the buffalo; but it is notable that there is no instance of a bull or a cow. Evidently the people who produced this peculiar form of art were not acquainted with the sacred animal of the Sanskritic Aryans. On the other hand, they must have been in touch with the bronze, using civilisation of Europe and Western Asia.

On the whole therefore it appears to me to be far more probable than otherwise that at the time of the Aryan incursions the earlier inhabitants of India had a more advanced civilisation than the invaders. The gradual triumph of Sanskritic over Dravidian languages is easily accounted for by the fact that the former are easier to learn than the latter. Hence we find that in the north of India Europeans use Hindustani in speaking to servants, but in Madras servants use English in speaking to their European employers. In either case the easier language is used in preference to the more difficult one. In the conflict between languages the more difficult language tends to become extinct.

But if the above hypotheses be accepted we then are called upon, to enquire with an open mind what contributions the ancient Dravidian culture has made to historic Indian civilisation. The answer I am disposed to give to this question is that Indian religion is essentially Dravidic. There appears to be no recognisable connection between the worship of Śiva and Viṣṇu according to the tenets of the Śaivite and the Vaishnavite sects, with the worship of the gods of storm, rain, etc., which are hymned in the Rg Veda. If, on the other hand, we look for the origin of the existing sects in the traces of more ancient religions that we can find in any South Indian village, it is, I think, quite easy, to see the dominant facts in the evolution of Indian religious thought.

I would suggest that probably the most ancient of all the religions of India are those of which cobra worship is a typical example, namely the propitiation of formidable creatures about whose existence there is no doubt. From this beginning a great advance in religious thought appears to be embodied in the worship of the so-called village goddesses. These goddesses should not, I think, be regarded as many, but in all cases as but one all being local variations of Kāli or Durgā, who is also Diana of Ephesus, and many others. The thought behind the worship of Kāli is the realisation at once of the bounty and the cruelty of Nature, and the further realisation of Nature’s fickleness and unaccountability, qualities which are naturally regarded as feminine. Then the
next stage in religious thought is that which is expressed in the worship of Ayanar. He, unlike the great goddess who expresses her wrath in famine, cholera, or small-pox, and who requires to be propitiated with countless bloody offerings of male buffaloes, rams and cocks, desires no sanguinary gifts. He is served by being provided with the horses of terra cotta or masonry whereon he rides round the village by night to drive away all malignant and hostile beings. The worship of Kāli, or Durgā, or Gangamma, and the worship of Ayanar, both appear to have originated in a period before the discovery of the fact of paternity and the physiology of generation. The discovery of this fact appears to have been made in India independently of its discovery elsewhere, and its realisation was evidently the most momentous event in the evolution of Indian thought and religion. The natural result was the worship of the God of Paternity, the Giver of Life, whose symbol is the Lingam, representing the male organ of generation, or the Namam representing the act of procreation, and whose name is Śiva among some people and Viṣṇu among others. For it was, I take it, the same thought process that created the god Śiva in the more southern country and the god Viṣṇu in the more northern.

The failure to recognise the antiquity of South Indian civilisation is due to the disappearance of its more ancient remains. This again is due to pure accident. Ancient South Indian writing was upon palm leaves, ancient South Indian architecture was of wood and other perishable materials. The former fact is sufficiently well known and needs no demonstration. Of the latter fact any one can be convinced by visiting, for example, the ancient city of Conjiveram. There are found the remains of some of the most ancient stone temples in South India. These are built of an untractable material, a very hard granitic stone, and are yet most elaborately carved and ornamented. It is a style of architectural work which could never have been evolved on such a material. Broad outlines and massive style are what characterise the native art evolved in working upon granite, as Egyptian remains show sufficiently clearly. No craftsmen would have attempted the ornate work found in Conjiveram if they had not previously evolved their methods and forms while working upon much more tractable material. These most ancient of the stone temples indicate a very long period of architectural evolution in which the material worked upon was wood. Those old wooden temples have perished, but many of them
were Śaivite, and the sites of these are still marked by the practically imperishable stone lingams which can be seen scattered over the paddy fields.

We are tempted to follow this line of speculation and ask whether it does not throw some new light upon the question of the origin of caste. Because the Sanskrit word for caste means colour, and for various other reasons, the commonly accepted explanation of caste is that it is the result of the super-imposition of one race over another, each conquering race trying to maintain, as far as possible, its social superiority and purity of blood. But it is a curious commentary on this theory that it is in South India, where the super-imposition of conquerors upon conquered is least important, and not in North India where it is most important, that caste reaches its fullest development. Is it not possible that the caste system has fundamentally an economic root, and it has to be accounted for by an early industrial specialisation, characterising the ancient civilisation of a tropical country? The physiological fact of tropical lands, that early maturity is the basis of the social fact of early marriage, and the continued rule of parents over their children after they have become parents themselves. In a civilised community where there is early marriage, parental affection naturally leads the parents to guide and control their children in their married relations, and to bring up sons after the father's profession. Hence the customs of hereditary occupations, marriage at puberty or earlier, and social caste observances, which are all inter-related. Where an indigenous caste system already exists it is natural for a conquering race to take advantage of it, obtaining recognition from the earlier inhabitants as a distinct caste, and claiming caste superiority.

I am not in this paper endeavouring to prove any conclusions, but merely to state hypotheses. It appears to me that the questions I have here raised should be faced, and the answers to them should be sought for by careful investigation, and not by bold and baseless assumption.¹

¹ The reader is also referred to Mr. O. C. Gangoly's article "On some Iconographic Parallels" in Vol. III. (Orientalia-Part I) of this set—L. J. S. T.
OLD IRANIAN FORMS OF INVOCATION OF GOD.

SHAMS-UL-ULEMA DR. JIVANJI JAMSHEDJI MODI, B.A., Ph.D.,
C.I.E., Diplom. Litteris et Artibus (Sweden), Officier de
l’Instruction Publique (France), Secretary to the
Trustees of the Parsi Panchayet, Bombay.

Ancient Persian writings began with some forms of invocation to
God. All these forms meant to say that the writing was began "with
(or in) the name of God." In the Ahuramazda Yást, Zoroaster asked
Ahura Mazda as to what part of the māēra (माईर) gave most courage,
Victory, etc. Ahura Mazda replied that it was the recital of his and his
Amaēa Spāntās' names that gave one courage, victory, etc. On being
further asked as to his particular names which were most efficacious,
Ahura Mazda gives his twenty names, which, if properly recited day
and night may give one help and pleasure, (avayha (अवयय) and raññaghā).
Ahura Mazda then gives about 54 more names, the recital of which
may help a person in his difficulties. Among these, two are Ahura
(the giver) and Mazda (the Omniscient), which two names joined have
given us Ahura-Mazda, the Avestaic name of God.

All ancient Persian or Parsi writers follow, as it were, this injunction and give in the beginning the name of God as a form of invocation.
All Parsee prayers in the Avesta language begin with an invocatory formula: χσναοηχρ Ḥhrwhe Mazdā, i.e. "for the pleasure of Ahura
Mazda" or "may Ahura Mazda be pleased," followed by the recital of an Ḥznm Vohu formula.

Following this injunction, all Pahlavi books have some kind of
invocatory formulas. I give below a list of such formulas found in
various Pahlavi books.

I. Pavan shem-i Dātār Auharmazd.

i.e. In the name of the Creator Oharmazd.

This is found in:—

(a) The Bundehash, Justi’s text, (Der Bundehash), p. 1.
(b) The Nirangestān, the photo-litho facsimile by Dastur Darab Peshotan Sanjana.

(c) The Minokherad, Ervad Tehmurās’s text published with Introduction from my pen. The rendering of it in the Sanskrit translation is श्री भक्तमक्षय नमः।

(d) Aiyādgār-i Zarirān, Dastur Jamaspji’s Pahlavi texts.

II. Pavan shem-i Yazdān.

i.e. In the name of God.

This is found in:—

(a) Ardai Virāf-nām ah, Dastur Hoshang Jamasp’s text; also Dastur Kaikhosru Jamaspji’s text.


(c) Khūsrū-i Kavalān va Retaki, Dastur Jamaspji’s texts, p. 27.

(d) Andarz-i Peshīngān, ibid., p. 39.

(e) Chitak Andarz-i Poryōtakeshān, ibid, p. 41.

(f) Andarz-i Dānakān va Mazdayasnān, ibid, p. 51.

(g) Andarz-i Anusheh-robān Atrapāt Marespandān, ibid, p. 58.

(h) Sakhun ayochand-i Atar Farobaj-i Farkhōzādān, ibid, p. 79.

(i) Vajakīhā-i Bakht āfrid va Atarpāt-i Zartushtān, ibid, p. 81.

(j) Honakhtunishn-i Mandum-i-Gēlī, ibid, p. 82.

III. Pavan shem-i Yazdān datak nayōk.

By the name of God, the good Giver or the Giver of the good. This is used in (a) the Dinā-i Mainu Khrat (Minokherad), Dastur Darab P. Sanjana’s text, and in (b) Andarz-i Khosru-i Kavelān, Dastur Jamaspji’s Pahlavi Texts, p. 55.

IV. Pavan shem-i Yazdān va nyāishn-i nayōk yehevūnāt.

i.e. May this be in the name of God and His good praise. This is found in An Old Zand-Pahlavi Glossary by Dastur Hoshang Jamasp and Dr. Martin Haug.

V. Pavan shem-i Dātār-i vēh afzānīk.
i.e. In the name of God who is the good Increaser.
This is found in Shatroiha-i Airan, Dastur Jamaspji's text. Vide my translation, p. 51.

VI. Pavan shem-i Yazdān datak-i nayōk tan-durestih.

i.e. In the name of God, the Giver of good health.
This is found in Pand-nameh-i Dastur Astarbād Maraspand, Ervad Sheriarji's text and translation.

VII. Pavan shem-i Yazat Dātgar.

i.e. By the name of the Giver and the Just.
This is found in the Pahlavi Rivāyat accompanying the Dābistān-i Dinek by Ervad Bamanji Naserwanji Dhabhar.

VIII. Pa nām-i Yazdā.

i.e. In the name of God.
(This form is the Pāzand rendering of the above-mentioned formula Pavan shem-i Yazdān.)
This is found in the Aogemadaecā; the text reprinted in Bombay in 1891 from Dr. W. Geiger's text.

IX. Pa nām-i Hormezd Khadāe.

i.e. In the name of Hormazd the God.
This is found in Shikand-Gūmānīk Vījar, the Pāzand-Sanskrit text by Dastur Hoshang Jamasp and Dr. West.

This Pahlavi formula has assumed in later Persian books the form of ba nām-i Yazad (بناام یازد), i.e. In the name of God. This form is often amplified as بناام یازد بخشایندگه بخشایگر مریمان, i.e. In the name of God the Giver, the Bountiful, the Merciful.
ŚAṆKARA’S COMMENTARIES ON THE UPAṆIṆADS.

PANDIT VIDHUSEKARA BHATTACHARYA, Professor, Visvabharati, Šāntiniketan.

The object of the present paper is to show that the great Śaṅkara-cārya cannot be held to be the author of all the commentaries of the Upaniṣads that carry his name. It is popularly believed that Śaṅkara, Rāmānuja and other ṛcāryas in their attempt to explain the prajñāpāramit, ‘the Three Ways’ (leading to the common destination, viz. sambhūt), i.e. ज्ञाति, ज्ञाति, and ज्ञात, have written commentaries on the ten principal Upaniṣads which are included in the ज्ञाति. But this is contrary to the facts. For there are no commentaries by all the ṛcāryas on the Upaniṣads. The tradition may, however, be explained by saying that though there are no separate commentaries by all the ṛcāryas on the Upaniṣads a large number of passages or sentences of the latter have been quoted and dealt with by all of them in the course of their commentaries on the Brahmasūtras. But whatever may be the case we have strong reasons to believe that some of the commentaries of the Upaniṣads which are said to be the works of the great Śaṅkara are really not so, as will be evident in the course of this paper.

There are two commentaries on the Kena Upaniṣad called वचनमय ‘Word Commentary,’ and वाक्यमय ‘Sentence Commentary,’ both said to be the productions of Śaṅkara. But nobody seems to have any explanation to offer as to why one of them should be called ‘Word Commentary’ and the other ‘Sentence Commentary.’ Both the works bear the same author’s name, and as it is absurd to believe that one and the same person should indulge in the pleasure of writing two commentaries on the same work, an explanation has been sought for in vain in the assumption that it was owing to the desire of the author for dealing with the text in two different ways. But the internal evidence is strongly against it, for not only is the language in the two commentaries different but also the argument. Even the great Śaṅkara’s well-known views are misrepresented in the ‘Sentence Commentary.’ We ask our readers to compare the two commentaries on
the *Kena*, IV. 7 (32), and they will be surprised to find how diametrically opposite they are to each other. The text of the Upaniṣad runs as follows:

\begin{quote}
उपनिषदं भो ब्रह्मतिः
उष्ण न उपनिषद् | भ्रात्री वार न उपनिषदम् भ्रामेति | ३२ | ४. ७ |
\end{quote}

The *Padabhāṣya* explains it thus:

\begin{quote}
उपनिषदं रहस्यं वचि नं भोभगवनं ब्रह्मतिः | गृहस्त्रूपरवित्तं श्रीके ब्राह्म ब्राह्म वार | उष्ण अभिरंगता ते तन उपनिषद् | का पुनः सेवावर्ग ब्राह्मी ब्रह्मम् परमालव इव ततो... उपनिषदम् अस्मी इति | उष्णमिव परमालवियाम् उपनिषदम् अस्मीकरणार्यस्मार्थ- व्यासरघर्षते |
\end{quote}

But it is explained in the *Vākyabhāṣya* as follows:

\begin{quote}
उपनिषदं भो ब्रह्मज्ञातायामप्रविषयं श्रीके श्रीवर्ग ब्राह्म ब्राह्म ब्राह्म ब्राह्म ब्राह्म ब्राह्म | उष्ण ते तुस्मं उपनिषदं ब्रह्मकारणां च | अथुपर ब्राह्म मं तुस्मं तुहं ब्राह्म ब्राह्म ब्रह्म ब्राह्म वियाम इव | ब्राह्म रितिः | ब्राह्म कोला उष्ण लाभोपिनिषद् | तस्माद् बुलाभियोजऽक्षेत्रमिति ब्राह्म। |
\end{quote}

The contradictory nature of these two explanations will be evident if the reader takes note of the different treatment of the words अस्मी and ब्राह्म in these different works. It will also be noticed that the explanation in the former is evidently correct and far better than in the latter.

Other evidences bearing on the point are easy for any careful reader to come across if he will try to compare these two commentaries.

I have also reason to believe that Śaṅkara was not the author of the commentary on the *Śvetāśvatara*. The style and the mode of interpretation are far different from and inferior to these in the commentary of the *Brahmasūtras*. The long extracts from the *Purāṇas* with which the *Śvetāśvatara* commentary is filled are never to be found in any commentary of Śaṅkara the authorship of which is beyond dispute.

---

1 Such as divergent explanations (*Kena*, II. 1. 2), different readings of the text (thus in II. 2, the *Padabhāṣya* reads नान्ध while the *Vākyabhāṣya* has नान्ध), etc.

2 It will be found in the "Proceedings of the first Oriental Conference" held at Poona (Nov. 1910), p. xci, that Pandit Śridhara Śāstri Pāthaka has arrived at the same conclusion showing further that the 'Pada Commentary' is written by the celebrated Śaṅkara while the 'Sentence Commentary' is by one Vidyāśaṅkara who ascended the seat of the former.
The author of the commentary on the Śvetāśvatara quotes a couplet from Gaṇḍapāda’s Kārikā (III. 5) introducing it with the words

तत्त्वम तुकमिदो मीडयापदाचार्यः।

It is well known that Gaṇḍapāda was the परमपुरुष of Śaṅkara being the direct spiritual guide of Govinda Bhagavatpāda, whose disciple was our Śaṅkara. So it is expected that Śaṅkara would designate his spiritual ancestor by some honorific epithet such as महंत as he has actually done on the occasion of quoting Vyāsa the मुख of Śuka. Or possibly he would quote from him without the mention of his name as he has done twice in the commentary of the Brahmasūtras.

Now as regards the commentary on the Māṇḍūkya Upaniṣad which also bears the name of Śaṅkara, it will appear from the following facts that it, too, is not a work of the great Śaṅkara. The commentary begins with two verses of such inferior quality that they could never have been composed by Śaṅkara. These verses are in the form of महंताचरण generally seen in comparatively modern works. And this book ends also with three verses of the same kind and quality, the last of which even contains grammatical inaccuracies. The second of the opening verses is defective in its metre. There is no salutatory verse in any of the authentic commentaries of Śaṅkara with the single exception of the commentary on the Taittiriya Upaniṣad which has three such ślokas, but these, too, can hardly be considered as genuine. Following the example of ancient teachers Śaṅkara generally plunges at once into his subject without making salutation to any deity, not

---


5 तत्र च कर्माधिविदार्थविक्रमी, Brahmasūtra, I. 4. 14; चचोविर्विकर्षविक्रमा, भेदाधीयविक्रम।

6 The reading महर्षिकल्प cannot be defended. One may read here महर्षिकल्प, but in that case the metre breaks down. महर्षिकल्प may, however, be right. But the use of महर्षिकल्प is grammatically not admissible the correct form being महर्षिकल्प.

7 The first three lines of the stanza are in Mandākrāntā metre while the last one is in Sragdrāma. Such mixture is not allowable.

8 Vīṣekcāgūmanī and other minor works which are generally ascribed to Śaṅkara are not here taken into consideration. For they have not वाचन been critically examined and it has not been conclusively proved that Śaṅkara was the author of them all. Nor can it be ascertained that he is the author of the commentary on the Vīṣṇusahasranāma or Sanatsujātiya, or at any rate of the salutatory verses in the beginning of these.
even to Brahman or Paramātman. The commentaries of the Brhadāraṇyaka and Katha are opened with salutation to the ancient teachers or Rishiś by whom the Brhamavidyā has been handed down, but even these have the appearance of being interpolations. The printed books or the manuscripts which bear these texts cannot be fully relied upon. When compared with the other colophons of Śaṅkara’s works it will at once become evident that these could not be from his hand. He himself would never inscribe his name in his own work as परमेश्वर परिभाषक चायेषद्रकरणम् हनी. These colophons were certainly added to the genuine ones by later hands, as for instance, in the commentaries of the Brhadāraṇyaka and Chāndogya.

It must also be taken into serious consideration that Śaṅkara has nowhere quoted Māṇḍūkyya, even where it could serve his purpose, as for instance, in connection with the commentary on the passage, चाँडग्राम श्वेत्व मर्मम् in the Chāndogya, II. 23. 3 which entirely corresponds to चाँडग्राम श्व of the Māṇḍūkyya I. Had Śaṅkara been the real author of the present commentary of the Māṇḍūkyya Upaniṣad he could not have helped referring to it in his Chāndogya commentary.

The first Adhyāya of the Chāndogya is professedly an explanation (स्पष्टिकान) of चाँडग्राम. Had there been before Śaṅkara any other text dealing with the same subject he would naturally have made use of it. But in all probability the Māṇḍūkyya itself was not written before or even in the time of Śaṅkara. This point has further been discussed in my forthcoming volume on the Āgamaśāstrā of Gauḍapāda

In the introductory part of the commentary of the Māṇḍūkyya there occurs a line as follows: रोमानन्दिन रोमानिविन्दी समानता तथा 10 दुःशीत्कछा चाहतो इत्यिथोपयोग्यम् समानता. In Vedānta and specially in Śaṅkara’s philosophy चाहता is चाभन्दर or चाभन्दरकष्य and never दुःशीत्कछा. Śaṅkara would certainly have expressed the same thought by some other word. Similarly the explanation of the word श्वेत्व वाणाम् in the Kārikā I. 10, as

9 For, it is well known that Māṇḍūkyya deals with चाँडग्राम, beginning with चाविभेदन- इत्यिथिंदिंदिं चे तस्मिनवर्गानां.... and ending in चाँडग्राम चाविभवन चाविभवनामानं य ये ये ये ये, य ये ये !

10 This तथा (or तथा, with MSS. प, क, ज, द of the Ānandārama ed. 1911) is superfluous and cannot have been used by Śaṅkara. But in justice to its author it should be stated that the word तथा is actually not to be found in the original reading of the passage which has been entirely quoted in the commentary of the Nrisinìhapūrvatāpaniya Upaniṣad ascribed also to Śaṅkara. See p. 3, Ānandārama ed.
\textit{Śaṅkara's Commentaries on the Upaniṣads.}

\textit{prākāramānīvāsāchāṇaṇām} as given in the commentary could never emanate from Śaṅkara. And, again, it is utterly strange for Śaṅkara to define his \textit{prākāramānī} as beyond the four points, viz. \textit{ṣvāt} "existent," \textit{bhūtāt} "non-existent," \textit{prabhūtāt} "existent and non-existent," and \textit{abhūtāt} "neither existant nor non-existant." The \textit{Māṇḍūkya} commentary (i.e. the commentary on both the \textit{Māṇḍūkya Upaniṣad} and the \textit{Kārikās} on it by Gauḍapāda) betrays such crudeness of thought and expression in its author that he could never be identified with the great Śaṅkarācārya. Detailed discussion will be found in my \textit{Āgamaśāstra of Gauḍapāda} referred to above. The mere fact of Śaṅkara's name being in the colophons of different works must not lead us to assume their common authorship. For certainly there were more than one Śaṅkarācārya who were writers of Vedantic works. It appears to me to be certain that the author of the \textit{Māṇḍūkya} commentary is different not only from the celebrated commentator of the \textit{Brahmasūtras} but also from the commentator of the \textit{Nṛsiṁhāpūrva-tāpanīya Upaniṣad}. The following are some of the reasons for this assertion.

There are numerous passages \textsuperscript{11} common to both these works without any acknowledgement of debt in either of them. And yet it is not at all difficult to discover that it was the commentator of the \textit{Nṛsiṁha} who quoted from that of the \textit{Māṇḍūkya} and not \textit{vice versa}. The grounds hereof are given below.

The introduction \textsuperscript{12} contained in these two commentaries, almost identical in both of them, appears to be more relevant to the \textit{Māṇḍūkya} than to the \textit{Nṛsiṁha}. Certainly any attempt at explanation was needless such as was offered by the commentator of the \textit{Nṛsiṁha} for stating first the \textit{vāditā} "relation," \textit{ādiśāsya} "subject," and \textit{prāponent} "object" of no

\textsuperscript{11} (i) \textit{कर्म उपरीक्षाविशेषः...पद्यत दृशि कर्माधिकम प्रादश्य}:—\textit{Māṇḍ.}, pp. 9-14= \textit{Nṛ.}, pp. 44-45 (Ānandāśrama ed. 1900 and 1896 respectively).

(ii) \textit{पप्पि श्रुणस्याद्वा...शुचानाविविधे स्वन}:—\textit{Māṇḍ.}, p. 24=\textit{Nṛ.}, p. 48.

(iii) \textit{सप्तल कारणोप विविखो, वि...प्रावश्यम विषयी शोधय स्वन दृश्य चुति}:—\textit{Māṇḍ.}, pp. 27-30 =\textit{Nṛ.}, pp. 48-49.

See also the beginnings of both the commentaries.

\textsuperscript{12} वेदज्ञानविज्ञानविद्याः प्रधानविद्याः एव। श्रुतं यात्र यथा वेदज्ञानविज्ञानविद्यां वेदद्वारः। वेद-विद्याः तथा विद्याः। यात्र वेद-विद्याः श्रुतं यथा वेदज्ञान-विद्याः। \textit{Māṇḍ.}, p. 5.

An\textit{I} तत्रव वेदज्ञानविज्ञानविद्यां वेदद्वारः। वेद-विद्याः तथातः तथा विद्याः। \textit{Nṛ.}, p. 3.
other work but the Upaniṣad under discussion. Nor is the author’s use of the word विषयः ‘briefly’ at all appropriate; while, on the contrary, in the Māṇḍūkya commentary it really serves some important purpose. The Māṇḍūkya commentary nowhere mentions the name of the Nyāsaṁha, but on the other hand, the Nyāsaṁha commentary not only makes mention of the Māṇḍūkya Upaniṣad but also attempts to harmonise its own views with those expressed in its commentary. Sometimes it gives a meaning quite different from that given in the Māṇḍūkya commentary and offers the reason thereof. If both the commentaries had been by the same author, the Nyāsaṁha or its commentary would also have been referred to in the commentary of the Māṇḍūkya. But the fact is otherwise.

Moreover, it appears from the commentary of the Nyāsaṁha that its author has taken the Kārikās of Gauḍapāda as a part of the original text of the Māṇḍūkya and not as a separate work based on the latter as it is generally known. In this it differs in all appearance from the author of the Māṇḍūkya commentary. The following lines from the commentary of the Nyāsaṁha (p. 48) in the course of discussing some readings of both the Upaniṣads deserve to be quoted in this connexion:

चतु उद्देश्यां माहु उक्त व्यवर्ध श्लोकान्त पदिला ठोल्या पादः; यति मिसंलापनेबे तु नान विश्वाय ठोल्या पादः।

‘After this in the Māṇḍūkya on the very subject mentioned above, first some slokas are read and then the सुरीय पाद; but here in the Tāpaniya the सुरीय पाद is read omitting them (i.e. the slokas).’

These slokas are nothing but Gauḍapāda’s Kārikās beginning with चतुःप्राच्यसि विस्मृतिः . . . (1), etc. It seems that the short sentences चतुः प्राच्यसि निकालता, ‘on this (subject) here are these (following) slokas (Māṇḍ., pp. 25, 46, 57, 61) introducing the Kārikās are wrongly taken by the author of the Nyāsaṁha commentary as forming the parts of the original Upaniṣad. But it can easily be proved that the introductory sentences alluded to are really composed by the author of the Kārikās,

13 Nr. comm., p. 46, four times; 48, once.
14 Nr. comm., p. 46: नवं न्यासियसितम विविधायां वाक्यालम्।
15 See the explanation of the words उपायेको निविदा निविदम्, Māṇḍ., p. 14; Nr., p. 45.
16 This question has been discussed more elaborately in my forthcoming work on the Āgamaśāstra of Gauḍapāda.
i.e. Gaudapāda or by some other person. It may be noted here that some of the MSS. of the commentary or its tīkā introduce the sentences saying अथ वादिकादिरौं वाक्यम्. The Vārtikakāra mentioned here is no other than Gaudapāda.

The Nṛsimha belongs to later Upaniṣads and is a Tantric one mixed with Vedantic views. The author of its commentary is also the author of a Tantric book, Prapaṇcāgamaśāstra, or Prapaṇcasāra, as he himself styles it in quoting it frequently in the former work, where he clearly states that it is his own writing. This Prapaṇcasāra is still extant and its different editions are also available. Not less than six verses of this work have been quoted in the Nṛsimha commentary and they have all been traced and found in the former. The Nṛsimha commentary has a strong flavour of Tantricism in it which is never found in the commentary of the Māṇḍūkyya.

I shall show later on how defective is the commentator of the Nṛsimha in his knowledge of grammar, though the commentator of the Māṇḍūkyya is not very far removed from him in this respect. But yet in the depth of ignorance in grammar the commentator of the Nṛsimha easily takes the first place. For not only he makes mistakes himself, but he also fails to detect them in others. As an instance, the following line which occurs in both the commentaries under review, may be quoted: झाडः परमर्थ: भन् प्रावधि विकल्पवाक्याः। The word झाडः is neuter and can never be used in the masculine. The commentator of the Nṛsimha has blindly quoted it and, as I am going to show, this is not unusual with him.

In language and in style the two commentaries are different and by far the superior one in this respect is the Māṇḍūkyya commentary. In the commentary of the Nṛsimha the interpretations of the passages

---

17 Viz. च, म, द of the Ānandārama ed.
18 See Nr., pp. 30, 33, 35, 37, 51 and 61.
19 (i) Nr., p. 30, चुरुस्स वृहिमण्डलात्... = Prapa., (Vānīvilās Press) p. 64, VI. 7.
(ii) Nr., p. 33, तुहायमाधिरोहिस्य... = Prapa., p. 64, VI. 8.
(iii) Nr., p 35, जीवम तेजस्मुगुडितम्... = Prapa., 64, VI. 9.
(iv) Nr., p. 37, कन्दरथाद्र यवसः... = Prapa., 64, VI. 10.
(v) Nr., p. 51, भुजपरस्पर वाहुलयं... = Prapa., p. 417, XXVIII. 7. 9.
(vi) Nr., p. 61, छादुरवांचिद्रवंधार... = Prapa., 64, VI. 12.
It is to be noted that as regards readings there is some difference between the works.
20 Māṇḍ. p. 9, and Nr. p. 9.
common to both the *Upaniṣads* are too forced and far-fetched while in
the former they are not so.

I have already alluded to the defective grammar in the commentary of the *Nṛśimha Upaniṣad*, to prove which let me give a list of
words used by the author which are grammatically wrong. These
words are taken from the *Prapâñcasūra*, another work by the author of
the *Nṛśimha* commentary, as we have seen above.

1. धनेन्त्र (for प्रज्ञावत् which, too, is used, XVIII. 6) VII. 62, 66;
   XVII. 5; XVIII. 5, 19.  

2. प्रोक्ता (for प्रोक्त) XVII. 11, 12; XIX. 10, 11.  

3. वीर्यविलय (for वीय्य) XVII. 14) XVII. 13.  

4. संगङ्क्रेत (for संगङ्क्रेत) XVII. 30.  

5. ब्रह्मोद्वजप्रभ (for ब्रह्मो ब्रह्म) XVII. 33.  

6. लभेत् (for लभेत) XVII. 38.  

7. कभिभज ने (for कभिभज तब) XXXIII. 62.  

8. विषयोन्त (for विषयोत्तम) XVIII. 4.  

9. यूतज (for योत्तम) XX. 46.  

10. विभाजत (for विभाज) X. 8.  

11. विहवास (for विहवास) VII. 14.  

12. ज्ञात (for ज्ञेत) VIII. 20.  

13. जनिचोस (for जनिचोस) II. 5.  

14. मन्वादश (for मन्वादश) I. 20.  

15. लोग (for लोगा) VII. 64, 65.  

16. वानक्तामिनि (for कामिनि) XX. 44.  

17. उपर्युतंत्र (for उपर्युतंत्र) XX. 144.  

As regards efficiency in the use of metres the author of the *Prapāñca-
sūtra* cannot be commended. He can hardly manipulate caesura or
pause (ञि) in his metres, especially in longer ones, such as *Śārdūli-
krīḍita*, *Srāgdrārā*, etc. His *Āryās* are also often defective going
against the rules laid down for them.  

Thus it may be safely concluded that the great Śaṅkara must not
be held responsible for the *Nṛśimha Upaniṣad* commentary and the

---

21 This word which shows a Prākritism is found employed also in many Tantric
works.  

22 Cf. ज्ञात (for ज्ञात) referred to above.  

23 Indicating Prākritic influence  

24 See IV. 68, 69, 72; VII 79, 83.
Prapancagamastra or Prapancasara. It has also been shown that the commentators of the Manjukya and Nrsimha Upanisads are different persons and the commentator of the Manjukya cannot be our Sankaracarya.

In support of the view that the commentaries on the Manjukya and Nrsimha Upanisads were written by the same person, the following lines may be quoted from the Nrsimha commentary:—

(i) मन्त्र... वाक्यदेव मात्रकोपनिषदप्रवाचितमायां (Mṇḍ., p. 14) 

याज्ञवातम्, तथारायिण कश्माय याज्ञवायते। Nṛ., p. 46.

(ii) नन्द यथा... मात्रेय (pp. 17-18)... याज्ञवातम्, तथा तारायिण याज्ञवाय- 

तम्। Ibid.

Here it may be argued that the subject of both the verbs याज्ञवातम् and याज्ञवायते in the first extract, and याज्ञवातम् and याज्ञवायतम in the second is one and the same, and it refers to the commentator himself; thus proving that the authors of the two commentaries are identical. But at the same time it presents no difficulty whatever in construing the verbs याज्ञवातम् and याज्ञवायते (or याज्ञवायतम् as in the second passage) also with different nominatives or subjects. And in that case the sense of the sentence becomes as follows: “Why do you not explain the passage in the way in which it has been explained by one (i.e. the commentator of the Manjukya) in the Manjukya?” In face of the evidence against the identity of the two authors no other interpretation of the passages can reasonably be accepted.

The sentence, निर्देशाय विवाचन पावनेदवाचायाः आनाभि द्वितिषय (Nṛ., p. 48),
cannot refer to the Manjukya commentary where there is no variation of readings, but it must refer to the Nrsimha commentary where we actually see the various readings only a few pages earlier (p. 46).

It follows, therefore, from what we have stated above that there are at least three different authors of the Upanisad commentaries who are all known by the name of Sankara: first and foremost, the commentator of the Brahmasutras, Chāndogya, Brhadāraṇyaka, Gita, etc., second, the author of the Manjukya commentary, and the third, the commentator of the Nrsimhapūrvatāpaniya Upanisad.

Though it has been proved that the authors of the Vākyabhāsya of the Kena Upanisad and the commentary of the Śvetāsvatara are different from the great Śaṅkara, I am not yet in a position to say whether
they are one person or whether they may be identified with either of the commentators of the Māṇḍūkya or Nṛsiṁhapūrvatāpanīya Upaniṣads.
INTRODUCTION OF THE ALPHABET INTO TIBET.

Mahāmahopādhyāya Dr. Satishchandra Vidyabhushana,
Principal, Sanskrit College, Calcutta.

The Tibetan alphabet consists of thirty letters as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Letter</th>
<th>Sound</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ṭ</td>
<td>ka</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ṭ</td>
<td>kha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ṣ</td>
<td>ga</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ṣ</td>
<td>na</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ḍ</td>
<td>cha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ḍ</td>
<td>chha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ḍ</td>
<td>ja</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ḍ</td>
<td>nya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ṭ</td>
<td>ta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ṭ</td>
<td>tha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ṭ</td>
<td>da</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ṭ</td>
<td>na</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ṣ</td>
<td>pa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ṣ</td>
<td>pha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ṣ</td>
<td>ba</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ṣ</td>
<td>ma</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ṭsa</td>
<td>tsha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ṭsa</td>
<td>dsa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ṭsa</td>
<td>wa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ṭha</td>
<td>zha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ṭha</td>
<td>za</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ṭha</td>
<td>ha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ṭha</td>
<td>ya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ṭra</td>
<td>ra</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ṭra</td>
<td>la</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ṭra</td>
<td>sha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ṭra</td>
<td>sa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ṭha</td>
<td>h’a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ṭha</td>
<td>ḍ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ṭha</td>
<td>á</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These letters are traditionally known to have been introduced into Tibet by Sroñ-btsan-sgam-po, from Magadha, in the 7th century A.D. But some scholars doubt

(1) that India could have been the place of origin of the Tibetan alphabet; and

1 This was probably the last article written by the talented author, about a fortnight before his lamented and unexpected death in April 1920.—I.J.S.T.
that the Tibetan alphabet could have been invented at so late a date. The first objection has been advanced by Dr. A. H. Francke and Dr. Hoernle, and the second objection by Sir M. Aurel Stein.

_The views of Dr. A. H. Francke and Dr. Hoernle._

Dr. Hoernle states his own view as well as that of Dr. Francke as follows:

"Dr. A. H. Francke, in an excellent article in the _Epigraphica Indica_, has shown that, so far as the country of origin of the alphabet is concerned that understanding is erroneous and that the country from which Sambhoṭa brought the knowledge of the alphabet to Tibet was really Kāshmīra and, further, that there he had come into contact with a Brāhmaṇa from Khotan whom the Tibetan tradition calls Li-byin or 'Blessing of Khotan' and that that Brāhmaṇa taught him the alphabet of his own country. This, in effect, means that the alphabet, as introduced into Tibet, is the alphabet of Khotan, Li being the well-known Tibetan name of Khotan. This is not the alphabet of India." ¹

_Sir M. A. Stein's view._

Sir M. A. Stein expresses his view as follows:

"Seeing that by the evidence of our _Endere_ text this script is shown to have always assumed in the eighth century that final form in which it continued to the present day, while the classical orthography, so intimately connected with it, is proved to have been at that time already archaic, it seems difficult to resist a doubt as to the correctness of the tradition which places the invention of both the Tibetan orthography and characters only about a century earlier." ²

_Dr. Waddell’s view._

I agree with Dr. L. A. Waddell that the Tibetan letters bear a strong family resemblance to the Kuṭila variety ³ of the Magadha alphabet of the 7th century A.D., e.g. Apśad Inscription of Ādityasena of Magadha. ⁴

Dr. Waddell ⁵ further observes that the edicts prepared by the re-

---

² Stein, _Ancient Khotan_, p. 427.
⁵ See Pl. xxviii of Fleet's _Corp. Ins. Ind._
actionary and revolutionary party present the archaic forms while the edicts which were prepared by the staff of scholarly Indian and Tibetan monks, under the orders of the king, Khri-Sroṅ-lde-btsan, present remarkable classical purity in their orthography.

*My own view.*

My own view is given below with regard to these two points, viz. (1) the place of origin of the Tibetan alphabet; and (2) the antiquity of the Tibetan alphabet.

1. *Place of origin.*—Magadha is the place of origin of the Tibetan alphabet. When Tibet first emerges into the ken of history, we find one independent sovereign ruling over the whole country. Legends supply us with a fairly long list of kings of Tibet reaching back up to the mythical founder of the monarchy, Nya-khri-btsan-po, who is said to have lived about 416 B.C. The first king however of whom we know anything definite is Sroṅ-btsan-sgam-po, who was born about 600 A.D., and is reported to have introduced Buddhism and the art of writing from India into Tibet and to have founded Lhasa in 639 A.D. Sroṅ-btsan-sgam-po was a contemporary of the famous Chinese pilgrim Huen-thsang who travelled in India between 629 and 650 A.D. The principal wives of this king were the daughter of king Aṃśuvarman of Nepal and a lady called Kongjo, who was a daughter of the Emperor of China.

Having established matrimonial connections with Nepal, he sent his minister Thon-mi-sambhoṭa to Magadha to learn the Nāgarī character and the Sanskrit arts and sciences. Thon-mi-sambhoṭa returned about 647 A.D. and shaped the Tibetan character on the model of *Rtags-hjugs*. He prepared the first Grammar of the Tibetan Language, divided into eight chapters of which two, namely *Sum-cu-pa* (30 letters) and *Rtags-hjugs* (introduction to gender) have come down to us. Situ, a commentator on Thon-mi-sambhoṭa’s Grammar, observes that Magadha was the place of origin of the Tibetan alphabet. Situ’s remarks in Tibetan may be translated as follows:—

"In conformity with the prophecy of our Teacher contained in the *Maṅjuśrīmūla tantra*, etc., there arose in the centre of Tibet a city named Lhasa where, during the time of king Harṣavardhana, was born in a

* Dharmapāla" stands for Harṣavardhana.
royal line of the Litsabyi race a great king named Sroṅ-btsan-sgam-po, resplendent by renown as the sun. He received the three-fold title of Sroṅ (straightener) on account of his controlling all bad people by the two customary laws, a btsan (strict) on account of his possessing the strength of administering the right law without partiality, and sgam-po (profound) on account of the depth of his mind not being measurable. He truly flourished as the glory of mankind under the distinguished name of Sroṅ-btsan-sgam-po (the strict and profound straightener). His chief minister was widely known by the bright name of Thon-mi-sambhoṭa. He, through his special meditation and by order of the king succeeded in going to Magadha, the country of the noble, and propitiating Paṇḍita Deva-vidyā-simha and Brāhmaṇa Lipikara and others, learnt many esoteric and exoteric sciences. Wearing the necklace of learning he came back to Tibet and resided at the royal castle named Sku-mkhar-ma-ru where he shaped the Tibetan character after the model of the nāgarī.

Having pleased the king with stanzas of eulogy, he wrote successfully eight treatises on Grammar. Just as a person lights a lamp in darkness he illuminated the first path for spreading in the north the Śāstra of Śākya. From the eight treatises on Grammar only two, viz. Sum-cu-pa (grammar of thirty letters) and Btags-kjung (introduction to gender) have come down to us. Many persons, wise and foolish, having undertaken to write commentaries on them, there grew up a series of books containing meanings different from one another. Nevertheless many persons of fine intellect, by the sharpness of the arrow of their learning, penetrated into the treatises and mastered their meanings. In the northern country, people in general, owing to the treatises having been damaged by fire and the commentaries that were extant having been incomplete, could not carry on their study from mere oral instruction. Though it is not easy for a person like me to write an accurate commentary, yet under the guidance of the people of precious intellect I venture to enter into the two most noble treatises to unfold their real meanings.”

2. The Age of the Tibetan Alphabet.—Da-drag-can does not indicate antiquity. Da-drag-can is a term used for the d as a second final after n, r, and l, e.g. ཨི། དི། །ི།. Observing the total absence

3 Spiritual and temporal.
of the da-drag-can in the Tibeto-Chinese treaty on the Rdo-ring Tablet at Lhasa, Barnett and Francke concluded that the reform in spelling had already commenced in A.D. 783, the date on which the treaty was inscribed. If the Tibetan alphabet had not been created long before A.D. 783 we could not have noticed the da-drag-can as an archaic form within so short an interval.

In reply we say that at all times Grammar allowed the da-drag-can, as well as the absence of it. Thon-mi-sambhoṭa is perfectly silent in the matter. He lays down:—

\[\text{ཤི་ཤི་ཤི་ཤི་ཤི་ཤི་ཤི་ཤི་ཤི་ཤི་}\
\text{ཤི་ཤི་ཤི་ཤི་ཤི་ཤི་}\
\text{ཤི་ཤི་ཤི་ཤི་ཤི་}\
\text{ཤི་ཤི་ཤི་ཤི་}\

The ten suffix-letters suitably used after any syllable and with the fourth vowel joined, are to be known as lar-du, “the finishing letters,” e.g. rtag-po, bzaṅ-no, yod-do, yin-no, sgrub-bo, bsam-mo, bya-bo, bgyur-ro, sel-lo, byas-so.

The commentators supply to, do being changed into to, after syllables ending in \(n\), \(r\) and \(l\), which are of great strength and which have a second suffix; e.g. bstand-to, gyurd-to, stsald-to.

According to them the three forms—zind-to, zin-to and zin-no—are correct.

The Rdo-ring Tablet presents the third form while the inscriptions on the pillar of Victory at Potala⁹ bear the first form. Formerly the first form was extensively used. So all the three forms may have been simultaneous. One form does not indicate greater antiquity than the other. In fact all the three forms were used in the seventh century A.D.

Semitic Influences.

The Tibetan Alphabet exhibits Semitic influence as well. The \(a\) is included in Kāli, i.e. the K-series of thirty letters, while the \(i\), \(u\), \(e\), and \(o\) may be joined with \(a\) as with \(k\), etc. So the consonants to which the four vowel signs are joined are thirty. The commentator Situ remarks upon this as follows:—

"The letter a must be included in äli which should consist of five signs viz. a, i, u, e and o and the kāli should consist of the remaining twenty-nine letters." In reply we say that in former times people occupying the rôle of the learned did not raise any objection to the letter a being included in the kāli group. We cannot deny the sound a inasmuch as it is impossible to pronounce a letter clearly unless the sound a is inherent in it. Without the sound a all letters are lifeless (षूणमिद्). Now the letter producing the sound a cannot be included in the list of äli (the series of vowels) which performs a distinct function and produces sounds. It must be included in kāli or the special series of consonants inasmuch as the four signs of äli can be joined with a in the same way as with k, etc. In fact the so-called vowels (i, u, e and o) are mere a modified by means of any of the four signs on its head or at its foot. Therefore a is to be included in kāli (the series of consonants) which consists altogether of thirty letters.

Gsäl-byed (ग्सांग्स ् येद) are the thirty simple letters, viz. k, etc.; Ḫdoys-can (ख्रिंग्स ग्सां) are the consonants joined with any of the four vowel signs such as नृ ग्न ग्न जू चू जो ग्रू घो ग्रू घो These are like the Hebrew letters consisting merely of consonants with or without vowel signs. May not the Licchavi race to which Sroṅ-btsan-sgam-po belonged, have been Semitic?
THE DOCTRINE OF REVELATION IN THE RGVEDA.

PANDIT DHIRESHCHANDRA ĀCHARYYA, Vidyāratna, Śāstri, M.A., B.L.,
Premchand Roychand Student, Professor, Sanskrit College, Calcutta.

A careful study of the Rgveda shows very clearly that the doctrine of Revelation was not unknown to the Vedic Rṣis or seers. Though it is generally held that the doctrine of Revelation is of very late growth in the Vedic age, a glance at the following verses of the Rgveda will convince any one that they very definitely presuppose a knowledge of that doctrine on the part of the seers of such hymns. For example one Rigvedic sentence runs thus: दृवण प्रव गाधन (sing the hymn bestowed upon by God or the gods). This is not an accidental sentence of the Rgveda, but it seems to contain a stereotyped idea embodying the opinion of the Vedic Rṣis on the doctrine of revelation, for it occurs more than once in the Rgveda.¹

In the very third hymn of the Rgveda, we come upon a passage which according to many Indian commentators refers to the doctrine of revelation. Though it is not very exact, still it is significant and so the passage may be quoted first.

षोद्धर्थश्च सम्भवते चेतन्ति समलोकाम् ।
युष्म रक्षे सर्वकाम् ॥ ॥

' Sarasvati, the sender of true and delightful speech, the inspirer of right knowledge, accepted our sacrifice.'

Here both Uvāta and Mahidhara observe (for the passage also occurs in the Sukla Yajurveda, which they comment upon) that the "true and delightful speech" (कृष्णम) refers to the collection of Vedic hymns or in other words Sarasvatī revealed the Vedic hymns to the Rṣis.²

¹ I. 37. 4 and VIII. 32. 27. ² I. 3. 11.
³ Cf. Sukla Yajurveda, XX. 85. वैद्या जय-वर्षा वायूविविभक्त-वायुविविश्—Uvāta. वेदविविशार वायूविविश—Mahidhara.
But there are other passages, which very clearly presuppose the doctrine and which are so precise that no doubts are possible

उप ते स्लोमौन प्रश्न्या इवाकरुः

"I present to thee the glorifying hymns (bestowed upon us by thee), as a shepherd (returns his sheep to their owner)"

This very clearly shows that the hymns were bodily derived from the gods and thus comes very close to the later doctrine of revelation.

युद्धा नं सूचनाकावित कर ब्राह्मणावास इति

"When thou makest us possessed of true and delightful speech, thou art solicited with it". (That is we pray to you by means of the prayer which you give to us).

दुधा इत्यह ध्योतिषा मघो विनेष्यामिवत्तिना ब्रह्मांशमि

"In like manner as the sun, splendid by his radiance, generates the sunbeams, so art thou the generator of all prayers without exception."

Here we find that all the prayers or hymns without exception (observe the force of the particle इति) are generated by Brahmanaspati.

In this way many other hymns may be quoted, which testify to the assertion made in the beginning of this note. But I shall not quote any more verses, I shall only refer to some other verses which speak in the same strain.

The verse VII. 66. 11 speaks of the holy text (the Rks) as established by the gods in the same way as the year, month, day and night are established by the gods.

The verse VIII. 75. 6, speaks of the eternity of the hymns and is quoted by Šabara Svāmin in his Pūrva-mīmāṃsā-bhāṣya to prove the eternity of the Vedic hymns.

The following verses from the tenth manḍala are also very significant; 28. 5; 88. 8; 98. 3 and 7; and others may be added as well.
ERRATA

To the Article on "The Eastern School of Prakrit Grammarians and Paisācī Prakrit."

Page 127, line 1: *For ॥च्र: read ॥च्र.*
 .. 128, line 2: *For शिवः read शिवः.*
 .. 128, last line of note 9: *For बोधः read बोधः.*
 .. 130, line 2 from below: *For मिसो द्वात read मिसो द्वात.*
 .. 130, verse 20. It has been suggested to me that for केवल-खृचं we should read केवल-खृचं
 'only the thread.'
 .. 140, lines 9 and 14: Read kāmakāla.
 .. 140, lines 10 and 15: Read kāmakara.

GEORGE A. GRIERSON.
THE EASTERN SCHOOL OF PRÄKRIT GRAMMARIANS AND PAIŚ ĀCI PRAKRIT.


(With two Plates.)

The illustrious Auguste Barth, in a footnote to one of his fascinating *Bulletins des Religions de l'Inde*, quotes a Tibetan authority to the effect that, while the Sarvāstivādin Buddhists employed pure Sanskrit in their liturgy, the Mahāsāṅghikas employed corrupt Sanskrit, the Mahāsammatīyas Apabhramśa, and the Sthaviras Paiśāci. To this Barth added the remark that the last-named language was probably meant Pāli.

Quite independently, in an article on The Home of Literary Pāli in the R. G. Bhandarkar Commemoration Volume (p. 181). I myself suggested that a number of so-called Paiśāci dialects were probably only local varieties of Pāli. This would account for the presence in the western lists of such names as Bōṭa (Tibet), Pāṇḍya and Drāviḍa. I also remarked upon the obvious points of connexion between Paiśāci and Pāli, to which other scholars had previously drawn attention, and suggested as a probable explanation that Pāli,—a literary language based on Māgadhī Prakrit,—was much mixed with other forms of Indo-Aryan speech, and, in certain respects had drawn upon Paiśāci. I further pointed out that the Paiśāci influence could easily be accounted for by the fact that Takṣaśilā, the great Buddhist university, was situated in the country which was the home of the standard, Kākāyī, Paiśāci; and drew a parallel with the growth, in Benares, of Hindi as a literary language, although its birth-place was the distant country in the neighbourhood of Delhi.

For the above reasons, I venture to think that Paiśāci Prakrit deserves more attention from scholars than it has hitherto received, and the present paper is offered as a contribution to the subject.

There were in India two schools of Prakrit grammarians, belonging to the West and to the East respectively. For shortness, we may call the former the school of Vālmīki, and the latter the school of Vararuci. A collection of sūtras attributed to Vālmīki has been commented upon by Trivikrama in his Prākṛta-vyākaraṇa, by Lakṣmīdhara in his Saḍbhāṣā-candrikā, and by Śimharāja in his Prākṛtarūpāvatāra. Following the same system, but with independent sūtras, is the well-known Prakrit Grammar of Hēmacandra. These are the principal writers of the western school. Hēmacandra does not mention who were his predecessors. Trivikrama refers to Hēmacandra as his chief authority, and Lakṣmīdhara consulted the works of Trivikrama, Hēmacandra and Bhāmaha. Śimharāja does not name former authors as having been consulted by him.

The eastern school is headed by Vararuci, whose Prākṛta-prakāśa, with Bhāmaha’s commentary, is well known. Bhāmaha’s is the only name common to the two schools, and, as he was a Kāshmiri, he is outside both of them, and is used indifferently by either. Later writers of this school were Rāmaśarman Tarkavāgiśa, the author of the Prākṛta-kalpataru, and Märkaṇḍeya Kavindra, the author of the Prākṛta-sārvaśva. Rāmaśarman mentions as his source (Introduction verse 13) the works of Laṅkēśvara, who, according to Rājēndralāla Mitra, was the author of a grammar entitled Prākṛta-kāmadhēnu, and, under the name of Rāvaṇa, of a commentary thereon called Prākṛta-laṅkēśvara. Märkaṇḍeya was later than Rāmaśarman, and in his account of the dialects of Apabhraṃśa he quotes him at length without naming him. He lived in Orissa, and in the preface of his grammar mentions as his predecessors and sources Śākalya, Bharata, Kōhala, Vararuci, Bhāmaha, Vasantarāja, and others. About Śākalya and Kōhala, as authorities on Prakrit grammar, I can find no information except the few quota-

---

2 Traditionally identified with the author of the Rāmāyaṇa. In his edition of the Saḍbhāṣā-candrikā, Mr. Kamalasāṃkara Prāgasaṃkara Trivēdi has shown clearly that this cannot have been the case.

3 Pischel, Prakrit Grammar. § 38.


5 Note the correspondence of titles, — kāmadhēnu and -kalpataru.

6 It is greatly to be regretted that these manuscripts, of which full descriptions are given in the Notices, cannot now be traced. They are of importance for the history of Prakrit studies in Bengal, and I would urge that those who are more fortunately situated than I am should endeavour to find their present possessors.

7 P. 122 of the printed edition.
tions made by Mārkaṇḍeya. Bharata, of course, is well known. Vasantarāja was the author of the Prākrit-saṃjīvani, a commentary on Vararuci’s Prākṛta-prakāśa. He is quoted not only by Mārkaṇḍeya, but also, according to Aucrecht, by Vasuḍēva in his commentary on the Karpūra-maṇjarī. So far, therefore, as we can say for certain, we can trace the pedigree of the eastern school from Vararuci, through Laṅkēśvara and Rāmaśarman, to Mārkaṇḍeya.

The two schools of Vālmiki and of Vararuci differ from each other in several respects. Putting minor points out of consideration, their gānas rarely agree, and, above all, their accounts of Paisācī Prakrit are mutually inconsistent. In fact, the Paisācī of Vālmiki is not the same language as that of Vararuci. The Vālmiki sūtras describe a form of speech in which the only sonant mute that is universally hardened is d. According to the eastern school, all sonant mutes are hardened. It is true that the Vālmiki school does also describe the Vararuci Paisācī, but it does so under another name,—Cūlikā-paisācika,—and devotes only three sūtras to it. In other words, the Vālmiki school has its own Paisācī, and treats the Vararuci Paisācī as an insignificant variety; while the Vararuci school has its own Paisācī, with seven different dialects, none of which agrees with the Paisācī described by the westerners.

Hēmacandra, in his account of the Vālmiki Paisācī, gives a large number of examples, but, more suo, does not mention the source or sources whence they are taken. Various scholars have suggested that these were extracts from the famous, lost, Brhatkathā. This, however, is a supposition and nothing more, and Indian authorities are silent on the point. On the other hand, the only certain passage of the Brhatkathā that we possess is quoted by Mārkaṇḍeya as an example of the Paisācī described by the easterners, and of the two words there given one is wrong according to western teaching. We are thus driven to one of two alternatives. In one, we must assume that the eastern and the western Paisācī are identical. In that case one of the two accounts must be wrong. They cannot both be right. In the other alternative, the examples given by Hēmacandra cannot have been

8 Catalogus Catalogorum, p. 360.
9 E.g. Pischel, Prakrit Grammar, § 27.
10 xix, 9, kucī for kvucī. The change of v(b) to p is directly contrary to the teaching of the Vālmiki sūtras and of Hēmacandra.
taken from the Brhatkathā, for that work can hardly have been written in two different dialects of Paiśāci.

In one respect the eastern grammarians are superior to those of the West. All our extant grammars of either school, except that of Vararuci, were written when Prakrit was a dead language. Hēmacandra belonged to the 12th century, and Laksāmidhara and Simharāja were much later. Rāmaśarman and Mārkaṇḍeya probably both belonged to the 17th century. While, no doubt, these authors had tradition to help them, the only real authorities for their rules, so far as they added to the rules of Vararuci and other old grammarians whose works had been lost, were Prakrit works, then surviving, by authors long since dead. By analyzing the forms contained in these works they formed their rules. Hēmacandra and the author of the Vālmiki sūtras did this most successfully, though, in doing so they often mixed up different dialects in great confusion. They got together an enormous number of grammatical forms, discovered a system under which they could be arranged, and wrote their grammars. But very rarely does Hēmacandra or, say, Laksāmidhara mention the sources from which he collected the words given by him in support of his rules. On the other hand, the authors of the Vararuci school, Rāmaśarman and Mārkaṇḍeya, are most careful to quote their authorities, and, when any unusual form occurs, they give the passage in which it is to be found, and name the author. The principal works from which they quote are the usual plays, Hāla's Saptaśatikā, Pravara-sēna's Sētubandha, Vakpati's Gaṇđavahō (including quotations from the lost books), and Rāja śekhara's Karpūra-mañjari; but many other works, now extant or non-extant, are drawn upon by them and named, and owing to this scholarly carefulness we possess authentic and precious fragments of works, such as the Brhatkathā already mentioned, which have long been lost to modern readers.

It has often been urged to me, when I have quoted Mārkaṇḍeya's authority against that of Hēmacandra, that the former was a late writer, and therefore of little consequence. No other objection could have been so unfair. It is true that he lived five centuries after Hēmacandra, but that is a fact of no importance in regard to the comparative correctness of their respective works. A still later writer than Mārkaṇḍeya was Professor Pischel, and the same opponent who objects to the one will quote the other as infallible. It is not a question of
date but of sources and of critical acumen. As already said, both Hēma-
candra and Mārkaṇḍēya were dealing with what was to each a dead
language. They had the same sources of inspiration,—the manuscripts
of Prakrit works,—and each used these sources to the best of his ability.
If date were a relevant point in such a matter, then the Latin gram-
mars written at the present day would be of no value as compared
with those written in the days of Henry VIII. If the manuscripts
used by Hēmacandra and Mārkaṇḍēya had all survived to the present
day, it would be quite possible for some great scholar of the twentieth
century to write a new grammar still more authoritative and more ac-
curate than that of either of the two authors whom we have been con-
sidering. The only extant grammarian whom we can assume to have
been living when Prakrit was a spoken language was Vararuci, and he
was an Easterner.

Of the eastern grammarians whose works are available, Vararuci
is familiar to all students. His account of Paiśācī differs from that of
the other two in regard to the treatment of sonant consonants. Accor-
ding to them, these are always hardened, but Vararuci (x, 3) excepts
those which are initial or which happen to be members of a conjunct.
Thus, while Rāmaśarman and Mārkaṇḍēya would write kākāna for
gagana, and kaṅkā for gaṅgā, Vararuci would write gakana and gaṅgā.
In this, his Paiśācī agrees with a sub-variety of Cūlikā-paiśācikā men-
tioned in a single sūtra of the Westerners as taught by some authori-
ties.

Mārkaṇḍēya’s grammar is available in the excellent printed edition
of Bhāṭṭanātha Svāmin, published in Vizagapatam in the Grantha-
pradarśanī series. I have also, myself, been able to select variant read-
ings of the text from five different MSS. The state of affairs regard-
ing Rāmaśarman’s Prākṛta-kalpataru is very different. So far as I
know, our sole authority is one MS. (No. 1106) in the India Office
Library, written in the Bengali character. It was long ago described
by Lassen,11 but his account is incomplete, partly owing to the corrupt
nature of the contents, and partly because he did not notice that
several pages had been misplaced. Since Lassen’s time, much progress
has been made in our knowledge of Prakrit, and in the following pages

11 Institutiones Linguae Practicæ, pp. 19ff. and Exercitus I. On Plates I and II will
be found slightly reduced facsimiles of the four pages of the manuscript which contain
the portion dealing with Paiśācīka.
I attempt to transcribe those portions of the MS. which relate to Paiśacī Prakrit, or, as Rāmaśarman calls it 'Paiśācika.' The task has been by no means easy. The old Bengali characters are difficult to read, and, in places, the text is atrociously corrupt. In those parts which the author had in common with Mārkaṇḍēya, I had the latter's grammar as a guide and check. For the rest I gratefully acknowledge the kind help which I have received from Dr. Thomas, the Librarian of the India Office, and from Dr. Sunīti Kumār Chatterji, whose presence in London gave me a fortunate opportunity of availing myself of his accurate scholarship and of his familiarity with old Bengali script. I desire to emphasize my indebtedness to these two gentlemen, as, without their help, I should not have ventured to write this paper.

The Prākṛta-kalpataru, or 'Wishing-tree of Prakrit' is divided into three Sākhās, or 'Branches.' Each Sākhā is again divided into so many Stabakas, or 'Cluster's,' and each Stabaka into so many Kusumās, or 'Flowers,' i.e. verses or paragraphs. The body of the work is mainly in the Upajāti metre, but other metres are also common. Occasionally a prose commentary is added to a verse. This is most frequent in the earlier Sākhās, where each verse has its commentary, with numerous examples. In the later portions of the work, the commentary is much more rare, so that in the final Stabaka of the third Sākhā, dealing with Paiśacika, there is hardly any commentary at all.

I have already mentioned that Rāmaśarman speaks of Paiśacika (neuter), and not of Paiśācī. The two terms are not exactly convertible. Under 'Paiśacika' he includes not only the Paiśācī of other grammarians, which he calls 'Śuddha Paiśacika,' but also those polyglot tours de force loved by old Indian writers, in which Paiśācī or some other Prakrit form of speech is mixed, or combined, in the same poetical work, with Sanskrit. A familiar example is the thirteenth canto of the Bhāṭṭi-kāvyā, which will be again referred to later in this paper. Rāmaśarman calls this mixture 'Saṃkīraṇa Paiśacika.' Other writers do not include it under the name of 'Paiśācī.'

The first page of the MS. is the most corrupt of all. It contains a few disjointed fragments of the Introduction to the work. This Introduction, according to its colophon, originally consisted of fourteen Kusumās, or verses; but fragments of only six are given, and most of
what is written is full of mistakes of the copyist. The earlier part of
the page is a fragment of a list of Apabhramaśa dialects. The two verses
referring to Paiśācika are legible, but one word, which it is easy to
supply from the fuller description to be subsequently given, is missing.
The verses are as follows, the missing word being enclosed in square
brackets. The last two pādas of the second verse are corrupt, and
have been conjecturally emended, the original text being given in a
footnote. For the emendations, I am indebted to a suggestion of Dr.
Sūnītī Kumār Chatterji.

[पेशार्थिकं] केकय-यूर्सेन-  
पाल्पाल्ल-गौर-प्रभव-ब्रमणा।  
स-मागध-श्राचि-सुधामेर्  
भाषाविश्वसं मलम् ब्यधशुद्धम्॥  
तथा चन्द्रार्कन्तिशुद्धम् अन्याद्  
शुद्धम् एकादशयं तद्वितयम्।  
तेषां सिद्धान्तावेशः  
न सन्त सौधेण सुकरा छूपाया: ॥

From this we learn that there are eleven kinds of Paiśācika, viz.:
1. That born in Kṣekaya.
2. , , Şūrasēna.
3. , , Pāñcāla.
4. , , Gauḍa.
5. Māgadha.
6. Vṛacāda.
7. Sūkṣmabhēda.
11. Asūddha.

The name ‘Sūkṣmabhēda,’ ‘having minute points of difference,
may give rise to doubts, but the author, as we shall see in the sequel
does appear to name one variety thus, and, if we do not include it as a
name, our list of eleven dialects will be incomplete. The author adds
that there are no easy means for understanding the peculiarities of those of the first (seven) which stand (in the various accounts of them) without any special differentiation. Here he evidently alludes to Nos. 4–7, and, as we shall see in verse 13, especially to No. 7.

The fifteenth, and final, stabaka of the third śākha of the Prākṛta-kalpataru deals with Paiśācika in detail. The MS. is here not nearly so corrupt as on the first page, and it can generally be read. Emendations are now and then necessary, but most of them are obvious. There are, however, a few passages which defy my efforts and those of my friends. I here give the text with my emendations, and with, when necessary, the actual readings of the MS. in the footnotes. Before proceeding, it is advisable to state again that Rāmasarman’s list of eleven kinds of Paiśācika falls into two groups of seven and four, respectively. The first seven are various forms of true Paiśācī, and the other four are different kinds of mixtures of different Prakrits with Sanskrit. The first seven are called Śuddha Paiśācika, and the other four are called Saṃkīrṇa Paiśācika.

1. Metro, Upajāti (सुकुमार-भृदन्न न्ववोदितानि). MS. संकीर्ण-प्रमन्यन्त चपुःमादः. Misaed by this blunder of the copyist, Lassen (Institutiones Linguae Pracriticae, p. 22) speaks of a dialect named ‘Chasha, vox dubia et mihi ignota.’

2. MS. प्रारम्भतीयीयंतियोर्जन्याद्य, which is certainly a scribal error. Cf. Vararuci, x, 3, and Mārkandōya, xix, 2.
3. MS. एवम् स्थाप्यातः।

4. I have inserted तत्, in order to complete the metre. For शँ, MS. seems to read शन्ति. This I have corrected as above to agree with Mārkandēya, xix, 19, where all my MSS. read शँ, although the printed text has शँ.

5. Metre, Drutavilambita (०-०-०-०-०-०-०-०-०-०-।). MS. पुष्पम् पुष्पमिष्ठाति। विख्यातमेव तुषारं कासिदेवकम्। प्रवाहम् समस्। I have corrected to agree with Mārkandēya.

6. Metre, Śālinī (०-०-०-०-०-०-।). MS. ादिकायः। In the third pāda, पषिष्णु is clear in the MS., and is required by the sense; but it breaks the metre, which here requires कँत्ति. After पषिष्णु MS. has किद्वयात्, which I have conjecturally emended as above. MS. ादिकायः।

7. Metre, Indravajrā (-०-०-०-०-०-।). MS. कः स्थः। The कः is quite
clear in the MS., and agrees with the general character of the dialect, which closely follows Māgadhi, not Śauraseni, Prakrit. On the other hand, according to Mārkaṇḍeya, xx, 6, every छ should become श्च.

8. Metre, Tvaritagati (००००-००००००). MS. च, which breaks the metre. The printed edition of Mārkaṇḍeya has च, which suits the metre, and which is supported by three of my MSS. of Mk. Two MSS. of Mk. (Hnb) read च, which will not suit the metre here. चित्रित पिथा: is doubtful. MS. has पिथितिपिथति; Mk. has nothing like it. MS छतसमया।

9. Metre, Bhūjaṅgprayāta (०-०-०-०-०-०-०). The whole of this verse is corrupt. The first pāda is conjecturally emended. I think that the original meaning has been restored with fair certainty, though the wording is doubtful. The MS. has मभिविर्यादिक पृथ्वितुंश्च. In the second pāda, MS. has चित्र for चित्र and श्च for श्च. In the third, it has श्च for श्च. My emendation of the fourth is mere guess-work. MS. has श्चित्रितिष्ठातो श्चित्तिष्ठादिवर्ताय।

10. Metre, Upajāti (०-०-०-०-०-०-०). MS. चित्र. For पल मनुष्यो, MS. has चलन मनुष्यो. The example, as emended, is taken from Mk. xx, 10. The words म व अ are not in the MS.
तद् गौड-पेशाचिक्रमिष्टे [तु]
स्वातं र-रूर रूर च लिः च दो [२१]

मतं मागधं नाम पेशाचिक्रं [तु]
यदा मागधानां प्रजाष्टित माया

श्रवणं नाम पेशाचिक्रं तत्
पदानं यदा संक्षणेमिन्यं ग्यात् स्वात् [२२]

जजे श्र-भेदादिरो च पेशाचिक्रं
चिकं विवेचनित्वं सुश्रुभेदम्

गैत्रिमात्राः स्वयं बतात्
न विद्यते निवृत्तमाय प्रक्षितः [२३]

संकीकरण-पेशाचिक्रम: सुह्रणा-
सूर्य-भेदाययाम: संभवेदम्
सूर्य तु माया-पद-सूर्य-भेदाय
धिष्ठा विनाशं कवयो वदन्ति [२४]

दिविंधं पद-सूर्यम् द्यते
मतमेकं पुनः अध्य-सूर्यम्
श्लोकं तु निर्बाचते चन्द्रम्-
पद-सूर्यं तद्विदत दिविंधभए [२५]

वर्षेकभाषामयमयमण्डितम्-
भाषाय वर्षेक वधा-सूर्यम्

11. MS. प्रवक्त्ये | त्तः | The word तु is not in the MS., and is added to complete the metre.

12. Metre, Bhujaṅgaraprayāt (सूर्यम् ॥ सूर्यम् ॥). MS. omits तु. It has been added to complete the metre. MS. संभाषामयमयमण्डितम्.

13. Metre Upajāti (सूर्यम् तु निर्बाचते चन्द्रम् पद-सूर्यं तदविदत दिविंधभए [२५].

14. MS. पेशाचिक्रम: सुह्रणा-सूर्य-भेदाययाम: संभवेदम् | श्रवणं स्वयं बतात्

15. Metre, Vīyōgini (सूर्यम् ॥ सूर्यम् ॥). MS. यपरस्पं निष्कर्षस्ते.
चतुष्पादित् वदा चतवः
भाषान्न चतुष्पादि-विष्णुम् १६।

विशालकूलव्रताद् तु भाषा:
प्रविष्णूलोचनोऽवश्यकार उत्तरः:
तद् विष्णुम् उदाहृतं तु काये
तत्तत् सुखाच त्यारिं || कामेगा १७॥

यथा ममः--

कमला-कर-चन्द्रोऽल कामाकाण कालकोमलालीकः
कलिविन-काल-कलिविन सुचिः से मोक्ष-कालोऽलः १८॥

[ कमलकर्षणोऽल कामाकाण कालकोमलालीकः
कलिविनकालकलिविन सुचिः से मोक्षकालोऽलः १८॥ ] अधि पाण्डित्यप्रमाणिकः
काव्याः संज्ञा: [ श्रद्धा: ] सत्री एव पञ्चपञ्चः भाषा: || संज्ञालोकमतिः
संज्ञाविनोऽवश्यकः संज्ञाविनोऽवश्यकः यथा तत्ततोऽमाधवः--

सरस्त मात्रोऽगम्प विरिष्णु रक्षोऽन्त मूच संरम्मः
विरिष्णु विरिष्णु मोऽत्त तव विनामस्तः मे १९॥

एवं भाषा वर्णकाण्डः ... ... तथा अर्गुमम्। यथा--
भाषेन्यं विरिष्णुं चि गोमलिन्-सचिब्धुः फुड़िधुः पदिधिः
कालमन्त्री-मुख्य विरिष्णूपस्त काल-पाण्ड २०॥

16. Metre, Upajāti (७०-०-०-०-०-०-०). MS. पदक्रमांकविबन्धः। चतुष्पादित्

17. Metre, Aupacchandasa (७०-०-०-०-०-०-०-०). MS. विष्णुम् काये। In the fourth pāda, some such word as कार्यिं is required by the metre. It is not in the MS.

18. The text is here corrupt, and the emendation given above is very doubtful. The MS. has कमलाकाण्ड गोमलिन-सचिब्धुः पदिधिः। कलिकालकलिकिनं सुचिःमोक्षकालः। Assuming that three mātrās have been omitted (which I have supplied by inserting the word पदिधिः), the metre of the verse, as emended, is Gāhā.

19. Metre, Gāhā. I give the verse as it is found in the printed editions of the Mālafi-Mādhava (6th Act). The MS. has सरस्त मात्रोऽगम्प परिवर्त्तता पुष्पमिश्रेण। विरिष्णु विरिष्णु। सरस्त मात्रोऽगम्प। In the following prose passage MS. has एवं भाषा चर्मक्रोप्रहः अर्गुमम्, of part of which I can make nothing.
In the following annotated translation of these verses I shall so far as is possible give references to the corresponding sūtras of Mārkanṭāyā's Prākṛta-sarvasva. These I shall usually quote from the printed edition, but, where necessary, I shall refer to MSS. of the grammar which I have been able to collate. These are:—

O. A valuable palm-leaf MS. in the Oriyā character, the property of Mahāmahopādhyāya Sadāśiva Miśra, of Puri, of which I possess a photograph.

Hn. A copy in the Nāgarī character taken from the Bengal Asiatic Society's MS. No. 1555. This was lent to me by Dr. Hoernle.

29. Metre, Gāhā. Here, too, the MS. is corrupt, and my emendations are far from certain. It reads भावेव विरचित्विषयमपूवपूवातिर्विरचितः। कथे वर्णस्तें विरचितः। कलिपाः रूप। In the second line I have inserted तु, in order to complete the metre. In the MS. the following prose passage runs यथाकालसाधितः

21. Metre, Gāhā (half). MS. गिरितत्तज्ज. In the following prose passage it has शब्द for शब्द. As an example, the verse is incomplete, the Sanskrit half being, missing. The entire verse appears in the Sarasvatī-kunḍābhārana (II, ii, 9) as follows:—

अयस्मि अवलाभित्वस्त्ववित्तादिप्रद: कलिपपद्धति गिरितः।

See Raṅganāthasvāmi Aryavaragun, in Indian Antiquary XLVIII (1919) p. 212.

In the Colophon, the word पद्धति is clear, but the Stabaka contains 21 Kusumas, or verses, or, if we omit the examples, 17. In the MS. the verses are regularly numbered down to, and including, 18. After that they are not numbered. We should almost certainly read पद्धति, as the Śākhā does contain fifteen Stabakas, that on Paiśācika being the last, and concluding the work.
Hb. Another copy of the same, in the Bengali character, also lent to me by Dr. Hoernle.

Io. India Office MS., Mackenzie, No. 70. It is on palm-leaf, and is in the Nāgārī character. It has evidently been copied from an original in the Oriya character.

Ox. The Bodleian MS., Wilson, No. 158b. It is on paper, and is in the Nāgārī character. It also has evidently been copied from an original in the Oriya character.

1. The Paisācikas fall into two groups,—viz. Śuddha Paisācika, or 'Pure Paisācika,' and Saṃkīrṇa Paisācika, or 'Mixed Paisācika.' Of these the first group of seven is 'Pure,' and the remaining group of four is 'Mixed.'

[There is nothing like this in Mk. In the verses of the introduction quoted on p. 125, Rāmasarman states that there are eleven kinds of Paisācika, and gives their names. He now states that the first seven in that list are 'Puro,' and the remaining four 'Mixed.' The seven Pure Paisācikas are therefore Kaikēya, Śaurasēna, Pańcāla, Gauḍa, Māgadha, Vṛācaḍa, and 'Sūkṣmabhēda.' The four Mixed Paisācikas are Bhāṣa-viśuddha, Ardha-śuddha, Catuspāda-viśuddha, and Aśuddha. In the Commentary to verse 2 of the introduction of his grammar, Mk. quotes a list of eleven 'Piśācaja' languages, viz. Kañciddiśiya, Pāṇḍya, Pańcāla, Gauḍa, Māgadha, Vṛācaḍa, Dākṣiṇātya, Śaurasēna, Kaiṅkaya, Śabarā, and Drāvīda. Mk. does not say who is the author of this list, and condemns it as absurdly meticulous. He adds that there are only three used for literary purposes, viz. Kaikēya, Śaurasēna, and Pańcāla, and it is only these three that he describes in Chapters XIX and XX of his grammar. It may be observed that in the list on p. 125 Rāmasarman names some forms of Paisācika as 'born in' certain countries, while others are described by simple appellatives. In the Saḍbhaṣa-candrikā (Introduction, 28-30), Lakṣmīdhara makes a similar distinction. He says that there are two kinds of 'Paisācī,' viz. (1) that maintained (niyata) in the Piśāca-dēsas [each variety being affected by the qualities of its own special country]; and (2) that born among the Piśācas. I understand this to mean that the second kind was the vernacular of the Piśācas in their proper home, or at least the vernacular of some tribe or religious sect (? Buddhists), while the

13 I shall employ this contraction throughout for 'Mārkaṇḍēya.'
second kind was the Paišācīi spoken by Pišācas settled in foreign countries, who no longer spoke their own language in its original purity. The 'Pišāca-dēsas,' i.e. the countries in which Pišācas had so settled were Pāṇḍya, Kēkaya (but it was here that according to the Easterners the standard Paišācī was spoken), Bāhlīka, Simha (or Sahya), Nēpāla, Kuntalā, Sudhēśṇa, Bhōja, Gāndhāra, Haiva (identified by Lassen with the Tuluva country), and Kannōjana (=Kanyākubja). All these countries except Sudhēśṇa are well known. A variant reading of Bhōja is Bōṭa (Tibet). As previously stated, my opinion is that the various Paišācīs of these countries were simply local varieties of Pāli.

Rāmaśarman now proceeds to describe the seven varieties of Śuddha, or Pure, Paišācika, and begins with Kaikēya.]

ŚUDDHA, OR PURE, PAIŠĀCICA.

(1) Kaikēya Paišācika.

2. Kaikēya Paišācika is now described. The modifications observed in its established form are based on Sanskrit and Śaurasēnī. In it, in all cases, the first and second consonants of a class (i.e. surds) are to be substituted, respectively, for the third and fourth (i.e. sonants).

For the originals, cf. Mk. xix, 1, which is to the same effect. It should be noted that one of the originals is Śaurasēnī. On the other hand we shall find (see note to verse 7) that Śaurasēna Paišācika is based, not on Śaurasēnī, but on Māgadhī. For metriccal reasons, the author here calls the language Paišāca, not Paišācika.

Regarding the change of sonants to surds, cf. Mk. xix, 2. The MS. says that the first and third letters of a class are substituted respectively, for the second and fourth, but this is evidently a scribal error. If it were correct, it would mean that non-aspirates are substituted for aspirates, which is not borne out by any author of either the eastern or the western school.

3. A dental s is substituted for ś and ṣ (Mk. xix, 3). A dental n is substituted for the n of the cerebral class (Mk. xix, 4). In the words bhārīyā, etc., ria is substituted for rya (Mk. xix, 5), and sana is substituted for sna in snāna-, etc.

According to Mk. bhārīyā becomes bhāriā, with the first syllable shortened. With regard to snāna-, Mk. xix, 7 gives a general rule
that conjunct consonants are often resolved into their component elements, the inserted vowel being a. His examples are kasatam for kaṣṭam; sanānam for snānam; thavama-patani or thamma-patti for dharma-patni; and cihamako or cihamakō for jihamagāha.

4. In ratna-, etc., the compound consonant is separated into its component parts (cf. Mk. xix, 7, quoted above). The word grham becomes kiham (Mk. xix, 8), and iva when it means 'like that' becomes piva (Mk. xix, 16). Moreover, in the word kaṣṭa-, satā is substituted for sta (cf. Mk. xix, 7, quoted above), and prthuni is irregularly used for prthivi (Mk. xix, 10).

The word tadad in the text appears to indicate the particular meaning of iva when it is changed to piva. Mk. gives as an example canto piva, i.e. candra iva. The form prthuni is doubtful. See the note to the text.

5. The word hrdayam becomes hitapakam (Mk. xix, 11). Again prthumanā is required in place of prthama (Mk. xix, 15). For vismayāh and sākṣaṃ we have, respectively, pisumā (Mk. xix, 14) and sukhamaṃ (Mk. xix, 13). Kupaci is used in the meaning of kvacid (Mk. xix, 9), and the word pakhama becomes pakhama (Mk. xix, 12).

The words prthumanā and pisumā are doubtful. See the note to the text. The word kupaci is interesting. As an example Mk. gives a quotation from the Brhatkathā. He says: राजश्यायास्—'कुपचि पिसाल' equivalent to the Sanskrit कृपाचितिश्रास्त्र. The प्रकान्त of the MS. is certainly a scribal error for प्रकान्त.

6. The word kāryam becomes kaccam (Mk. xix, 6). The suffix tvā of the gerund becomes tūnām (Mk. xix, 17). The double letter ṇa is substituted for ṇa, for ṇa, or for ṇa (Mk. xix, 18). In the instrumental, ablative, genitive and locative singular of the word rajan-, rāci- is employed. In this word there is also another (set of forms as in) raunā as well as rācinā (Mk. xix, 19).

Mk. says that the use of rāci- in rajan- is optional, and gives raunā, rannā, rānī, raunā, raunā, raunā, and raunā as optional forms.

This concludes Ramaśarman's account of Kaikēya Pāśācika. Mk. adds two other rules. The first (xix, 20) is that in other respects Kaikēya-Pāśācikī follows Saurāsēni. The other (xix, 21) is that it follows Māgadhī in the forms of yusmad- and asmad-, but that in the forms containing bh, this bh does not become ph, as we
might expect from verse 2, above. Thus, it has tumhē, not tumphē; and ambhē, not amphē. We now proceed to deal with Śaurasēna Paiśācika.

(2) Śaurasēna Paiśācika.

Rāmaśarman does not state on what Prakrit dialect his modifications for Śaurasēna Paiśācika are to be based. As, in his first verse, he mentions the letter s as possibly occurring in the basal speech, and as this letter occurs only in Sanskrit, it is to be inferred that, as in the case of Kaikēya Paiśācika, he looks upon it as based on Sanskrit and Śaurasēṇī. In this he differs from Mk., who takes his own Kaikēya-Paiśācikī as the basis of his modifications. The ultimate result is, of course, the same, but the adoption of different bases involves differences in the rules. For instance, in his first verse, Rāmaśarman teaches that s and ś both become ṣ. As Mk. takes Kaikēya Paiśācika as his basis, and, as in that dialect (see verse 3, above) ṣ and ś have already become s, he has only to say that every s becomes ś.

Although this is called Śaurasēna Paiśācika, it is most closely allied to Māgadhī Prakrit. Nearly all the points in which it differs from Kaikēya Paiśācika are typical of Māgadhī. Such are the changes of sibilants to ṣ, the change of r to l, the change of kṛta-, mṛta-, and ḫeta-, to kaḍa-, maḍa-, and gaḍa- respectively, and others. This is borne out by Mk.'s 13th sūtra, for which Rāmaśarman has nothing corresponding. Mk. there says 'in other respects it (i.e. Śaurasēna-Paiśācikī) is like Prakrit (i.e. Mahārāṣṭrī), (but) some say that it is optionally like Māgadhī.'

7. In the Paiśācika which is (called) 'Śaurasēna' ś, the first of the three sibilants, is substituted for s and ṣ (Mk. xx. 2). The letter l and ḫ alone, is under all circumstances substituted for r (Mk. xx, 3), and śka is substituted for kṣa in words such as kaukṣēyaka- and rākṣasa-.

This typical Māgadhī change of r to l distinguishes this dialect from Pāṇcāla Paiśācika, in which the interchange of r and l is mutual (verse 11). The MS. is quite clear in stating that in certain words ks becomes śka as in Māgadhī. But Mk. (xx, 6) lays it down as a general rule that kṣa becomes ccha.

8. According to the opinion of the learned adhunā becomes ahunī (Mk. xx, 12). When tip, the termination of the third person singular,
follows, pia is substituted for pibati [so that we get pïati, not pipati, by verse 2, for pibati, he drinks]. Kaḍa- and maḍa- are substituted for kṛta- and mṛta-, respectively, and men pronounce gata- as gaḍa- (Mk. xx, 5).

Regarding the word ahuni, see the note to the text. The cerebral v is surprising. As for pïati, I have probably got what the author intended, but I am by no means sure of the text. Mk. does not mention any change.

9. It is considered that the rya (in such words as bhāryā becomes ria as in) bhāriā, as before (verse 3). But in the word atti (=asti) the tth remains unchanged [and does not become śtha, as in Māgadhi, see Mk. xii, 7]. In the conjugation of the root stā-, nātha is substituted for the śtha (in Śaurasenī citthadi), as in ścitthadi, while sthitam becomes thimā.

The whole of this verse is corrupt in the MS. and even with the conjectural emendments is difficult to translate. Mk. does not here mention bhāriā, as he has already given bhāriā under Kaikēya-Paśācikī (see note to verse 3). He makes no mention of atti. He says that the śtha of tiṣṭhati becomes ṣta (xx, 7). This is the reading of the printed edition and O Hnb read ṣṇa, and Io and Ox read ṣna. According to Mk. xii, 32, the Māgadhi form is ścitthadi. In the MS. of the present work, the only portion of the word which is clear is n̄thadi. The initial syllable seems to be phī, which I conjecture to be a scribal error for ści. In the Oriya character, ṣ and ś are easily confounded.

10. In the case of abuse or the like, the termination of (the nominative) of a noun whose base is a, is ī, as in sīāti (for śyālah, a brother-in-law). Elsewhere, such nominatives end in ī, as in palē manuṣē (for parō manuṣyah) (Mk. xx, 10). Also the accusative singular may optionally end in ī, as in gāmē, or, as in Kaikēya Paśācikā, gāmām (for grāmam) (Mk. xx, 11).

Mk. says nothing about the ī termination of a-bases. We may compare the Māgadhi termination in short ī (Mk. xii, 26). In Māgadhi, śyālah becomes sīālē (Mk. xii, 12). In the printed edition of Mk. xx, 10, sōr īt is a misprint for sōr īt. This concludes Rāmaśarman’s account of Śaurasena Paśācikā. Owing to the condition of the MS. it is not so satisfactory as that for Kaikēya P. On one important point laid down by Mk. he is silent. Mk. (xx, 4)
states that the letter \( y \) is always prefixed to a letter of the \( ca-varga \). This again is a peculiarity, as explained by later eastern grammarians (cf. Mk. xii, 21) of Māgadhī, and is apparently referred to by Vararuci (xi, 5). We next proceed to deal with Pāñcāla Paiśācika.

(3) Pāñcāla Paiśācika.

11. Those who are skilled in this matter say that Pāñcāla Paiśācika is distinguished by the confusion of \( r \) and \( l \).

The meaning of प्रयोग, which I translate by 'confusion' is made clear by the corresponding sūtra of Mk. (xx, 14), where the word used is त्रिपर्यथ, or 'inversion.' In other words, \( r \) becomes \( l \), and \( l \) becomes \( r \). In Śaurāṣṭra Paiśācika, on the other hand, every \( r \) becomes \( l \), but \( l \) remains unchanged. For the remaining kinds of Paiśācika, Mk. gives no rules. He simply ignores them.

(4) Gauḍa Paiśācika.

In Gauḍa Paiśācika either \( r \) or \( l \) may be used for \( r \) or for \( l \).

I.e. \( l \) may optionally be used for \( r \), and \( r \) may optionally be used for \( l \). In Pāñcāla Paiśācika, on the contrary, the interchange is obligatory.

(5) Māgadhā Paiśācika.

12. When the language originates (in the country) of the Māgadhās, it is regarded as the Paiśācika called Māgadhā.

(6) Vṛācaḍa Paiśācika.

In the next place Paiśācika is called Vṛācaḍa in which there is an admixture of Sanskrit words.

Mk. says nothing about a Vṛācaḍa Paiśācika. But both Rāmaśarman (xiv, 1), and Mk. (xviii, 1) describe also a Vṛācaḍa Abhbhramśa, which they say was spoken in the Sindhu-dēśa.

(7) Sūksamabhēda Paiśācika.

13. Another authority has recognized a Paiśācika, owing to a differentiation in regard to the letter \( ša \). That, forsooth, is a Sūksamabhēda, for it has but a minute point of difference, and there does not appear to be any possibility of differentiation, any more than of differentiating between the sweetness of molasses and of sugar.
SAṆKĪRṆA, OR MIXED, PAIṢĀCIKA.

This concludes Rāmaśarman's account of Śuddha Paiṣācika. We now turn to his account of Saṃkirṇa Paiṣācika. As already stated, there is nothing in Mk. corresponding to this, and hence there is nothing to help us in regard to the corrupt text of the India Office MS. of the Prākṛta-kalpataru. For this reason there are one or two passages which defy my efforts at emendation.

According to Rāmaśarman, Saṃkirṇa, or 'Mixed', Paiṣācika is a mixture of various languages,—usually Paiṣācika and Sanskrit, although other forms of Prakrit may be used instead of either. Writers on poetics often describe this kind of mixed language, the basis being not necessarily Paiṣācī; but their accounts, and their systems of nomenclature do not tally with each other.

The Sāhītya Darpaṇa (642) says 'when a sentence is formed of words which are the same in a variety of tongues, it is named Bhāṣā-sama, or Linguistic Sameness.' The author then gives a verse which may be read as Sanskrit, or as Prakrit, Śāurasenī, Prācī, Avanti, or Nāgara Apabhramśa.

Rudraṭa (Kāvyālaṅkāra, iv, 10–23) says that there are two kinds of Bhāṣā-śleṣa. In one a passage may be read in one language with one meaning, and in another language with a different meaning. In the other, a passage may be read in two different languages, and have the same meaning in both. The latter kind is known as Bhāṣā-sama śubda-citra. (See Mallinātha to Bhaṭṭikāvyya, xiii, 1. The whole, or nearly the whole, of the thirteenth canto of the Bhaṭṭikāvyya is in this Bhāṣā-sama.) Rudraṭa gives several examples of Sanskrit-Paiṣācī Bhāṣā-śleṣa.

According to the Sarasvati-kaṇṭhābharaṇa, ii, 17, and Ratnēśvara's commentary, in composition, there are six methods of using (jāti) language,—(1) śuddha, (2) sādhāraṇī, (3) miśra, (4) saṃkirṇa, (5) ananyagāminī, and (6) apabhraṣṭa.

(1) Śuddha is when one language (Sanskrit, Prakrit, Paiṣācī, etc.) is used throughout, according to its special grammatical rules (= Rāmaśarman's Bhāṣā-śuddha).

(2) Sādhāraṇī, or common, is when a passage may be read in two or more languages, with the same meaning in both cases (= bhāṣā sama, above). The languages are mixed like milk and water. According to the languages, and their number, there are altogether 57 varieties.
(3) Miśra, when it is in two parts (e.g. two different lines of a verse), one in one language, and the other in another, like the voices of a man and a lion answering each other (=Ramaśarman’s Pada-śuddha).

(4) Saṁkīrṇa, when two languages are mechanically mixed in the same sentence, like sesame and rice (=Ramaśarman’s Abuddha).

(5) Ananyagāmini, when two different languages are written consecutively, and the matter of the second has no connexion with that of the first.

(6) Apabhraṣṭā, when, in parody, or in imitation, corrupt forms (even of Prakrit or of Apabhramśa) are employed.

He gives examples of all these.

With this preamble, I attempt the following translation of Ramaśarman’s account of Saṁkīrṇa Paiśācika.

14. Saṁkīrṇa Paiśācika is in the first place divided into two kinds, viz. Śuddha, or pure, and Abuddha, or impure. Moreover, poets describe the Śuddha variety as being of two kinds, viz. Bhāṣā-śuddha, or that in which the language is pure, and Pada-śuddha in which the different quarters of a verse are each pure.

The author does not further describe the Bhāṣā-śuddha variety, the name being self-explanatory. It is the Śuddha method of using language described by the Sarasvatī-kaṇṭhābharaṇa, in which one language is used throughout a verse, according to its particular grammatical rules. The author now proceeds to describe the various kinds of Padaśuddha-saṁkīrṇa Paiśācika. Here a pada, as we shall see, means a quarter of a verse.

15. Padaśuddha-saṁkīrṇa Paiśācika is prescribed to be of two kinds. Moreover, one of these is considered to be Ardha-śuddha, or half-and-half pure, while the other is declared to be Catuspāda-śuddha, or having each of the four quarters of a verse (independently) pure. This division is now explained, as follows:—

16. Ardha-śuddha is when one half (of a verse) is in one language, and the other half is in another language. Catuspāda-śuddha is when the four quarters of a verse are in four different languages.

17. When languages enter into a verse (mixed together) like sesame and rice, uttered in varied ways, that is called Abuddha saṁkīrṇa Paiśācika, as in the following verse of my own composition:

18. ‘O Thou, who longest for [the touch of] the hand of Lakṣmi,
who art the source of love, with dark and tender forehead, release
Thou me from the turmoil of delusion caused by the black confusion of
the Kali age.' The above is Sanskrit polluted by Pāñcāla Paiśācika.

The text of the first line of this verse is altogether conjectural.
The MS. is so corrupt here that it is impossible to do more than
guess, and to make as few changes as possible. The true text
must remain doubtful till another MS. is found. The word alika
occurs in the Kādambari in the meaning of 'forehead,' but I
confess that it is not a likely word to occur here. I take kāmakala,
as the equivalent of kāmakara. It might be taken as the equiva-

tent of kāmakāla, were not that word specially employed as a
synonym for Rati. The verse is, of course, addressed to Viṣṇu,
who could not be compared with a woman. The pollution by
Pāñcāla Paiśācika consists in the change of r to l in kāmakala for
kāmakara.

There are altogether fifty-five languages.

There must be something wrong in the text here. The sentence
begins a new folio (47b), and may have been misplaced. Or some-
thing may have been omitted between it and the preceding folio.
Perhaps the author originally said that there are fifty-five possible
kinds of Saṃkīrṇa Paiśācika. The Sarasvatī-kaṇṭhābharaṇa cal-
culates that there are fifty-seven possible kinds of Śadhārāṇi
mixture, in which a verse may be read indifferently in two lan-
guages. The author now proceeds to give an example of this
very Śadhārāṇi.

The following is an example of the blending of mixed Śaurasenī
and Sanskrit. It is taken from the Mālati-Mādhava:—

The passage occurs in Act VI. It is capable of being read in
either of these two languages, with the same meaning in each. I
give Wilson's translation.

'Forego such desperate purpose, simple maid,
My heart, dear girl, will never bear thy loss.'

So, again, there is an Ardha-śūdha verse by Harāsaṅkara:—
20. 'Verily, in my loneliness, with broken heart, I am fallen upon
my bed of jasmine flowers. For a lonely damsel, even the kārala-
thread round her neck, seems as though it were a noose (of all the
terrors) of the Kali age.'
There is a word in the prose introduction to this verse of which I can make nothing. I am not certain of the meaning of the expression केरलस्थ्रेण्य. It appears to refer to a thread worn on the neck by married women of the Kērala country. Perhaps we should emend it to केरलस्थ्रेण्य. The first half of the verse is in Śaurasenā Paiśācika, and the second in Sanskrit. The Haraśāṅkara mentioned as the author of the verse may possibly be Hariśāṅkara, the author of a work on prosody who is mentioned on p. 26 of the Kāvyā-mālā edition of the Prākṛta-Piṅgala.

Or, again, another verse by an author not named:—

21. Victory to Pārvatī, the daughter of the Himālaya, who ascends upon pride to destroy it, but who is a wishing-tree to him who bends low before her.

This is an example of the Asuddha-sāṁkīrṇa Paiśācika. Forms such as जच्छ and कप्यलञ्ज्य are ordinary Prakrit, while सतम्प for सदम्प is Kaikēya Paiśācika.

So, as we see from the above examples, it is to be understood that all other languages may be similarly mixed together.

So ends the explanation contained in the third Branch, containing fifteen Clusters, of the Wishing-tree of Prakrit.
RŚI.

IRACH J. S. TARAPOREWALA, B.A., Ph.D., Barrister-at-Law.  
Professor of Comparative Philology in the University of Calcutta.

The last verse of the Yasna (LXXII. 11) reads:

aēvō pāntā yō aṣahe
vispe anyāṝṣaṁ apanṭāṁ.

"There is (but) one Path, that of Righteousness; all the others are wrong paths." These words remind us at once of the चतम्य पञ्च which occurs in so many Vedic passages, e.g. RV., VII. 65. 3 (चतम्य भिजावधा पञ्च वास्यो न नाना दुर्लभा तर्फः). There is thus a clear identity of idea between aṣahe pāntā and चतम्य पञ्च for both mean the Path of Righteousness or Purity; in other words aṣa in Av. and चत in Skt, both imply Righteousness, the Law of God which regulates the whole of our upward progress. Doubtless this complete similarity of connotation helps us to understand more clearly the phonetic identity of the two words as established by Bartholomae.²

This phonetic identity is hard to understand at first sight. But there is a regular gradation observable in Avesta itself leading up from rta to aṣa. Very probably the various steps in this gradation mark dialectic differences. These steps are rta-arṣa-arṣa-arṣa-arṣ (or arṣ)-aṣa; and the most notable point about all these words is that their meanings are practically all identical.

As to the identity of the चत and arṣa³ there can be no question. Bartholomae takes it as the past participle of जर (चत).⁴ This form occurs in Avesta in only two places and then only in composition. We get Uxšayat-arṣa (Truth-increaser) as the name of one of the three "mystic sons" of Zoroaster.⁵ And in Ven. V. 59, we get the compound aīpi-arṣā-gātuḥ (nom. sg. fem.) which means "she whose place is fixed

1 See Grass(mann), W(örter)b(uch zum Rig-veda), 284 for other passages.
3 Skt. चत = Av. aṣa.
4 (Altiranisches) W(örter)b(uch), 349.
5 Barth. compares 'Oxšapāt, Wb. 384, the name occurs in Yt. XIII. 128.
The word arsta in this latter place means “the law of religion.”

The form arsta occurs in a compound arst-o-karshana in Vis. I. 2 and II. 2 and in Purâṇa-nâtha 39. In the Vis. it is used as an adj. and is applied to Hamasa-pramâdlaya (the last of the six festivals of the year). The meaning of this compound as given by Spiegel is “full of holy works.” The negative anarsta (अनरस्त) is found only once, Yas. XII. 4.

The arsta is found as the first member in the two names Artaxshatra and Arta-vardhiya. The former is the honoured name of many of the great kings of Iran, more familiar to us in the Greek form Artaxerxes or the Pahlavi form Artaxshir. The name could be translated as अर्तकश्य, the meaning being nearly identical with अर्तैन found in RV., VIII. 26. 21, where it is applied to Vâyu. The other —Arta-vardhiya— is found in the Behistun Inscription (III. 6 and elsewhere) as the name of a general of Darius and may be rendered into Skt. as अर्तन्यस्त.

The form arš is decidedly a younger Avestic form. The word by itself is not found at all in younger Av. but in the Gādhas we get the fuller arša fairly often. This arš occurs only, in compound words not alone by itself. Such words are arša-uxša (Gâthic, arša-uxša), truly uttered, arša-dâta, truth-created; arša-manaṣ, truth-thinking, arša-vacaḥ (Gâthic, arša-5), truth speaking and arša-śyaavāna, truth-acting.

The arš has been got out of the arta by a sort of spirantising of the t in conjunction with the r. This change of the t to the spirant is regulated partly by rules of accentuation. We need not here enter into details beyond what Jackson gives—namely, as a rule, Av. ś = Skt. ārt, or ft (observe accent), and Av. arṣa = Skt. rta (observe, unaccented): e.g. Av. marto, Skt. mṛtâs; Av. brôstam “carried,” Skt. bhṛtām; Av. (fra)-bôrtaem, title of priest, Skt. bharṭâram. “Allowing a shift of accent, would explain a number of apparent anomalies where the law as to accent appears not to hold.”

In Av. we find several words

6 Barth., Wb., 83; see also ib., 185 (Var).
7 Ib., 193.
8 Ib., 120.
9 Ib., 193.
10 The ś used in the transliteration is a mere convenience, because in Av. the two letters ś and ṣ do not differ appreciably in pronunciation from each other and from the cerebral ū of Skt. In any case the Av. ś though represented as ū by convention (see Kanga, Av. Gram., p. 3, fn. 1 and 2) is not a true palatal.
11 Barth., Wb. 355.
12 Barth., Wb. 204-206.
13 The superlative “tama is also found (loc. cit.).
14 cf. Old Pers. er changing to ar. in Av. (Gurundriess d. Iran Phil. I, § 128).
15 Av. Gram., § 163, note.
which show both varieties of forms, those with the t as well as those with the ṭ̐ (or ṭ̐) the r being present with the former: such are marṣtaṇ and maṣya "mortal"; paṟastu and paṟu, "bridge"; amarṣta and amaṇḍa, "mortal," "immortal."  

The double forms may represent dialectical peculiarities and may have been originally caused by a shift of the accent as Jackson has hinted. But the whole has not as yet been clearly worked out. We are here concerned with the two words which practically form the two extremes of the Avestan series əɾstə and əɾəš. Phonetically we may construct the Skt. equivalents as əṃṣṭaḥ and əṃṣṭu. The latter as a noun is unknown in Skt. But I think the word əṃṣṭaḥ is a derivative from this əṃṣṭu (truth or righteousness). The word əṃṣṭaḥ, therefore, would mean literally "the righteous one", "the holy Sage", and the whole connotation of the word as used in Skt. fully supports this interpretation. This is especially supported by the various compounds of əṃṣṭaḥ found in the RV. For instance əṃṣṭaṃsu and əṃṣṭikaḥ are used of Śiva in RV., IX. 96. 18 (əṃṣṭaṃsu: əṃṣṭikaṃsu: əṃṣṭikīsūra: əṃṣṭaṃsūra) and there is no reason whatever against our taking the əṃṣṭaḥ in both these compounds to mean "Truth" or "Purity"; and the former word is exactly the Av. əɾəš-manah found in Yas. XIX. 17. Thus there seems to be highly probable that the word əṃṣṭaḥ means literally "the truthful one" or "the righteous one."

It is remarkable that the word əɾəš, the last in Avestan series is the most often used of them all, both by itself and in its derivatives. In Skt. we find but one instance of the use of this word in RV. I. 173. 4 (əɾəšapuṇha əɾəšaṃsu əɾəšikā əɾəšaṃsūra and the əɾəšaṃsu), and the əɾəšaṃsu (neu. plu.) here may well be rendered by the Av. əɾəṣaṭa meaning "more pious," Griffith translates "welcomest oblations."

As regards the accent also we find that there is such a contrast in Skt.— əṃṣṭaḥ and əṃṣṭaḥ—as we might expect from the rule as given by Jackson, quoted above. In fact the Av. shows the ṭ̐ when the Skt. ṭ has the accent and the ṭ̐ when the ṭ is accentless. Probably this restatement of the rule may be found of some help in solving this problem.

---

16 Kanga, Av. Gram., p. 37. He also notices (p. 38) similar pairs of words in Persian, e.g. əɾəšaṭa (dāṣhtan) and əɾəšaṭa (dāraṇ); əɾəšaṭa (gaṣhtan) and əɾəšaṭa (gaṛḍaṇ); etc.
17 See footnote 10 above.
18 Grass., Wb. 293.
19 The Avesta translation of this word may be arṣāṭa.
20 Barth., Wb. 206.
If other parallel cases could be cited from Skt. showing the same variation of form between (t)ə and (r)s our case would be complete. There may be some such pairs which may be semantically as well as phonetically connected. Thus कठ and कष from a fairly obvious pair. I must confess that I have not come across another pair of such words in support of my argument. But even as it stands we can almost definitely say that चत and चष form such a pair, and that the strongest argument in favour of bracketing them together is the meaning of these two words.
KHACCHE PHALU: A TIBETAN MORALIST.

JOHAN VAN MANEN.

The booklet of which I wish here to give a preliminary and brief account is one often met with and fairly generally known amongst the Tibetans in Darjeeling. In Tibet itself also it seems to be a very popular work. In the Darjeeling District I had no trouble in acquiring a few copies, and later on a Tibetan friend brought me another half a dozen on his return from a visit to Lhasa, though I do not know whether he obtained these there or somewhere on the road, for instance in Gyangtse. All my copies are blockprints in the very prevalent size and style of hundreds of small popular texts easily procurable in British territory. They measure about ten by three inches as to paper, and 8½ by 2½ as to print. As in the case of several of these smaller texts they are printed on double sheets and folded together at the top, thus keeping the leaves better together, in contrast to larger and more voluminous prints which are always printed on loose single sheets. All my copies represent only two sets of blocks, very intimately akin. From the comparison of different editions of popular little works it seems to me to be evident that it is a typographical practice in Tibet to make new blocks by pasting printed sheets of an earlier edition upon new slabs, and then to cut the blocks after the model so obtained. Similarities in minutiae of the disposition of strokes and spaces, especially evident in the case of the vowel signs and similar significant details, make this a necessary assumption in the absence of matrices and cast letters. Nevertheless little deviations and variations make it certain that in the present case the two sets of blocks are different, though very intimately connected.

I am told that such a typographical practice as here described is indeed prevalent in Tibet. The text is printed for the purpose on one side of the sheet only, on paper thin enough to be transparent. The sheet is then pasted on the block upside down and the new block cut after the model thus obtained. This method is technically called नूतन or नूत्तर. 
Studying the booklet with some care I found it exceedingly interesting from several points of view. Philologically it proved of value. Its flowery, and yet homely, language is not only modern and colloquial, but exceedingly idiomatic. I think that with mere dictionary knowledge, at the present stage of Tibetan lexicography, it would be hardly possible to understand the text fully in all places. Digging up this field has afforded me considerable pleasure. Except for the introductory chapter the book is metrical, written in nine-syllabled lines. The introductory chapter is in prose, of an intricate and long-winded style which seems scarcely so natural as that of the metrical part. The spelling of the booklet is atrocious, of the kind called 'anarchical' by Grünwedel. My emendations average about one for every line. This incorrectness is the result of a lack of grammatical or orthographic knowledge helped out by an unsystematic blend of phonetics and association. As no canons for a correct writing of modern and colloquial Tibetan have as yet been evolved, either by the Tibetans themselves or by Western students of the language, any attempt to produce an orthographically correct text of a colloquial modern book can at most be in the nature of a suggestion, and cannot be regarded as final. Here I give only my results, for what they are worth; and in order to furnish preliminary material for comparison for such readers as are desirous to draw their own conclusions about this matter, I append, after the corrected part, a small portion of the text in its original form, without any revision of the spelling.

After the philological value of the text, that of the contents ranks next. This is indeed a remarkable little poem. Its interest may be classed under three headings. First of all, one is almost tempted to regard it as containing in part a faint reflection in Tibetan literature of Sufi modes of thinking and expression. About this, something more later on. This hypothetic Sufi-element is, however, altogether assimilated by, or adapted to, Buddhist thought and phraseology. The reader will judge for himself in reading the translation. Be it enough to remark that a well-known Arabic scholar whom I showed this translation received the same impression from it. Secondly, this little poem, or Lehrgedicht, throws an unexpected light on the Tibetan psyche in one of its aspects and illustrates genuine ethical and mystical thought, and an unworldly and ethical frame of mind, entirely divorced from the ritualistic, demonological and Tantric influences which we are accus-
tomied to meet at every step in the great Tibetan literary jungle. This little book can be translated and understood in any language and any part of the world and needs no elaborate commentary to explain its system, terminology or doctrine. It is very pure and very human, in a word very universal. Lastly, much of the gentler teaching given in it is of considerable refinement and spirituality, free from grossness or materialism. Together with much which is exceedingly matter-of-fact and practical, bluntly worldly-wise, we also meet here with genuine Weltschmerz, renunciation, such as we find in the pessimism of Christians or Buddhists; and the ethical seriousness of the message in its naive form cannot but appeal to us. In short, this is a little book which, on the strength of what has been made known of original Tibetan literature, we would scarcely expect to find in Tibet as the production of a man belonging to only a generation ago. From this point of view the booklet surely gives food for thought.

Now, what can be said of the author and the circumstances which made him write his poem? Not much with certainty, and still less in detail. The author calls himself, in the final lines to several of the chapters, Khachhe Phalu. Phalu, I am told, is a family name, and Khachhe means in classical Tibetan "Kashmiri," but in modern Tibetan "Mohamedan." The history of Kashmir, of course, at once explains the transition in meaning. The difficulty is to decide whether Khachhe Phalu must be understood as Phalu the Kashmiri or as Phalu the Mohamedan. From internal evidence we would have to come to the latter conclusion. At least: perhaps. In lines 12 and 13 of the second chapter the author mentions God, and says:

In Tibetan His name is the Precious Best Rarity,
In my own language Khodā.

He speaks of language only, and not of religion, so that the saying is not absolutely conclusive. Students of Kashmiri would be able to enlighten us as to whether non-Mohamedan Kashmiris use the Persian name Khodā for God or not. If not, then the presumption is that Phalu was a Mohamedan, at least originally. If the term is used, however, also by non-Mohamedans, then no valid conclusion can be drawn from the passage. It may be argued that the introductory chapter is explicitly Buddhistic, and that in the body of the work several Buddhistic expressions occur. But against this it may be remarked that it is quite possible that this introductory chapter is not at all by Phalu
himself, but a pious heading to safeguard the orthodoxy of the body of the little work, perhaps prefixed by a friendly patron or adviser or editor, or else for the same reason by the author himself as a special pleading. And as to the Buddhist expressions in the work itself, they are evidently of so mystical a character that a Sufi might well use them in a Buddhist country, as mystics are apt to use any phraseology of the religious and literary milieu in which they express themselves. My Tibetan friends could at first tell me very little about the author and his history. The first story I heard about him was, as proved later, entirely legendary. It was said that the booklet had been written by one of the Grand Lamas, I think one from Tashilhunpo was meant, a so-called Teshu Lama, who was said to have composed it pseudonymously under the guise of a Mohamedan in order to shame his own co-religionists and compatriots who had become lax in religion and did no longer live up to the sublime precepts of Buddhism. By circulating this work as coming from a despised, semi-barbarian, Mohamedan, he meant, it was said, to teach his own people a salutary lesson. The story was attractive enough. Later on, however, I received more historical and, as it seems to me, reliable, information, which told another tale. It was said that Phalu was an official in the service of a previous, most likely the previous, Teshu Lama. He was a chibs dpon, groom, equerry, master of the horse, or whatever the equivalent name in English would be, in short the official in charge of the horse which form part of the Lama’s state. He was a Kashmiri by birth, and was more or less vaguely said to have been a Buddhist, not a Mohamedan. I think, too, that it was stated that he had come from Kashmir, and had not been born in Tibet. This man was by nature much of a philosopher and, besides, personally a friend of, that is on an intimate footing with, the Teshu Lama, his master, to whom he had very free access. In his old age he met with some great sorrow or disappointment, and discarded all worldly rank and wealth, living the life of a recluse and philosopher. Then it was that he wrote his booklet. It is said that he practically left the world and became a hermit, but not in the sense of becoming a Buddhist monk. And this is all I have gathered about him. Tibetan friends vouch for it, however, that very old men, and people of an older generation, have known him personally living in Shigatse, and his floreat is fixed vaguely at about some thirty years ago. It is said that his descen-
dants still live in Tibet, belong to its nobility, and are people of position.

I have been told that on its first appearance the little book created quite a stir and was much admired, but that now it is not regarded as something very great, especially by the literati, as the book is not classical and not learned and "contains nothing new." Evidently the way of the world is the same in Tibet as elsewhere. That the booklet is very popular among the common people is certain, however, and that it appeals to them speaks well for and shows an attractive side of the Tibetan character. It is, for instance, the constant companion of my servant, who is a Tibetan in exile in Calcutta, and whenever he has nothing else to do, I see him either with his Khachhe Phalu or with his Timekunden, laboriously plodding away at their lines, ever anew, and always with the same evident pleasure. But to a simple Tibetan reading is hard work, and so the message does not become stale very soon, and the delight of it is a joy, if not for ever, still at least for a very long time.

The booklet numbers 28 sheets or 55 pages of text, the first page containing only the title. It consists of 11 short chapters, of which in all the copies the 10th is numbered 11th and the eleventh not numbered at all. The chapters are very unequal in length; some have more than a hundred lines, others less than or only a few over thirty. To work out in full detail every question suggested by the study of the work would require considerable space; my notes for the first half cover more than 200 pages foolscap. As my occupations do not allow me to finish and to prepare for publication, now, and probably for some time to come, a complete critical edition of the text, it may have its use to publish the net results of the work already done as a preliminary. No better occasion for that could be found than in the present volume in which we honour the man who in Calcutta has been such an active promoter of Tibetan studies, and who in so many ways has shown his enlightened interest in all what conduces to greater knowledge of the Snowland, its language and its civilisation.

So, hereunder, I give the text of the first five chapters of our booklet, in a corrected form in so far as I am able to establish it. The corrections, be it understood, are only in orthography, without any verbal modification, which would be uncalled for. Then I add the next two chapters which are short, in the original spelling. The first five I
have divided into paragraphs as their sense seemed to suggest. The next two are left as they appear in the original without further analysis. Next I give the translation of these first five chapters, which I have attempted to make practically literal, with as little polish as seemed indispensable to ensure a good understanding. In my manuscript notes I have attempted a full justification for my renderings, and I hope I shall, at some future time, be able to publish these in proper form in a suitable place. Meanwhile I hope that those competent to judge will find the translation reliable. I have taken especial pains to render colloquialism by equivalent colloquialism. A few brief notes at the bottom of the pages are intended to bring out better some implied meanings in the translation.

The question in how far Khachhe Phalu's booklet is an original production deserves some discussion. From the first chapter the impression is gathered that what he wrote was derived from Indian models, but a study of the text does not bear out that impression. In line 37 of the seventh chapter it is expressly stated that "Indian speech has been turned into Tibetan speech," but that seems a mere façon de parler. In most of the chapter endings Phalu indicates that his production proceeds from his own meditations, and the nature of his language and thought seems to tally with these statements. So we find in II. 55: "Khachhe Phalu reminds the world," quite in the style of "Kabir says." Again in III. 93: "Khachhe Phalu's exhortation is explained"; in IV. 105: "Khachhe Phalu's serious counsel"; in V. 26 "Khachhe Phalu's heart's word has flown over from his mouth"; and similar expressions in VI. 29; VIII, fourth line from the end; IX, idem; and, lastly, XI, fifth and fourth lines from the end. For the present it would seem that we are justified in taking his booklet as an original production, the unmixed expression of his own individuality. In the meantime this little contribution is only meant as a preliminary announcement of results and the subject must wait for its fuller treatment and discussion until I can find the leisure necessary for a publication on a much ampler scale, adequate to the subject. May, in the meantime, old Khachhe Phalu gain some new friends and the attention he deserves by what is now and here shown of him.
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ཆོས་ཀྱི་མི་བློ་གྲུབ་ཞི་ཞི་
དོན་དོན་དོན་དོན་དོན་དོན་
ཐོབ་སྟེང་ཐོབ་སྟེང་ཐོབ་སྟེང་ཐོབ་
དེར་བའི་བོད་ལྡན་ནུས་སོགས་

63. དཔེར་གྲོས་ཤེས་པའི་བོད་ལྡན་
བཞི་བཞི་བཞི་བཞི་བཞི་བཞི་
དོན་དོན་དོན་དོན་དོན་དོན་
ཤེས་པའི་བོད་ལྡན་
དེར་བའི་བོད་ལྡན་ནུས་སོགས་

71. བོད་མོང་པོའི་ཐོགས་པ་འབྲེལ་བ་ཐོང་ཁབ་
སྐྱུས་ལྷན་དབང་བཞག་ལས་མོས་
རེད་དོན་གདུགས་ི་བར་ཁྱོད་

75. སྐོར་བུ་དྲོད་པའི་ཐོགས་པ་འབྲེལ་བ་ཐོང་ཁབ་
སྐྱུས་ལྷན་དབང་བཞག་ལས་མོས་
སྐྱུན་གནོན་མཆེན་ི་རྱང་བསྐྱུར་ལྷན་

85. སྐོར་ཞེས་སུ་མི་མཐའ་བརྟག་པ་ནི་རྟོན་པོ་འཛིན།
ཞུ་བུ་བཞུགས་བཟོ་དོན་ཁྱོད་མཁྱོཊ་ལས་

88. མི་མཐའ་བརྟག་པ་ཐོན་ཁ་འདྲ་བྲུ་
སྒྲ་མཚོ་ཀློ་བཟོ་དོན་ཁྱོད་མཁྱེན་ལས་
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93. ཞེས་ཐེག་པའི་ཤེས་པའི་དབུས་པས་དུས་པའི་
ཐོན་པ་མི་བ་མི་མ་ཤེས་པའི་མི་མན་སྒྲོན་
ཐོན་པ་མི་བ་མི་མ་ཤེས་པའི་མི་མན་སྒྲོན་
ཐོན་པ་མི་བ་མི་མ་ཤེས་པའི་མི་མན་སྒྲོན་
ཐོན་པ་མི་བ་མི་མ་ཤེས་པའི་མི་མན་སྒྲོན་

1. བཀྲ་ཤིས་ཐུབ་པའི་བསྡུས་འཛིན་
ཐོན་པ་མི་བ་མི་མ་ཤེས་པའི་མི་མན་སྒྲོན་
ཐོན་པ་མི་བ་མི་མ་ཤེས་པའི་མི་མན་སྒྲོན་
ཐོན་པ་མི་བ་མི་མ་ཤེས་པའི་མི་མན་སྒྲོན་
ཐོན་པ་མི་བ་མི་མ་ཤེས་པའི་མི་མན་སྒྲོན་

9. སེག་དཔལ་ལྡན་ལམ་ཐོན་པ་མི་མི་མན་
ཐོན་པ་མི་བ་མི་མ་ཤེས་པའི་མི་མན་སྒྲོན་
ཐོན་པ་མི་བ་མི་མ་ཤེས་པའི་མི་མན་སྒྲོན་
ཐོན་པ་མི་བ་མི་མ་ཤེས་པའི་མི་མན་སྒྲོན་
ཐོན་པ་མི་བ་མི་མ་ཤེས་པའི་མི་མན་སྒྲོན་
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16. མ་སྟོན་གཞག་འཕོཉི་བྱས་
   ཏོབ་མི་བདེ་བ་ཕྱི་རིན་གཞི།
   སྤུ་སྟོན་ཀཱ་མི་ལས་ཤེས་ཤེས།
   ཏོབ་མི་བདེ་བ་ཕྱི་རིན་གཞི།
   དོན་ཚིགས་ལྡན་གྲེང་ཤེས་་
   དོན་ཚིགས་ལྡན་གྲེང་ཤེས་་
   དོན་ཚིགས་ལྡན་གྲེང་ཤེས་་
   དོན་ཚིགས་ལྡན་གྲེང་ཤེས་་
   དོན་ཚིགས་ལྡན་གྲེང་ཤེས་་
   དོན་ཚིགས་ལྡན་གྲེང་ཤེས་་

22. མ་སྟོན་གཞག་འཕོཉི་བྱས་
   ཏོབ་མི་བདེ་བ་ཕྱི་རིན་གཞི།
   ཏོབ་མི་བདེ་བ་ཕྱི་རིན་གཞི།
   བོད་སྟེ་བར་བུ་གཏོད་པ་རིས་།
   བོད་སྟེ་བར་བུ་གཏོད་པ་རིས་།
   བོད་སྟེ་བར་བུ་གཏོད་པ་རིས་།
   བོད་སྟེ་བར་བུ་གཏོད་པ་རིས་།

27. ནི་མ་དོན་ལྡན་གྲེང་ཤེས་་
   དོན་ཚིགས་ལྡན་གྲེང་ཤེས་་
   དོན་ཚིགས་ལྡན་གྲེང་ཤེས་་
   དོན་ཚིགས་ལྡན་གྲེང་ཤེས་་
   དོན་ཚིགས་ལྡན་གྲེང་ཤེས་་
   དོན་ཚིགས་ལྡན་གྲེང་ཤེས་་

33. བོད་ནམ་མཁའི་ལྡན་གྲེང་ཤེས་་
   བོད་ནམ་མཁའི་ལྡན་གྲེང་ཤེས་་
39. นุ่ม ฉัน ฉัน ฉัน ฉัน ฉัน ฉัน ฉัน ฉัน ฉัน
ฉัน ฉัน ฉัน ฉัน ฉัน ฉัน ฉัน ฉัน ฉัน
กู๊ก ฉัน ฉัน ฉัน ฉัน ฉัน ฉัน ฉัน ฉัน
กู๊ก ฉัน ฉัน ฉัน ฉัน ฉัน ฉัน ฉัน ฉัน

43. นุ่ม ฉัน ฉัน ฉัน ฉัน ฉัน ฉัน ฉัน ฉัน
กู๊ก ฉัน ฉัน ฉัน ฉัน ฉัน ฉัน ฉัน ฉัน
กู๊ก ฉัน ฉัน ฉัน ฉัน ฉัน ฉัน ฉัน ฉัน
กู๊ก ฉัน ฉัน ฉัน ฉัน ฉัน ฉัน ฉัน ฉัน
กู๊ก ฉัน ฉัน ฉัน ฉัน ฉัน ฉัน ฉัน ฉัน

49. นุ่ม ฉัน ฉัน ฉัน ฉัน ฉัน ฉัน ฉัน ฉัน
กู๊ก ฉัน ฉัน ฉัน ฉัน ฉัน ฉัน ฉัน ฉัน
กู๊ก ฉัน ฉัน ฉัน ฉัน ฉัน ฉัน ฉัน ฉัน
กู๊ก ฉัน ฉัน ฉัน ฉัน ฉัน ฉัน ฉัน ฉัน

53. นุ่ม ฉัน ฉัน ฉัน ฉัน ฉัน ฉัน ฉัน ฉัน
กู๊ก ฉัน ฉัน ฉัน ฉัน ฉัน ฉัน ฉัน ฉัน
กู๊ก ฉัน ฉัน ฉัน ฉัน ฉัน ฉัน ฉัน ฉัน
65. ཨོི་རིང་ཞིོ་ཞིོ་ཡོན་ཏོས་བོད།

66. རྒྱུགས་ུ་བུ་ལེ་བུ་མཁྱེན།

71. ནང་བཞི་ཉིད་ཀྱི་ོོ་ོ་པོ་དཔེ་ནི།

76. ནིལ་ཞི་ོ་ོ་དོ་ནོར་བོད་ོ་པོ་དཔེ་ནི།
105.

1. རྩེ་ཞེས་པའི་དབང་ཕྲུག་པ་མཁས་པའི་ལོག་

6. ནི་ལ་མི་དེ་བསྡུ་སྡེ་དགོས་པ་དེ་ཡིན།

གཞན་གཞན་བདེ་ན་ཐན་པ་རིགས་ཀྱི་ཤེས་སུ་

བསྟོ། །བོད་ལེགས་ཐོབ་མི་ཤིང་།
1. ཞུས་སྣང་། བོད་པ་སིད་ཧི་ཤེ། བཞི་གཞི་སྒྲུབ་བཟློན་པའི་དབང་།

2. རྗེ་བཙུན་ཆུས་ཅོན་པའི་དབང་།

3. སྤྱིན་སྤྱིན་ཐོ་རྣམ་མཁྲིད་བཟློན་པའི་དབང་།

4. སྤྱིན་སྤྱིན་ཐོ་རྣམ་མཁྲིད་བཟློན་པའི་དབང་།

5. གཞི་ཕྲག་སྟེགས་བཟློན་པའི་དབང་།

6. འདོད་དམངས་ཁྲུང་སྟོན་པོ་བཟློན་པའི་དབང་།

7. འདོད་དམངས་ཁྲུང་སྟོན་པོ་བཟློན་པའི་དབང་།

8. འདོད་དམངས་ཁྲུང་སྟོན་པོ་བཟློན་པའི་དབང་།

9. འདོད་དམངས་ཁྲུང་སྟོན་པོ་བཟློན་པའི་དབང་།

10. འདོད་དམངས་ཁྲུང་སྟོན་པོ་བཟློན་པའི་དབང་།

11. འདོད་དམངས་ཁྲུང་སྟོན་པོ་བཟློན་པའི་དབང་།

12. འདོད་དམངས་ཁྲུང་སྟོན་པོ་བཟློན་པའི་དབང་།

13. འདོད་དམངས་ཁྲུང་སྟོན་པོ་བཟློན་པའི་དབང་།

14. འདོད་དམངས་ཁྲུང་སྟོན་པོ་བཟློན་པའི་དབང་།

15. འདོད་དམངས་ཁྲུང་སྟོན་པོ་བཟློན་པའི་དབང་།

16. འདོད་དམངས་ཁྲུང་སྟོན་པོ་བཟློན་པའི་དབང་།

17. འདོད་དམངས་ཁྲུང་སྟོན་པོ་བཟློན་པའི་དབང་།

18. འདོད་དམངས་ཁྲུང་སྟོན་པོ་བཟློན་པའི་དབང་།

19. འདོད་དམངས་ཁྲུང་སྟོན་པོ་བཟློན་པའི་དབང་།

20. འདོད་དམངས་ཁྲུང་སྟོན་པོ་བཟློན་པའི་དབང་།
25. དགུན་པར་འདྲོལ་པའི་བུ་འཇམ་དུང་དགེ་
རྒྱུད་སོ། །
ཨི་ཞེས་པོ་དོན་སོགས་ཀྱི་ཤིག་འེས་
དངོས་ཅན་ལྟར་ཤིག་འེས་
དོན་བོད་ཀྱི་ཤིག་འེས་
ཉི་ཐོ་དགུན་པར་འདྲོལ་པའི་བུ་འཇམ་
དུང་དགེ་
ཨི་ཐོ་དགུན་པར་འདྲོལ་པའི་བུ་འཇམ་
དུང་དགེ་
30. དགུན་པར་འདྲོལ་པའི་བུ་འཇམ་དུང་དགེ
རྒྱུད་སོ། །
ཨི་ཞེས་པོ་དོན་སོགས་ཀྱི་ཤིག་འེས་
དངོས་ཅན་ལྟར་ཤིག་འེས་
དོན་བོད་ཀྱི་ཤིག་འེས་
ཨི་ཐོ་དགུན་པར་འདྲོལ་པའི་བུ་འཇམ་
དུང་དགེ

5. རྒྱུད་སོ། །
ཨི་ཐོ་དགུན་པར་འདྲོལ་པའི་བུ་འཇམ་
དུང་དགེ
ཨི་ཐོ་དགུན་པར་འདྲོལ་པའི་བུ་འཇམ་
དུང་དགེ

10. རྒྱུད་སོ། །
ཨི་ཐོ་དགུན་པར་འདྲོལ་པའི་བུ་འཇམ་
དུང་དགེ
35. རྩ་ཆུ་གསུམ་གྱི་བོད་སྐད་ཀྱི་དོན་གྱི་ཁྱད་ལྡན་ལྡན།
ངོ་བོ་དོན་ཤིང་ཆོས་གིས་མཐུ་བུ་བོད་ཀྱིས་ངོ་བོ་དོན་ཤིང་།
ཤིང་ཤིང་བོད་ཀྱི་ཡོད་དཔེར་དང་།
རྟེན་ཤིང་བོད་ཀྱི་ཡོད་དཔེར་དང་།
རུས་ནས་རུས་ནས་དོན།
THE TEACHING OF PHALU THE KASHMIRI

CONCERNING THE CALCULATION OF THE FRUITS OF ACTION IN THIS WORLD.

AUM. HAIL.

[CHAPTER ONE.]

When the Enlightened One had reached the age of ten, India was a land of perfect signs and omens and miracles. Innumerable men of learning and religion performed glorious deeds. This was not only true of India in general but especially so of the Happy Land in particular. If it were necessary to relate it all in detail it would take many a lifetime. So, instead, I will only give a few salient points from the wisdom, of these times. The Buddha's teachings, when he was ten years old, had already expanded into a mighty tree of wisdom, of which the luxuriant leaves may be called his instructions concerning the spiritual and worldly life and about actions and their retributions, and his examples of piety, love, and pity, as well as all his other manners of conduct. Its roots may be called that treasury of righteousness, that fountain of the law, that ocean of piety, that royal road of charity, and all those various manners of devoting himself to religion, which were characteristic of Him at the time. This vast mass of wisdom is like an ocean from which I, Khachhe Phalu, have drawn. I have taken all sorts of minute fragments, like particles of drops, from this ocean, and combined them anew by hundreds into new drops, which I have strung like pearls on the thread which is this present exhortation. In the form of words they have taken shape; I have arranged them metrically, and these written down now constitute this little book of instructions, which is called the fountain of perfect teaching, and of which this introductory explanation is the first teaching-chapter.¹

¹ I have found no satisfactory reference to any incident connected with the Buddha's manifestation of wisdom especially at the age of ten. In Buddhist books the sixteenth year is mentioned in this connection. We may keep in mind the question whether these ten years are represented by the following ten chapters.

By hundreds, i.e. in chapters of about a hundred lines; see II. 52.
[CHAPTER TWO.]

6. When that land which is subject to seasons, and varying lengths of days, and differences of temperature,

1. Has its source of religion above the Diamond Throne
2. And the high-topped rock of religion behind,
3. With the shining lake of love in front,
4. And when its days have been made equal in length, whatever its seasons,
5. And when it is without summer-heat or winter-cold,
6. Then, when the sun has reached the centre of the heavens,
7. And the house casts no longer any dark shadows,
8. Then it is the time to seek the world's heart
9. And the road from that heart heartwards.⁸

11 Obeisance to that heart's heart!
   In Tibetan its name is the Precious Best Rarity.
   In my own language Khodā. Obeisance.

14. If you want to go to the Holy Land,³

Then if, after first having removed the last traces of ignorance in the soul's country,
And after having flung black lust to the ocean's bottom,
And, lastly, after having set aflame jealousy and hatred in red fire,
If it can be said that you have only one single thought with one single meditation and one single memory,
And that that one thought gives no hold to any other,
Then, my son, you may prepare your travelling requisites for setting out towards religion.

21. And whilst you are going you will behold a wonderful sight.
If whatever you have done is religion, then whatever you have done will turn out right.
If whatever you have thought is high, then whatever is needed comes to you.

---

⁸ II. 1-10. This may be understood mystically, and the "house" in line 8 may be both the human body and mind. Except in this one place and in the last two lines of this chapter, the translation follows the sequence of the lines of the original.
³ II. 14. In the whole "travelling" allegory in this chapter I am inclined to find Sufi influence. The "Holy Land" is no geographical locality.
If whatever you have spoken is true, then whatever is needed strikes home.

25. If you really wish to travel to such a country
   There are three essential necessities.
   First:
   You need a soul as clear as a mirror.
   Second:
   You need a faithfulness as pure as the Tsang river.
   Third:
   You need a greatness as of a bold lion.
If these three qualities are combined you will have arrived there.

31. But even these true sons of men who have arrived at such a place,
   If they have not wrapped themselves up in discrimination,
   Will be sucked up in the world's maelstrom.

34. If they keep on saying: "to-morrow, to-morrow," and "day-after-to-morrow, day-after-to-morrow," they will lose their time.
   And precisely whilst doing so the Caller will come⁴
   And they will drop into the region of remorse.

37. Like a date tree grown on a bleak field,
   But with branches and leaves suddenly sprouting,
   With on each leaf its proper name growing,⁵
   Like unto the unspoiled wisdom of all the sages,
   So I now offer my heart's petition to (all) hearts.

42. And like the seal behind, which validates the document,⁶
   So the (following) word of most excellent, most essential import
   Goes (now) to myself, great sinner, and to all the world's beings,
   This petition showing the road to religion.

⁴ II. 35. The caller: death.
⁵ II. 39. There are Mohamedan traditions of miraculous trees whose leaves bear the names of Allah.
⁶ II. 42. In the Tibet of to-day, as in Europe before modern postal developments, letters are sent by private agency, and all depends on the intactness of the seal.
46. O Thou place of refuge for both the present and the next life,  
   O Thou sanctuary for both soul and mind,  
   Having looked upon us from the distance of perpetual mercy,  
   Having looked upon us with the eye of wisdom—bear us in  
   mind,  
   And, out of love and kindness having protected us, show the  
   road.

51. Having now looked at the world by the light of the Great Star  
   Up to a hundred and fifty two small stars  
   Even the pen has understood its own explanation.  

55. Khachhe Phalu reminds (the world)  

54. By means of black strokes (of the pen) filled with white words.  
   This is the second teaching-chapter.

[CHAPTER THREE.]

1. Religion and worldly life are each (quite) different.  
   Soul and body are each different.  
   Though the soul, when having suffered hardships, wants to  
   go on,  
   The body, having eaten nice food, greatly desires to sit still.  
   The length of bodily happiness is only three days.  
   The soul’s sorrow is pain to the very end.  
   If you desire the soul’s happiness, suffer the body’s hardships.  
   If you think of the body, join the soul to suffering.  
   If you listen to me, you distinguish between body and soul.

10. The man who barters gold for brass is a fool.  
   If he mistakes genuine for false turquoises, he is a simpleton.  
   If he does not know profit and loss of this and the next life  
   It may (indeed still) be said that he will (nevertheless) reach  
   the end of his human lifetime in this worldly round,  
   Not only one or two years but (if you like) up to (a full)  
   hundred.

1 II. 52. The "Great Star" is evidently the Buddha himself as the subject of the  
   first chapter. The 152 small stars are the first chapter of, symbolically, "a hundred  
   words," and the 52 lines of the second chapter. In the first chapter Phalu says he has  
   combined his words by "hundreds" into new drops. See also IV. 108.;  

8 III. 5. Three days, i.e. a short time, a moment. Three, here and elsewhere,  
   is: a few.
Yet in the end the heap of earth and bones will dissolve to earth.\(^9\)

16. The king reposing on his golden throne
As well as the beggar boy sheltering under his tatters, both,
Are equal when the time of impermanent death arrives.\(^10\)
The sweet taste of food stretches only from tongue to throat.
The ups and downs of worldly life last only three days.
The beggar, however much he may suffer, will live out his life.
The king, however happy he may be, will, in the end, come to die.

23. There is no knowing of the number of those who have gone before.
And who knows precisely about further goings
In all this perpetual going and coming?
Men must go by virtue of their having come.
This worldly life has not even a single permanent element.
To whom, impermanent, shall come the truth?
This human life without permanent stability
Is like the throne-roofing sun over the top of the pass,\(^11\)
Which, when arrived, cannot do anything like staying.

32. Furthermore, not absent-minded like a child’s mind,
If you are wise, you will seize the fundamental meaning,
And, having seized the core of the meaning, you are the topmost hero.\(^12\)

35. The work of this worldly round is without substance.
This round is not a place of everlasting staying.
The traveller is three days host and guest in the inn.
If one reflects on oneself, happiness (will result).
If the traveller has not beforehand prepared the travelling necessities
There is no going with the inn carried on the back,

---

\(^9\) III. 15. Heap of earth and bones: the body.
\(^10\) III. 18. Impermanent death (cf. the European pale death): death which is the inexorable consequence attendant on impermanence.
\(^11\) III. 30. Throne roofing sun. Early at the end of the day the sun disappears, as seen from the valley, over a pass. For a moment it hovers over it like a golden baldaquin.
\(^12\) III. 34. Hero, in Tibetan of special meaning, with Tantrik connotations. The heroic soul subdues not only the world but the Gods. Sk. Vira. We may think of a "Warrior of the Lord," a "Knight," but also of a magician.
And there will be no conducting of the landlady as a companion.
As long as you can dispose of your own property, reflect.
When the key passes into the hands of another there will be repentance.\(^13\)

44. Perhaps many parents’ deaths may occur.\(^14\)
Perhaps one may see many children left behind.
It is not possible that the little son follows the mother,
It is not possible that the daughter follows the mother.
When each has spent his season, he goes.
Think yourself about yourself.

50. These are the travelling requisites for the road on which one travels alone:
First, first, first of all: give to the poor.
Teach your wealth-horse to go at a pace.\(^15\)
Prepare (yourself) to start on the road to the next life.

54. If you really want to enjoy rich man’s wealth in your next life,
It is good to contemplate here the fate of the poor.
If you want to eat a peach under the ground,
Then you had better plant a peach tree here above the ground.
(So) you had better plant the root of happiness for all.

59. If the root of religion is there, man’s mind has no greed.
If the quintessence of religion is there, one studies the welfare of others.
If you choose to follow (only) your own desires,
Then there is nothing better than beer and brandy.\(^16\)

63. When greedy, so as to say: ‘‘I, I, I must flourish,’’
And saying: ‘‘I must have gold, silver, copper and fame,’’
And: ‘‘I must have sweets and finery,’’
‘‘I must have able-bodiedness and beauty,’’
Then even holy-place pilgrimage is only vain foot-soreness.

\(^{13}\) III. 43. After death, by having been miserly in life.
\(^{14}\) III. 44. In the ordinary course of nature children outlive their parents, however strong their mutual love may be.
\(^{15}\) III. 52. Let your wealth flow freely; do not hoard it.
\(^{16}\) III. 61, 62. ‘‘Let us drink and be merry, for to-morrow we die.”
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And even solitude-dwelling is only vain ear-confusion.
And even the realisation of the sap-circulation of the vital
current is emptiness.
(Yes even if you take) the stone-elixir you have (only) bought
your own suffering. 17

71. Those old venerables who know how to behave 18
Are superior to hundred whose religion is full of desire.
A man who is full of love of self, is shameless
And such a shameless man belongs to the tribe of the beasts.

75. A girl, though she may be decked out in jewels and fine rai-
ment
Will not, for all that, be fit to become King Good-Jewel’s
spouse. 19
When the heart is not righteous, even if the religious com-
mandments have been kept,
The mirror cannot shine in the dark region. 20
When the eyes of the mill-ox are covered with blinkers,
Then, even after having walked all day, he will find himself
(still) in the same place.
As long as you have not loosened the noose of desire from
your feet,
So long, though you may say you have obeyed your religion,
that is emptiness.
If his wings are pinioned with a silken thread,
Even a vulture cannot cleave the high skies.

85. (True) faithfulness must (proceed) from the soul, (true) zeal
must (proceed) from the heart.
Whatever you meet, meet it in the soul,
This, indeed, is the road for the sincere.

88. Sweep your soul ever and ever again.

17 III. 69, 70. References to conceptions of Yoga physiology. The stone-elixir is
the Tibetan Lapis Philosoporum.
18 III. 71. Old venerables, vieillards, Greise, anciens, old men (without any special
connotation of learning).
19 III. 76. King Good-jewel, Norsang, in a way the Prince Charming of Tibetan
legend, or rather, in this connection, the King Cophetua of the Tibetan beggar maid.
20 III. 78. The mirror in which after death the judge of the dead sees the man’s
past deeds reflected.
Whether you will be blessed by all, well that is your own look-out.
Whether you will be praised, well that if your own look-out.
Whether you will behave well, well that is your own look-out.
If these three things are combined, then you are the foremost of all.

93. Khachhe Phalu's exhortation is explained.
It is left to everyone to listen or not to listen.
Anyhow, the Chinese paper has become filled with lines 41
And the yellow Chinese reed-pen has unbosomed itself to the very bottom of its heart.

This is the third teaching-chapter.

[CHAPTER FOUR.]

1. A great king is the country's ornament.
If he conforms to the law his estate will be powerful. 42
If from the beginning the law is obeyed his plans will be executed at once.
If he keeps strictly to the law (the country's) welfare will be perfect.
When the lake is perturbed the fish cannot but be perturbed also.
When the country is poor, the king cannot but be poor also.
When the heads flourish, then the king's lands get spoiled.
(On the other hand) heads without a district are the laughing-stock of all. 43

9. Chief and people are like patient and doctor.
Apply salve to the wound of the lancet-prick.
Be kind after reprimand and anger.
First (impose) a light fine according to circumstances.

41 III. 95. Chinese paper and pen. The word rgya may stand for rgya-nag, China, or rgya-kar, India. If Phalu alludes to his Indian origins, Indian must be understood; but as Chinese paper and pen are of good quality in Tibet, 'articles de Pars' as it were, we translate Chinese. So also elsewhere in the chapter endings.
42 IV. 2. Law, here and below klriims legal (i.e. municipal) law, not chos, dharma, religious law.
43 IV. 7, 8. Obscure. Seems to say that local chiefs, feudal heads, must neither be allowed to become too important, nor starved out; the middle course.
Secondly add flogging to the fine.
Thirdly, it is also proper to have the wicked exterminated.
It is unnecessary to treat such people with pity. 24

16. Before the lamb is carried off, seize the wolf.
Before the district is perturbed expel the wicked.
If the king sits sluggish like a lump of curds
He remains ignorant of the convulsions of the district.
If the shepherd yields to food and liquor
It is absolutely sure that the lamb will be carried off by the wolf.

22. Set each man to do whatever work he understands specially well.
Though one may be clever in carpentry, one may not understand the painting of religious pictures.
What may please the wolf may seem unheard of to the shepherd.
Appoint one chief of men who knows what is right and what is wrong,
(Otherwise) the lamb will be put into the wolf’s mouth.

27. Enquire about the real meaning of things from the illustrious.
If you want jewels, you have to dive to the bottom of the ocean. 25
Put your faith in the utterly true man.
How could the diamond-rock ever change? 26
Night and day conform to the wise.
(Even) a dog’s carcass turns at last to salt in the saltfields. 27

33. Support the true friend quietly to the very end
And if their work shows only some result they will be fully satisfied. 28
Don’t let the helper’s heart be distressed.

25 IV. 28. The Tibeto-Indian belief is that the Nāgas guard treasure at the bottom of the ocean. The Rheingold is sea-gold (or perhaps even lake-gold) in Tibet.
26 IV. 30. The diamond-rock is a mythical emblem of unchangeability.
27 IV. 32. In Tibet salt is gathered from salt fields.
28 IV. 34. Friends are already satisfied with proper appreciation and should, therefore, be made to feel that their value is recognised.
Then, when face to face with work, many will be the workers. Support those who have put their faith in you from the bottom of your heart. (Then) this entire world will be full of your praise.

39. Look after the brave whilst you have leisure to do so. When helpless you will need them. Fill your store unceasingly with riches For trouble will come and the enemy will jump. 49

43. When the enemy is to be subdued two things are required. Defeat the enemy with riches and with helpers. If you are without riches you are helpless without helpers. If you are without helpers you are helpless without riches. If these two are combined the enemy is sure to be conquered. So take care of your wealth as of parents and children.

49. Listen to the words of the old one of many years. He is an old man who has tasted much joy and sorrow. When you come face to face with an extremity The old man’s cunning will be better than the young man’s strength.

53. If you want to subdue the enemy at once, It would be better to continue treating him like a friend for the present. If you can, by any means, attain your inmost aim Then to brandish arms would be madman’s work. It is better to desist from fighting with an invincible enemy. How can one strike with one’s fist on the point of a lancet? For Dama, not to mention Gesar himself, 30 To agree is the most important matter, if any agreement there be. Face to face (with the enemy), even if you are (brave as) a hero and (rich as) a king, when there is trouble, Shoot from a distance with the magic gun of cunning. First consider ninety-nine ways (out of the trouble). Then, if the hundredth demands fight, there is no help for it.

49 IV 42. In Tibet the enemy "jumps," i.e. becomes active, shows his hand. The "enemy" is every form of adversity, either personified or not, adversity as well as adversary.

30 IV. 59. Dama, King Gesar’s chief bowman or general, a hero of Tibetan legend.
65. A man without understanding is worse than a dog. 
If you meet a bad dog hit him with a stick on the nose. 
If it is said "Let us go," then make way (for those saying so). 
If it is said "Let us fight," then take three strides forward first.31 
If you do not remember your fist when in anger, 
Then, when you remember it (later on), hit your (own) face (with it).

71. If by means of gentleness you can attain your inmost aim 
Then the wrath of haughtiness is absolutely senseless. 
If wrath is suppressed that is the sign of the wise. 
The man who obeys his wrath is a fool.

75. If you make up your mind beforehand, you are wise. 
Everyone can see the trouble that stares him in the face. 
Everyone can see the breaking of the right-winding white conch.32 
But when the broken pieces must be joined (again) it is (like) joining fishes.33

79. If the enemy comes in submission 
Then expel from the bottom of your soul the anger proceeding from your heart. 
Don't let the enemy who has submitted be humiliated, 
Although it is necessary to guard against falsehood and deceit: 
The river running under the foundations of the house 
Will finally break through the house if no dam is thrown.

85. If a wicked one is protected, it is as if a good one is beaten. 
If a thief is tended, it is as if a merchant is killed. 
If a poisonous snake is kept, it is bad for men. 
If a wolf is kept it is bad for the poor sheep. 
Don't say: "The dog has bitten the man." 
The keeper of the bad dog is the bad man.

31 IV. 68. If the adversary is willing to make peace, make peace, but if he wants to fight, fight first and hardest. 
32 IV. 77. The white conch is, as in India, of special value in Tibet if the whorl turns to the right, if dextrorygous. 
33 IV. 78. Obscure. The conjecture is that fishes, jumping and writhing, cannot be nicely arranged in a row, at least as long as they are alive.
The subduer of his enemies must be the protector of his comrades.
If he overdoes his softness the enemy will become stiff-necked.
If he overdoes his harshness he may be sure to come to grief.
Adopt towards all the method of mixing soft and rough.
Manage, never mind how, to turn all enemies and comrades into friends.

If you wish to be firmly established in your royal position, now and henceforth,
Then rule impartially from the golden throne
With thoughts of the future welfare of country and inhabitants.
In the evening when you have stepped down (from the throne), apply yourself strenuously to religion.
With the threefold body, speech and mind make obeisance and offer prayers.
Pray to the everlasting refuge of our hopes, the Triple Supreme Rarity.
Conform to the word of the Lord of the precious Star.
If you wish that the sublimity of this and the next life should be great,
Then bear in mind not to forget impermanent death.

Most earnest Khacche Phalu's serious counsel's
Pregnant memorial (which is like) pearls strung on a silken (thread).
Has now been offered up before the Ruler of the three worlds.
When its value is calculated (it will be found to) enter the number of the hundred group.\(^{34}\)
This is the fourth teaching-chapter.

[CHAPTER FIVE.]

In this world there is many a spur and many a dale.
Circumstances, relations, dimensions are innumerable.
It is evident that not even a single thing is alike.
So one had better reconcile oneself to this.

\(^{34}\) IV. 108. See notes to Ch. I., and to II. 52. The number of lines in this chapter is 108, exactly that of the beads of the Tibetan rosary.
5. Even if you (try to) rub out the lines (of fate) on your forehead, they will not vanish.
Much better than that is to conform to the verdict of the lines.
Even the Charong donkey’s troubles are his own.\textsuperscript{35}
It is impossible for him to escape the load imposed on him.

9. When one has settled (the problem) in one’s mind, there is no (longer any) much or little as to riches.
If both the king and the beggar are dissatisfied (Then) if the beggar settles (the question) in his mind, he is superior to the other.
After having enjoyed all the fruits from his royal estate the king feels as if still hungry.
But the beggar boy, if his food wallet is full, can hardly bear it.\textsuperscript{35}

14. If you have not made yourself contented with the fate which is decreed
To call up your own trouble is senseless.
If you are contented, then there is no rich or poor.
If destiny has decreed it (even) your enemy’s fortune becomes your own.
If it is not so decreed, the son will find difficulty in obtaining (even) his (own) father’s fortune.\textsuperscript{37}

19. No young corn can sprout out of a stone.
What (then) is the use of railing against fate?
If you envy at all, envy the righteous man.
Having made yourself contented, don’t torment body and soul.
Give up all dealings with the wicked.
A good man thinks of his future welfare.

25. Your reputation in this and the next life lies now within your (own) power.

\textsuperscript{35} V. 7. Charong, \textit{zechag rong}, a geographical name, Ironvale, a valley about 5 miles N.E. of Lhasa, where there is much agriculture and where the donkeys are very hard-worked.

\textsuperscript{36} V. 13. A good feed is to him already the acme of bliss.

\textsuperscript{37} V. 18. His inheritance will not come to him; see III. 43.
Khachhe Phalu's heart's word has flown over from his mouth. O, children of my heart, consider (all this) from (the bottom of) your hearts. If there be any understanding then the matter for understanding has now been written. (And) though it be not much, its taste is full of flavour. This is the fifth teaching-chapter.
THE TĀZIKS OF THE NIRANG-I SRAOŚA YASTI.

SHAMS-UL-ULAMA DR. JIVANJI JAMSHEDEJI MODI, B.A., PH.D., C.I.E.,
Diplom. Litteris et Artibus (Sweden) Officiére de l'Instruction Publique
(France), Secretary to the Trustees of the Parsi Panchayet, Bombay.

Introduction.

In the Pāzend prayer (Nirang) recited after the greater Sraośa Yašt (Sarosh Yasht Vadi) or Yasna LVII, one invokes the help of Sarosh Yazad upon, among several others, the Tāzis¹ who put on the kusti or the sacred thread (Tāziān-i basta-kustiān).

Ervad Kavasji E. Kanga very properly translated the above words as कस्ती चांघनारा अर्थवः (इन्हें जे चांघरोप अर्थोपात्रो घर संवो लोगो चोय तेष्वो)² or "the Arabs who put on the kusti, i.e. those Arabs who have accepted the Zoroastrian faith." Dr. Spiegel has mistaken the word Tāzi for Tāji, and so has translated the above words as "the wearers of crowns, those who have girded on the kusti."³ If we take the word to be Tāji as he has taken it, the word would not mean "the wearers of crowns." No Persian Dictionary gives the word Tāji in that sense. The proper Persian word in that sense would be tāj-dār.⁴ Spiegel seems to have been misled by some previous Parsee translations. For example, we have the translation of the late learned Dastur Edulji Darabji Sanjana, published in 1187 Yazdazardi (1818 A.D.). There, the translation runs as ताजदारः (इन्हें ने पादशाह) अने अर्थोपात्रो दोनो लोगो जे कुस्ती चांघनाराहें,⁵ i.e. the tājilārs (or the kings) and the people of the Zoroastrian religion who put on the kusti. As all the Zoroastrians at the time when the Nirang was written were expected to put on the kusti, the grouping of the names by the learned Dastur does not seem to be proper.

¹ The word, as written in Pahlavi characters, may be read as either Tāzi or Tāzik.
³ Khordeh Avesta, Fragment LXIV, p. 190.
⁴ Vide the Persian Dictionary of Steingass.
I possess a book of Avesta with translation written in Gujarati characters in Samvat 1800 (A.D. 1743). In this manuscript the word is written as Tâjehân and the translation of the word is omitted. The translation of the wording after the omitted word runs as जर्योत्त्री दूत माई कॉल्लीन बांधनारा, i.e. those in the Zoroastrian faith who gird on the kusti. Perhaps the writer knew that the word referred to the Arabs, but, he may have thought to himself: "How could the Arabs, who destroyed the country and religion of Iran be remembered together with the true believers?" Not being able to give a satisfactory answer to himself he omitted to explain the word.

This Nirang is contained in the Pâzend Texts published by the late Ervad Edalji Kersaspji Antia (p. 163). There Ervad Antia also has followed the incorrect reading of the word as Tâjehân instead of as Tâziân.

But the late Ervad Framji Minocherji Dastur Jamaspji, B.A., has given the correct reading in the Avesta characters in his Khordeh Avesta as Tâziân-i basta kustiân. Thus we see that the Tâziks of the Nirang of Sarosh Yasht are Arabs.

Who were the Tâziks?

The question is: Who were these Tâziks, the Arabs, who are spoken of as basta-kustiân, i.e. those who had put on the kusti or the sacred thread, the symbol of Zoroastrianism? Do Parsi books...
lead us to say that there were Arabs who were Zoroastrians? Does any book of history show that any of the Arabs had at any time taken to Mazdayasnism or Zoroastrianism? The object of this paper is to answer these questions in the affirmative and to show that in pre-Zoroastrian times there were Mazdayasnized Arabs, i.e. Arabs who had to some extent, followed the Mazdayasnan faith which prevailed at the time, and one of the principal elements of which was Fire-reverence. In Zoroastrian or post-Zoroastrian times there were Arabs who had taken to Zoroastrian faith.

According to the Iranian Genesis, the Pahlavi Bundehesh (Chap. XV), which describes the evolution of mankind, the Tāzikas were so called, because they descended from a pair named Tāz and Tāzik, whose progeny went to the desert of the Tāzikas (dasht-i Tāzikān), i.e. the Desert of the Arabs or the Arabian desert. The Iranians came down from the progeny of Hoshang and his wife Gujak. These two, Tāz and Hoshang, the progenitors of the Arabs and the Iranians were brothers both being the sons of Fravāk the son of Siāmāk (ibid., ch. XXXI, 1 and 6). Thus, without imparting too much importance to the details, we may say, that according to the old Iranian tradition, both the Arabs and Persians, the Semites and the Iranian Āryans had a common stem somewhere in Western Asia. The accompanying table, based on the Bundehesh (chap. XXXI) and the Dinkard (Bk. III, chap. I, 34) shows us the descent of the Semitic and Iranian stems generally and of Faridun and Pāt-khosrub in particular.²

According to the Arab historian Maçoudi, some Arabs derived their genealogy from Kahtān and others, especially those of the tribe of Nizān, considering themselves above the Kahtānides of Yemen invoked their relationship with Persia (Maçoudi par B. de Meynard, II, p. 142). This Arab view then supports the Iranian tradition of the Bundehesh.

As to the religion of the ancient Arabs, according to Firdousi, they worshipped a stone arch (mehrāb sang, Mohl’s text, p. 36). This shows, that just as the Christian Cross existed before Christ, and just as the Zoroastrian Fire-reverence and kusti, the symbols of its followers, existed before Zoroaster, so the Mahomedan custom of turning to the arch in worship existed long before Mahomed. But according to Maçoudi (I, 131), at one time, Zoroastrian Fire-worship had, side

² P. 228 of the Text of the Bundahshn edited by the late Ervad Tehmurās Dinshahji Anklesaria (1908).
by side with the above worship, entered Arabia, at least in a particular part or tribe of Yemen. All the people were on the point of following it, but one Khālid bin Sinān banished it from the country. A miracle was expected from that event but was averted. With a baton in his hand, he threw himself over the fire burning in a brazier. The fire was extinguished and he was burnt.

In this story, we see the first trace or glimpse of Mazdaism as prevalent at one time in the dashī-i Tāzikān, i.e. the Desert of the Arabs. This faith continued in one part or another of the country, more or less, at one time or another, and it is these Tāzik, these Arabs, who followed the Mazdayasnan faith, who are remembered as Tāzikān-i basta-kastiān (i.e. the Arabs who put on the kasti or the sacred thread) in the Nirang recited after the Sarosh Yasht.

Azhdahāka or Zohāk, whose rule over Persia is spoken of as a foreign rule from Bawri or Babylon, is spoken of in Persian books as a Tāzik or an Arab. So, he was an Arab of the old Arab faith, who had not accepted the Mazdayasnan faith of Fire-reverence. But, there lived at the time another Arab of the other class, i.e. a follower of the Mazdayasnan faith. He was one Pāt-khusrū who is spoken of as the king of the Arabs (Tazikān Malkā). This Pāt-khusrū (or Pāt-khusrub or Pāt-sarub, which is his name in Pahlavi books) is the Sarv of Firdousi, according to whom he was the Arab king of Yemen.9 The three sons of king Faridun of Iran—Selam, Tur and Erach—were married to the three daughters of this Arab king. There seems to have been a long line of the kings of this name and I think that this Srub or Surb or Sarv of the Iranian books is the same as the Saba’a of Arab authors from which name a line or tribe of the Arabs is known as the Sabaeans.

This Arab king Pāt-khusru, or Pāt-khusrub or Pāt-sarub, is referred to in several Pahlavi books. He is referred to in the Pahlavi Vendidad 10 as a very wealthy (tobanikān, Pers. tavāngar) person, Darmesteter, on the authority of Hamza Isfahāni, says, that the Arabs of Yemen were supposed to be very rich (sont légendaires par leur richesses).11 According to Tabari, 12 India had a share in making Yemen rich. It seems that there was a brisk trade between India and Arabia.

9 The dropping of Pāt, the first part of the name, and then of khu gives us the name Sarv.
10 Chap. XX.
12 Tabari par Zotenberg, I, p. 275.
Gayomard
  | Mashya
  | Siyāmak
  | Fravak

  Hoshang
  | Yanghat
  | Vivanghan

  Tehmurasp | Jamshed | Pātkhosrub (Tāzikan Malakā)
  | Vanegrāhesu the Āspiyan or Āthwiyan
  | Ramaktorā Āspiyan
  | Gefartorā Āspiyan
  | Sopīdorā ...
  | Sihaktorā ...
  | Burtorā ...
  | Soktorā ...
  | Puztorā ...
  | Faridun ...

  Taz (the ancestor of the Tāzikān or Arabs)
  | Virafshang (or Aīryeshva of Dinkard, Bk. VII, Ch. 1, 34).

  Zainigāv
  | Khrutasp
  | Dahāk (Zohāk)
Tabari particularly refers to an Arab king Raisch who came to India and carried riches.

The matrimonial relationship of Faridun's sons with the Arab king Pāt-Srub is referred to in the Dinkard, where he is spoken of as the king of the Arabs (Tāzikān Malkā) and as a relative of Tāz (Tāz patvand).

There is another reference to him in the Dinkard which is more important for our purpose. It is in the commencement of the seventh book, in the chapter which Dr. West numbers as Chap. I, but Dastur Darab as Introductory. The chapter treats of the Glory (vakhs, elsewhere spoken of as gādman, Avesta xᵛarenyh, kavaem xᵛarənō, Pers. khur) of the ancient Iranian world. It is as it were a modified and amplified form of the Avesta Zamyād Yašt (Yt. XIX), which, as said by Darmesteter, would serve as a short history of the Iranian monarchy, an abridged Shah Nāme. The Kayanian Glory (kavaem xᵛarənō of the Avesta or the vakhsh of the Dinkard) is represented as running in succession from one great monarch or worthy to another. The list of the Zamyād Yašt varies a little from that of the Dinkard. For example, the Zamyād Yašt begins with Hoshang but the Dinkard names Gayomard, Mashya-Mashyai, Siāmak and Vaçgard before Hoshang. Among such differences, one is that of the addition of the name of Pāt-khusrub by the Dinkard. But what strikes us as a little strange is, that the name occurs after that of Kaikobād, whereas, he being a contemporary of Faridun, his name ought to have been mentioned higher up. But that question should not concern us here, because the patronymic name may have caused some confusion.

Now, the importance of this reference is in the matter of what is stated here about Pāt-khusrub's religion. I will give the passage here as translated by Dr. West.

"34. And it (i.e. the Glory) came to Pāta-khasrōbō, son of Aīřefshvā, son of Tāz, who (was) king of the Arabs, through the mindfulness".

---

16 aŋtāgīh, Dastur Darab reads the word as āshṭih in one place (Eng. translation p. 14) and aŋtāgīh in another (Patd. transliteration of the text, p. 13) and translates it as
of the archangel Ashavahishtō and his enquiry about it from its own tribe—for the demon of greediness (azō), with one similarly destined had rushed for the destruction of him who (was) very gentle

"friendly communion or friendship." I am inclined to take it as a form of yashtgīh, i.e. worship, invocation.

17 pāzdinītan; Dr. West, while translating the word as "enquiry," does not give his reading or derivation. Dastur Darab reads it as pāzdinītan and translates it as "inspiration." He does not say, how he derives that meaning. Had it been pīsh-dīnīdan his translation would do. I translate the word as "pursuing." In the Vendidad (XV. 5) we have a word pāzdayēiti. There the sentence runs thus: trīśīm attādām ṭyaotnanām yōi varzīnī nādyūka yō pādwām īyām apārṣrma janāīti vā vayeit vā xraoqyeiti vā pāzdayēiti vā.

This sentence is in reply to the question in the commencement of the chapter as to which are the evil deeds which make man peshō-taun, i.e. which make him guilty of a tanafur gûnah, or a sin that cannot be atoned. The reply is, that there are five deeds which are of this worst kind, viz. (1) maligning a righteous man; (2) giving bad food to the watch dogs which protect the streets and the cattle; (3) striking, driving away, frightening and pursuing a bitch that is with child; (4) cohabiting with a woman in her menses; (5) cohabiting with a woman who is in an advanced state of pregnancy.

Now the above sentence refers to the third evil deed in the list. Therein the word pāzdayēiti is variously translated. Ervad Kavasji Kanga translates it as "kicks" जात सार्र. In his Avesta Dictionary (p. 313), he gives the word under the word pāzda as "to stamp on the ground" deriving it from pod=pūrha, foot and dvā to put (पढ मायर जपाव). The word occurs as third person plural pāzdayanta in the Asrīshavasang Yāsht (Yt. XVII. 55). There, Kanga translates it in the sense of "running after," "pursuing." He does not say, how he derives that meaning, but it seems, that here he does not follow his former derivation but takes it has pāz and dvā. Just as we have avi-dā (अखिल धि), to attack; so paz-dā means to pursue.

Now this Avesta word pāzdayēiti is given in the Pahlavi Vendidad as pāzdinēt, which Dastur Hoshangji translates as "stamps on the ground" (vide his Vendidad Glossary p. 188). He does not derive the word but he seems to follow Ervad Kavasji Kanga.

Prof. Darmesteter, following the Pahlavi rendering ғīghas ṣadman min ākhār shikavat; (vide Dastur Jamaspji’s Pahlavi Vendidad, translation, p. 108) has translated the words as "clapping of hands," but in his footnote (S.B.E., IV, 1st ed., p. 173, n. 2) has said "or with stamping in the ground" and has referred to the 31st chapter of Sad dar nāsr (vide Ervad Bamanji N. Dhabhar’s text, p. 25, l. 10) where, speaking of regard and care for the dogs, it is enjoined, that one should not walk carelessy when a dog is asleep, so as to disturb it (na shāyad kē pāe sakht bar zamin nehad ke u bidār shawad).

Now whatever the meaning of the Avesta word, of which the Pahlavi rendering is pāzdiñēt, I take the word in the Pahlavi Dinḵard to be this word, and not as Dr. West and Dastur Darab have taken it. I take it in the sense of "pursuing" or "attacking."

18 hamūnbakhtō seems to be the reading of Dr. West, Dastur Darab reads it as amūl-būt and says that "it may be a Pahlavinised form of some such Arabic proper name as Amuel-ul-bātil. I am inclined to agree with Dastur Darab that it is a proper name, though not that nor that of the kind which he suggests. As said above, I have
to that tribe — (as he had) a full inclination for the ascendancy of the portion whose guidance to the lofty priestly master (was) owing to the archangel Ashovahishtō just as the fish image of the (other) portion (was) for falling into the river; and it is declared that he came to the ceremonial of Zaratušt."

The passage of the Dinkard is rather difficult and both the translators, Dastur Darab and Dr. West, differ a good deal in their translations. But the pith of the passage is in the last sentence, viz. val yazashna-i Zartuhast matan paētāk, i.e. his coming to the worship of Zoroaster is well known, or as Dr. West puts it "he (Pāt-Kusrob) came to the ceremonial of Zaratusht" or as the Dastur puts it "its (the tribe's, i.e. Pat-khusrub's tribe's) coming to the ceremonials of Zarathustra". I give below my transliteration and translation of the passage!

Mat val Pātthosrub i Airyafshva i tāz i Tāzikān Mālkā. Pavan Ashavahishta Amhōspand yashtgih avash pazdinidan patash min naftshman ram āz shaēdā levatman Amānbātak pavan marōchindan i zak i narm narm val zak ram dōbarest ikvimūnāt Pavan lāláih forūmānīh i bāhar val rad i bāland min Asha-vahishta Amhōspand nimāyāshna chēyun zak bāhar i māhik kalp pavan rūd nafrūnastan va val yazhashna i Zartuhasht matan paētāk.

Translation—(That Glory) came to Pātthosrub the son of Airyafshvā, son of Tāz, who was the king of the Tāziks. He (Pātthosrub), by (virtue of) the worship of Ashavahisht (Ardībēhesht) Ameshaspand, by slow degrees ran after (i.e. brought about) the destruction of (his) tribe by pursuing (or fighting with) Amānbātak the ambitious demon of his own tribe. He was nobly (lāláih) inclined towards the belief of that high leader, Ashavahisht, Ameshaspand in the same way as he

taken the word pazdinidan in the sense of attacking or fighting, so here the mention of the name of an enemy is probable.

Dr. West gives a footnote and says that the sentence indicates "that the Arab subjects of the king had revolted, because he favoured those of the primitive faith, who no doubt, gained further favour by putting down the rebellion." Here it is not merely the question of favouring the primitive faith, i.e. the old Paōiyotkaēsh Mazdayasnan faith, but the question of Pāt-khusrub himself being a Mazdayasnan and a worshipper of fire as is indicated by the passage.


I follow Dastur Darab in reading this word.

A 13
was for throwing into the river the belief (of the worship) of fish-figures. His coming to the worship of Zoroaster is made known.

Now, as said above, though translators may differ as to the literal translation of the passage, what it tends to show is this: Pât-khusrub had parted with his ancestral Arab faith and turned to Mazdayasism the faith of Iran.

We saw above, on the authority of Macouidi that in very early times, some of the Arabs of Yemen followed the Iranian Fire-worship and that it was one Khâlid who abolished it. So here, Pât-khusrub’s “mindfulness” or “friendliness with” or “worship of Ashavahishta (Ardibehesht) Ameshâspand, who presides over fire, (“Ardibehesht âtash âtash sardagân jas” in Patet Ādarbâd, 8) is a clear reference to his and to his Arab followers’ religion that they followed the old primitive Mazdayasnan religion wherein reverence to fire played an important part and that they were opposed to the worship of fish and such other fetishes.

The last part of the above passage, viz. that it is declared that he came to the ceremonial of Zarathushtr (val yazashna i Zarttuhasht mutan paštâk) is very significant. It clearly points to Pât-khusrub and his followers being Mazdayasnans.

As the time of Pât-khusrub was far anterior to that of Zoroaster, the reference to Zoroaster is an anachronism. But what the later writer of the Dinkard may be taken to mean, is that Pât-khusrub took to the Iranian way of paying reverence to fire which was prevalent among the ancient Mazdayasnans, the way which led to the final reform of Zoroaster wherein also the reverence to fire continued.

The Pahlavi Shatroiha i Airân says that Faridun conquered that part of Arabia which is known as the Dasht-i Tâzikân, i.e. the Desert of Arabia and presented it as a marriage gift to Pat-khusr the Arab king of Yemen. According to the Madigân i Binâ Farvardin yûm Khurdâd the above referred to marriage of the three sons of Faridun with the three daughters of the king of Yemen took place on the Khordâdsâl day.

The Tâzik, who nowadays form a special group, one of the two principal ethnical groups of Persia, are the descendants of these Persianized or Zoroastrianized Arabs. Dr. Luschau speaks of them as

---

23 Vide my translation of the Yâdgûr-i Zarîvan, Shatroiha-i Airûn va Aṣdib va Sahigîh-i Seistân, pp. 87-88.
24 Dr. Felix V. Luschau in his article entitled “The Early Inhabitants of Western
the "descendants of the old Persians and Medes." Dr. Bellew says, that in Afghanistan even now, the Täzik are known as the Parseiwan. This very name points to their relationship with the ancient Persians, He says: "The term Täzik, it is said, is derived from the ancient Per-
sian name for the Arab. The ancient Persian writers distinguishing
their hereditary enemies on the north and south respectively by the
terms Tärk and Täz or Täj. And hence it is that the term Täz applied
to the Arab only in Persia; and everything connected with him, or
proceeding from him, was called by the Persians Täzi or Täzik, which
are the same as Täzi or Täzik. In course of time, it seems these
terms became restricted to designate things of Arab origin in Persia
in contradistinction to the pure and native article. Thus an Arab
settling in the country, and not intermarrying with its people, retained
his proper national title through successive generations. But the Arab
intermingling with the people of the country lost his proper nationality,
and in the succeeding generations, was called Täjik by the Persians. An
imported Arab horse or dog, etc., was not called Täzi but Arabi. Their
offspring, however, from a Persian mare or bitch, received the name of
Täzi and were no longer called Arabi." 25

History points to a long list of Mazdayasnans kings of Iran who had
relations at one time or another with one part or another of Arabia and
with one or another tribe of the Arabs. 26 In the case of the reign of
Noshirwan (Khusro Kobadan, Chosroes I.) we find clear references to
Zoroastrian rule over Yemen. So, it is quite possible that the Mazday-
snan faith, and later on, the Zoroastrian faith prevailed there and that
the Tazis referred to in the Nirang-i Sarosh Yasht were Zoroastrianized
Arabs.

Asia" in the July to December number (Vol. XLI, 1911) of the Journal of the Royal
Anthropological Institute.

25 The Race of Afghanistan, being a brief account of the principal nations inhabiting

26 Vide my Paper entitled "The Physical character of the Arabs, their relations with
ancient Persia," read before the Anthropological Society of Bombay on 24th June, 1919
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GONARDA, LE BERCEAU DU GONARDIYA.

SYLVAIN LÉVI, D.LITT. (CAL.),
Professeur au Collège de France, et à l'Université de Strasbourg.


L'itinéraire vaudrait l'honneur d'une étude intégrale. Ici, toutefois, je ne m'occuperais que de l'étape intermédiaire entre Ujjenī et Vedisā, deux localités bien définies : l'une est aujourd'hui encore Ujjain (Ogein), au nord d'Indore, Lat. 23°11'10" N., et Long. 75°51'45" E. ; l'autre, Besnagar, tout près de Bhilsa, Lat. 23°31'35" N., et Long. 77°50'39" E. Le Parāyaṇa place entre ces deux points la ville de Gonaddha.

Le Catalogue des Yakṣa dans la Mahāmāyūrī 1 suit un ordre exactement identique : "à Avanti, le Yakṣa est Priyadarśana ; à Gomardana, Śīkhaṇḍin ; à Vaiḍīṣa, Aṇjaliṇi. Avanti est un autre nom d'Ujjayinī ; Vaiḍīsa est la forme sanscrite du pali Vedisa. Le nom de la localité intermédiaire est flottant dans la tradition des manuscrits ; j'ai reproduit dans le texte la lecture des MSS O et H ; mais D lit Gonardane, des trois versions chinoises, S transcrit kiw-kia t'o-na qui suppose un original Gogardana. Y traduit you-hi "bœuf-joie."

qui ramène à Gonandana ; A traduit you-ts'oei "boeuf-comprimer," soit Gonardana. Le traducteur tibétain a suivi le même texte (ba-lau 'joms "boeuf-comprimer" ) Le témoignage du Sutta nipāta vient confirmer la lecture Gonardana, car il est évident que de part et d’autre il s’agit de la même localité. Le pali Gonaddha se ramène sans difficulté au sanscrit Gonarda. L’aspiration introduite subsidiairement dans la forme palie est un phénomène qui n’a rien d’exceptionnel ; dans cette même introduction du Pārāyaṇa, nous avons déjà rencontré le nom sanscrit de la Godāvari modifié, lui aussi, par l’aspiration de la dentale à l’intérieur du mot, Godhāvari ; on trouvera une liste de cas analogues p. ex. dans le Tali de Geiger § 40 et § 62, et pour les pracrêits en général dans la Grammatik der Prakrit-Sprachen de Pischel § 207–209. Dans les noms propres, le phénomène semble dû généralement à une interprétation erronée : p. ex. Khandha, "le dieu Skanda," doit son aspirée à une confusion avec skandha "l’épaule" ; Erāpatha—Airāvata, l’éléphant divin, a subi la contamination de patha "chemin," (comme il a subi ultérieurement en sanscrit même la contamination de pattra "feuille" en devenant Elāpattra). On aura cru reconnaître dans les premières syllabes du nom de la Godāvari le mot godhā "grand lézard," Le sanscrit gonarda (ou gonardana, par suffixation développée) signifie clairement "le mugissement de la vache." Passé en pracrêit, sous la forme gonadda (ou gonaddana) le mot devenait inintelligible. La racine nard semble avoir cédé en pracrêit devant la racine nād dont elle ne se différenciait plus qu’à peine. D’autre part, le mot go suggérait tout naturellement le mot naddha "attaché, lié".

Quoiqu’il en soit de l’explication, l’équivalence Gonarda=Gonaddha est certaine. Le nom de Gonarda est lié indissolublement au souvenir de Patañjali "le Gonardien," Gonardiya. Une tradition constante attestée par Kaiyāta, par l’auteur du Trikāṇḍasēsa, par Hemacandra, identifie le personnage désigné sous le nom de Gonardiya dans le Mahābhāṣya avec l’auteur du Mahābhāṣya. Kielhorn a, il est vrai, vigoureusement contesté la valeur de cette tradition et soutenu que le Gonardiya était l’auteur du Kārikā en vers utilisées et citées par Patañjali. L’autorité de Kielhorn dans les questions qui touchent au Mahābhāṣya mérite à coup sûr la plus haute considération, mais son interprétation n’est pas en contradiction nécessaire avec la tradi-

2 Ind. Antiq., XV, 81–83.
tion indienne. Patañjali peut se référer dans le Mahābhāṣya à une œuvre antérieure qu’il aurait composée, en se désignant lui-même sous une appellation de caractère impersonnel, dérivée de son lieu d’origine. Toujours est-il que la situation géographique de Gonarda cadre à merveille avec les rares indications qu’on a pu dégager du Mahābhāṣya pour fixer la date de Patañjali. Les deux faits essentiels sont : 1° la mention de Puṣyamitra, de sa cour (sabhā), de son sacrifice (iha Puṣyamitraḥ yājayāmaḥ)—2° la mention des conquêtes Grecs dans l’Inde (arunād Yavanaḥ Sāketam, arunād Yavano Mādhyanikām). Or Gonarda est l’étape la plus voisine de Vidiśā. Vidiśā, au témoignage des récits suivis par Kālidāsa dans Mālavikāgnimitra, était la capitale où résidait, en qualité de vice-roi, le fils de Puṣyamitra. Et Vidiśā était aussi en rapports étroits avec la politique grecque ; la colonne de Besnagar, sur le site de l’ancienne Vidiśā, préserve le souvenir d’un ambassadeur grec (Yonadūta) Héliodore, envoyé par le roi grec Antialkidas auprès du roi indien Kāśiputra Bhāgabhadra. De plus, l’horizon géographique du Mahābhāṣya s’ordonne harmonieusement autour de la région Gonarda-Vidiśā comme centre. En dehors, des désignations générales de territoires, comme Vidarba, Videha, Cola, Kerala, etc., qui n’impliquent pas une connaissance directe et personnelle, les noms de localités, villes ou bourgades, s’encadrent dans une sorte de triangle dont la base va de Pāṭaliputra au Penjab, et dont le sommet atteint la basse Narmadā avec Māhiṃmati. Māhiṃmati figure, dans l’itinéraire du Pārāyaṇa, comme l’étape intermédiaire d’où les disciples de Bāvari, partis de Pratiṣṭhāna, se mettent en route pour Ujjayinī; de même le Mahābhāṣya,\(^5\) Ujjayinīyāḥ prasthitō Māhiṃmati-yaḥ sāryam udgaṇayati.

Une difficulté toutefois semble s’opposer à la localisation de Gonarda que je propose. Le nom de Gonarda est cité comme un nom de lieu “chez les Orientaux” dans la Candravṛṭh\(^4\) dans la Kāśikvṛttī, sur Pāṇini I, 1, 75, et justement pour expliquer la formation du dérivé Gonardiya, sans la vṛddhi. Pāṇini enseigne que, par exception, les dipthongues e et o doivent être considérées comme le degré de la vṛddhi (qui est normalement ai et au) dans les noms de lieu des Orientaux (en pṛacām dēśe ; Candragomin reproduit ce sūtra en l’adaptant à son système III, 2, 25 eṇādyacah pṛagdeśāt). Evidemment nous sommes

\(^{5}\) Sur Pāṇini III, 1, 26.  
\(^{4}\) Sur Candragomin III, 2, 25 etc.
surpris, et même choqués de voir Gonarda, en plein Malva, englobé dans “l'Orient” de l’Inde. Nous n’avons pas cependant le droit de révoquer en doute l’assertion de Candragomin et de la Kâsîkâ. Il ne s’agit pas d’accorder une confiance aveugle aux connaissances géographiques de ces commentaires; mais leur raisonnement, d’ordre grammatical, est indiscutable : Gonardiya est un dérivé formé au moyen du suffixe cha (=îya); le suffixe cha s’ajoute à un thème ayant la vrddhi⁶; Gonardiya est traité comme un thème à vrddhi, quoiqu’il ait o, et non au, dans la première syllabe; c’est donc qu’il entre dans l’exception prévue par Pâñini⁹: donc Gonarda, d’où il dérive, est un nom de localité des Orientaux.

Mais que faut-il entendre par “les Orientaux”, prâñcaḥ? La grammaire, depuis Pâñini, ne connaît que deux groupements en fonction des points cardinaux: les Septentrionaux (udañcaḥ) et les Orientaux (prâñcaḥ). Un vers traditionnel, rapporté par la Kâsîkâ⁷ et par Kṣīrasvāmin⁸ établit cette répartition:

prâgudañca avihajate hamsaḥ kṣirodake yathâ
viduṣām śabadasyaḥ kṣīryartham sa nah pâtu sarâvati

“Elle sépare l’Est et le Nord, comme le cygne sépare le lait et l’eau, pour bien fixer l’usage de la langue classique. Qu’elle nous protège, la Šarâvatī!”

Et le Dictionnaire d’Amara, en décrivant la terre, s’en tient encore à cette double division, qu’il complète par l’adjonction secondaire des deux autres directions:

Šarâvatyaḥ tu yo ‘vadhaḥ | desaḥ prâgdañsinaḥ prâcyya udîcyah
paścimottavaḥ,⁹

“à partir de la Šarâvatī, le pays qui est au Sud-Est, c’est l’Orient; celui qui est au Nord-Ouest, c’est le Nord.”

Ainsi, pour Amara, le Sud fait corps expressément avec l’Est, le Nord avec l’Ouest. Le glossateur Vandyaghaṭiya écrit sur ce passage que “la Šarâvatī est une rivière de l’Inde qui coule du Nord-Est vers l’Océan Occidental” (etasmim ca bhârate varse sarâvatî naṁ ma nadi aîśânya dīṣaḥ sakâsât paścimasamudragâminī vahati). L’indication paraît nette et claire; malheureusement la géographie réelle ne la confirme pas. Vandyaghaṭiya, en véritable glossateur, a déduit de son texte même l’indication qu’il paraît y ajouter, il ne l’a empruntée ni à

⁶ vrddhaḥ chaḥ P. IV, 2, 114.
⁷ Sur P. I, 1, 75.
⁸ Sur Amara II, 1, 6-7.
⁹ I, 1, 75.
la géographie moderne, ni à la géographie ancienne, ni aux nomenclatures consacrées des rivières dans les épopées et les Purâna. On y chercherait en vain la prétendue Saravati de Vandyaghaṭiya. En fait la tradition a, cette fois encore, perpétué une appellation qui n'avait plus, et depuis longtemps, aucun rapport avec la réalité. Un temps avait été où le nom de Saravati "(la riviè re) aux roseaux" était appliqué à un cours d'eau qui séparait en deux parties l'ensemble de l'Inde aryenne. Pânini enseigne expressément la formation de ce nom.10 Le souvenir d'une frontière tracée par la riviè re Saravati s'est curieusement conservé dans un épisode célèbre de la doctrine bouddhique. Lorsque Kotikarṇa va consulter le Boudda sur la limite des pays de stricte observance, le maître fixe à la Saravati la limite méridionale. "Au Sud il y a une ville nommée Saravati, et par delà une rivière nommée Saravati, c'est là le bout" (dakṣiṇena Saravati nāma nagari tasyaḥ pareṇa Saravati nāma nadi so'ntah). Telle est du moins la tradition de l'école Mūla-Sarvastivādin dans son texte original recueilli par les compilateurs du Divyāvadāna (p. 21). Les éditeurs du texte, Cowell et Neil, citent deux variantes du nom fournie par des manuscrits de valeur inférieure: Saravati (ms. A.) et Savaravati (ms. B.). C'est cette dernière lecture qui a été suivie par Yi-tsing, auteur responsable, sinon effectif, de la traduction chinoise du Vinaya Mūla-Sarvastivādin; il a rendu le nom de la ville et de la riviè re par che-pa (ou: fo) -lo-fa-ti qui suppose un original Savaravati.11 Yi-tsing reproduit la même forme dans un autre traité du même Vinaya, le Mūla Sarvastivāda Ekaṣatakarma12 où le même épisode est répété en abrégé. La leçon Savaravati est due sans doute à un essai de correction pour substituer à l'inconnue Saravati un nom qui évoquait l'idée des Savara dont les tribus sauvages peuplaient le plateau central, à la lisière sud du bassin du Gange. Le passage correspondant du Vinaya des Sarvastivādin ne nous est connu que par la version chinoise due à Puṇyatāra, il s'y présente, par la faute du traducteur ou de l'original, dans un état d'inextricable confusion. Après avoir régulièrement donné le mont Usīra (Yeou-chi-lo) comme la limite septentrionale, il ajoute: "Par-delà cette montagne, et non loin, il y a l'arbre so-lo de la source aux jones

10 Saravatīna ca VI, 3, 120.
11 Tok. XVII, 4, 108a, 9
12 Tok. XVII, 5, 57b, 2.
13 Tok. XVI, 4, 50a, 17.
semble remonter au même original. En outre ce Vinaya donne comme limite au Nord-Est "le fleuve des Bambous," qui lui aussi évoque la Śaravatī. Tel qu'il est, ce passage est donc inutilisable. Le Vinaya pali, de l'école Sthavira, substitue à la Śaravatī la Salalavatī (avec les variantes Sallavatī et Salilavatī ; mais le témoignage de Jātaka I, 49 et Sūmaṅgala vilāsini I, 173 confirme la lecture Salalā"); il fait de cette rivière la limite au Sud-Est : puratthimadakkhīṇāya disāya salalavatī nāma nādi. L'orientation Sud-Est donnée par le pali concorde en partie avec l'orientation Sud donnée par le Vinaya des Mūla Sarvāstivādin ; elle est en contradiction absolue avec la détermination brahmanique de la Śaravatī qui, séparant le Nord et l'Est, doit couler au Nord-Ouest du Pays du Milieu, le Madhyadeśa, lequel est le pays de stricte observance.

La ville de Śaravatī (Śaravatī nagari) que le Vinaya des Mūla Sarvāstivādin place immédiatement en deçà de la rivière Śaravatī n'est pas mieux connue que cette rivière même. Une ville du même nom reparait, il est vrai, dans le Raghuvamsa XV, 97, comme la capitale où régnaient Lava, fils de Rāma ; tandis que son autre fils régnaît à Kuśāvatī : sa nīvesya Kuśāvatyāṃ ripunāgāṅkusāṃ kusam śaravatyny satāṃ sūktair janiṭāśrulavasyṃ lavam." Tel est du moins le texte adopté par Mallinātha et généralement accepté sur la foi de ce commentateur. Mais les commentateurs Vallabha, Vijayānandasuri, Cāritravardhana lisent : Śravastyāṃ ca ; Hemādri et Sumativijaya lisent Śravatyāṃ ca. Et l'Uttarakanda du Rāmāyaṇa, que suit Kālidāsa, nomme en effet la capitale de Lava Śravasti, dans le texte de Bombay CVIII, 5, comme dans le texte de Calcutta CXXI, 4 : Śravastiti purī ramya śravita ca lavasya ca. Et c'est, en effet, d'après tous les textes du Rāmāyaṇa, sur l'Uttara Kosala que régnaît Lava tandis que Kusa régnait sur le Kosala proprement dit (Kosalesu kuśam viram uttarēṣu tathā lavam). Śravasti est la capitale de l'Uttara-Kosala. La ville et la rivière de Śaravatī, sur les confins du Nord et de l'Est, n'ont rien à faire ici.

Il faut donc renoncer à préciser le site de Gonarda en fonction de l'introuvable Śaravatī. Mais un fait subsiste : dans la division traditionnelle de l'Āryāvarta en deux régions, Nord et Est, Gonarda, traité

14 Vinayapiṭaka, Mahāvagga V, 13, 12.
15 L'édition de Gorresio CXIII, 21 a Śravati : lavasya tu purim ranyāṃ śravatīṃ lokavīśrutam.
grammaticalement comme une localité des "Orientaux" n'est pas du Nord, quelle que puisse être son orientation secondaire. On ne sera donc pas surpris si Varāha Mihira, le seul auteur connu qui mentionne Gonarda après les textes déjà cités, place Gonarda parmi les pays du Sud dans sa carte astrologique de l'Inde, Brḥatsamhitā XIV, 12: aṭha daksīṇena lāṅkā . . . . . bharukacchāh . . . . . vanavāsi konkanābhārāh ākuraṇavārtata (corr. ānari?) dašapuragondaradakalakāh karnāṭa . . . . . nasīkā . . . . tumbavanakārmanēyakāh." Le nom de Gonarda paraît encore deux fois dans la Brḥatsamhitā à l'intérieur de deux groupements purement astrologiques: IX, 13, anyenātrākrānte melecchāṭavikākṣa- jīvigoromantān gonardanīcasūdrān vaidehāṁś cânayah sṛṣati. Et XXXII, 22: gonardacedikukurān kirātavaidēhakān hanti. Dans sa nomenclature géographique, Varāha Mihira semble jeter les noms au hasard du mètre, sans qu'on puisse rien inférer de leur disposition relative en se fondant sur l'ordre de classement. Parmi ces noms de la région méridionale, il en est un toutefois qui mérite de retenir l'attention: c'est le nom de Tumbavana. La localité est par ailleurs, autant que je sache, complètement inconnue dans la littérature; cependant, dans son commentaire sur le Sutta-nipāta, la Paramatthajotikā, Buddhaghosa note à propos des vers du Pārāyaṇa où est mentionné Gonaddha:

_Ujjjeniṁ cāpi Gonaddhaṁ Vedisaṁ Vanasavhayaṁ_,
que "Vanasavhaya (littér. 'qui porte le nom d'un bois') désigne Tumbavananagara; d'autres prétendent que c'est Vanassāvatthi.' (Vanasavhaya ti tumbavanagaram (sic) vuccati vanasāvatthinis ti pi ekc; la glose est rapportée par Andersen-Smith dans leur édition du Sutta-nipāta.\(^{16}\) Ainsi, au dire de Buddhaghosa, Tumbavana serait l'étape entre Vidiśā et Kauśāmbi, sur la route de Gonaddha-Gonarda vers la Yamunā. De fait, au stūpa de Sanchi, voisin du site de Vidiśā (23°28' N. de lat., et 77°48' E. de long.) cinq inscriptions\(^{17}\) commémorent des donations faites par des habitants de Tumbavana. On voit aussi figurer parmi les bienfaiteurs du stūpa des habitants de Māhiṣmati, d'Ujjayini, de Vidiśā; on s'étonne de n'y pas rencontrer des gens de Gonarda.

L'authenticité de la nomenclature géographique dans l'introduction au Pārāyaṇa est confirmée par un trait décisif. Bāvari y est représenté comme installé sur le bord de la Godhāvari, dans la région d'Alaka:

\(^{16}\) Ad. loc., p. 194.
\(^{17}\) Lüders, List, Nos. 201, 202, 440, 450, 520.
Quand ses disciples le quittent, leur première étape vers le Nord est la ville de "Patiṣṭhāna d'Ālaka" (ālakassa Patiṣṭhānapṛthivī, v. 36). Tel est le moins le texte adopté par les éditeurs, Fausböll et Andersen-Smith. Mais l'appareil critique fourni par ceux-ci montre que dans les deux passages les manuscrits birmans portent, au lieu d'Ālaka, "Mulaka".


Bhagwanlal added the dynasty of the Munḍakas, known from the Vishṇupurāṇa; and the way in which they are there mentioned together with the Śakas and Tukhāras is such as to commend the hint. But I am doubtful about the change of ụ into ụṇ."

Le mystère est dissipé, grâce au texte du Parāyana. Le site du Mulaka peut être même déterminé avec assez de précision, puisqu'il se trouve entre l'Asaka (Assaka, Aśmaka) où est la ville de Pratiṣṭhāna (Patiṣṭhāna) aujourd'hui Paithan sur la haute Godavari, près de sa source, et le Suraṭha (Suraṣṭra) qui est aujourd'hui la presqu'île de Kathiawar. Mulaka doit donc désigner la portion de la côte avec l'arrière-pays au nord de Bombay, le Guzerate.

On m'accusera peut-être d'attacher une importance excessive à l'ordre de succession où les noms de provinces défilent dans l'inscription de Pulumāyi. Mais l'inscription de Rudradāman à Girnar, qui remonte à la même époque, contient, elle aussi, une liste des provinces soumises par Rudradāman, l'adversaire de la dynastie Sātakarṇi à laquelle appartiennent Gotamiputra et Pulumāyi. Son domaine est en partie formé de territoires conquis sur les Sātakarṇi ; on y retrouve l'Ākarāvanti (Ākara+Avanti), l'Anūpa, le Suraṣṭra, le Kukurāparānta (Kukura+Aparānta) : pūrvaparākarāvantiyanipaniydpāṃśūvatrasurāstrasvabhramarukacchahindhusauvīrakukurāparāmantanisādhādinām.

Mais ici l'ordre de succession est inverse, puisque Rudradāman a étendu ses conquêtes du Nord au Sud en partant de la région d'Ujjayini, sa capi-

18 Epigr. Indica VIII, 62.
tale, tandis que Gotamîputa avait marché en conquérant du Sud au Nord, à partir des bords de la Godavari.

Le souvenir du pays de Mulaka n’est peut-être pas entièrement effacé dans la tradition pouranique. Le Visnou purâna (IV, 4) dans la généalogie de la race d’Ikṣvāku donne Kalmāsapaḍa un fils nommé Aśmaka; Aśmaka a pour fils et successeur Mūlaka, surnommé Nārika-vaca, parce que des femmes l’auraient caché et sauvé lors du massacre général des ksatriya. Aśmaka est clairement un héros éponyme, l’éponyme du pays d’Aśmaka, ce territoire “pierreux” (aśman “pierre”), situé au Sud d’Avanti et qui fait étroitement corps avec lui (Avantya-aṃakāh, Gaṇapātha, gaṇa Kārtakaujapādayaḥ, Aṃkāvanti dans le Sarva-stivādi vinaya, épisode de Kōṭikarna; le Mūla Sarva-stivādi vinaya19 a Aṃkāparāntaka que Cowell et Neil lisent a tort: asmāt parāntaka). La relation entre l’Aṃkā et le Mūlaka, si nettement exprimée dans le Pārayaṇa (so Assakassa visaye Mulakassa samāsane, v. 2) donne à penser que la filiation indiquée dans le Purāṇa entre le roi Aṃkā et le roi Mūlaka traduit en généalogie un rapport géographique.

On s’étonnera moins de rencontrer dans une section du Sutta-nipāta des détails si précis sur la géographie des régions qui encadrent le golfe de Cambaye si on se rappelle qu’une des perles de la collection, l’admirable Dhaniyasutta 20 a pour scène la rive de la Mahī. Le berger Dhaniya y est installé: Anutiṭhe Mahīyā samānavāso; le Bouddha passe la nuit au bord de la rivière: anutiṭhe Mahīy ekarattivāso. Pour amener le Bouddha dans ces parages exotiques, si éloignés de son activité réelle, en contact prochain de la mer fréquentée par les barbares, il fallait l’audace d’un poète du terroir et d’une inspiration locale.

19 Divyāvadāna, 1.
20 Uraga Vagga, 2.

(Note.—The correct form of the Chinese character for shu4 not being available at the press, the form 株 has been used. The horizontal top-line of the central element — should be 土, and the whole centre is as in 鼓 without the 支 Ed.)
THE THEORY OF RASA IN SANSKRIT POETICS

Sushilkumar Dē, M.A., D.Lit. (Lond.), Premchand Roychand Research Student, and Lecturer, Calcutta University.

The theory of rasa, like the theory of dveani with which it is intimately connected, forms one of the most important aesthetic foundations of Sanskrit Poetics. From its first appearance in the dramatic theory of Bharata down to its establishment as the 'soul' of Poesy in the work of Viśvanātha, there has been a steady working out of the idea into a fundamental aesthetic conception; and it is worth while to study the gradual unfolding of the idea through its fairly long course of history.

The dogma of rasa, apart from any theory thereon, was naturally known to the old writers on Poetics; but in the beginning it was taken into account only in connexion with the drama, and its importance as one of the essential factors of poetic theory was not properly understood. This importance was probably for the first time ably set forth by the Kashmirian Anandavardhana in the ninth century, and subsequently elaborated with such mastery by his commentator Abhinavagupta that it became thenceforth an accepted fact in Sanskrit Poetics, never to be set aside by rival systems and improved only in detail by later speculations.

But it can be easily shown that some theory of rasa, however undeveloped, or even a Rasa School particularly in connexion with the drama, was in existence long before the time of Anandavardhana, although the bearings of this theory on poetry, in contradistinction to drama, were seldom discussed. The importance of this dramaturgie Rasa School must have been somewhat overshadowed by the dominance of the Alamkāra and the Riti Schools in the sphere of poetic theory; but its comparative antiquity, going back to a period even anterior to Bharata, is undoubted. Dramaturgy, however, appears at first to have formed a study by itself; and even among later writers, only Vidyanātha and Viśvanātha think it worth while to devote special chapters to it. Both Bhāmaha and Daṇḍin, no doubt, speak
of nātaka as a species of kāvyā, but refer to specialised treatises for its detailed treatment. Similarly Vāmana shows an unusual partiality towards the drama (I. 3. 30), but its treatment is omitted because it did not apparently come within the province of poetic theory. The earliest known writer who includes a treatment of Dramaturgy is Hemacandra, but his work is more or less a compilation, and his enormous admiration for Abhinavagupta’s writings will sufficiently explain this tendency. It seems, therefore, that the school of Dramaturgy had an existence separate from the orthodox schools of Poetics, and the rasa-theories which sprang up in connexion with this school, confined their activity, in the first stage of their development, to the sphere of dramatic composition and exerted only a limited influence on poetic theories.

The oldest known exponent of this dramaturgic Rasa School is Bharata, from whom apparently sprang all later schools and theories, and whom even Ānandavardhana himself, as we shall see, takes as his original authority. But rasa does not appear to be Bharata’s principal theme, and it is treated only in connexion with his exposition of dramatic representation, with which he is chiefly concerned. We can understand, therefore, why Rājaśekhara should, in accordance with some current tradition, regard Bharata as an authority on rūpaka, rather than on rasa, and speak of one Nandikesvara as the original exponent of the

1 Kāvyādarśa I. 31; Bhāmahālavākāra I. 24.
2 Hemacandra, for instance, copies (pp. 57-66) almost verbatim the whole of Abhinavagupta’s commentary on Bharata’s dictum on rasa (tatra vībhāvanabhāva-vyabhīṣṭi-sanyogī rasa-nispatiḥ, ed. Kāvyamālā, p. 62, ed. Grosset, p. 87, l. 7) with only a concluding acknowledgment etan-matam evdsūnāḥveṇuṣūnāṃveditavyam.
3 Kāvyā-mimāṃsā, p. 1.
4 Although no work of Nandikesvara on rasa has yet been discovered, the name occurs in connexion with several works (Aufrecht, Cat. Cat. I. 278, ii. 59, iii. 298) on music, histrionic art, erotic, grammar and tantra. The writer on erotic is cited as Nandīśvara in Pañca-sāyana (Bil. Cat. 533. Peterson ii. 110) who is supposed by Aufrecht to be the same as Nandin quoted by Vatsyayana (I. 1. 8); but the name Nandikesvara is given in Bṛti-rāhasya (Oxf. Cat. 218a: Schmidt, Ind. Erotik, 1911, pp. 46, 50). See Schmidt’s remarks, ibid., p. 47. The work on histrionic art attributed to Nandikesvara is called Abhināyadarpāṇa (ed. Poona, 1874; MSS. Ind. Off. Cat. 3092. 3099; Winternitz, 109; Madras Cat. xxii 1290; Śeṣagiri Śastri, Rep. ii. 304; Burnell, 436; also in Oppert). Work on music called Nandikesvara-mate tāli̊khāya in Weber 1729. See also Madras Cat. xxii. 13906-8, where mention is made of Bharatārāvya supposed to be a condensed version, apparently, after Bharata, of the work of Nandikesvara by Sumati, treating of dramatic gestures and tālas.
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Rasa-theory, which Bharata, if Rajaśekhara is right, must have borrowed and worked up into his own system. That the rasa-theory was older than Bharata is apparent from the fact that Bharata himself cites in chs. vi and vii several ślokas in the āryā as well as in the anusṭubh metres in support of his own statements; and in one place, he distinctly quotes two āryā-ślokas from a chapter of an unknown work relating to the discussion of rasa. It may be mentioned, however, that Keśava Miśra, a comparatively recent writer of the 16th century, speaks of one sūtra-kāra bhagavān Śauddhodani, who, according to him, was one of the first to formulate the view that rasa is the essence of poetry. Nothing is known of this mysterious Śauddhodani, apparently a Buddhistic writer, except that Keśava Miśra, on his own acknowledgment, is following this old master, whose views, as recorded in the Alāṅkāra-śekhara, do not seem, however, to deviate in any material way from those of Mammatā.

With Bharata, on the other hand, we arrive at a distinctly definite landmark. Long before the Dhvani School, led by Ānandavardhana and Abhinavagupta, was dominant, Bharata's views on rasa seem to have been discussed in some detail, with the result that divergent theories came to prevail under the names of Bhattach Lollaṭa, Śaṇkuka, Bhattach Nāyaka and others, all of whom appear to have been commentators on Bharata's Nāṭyaśāstra and to have, therefore taken Bharata


Alaṅkāra-śekhara, pp. 2, 20, etc.

7 The views of all these writers, whose works are now lost, are known from the exposition of Abhinavagupta (followed by other writers, e.g. Mammatā, Hemaścandra, Vidyādhara, etc.) who also cites some less known commentators such as Rāhula or Rāhala, and Bhattach Yantra. This practically coincides with the enumeration of the different commentators on Bharata by Śāṅgadeva as the source of his work (13th century, see intro. to Ānandārama edition of the text), with the exception of the name of Udbhata mentioned by the latter (I. 1.19). It is curious that Udbhata actually quotes (iv. 4) the first half of Bharata vi. 15 enumerating the eight rasas, only making enough verbal change in the latter portion of the verse to admit śānta as the ninth rasa in the category. Rāhula is cited by Śāṅgadeva as one of his authorities (I. 1.17); while Lollaṭa and Śaṇkuka belong in all probability to the 8th and the 9th centuries. Bhattach Nāyaka does not appear to be very distant chronologically from Abhinava, who is the oldest writer to quote him, and probably belongs to the end of the 9th or the beginning of the 10th century, a date which makes it likely that he is identical, as Peterson suggested (intro. Subhās, p. 51), with the Bhattach Nāyaka who is mentioned by Kalhana (V. 159) as having flourished in the reign of Śankaravarman, son of Avantivarman of Kashmir (see JRAS., 1897. p. 296). Sundaramśra in his Nāṭyaapradīpa (Ind. Off. Cat. iii. p. 347) as well as Rāghavaḥatta speaks of a commentary on Bharata by Māṭrīguptacārya, who is also mentioned by
as their starting point. As their discussion, however, chiefly related, as we have stated above, to the dramatic art and as there existed side by side the rival theories of the more influential Alamkāra and Riti Schools, who never realized its aesthetic importance, the rasa-theory and its exponents never seem to have come into prominence, until the idea was taken up by the Dhvani School and worked into their system. In the meantime the dramaturgic Rasa School succeeded, to a certain extent, in reacting upon and influencing the rival schools, who were apparently forced to acknowledge rasa and accord it even a subsidiary place in their general theory of alamkāra or riti.

This will be evident from a reference to the standpoints of Bhāmaha and Daṇḍin, the two earliest known writers on Poetics whose works have survived. Without going into details we may state that to Bhāmaha the most important element in poetry is vakrōkta, which is apparently identified with atikṣayōkta and which probably means a kind of heightened expression which is the underlying principle of all poetic figures (alamkūras). Bhāmaha does not seem to possess a very clear notion of the function of rasa in poetry, the only direct reference to it occurring in the definition of the figure rasavat, which, in his opinion, should manifest the rasas clearly.\(^8\) Rasa is thus apparently included in the sphere of a particular alamkāra and given a very subordinate place in his system. Commenting, however, on Bhāmaha’s central verse on vakrōkta II. 85,

\[\text{saiśā sarvaiva vakrōktir anayārtho vibhāvyate,}\]

Abhinavagupta attempts to read into it his own idea of rasa and interprets vibhāvyate in the technical sense as pramadōdyānādir vibhāvatām niyate, viśeṣena ca bhāvyate, rasamayikriyata iti.\(^9\) In other words, he takes Bhāmaha to mean that by vakrōkta, the sense of poetry is rendered into a suitable factor of the rasa, so that by using the word vibhāvyate with the meaning given to it by Abhinava, Bhāmaha apparently implies that

Śaṅgadeva as one of his authorities (I. 1. 17). If this Mātrgupta is the same person mentioned by Kalhaṇa (III. 125, 252) as living under Harṣa Vikramāditya and referred to by Vāsudeva on Karpūra-maṇjari (Aufrecht, Cat. Cat. i. 448) as a writer on Alamkāra, then he must have been one of the earliest commentators on the present-day text of Bharata. But this view about the date of Mātrgupta is very doubtful. These points have been discussed in detail in my Sanskrit Poetics (vol. i, p. 24/), which see also on questions of chronology, omitted as a rule in this article.

\(^8\) rasavad darśita-spaṇṭa-śrīghārādi-rasam, III. 6.

\(^9\) Locana, p. 208.
rasa as well as alaṁkāra originates in vākrōkti. The scholastic speculation with regard to the origin and function of rasa does not appear, however, to have started in Bhāmaha’s time; and Bhāmaha, in common with Daṇḍin, never uses the technical terms vibhāva, anubhāva etc., so familiar to later theorists. On the other hand, Bhāmaha’s opinion seems to be that rasa need not be invariably present in poetry; what must be present is vākrōkti.\(^\text{13}\) In V. 3, no doubt, Bhāmaha speaks\(^\text{11}\) of kāvya-rasa as mitigating the rigour of the śāstra, a sentiment which is endorsed by Rudraṭa\(^\text{12}\) and which probably inspired the dictum of later writers that the śāstra is prabhū-sammita, while the kāvya is kāntā-sammita.\(^\text{13}\) It is probable that the phrase kāvya-rasa is used here in the general untechnical sense of ‘the flavour of poetry,’ but if we read, with Abhinavagupta,\(^\text{14}\) a technical meaning into it, it only shows that the earlier authors were satisfied with assigning only this pleasing and extraneous function to rasa.

The same remarks with regard to the recognition of rasa apply more or less to Daṇḍin; but Daṇḍin seems to be more alive to its importance than Bhāmaha. Like Bhāmaha, Daṇḍin allows rasa to be included in the poetic figures and therefore assigns to it only a minor place in his system. It may be contended that Daṇḍin gives greater prominence to rasa by including it in one of the essential qualities (guna) of diction (rīti), viz. in mādhurya, which is defined as the establishment of rasa in the word and in the object\(^\text{18}\); but from II. 292 it appears that Daṇḍin means by mādhurya guna mere absence of vulgarity (agrāmyatā) and does not contemplate the inclusion of rasa as such. This is made clear by I. 64 where agrāmya artha is said to be rasāvaha, as well as by the Ḫṛdayaṅgama commentary on this point: mādhurya-guṇe pradarśitah sābdārthayor agrāmyatayā jātaḥ raso vākyasya bhavati, alaṁkāratayā nirdiṣṭāṁ rasavattvam aṣṭa-vasāyattam (p. 167), the last part of this passage calling attention to the fact that the only cases, where the eight

---

\(^{10}\) I. 30, 36; II. 85–6; VI. 23.

\(^{11}\) svādu-kāvya-rasāṇāmi ram śāstram apyupayuñjate prathamādikṣa-madhavah pibanti kaṭubherajam.

\(^{12}\) XII. 1, 2.

\(^{13}\) Abhinava uses the terms prabhū-sammita and mitra-sammita (Locana, p. 12) which is followed by Mammata (Kāvya-pr. ed. Bombay Sanskrit. Ser. 1917, p. 9). Later writers distinguish (Ekāvali, pp. 13–5) between the Vedas which are prabhū-sammita, the Itihāsa, etc., which are mitra-sammita and the Kāvya which is kāntā-sammita.

\(^{14}\) Locana, p. 182.

\(^{15}\) tāci uṣṭunyapi rasa-ṣṭhitā I. 51.
rasas are admitted by Daṇḍin and which we shall discuss presently, occur in connexion with his inclusion of this element in poetic figures like rasavat. The mādhurya guṇa, according to Daṇḍin, may appear in two aspects, in so far as it creates vāg-rasa and vastu-rasa (I. 51), the former consisting of alliteration of similar sounds (śruti-vaṇṇaprśā) and the latter denoting absence of vulgarity (agrāmyatā). Thus Hemacandra rightly explains rasa in Daṇḍin’s mādhurya, according as it resides in vāc or vastu, in this way: śruti-varṇānuprāsābhyaṁ vāg-rasaḥ ... agrāmyabhūdheyatā tu vastu-rasaḥ (p. 198). The rasa in mādhurya, therefore, has a distinct technical connotation different from that imparted to it by the exponents of the Rasa School. A similar loose use of the term, which, however, Daṇḍin does not explain, as he does in this particular case, is to be found in III. 149 (or IV 26 in the Madras edition) where the phrase girāṁ rasaḥ should be interpreted, as it is done by Tarunavācaspati, as sādhutvam.

At the same time it cannot be affirmed that Daṇḍin was entirely ignorant of the idea of rasa; for he declares that poetic figures, to which he attaches great importance as an element of poetry, endow the sense with rasa (I. 62), although here as elsewhere the artha-rasa has a distinct reference to agrāmyatā from the context. Again, a mahā-kāvyā, in his opinion, should invariably possess rasa and bhāva (I. 18). A clearer indication is given by his treatment of the figures rasavat, preyas and ʿurjasev (II. 275–92), where he betrays an undoubted acquaintance with the existence of the eight recognised rasas, all of which he enumerates by their respective names and four of which (viz. kṛṣṇa, raudra, viśva, karuṇa) he illustrates as elements of the poetic figures under discussion. If we are to accept Abhinavagupta’s interpretation, Daṇḍin’s conception of rasa, like that of Lollaṭa, is what may be described as objective; or, in other words, Daṇḍin believes in the causal development of rasa through the ‘Excitants’ (vibhāvas) and ‘Ensuants’ (anubhāvas). Without mak-

---

17 The modern commentators are sometimes misled by their own ideas of rasa and interpret Daṇḍin in that light. For instance, Premacandra, commenting on Daṇḍin’s exposition of the kāvya-sārira in I. 10, notes kāvyaṁ śārīram ca, atmahūtāya rasād-vyan-gyaya deha-bhūta śārayai ca, although Daṇḍin himself nowhere speaks of the ‘suggestion’ of rasa as the ‘soul’ of poetry. The same remark applies to the modern commentary in recent ed. of Daṇḍin in the Benares Sanskrit Series.
18 On Bharata ch. vi (text of which follows below), reproduced partially by Hema-candra, p. 57 comm.
ing a definite statement on this point—for Daṇḍin’s somewhat meagre
indication hardly justifies us in doing so—we may, however, affirm that
Daṇḍin apparently speaks of rasa as being developed as an effect from a
temporary (e.g. rati or krodha) to a permanent mood (e.g. śṛṅgāra or
raudra); and the way in which he deals with the question lends colour
to Abhinavagupta’s interpretation, or at least indicates that Daṇḍin
was probably aware of some such theory. For, speaking of the figure
rasavat, which, according to him, possesses the characteristic of manifest-
ing the rasas, he gives an example of the manifestation of śṛṅgāra in
such a figure, with the remark ratih śṛṅgāratāṁ gataṁ rūpa-bāhulya-yogena
(II. 281). Similarly with reference to the development of raudra from
krodha, he says ityāruhya parāṁ kōṭim krodho raudrātmatāṁ gataṁ (II.
283). But the rasa in these figures is of course subordinate to the ex-
pressed figure itself (alaṁkāratayā smrtam, II. 287), of which it serves as
a means of embellishment. It seems, therefore, that Dandin was to some
extent cognisant of rasa, bhāva etc., but he could not give them a place
in his system except as an embellishment of the language or of the sense;
and this objective view of rasa was, apparently, chiefly responsible for
the subordinate position assigned to it in the Alāmpāra and the Rūti
Schools.

Although Vāmana makes a great advance on Daṇḍin’s system in
other respects, he does not seem to have gone further than his predeces-
sor in the treatment of rasa. He emphasises, no doubt, the necessity of
distinguishing between those characteristics (guna) which are essential
(nitya) and those (alaṁkāra) which are secondary (anitya) in poetry, and
marks an improvement on Bhāmaha and Daṇḍin, who include rasa only
in the poetic figures, by including it in the essential characteristics; for
he defines the artha-guṇa kānti as that essential excellence of sense “ in
which rasa is conspicuously present” (diptarasatvam III. 2.15). In this
respect, Vāmana in a way anticipates the importance which rasa assumed
in later schools; but it must be admitted that although Vāmana
includes rasa in the essentials of poetry, he had no clear idea of its
aesthetic significance except as an accessory element, just in the same
way as he had no clear notion of the ‘suggested sense’ except as a simi-
lar accessory element in a particular figure (IV. 3. 8).

Udbhāta, a follower of Bhāmaha and a contemporary of Vāmana,
adoheres in the main to the views of his predecessors and treats rasa as
a subsidiary element in poetry, including it like Bhāmaha in the figures
like rasavat; but in one passage, curiously enough, he apparently designates rasa as the 'soul' of poetry, without, however, setting up an aesthetic system on its basis. This verse occurs as VI. 17 in the text of Udbhāta's work published by Col. Jacob in the *J.R.A.S.*, 1897, p. 847; but the verse appears to be a little out of place in the context in which it occurs, and in the text published by the Nirṇaya Sāgara Press it is wanting, although given as a quotation with a tad āhuh in the accompanying commentary of Pratihārendurāja (p. 77). Prof. Jacob's supposition, therefore, based on Jacob's text, that Udbhāta was the first writer to consider the question as to what constitutes the 'soul' of poesy, and to regard rasa as such, does not appear to be at all plausible. Even if the verse in question be Udbhāta's, it should be taken as one of his obiter dicta, which does not fit in well with his system as a whole, although Pratihārendurāja would probably find a place for it by reading into Udbhāta, as he does, his own views about rasa. It is true that Udbhāta betrays a closer acquaintance with the rasa-theory in some form or other and its technicalities, using terms like vibhāva, sthāyin, saṅcārin (IV. 4) and anubhāva (IV. 2) and enumerating after Bharata VI. 15 the eight orthodox rasas with the addition of a ninth śīnta in the category; but all this is taken into account as an embellishment of the expressed figure, or in other words, rasa is not considered for its own sake, but because it helps to emphasise and constitute the charm of the particular figure. Hence Pratihārendurāja remarks that the question as to the nature of rasa and bhāva, and how far they may stand as a mere kavyālāṁkāra or as the very 'soul' of poetry, is not discussed, partly for fear of prolixity and partly because it is not relevant.11

11 rasidyaḥbhīṣhitāṁ kāvyam jivad-rūpatayā yataḥ
kathyaṁ tad rasindināṁ kāvyātmakāṁ vyacasthitam.
20 ZDMG, 1902, p. 396. In a conversation recently with the author of this article, Prof. Jacobi admitted that his contention was no longer tenable.
21 Ed. Kāvyamālā, p. 59. Not much capital can be made out of the fact, referred to in footnote 7 above, that Śāṅgadeva mentions Udbhāta as one of the commentators on Bharata. If it were true, it only shows that Udbhāta was conversant with Bharata's theory, as his citation of a half-line from Bharata and use of technical terms like eibhāva etc., would indicate. It does not prove that he belonged to the school of Bharata. On the other hand, evidence is not wanting that Udbhāta belonged to the Aśaṅkāra School (Ruṣyaka, p. 7) and was a follower of Bhāmaha, whose definitions of many poetic figures (e.g. rasavat, atīdayākhyā, sasanādeha, sahākhyā, upaknutil, utpekeśā, yathāsāṅkhyā, aprastuta-praśāśeśā, paryāyākhyā, ākārap, eibhāvanā, viprālāha and bhāvika) he faithfully copies and on whose text he also appears to have written a vīvāraṇa (Prati-
Rudrata, on the other hand, seems to be the earliest writer who explicitly includes a treatment of rasa as a separate topic, devoting four chapters to the discussion of rasa and its adjunct subject of the hero and heroine (nâyaka, nâyikâ). It is not clear, however, what theoretical significance he attaches to rasa; for although at the beginning of his work he praises the poets who have won eternal fame by composing poetry enlivened by rasa, he devotes a comparatively small part of his work to its treatment and is entirely silent with regard to the theoretical aspect of the question. Out of the sixteen chapters into which his work is divided, only two chapters deal directly with rasa, not theoretically but descriptively, while the rest is taken up with the details of the poetic figures (alaîkâras), on which apparently he puts greater emphasis. Speaking of the necessity of making a poem sarasa, he says (XII. 1) that to those who enjoy the rasas but fight shy of the dry sāstras, instruction in the caturvargas is easier to impart through the medium of delectable writing; and this seems, in his opinion, to be the chief motive for inspiring the sense of poetry with rasa. Rudrata, in his theoretical tendencies, has no affinity with the Rasa School, but rather with the Alamkâra School; and we have the testimony of Ruuyaka and Jayaratha to this effect. Ruuyaka says 11 that Rudrata laid special stress on alaîkâra, in which he comprised the three kinds of ‘suggestion’ including the suggestion of rasa (rasa-dheani); and that in the figure rasaveat and the like, the rasa and bhâva implied are taken as elements which only heighten the charm of the expressed idea. Nami-sâdhhu, Rudrata’s commentator, however, explaining Rudrata XII. 2, states in the usual metaphorical language that in the opinion of his author, sabda and artha constitute the body of poetry, the poetic figures take the place of artificial ornaments, while rasa resembles natural qualities like beauty, prowess etc. (rasas tu saundaryâdaya iva sahajâ gunâh). This interpretation only shows that like Vâmana, Rudrata was a step in advance of Bhâmaha and Dañdîn, inasmuch as he would regard rasa as a natural quality which is not extraneous but stands in intimate relation to poetry; but there is nothing anywhere in Rudrata which will support this elaborate description, especially as Rudrata can scarcely be supposed to look upon poetic figures, which

hâr nêdu p. 13; Locana, pp. 10, 40, 159; Hemacandra, p. 17; Ruuyaka, p. 183; Samudrabandha, pp. 89-90).

11 Ed. Kâvyamâlâ, p. 5. Samudrabandha agrees with this.
are of utmost importance in his view of poetry, as mere artificial ornaments of expression.

The older writers on poetics, therefore, before the advent of the Dhvani School, contented themselves with the working out of the outward form of expression and hardly troubled themselves with the question of an ulterior aesthetic principle, the 'soul' (ātman) of poesy; nor do they identify, as some later writers do, this 'soul' with the subtle psychological factor known as rasa. Vāmana, no doubt, offers to solve the question by declaring (I. 2. 6) that the rīti, which has been usually but inadequately translated as 'style' or 'diction,' is this 'soul'; but in Vāmana's view, the rīti is not the expression of poetic individuality but the objective beauty of its representation called forth by the unification of certain more or less fixed excellences, known as guṇas, or by adjustment of word and sense. The older writers, therefore, lay the greatest emphasis on the poetic figures or alaṁkāras, as Ruyyaka (p. 7) testifies, or on rīti or diction in the objective sense; and although cognisant of that aesthetic delectableness, which should be present in all poetry and which in Sanskrit goes by the name of rasa, they could not yet harmonise it well into their theory of externals, and treated it more or less as an embellishment of the language by including it in certain poetic figures, or by allowing it to form an element of the excellences of diction. The rasa could come into their system only through this backdoor, as it were. It is partly for this reason that the Dhvanikāra (III. 52) condemns earlier theories as crude and insufficient for the purpose of explaining the nature of poetry and expounds his own aesthetic doctrine in which dhvani, especially rasa-dhvani, plays such an important part.

The Dhvanikāra, however, in his exposition of rasa-dhvani, seems to have been greatly influenced by the dramaturgic Rasa School. Bharata declared that the business of the drama is to evolve one or more of the eight rāsas; and therefore a more or less elaborate psychology of human sentiments had been analysed in the service of the dramatic art. Bharata's ideas on these psychological processes and on rasa, which is the final internal experience consisting in the consciousness of a certain objective condition of the ego, were elaborated by his commentators and followers till the Dhvanikāra, followed by Ānandavardhana and Abhinavagupta, came into the field. From the earlier drama and dramatic theory, therefore, the idea of rasa was taken over
to poetry and poetic theory; and as the transition from the naive to the sentimental poetry was accomplished, the theorists went a step further and erected *rasa* into one of its essential aesthetic foundations. Ānandavardhana is quite explicit on this point when he says *etac ca rasādi-tātparyaṇa kāvyā-nibandhanam bharatādāvapi suprasiddham eva* (p. 181). In other words, what was already well established in the drama by Bharata and others thus found its way into poetry, profoundly modifying, as it did, the entire conception of *kāvyā*. In the same way, Abhinavagupta, commenting on the concluding portion of the prose passage just before Bharata VI. 33, says: *nātyāt samudaya-rūpād rasah, nātya eva rasah, kāvyē’pi nātyāyamāna eva rasah kāvyārthaḥ*. Similarly Rudrabhaṭṭa states at the beginning of his work (I. 5) that Bharata and others have already discussed *rasa* in connexion with the drama, while his own object is to apply it to the case of poetry.

It must be noted, however, that although all later theorists take Bharata as their starting point, and build up their own theories round his authoritative, if somewhat meagre text, Bharata himself, like most old masters, is very simple in his statements: and the subject does not appear to have been yet brought into the realm of scholastic speculation. Bharata’s work is encyclopaedic in scope, but his primary theme is the drama and his conception of poetry dramatic, a view which perhaps inspired Vāmana’s partiality towards dramatic composition expressed in I. 3. 30–32 and which is concisely put by Abhinavagupta by saying *kāvyam tāvan dasārūpātmaṇam eva*. In such a composition, *rasa*, according to Bharata, should be predominant; for he says that the drift of sense which arises from *rasa* appeals to the heart and pervades the body, like fire lighting up dry pieces of wood. Without *rasa* there can be no sense of poetry. Although Bharata does not go much into technicalities, he seems to be of opinion that the *vibhāvas* and *anubhāvas*, which, according to later theory, constitute the essential factors, call forth *rasa*; but he is not clear as to what this process of evolution exactly is. He explains *bhāva*, the basis of *rasa*, generally as that which brings into existence the sense of poetry through the three kinds of representation, viz., through words, gestures and internal feeling. This *bhāva*, when permanent and not transitory, reaches the state of *rasa* through the

21 VII. 7  
23 vāg-aṅga-sattvopetān kāvyārthān bhāvayantībhāvāḥ, op. cit., p., 100; op. cit. p., 69.
factors known as vibhāva and anubhāva. A vibhāva is explained thus: vibhāva iti kasmād ucyate, vibhāvo nāma vijnānārthaḥ, vibhāvyante'nena vāg-aṅga-sattvābhinaya ityato vibhāvaḥ. The word vibhāva is used therefore to imply knowledge or understanding and may be explained generally as that which makes the three kinds of representation capable of being sensed. In the same way, the anubhāva is explained as that which follows upon and makes the three kinds of representation actually sensed. The third element of rasa, the vyabhicāri-bhāva, consists of accessory facts which help and strengthen it, and is etymologically described as vi abhi ityetāvupasragau, cara gatau dhātuḥ, vividham ābhimukhyena rasān carantī tyabhicārīnāḥ. As to what relation these factors bear to rasa and how this state of relish is brought about, Bharata simply lays down vibhāvānubhāva- vyabhicāri-sāmyogad rasa-nispatīḥ, a formula which, in spite of his own explanation, is so ambiguous with respect to the exact significance of the central terms sāmyoga and nispatī that a great deal of controversy has gathered round its interpretation and as each commentator has tried to explain it in his own way, it has given rise, as we shall presently see, to a number of theories on rasa. Bharata's own explanation, if it can be called an explanation, is that just as a beverage is accomplished through various seasoned articles and herbs, so the permanent mood, the sthāyibhāva, reinforced (upāyata) by various bhāvas, attain the state of rasa; and it is so called because its essence consists in its taste or relish (rasa iti kath padārthaḥ, ucyate āsvādyatevāt). He also explains that the sthāyibhāva is the basis of rasa because it attains, as it were, mastery or sovereignty among the forty-nine different bhāvas (viz. eight sthāyi-bhāvas, eight sattvika-bhāvas and thirty-three vyabhicāri-bhāvas mentioned by him in VII ad 6 and VI. 16 ff.), which naturally rest upon it as being pre-

---

26 sthāyina eva bhāva rasa-avam āpnuvanti, op. cit. p. 102; op. cit. p. 70. tatra vibhāvānubhāva-vyabhicāri-sāmyogad rasa-nispatīḥ, op. cit., p. 87; op. cit., p. 62.
27 op. cit., pp. 100-1; op. cit., p. 69.
28 anubhāva iti kasmād ucyate, yad ayam anubhāvyayatā mānārthābhīhināpna vāg-aṅgā- sattva-kṛtam abhīnayam iti, op. cit., p. 101; op. cit., p. 69.
29 Bharata deals with lākṣaṇa, alāṅkāra, doṣa and guna under vācika abhīnaya treated in Ch. XIV to XX; and these are thus made subordinate to rasa. All these elements are considered in so far as they form dramatic embellishments; but lākṣaṇas disappear in later works, being included either under alāṅkāra (Dandin II. 366 and Daśārthā ed. Hall IV. 78) or under guna and alāṅkāra (Viśvanātha VI., p. 332, ed. Durgāprastāda).
sumably the principal theme of the composition in question. Nothing definite can be concluded from all this except that in Bharata’s opinion the sthāyi-bhāva is apparently the basis of rasa, while the vibhāva, anubhāva and vyabhicārin contribute to its final realisation. But this explanation by its very ambiguity or vagueness taxed the ingenuity of the commentators, its general trend anticipating theories like the utpattī-vāda of Lollāṭa and the anuṃiti-vāda of Śaṅkuka, while special technicalities (used probably in an untechnical sense by Bharata himself) like vyānjīta and sāmāṇya-guṇa-yoga occurring in the text, suggesting or lending support to specialised doctrines like the vyakti-vāda of Abhinavagupta or the bhukti-vāda of Bhaṭṭa Nāyaka.

The general foundations of the theory, however, remain as fixed by Bharata. It is practically admitted on all hands that the rasa is realised when a permanent mood or sthāyi-bhāva is brought to a relishable condition through the three elements, viz. the vibhāva, the anubhāva and the vyabhicāri-bhāva. Of these the first two are the more important, the vyabhicārin being only concomitant or accessory. Bharata’s explanation of these terms are rendered with greater precision by his followers. By sthāyi-bhāva in poetry and drama are meant certain more or less permanent conditions of the mind, such as love, grief, anger or fear. This permanent mood, constituting the principal theme of composition and running through all other moods like the thread of a garland, cannot be overcome by those akin to it or those opposed to it, but can only be reinforced. Those elements which respectively excite, follow and strengthen (if we may use these expressions) the sthāyi-bhāva are in poetry and drama known as vibhāva, anubhāva and vyabhicāri-bhāva, although in the ordinary world they may be known as mundane cause and effect (laukika kāraṇa and kārya). Devoid of technicalities, a vibhāva may be taken as that which makes the permanent mood capable of being sensed, an anubhāva as that which makes it sensed, while a vyabhicāri- (also called saṅcāri-) bhāva as that which acts at an auxiliary or gives an impetus to


32 Ballantyne renders these terms conveniently, if not very adequately, as the Excitant, the Ensuant and the Accessory respectively, a nomenclature which is accepted by Dr. Gaṅgānāth Jhā in his translation of the Kāvyaprakāśa. Prof. Jacobi, however (ZDMG., 1902, p. 394 ff.), uses the terms Factor, Effect and Concurrent.
it. In the case of Love as a mood, the stock-examples given of vibhāva are women and the seasons; of anubhāva, glance and embrace; of vyabhicārin, the transient subordinate feelings of joy and anxiety. Now Bharata says that the rasa is realised through a certain correlation of these elements with the sthāyīvibhāva or permanent mood. The question therefore arises, to which Bharata himself gives no definite solution, viz. what this process of realisation actually consists in, and what relation do these elements bear to rasa in this process, the solution depending upon the explanation of the two much-discussed terms samyoga and nispatti in Bharata’s original dictum cited above.

Bhaṭṭa Lollaṭa appears to be one of the earliest commentators of Bharata to offer an explanation. But excepting the brief review of his opinion in Abhinavagupta’s commentary on Bharata, which is copied more or less by all subsequent writers from Mammaṭa and reproduced almost literally but anonymously by Hemacandra, Lollaṭa is unknown to us and his work is apparently lost. Very little can be gathered from this summary exposition by an adverse critic; but it appears that Lollaṭa took the vibhāva as the direct cause (kāraṇa) of rasa which is therefore an effect (anukārya or utpādiya), and the word nispatti of Bharata is explained as utpatti or pusṭi. The rasa, found in characters like Rāma, is attributed to the actor who imitates the character in form, dress and actions, and thus charms the spectator. Mammaṭa and his followers agree with this interpretation of Lollaṭa by Abhinava, but they make it more clear by saying that the permanent mood or the sthāyin is directly connected with the hero (mukhyayā vr̥ttyā = sāksāt sambandhena), but it is recognised as existing in the actor through

33 The extracts given below are taken from a transcript, published herewith, of the Trivandrum Palace MS prepared for me through the kind offices of Dr. Gaṅgānāth Jhū. Lollaṭa’s views are reviewed, after Abhinava, in Mammaṭa IV, ed. Bom. Sansk. Ser., p. 87; Hemacandra p. 57; Mallinātha on Viḍyādharma, p. 85; Govinda, ed. Kāvyamālī, p. 63. Hemacandra practically reproduces Abhinavagupta’s very words.

34 the bhāṣya-lollāta-prabhāṣṣya tāvad evam vyācacyaut. Vibhāva-diṣṭā saṁyogor ihākṣat sthāyīnām tato rasa-nispattīḥ. Tatra vibhāvaś cāttavyeśthā thyāyāṃśikābhī utpattattvā kāraṇam; anubhāvaś ca na rasa-jāyā cātva vyākṣetā, te tām rasa-kāraṇātvena gaṇandharetī, api tu bhāṣānām eva etc. Abh. on Bh.

35 sthāyīnā vibhāva-mahābhūta-dīśaḥ aparitā rasaḥ, sthāyī bharate-anupacitaḥ. Sa cibha yo’pyanukārī ye nukārtyaapi [vi]kārāṇānandhāna bhāṣā iti cārayarānām ca-yam pakṣāḥ, Abh. on Bh.

36 rāmādavanukārī ye tad rūpadānandhānaṁ nartakeśi pratiyamānō rasaḥ, Mammaṭa loc. cit., where the term pratiyamānō is interpreted by Govinda as āropamānō (naṭe tu tulya rūpadānandhāna-vaśād āropamānō sāmājikānām ca-matākāra-hetūḥ, p. 61).
a clever imitation of the original character, this imitation being apparently the source of the charm (camatkārāhetu) to the spectator. The locus of the rasa, therefore, is supposed to be in the hero; but it is not clear how it is apparently transferred to the actor and how the spectator is charmed by a feeling which does not exist in him. Govinda, therefore, rightly comments on this view of Lollāta: tad apekṣalam, sāmājikesu tad-abhāve tatra camatkārānubhava-virodhāt, na ca tajñānānaṃ eva camatkārāhetuḥ, laukika-śṛṅgārādi-darśanenāpi camatkāra-prasaṅgāt (p. 63).

The rival school of Śaṅkuka, we are told by Abhinavagupta, and following him, by Hemacandra, bring forward ingenious objections, into the technicalities of which we need not enter here. The later writers, however, demur to this cause-and-effect theory on more philosophical grounds. An effect, they argue, may exist when its efficient cause is destroyed; but as the life of rasa is circumscribed by the investigation of the vibhāvas (vibhāvādi-parāmarṣa-jīvitāvadhi), it disappears when the latter disappear, a fact which goes to prove that the rasa must not be taken as an ordinary mundane (laukika) effect. Again, the cause and the effect cannot be contemporaneous; if rasa is supposed to be an effect, its relish cannot be, as it actually is, contemporaneous with the appearance of the vibhābas. Hence Viśvanātha remarks that if rasa is an effect, having for its cause the perception of the vibhāvas, then at

Śaṅkuka, for instance, maintains that Bharata apparently uses the terms rasa and sthāyin synonymously, for the latter mentions the same vibhāvas with respect to a particular sthāyin and its corresponding rasa; and hence if they are identical, there is no question of one being produced from the other. Nothing can be gained by replying that in its undeveloped state it is sthāyin, but in the developed state it is rasa; for such a supposition will involve an infinite multiplication (ānantyāpatīḥ) of the stages of sthāyin and its corresponding rasa. If it is said that in its highest stage of development it is rasa, then how can we imagine sixteen different varieties of hāṣya-rasa (Bharata VI. 52) or the ten different stages of śṛṅgāra (Bharata XXII. 154–175). Besides the priority of bhāva in relation to rasa is not always vouchsafed by experience, and a great sorrow felt in its intensity at the beginning is not seen to subside in time but grow stronger (see Hemacandra, pp. 57–8).

Among the earlier authors, Daṇḍin, as already noted, appears to have been influenced by Lollāta's theory, which is entirely discredited in later times. This does not argue the priority of Lollāta to Daṇḍin, for the theory, in which the influence of Mimbānsakas is apparent, might have obtained in the schools before Lollāta first brought it into prominence.

Mallinātha, p. 87 kāryate ghaṭṭiveṣa vibhāvādi-nimitta-nāśeḥ pi rasdmurtī-prasān-gaḥ . . . na cēṣyālaukikasya svā-prakāśānandāmataḥ kāraṇa laukika-pramāṇa-ganyatvam, see also pp. 93–4; Govinda, p. 69 vibhāvādi-parāmarṣasya kāraṇavām yadi syāt tadā nimitta-kāraṇavām, etc.
the time of the relish of rasa, the vībhāvas would not be perceived; for we do not find the simultaneous perception of a cause and its effect. The perception of the touch of the sandal-wood unguent and the perception of the pleasure produced thereby cannot take place simultaneously, however, rapid the one may succeed the other.\footnote{Ch. III, p. 86, ed. Durgāprasadā.}

Śaṅkuka, therefore, the next commentator on Bharata, rejecting this theory, lays down that the rasa is not produced as an effect but inferred. The permanent mood is inferred to exist in the actor—though not actually existing in him\footnote{nāte 'tyamāvidyāmāno 'pi, Hemacandra, p. 58.}—by the means of the vībhāvas etc., cleverly exhibited by him in his acting; so as to produce an illusion of identity with the feelings of the hero\footnote{rāmādyabheda-bhāvatra naṇe tatprakāśitair eva vībhāvādibhir anumāṇaḥ, Mallinātha, p. 85.} ; and the mood thus inferred, being sensed by the spectator through its exquisite beauty,\footnote{vastu-saundarya-balād rasaniyateena sthāyinām anyānumeya-vailakṣaṇyāt, Govinda, p. 65; practically paraphrasing Mammāta, p. 50.} adds to itself a peculiar charm, and thus develops into a relishable condition called rasa. The realisation of rasa, therefore, is simply a process of logical inference, the niṣpatti of Bharata being explained as anumāṇa; and the vībhāva stands to rasa in the relation of anumāṇapaka or gamaka to anumāpya or gamya. But the mood itself, though inferred in this way from the relation of the major and middle terms (liṅgalatatah), is yet cognised as different from the objects of ordinary inference, being inferred, as it were, by force of its exquisite charm as something to be relished on account of its connexion with the vībhāvas etc. which, though artificial, are not recognised as such.\footnote{kūraṇa-kūrya-sahakāribhiḥ kṛtānair api tathā ' nabhīnanyamanānaḥ, Mammāta IV; also Hemacandra, p. 58.} This cognition or knowledge is characterised\footnote{Mammāta ibid. Hemacandra, expanding Abhinava's exposition on this point, puts it in this way: na cātra nartaka eva sukhitī pratipattiḥ, nāpyayam eva rāma iti, na cāpy, am sukhitī, nāpi rāmaḥ nyād vā na veyam iti, na cāpy tat-sadāpi iti, kānta samyakā.} as based on what is called citra-turaga-nyāya,

(viz. the analogy by which a horse in a picture is called a horse), and should be differentiated from the true ('he is Rāma'), the false ('he is Rāma' with a following negation 'he is not Rāma'), the doubtful ('he may or may not be Rāma') knowledge, as well as from the knowledge of similarity ('he is like Rāma').

This theory, however, has been discredited by later schools, be-
cause, as Govinda concisely sums up the objections, it disregards the well-recognised fact that the inference of a thing can never produce the same charm as its direct cognition. It has been pointed out that the rasa is not capable of being cognised by the ordinary means of arriving at knowledge, for the feeling of Rama, the hero represented on the stage, being past, cannot be cognised by the organs of sense belonging to the present time and the present place. The anumāna-theory is discussed elaborately in connexion with the theory of 'suggestion,' coming topically within the province of the suggestion of rasa (rasa-dhvani), by later adherents of the Dhvani School; and the general argument with which it is sought to be discarded is that the vibhāvas cannot be taken as the middle term in proving the sthāyin, because the vibhāvas do not stand in the same relation to the sthāyin as the middle term (sādhana) does to the major term (cādyya), but are simply its suggestor (vyānjaka).

mihyā-sāṅśaya-sāṅśraya-pratitiibhyo vilakṣaṇe na citra turagādi-nyūrṇa ya bhukhi rāma asaivyam iti pratir aṣṭi (p. 59).

... etad apyahdayagrāhī, yateḥ pratyaksam eva jñānāh sa-camatkārah nānumityādir iti toka-prasiddhim avadhānyathā-kalpane mānabhbāv, p. 65.

... yad api rāṣṭrayādhyāpyatēbhīdhānān tad api rāmasya rater atisavat sannihita deiva-varttamāna kālendriya-sannikareśva jādypatebhīprāyena, Vidyādhara, p. 94.

The anumāna-theory never appears to have received liberal recognition in the hands of later theorists. Mahimabhaṭṭa, author of the Vyaṅkti-viveka, was the only known writer who put forward a similar theory; for, trying to prove in opposition to the accepted dhvani-theory that the so-called dhvani, including rasa-dhvani, can be arrived at by the ordinary process of logical inference, he professed himself to be an anumāti-vidūś in his idea of rasa. We do not possess enough data to decide what relation, if any, Mahima bore to his predecessor Śāṅkuka. We have the testimony indeed of a very late (A.D. 1700) and not unusually careful writer, Rāmacarana, who commented on the Śāhīya-darpaṇa, that Mahima was in reality a follower of Śāṅkuka (śāṅkuka-matānyāyīnām vyākti-vivekatārādinān matsai dāyaati, ed. Durgāprasadā, p. 248; ed. Roer, p. 121 note); but the omission by Mahima himself, who throughout takes pride in his originality, of all reference, direct or indirect, to his predecessor is strangely significant. It is probable, however, that the theory developed by Mahima was not originated by him. Ānanda-vardhana himself refutes at some length (pp. 201 ff.) a similar theory which tried to establish that the cognition of the unexpressed is nothing more than the cognition of the object of a logical conclusion so that the relation of the suggester and the suggested is that of the syllogistic middle and major terms. Mahimabhaṭṭa's theory bears little resemblance to that of Śāṅkuka; for the former proceeds in a quite different line. Although accepting the new concept of dhvani, he differs from Ānanda in holding that it can be realised by anumāna, and that therefore there is no need to establish a separate function of vyāñjanā; and by a process of elaborate destructive criticism, he attempts to make the definition of dhvani conform to what he calls kṣarynumitā as the process in which another sense is revealed by the expressed sense (vāca) or by a sense inferred, sometimes connectedly from it (p. 22). He argues that the existence of a krama or sequence however imperceptible (asaṁ-
The vibhāvas, therefore, are neither the efficient cause (kāraka-hetu) nor the logical cause (jñāpaka-hetu) of rasa, as held respectively by Lollāṭa and Śaṅkuka. In both these theories the difficulty remains, namely, that if rasa is an objective entity, produced or inferred, how can it bring about a subjective feeling of relish in the audience in whom these factors are presumably absent? If, on the other hand, it is supposed that it exists in the audience also, the question still remains as to how the particular feelings of a particular hero, like Rāma who is different or superior to the spectator himself, can be relished or realised as his own by the spectator. These objections are ably set forth by Bhaṭṭa Nāyaka, as interpreted by Abhinava in his Locana (pp. 67–8): rasa yadi para-gata-tayā pratiṣṭaye, tarhi tātasthīyam eva syāt. Na ca sva-gata-tvena rāmādi-carita-maraya kāvyād asau pratiṣṭaye. Sva-gata-tvena ca pratiṣṭa svātmanī rasayotpattir evābhivyapagatā syāt, sā cāyuktā, sāmāyikānām pratyavibhāvatā. Kāntātvam sādhāraṇām visanā-vikāsa-hetur vibhāvanāyām prayojakām iti cet. devatā-varjanādau tad api katham? Na ca sva-kāntā-smarayām madhye saṃvedyate. Aloka-sāmāyīnām ca rāmādinām ye samudra-setu-bandhādayo vibhāvas te kathāṃ sādhāraṇām bhajeyyā?

Hence Bhaṭṭa Nāyaka attempts to refute these earlier theories (as well as those of the new Dhvani School who later on found a champion in Abhinavagupta), and sets up a peculiar theory of aesthetic enjoyment (bhoga). He argues that (1) rasa cannot be produced as an effect, because the causes, namely, the vibhāvas, being non-realities, cannot bring about real effects; (2) it cannot be inferred, because the real character, Rāma, not being before the audience, his feeling does not exist, and what does not exist cannot be inferred (na ca tattvato rāmasya smṛtir, anupalabdhadhā).
Besides, how is it possible for the ordinary reader or spectator to identify himself with the extraordinary virtues of a hero like Rāma?

To solve these difficulties, Bhaṭṭa Nāyaka, as interpreted by Abhinava and others, maintains that the rasa is enjoyed in connexion with the vibhāvas through the relation of the enjoyer and the enjoyed (bhōjaka and bhōjya).

This school postulates three different functions of a word, namely, abhidhā (already admitted by Mimāṁsakas and grammarians), bhāvakatva and bhōjakatva. Abhidhā, however, is not Denotation merely, but is given an extended meaning so to include laksanā or Indication in its scope, thus embracing the two functions already analysed by previous speculation. Bhāvakatva which, as Abhinavagupta suggests, is derived apparently from Bharata’s general definition of bhāva, is described as the power of generalisation which makes the vibhāvas, as well as the sthāyi-bhāva, sensed in their general character without any reference to their specific properties. For instance, the vibhāva, Sitā, is understood through this power not as a particular individual but in the general character of a woman; and the sthāyi-bhāva, e.g. Rāma’s love towards her, is taken as love in general without any reference to the agent or the object.

By the third function of bhōjakatva, the sthāyin is enjoyed in this general form, accompanied by the vibhāvas, sensed also in a general form: and this enjoyment is described as a process of delection similar to the enlightened, self-sufficient and blissful knowledge, arising, in the language of the Sāṁkhya philosophers which is borrowed by these theorists, from the prominence of the attribute of goodness (sattva) in a man and different from what is known as worldly happiness. It is differentiated from the two kinds of knowledge anubhava and smarana;

---

49 abhidhāpi lakṣaṇaśca, Locana, p. 68; tatrabhidhā nirantara-santarārtham-ṣañtabhavena dvidhā, Govinda, p. 66.

50 vibhāvadi-sādhūrāṇikaranaṇatmanābhidhāto deviyenāśeṇa bhāvakatva-vyāpāreṇa bhāvamanāḥ, Abh. on Bh.; tae caitat bhāvakatvam nāma, yat kavyasya tad-vibhāvaddināṁ sādhūrāṇatvād-pādenāṁ nāma, Locana, loc. cit.; bhāvakatvam sādhūrāṇikaraṇam, tena ca vyāpāreṇa vibhāvādayaḥ sthāyī ca sādhūrāṇikriyante, Govinda, p. 66.

51 sādhūrāṇikaraṇam caitat eva yat sitādi vīśeṣānāṁ kāmintvādī-sāṁśayaśc hitiḥ, Govinda, loc. cit.

52 sādhūrāṇikriyena vibhāvādikena bhāvapyaścaraṇaḥ sādhūrāṇi-pādenāḥ pārihāreṇa sādhūrāṇa-śayayānusādhyāmāṇāḥ sthāyī, Mallinātha, p. 85.

53 satviddreka-prakāśāpradānadvaya-savīvid viśeṣānti-sattatvena bhogenā bhujyate, Mامma, explained by Govinda as bhogai ca satva-guṇađeśkāt prakāśate ya śāntas tat-svarūpāśdāntamāṇo ya saṁvit tat-svarūpo lāukika-sukhānubhava-vilakṣaṇaḥ, iti sāṁkhyā-sādhūrāṇikaradyaṇaḥ vīśeṣānte, p. 66.
and consisting of the qualities of melting, pervading and expanding the mind, it is compared to the indescribable bliss of divine contemplation. According to Bhaṭṭa Nāyaka, therefore, the rasa consists in the sthāyi-bhāva or the permanent mood, experienced in a generalised form in poetry and drama through the powers of abhidhā and bhāvakatva, and enjoyed by a blissful process, known as bhoga, till it is raised to a state of pleasurable relish, which is not worldly (alaukika) and which is akin to the philosophic meditation of Brahma.

It will be noticed that all these different theories about rasa, though applied to drama and poetry, are at the same time tinged with the doctrines of the various schools of Indian Philosophy. Lollaṭa appears to be a Mīmāṁsaka; Śaṅkuka a Naiyāyika; while Bhaṭṭa Nāyaka seems to follow the Sāṅkhya doctrine. But what is more noticeable is that in Bhaṭṭa Nāyaka we mark a transition from what may be called the objective to the subjective view of rasa, and an understanding that the whole phenomenon should be explained in terms of inward experience. If we may judge from the somewhat elaborate criticism levelled against this theory, it seems to have produced a greater impression and no doubt, paved the way for the later theory of Abhinavagupta, to whom really belongs the credit of elaborating the new aesthetic system of the Dhvanikāra and Ānandavardhana. From his extensive literary and philosophical studies as well as from his interest in the works of Bharata and his followers, Abhinava seems to have realised that no system of Poetics, like no system of Dramaturgy, can ever completely ignore the feelings, moods and sentiments, and must find an important place for rasa, the manifestation of which is much the business of poetry as of the drama. The insufficiencies of the earlier theories on rasa are obvious, but it was a happy idea to elaborate the theory in such a way as not only to supply these deficiencies but also to fit it well into the dhvani-theory formulated by the new school.

It is not necessary for us to enter into the details of the dhvani-theory; it will suffice here to indicate generally how the idea of rasa

---

44 rasa'nuḥbava-smṛtyuddhi-vilakṣaṇena . . . druti-vistara vikāsātmā . . . para-brahmāvasvāda-savidhena bhogena, Abh. on Bh.; bhāvite ca rase tasya bhogab, yo'nuḥbava-smaraṇa pratipatibhyo vilakṣaṇa eva druti-vistara-vikāsā-nāma . . . para-brahmāvasvāda-sacivaḥ, Locana, p. 68.

45 There is some difference in the general theoretical positions of Ānandavardhana and Abhinavagupta, which will be noticed in its proper place later.
was worked up into them. The Dhvani School, in its analysis of the essentials of poetry, found that the contents of a good poem may be generally distinguished into two parts. The one is that which is expressed and includes what is given in so many words; the other content is not expressed, but must be added to it by the imagination of reader or the listener. The unexpressed or the suggested part, which is distinctly linked up with the expressed and which is developed by a peculiar process of suggestion (vyañjanā), is taken to be the 'soul' or essence of poetry. To the grammarians and learned writers, it seemed paradoxical to state that the very essence of a poem is that which is not even expressed. On the other hand, some form of symbolical speech, in which wisdom demands that one should express oneself more in hints and suggestions than in actual words, was always in vogue, and the poets had been more or less partial to the method of speaking in metaphor or wrapping up their ideas in transparent allegories. But the suggestive poetry is something different from the merely metaphorical, which Vāmana had already amply recognised and on which the Alamkāra and the Riti Schools had put so much emphasis. The metaphorical or the allegoric, however veiled it may be, is still in a sense expressed and must be taken as such; but the suggestive (vyañgya) is always unexpressed, and is therefore a source of greater charm through its capacity of concealment; for this concealment, in which consists the essence of art, is in reality no concealment at all. The new aesthetic school claims a particular function of suggestion, appertaining to words and their senses, whereby the unexpressed or the inexpressible is called into being; or to speak with Kant, whereby poetry becomes an expression of 'the aesthetic idea.'

Now the unexpressed, through the suggestive power of word or idea, may be an unexpressed thought or matter (vastu) or an unexpressed figure of speech (alamkāra), but in most cases it is a mood or feeling (rasa) which is directly inexpressible. The Dhvani School, therefore, took up the moods and feelings as an element of the unexpressed and tried to harmonise the idea of rasa with the theory of dhvani. It was realised that poetry was not, as Daṇḍin thought, the mere clothing of agreeable ideas in agreeable language; the feelings and moods play an important part in it. But the feelings and moods in themselves are inexpressible. We can give a name to them, but naming a mood or feeling is not equivalent to expressing or developing it. At best, therefore,
we can suggest it. What the poet can directly express or describe are the vibhāvas etc.; but with the help of these expressed elements, which must be generalised and conceived not as they appear in the mundane world but as they may be imagined in a poetic world, the poet can awaken in us, through the power of suggestion inherent in words or ideas, a particular alaukika condition of the soul in which the relish of the feeling is possible. It is true that the poet cannot rouse the same mood or feeling as the person (e.g. Rāma) whom he describes, felt in times past, but he can call up a reflection of it, which is similar in some respects; and this condition of enjoyment in the reader’s soul is the relish of rasa, which can be brought into consciousness by the power of suggestion inherent in words and their sense.

Here comes in the new colour given to the rasa-theory by the exponents of the Dhvani School. They interpret Bharata’s much-discussed dictum to mean that rasa is suggested by the union of the permanent mood with the vibhāvas through the relation of the suggested (vyāngya) and the suggestor (vyānjaka); and that the nispatti of Bharata should mean abhivyakti. Commenting on Bhaṭṭa Nāyaka’s theory, Abhinavagupta points out that there is no need, as there is no authority, for assuming the two powers of bhāvakatva and bhogikarana; for they are implicitly included in the idea of rasa-vyāñjanā and its ultimate āsvāda. Bharata’s dictum kāvyārthaḥ bhāvayanantī bhāvāḥ (VII. ed. Grosset, p. 100) implies bhāvakatva to be an inherent capacity of all bhāvas as the cause of existence (bhū iti karane dhātuḥ, ibid.) or diffusion (vyaptiyartham, ibid.) of the sense of poetry, the sense indicating the principal sense consisting of the relish of rasa. Hence the sthāyin, together with the vyabhicārin, being bhāvas themselves, bring into existence through this inherent power the extraordinary relishable sense of poetry, cognised in a general form (sarva-sādhāranaalayā āsvādayati). In this way the sthāyin, or even the kāvya itself, may be regarded generally as the bhāvaka or nispādaka of rasa; and this so-called bhāvakatva, according to Abhinava, consists in nothing more than a suitable use of gūṇa and alaṁkāra for the ultimate purpose of awakening rasa through the suggestive power of word and sense. Thus disposing of the power

55 etuḍra-vyāpāra-deva-kalpane prāmūnabhāvāt, Govinda, p. 65.
57 bhāvakatvaṃ api samuṣṭa-guṇḍalāṃkāra-parīṣṭihadānam asmūbhir vitatya vakṣya
of bhāvakatva, Abhinava turns to the other power assumed as bhoga or bhogikaraṇa by Bhaṭṭa Nāyaka. He remarks that beyond the pratīti or perception of rasa, he is not aware of any other process called bhoga. If it is relish or enjoyment, it is already admitted, and nothing is gained by giving it a new name, just as nothing is gained by arriving at the same idea by the use of different terms like āsarkaṇa, anumiti, ārūti, upamiti or pratibhāna, according only to the distinction of the means employed. Hence bhoga is nothing more than the perception of rasa, consisting of its essence of relish, based on permanent moods like rati etc. But it must not be supposed to rest there; for although it is admitted that wherever there is rasa there is no doubt its perception, consisting in its enjoyment, yet since the nature of sattva and other guṇas, involved in such enjoyment, is diversified, according as they are principal or subordinate, and is therefore in itself infinite and incomprehensible, the relish of rasa is not to be measured by the mere supposition of three functions. The bhoga, supposed by Bhaṭṭa Nāyaka, therefore, consists essentially in the āsvāda of rasa, possible by the suggestive power of poetry, and, falling naturally within its domain need not be taken as a separate function.

This pratīti of rasa, Abhinava maintains, is nothing more than its abhivyakti or manifestation by the power of suggestion, resulting in an extraordinary state of relish, known as rasanā, āsvāda or carvaṇā. What is manifested is not the rasa itself, but its relish; not the mood itself, but its reflection in the form of a subjective condition of aesthetic enjoyment in the reader. This taste or relish partakes, no doubt, of the nature of cognition; it is nevertheless different from the ordinary of laukika forms of the process, because its means, the vibhāvas, are not to

te. Na ca kāvya-sābdānāṁ kevalānāṁ bhāvakatvāṁ . . . na kevalānāṁ arthānāṁ . . . deva-yos tu bhāvakatvam asmiḥbhir uktam . . . āstumād vyaṇḍakātuḍkhyena vyāpūreṇā guṇālaṁ-kārauvāyādikatayāti-kartāvyatayā kāyasa bhāvakam rasaṁ bhāvayati, Locana, p. 70. 

\[ \text{pratipādi-} \text{vyāturītas ca avināre ko bhoga iti na vidmaḥ, rasanīti cet sāpi pratipāti eva; kevalam upāya-vaiśākhyāyānāṁ nāmāntaraṁ pratipādyatām dāsānānumitī-śṛtu-pamiti-pratibhānāṁ-nāmāntaravat (Hemacandra, p. 61).} \]

\[ \text{ātika} \text{ātikāte pratipādi avya bhogikaraṇam, tac ca ratiyādi-savarūpaṁ, tad astu. Tathāpi-na tāvan-mātram. Yāvanto hi rasaṁ tāvāya eva rasaṁnaḥ pratipāto bhogikaraṇa-savabhadhā, satteśādikapānam ācangāngi-vicicīryam anantam akalpyam iti kā tritvenyattā (ibid., loc. cit.).} \]

\[ \text{bhogikaraṇa-vyāpūraṁ ca kāvyaumakā-raṣa-viṣaya dhvananaṁmahāva . . . alaukiya druti-vistara-viśudātmanī bhoge kartavye lokottaro dhvanaṁ-vyāpūra eva mūrdhābhisktāḥ, Locana, p. 70.} \]
be taken as ordinary or laukika causes. Although rasa requires these factors for its manifestation and cannot exist without them, it cannot yet be regarded as an ordinary effect, and the cause-and-effect theory is inapplicable; for in the transcendental sphere of poetry, it is said, the connexion between cause and effect gives place to a imaginative system of relations, which has the power of stirring the reader's soul into rasa. The resulting rasa cannot be identified with its constituent vibhāvas, for the latter is not experienced separately, but the whole appear as rasa, which is thus simple and indivisible; and at the time of relish nothing else but rasa is raised to our consciousness. The writers on poetics are fond of explaining this phenomenon under the analogy of a beverage, which, though made up of black pepper, candied sugar, camphor and other ingredients, gives us a different taste from that of its constituents. The result therefore is an indissoluble unity of taste from which every trace of the constituent elements is obliterated.

Abhinavagupta goes a step further also in maintaining that the sthāyin or the permanent mood, inferred from its laukika causes (e.g. woman, garden, etc.) remains in the hearts of the appreciative audience in the subtle form of latent impressions. On reading a poem or witness-

64 rasanā ca bodha-rūpātva, kiṁ tu bodhāntare bhyya laukikebhyya vilakṣaṇaiva, upāyānāṁ vibhāddināṁ laukika-vaitākeyyaniḥ (op. cit., p. 66). This will make it clear why rasas like karuṇa, vibhāsa or bhayānaka, which cause pity, disgust or horror, be termed rasa in which enjoyment is essential. The relish of rasa is supposed to be an extraordinary bliss, not to be likened to ordinary pain or pleasure, and the mind is so entirely lost in it that even when the sentiment of grief or horror is relished in such a state, pain is never felt, and even when it is felt it is a pleasurable pain. The fact is borne out by the common experience that when grief is represented, the spectator or the reader says, 'I have enjoyed it.' Hence Viśvanātha remarks (III. 6-7 and vyṛtti, ed. Durgāprasāda, p. 78) that those very things which are called causes of pain in the world (like banishment of Sītā in the forest), when consigned to poetry and dramatic representation, possess the right to be called, in consequence of their assuming such a function, alaukika vibhāvas etc., and from them only pleasure ensues, as it does from bites and the like in amorous dalliance. It is also maintained (ibid. III. 8) that tears constitute no proof that anything but pleasure is felt in poetry: for the tears which are shed by the reader are not those of pain but those of sentiment. Jagannātha's remarks in the connexion are interesting. He says (p. 26) that the shedding of tears and the like are due to the nature of the experience of particular pleasures, and not to pain. Hence in a devotee the tears arise on listening to a description of the deity: in this case there is not the slightest feeling of pain. Such is the power of the extraordinary function of poetry that even unpleasant things like sorrow generate alaukika pleasure, and this pleasant aesthetic relish should be distinguished from the experience realised by other ordinary means.

65 explained by Mammaṭa as sāmājikānāṁ vīśaūdīmatayā sthitāḥ, on which Govinda
ing a drama this permanent mood, remaining in the form of latent impressions (vāsanā), is suggested by the depicted vibhāvas etc., which cease to be called laukika causes but go by the name of vibhāvas etc., in poetry and drama, and which are taken in their general form without specific connexions. The vibhāvas, therefore, are generalised in the minds of the reader and do not refer to particularities, not through the power of bhāvakatva, as supposed by Bhaṭṭa Nāyaka, but generally through the suggestive power of word and sense and specifically through a skilful use of gūṇa and alāṃkāra in poetry, and clever representation in the drama. In the same way, the sthāyi-bhāva or the permanent mood, which is the source of the rasa, is also generalised, because the germ of it is already existent in the reader's soul in the form of impressions; and this, together with the beauty of the generalised representation of the vibhāvas etc., removes all temporal and spatial limitations.

The mood is generalised also in the sense that it refers not to any particular reader but to readers in general, so that although it is relished by a particular individual, yet at the time of relishing it, he does not think that it is relished by him alone, but by all persons of poetic sensibility.

This relish is known as rasa in poetry and drama.

To state it briefly and without any technicality, there is in the mind a latent impression of feelings which we once went through, and

comments sūmājīkānāṁ sūkṣmatayāntah-sthītaḥ and Mallinātha adds sūmājīkānāṁ svānu-bhava-janita vāsanāyāntaḥ sthītaḥ, explaining vāsanā as sāṃskāra.

The sthāyin is so called because, though the feeling itself, like all feelings, essentially transient, its impression in the form of vāsanā or sāṃskāra is more or less permanent, being called up when the rasa is cognised. Cf. Prabhū p. 61: antāḥ-karaṇa-praṇīti rūpasya ratyāder āyu-vināśate'pi sāṃskāraścchanā nanā-kālā-sthāyīte'd gṛcch-dras-ṛasa-prati-kālam anuśamābhūtac ca sthāyitvam. But the sthāyin itself is not rasa; it must be vyakti-viśeṣa and vibhāvadī-mālaka and thus made relishable (caraṇāparītya), Govinda p. 62. The ultimate relish of rasa is free from all contact either of the vibhāvas or of the sthāyin.

mukūta-pratiśrākādānāḥ āvaṃ nāla-buddhir ucheñḍyate, gṛgīha-prūkṣtāna-sānuścāra-śīrṣā ca kāraṇa-balūd aniyamānāpi na tatu rāma-dhir vṛśrāmyati, tata evahāya-deśā-kāla-parityāgaḥ Abh. as cited by Hemacandra, p. 66.

mamaite vibhāvādyayā nham eva rasādaśāyanā śaṃ rāgā-devyādānā.

nitya pramāṇy-gatavatena sthito'pi sādhāraṇapāha-balāt tascāla-vigraha-parimittā-pramāṇy-bhāva-cāsōṃgranāśa-varjanavara-sāmparka-TVngāparimittā-bhāvena pramāṇā. ... sādhāraṇyena svākāra tvadbhinnopīgocarikītyaḥ, Mammata.
this is roused when we read a poem which describe similar things. By universal sympathy we become part and parcel of the same feeling and imagine ourselves in that condition. Thus the feeling is raised to a state of relish, called rasa, in which lies the essence of poetic enjoyment. It will be noticed that these theorists presuppose latent impression of experience (vāsanā) and universal sympathy (sūdhāraṇya or sūdhāraṇikarana). Those who have never experienced the feeling of love, for instance, and have therefore no impression of experience left in them, as well as those who have no sense of community of human feelings can never relish rasa in poetry. The vāsanā, we are told, is natural (svabhāviki or naisargiki), but it may be acquired by study and experience. The writers on Poetics, therefore, are merciless in their satire on dull grammarians and old Mīmāmsakas, to whom such relish of rasa is denied, and they declare unanimously that rasikā eva rasāsvāde yogyāh. As rasa is not an objective entity which can reside in the hero or the actor, it is realised, as Dhanañjaya puts it (IV. 36), by the reader's own capacity of enjoyment. Thus a degree of culture and aesthetic instinct is demanded in the critic, the rasika or sahṛdaya, who is the adhikārin, dignified with the appellation of pramātra, compatible with this subtle and extraordinary conception of poetry. As Abhinavagupta puts it adhikārī cātra vimala-pratibhānasāli-hṛdayaḥ; and elsewhere (Locana, p. 11) he describes such a sahṛdaya as yeṣāṃ kavyānuśilanabhyāsa-vaśād Visadibhūte manomukure varṇaniya-tanmayi-bhavana-yogyatā te hṛdaya-sānsvadbhājaḥ sahṛdayāh.

It may also be pointed out that this subtle conception of rasa makes it difficult to express the notion properly in Western critical terminology. The word has been translated etymologically by the terms 'flavour,' 'relish,' 'gustation,' 'taste,' 'Geschmack' or 'saveur;' but none of these renderings seems to be adequate. The simpler word 'mood,' or the term 'Stimmung' used by Jacobi, may be the nearest approach to it, but the concept has hardly any analogy in European critical theories. Most of the terms employed have ideational associations of their own, and are therefore not strictly applicable. For instance, the word 'taste' or 'relish,' though literally correct, must not be understood to imply aesthetic judgment, 'good or bad taste,' but must be taken to indicate an idea similar to what we mean when we speak of tasting food. At the same time, this realistic description must not lead us to drag it down to the level of a bodily pleasure; for this artistic pleasure is given as almost
equivalent to the philosophic bliss, known as ānanda, being lifted above worldly joy.

This peculiar condition of the ego, the rasa, is realised through the characteristic function of vyañjanā or suggestion in poetry. The idea is elaborated by later theorists, who take pains to show that it does not come under the province of abhidhā (denotation), nor of tātparya (import), nor of lakṣanā (indication), nor of pratyaksā (perception), nor of anumāna (inference), nor of smarana (reminiscence), admitted by philosophers and grammarians. Into these technicalities which properly come under the discussion of the vyañjanā-vṛtti, we need not enter; but it may be noted that Abhinava describes this abhivyakti, which is taken as synonymous with carvanā,\(^{70}\) as vita-vighna-pratiti or cognition rendered free from obstacles. Following him, Jagannātha notes in this connexion: vyakti ś ca bhagnāvaranā cit, yatā hi saravādāna pihito dipas tan-nīrttau sannihilān padārthān prakāśayati, svayam ca prakāśate, evam ātma-caitanyam vibhāvido-samvālitaṃ ratyādīn. Similarly carvanā is described by the author of the Prabhā as vibhāvādi-samūhālambanena ratyavacchinna-caitanyādbhivyakti carvanā, sā ca bhagnāvaranā cit. The cognition of rasa, therefore, is a distinct realisation freed from all doubts and obstacles by means of the vibhāvas etc., which are accordingly designated as vighnāpasāraka\(^{71}\), and is variously described as camatkāra-nirveśa (awakening of poetic charm), rasanā (relish), āsvāda (taste), bhoga (fruition), samapatti (accomplishment), laya (fusion) and viṣrūnti (repose).\(^{72}\)

The essence of rasa, therefore, consists in its āsvāda or carvanā (carvyamānaika-prāṇāḥ), which is alaukika, being incomparable by the ordinary processes of knowledge. It is a relish in which the rasa alone, apart from its constituent elements, is raised to consciousness; and it is therefore described as a relish in which the contemplation of any other thing but rasa itself is lost (vīgalīta-vedyāntara) or which is free from the contact of aught else perceived (vedyāntara-sparsā-śunya), like the state of mind lost in the philosophic contemplation of Brahma. It is not capable of proof or designation and cannot be made known, because its

---

\(^{70}\) vyakti ś carvanāti parājyoh, Govinda, p. 62.

\(^{71}\) See Hemacandra p. 63 sarvātthā rasanātmataka-vita vighna-pratiti-grhita bhāva eva rasaḥ, tatra vighnāpasāraka vibhāvā-prabhrītayah, where the vighnas are enumerated as seven in number and discussed in detail.

\(^{72}\) loke sakala-vighna vinirmuktaś ca sarvātthā eva camatkāra-nirveśa rasanāvādāna-bhoga samapatti-laya-viśrūntyādi-sabdair abhidhikhyate, Hemacandra loc. cit., following Abhinava.
perception is inseparable from its existence; or in other words, it is identical with the knowledge of itself. The only proof of the existence of rasa is its relish itself by the sahṛdaya. It is therefore sakala-sahṛdaya-sahṛdaya-samvedana-sākṣika, or in the words of Mammata, sakala-sahṛdaya-samvädabhāja pramātrā gocarikṛtaḥ. Although it is a very intimate relish, camatkāra is supposed to constitute its life-breath. This camatkāra, which has been compared to the ‘wonder-spirit’ of modern critics, is described by Viśvanātha as a kind of expanding of the mind, of which another name is ‘surprise’ (camatkāraḥ citta-vistāra-rūpo vismayāparaparyāyaḥ), implying that the marvellous always underlies the rasa (tac camatkāra-sārate sarvatrāpyabhibhuto rasaḥ, under III. 3). Jagannātha, however, completes the idea by correlating this camatkāra with the vaicitrya or vicchitti of the Alaṁkāra School, who mean by it a special charm, due to an act of imagination on the part of the poet (kavi-karma or kavi-pratibhā) underlying and constituting the essence of all poetic figures. The camatkāra, therefore, which is the essence of all poetic figures, is also the essence of rasa, and has been defined as a fact of our consciousness (anubhava-sākṣika), consisting of extraordinary pleasure (alaukikāḥlāda) which depends on a concept formed by continued contemplation of itself.

The last step in this idea was taken by the attempt of bringing Poetry to the level of Religion by likening this aesthetic enjoyment to the estatic bliss of divine contemplation (brahmāśvāda). Viśvanātha sums up the idea briefly thus: The rasa, arising from the exaltation of sattva (purity), indivisible, self-manifested, made up of joy and thought in their identity, free from the contact of aught else perceived, akin to the realisation of Brahma, the life whereof is super-mundane wonder, is enjoyed by those competent in inseparableness (of the object from the realisation thereof) and as it were, in its own shape. It follows from this that the pramātr, to whom alone this bliss is vouchsafed, is like a yogin or devotee who deserves this preference through his accumulated merits (punyavantaḥ pramāṇvanti yogavat rasa-saṁtatiṁ).

This, in its general outlines, is the rasa-theory as finally fixed by the

---

75 Viśvanātha, III. 20
74 Ibid III. 26.
76 See Jacobi, Ueber Begriff und Wesen der poetischen Figuren in GN, 1918, where this conception of an alaukikāra is elaborated. See also Introd. to my edition of the Vakrokti-sūtra.
Dhvani School; and all later writers, from Dhanañjaya to Jagannātha, accept this new interpretation and attempt to work it out in detail. Thus an endeavour was made not only to explain the concept of *rasa* in terms of inward experience, but also to absorb this idea of aesthetic delocation into the new theory of *dhvani*, and make it applicable to poetry; and the Rasa School, properly so called, began to merge from this time onwards into the dominant Dhvani School. Even Mahimabhaṭṭa, who attempted to demolish the *dhvani*-theory, was forced to acknowledge *rasa* and declare that on this point there is no difference of opinion between himself and the Dhvanikāra\(^7\), the only difference existing with regard to the function *par excellence* which should be operative in poetry. But the Dhvani School and its followers consider *rasa* as an element of the unexpressed only; and though their theory, which puts a great emphasis on *rasa-dhvani*, practically leads to such a conclusion, both the Dhvanikāra and Anandavardhana are yet careful not to erect it into the very 'soul' of poetry. From the theoretical standpoint at least, they could not give exclusive preference to *rasa-dhvani*, however important it may be; for in their complete scheme of Poetics, the unexpressed may also take the form of *vastu-dhvani* and *alamkāra-dhvani*, and the centre of gravity in a poem may lie in its matter or in its poetic figure as well as in its *rasa*. Abhinavagupta, however, appears to have attached little weight to these theoretical considerations; and brushing them aside, he boldly brings forward the essentiality of *rasa*, declaring that there can be no poetry without *rasa* (*na hi tac-chūnyāṁ kāvyam kiṁcid āstī\(^9\)*) because all poetry lives through *rasa* (*rasenaiva sarvam īvati kāvyam*). He attempts, however, to reconcile the theoretical discrepancy by saying that although admittedly the unexpressed may also take the form of a *vastu* or an *alamkāra*, these two kinds of 'suggestion' resolve themselves ultimately into the suggestion of *rasa*, which is in fact the essence of poetry.\(^8\) This opinion apparently led Viśvanātha to push the theory to its logical limit and formulate his somewhat extreme view that the *rasa* alone constitutes the essence of poetry (I. 3). But the considerations, which led the founders of the *dhvani*-theory to leave this view wisely unstated, could not be easily put out of the way; and Jagannātha objects

---

\(^7\) *kāvyasyādīmanī... rasādīrūpe na kasyacid vimatih* p. 22.

\(^8\) *Locana*, p. 66.

\(^9\) *rasa eva vastuto ātmā, vastvalaṅkāra-dhvani tu sarvathā rasam prati parvavasyete* p. 27.
on this very ground. The definition of poetry given by Viśvanātha, he says, cannot be accepted, because thereby poetry, in which the central charm lies in the matter or in the poetic figure (e.g. in professedly descriptive and ornamental poetry) would be entirely excluded, and such an exclusion is not warranted either by theory or by the practice of great poets. Viśvanātha anticipates this objection by saying that in these cases there is a semblance of *rasa* (rasābhāsa), and the verse given in *Dhvanī-āloka* p. 20 as an instance of *vastu-dhvani* is, in his opinion, admissible because there is a touch of *rasa* (rasa-sparśa), and not because mere vyāṅgya vastu can constitute the essence of poetry. Jagannātha replies that nothing is gained by this clumsy subterfuge of an indirect reference to *rasa*, because such a reference may also be construed in phrases like ‘the cow moves’ or ‘the deer leaps.’ This cannot be taken as a criterion, because thereby any and every content of poetry would be reduced to the position of a vibhāva, anubhāva or vyābхиcāri-bhāva of the *rasa*. Jagannātha himself, one of the latest writers on the subject, therefore tries to solve the difficulty by studiously avoiding all mention of *rasa* in his definition of poetry, although in theory he, like Viśvanātha, adheres in the main to the views of the Dhvani School. Jagannātha mentions as many as eight different theories about *rasa* (p. 28); but the existence of so many conflicting views, as well as the fact that *rasa* cannot be taken as the essence of all poetry, makes him define poetry as ramaṇīyārtha-pratipādakah śabdakāḥ, inasmuch as all theorists agree that *rasa*, which cannot be manifested without an accompanying state of joy, conveys a peculiar ramaṇīyatā essential to poetry. It will be noticed, therefore, that recognition was refused to any attempt, like that of Viśvanātha, to develop the theory further out of itself; and the views of the Dhvani School, as represented later by Mammaṭa, became in spite of many attempts at improvement in detail, a kind of canonical code for all future time.

In spite of this unquestioned dominance of the Dhvani School, which amply recognised *rasa* but regarded it as one of the phases of the unexpressed in poetry, one class of writers still adhered to *rasa* as the only element worth considering in poetry, although they never theoretic-
ally discussed the position like Viśvanātha, and build up a system on its basis. Of all the rasas, however, as śṛṅgāra or love forms the absorbing theme of Sanskrit poetry and drama in general, and as this particular poetic mood possesses an almost universal appeal, these writers naturally work out the śṛṅgāra in all its detail; and we have in consequence a body of erotic-rhetorical treatises, of which the earliest and the most remarkable is Rudrabhaṭṭa’s Śṛṅgāra-tilaka, one of whose avowed objects (I. 5) is to apply the rasa, already discussed in connexion with the drama by Bharata and others, to the case of poetry. Following upon this we have Bhoja’s Śṛṅgāra-prakāśa, cited by Vidyādhara (p. 98) and Kumārasvaṁin (p. 221),83 which deals with the subject in the usual elaborate cyclopaedic manner of its author, with profuse illustrations of every phase of the sentiment, in no less than twenty chapters. After this come innumerable works of a similar nature, which take rasa, especially śṛṅgāra, as their principal theme, and which were composed with the apparent object of guiding the poet in the composition of erotic pieces so popular and profuse in Sanskrit poetry. Of these the Bhāva-prakāśa of Śrāvadātanaya, which reproduces the substance of most of the chapters of Bhoja’s work, and the Rasāraṇa of Śiṅgabhpulā as well as the two well-known works of Bhānudatta, the Rasamāṇjari and Rasatarunāṅgiṇī, deserve mention. None of these specialised treatises, however, add anything of speculative interest to a topic already threshed out to its extreme; and as they belong properly to the province of Erotics rather than Poetics, a treatment of them must be sought elsewhere. The simple idea elaborated more or less in all these works84 is that the fundamental rasa is śṛṅgāra, which is consequently treated in detail with regard to its vibhāvas etc. This brings in topically the extensive discussion of nāyaka and nāyikā and their various conditions and emotions acting as a factor of the rasa. Into these elaborate definitions, distinc-

83 A MS of this work has been recently acquired by the Madras Govt. Oriental MSS Library (see Rep. of Periapatetic Party, 1916-7, 1918-9).

84 This is clear from the attitude of Bhoja in his Śṛṅgāra-prakāśa, as reported by Vidyādhara and Kumārasvāmin, both of whom point out that Bhoja only accepts one rasa, the Erotic (rājā tu śṛṅgāram ekam eva śṛṅgāra-prakāśe rasam uraricakāra, Ekāvali, p. 98; śṛṅgāra eka eva rasa iti śṛṅgāraprakāśī kāraṇī, Rētiṣyānāya, p. 221). Although Bhoja mentions as many as ten rasas in his Saravatī-kaṇṭhādhoraṇa, he appears to devote almost exclusive attention to śṛṅgāra in his treatment. In the same way Rudrabhaṭṭa declares śṛṅgāro nāyako rasaḥ, I. 20, and Bhānudatta appears to take it for granted that śṛṅgāra occupies an honoured place among all the rasas (tatra rasaḥ śṛṅgārasyaśyābhynrhitatvena, ed. Benares, p. 21).
tions and classifications of the amorous sentiment with its varying emotional moods and situations, which these works industriously discuss and which always possessed an attraction to mediaeval scholastic minds, we need not enter here in the discussion of general principles. These theorists delight in arranging into divisions and subdivisions, according to rank, character, circumstances and the like, all conceivable types of the hero, the heroine and their adjuncts, together with the different shades of gestures, graces, feelings, moods and emotions, in conformity to the tradition which had already obtained in the sphere of Dramaturgy. We cannot refuse to recognise the subtle power of analysis and insight which these essays indicate; and although much of it is marked by scholastic formalism, there is an unmistakable attempt to do justice to facts, not only as they appear to experience but to the observation of general poetic usage. In the elaborate working out of the general thesis that the rasa is evolved on the basis on one or other of what they call the permanent mental moods with the help of various emotional adjuncts, the writers on poetics have proceeded a long way in the careful analysis of poetic emotions, the psychology of which bears an intimate relation to their theory and in itself deserves separate study.

A new turn was given to the theory by Rūpa Gosvāmin’s Ujjvalanila-māṇī, which brings erotic-religious ideas to bear upon the general theme of rasa. It attempts to deal with rasa in terms of the Vaiṣṇava idea of ujjvala or madhura rasa, by which was meant the śṛṅgāra rasa, the term ujjvala being apparently suggested by Bharata’s description of that rasa. The madhura rasa, however, is represented not in its secular aspect but primarily as a phase of bhakti-rasa (madhurākhyo bhakti-rasaḥ I. 3); for the Vaiṣṇava theology admits five rasas as forming roughly the five degrees or aspects of the realisation of bhakti or faith, viz. sānta (tranquillity), dāsyā (also called prīti, servitude or humility), sakhyā (also called preyāsa, friendship or equality), vātsalya (parental affection) and mādhurya (sweetness). The last, also called the ujjvala rasa, being the principal, is termed bhakti-rasa-rāt and constitutes, as such, the subject-matter of the present treatise. Kṛṣṇa-rāt or the love

\[86\] yat kiścin loke śucī methyam ujjvalaiḥ darśanīyam vā tuc chṛṇaśṛṇāpamānyate, ed. Groset, pp. 89-90.

\[88\] I, 2, explained by Jiva Gosvāmin as sānta-prīti-preyā-vātsalya-ujjvala-nāmaśu mukh-yeṣu . . . . sa eva ījjvalāpārā-paryāyo bhakti-rasānām rūjā madhurākhyo rasāḥ, ed. Kāvyamālā, p. 3.
of Kṛṣṇa forms the sthāyi-bhāva of this rasa, and the recipient here is not the literary sahṛdaya but the bhakta, the faithful. This sthāyi-bhāva, known as madhurā rati, which is the source of this particular rasa, is defined in terms of love of Kṛṣṇa; and the nature of the nāyaka and nāyikā is defined in the same manner, and their feelings and emotions illustrated by examples adduced from poems dealing with the love-stories of Kṛṣṇa and Rādhā. The work is, therefore, essentially a Vaiṣṇava religious treatise, presented in a literary garb, taking Kṛṣṇa as the ideal hero, with the caution, however, that what is true of Kṛṣṇa as the hero does not apply to the ordinary secular hero (I. 18-20).

svādyatām hṛdi bhaktiṁ ānītā śravanādādhīhi

madhurākhyātī rater lakaṇṭam cōktam
māhi harer mrīḍāyāh ca saṁbhogasyādikāraṇāṁ
madhurāpara-parājāyā priyākhyātī ratiḥ, ibid., loc. cit.

N.B.—The word “School” used in this article to denote the different systems of Poetics, which emphasize respectively the alāṃkāra-, rasa-, rīti- or dhwani-theories, has been criticized as misleading; but it must be understood in a general sense. One has to admit so many mutual contaminations of the different systems that no particular system can be taken as self-standing or self-sufficient; and the word “School,” therefore, as a term of classification becomes of doubtful significance. There is no evidence (except in case of Udbhata and Vāmana who, we are told, founded schools in the true sense of the term) that the particular ideas of the rasa-, alāṃkāra-, rīti-, or even dhwani-systems were worked out in proper “schools,” consciously or unconsciously founded by a great writer and supported by his followers; but it can hardly be doubted that these ideas originated and developed, in the course of time, as it were, by a process of natural and inevitable appropriations, had a tradition and a history, which naturally passed over from his predecessors those ideas which had stood the test of criticism and which he could combine in a self-consistent system of his own. In this way really valuable ideas have been generally adopted, although other ideas of the same author (as we seem to have in the case of the vakrōkṣi-theory of Kuntala) have been rejected by common consent. But at the same time, one cannot mistake the fact that each writer conforms, in his fundamental principles, to some theory which throws into prominence the theory of alāṃkāra, rasa, rīti, or dhwani. One should say, for instance, that Abhinavagupta pays his allegiance in general to the dhwani-system of Ānandavardhana, although he acknowledges the importance of the rasa in poetry. The word “school” has been used in this sense to indicate affiliation to a group or system or theory; and if this is understood, the rest is merely a question of words.
अपेंडिक्स.

[We give in the following pages the text of Abhinavagupta’s unpublished commentary on Bharata ch. vi, with reference to his famous शृंगार on रसा referred to in our article. The passage gives a learned summary of the various theories on रसा obtaining in Abhinava’s time, and as such will prove acceptable to interested scholars. Most of it has been, as we have noticed, appropriated by Hemacandra in his commentary on his own Kavyanudśasan (p. 57f). Manuscripts of Abhinava’s commentary are by no means plentiful; and so far, only two copies are known to be in existence, one of which is now in the Trivandrum Palace Library and the other in the Government Oriental Manuscripts Library, Madras. Our text is based on a Devanāgarī transcript procured for us by Dr. Gaṅgānāth Jhā, presumably from the Trivandrum MS. The text offered here, being based on such imperfect material, is indeed deficient and unsatisfactory in many places; but we have ventured to publish it in this tentative form not only out of a consideration of its importance but also with the expectation that better readings may be determined in future with the help of other and more correct MSS].

श्रीमद्भिनवगुमवर्चिता श्रीभिनवभारती

भरतनाथशास्त्रे व्याख्या

(काश्यपाला, पं: ५२, पं: ६)

रसविवधयलब्धासुवचनाह—विभवानुभवायमिचारिसंयोगाहसन्यायितः।

अज्जन भुजल्लोल्प्रमस्तन्त्रास्वदेवं व्याख्या—विभवार्दिभः सम्बंधोपपर्यंत्यायिनिः सतो रसायनिताः। तत्र विभवार्दयित्वा श्रायामिकाया उत्तरी कार्याम्।

वनुभाषाय न रसज्ञा अज्जन विष्णुलातः। तेषां रसकारालाणे मणानाहलात्। अविश्वा भवानामेव बड़बुभावाय त्रिवचिरायख [तस्मां] विन्दस्यामालाक्षायपि न सहभावानिः। वाणिज्निः, तथापि वांगाहात्तेभ्यं विशिष्ट। वृहासपिं (पं: ५२, पं: ७—८) वाङ्कायनामेव कालकालाकालायपिः। तेन श्रायित्वं विभवानुभवार्दिभिः श्रायित्वं रसः। श्रायित्वं भवावार्दितः। स चीमायऽत्तुकुरितेशुकलत्वपिः। [श] पारायम्यायमेव पत्रः। तथा हि दशिना—

१ भरतनाथशास्त्रे ५२
५ 'स चीमायऽत्तुकुरितेशुकलत्वपिः' [श] पारायम्यायमेव पत्रः। तथा हि दशिना—
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गौरित वन्धु, प्रदीपादिभिंतः।

'प्रतिनिधित्वः' इति दुः पाठः।

'सत्याधिकारः' इति रमणधनुस्च देवादातुत्पतः।

'कविताधिकारः' इति प्रतिपाद्यः।

'तत्त्वातिकारः' इति प्रतिपाद्यः।
न ददुळ्या गति खातुः, न चाप्रांत मक्खल क्रन्द्या थोर्ये योगम्। चांगोऽत्य प्रतीतीसमि रसस्य भोवनकृतवर्धम, तच रसाधिकारस्य, तद्वगतुः। तथापि न तान्त्रिकम्। चालाको चि रसाल्कावले यह रसाल्कन: प्रतीतीस्यो प्रमाणकर्ताकाल्लभावः। मुखानां च चालाकिन्वित्वां-मन्नमकल्यणति का निलेख्यः।

भावनाभाव रूपेष्टिप दृष्टार्कितांगावहयत हः ॥

इति। यत्नाः भावाये रसा इत्याध्ये तत्त्र विभवातिनितन्त्रवर्धा काल्लभावस्यस्य-गोष्ठाद्यायनेभव विदि भावाः तद्भवाभिपोऽवः। चालाम्—

विदेशनात्तप्याक्रमः च ॥ परस्परस्यसंवित्तमोचः ॥

आल्लाहुमारामकामहायो रसः काव्यां उच्चते ॥

इति। तच वाचमाणत्या वैभोरायो विवर्ते। आल्लाहुमाय च तद्भवय इति मन्नत्वम् ॥ गन्ध्रवं को सरसतत्वम् ॥ आसां किं कुमः।

आल्लाहुमासिंधृ शौम्पुरस्यमेवतः
संविद्विक्षिते दिग्विगतामसिंधृम्।
इत्यं सदयाँत्तकामः हृदयुः
हन्देन किं दृष्टिप्राप्त न शोकः।

ऊँझिंच्छावश्च वर्धत् चतुष्कं
धोः प्रक्षरति आल्लाहुमावेदयानिः।

चरां तदाद्वै परिकालितानां
विसेरवसियापपापरागास्।

अंगं गतिः परिलक्षितस्य
प्रमेयसिंधृ प्रथमावतारस्यः।

तत्त्वार्थालाभ सति सीतुनस्य-परस्परविवाहादिनि विवाहायः।

तत्त्वतः सतामच्छः न दृष्टिनि
मतान्ति तान्त्रेऽदृष्टिनि।

13 आल्लाहु माणाचार्य नद्दोकसानमेव च।
आल्लाहुमाभाव यती शिक्षिः सतादशिकाहम्।
आल्लाहुमाय एष्टपिपि दुःहरादितिमोऽस्यम्।
नद्दोकसानमहैप्प्यो वायते प्रभिवादः।

रमणे चेम्भापि भावलाहाल्लोकसायम्।
पूव्यप्रतिष्ठापितयोजनासु
मूलप्रतिष्ठापणालमाननिति॥

tadhunyadham—astiupaddhatamundhe suhima, na lapne jhincchit. tatha aha—kaivarya
bhavvanati tat krayaha rasa. yatha rishi—“sahboraat samabhi pradaau” bhagwa
prashitaavivartSimasthaayikari: pratipadta maandadharisastu (?). pachchitamratha samprajna-
vidhayaamadhipya yadnyaadyah kshetrayuvyakta. pradaanaadharisastu samkramadhidi-
shambava. yatha deshaan pratimaanadhi vivukhayaadhi (?). bhavabhavakshetra pratipadta-
sevaya krayaamadhipya pradaadhyakshaagamaayagamakatarmasthitvashavyakta.
abidhakaryo chaat
vimlapanishchayigdhatayyaas. tus ca ‘yuvamakshaāharasa’ "16 irīt ‘umaapi nīlā-
lak’ "15 irīt ‘hastu jhincchito’ "15 bhagwaadharishyova karyaagatvitarternanāt maamgī-
saivāyapitraayuṣadhikā. yathā yathā dharmayuddhānaadhi prabhaāhahā pratigamitāv
dharmayuddhānaadhipa āpadyāturāyapitahākṣatāayadhipādharisamāsthitvashavyakta.

tathā yathā
yā dharmaadipā sevaya krayaamadhipya pradaadhyakshaagamaayagamakatarmasthitvashavyakta.
yathā yathā dharmayuddhānaadhipa āpadyāturāyapitahākṣatāayadhipādharisamāsthitvashavyakta.

16 bhagwaanmahārājā 1 1 15 kumārasūdrā 1 1 6 16 bhāvav 3 1 4 7
APPENDIX: अभिमन्युभारती

लभेषित स्वरूपम् नृगमवोधपूर्वः
भावनिदेशकलिन जगनान्तरसौंभूदानि॥

इवादि सत्यं तावदेश वित्तविशालाकामा, यथा रतिरेव भारतः। अततं विशेक-नरातुपितलातः सा रसनीया सति न लौकिकिनी, न प्रीति, न गानविधा, न लौकिक-तुल्या, न तदवरूपादिश्या। तवेऽव वोषक्षास्तमु देशालविद्यन्तमातुः। अतुकारोऽप्य-भावरुगामिता कर्तमात्। विश्वसामयाममेव भवतु विश्वासवादावलमनात्।

सत्यं रसनामकर्मविद्वितिनिग्राही भव संवर्ग्याः। तत विश्वासप्रसन्नविवाहप्रभुत्वः।

तथा य लोकेऽस्यलिङ्गविशिष्टा संस्थितिरेव चमलारीर्तिविवर्गा-रसनामकर्मविद्वितिनिग्राहायुवक्ष्मा देशालविद्यन्तमातुः। विश्वासां युत्तिपतियानां संस्थितादिरूपः। नृगमवोधविवर्गा देशालविद्यन्तमातुः।

तथा विषयसंवर्ग्याः संवर्ग्याः संवर्ग्याः संवर्ग्याः।

श्रद्धारमणां सा वहनेषु संवर्ग्याः संवर्ग्याः संवर्ग्याः तदपगमनमोहिनाः। तथातते विषयसंवर्ग्याः संवर्ग्याः संवर्ग्याः।

श्रद्धारमणां सा वहनेषु संवर्ग्याः संवर्ग्याः संवर्ग्याः तदपगमनमोहिनाः। तथातते विषयसंवर्ग्याः संवर्ग्याः संवर्ग्याः।

श्रद्धारमणां सा वहनेषु संवर्ग्याः संवर्ग्याः संवर्ग्याः तदपगमनमोहिनाः। तथातते विषयसंवर्ग्याः संवर्ग्याः संवर्ग्याः।

श्रद्धारमणां सा वहनेषु संवर्ग्याः संवर्ग्याः संवर्ग्याः तदपगमनमोहिनाः। तथातते विषयसंवर्ग्याः संवर्ग्याः संवर्ग्याः।

श्रद्धारमणां सा वहनेषु संवर्ग्याः संवर्ग्याः संवर्ग्याः तदपगमनमोहिनाः। तथातते विषयसंवर्ग्याः संवर्ग्याः संवर्ग्याः।

श्रद्धारमणां सा वहनेषु संवर्ग्याः संवर्ग्याः संवर्ग्याः तदपगमनमोहिनाः। तथातते विषयसंवर्ग्याः संवर्ग्याः संवर्ग्याः।


\textit{तथा विषयविभागः कते संदर्भानि द्वारा अत्र विनिमयार्थ्यो न हेतु रहितः अन्यथा कर्मदीर्घतां विवेचनार्थः।}
सवीत्रिकृत सत्ता श्रीमति परविनामार्थि, स्वयम्‌भारतितः च सर्वं च विस्मयते।

स्वयं श्रीमति परविनामार्थि, स्वयम्‌भारतितः च।

राजावशिष्यता तु पुरूषरूपयोगिनिमति शास्त्रायाम। तत्त्वं ग्रहणार्थावकृत श्रवः च

दशौश्यकार्तिविविधाति ख्रिः ख्रिः। ख्रिः च चांगलं चंतनामावेश।

अवतर्ण जन्मवित्षुकः सर्वं श्रवः च। सर्वं श्रवः च। सर्वं श्रवः च। सर्वं श्रवः च।

अवतर्ण जन्मवित्षुकः सर्वं श्रवः च। सर्वं श्रवः च। सर्वं श्रवः च। सर्वं श्रवः च।

अवतर्ण जन्मवित्षुकः सर्वं श्रवः च। सर्वं श्रवः च। सर्वं श्रवः च। सर्वं श्रवः च।

अवतर्ण जन्मवित्षुकः सर्वं श्रवः च। सर्वं श्रवः च। सर्वं श्रवः च। सर्वं श्रवः च।

अवतर्ण जन्मवित्षुकः सर्वं श्रवः च। सर्वं श्रवः च। सर्वं श्रवः च। सर्वं श्रवः च।

अवतर्ण जन्मवित्षुकः सर्वं श्रवः च। सर्वं श्रवः च। सर्वं श्रवः च। सर्वं श्रवः च।

अवतर्ण जन्मवित्षुकः सर्वं श्रवः च। सर्वं श्रवः च। सर्वं श्रवः च। सर्वं श्रवः च।

अवतर्ण जन्मवित्षुकः सर्वं श्रवः च। सर्वं श्रवः च। सर्वं श्रवः च। सर्वं श्रवः च।

अवतर्ण जन्मवित्षुकः सर्वं श्रवः च। सर्वं श्रवः च। सर्वं श्रवः च। सर्वं श्रवः च।

अवतर्ण जन्मवित्षुकः सर्वं श्रवः च। सर्वं श्रवः च। सर्वं श्रवः च। सर्वं श्रवः च।

अवतर्ण जन्मवित्षुकः सर्वं श्रवः च। सर्वं श्रवः च। सर्वं श्रवः च। सर्वं श्रवः च।

अवतर्ण जन्मवित्षुकः सर्वं श्रवः च। सर्वं श्रवः च। सर्वं श्रवः च। सर्वं श्रवः च।

अवतर्ण जन्मवित्षुकः सर्वं श्रवः च। सर्वं श्रवः च। सर्वं श्रवः च। सर्वं श्रवः च।

अवतर्ण जन्मवित्षुकः सर्वं श्रवः च। सर्वं श्रवः च। सर्वं श्रवः च। सर्वं श्रवः च।

अवतर्ण जन्मवित्षुकः सर्वं श्रवः च। सर्वं श्रवः च। सर्वं श्रवः च। सर्वं श्रवः च।

अवतर्ण जन्मवित्षुकः सर्वं श्रवः च। सर्वं श्रवः च। सर्वं श्रवः च। सर्वं श्रवः च।

अवतर्ण जन्मवित्षुकः सर्वं श्रवः च। सर्वं श्रवः च। सर्वं श्रवः च। सर्वं श्रवः च।

अवतर्ण जन्मवित्षुकः सर्वं श्रवः च। सर्वं श्रवः च। सर्वं श्रवः च। सर्वं श्रवः च।

अवतर्ण जन्मवित्षुकः सर्वं श्रवः च। सर्वं श्रवः च। सर्वं श्रवः च। सर्वं श्रवः च।

अवतर्ण जन्मवित्षुकः सर्वं श्रवः च। सर्वं श्रवः च। सर्वं श्रवः च। सर्वं श्रवः च।

अवतर्ण जन्मवित्षुकः सर्वं श्रवः च। सर्वं श्रवः च। सर्वं श्रवः च। सर्वं श्रवः च।

अवतर्ण जन्मवित्षुकः सर्वं श्रवः च। सर्वं श्रवः च। सर्वं श्रवः च। सर्वं श्रवः च।

अवतर्ण जन्मवित्षुकः सर्वं श्रवः च। सर्वं श्रवः च। सर्वं श्रवः च। सर्वं श्रवः च।

अवतर्ण जन्मवित्षुकः सर्वं श्रवः च। सर्वं श्रवः च। सर्वं श्रवः च। सर्वं श्रवः च।

अवतर्ण जन्मवित्षुकः सर्वं श्रवः च। सर्वं श्रवः च। सर्वं श्रवः च। सर्वं श्रवः च।

अवतर्ण जन्मवित्षुकः सर्वं श्रवः च। सर्वं श्रवः च। सर्वं श्रवः च। सर्वं श्रवः च।

अवतर्ण जन्मवित्षुकः सर्वं श्रवः च। सर्वं श्रवः च। सर्वं श्रवः च। सर्वं श्रवः च।
नौकालातूँ. कवितारिगां स विनाशकाव्यातीत वितरितायते जैतुषायों अयावसरे। ग्रहम्प्रसन्नविनिर्माणः। यात्रिकत्रिपायः। कवितारिगां स विनाशकाव्यातीत वितरितायते जैतुषायों अयावसरे।

तत्त्वातुस्माराहूँ कवितारिगां स एवयु स्थायीतिष्ठयो नासक्ति, बालार्थ:-

ग्रहम्प्रसन्नविनिर्माणः। कवितारिगां स विनाशकाव्यातीत वितरितायते जैतुषायोऽसंस्कृतविश्वासम्। कवितारिगां स एवयु स्थायीतिष्ठयो नासक्ति, बालार्थ:-

तत्त्वातुस्माराहूँ कवितारिगां स एवयु स्थायीतिष्ठयो नासक्ति, बालार्थ:-

तत्त्वातुस्माराहूँ कवितारिगां स एवयु स्थायीतिष्ठयो नासक्ति, बालार्थ:-
अप्पेंडिस: अभिव्यक्तती

विश्वास्प्रकाशकं स सौद्यविवेचारः। अथ तु सालकेगतबलिनिवाससंभाव्याखातः। प्रवेशातर्गतिविनिवासादिकोऽपितिनिर्माणविद्वासादिनाथगताः। तत्तथव भावादयोऽनि निर्विचित्रतो रसाय, तद्वहारमेंदिय रससंभवायतः। नायव चतुर्थतो वेन प्रमाणमभिये परतेतुः। सिद्धव कारणिक्रियेभुजय रसायनाभावातः। किं तत्त्वतिथिवादाय इति, अयोगीक यथाय छव्वेश्चोपयोगः विभाविद्वाचारः। काण्ठेन दृष्ट्वभित्त वेदान्तावेदमेदसाक-कमोदकालिकायः। याणसाधारोषियः किं गुडमराजचादिभु कृष्ण इति समाजस्वातः।

नेवेन रसोप्रमेयं स्थानं, पदं दुःख भवितृमश्चएव—रस्वेतृक्षाप्रायं भूसैं, न मन्मेयपरिच्छान्वातः। तत्रीपि सप्तनिपदीति जात्मं? नेवं रसाय, अधि तु तद्विषयसनातः। तत्तबन्धु कु ल बति तद्वेकीवर्णावित्त्वं रसाय निवित्तिरूपं तेन न वैचिद देवः। सा च रसाय न प्रमाणायपारो न कार्क्षापारः। कु ल तु नागामन्तिका कहं नवेश्चोपप्रज्ञालात्। रसाय बोधीचित्ते किं तु बोधारोयो विलासोऽवेन, उपपायानि विभावनोऽनि वैदिकविवेचारः। तेन विभावादिस्वेकाधसना चतो नित्यायते तत्त्वाचार वर्षाणागोपारे चौकिकोर सरोधी रस इति वाक्यमित्रः। स्वरुपायमें संचिदीपम्—सूक्तप्रत्तीर्थज्ञां नायवाबदिर्षिकाचारः। गाथाप्रामविवेजतस्माराच कालवासानागोपारे भवित्तिकामापि न तति रामण्डीविवाचारः। अयोगीकविभवेंद्रकाल्याम्। रोमाछापरख भूजस रतिप्रतिलोक्तिकारित्वा वृंदावन्तलि पुंचिकां देशकालाविश्वेन रति गमचन्ति। यथाः सालापि तद्वहारमविद्वाचारः। वियोगेन न तद्वात्त्वा रामवर्गः। न च नियत्तामार्शतव, बेनाजीवोधाकादिस्वेतमापि। न च नियत-प्राकादमार्शतव, बेन दुःखदेवावधुः। तेन साधारणीभूता संयत्ताकोरदेवः च वा संगीतो गोष्टोमूला रति सूक्ष्मः। साधारणीभूता च विभाविदिन्तिरिति।

तथ साधारणान्तः [वाहा]

केलीकोण्डिलित्व विभासाहो धुम बृहस्ते दूषी
महंधुकाराकामायुक्त सम्बन्धः कालमकर्मम्।
अयोगीक विकारारामली व्याख्यामन्तिकांसः।
सर्व निष्पादुः वेदान्तावेदमेदसान लमेका इति।

कथा च विभावकं सौद्यविवेचारः प्राधाशिष्येन भावः। तद्वहारमवेन केलीविभामुक्तगतकम्
योमिग्रहां चायमादिभें महंधुसात्रिकादिस्वेतमासः। प्रतिवासितं तथा वाक्यकालितमापि रामकालितमापि भूक्षादमस्वे भूक्षादमस्वे।

१० केमचण्डकालानुशास्त्रम् (प. ४४)।
विधिवानभावप्राधान्य— यथा सुक्षमार्थतप्राधान्यवित्तिसकलवाण्यस्मार्थस्यपूर्ण-
भावसंतपदनिहितजगानस्येिन्द्राणस्य।

51 वहिष्ठिकिरतं विलोकितं वज्रो निन्दितं लोचने
यद्यायो दर्शितं प्रतिदिनं लुग्नाकिनीगामवतं।
दूहं द्वाककाविनिर्द्वकं निबिधं यथाविधमं गमयं।
तारो युनि सन्योगानं वानृतक्षेत्रं वेिस्वतिः॥

अध्ययनेति वज्रश्र इति प्रतिदिननिति च पदसम्पर्वता विभिन्नस्य। काले इति
परालिन्तच विभिन्नो गुणलेन प्रतिभास्ति। विभिन्नभावस्यभ्रमितं विनिविधमाचर
तान्तरतत्त्वमुविमाकेवायूक्तिमभीषितमुक्तीमात्रः।

विभिन्नस्य तु प्राधान्यं विभिन्नानुवाचप्राधान्यकं तत्चादं यथा, मथाये।

कालसम्म

विभिन्नमात्रामधिकामूलितं
कालाः प्रकेिष्ठोंचित्रीचित्री।
वज्रो जलमोक्षाचीमाना
वोषणप्रतिशारीकालक्षतम॥

32 इत्यज सुकुमारप्रसंगदानमुखातिमभिन्नस्य विथाणिसमविन्दुस्वरूपमेििििििेितिेः प्राधान्यम्।
तद्भवानां प्राधान्यादि सौंदर्यकितिनविन्दुस्वरूपम् तद्भवानां तद्भवानां। यथं
इस्प्राधान्ये चोदार्थवर्तम्यूं, किंतु समप्राधान्य एव रसाकाशस्योऽस्य। तत्र प्रभुवः एव
भवति, वक्तुः द्रेणाश्चर्वेव। यदा वामम्— "साधनेभु द्रश्चर्वेव वेऽः।" इति।
तृप्तसम्पवात् य ग्रन्थे भावविन्दुस्वरूपमहाज्ञातविन्दुस्वरूपातु।
तपश्रीक्षोत्कम्यं सुहः। तथा च तत्र सस्त्रां वृत्तारेिम्यं विचित्रम्। तेन चे
कायास्मातप्राधान्यमूलितोऽितुविन्दुस्वरूपम्। तेनां प्रतिरिविविभावासुमोलनेवपि
परिस्थितिः एव साज्ञातार्थस्य कायाः। कृतुः। अत्यवः तेनां कायमेव प्रतीविविधाते
र्वान्, वानपदित्वान्नामणि। तेनां तु हावे। "नियोभितस्पएिा ग्रहितस्वास्त्:।" इति
नाथायेन सुिरं निरंमुीमार्थाय। आहस्यानं च तदेव नात्मायाधिकार, यथा पन्नता
गौतमकाठो न वैस्विन्ताय परिभाषिनि नाथोपलकाठात्। तत्र च नातो(?) वायिनानि

51 सौंदर्यानुवाचप्राधान्यमूलकोशोंचित्री।
52 विभिन्नभावस्य भ्रात्रकितिसाधनेनृितुविन्दुस्वरूपमेििििेितिेः प्राधान्यम्।
53 कायामेव प्रतीतिनिविधिकारणम्।
इदं ध्यानपद्ध, न च तत्तत्त्वेऽव सिद्धार्थामुः वासुदेवं स्मरणाप्रार्थिनि:। अयिपि तु
तत्तुपायद्दातिस्तमातारतैः समस्तमक्षीत्रगोचरो देवतादिविशेषो ध्यायिणं प्रवशसः।
तदस्मातप्रक्रिया
नान्योपश्रादितिनिदिवस्तद्ध्वसायविधायो नियतदेशऽकारादयस्यः।
(?) इदं पञ्चमीति विधिस्वामीयोऽत्यो भृतातिविमतरस्तिसुः।(?) कृष्णन्यायिनिमादी
प्रवर्धवचारी वा न
वाध्यकोदयः।
HISTORY OF THE RĀTHORS.

PANDIT RĀM KARAN, VIDYĀRATNA,

Historical Department, Jodhpur, Lecturer in Rājput History, University of Calcutta.

The Rāṭhor tribe claims a high antiquity for itself. As early as the middle of the third century B.C., during the time of Aśoka, his inscriptions mention the Rāṣṭikas. It appears that in his time the modern Rāṭhor tribe was known as Rāṣṭikas.

Of the numerous inscriptions of Aśoka, discovered in all parts of India, those at Jūnāgaḍh, Mānsērā and Šahabāzgaḍhi only contain reference to the Rāṣṭikas. In the Fifth Rock Edict of Jūnāgaḍh, the Rāṣṭikas are mentioned along with other races, such as, the Yavanas, the Kāmbojas, the Gāndhāras and the Petenikas.

“थमाय तस च योम-कांबोज-गंधारां रास्तिक-पेतेनिकां वे चापि चाजे अपराता।”

Likewise, the edicts at Mānsērā and the Šahabāzgaḍhi also mention the Rāṣṭikas, from which it is clear that at that period the Rāṣṭrakūṭa tribe abounded in large numbers in those places and was regarded as an important and brave one.

It is from ‘Rāṣṭika’ that the apabhraṃśa term Rāṭṭa was derived; the latter, again, in the hands of learned Sāṃskṛt writers took the form of Rāṣṭra; and the important members of this tribe were thenceforward known as the Rāṣṭrakūṭas. Traces of Rāṣṭrakūṭa principalities from early times are met with both in Southern as well as in Northern India. But that in the Deccan acquired so much strength after it had conquered the Chālukyas, that a large part of India passed into its hands within a short interval. Its possessions then extended from the Adams Bridge, the farthest limit in the south, to Nepāl in the north.

1 “संक्षेपसम्बन्धमाय तस्य च यवनवालाष्मय राष्ट्रपदेशिकाः वे चापि चाजे अपराता।” Bhāvanagar Inscriptions, p. 203.
2 Near Baluchistān.
3 Words like कुट, शिशर, तिंकक, सुकुट, शाङूल, etc., indicate superiority.
and from Guzerat and Malwa in the west to the Central Provinces, Behar, Bengal and the Himalayas in the east.

Inscriptions of the Rāṣṭrakūṭas have been traced both in the Northern as well as Southern India; and, according to Dr. Fleet, the Rāṣṭrakūṭas of the south migrated there from the north. This conjecture seems reasonable in so far as the Aśoka edicts containing the reference to the Rāṣṭikas have been found at Jūnāgaḍh, Mānsāra and Shahabāzgaḍhī, places situated in or contiguous to the North-Western parts of India.

Although inscriptions relating to several Rāṣṭrakūṭa families in Northern India have been traced out, they do not enable us to construct a connected and systematic history of those families like the Rāṣṭrakūṭas of the south—save and except the Rāṭhors (Gahaḍawālas) of Kanouj.

Copperplates of Abhimanyu, Nannarāja and Nandarāja, (all belonging to the Rāṣṭrakūṭa tribe), discovered in Northern India, are in point of time earlier than any inscription, so far discovered, relating to the Rāṣṭrakūṭas of the South. The copperplate of Abhimanyu was found at Undiskavatikā and has been published by Dr. Bhāu Dāji. Though it contains no date, Dr. Bhagavānlāi Indrajī ascribes it to the fifth century A.D. Dr. Fleet however refers it to the seventh century and in support of his conjecture says that its palaeography tallies with the Vallabhi plates. This copperplate contains the following four names:

1. Mānāṅka.
2. Devarāja.
4. Abhimanyu.

Two other inscriptions of the Rāṣṭrakūṭas have been found at Multai, in the Beṭūl pargannah, Central Provinces. One of them referring to Nanparāja, Śaka Saṃvat 553 (631 A.D.), discovered at Tivarakhed, contains the following four names:

1. Durgarāja.
2. Govindarāja.
3. Swāmikarāja.
4. Nannarāja.

---

5 Kielhorn, Northern Lías, No. 607.
6 Ibid., footnote No. 4.
The second inscription refers to Nannarāja and the Śaka year 631 \(^{3}\) (709 A.D.). This also supplies us with four names:—

1. Durgarāja.
2. Govindarāja.
3. Swāmikarāja.

It will be found that the first three names in the above two inscriptions are the same. The fourth name only is different; it is Nannarāja in the first and Nandarāja in the second inscription. It should also be noted that Nannarāja is spoken of as the son of Swāmikarāja in the first, while in the second inscription Swāmikarāja’s son is said to be Nandarāja. It is clear therefore that Nandarāja was the younger brother of Nannarāja and it is highly probable that after Swāmikarāja, Nannarāja ascended the throne and he was succeeded by his younger brother Nandarāja.

A fourth and later inscription of this tribe referring to the time of Parabala of Vikrama Samvat 917 \(^{9}\) has been found at Paṭhārī in the Bhopāl State. It contains three names:—

1. Jejjaṭa. \(^{10}\)
2. Karkarāja.
3. Parabala.

Parabala’s daughter Raṇṇādevī was married to Dharmapāla \(^{11}\) of the Pāla dynasty of Gauḍa. Verse 14 of this inscription informs us that Parabala defeated Nāgāvaloka who appears to be Nāgabhaṭa, son of the Pratihāra king, Vatsarāja. An inscription \(^{12}\) of Nāgabhaṭa has been traced at the village of Ruchkalā in the gargannah of Bilādā, Mārwār. It bears the date of Saṃvat 872 and is thus close to the time of Parabala.

A fifth and still later inscription \(^{13}\) referring to the reign of Tuṅga-dharmāvaloka and discovered at Buddh-Gayā contains the following three names:—

1. Nanna-Guṇāvaloka.
2. Kirtirāja.
3. Tuṅgadharmāvaloka.

---

\(^{3}\) Ind. Ant., Vol. XVIII, pp. 234.  
\(^{10}\) Professor Kielhorn reads ‘Jejja’, but it is Jejjaṭa.  
\(^{11}\) Vide Kielhorn, Northern List, No. 635.  
\(^{13}\) Dr. Rājendralal Mitra, Buddha-Gayā, p. 195 and Plate XL.
Tuṅga's daughter Bhāgyadevi\(^{14}\) was married to Rājyapāla, the fifth lineal descendant of Dharmapāla of the famous Pāla dynasty of Bengal. It is this connection which clearly proves the present inscription to be later than the preceding one.

All the important Rāṭhor ruling families of Rājputānā trace their descent from Sihāji who carved out an independent principality for himself in Mārwār about the middle of the thirteenth century of the Christian era. But epigraphic evidence shows that long before the establishment of a Rāṭhor principality by Sihā, independent Rāṭhor principalities existed in Rājputānā. Close to Bijāpur, a village in the Godwādā district, Mārwār, lies a solitary Jaina temple, stuck up against the walls of which was found an inscription of 1053\(^{15}\) which has now been deposited in the Ajmer Museum. It informs us that there was a city named Hastikundī ruled over by a Rāṣṭrakūṭa family. It also supplies us with the dates of the three princes of the ruling family. The genealogy as given in this inscription is:

1. Harinvāma.
2. Vidagdharāja—V.S. 973.
4. Dhavala —V.S. 1053.
5. Bālaprasāda.

Inscriptions of still another Rāṣṭrakūṭa family of Rājputānā have been discovered at Dhanop in the Koṭā State. One \(^{16}\) of these bears the date of V.S. 1063 and supplies the following names:

1. Bhallila (†).
2. Dantiyārāṇa.


The inscriptions and copperplate grants mentioned above have been found at various places and although of the same Rāṣṭrakūṭa tribe they refer to independent branches of it. It is therefore impossible to form any connected history or genealogy out of these disconnected materials.

Copperplates varying from 60 to 65 in number have been discovered

---

\(^{14}\) Kiellhorn, *Northern List*, No. 640.


\(^{16}\) Unpublished.
dealing with the Rāthors of Kanouj alone. From these it has been possible to establish a connected account and genealogy of the Rāthors of Kanouj from the time of Yaśovigraha to that of Hariśchandra; while, from an inscription in Badāun we get the genealogy of the Rāthors of Badāun from the time of Chandra, grandson of Yaśovigraha, to that of Lākhaṇa-pāla. To this day the Rājās of Rāmpur in Etāh district claim lineal descent from Jajapāla, a descendant of Jayachandra of Kanouj; and it was Rāv Sīhā, another descendant of this Jayachandra, who migrated to Mārwār and members of whose family hold many principalities in Rajputānā and Mālwā even now.

In the Kanouj plates the name of the tribe is invariably given as Gahāḍawāla, in the Badāun inscription it is Rāṣṭrakūṭa and in the inscriptions of Mārwār it is either Rāṣṭrakūṭa or Rāṭhor. Besides these variations others also occur; such as, Raṣṭraudā, Raṣṭravara Rāṣṭravarya, Raṭṭtha-uda, Raṭha-uda, Raṭhaḍa and Raṭhavara. The Prākṛta version of the term Rāṣṭra, was Raṭṭa, as, that of Kūṭa was Ûda; and the name Raṭhauḍa was derived from the conjunction of these two Prākṛta terms.

The late Dr. V. A. Smith maintained in his books that the Gahāḍawāla dynasty of Kanouj had nothing to do with the Rāṭhors or Rāṣṭrakūṭas, and that therefore the claim of the Gahāḍawālas to be reckoned as Rāṭhors lay on no sounder basis than a myth. But it will be seen from what follows that the Gahāḍawālas formed an important sept of the Rāṭhor tribe or clan; just as the Hāḍās, the Khichis and the Devḍās did of the Chauhāns, or the Sisodiyās and the Āhāḍās of the Gehalots. The following facts will show clearly that the Gahāḍawālas were Rāṭhors:—Firstly, the Gahāḍawālas, to this day, maintain that they belong to the Rāṭhor clan. The Rājā of Māndā, Bijāpur, in the Mirzāpur district belongs to the Gahāḍawāla sept and claims that he comes of the Rāṭhor clan. It is also held that he is a lineal descendant of Māṇikchandra, brother of Jayachandra of Kanouj. Secondly, it is accepted on all hands that Jayachandra of Kanouj belonged to the Rāṭhor clan. Thirdly, Chandavardāi, the author of Prthvirājarāso, applies the epithets Rāṭhor and Kamaḍhajā to Jayachandra. These two terms are synonymous—the latter one being used almost always in poetry in place of the former. Fourthly, the inscription of Lākhaṇa-pāla of Badāun clearly says that the first Rāṭhor prince to conquer Paṇchāladeśa was Chandra; and in the copperplate found at Chandrā-
vati and relating to the Kanouj princes also Chandra is mentioned as the first prince who conquered Pañchāladeśa by his own arms. We quote the following from the Badāun inscription (lines 2–3):—

"प्रक्षालविन्दुः कुचविन्दुः पत्तलविन्दुः पालदोपालिता।
प्रक्षालविन्दुः पौनमस्य वीरविन्दुः पौरी॥
तचारितो भवदेवस्य गरेयः
'चसः सक्तेऽभयभृतिवेपिन्दः'॥

which means, "There is the city named Bodāmayūtā (Badāun), the ornament of the tract known as Pañchāla, and protected by the arms of princes of the celebrated Rāṣṭrákūṭa clan. In that city the first prince to rule was Chandra, the receptacle of all virtues, and the terri- fier of his enemies by the power of his own sword."

And in the Chandrāvatī copperplate of Saṃvata 1150 also occurs the following description of Chandra (line 12):—

"चलप्रस्वाकृतीलकन्यन्तरसीमाः"

"he whose sword kissed the locks of (i.e. conquered) the fickle Pañchāla country." It is clear therefore, that the Chandra of the Chandrāvatī copperplate and that of the Badāun inscription must be one and the same individual. The Badāun inscription states in unequivocal terms that the first prince to conquer Pañchāladeśa was Chandra; and the Chandrāvatī copperplate no less distinctly affirms that Chandra was the first king of Kanouj who conquered Pañchāladeśa. No doubt should therefore be entertained that these two Chandras indicate but one and the same individual, since both the inscriptions regard Chandra to be the first conqueror of the tract referred to. Moreover, the fact that these two inscriptions refer to about the same time supports the above argument. A copperplate of Jaychandra’s son, Hariśchandra, the sixth in descent from Chandra, bears the date of V.S. 1253; while the Badāun inscription of Lākhanaṇāpāla, who was eighth in descent from Chandra, refers to about 1280 V.S. The interval between these two inscriptions is only 27 years—a period which is quite possible to be covered by two generations of rulers.

The genealogy of the two branches is as follows:—
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Kanouj line.</th>
<th>Badānum line.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5. Jayachandra.</td>
<td>5. Tribhuvana Madanapāla Devapāla.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Śrīpāla.</td>
<td>7.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

We have set forth above the conclusive proofs which show that the Chandra's are indistinguishable. Also we know that the two lines of princes which branched off from Chandra were known by two separate designations, one being called Gahaḍawāla and the other Rāṭhor. Now the question arises which of these two names then was the earlier and original one? We have already seen that the Gahaḍawālas claim themselves to belong to the Rāṭhor clan. Thus, prima facie, it would appear that the name Rāṭhor was the earlier and original one, while the Gahaḍawālas were a sept of the Rāṭhors. Moreover, from epigraphic evidence also we learn that while inscriptions of the Rāṭhors have been traced bearing very early dates, no mention of Gahaḍawālas has been found in any inscription prior to the eleventh century of the Christian era. In these circumstances we are compelled to acknowledge that the Rāṭhor is the original name of the clan; while the Gahaḍawāla is but a name of one of its septs or branches. It is customary to mention only the sept when it has acquired some preeminence in place of the clan or tribal name. Thus although the Sindhals and the Ühaḍas are only septs of the Rāṭhor clan, they invariably style themselves as Sindhals and Ühaḍas respectively, instead of as Rāṭhors; and only when pressed for their tribal name they would give themselves out as Rāṭhors. In the same way, the Gahaḍawālas and the Rainkawālas are septs of the Rāṭhors; only after persistent queries would they tell us that they belong to the Rāṭhor clan; but, on the contrary, in their correspondence and inscriptions, they do invariably proclaim themselves as Gahaḍawālas or Rainkawālas.

The Kanouj plates supply us with eight names, from Yaśovigraha
to Hariśchandra. The Chandrāvatī plate of 1148 V.S. referring to the
time of Chandradev says that after a long line
of princes in the Solar line had ruled there arose
Yāsovigraha.

His son and successor was the celebrated Mahichandra, otherwise
known as Mahītala or Mahiyala.

The third prince of the line was Chandradev, sometimes written
as Chandra. Three copperplates of his time (V.S.
1148–1150; and 1156) have so far been discovered.

We are told therein that he was a just ruler, a crusher of his enemies and
a destroyer of the arrogant. It was by his own arms that he destroyed
the oppression exercised upon the people and acquired the widely-
extensive country of Kanouj. His dominion extended over Kāśi
(Benares), Kusīka (Kanouj), Northern Kosala (Oudh) as well as Indra-
thāna (Delhi). He is said to have been always travelling over the holy
places where he distributed gold equal to the weight of his own person.
He also set up an image of Viṣṇu, called Ādikeśava, at Benares and
conquered Pañchaladesa.

As his earliest date is that given in the copperplate of 1148 V.S.
when he had already become king; we may assume that it was some
years previous to the year 1148 that he had conquered and made him-
self master of Kanouj.

The Basāhi copperplate of V.S. 1161 expressly mentions that he
took possession of Kanouj after the death of Bhoja and Karna who
appear to have belonged to the Paramāra and the Haihaya dynasties
respectively. These two latter princes were at feud with each other.
Karna is mentioned to have once led an attack against Bhoja and was a
very powerful prince who conquered the Gauḍa and the Gurjara coun-
tries. It is likely that Kanouj fell into his hands at that time. After
Karna’s death disturbance arose in his kingdom which was taken advan-
tage of by Chandra who soon usurped the throne of Kanouj.

“Nayn Pāl . . . . in the year S. 526 (A.D. 470),” writes Col. Tod,17
“conquered Canouj, slaying its monarch Ajipāl; from which period the
race was termed Canoujea Rathore.” No trace, however, of the Rāṭhors
coming into possession of Kanouj as early as V.S. 526 has been so far
discovered. On the contrary, epigraphic evidence enables us to ascertain

that at that period the powerful Gupta dynasty held sway over Kanouj and continued in possession of that province till V.S. 589. Later on the Maukharis came into possession of that province about V.S. 611 and later still in V.S. 663 the famous Bais dynasty acquired that principality. Foregoing account of Tod, written on the authority of a Jaina Yaṭṭi, appears to be far from reliable.

Madanapāla, otherwise known as Madanadev, is said to have defeated a large number of his enemies. From a copperplate, dated V.S. 1154, referring to Madanapāla but issued during the lifetime of his father, Chandradev, it is known that during the latter part of his reign Chandradev, invested his son Madanapāla with all regal powers and renounced the throne.

Nearly 40 copperplates of his reign have so far come to light, besides several gold coins. He led an expedition against Gauḍa and gained a victory there. By this time the Mahomedans had advanced as far as Lāhore and were even trying to penetrate further south. Govindachandra was thus compelled to take up arms against these invaders to oppose their progress. He was noted for his heroism as well as his learning. His copperplates give him the title of विविधविषयाविचारस्य प्रमाणात to him. He was a patron of all learned men who were favoured by him in every way. His copperplates assign to him the dates V.S. 1161-V.S. 1211; but a copperplate of V.S. 1166 begins thus "In the victorious reign of Madanapāla—Mahārāja-putra Govindachandraddev." From this it appears that Madanapāla had invested his son with all regal powers during his lifetime. Govindachandra had three sons—Vijyachandra, Rājyapāla and Āsphoṭachandra. His queen, Kumaradevi, caused a temple to be constructed and handed it over to Dharma Chakra Jinaśāsana. By the royal order, his minister of peace and war Lakshmidhara, wrote a book named Vyavahārakalpataru.

Vijyachandra was also known as Malladev. His queen was Chandralekhā. He was a devotee of Viṣṇu and constructed several temples which were dedicated to this divinity. We know from his copperplate of V.S. 1224 that he installed his son Jayachandra into the Yuvarājaship.

Jayachandra was also known as Jaitrachandra and sometimes as Jayantachandra. His grandfather Govinda-
chandra conquered the country of Daśārṇa on the day of his birth and this led to his being called Jaitrachandra. His
coronation took place in V.S. 1226. As he had a large army at his command he acquired the epithet Dalapangula.\textsuperscript{18} He defeated the Chandel king Madanavarma\textsuperscript{19} of Kalinjara and annexed his territories to his kingdom. An inscription of this Madanavarma bears the date of V.S. 1219.\textsuperscript{20} Jayachandra was a patron of learning. The famous poet Śrī-Harṣa, the author of the great epic Naiśadha,\textsuperscript{21} adorned his court. This king is said to have performed the Rājasūya sacrifice in this Kali age, and it was on the occasion of this ceremony that enmity grew up between him and Prthvirāja, the Chauhāna king of Delhi and Ajmer which weakened both the contending parties and thus afforded an excellent opportunity to the Mahomedans who were steadily pressing forward. The invaders found another tempting occasion for interference as Jayachandra’s mistress Sūhavadevī requested her husband to make her son Meghabhāna the heir-apparent; and as this suggestion was declined by the king, Sūhavadevī sent a confidential messenger to the Mahomedans asking their aid.

Jayachandra constructed several forts. One was in the city of Kanouj itself, a second at Asai in the Etawah district and a third at Kurra on the Ganges. At the last place a severe battle took place between himself and the Mahomedans, and several of their important Amirslay dead on the field as indicated by the remains of old tombs there.

The first attacks of the Mahomedans were defeated by Jayachandra, but in the battle which took place at Chandāval in V.S. 1250 against Shāhābuddin Ghori, he was himself defeated and while fleeing across the Ganges he was drowned. Some authorities hold that he died on the field of battle. Whatever version may be regarded as true, it is admitted on all hands that he died in that very year. With the death of Jayachandra the Hindu principalities of Northern India fell easily into the hands of the Mahomedans who established their authority on the soil of India.

\textsuperscript{18} "ग्राभकामवानानवत्यहितिः प्रवहितिः निम्लिमिनिं न
At Jayachandra’s death Kanouj was occupied by the Mahomedans. The Rāthhors fled in all directions and founded independent states wherever there was an opportunity of protecting themselves against the onrush of the invaders. On enquiry into the early history of places like Rāmpur, Khemsepur and Śamsābād, we come to learn that after the fall of Kanouj the Rāthhors at first retired to Khoḍa (Śamsābād) and established themselves there. This is corroborated by the Āin-i Akbari. A copperplate grant of V.S. 1253 and referring to the reign of Hariśchandra, son of Jayachandra, attributes to that prince the titles like those of his father. Moreover we know that he made a gift of some villages to Brahmans. There is no reason to doubt that Hariśchandra was an independent prince. The early history of Rāmpur and the adjacent places shows us that Hariśchandra’s kingdom extended as far as Khoḍa (modern Śamsābād) a district which his father, Jayachandra, acquired after defeating the Bhors. The principality of Khoḍa was ruled by the Rāthhors from 1251 to 1270. In the following year, 1271, Śamsuddin Altamaś sent an expedition against Khoḍa and drove the Rāthhors from that place and its name was now changed into Śamsābād after himself. The Mahomedan conquerer also set up a governor of his own at that place. Driven out of their homes, the Rāthhors fled in all directions and established themselves wherever they found a refuge. The descendants of Jajapāla, son of Jayachandra, at this time, fled to Uset in the Badāun district where a branch of the Rāṣṭrakūṭas had been ruling. Soon however about V.S. 1280, Mahomedans attacked that place so that the Rāthhors retired to Vilasaḍa. Later on, Rājā Rāmasahāya settled down at Rāmpur. His descendants in still later times divided themselves off into two main branches—the scions of which at present are the Rājas of Rāmpur in the Etāh district and the Rāvs of Khemsepur in the Furrukhābād district. Besides these, there are still other families in that place.

The descendants of Hariśchandra (Vardāisena) retired in the first place to Furrukhābād from Khoḍa and settled at Mahui. A fortress was constructed on the river Kali; and, from that place they went to Mārwār. Mr. Kālīrāya states in his history of Fatehgaḍh that the name of

---

24 Fatehgaḍiḥnāmā, passim.
Hariśchandra is changed into Harsu, while in the history of Rāmpur and other places it is transformed into Prahaṣta, and in the history of Mārwār it becomes Vardāisena. The following lists will make the point clearer.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Kanouj</th>
<th>Fatḥgharh</th>
<th>Rāmpur</th>
<th>Khemsepur</th>
<th>Mārwār</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Copperplate.</td>
<td>nāma.</td>
<td>history</td>
<td>history</td>
<td>Chronicles.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


It will be seen from the above that Vardāisena, Prahaṣta, Harsu and Hariśchandra refer to but one and the same person. Occasionally in the inscriptions two or three names of the same person are given. Of the above names Harsu is but a variant form of Hariśchandra, while the others too may be regarded as indicative of the same person. All our authorities maintain that Sīhā who went over to Mārwār was a descendant of Hariśhechandra. The inscription ²⁵ of V.S. 1645 of Rāsiṃhaji of Bikāner speaks of Sīhā as the great-grandson of Jayachandra. The Āin-i Akbari ²⁶ holds Sīhā to be a nephew of Jayachandra; while Col. Tod describes Sīhā in different places as his nephew, ²⁷ his son, ²⁸ or his grandson. ²⁹ Whatever may be the relationship, every version declares Sīhā to be a lineal descendant of Hariśchandra and Jayachandra. In truth, Sīhā was the great-grandson of Jayachandra and his descendants are styled Kanoujā Rāṭhors.

In an inscription of Sīhā dated V.S. 1330, ³⁰ Setarāma ³¹ is held to be the father of Sīhā and as the epithet 'prince' is appended to Setarāma’s name, it is apparent

---

²⁵ Unpublished. "तप्रालिङ्गवन्द्रीमुख्यवन्द्रञ्जनभवन्। वर्दायेंसन्मति तन्वीसुतुलविक्रमः। नृदाराजः सीतरामो रामभवित्रायमः। सीतरामस्य तन्वी घापस्यिरामभिः। राजा सीह दत्त्वमिश्वान शीयस्यसम्बन्धः॥"

²⁸ Ibid., Vol. I, p. 78.
³¹ Col. Tod (Vol. II, p. 9) is of opinion that Setarāma is the brother of Sīhā and adds that Sīhā fought a battle with Lākhā Phulāni in which he was killed. But nowhere in the bardic chronicles (Khyātas) is Setarāma described as Sīhā’s brother, nor is there any mention of his having been killed in battle. Setarāma was not the brother, but the father of
that Setarâma was a younger son of Vardâisena. In the U.P. the custom prevails that the reigning sovereign is known by such titles as Râjâ Râv, etc., while the younger brother obtains the title of ‘prince’ (कुंवर) even after the father’s death.

In V.S. 1268, Šamsuddin Altamaś ascended the throne of Delhi and in 1271 led an expedition against Khôda where the descendants of Jayachandra were ruling. After a hard struggle in which Šamsuddin gained the victory, the Râthors were driven from that place. Râv Sihâji, or his father, passed through Modhâ and reached Mahui. There, on the bank of the river Kali built a fort, the remains of which exist to this day and which look like a mound of earthwork. Even now the people of the locality point out this place as the mound of Râv Sihâ.

It is very likely that owing to a Mahomedan invasion on this place Sihâji left it and proceeded towards the west. An inscription of Râv Sihâ dated V.S. 1330 found at Bîthû in Mârwâr enables us to say that Sihâ went to Mârwâr about 1300 V.S. In 1271 V.S. when Khôda had passed out of his hands, he proceeded to Mahui and built a fort there too, so he must have resided there for twenty-five or thirty years. It was after this that Sihâ proceeded to Mârwâr.

Sihâji’s descendants in Mârwâr are known as Kanoujiâ Râthors in accordance with their early history which, as we have just seen, shows us that they had come to Mârwâr from Kanouj. An inscription of Jagmâl II found at Nagara, dated V.S. 1686, applies the epithets Sûryavanâşi and Kanoujiâ Râthor to him. A copy of a copperplate inscription of Jodhâji has come to light which informs us that an

Sihâ. The above-mentioned inscription of 1330 mentions Setarâma as the father of Sihâ. His battle with Lâkhâ Phûlânî and his death therein, though based entirely on the authority of the bhâṣî chronicles are historical statements: Lâkhâ Phûlânî was a ruler of Cutch and was killed by Mûlarâja I of the Solañki clan, the chief of Anâhilwâd. Deyûsraya Mahâkâiûya written by Hemachandra-Achârya states, that Mûlarâja I with his iron spear killed Lâkhâ.

Mûlarâja’s copperplates dating from V.S. 973 to 1005, have been found. So Lâkhâ must have been his contemporary, while Sihâji’s inscriptions bear the date of 1330. As there is thus an interval of three centuries between Sihâji and Lâkhâ, so it is not possible for the latter to have killed the former.

32 “स्त्रिजविर्धी कनोजिया राठोड़ घोड़ा।”
33 “भुजरावजी वैजीधासी वचन के तथा कनोज वंश में अछे रिमो जात रे भारसू जीजा लोड़ सेवा लेने खायो दुर राठोड़ वंश में वे है—पहली राठोड़ वंश रे मानजी वी चादपणजी
image of his family goddess was brought to Mārwār from Kanouj. It may be said that the inscription is not in original. But a sanad, testifying to the accuracy of this inscription, is still in possession of a Sāraswat Brahman Jayarām, a lineal descendant of Rāshbhdev. Jodhāji’s copperplate supplies us also with this further information that when the image of the family goddess had been procured from Kanouj, Dhūhadji appointed Lumb Rṣi to be the priest for her worship and handed over a copperplate grant in testimony of the rights conferred upon him. Jodhāji’s copperplate of 1516 V.S. was only a fresh copy of this earlier one. It is said that the tutelary goddess appeared before Dhūhadji in the form of a serpent which acquired for her the name of Nāganechiyā. A temple dedicated to her still exists at Nāgānā in the Pachapadarā Pargannah and an image of the same divinity is also to be found in Jodhpur fort, the hereditary priests for her worship being Sāraswat Brahmans. It is still spoken of as having been made by Dhūhadji.

Sihāji was proceeding on a pilgrimage to Dwārakā after leaving Kanouj and was encamped near the sacred place Puśkar. At that time a party of Bhīnmāl Brahmans who had gone on a pilgrimage near Puśkar met him there, and finding that Sihāji commanded a very strong force requested him to protect them against the Mahomedans who were always giving them trouble. Sihā promised assistance and going forthwith along with them defeated the invaders. An old verse relating to this incident says

"भीममाल लोही भड़े, सोंहें सेल बनाय।
दल दोनों सत संग्रही, जो जस करे न जाय।"

After he had finished his religious duties at Dwārakā, Sihā stayed for a time at Anāhilvāḍa and then returned to Mārwār. At this time the Brahmans of Pāli approached Sihā, who had already earned a name for himself by his bravery, and prayed for his assistance against the Menās, the Mīrs, the Vālīsās and other freebooters of the locality.
and promised to pay him one lac of rupees in case he was successful. Pâli was at this time a famous entrepot for trade. Merchandise from the western countries, such as Arabia, Persia passed through it to the eastern parts of India and vice versa. Tradition has it that there were a lac of families in this city. Sihâ’s help was requested by Yasodhara, the leader of the Brâhmans who were saved from these freebooters. The Brâhmans gave him some villages wherewith he could maintain his retinue. Sihâ married into the Solaṅkî family and his wife bore him three sons—Āsthâna, Sonaga and Aja. A short time later, Sihâ took possession of some places from the Gohils of Khêd and was trying to establish himself there, when a Mahomedan invasion of Pâli took place. But Sihâji at once marched upon that place and not only drove away the invaders but followed them for some distance. An engagement took place at Bîthû and Sihâji was himself among the slain. His wife, the Solaṅkini Parvati, followed him to the funeral pyre. An inscription relating to this incident dated V.S. 1330 has been traced at Bîthû and is now in the Mehkmâ Tawârikh of the Jodhpur darbâr. Close by a well in Pâli there is a funeral monument which tradition attributes to the memory of Sihâji. It is possible that a memorial stone was raised up in this place by his successors, in addition to the regular one built over the cremation spot at Bîthû in accordance with custom. This has caused the erection of two memorial monuments in memory of the same person, the one being at the place of cremation and the other at the place where he lived.

Like his father, Āsthânji also stayed at Pâli on the revenue of lands bestowed by the Brâhmans. At this time some misunderstanding arose between the Gohil chief of Khêd and his minister who was a Dâbhî Râjput. The latter came at once to Āsthânji and proposed to raise him to the throne of Khêd, if the latter was willing. A plan was at once agreed upon and it was settled that should any engagement take place between the Râthors and the Gohils, the Dâbhîs who formed a part of the latter army would be on the left wing so that there might be no difficulty in recognising them. To this day a proverb says, “Dâbhîs to the left and Gohils to the right.” After this a pretext was sought out to stir up a quarrel.

26 Ain-i Akbari (transl. Blochmann and Jarrett Vol. II, p. 271) states that Sihâ was killed in a battle at Samsâbâd; but as it is contrary to what the inscription states, it cannot be believed.
Āsthānji demanded the hand of the daughter of Pratāpasimha, the Gohil chief of Khed, in marriage but the latter refused. Āsthānji took this as a good *casus belli* and immediately marched upon Khed and a sanguinary battle took place in which Pratāpasimha died along with a large number of his Gohil followers, while others fled to Kāthiāwār. The descendants of these latter are now chiefs of Ghoghā, Dhrangdhara and Bhāvanagar. As a result of the battle Āsthānji became the master of Khed. An old couplet says:

“गोष्टिल मल्लकुष्ठि, खेड़ घरा खागो मुख़े।
आसो अयालाविष्ट, गल्ल मरियो बल गंजियो।”

“Āsthānji won over Āsā Ḍabhī to his own side and with his help as well as by his own sword broke the power of the Gohils and killed them.”

Over Ídar at this time ruled a Bhil chieftain, named Sāṃvaliya Soḍ. Āsthānji killed him in battle and placed his brother Sonaga over that tract. The descendants of the latter are known as Ídariā Rāṭhors. Aja who was the third brother of Āsthānji went with a party to Okhāmandala, near Dwārakā, and having killed the Chāwḍā chieftain of that place Bhojarāja (Tod calls him Bhīkham Śāh), made himself its master. His descendants are now known as Vadhēla Rāṭhors.

Āsthānji was a strong and successful ruler. It was by his own strength that he conquered such an important principality like Khed and the elevation of his two brothers over two other places was also due to him. He died in 1348 V.S. leaving eight sons behind him, Dhāṇḍhala, Dhāṇḍhala, Chāchaka, Āsala, Haraḍaka, Khīpsā, Pohaḍā, Jopsā, who were the progenitors of twelve branches of the Rāṭhors. The Dhāṇḍhala, Chāchaka, Āsala, Haraḍakata, Khīpsā and Pohaḍā Rāṭhors were named after the six sons. Jopsā had eight sons after whom six branches were named. They were Sindhala, Īhaḍa, Jolu, Mūlu, Rājaga and Jorāwat.

He was as powerful as his father. He conquered 140 villages and annexed them to his paternal state. In his reign a Sāraswat Brāhman, Luṅb Ṛṣi, brought an

38 Col. Tod names him Mahēdasā.
37 Col. Tod mentions that Ḍabhīs were ruling over Ídar at that time. Forbes in his *Rāsmālā* states that the ruler of Ídar was Sāṃvaliya Soḍ.
33 Col. Tod calls them Hathūndiyā Rāṭhors. But the name Hathūndiyā has been derived from Hastikundī, and an inscription of the Hastikundī Rāṭhors bears the date V S. 1035.
36 This date has been supplied from the chronicle of Jośi Śivarāja of Mertā.
image of Chakrëswari, the family goddess of the Râthors, from Kanouj and delivered it to the custody of Dhûhâdji. Chakrëswari is said to have been pleased with Dhûhâdji and blessed him with a vision of hers in the shape of a snake. From this time the family goddess acquired the name of Nâganechïyâ. Dhûhâdji placed the image in a temple constructed near a hill, both of which exist to the present day in a village named Nâgâñâ. The image is still worshipped by the Nâganechïyâ Râthors and it is said that the names of both the village as well of the Râthors who worship her have been derived from her. The Râthors of this place regard with reverence and never cut the branches of the Nimb tree, as it is said that the goddess resided for a time in it. About four koss (eight miles) from Nâgâñâ lies the pargannah of Pachapadarâ and sixteen miles from that village there is a village named Tingdi given to the Brâhmans as a gift. In this village an inscription of Dhûhâdji bearing the date of V.S. 1366, has been discovered; but as most of the letters have been destroyed it is impossible to make out its purport. The date is however very important. We know that in this village a sanguinary battle took place between Dhûhâdji and the Parihâras in which the former lost his life.

Dhûhâdji left seven sons: Râyapâla, Candrapâla, Behâda, Pithâda, Khetapâla, Ûnañ and Jogo. The latter five became the originators of the following five septs respectively; the Behâda Râthors, the Pithâda Râthors, the Khetapâlots, the Ûnañs and the Jogâwats.

He is said to have preserved the life of his subjects by distributing food in times of famine, for which he is known as the Mahirelaña, which means that just as clouds by their showers satisfy the parched earth, in like manner he satisfied his subjects with food.

Rayapâlji left thirteen sons and out of them ten branches issued:—Kelaña’s son Koçechâ was the ancestor of the Koçechâs; Thânthi’s son Fiçaka, of the Fiçakas; Rândo, of the Rândâs; Dângi, of the Dângis; Sûndâ, of the Sûndâs; Mopâ, of the Mopâs; Mohâna, of the Mohaniâs;

40 Some chronicles state that the image was brought from Kalyânî in the Konkana. But Kalyânî from which this image was procured must refer to the Kalyânî Kakâk (Kalyânî) in Kanouj from where the Râthors came to Mârwar. Cf. Bom. Gaz., Vol. I., p. 150.

41 Unpublished.

44 One of the Khyâtas states that the battle in question was fought against a Châhamâna prince named Anâ.
as well as of the Mūhaṇot branch of the Jaina Oswālas; Būlā, of the Būlās; Vikramāditya, of the Vikramāyats.

He succeeded to the throne of Kheḍ and died fighting with the Mahomedans. He left three sons of whom Bhīma was very brave. In a battle which took place on the bank of the Kāka river with the Bhāṭṭīs, although he was killed, the boundary between Jaissalmer and Kheḍ was settled once for all. An old couplet says:

“भागी घरती मोव, भागी लोदरवे घमी।
काक नरौं से सैव, राठोरज ने माटिया॥”

The river Kāka forms the boundary between the Rāṭhors and the Bhāṭṭīs; on one side is the kingdom of Jaissalmer while on the other rules Bhīma.

This ruler declared a tree to be immortal and ordered that no one should pluck out a leaf, a flower or a fruit from it. A certain Soḍhā plucked a fruit of this tree; and as his orders were disobeyed Jālaṇṣī marched upon the culprit’s camp which was looted. A piece of turban cloth was taken away by the Rāv from the camp as a token of his victory. From this time the Rāṭhors began to wear a turban above their heads. An uncle of this prince was murdered by Hájī Malik of the Sarāi tribe and out of a revenge Jālaṇṣī marched to Pālanpur and killed him. He also looted Thaṭṭā and exacted tribute from Multān. The Mahomedans took the offensive and a battle took place in consequence, which ended in the death of Jālaṇṣī. He had three sons Chhāḍā, Bhākharsī and Dūṅgarsi.

On his death bed Jālaṇṣī reminded Chhāḍoṛi to take from Soḍhā Durjansāl of Ümarkoṛ the horses promised in tribute. The son carried out with a vengeance his father’s dying injunction, and took four times the number agreed upon. He compelled the Bhāṭṭīs of Jaissalmer to pay a tribute to him and also to give him a daughter of theirs in marriage. On their refusal, Rāvji marched to Jaissalmer and on a threat of plundering their city compelled the Bhāṭṭīs to accede to his terms. He left seven sons behind him and from them three branches issued: from Khokar, the Khokars; from Bānar, the Bānars; and from Sihāmal, the Sihāmalots.
He succeeded his father in V.S. 1401 and conquered the whole of Mahewā. His next victory over Sāmantasimha the Songara Chauhān chief of Bhīmāl, enabled him to exact tribute from the Bhāṭṭis as well as the Solaṅkis. About this time the Mahomedans fell upon Siwānā, a principality held by the Chauhāns under Sātal and Somā who turned for help to Tiḍoji. The latter marched to the help of his nephew to Siwānā, where a very fierce battle took place in which a large number of Mahomedans lay dead on the field. Ṛavji was himself slain (V.S. 1414). He left three sons, Tribhuvanasi, Kānhaḍa and Salkhā.

After the death of Tiḍoji, Tribhuvanasi ascended the throne. He had three sons, of whom, Ḫūḍ founded a branch called Bhēṭhwasiyā Ḫūḍawat. After Tribhuvansai's death Kāṅhaḍa ruled over Mahewā. During his time the Mahomedans fell upon him and acquired his kingdom.

Salkhājī had married the daughter of the Parihāra Rāṇā Rūpdā of Mandor. With the latter's help Salkhājī reconquered Mahewā from the Mahomedans in 1422. About that time Tribhuvanasi's son Kāṅhaḍa retook Kheḍ after defeating the Mahomedans; but Mallināṭhjī, the eldest son of Salkhājī, invited the Mahomedans of Jālor to attack Kāṅhaḍa who died at their hands. After a reign of eight years over Mahewā, Salkhājī died in a battle against the Mahomedans in 1430. He had four sons, Mallināṭhjī, Jaitmālajī, Vīramjī, Sōbhitajī.

Mallināṭhjī became the next ruler of Mahewā in 1431 after Salkhājī's death. He is regarded as a saint and a temple dedicated to him is now situated at Talawāḍā on the Lūni. His son Jagamālajī was a very brave warrior and brought away by force Gindoli, the daughter of the Mahomedan ruler of Guzerāt. Songs and stories relating to this incident are still to be heard in Mārwār. Eighteen branches originated from Mallināṭhjī, of whom ten were from Jagamāla:—Bāḥaḍamērā, Vāṭāḍā, Sāgara, Thūmaliyā, Khābāriyā, Üngā, Dhāriyā, Kāṅāsariyā, Koṭaḍiāyā and Gāgariyā from Jagmāla; Kusamaliyā from Māṅḍana; Āsādechā from Jaimā; Mahēchā, Jasoliyā, Varayechā from Mandalika; Gomēchā from Kūmpā; Pārakarā from Jagapāla, and Phalasūndiā from Mehā.

Mallināṭhjī appointed his younger brother Jaitmālajī to be the ruler of Siwānā, while Vīramajī ruled at Kheḍ. Sōbhitajī drove away the Paramāras from Osā and lived there. The descendants of Sōbhitajī are known as Sohaḍa Rāṭhors. Five branches originated from Jaitmālajī,
—the Jaitmâlots, the Junjhâniyâs, the Râdadaâs, the Sobhâwats and the Dhavechâs.

The capital of his kingdom was at Khed. A misunderstanding arose between him and Râwal Mallinâthji owing to the following reason. The Joyâs who lived in Sindh looted several articles belonging to the Emperor of Delhi and came to Mallinâthji for shelter. It happened that the Joyâ chief possessed a mare which attracted the fancy of Mallinâthji; but as the former could in no way be persuaded to part with her, ill-feeling grew up between the two, and the Joyâs went straight to Viramâji at Khed for protection. Viramâji welcomed them to his place and the latter were so much pleased with Viramâji that they of their own accord presented him with that mare. Viramâji refused to part with the mare, when his nephew Jagmâlji—Mallinâthji’s eldest son—asked for her, but fled to Mallânî desert and founded Setrâvâ which was given to his son Devrâj. He himself went away to Sindh and the Joyâs presented him with the district of Sahavân. But even then his erratic temperament led him into trouble. In order to have a drum of unusual size he destroyed a Palâsa tree which the Joyâs held sacred. Naturally his hosts resented this act of his, and a quarrel broke out between Viramâji and the Joyâs and he was killed. Viramâji left five sons; four of whom founded four branches of the Râthors: Devarâj, the Devrâjots; Gogâ, the Gogâdes; Jaisimha, the Jaisimhas; Châhaâd, the Châhaâdês.

Viramâji’s son Râv Chûndâjî was a powerful ruler and the principalities of the Râthors in Mârwâr grew extensive in his time. After taking possession of Mandor he conquered Nâgor, Dîwânâ, Khâtu, Ajmer and Sânîbhar from the Mahomedans. After the death of Viramâji, Mângâlyânî, the mother of Chûndâjî, came along with her sons to the Thal and resided in the house of a Châraâna named Alhâ in the village of Kâlau. It is said that Alhâ having noticed the remarkable physiognomy of Chûndâjî prophesied that he would be a renowned ruler. Shortly afterwards Chûndâjî was appointed a Thânâdâr by Mallinâthji over the village of Sâloû. Later still, the Índâs who were a branch of the Parihâras, captured the fort of Mandor from the Mahomedans; but as they found it difficult to retain possession of the place they called in Chûndâjî to their help

44 Col. Tod places the date of his accession in 1438. Bearing in mind that Viramâji died in 1440, it is impossible to hold that Chûndâjî came to the gâdi in 1438.
which was accorded. The leader of the Êndás named Ráyadhval now
married his daughter to Chûndâjí and gave him Mándor in dowry. 45
An old couplet refers to this incident:—

"हे रायद्वाल, कमधुन मत चुंदा कैः
चूंदा चंदरी चाख, दियो मंडोव दायनः"

As master of Mándor Chûndâjí was looked upon with much respect
by the Rajput tribes, such as the Êndás, the Mångaliyâs, the Asâyachs,
etc., who served under him. With the help of such a strong force,
he drove away the Mahomedans from Nágor and annexed that place.
He followed up his success by the conquest of Dîdwânâ, Khåtu and
Sâmbhar. The tract of country known as Jângal also came into his
possession.

About that time a marriage between Koçamade, the daughter of the
Mohil chief Månîkdeva of Aûdînt, with Bhâttî Sâdul, son of Râñangde;
chief of Pûgal took place. But as the hand of this bride had been sought
in marriage by Chûndâjí’s son Aûdakamala and as Koçamade had refused,
he promised to take revenge for the insult cast upon his Rajput honour.
With a force of 4,000 soldiers he awaited the return of Sâdûl on the way.
In his train was a Sânkhalâ chief named Mehrâja, father of Harbhû who
had entered into Chûndâjí’s service after the murder of his son by
Râñangde. While Sâdûl was marching home along with his bride on
the way he was stopped by Aûdakamala and his party. A sanguinary
battle took place in which Sâdûl lay dead on the field. His newly
married wife became a Sâti. 46 This news having reached Râñangde he
was overwhelmed with grief at the loss of his son; and finding Aûdakama-
la too powerful for him, fell upon Mehrâja and killed him. Râv Chûndâjí
now entered into the field and killed Râñangde who had dared to
lay hands on his vassal.

As a result of this, the Bhâttîs and the Mohils who lived in Pûgal
sought assistance from the ruler of Mûltân and brought down a force

45 Col. Tod says that Chûndâjí put the Parihâr chief to death and occupied his ter-
ritories. But no corroboration of this is available.
46 Col. Tod says that Lake Koçamadesara, situated in the village of that name, in
the Bîkâner State, was constructed by Koçamade. Mûhaçot Nensi also supports
him. But an inscription of the time of Jodhâjí, dated V.S. 1516, clearly states that
this lake was constructed to preserve the memory of his mother who also bore the name
of Koçamade. The similarity of the names must have led Tod and Nensi into the mis-
take.
under Salīm and besieged Nāgor. Some of the Rājputs in the train of Chūndāji advised him to retreat, but the latter remained obdurate in his refusal; saying that as he had never before retreated in the face of the enemy so he would not do it then. But he asked his sons to leave the fort, while he himself died fighting with the enemy in 1480.

Rāv Chūndāji is regarded as the founder of the village of Chūndāsar in Bīkāner. A temple dedicated to Chāmundā Devī and situated near village Chāvanda, about 8 koss from Jodhpur, is also said to have been constructed by him. Near that temple an inscription has been discovered bearing the date of V.S. 1451 and though it contains no name, so far at least it is clear that it refers to the construction of the temple itself. It is possible that it was built soon after the accession of Chūndāji to the gādi.47

Chūndāji left 14 sons all of whom were known as Rāvs. Twelve branches originated from them—the Satāvats from Satā, the Raṇadhirots from Raṇadhūra, the Bhimots from Bhim, the Arjunots from Arjun, the Aḍakamalots from Aḍakama, the Pūnāwats from Pūnā, the Kānхаwats from Kānха, the Śivarājots, from Śivarāja, the Lumbhāwats from Lumbhai, the Vijāwats from Vijā, the Sahasamalots from Sahasamal, the Harachandots from Harachanda.

Rāv Chūndāji once said to his eldest son that he wished that the throne of Mandor might pass on to Kānха after him, and in accordance with his father’s wish Raṇamalaji handed over the kingdom of Mandor to his younger brother, himself retiring to Chitor to the court of Rānā 48 Lākhā who gave him 40 villages for his maintenance. Kānха ruled for eleven months only.


47 An unpublished copperplate of Chūndāji has been traced at the village of Badaī and is dated V.S. 1478.

48 An inscription of Rānā Lākhā has been traced at Koṭ Solaṅki in Gōḍwāḍ and is dated V.S. 1475. (J.A.S.B., Vol. XII (N.S.), p. 115.) The late Dr. Tessitori read the date as “14(47)5.” The third figure in the date was misunderstood by him, for it should be really 1475. An inscription on the Chitor Jayastambha refers to Rānā Khetrasimha as having imprisoned Raṇamala of Ijār, who had humbled the pride of the Guzerāt king. This last incident must have taken place in 1403 A.D. when the son of Muzaffar Khān imprisoned his father and ruled for a short period. (Bom. Gaz. Vol. I, p. 234.) In this usurpation Raṇamala assisted Muzaffar’s son and thus humbled the pride of the Guzerāt king. Moreover a copperplate of Rānā Lākhā is dated V.S. 1462. Thus Rānā Lākhā must have come to the throne of Mewār between V.S. 1460 and 1462 and the date of this inscription must be later, i.e. V.S. 1475. Col. Tod assigns the date V.S. 1439 to the accession of Lākhā, but in view of the fact that Khetā was alive in V.S. 1460 this date must be regarded as incorrect.
After his death, Chûndâji’s son Satâ was raised to the throne, but he too reigned for a short period of 3 or 4 years. Satâ’s son Narabada presented Râna Kûṁbâ with his own eye on the latter’s request. Some misunderstanding arose between Satâ and his younger brother Raṇadhirji; when the latter went to his eldest brother Raṇamala in Mewâr and said to him that he had abdicated the throne in favour of Kânghâ only, and so Satâji had no right to the principality. Raṇamala was impressed with this argument; and with Mokalji’s help marched to Mandor, drove away Satâ and himself sat on the throne. Shortly after with the Râna’s help Raṇamalají led an expedition against Nâgor and defeating the Mahomedan army under Feroze and Mahomad annexed that state to his own.

There is an old verse which refers to Raṇamalají in the following terms:—

“ले मोगे पौरोज्ञ डाल मशिमद गो डाले।”

This event is also referred to in the Kumbhalgaḍh Praśasti of Mahâraṇâ Kûṁbhâ, dated 1517. In the description it contains about Mokalji it says:—

“पौरोज्ञ समाचरद ग्रामशेरापलय य: प्रोक्षते

कुणाहतिनिरपालदागिण्वयासमून्याण्डीन्तिनगः २२९।”

“(Mokalji) killed Feroze and Mahomad with a hundred arrows.”

This supports the proposition that with Mokalji’s help Raṇamalají conquered Nâgor.

Raṇamalají was of great assistance to the Rânas of Mewâr. In 1490 V.S., Châchâ and Merâ, two of the illegitimate sons of Râna Khetâjí, murdered Mokalji. When this news reached Raṇamalají he at once came to the help of Kûṁbhâ, Mokal’s son; and, having killed the murderers in their place of refuge, seated Kûṁbhâ on the throne. The administrative affairs of Mewâr were also settled by him. Thereupon the Sardârs of Mewâr headed by Châchâ’s son Akâ and the Paramâr Mahâpâ with the assistance of Mokal’s elder brother Chûndâ warned Kûṁbhâjí to be on his guard, otherwise the throne would pass on to the Râthors. The mind of Kûṁbhâjí was thus poisoned and in consequence in 1495 the Râna caused Raṇamala to be murdered.

49 So we learn from the inscriptions.
50 Col. Tod places Raṇamalají’s accession immediately after Chûndâjí. But as we have seen two reigns intervened between them.
Raṇamalaji’s son Jodhāji was with his father in Mewār. The news of his father’s death was sent to him with the hint that he must flee for his life. With the help of 700 followers Jodhāji fled from the city, but Sisodīa Chundāji followed with a large army. All along the way skirmishes took place, so that when Jodhāji reached Mārwār there were only seven of his followers left. Jodhāji at first thought of settling down at Maṇḍor, but since he was followed by the Mahārāṇā’s soldiers, he had to retire further and establish himself at Kāhunī in the Thal. Rānā Kuṁbha made himself master of the whole of the Mārwār, and placed Rāṭhor Pāghavadev, grandson of Rāv Chūṇḍā and son of Sahasamal, with the title of Rāv, upon Sojhat. At Maṇḍor and Chokdi the Rāṇā established powerful garrisons under well-known soldiers of the State. Of these latter, were Kuṁbha’s brother Sā, Kuntala and Māṇjā sons of Sisodiā Chūṇḍā, Hingolā of the Āhaḍa sept as well as Ākā the Sisodiā.

Raṇamalaji had 26 sons from whom 24 branches originated. Five from Akherāj, the Raṇāwat branch was named after Raṇā, the Bhadawats from Bhadā, Akherāj’s son; his grandson Kuṁpā gave his name to the Kuṁpawats; Panchāin’s son Jetā gave his name to the Jetawats; Kalā became the founder of the Kalāwats; Kāndhal, of the Kāndhalots; Chāmpā, of the Chāmpawats; Lākhā, of the Lākhawats, Māṇḍana, of the Māṇḍanots; Rūpā, of the Rūpawats; Dūngarsi, of the Dūngarots; Karaṇasi, of the Karaṇots; Bīrā, of the Bīrāwats; Sāṇḍā, of the Sāṇḍawats; Māṇḍalā, of the Māṇḍalots; Aḍmal, of the Aḍmalots; Singhā, of the Raṇamalots; Hāpā, of the Raṇamalots; Nāthu, of the Nāṭhawats and of the Harkhawats; Bhākharsi, of the Bālās; Jagmāl of the Jagmālots; Jetmāl, of the Bhojawats and Pāṭa of the Pāṭawats.

Jodhāji was a very brave and powerful prince. After he had settled himself at Kāhunī he led some attacks against Maṇḍor but all his attempts were futile.

On one occasion Rāv Jodhāji is said to have entered into the house of a Jāṭ...

51 Col. Tod takes Jodhāji to be the eldest son of his father. But the eldest son of Raṇamalaji was Akherāj, whose descendants are still living at Bāgdi. The latter, even to the present day, put the tilaka on the head of the heir-apparent.

52 Col. Tod holds that Jodhāji fled to the Aravellī mountains, but an inscription of Jodhāji dated V.S. 1516 has been found at Koḷamadesa in Bīnkāner. It appears, therefore, that Jodhāji fled in that direction, J.A.S.B. Vol. XIII, (N.S.) p. 217.

53 Col. Tod holds Kuṁpā to be the eldest son of Akherāj; but in fact he was his grandson, being the son of Mehrāj.

54 Col. Tod assigns the date V.S. 1494 to Jodhāji’s birth; but he was born in 1472, as his horoscope discovered recently clearly shows.
peasant and being very hungry, he requested the latter for some food. In the house there was only soup made from Bājri seeds and the wife of the peasant placed a plate of it before Jodhāji. Ravīji dipped his fingers in the soup, but as it was very hot his fingers were burnt. The Jātnī thereupon, remarked "I see you are a fool like Jodhāji." Jodhāji asked her the reason why she held him to be a fool. She replied that Jodhāji marched direct upon Māndor and this act like his placing his fingers in the hot soup only caused failure. Rāvji took the lesson to heart and in V.S. 1510 assisted by Sānkhlā Harbhū, Bhāṭṭi Jaisā and other relatives marched upon Māndor and defeating the Rānā's garrisons therein, annexed that territory to his own. This news having reached Rānā Kumbhā, he marched personally against Mārwār. Rāv Jodhāji prepared his army and marched with some of his followers on horses and camels, while others came in carts. The Rānā found that soldiers who came to meet him in carts were determined either to win or to die and thus apprehending much loss of life retreated to Mewār. Soon a large number of Rajput warriors joined Jodhāji who now fell upon Mewār to avenge his father's death. Goḍwād was plundered, and the Rāv then advanced upon Chitor. Rānā Kumbhā fled from the city; whereupon Jodhāji burnt the gates of the fort, committed some devastations in Mewār and drank his horses in the Picholā lake.

Some old sayings referring to this incident run thus:

कथयः

"चौतोडः तना चंहारे किंभाल्कु परालिया।"

गोदामोः

"चोध आंगम ब्यापरा पीछोति पाया।"

Rānā Kuṁbhāji, finding how very strong his enemy was, sent his son Ūdā to Jodhāji to negotiate peace; and it was settled that the boundaries of the two kingdoms should be determined by the plant Ānval on the Udaipur side and tree of Bānval on the Mārwār side. From this time forward Jodhāji's power went on increasing. In V.S. 1515, Rāvji constructed a fortress on the hill which lay three koss from Māndor and on which lived a Jogī of the name of Chidiyānātha. The gate of the original fort built by Jodhāji is still known as Jodhāji's gate. On the valley below the fortress was founded the town of Jodh-

---

56 Col. Tod finding that Rāmdev and Harbhū accompanied Jodhāji, took the latter for a Rāthor. Rāmdev really was a Yomāra.
pur named after himself. Close by the fort his queen Jasmāde constructed a tank named Rānisar.

About the year 1531, Rāv Jodhājī defeated and killed in battle the Mohil chief of Chhāpara Droṇapur now known as Bīdāvaṭī in modern Bikāner and made his own son Bīdā the ruler of that place. In the same way the Sānkhalā-chief Jesala, son of Bisala, who ruled over the Jāngal country, modern Bikāner, was defeated; his territory being taken possession of by Jodhājī’s son Bikā. The latter founded the modern city of Bikāner in 1541.

Ajmer was at that time an appendage to the kingdom of Mālwā. About 360 villages of this tract were annexed by Rāv Jodhājī who placed his sons Barsing and Dūdā over Mertā to which the above villages were added.

Jodhājī’s attention was not drawn to worldly affairs alone, but spiritual affairs had much fascination for him. He went on a pilgrimage to Gayā and there induced the king of Jaunpur in whose territory Gayā lay, to remit the taxes levied upon the pilgrims who went there. Maharāṇā Rāimalla’s inscription found at Ghusundi and dated 1561 V.S. alludes to this incident which earned for its author undying fame.

Rāv Jodhājī left this world in 1545 V.S. He left 20 sons who produced 11 branches. Barsimhā became the ancestor of the Barsimhots; Dūdā, of the Meḍtiās and the Chândāwats, Bikā, of the Bikās; Bīdā, of the Bidāwats; Banbir, of the Banbirots; Jogāś son Khangār, of the Khangārots; Karamsi, of the Karamsots; Bhārmal, of the Bhārmalots; Sīvarāj, of the Sīvarājots; and Rāypāla, of the Rāypālots.

For his sons he carved out independent principalities which he distributed among them so that they might not have an occasion to quarrel among themselves. In the latter part of his life he enjoyed complete peace, such as fell to the lot of very few Rajput rulers. His prowess, integrity, generosity and farsightedness are manifest in all his actions. From him originated the Jodhā branch of the Rāṭhor clan and this term exactly fits them because of their uncommon bravery.


"पुरोवातेल्लाज्ञानपर विनेद्रस्याँ "

57 Col. Tod says that there were 14 sons only.

58 Col. Tod says that Dūdā’s daughter Mirāṅbāī was married to Mahārāṇā Kumbhā; but Mirāṅbāī was the daughter of Ratnasimhā, Dūdā’s son; and she was married to Bhojrajā, son of Rāṇā Sāngā and grandson of Kumbhā.
After the death of Jodhāji in V.S. 1545, his son Sātalji 59 ascended the throne and reigned for three years only. He adopted his nephew Narā who founded the city of Sātalmer near Pokaran, and named it after Sātalji. Some of the chronicles hold that Sātalji himself was the founder of this city. His brothers, Barsimhaji and Dūdāji, who had been placed over Mertā by Jodhāji plundered the Mahomedan city of Sāmbhar which brought Mullu Khan, the Subedar of Ajmer, upon them. Rāv Sātalji came to the assistance of his brother along with Sūjāji. Mullu Khan was encamped near Pīpār. As the women of this place had gone out of the village to worship the Goddess Gauri, Mullu Khan fell upon them unawares and took them prisoners. This news having reached the Rāṭhoh princes, all the four brothers marched upon Mullu Khan to rescue the women 60 from the hands of the enemy. A battle took place at the village of Kosānā where the Mahomedan general Ghaḍūkā was killed and Mullu Khan saved himself by flight. Some of the annals put the name of Sariyā Khan in place of Mullu Khan. In the battle Sātalji 61 was mortally wounded, and he died in the same night. Sātalji’s wife Fūlam, a Bhaṭṭī, constructed a tank named Fūlelāo Talāv in 1547. An inscription 62 of Sātalji has been traced in Kolu, Phalodhi Pargannah, and is dated 1515. It attributes the title of Mahārāv to Jodhāji and Rāv to Sātalji and thus proves that during the lifetime of his father Sātalji was put in charge of the Phalodhi Pargannah.

On the death of Rāv Sātalji his younger brother came to the throne in 1548 V.S. Sūjāji’s son, Narā 63 had been taken in adoption by Sātalji; but, on the death of

59 Tod, Annals Vol. II, p. 17. Col Tod makes Sūjāji ascend the throne after Jodhāji, and says that the occupation of the gādi by Sātalji appears to be a mistake as he was killed in defending Sātalmer. But all the chronicles of Mārwār relate his history as given above.
60 Col Tod says Mullu Khan seized the “Rājputānis” of Pīpār. But this is a mistake. The women belonged to the lower classes, as the Rājput ladies never stir out of the harem.
61 Col Tod puts the name of Sūjā in place of Sātalji, and says that the event occurred in V.S. 1572. But the incident took place in V.S. 1518. When Sātalji died, Sūjāji was present in the battlefield and ascended the throne on Sātalji’s death.
63 Col Tod (Annals Vol. II, p. 18) says that Narā was son of Viramdev, the fifth son of Sūjā but Narā was not the grandson of Sūjā; he was the latter’s son. An inscription of Narā dated V.S. 1532 has been discovered at Phalodhi and it clearly mentions him to be a son of Sūjā. J.A.S.B. Vol. XII, (N.S.), p. 94.
his adopted father, Sūjājī handed over to him the Pargannahs of Pokaraṇ and Phalodhi where he ruled as Sūjājī’s vassal. At that time Phalodhi contained a small population; while at Pokaraṇ, a dynasty of Rāṭhors known as the Pokaraṇā Rāṭhors and descendants of Mallināṭhji’s grandson Hammīr ruled independently. The chief of these Pokaraṇā Rāṭhors was driven away by Narā who established his rule over that Pargannah. In 1555 V.S., this dethroned chief, Khīmā, with the assistance of a Rāṭhor soldier named Lūṅkā of Bāhaḍmer took away some cattle from Narā’s territory. Narā advanced to rescue his cattle and a battle took place in which Narā was killed. Sūjā, to avenge the death of his son, marched upon Lūṅkā and plundered Bāhaḍmer. After this he divided the territory of Narā among his two sons—Pokaraṇ was given over to Govinda, and Phalodhi to Hammīr. An inscription of Hammīr has been found in Phalodhi bearing the date of 1573 V.S. Another inscription of Sūjājī of 1552 V.S., has been discovered at Āso.

After Mallu Khān’s defeat, he inveigled Barsimhadev, Sūjājī’s brother, into a trap and held him prisoner in Ajmer. The news having reached Sūjājī, he prepared for an attack on Ajmer but even before he could reach there, his other brothers Bikājī and Dūdājī marched upon the Ajmer direct from Bikāner and demanded the surrender of their brother Barsimhadev. Mallukhān was compelled to surrender his prisoner and the three brothers then went to Merta.

From very early times the Sindhal Rāṭhors had been in possession of Jetāraṇa, which they held of the Rāṇās of Mewār. When Jodhājī conquered parts of Godwād from the Rāṇā, the Rāṭhors of Jetāraṇa were compelled to transfer their allegiance to him. But on Sūjājī’s accession, he drove away the Sindhal Rāṭhors from the place which was handed over to his own son Ūdā whose descendants are known as Ūdāwats. Sūjājī’s eldest son Bāghājī died in the lifetime of his father in 1571 V.S. In the following year Rāv Sūjājī died after a reign of 23 years. He had 11 sons who founded nine branches: Sekhā the Sekhāwats; Ūdā, the Ūdāwats; Devidās, the Devidāsots; Sāṅgā, the

64 Rāṃsā Pīr of the Tonwar clan founded the city of Pokaraṇ, with the consent of Mallināṭhji. Later on Rāṃsā Pīr gave his daughter in marriage to Hammīr, son of Jagmāl and grandson of Mallināṭhji, and also gave Pokaraṇ in a dowry to his son-in-law.

Sāngāwats; Prāgdās, the Prāgdāsots; Narā, the Narāwats; Māpā, the Māpāwats; Tilokasi the Tilokasiots: Khangār, the Khangārots.

When Baghāji was at the point of death his father Sūjāji asked if he had any wish to be carried out. Kunwar Baghāji requested his father to install one of his own sons after Sūjāji's death on the throne. Sūjāji, with the consent of his other son Sekhā, said that it would be done as he wished, and fixed upon Baghāji's son, Viram. But after Sūjāji's death, Viram's claims were overlooked and his younger brother Gāṅgā ascended the throne. Baghāji left 7 sons, of whom Viram and Pratāp were the founders of one branch of Rāthors known as the Baghāwat Jodhās.

After Sūjāji's death the Sardārs of the State led by Panchāin, Akherāja's son, met to install Kunwar Baghāji's eldest son Viram on the throne of Jodhpur. As the sons of these Sardārs felt hungry, they were told by their elders to go to the mother of Viram for their food and to send some dishes for the Sardārs themselves. But the old lady not only did not entertain them with any food, but retorted that she was not a cook. This displeased some of the Sardārs. When this affair reached the ears of Gāṅgāji's mother, she had the dishes prepared within a short time, served food to the sons of the Sardārs and showed every respect to them. This incident prejudiced the minds of the Sardārs against Viram and they delayed the time of installation on the plea that the hour was not auspicious. Gāṅgāji was at that time in Mewār. He was invited to return at once and on his arrival was installed on the throne. Viram was given the Pargannah of Sojhat. But his partisans led by Sūjā's son Sekhā at the same time made the tilaka on Viramji's head in the fort below Jodhpur and sent him direct to Sojhat with Mutā Rāyamal.

Rāv Gāṅgāji, before he was installed on the throne of Jodhpur, had been of great help to Rānā Sāṅgā and accompanied him in all his battles. In V.S. 1571, Muzaffar II reinstalled Bhārmal to the throne of Īdar which had been usurped by his cousin Rāimal with the assistance of his father-in-law Rānā Sāṅgā of Chitor. Rānā Sāṅgā thereupon determined to attack Guzerāt and to secure the assistance of Rāv Gāṅgāji sent Rawal Dūngarsi of Dūngarpur to the court of Gāṅgāji. In 1573 V.S. Rānāji

55 Col. Tod holds Gāṅgāji to be the eldest son of Baghāji; but he was not the eldest son as will be seen from the above.
marched upon Guzerat with Gангâji and defeated Muzaffar II. Râv Râimal was reinstalled on the throne of Ïdar. Later on Rânâ Sângâ fought a battle against Bâbar in 1584 V.S. in which Gангâji helped the Rânâ. It is said that Dûdâji's son Râimal 69 went with his brother Ratansinhâ at the head of 4000 soldiers to the assistance of Sângâ in the battle of Bayânâ. Both these brothers attacked the cannons of the Mogul invader and died fighting bravely in this battle.

Râv G gangbang's uncle Sekhâ had received PEEPâda as his share of the paternal estate. This Sekhâ had sided with Viramji and thus there were constant troubles between Râvji and himself. The dispute over the boundary provided a constant source of quarrel. In the end however Râvji proposed that the fields which produced the karaţ grass should belong to himself, while those producing bhurat should go to Sekhâji. But the latter did not want to come to terms and sent his officials Haradâs, an Ïhada Râthor, to Râvji saying that the proposal did not meet with his approval. Moreover in 1586 V.S. he induced Khânzâdâ 70 Daualt Khân from Nâgor to lead an expedition against Râvji. The Khânzâdâ encamped at Seoki, in Jodhpur, and Râvji marched forwards to meet him and encamped at Gàngâni. A battle ensued; but Râvji, having taken opium, was drooping down his head in his palanquin. His Sardârs approached him and scolded him for his apparent carelessness when his own forces were being cut to pieces. This remark brought Râvji to his senses and opening his eyes found that the Mahomedan army was marching forward with an elephant at its vanguard. The Mahomedan general had tied a sword to the trunk of the elephant which was carrying destruction right and left among the Rajput ranks. Gàngâji, as soon as he came to his senses, shot an arrow at the elephant which at once fled away and trampled down the Mahomedan army, which consequently took to its heels and Sekhâ 71 was himself among the slain. That elephant, which was named Dariâjoś, fled to Merta and was captured by Dûdâji's son Viramji. Mâldevji, Gàngâji's son, had followed the elephant and now demanded it of the latter. The

69 Col. Tod maintains that this Râimal was the grandson of Gàngâji; but in fact, the two are to be distinguished, Gàngâji had a grandson named Râimal but he was not born at that time.

70 Col. Tod says that he belonged to the Lodi family, but he was a Tâk Musalmân and belonged to the reigning family of Guzerât.

71 Tod mistakes the name for Sângâ.
demand was refused and thus enmity arose between Prince Mâldevvî and Vîramjî. This ill-feeling caused the defeat of Mâldevvî in his war against Sher Şâh as Mârwâr was deprived of the help of such heroic sons like Jeta and Kûmpâ. Two years after this battle Râvji died in 1588 V.S.

A well and a tank constructed by Râv Gângâjî, named Gângâri Bâudi and Gângelâv respectively, still commemorate his name. His queen Padmâvatî, daughter of Rânâ Sângâ built a tank known as Padamsar.\(^7\) The image of Gangaşâmîjî (Viṣṇû) which is still regarded as one of the principal images of the city of Jodhpur, was brought there by Râvji on the occasion of his marriage at Sirohî. Along with this queen of Râvji came some Oswâls of the Singhi tribe to Jodhpur.

Gângâjî had six sons. Two of these Kriśnasimha and Berisâl have left a branch known as the Gângâwat Jodhâs.


Mâldevvî ascended the throne on the death of his father in 1588 V.S. He was a very strong ruler and had in his service an army of 80,000 cavalry. His kingdom comprised a vast area and was bounded by Hansî and Hissâr on the north-east, Jângal on the north, Sindh on the west, Sirohî and Pâlanpur on the south and Mewâr and Hâdâvaṭî on the south-east.

When Mâldev came to the throne his territory included only two districts—Jodhpur and Sojhât. Nâgor, Jâlor, Sâmbhâr, Dîdwânâ, and Ajmer were under Mahomedan possession. Over Mâllaṅî, the descendants of Mallinâthjî reigned supreme. Godwâd was in the hands of the Rânâs of Mewâr. At Sâchor, the Chauhâns were ruling. Vîramjî was the lord of Mertâ. But all these districts were conquered by Râv Mâldevvî. Besides these, Châtsû, Naraṇâ, Lâlsot, Bonli, Fatehpur and Jûjhnû (in modern Jaipur) were annexed to his kingdom. To the west of his king-

---

7\(^{\text{nd}}\) Pandit Gaurishankar Ojhâ states in his History of Sirohi (p. 205) that Râwal Jagmâl’s daughter Padmâvatibâi excavated the tank known as Padmalasar at Jodhpur. The name is not Padmalasar but Padamsar, and it was excavated not by the daughter of the Sirohi chief, but by that of Rânâ Sângâ. Both these ladies bore the same name. In the Khyâta of Mundiaj written in the time of Jasavantsimha I, it is clearly written:

“मो मादिवृज्ञ असिगमे, राणा मांगा री बेठी, उद्धिस्मिध राणा री बलभम भम पद्मावती पीवर शो—पल री करायो महाव पदमसर।”

Panditji also says that the daughter of the Sirohi chief became a Sâti on the death of her husband Gângâjî, but the above Khyâta clearly mentions her as being alive after her husband’s death:

“रूवहंजे सायणकरा, मै पीवर री नाम यम्म बाइ सो, लिपष रा बेठा ९ मै बेठी ९ सु रेषो।”
dom, he added Chohatan and Pärakar from the Paramāras, and Īmar-
koṭ from the Soḍhās. In the south he extended his authority over
Sāchor, then ruled by the Chauhāns, as well as Rādhanpur and Khābād
ruled by the Paramāras. The districts of Godawād, Badnor, Madāriā
and Kosīthal were seized from Mewār. In addition to the above,
Puramāṇḍala, Kekrī, Mālpurā, Amarsar, Ṭoṅk and Ṭodā were added to
his kingdom. He occupied Sirohī as well; but as the Rāv of that place
was his maternal grandfather he was re-instated in his kingdom.
The state of Bikāner too was added to his kingdom after the defeat
of its ruler Jetsi. In fact the banner of Rāv Māldev waved over 52
districts and 84 forts.

Rāvji rendered much help to Rāṇā Udaisimhā of Chitor. After the
murder of Rāṇā Vikramāditya; Banbir, an illegitimate son of Rāṇā
Sāṅgā, had usurped the throne of Mewār. Udaisimhā, Sāṅgā’s son, then
a refugee at Kumbhalmer wrote to Rāv Māldev asking for his assistance.
The latter at once sent his famous Generals Jetā and Kūmpā to Udaisimhā’s help. They drove away Banbir and re-instated Udaisimhā
on the throne of Chitor in 1597 V.S. In recognition of this act the
Rāṇā sent 40,000 Ferozi coins and an elephant named Vasantarāī as a
present to Rāvji.

In 1599, the Moghul emperor Humāyūn after he had been deprived
of his kingdom by Śer Śāh, sought shelter with Māldevji. Humāyūn
stayed near Mandor for about 3 or 4 months. At that time the Moghul
Emperor was told by some person that Māldevji intended to appropriate
his treasures. In fear of losing his treasure, Humāyūn left Mandor
and marched out of Mārwār. Passing through Jaissalmer he had some
skirmishes with Rāv Lūnakaran, the chief of the place; and at last
reached Ūmarkoṭ, where the famous emperor Akbar saw the light of the
day. From that place Humāyūn went to Śāh Tahmāsp II, the king of
Persia.

We have already seen that there had arisen an enmity between
Vīramji of Mertā and Rāv Māldevji. The latter in pursuit of his revenge
drove out his enemy from Mertā. After some adventures, Vīramji
sought shelter with Śer Śāh and induced the latter to attack Māldev.
The Emperor advanced and took his post at Sumela in Ajmer. Māldevji
too moved forward and encamped at Girri facing the Mahomedan army.
Śer Śāh was seized with fear and desired to construct redoubts on all
sides of his camp. He filled a large number of sacks with sand and
placed them one over another so as to form a wall which could protect his army. In this fashion the two armies remained entrenched for a month "Sr Şāh would gladly have retreated quickly," says Feriştā, "but the danger was too great to admit of his venturing to quit his entrenchments; while the position of the enemy was such as to render an attack on him very hazardous." At this juncture Viramji of Mertā, approached Sr Şāh and said to him that there was no cause of anxiety and that he would be able to gain the victory for him without the loss of a single life.

Viramji adopted a stratagem. He caused letters addressed to the chief officers in Māldev’s army to be written and had them stamped by the imperial seal. These letters were then sewed down in the cushion inside the shields and sent to the respective Rājput officers along with some money. At the same time some spies were also sent to Māldevji, who was informed that his officers had joined the Mahomedan Emperor, and that if the Rāv were only to unsew the cushions of their shields their treachery would be made manifest to him. Rāvji sent for the shields of his officers and the letters were found inside them. Māldevji was seized with fear and at once retreated to Jālor. Jetā and Kūmpā as well as other officers of his army tried their best to remove the suspicion of Māldev, but the latter remained obdurate. At this stage Jetā and Kūmpā said that even should Rāvji leave the field they would never leave their position. With a small band of 12,000 Rājput soldiers, Jetā and Kūmpā stood ready for the attack which followed soon. But this small band repeatedly repulsed the vast army of the Emperor which amounted to 80,000 and would probably have defeated them had not a reinforcement joined the Mahomedan ranks. "Sr Şāh now falling on the Rājputs with renewed vigour threw them into disorder" (Ferishtā). The Rājput lines broke, and Jetā and Kūmpā together with all their followers were cut to pieces. Sr Şāh is said to have declared after this hard-won victory, that for a handful of bājrā he had almost lost the empire of Hindustān.

With this battle began the decline of Māldev’s fortunes. In 1605, Rāvji was able for a second time to establish his authority upon Ajmer and Nāgor, but in 1613 Hāji Khān a Paṭhān adventurer, again drove out Māldevji from Ajmer. In the meantime Akbar had ascended the throne of Delhi in 1611. Shortly after his accession he won over Bhārmal, the rājā of Āmber, to his side and annexed certain territories

---

in Rājputānā. In 1614 V.S. Akbar sent his general Śāh Kuli Khān Muharam to Ajmer and drove away Hājī Khān from that place. As a result of this victory, the districts of Ajmer, Jetāran and Nāgor were annexed to his kingdom. Gradually the authority of the Emperor was established in the eastern parts of Mārwār and the kingdom of Rāv Māldev was reduced to a small principality. In 1619 V.S. Sharuddin Husain Mirzā, the Subedar of Ajmer, fought a battle which continued for three days with Rāṭhor Devidās and Jagmāl, the Generals of Māldevī, in Mertā and drove them away from that district, where Vīramji’s son Jaimal was placed as governor. In that very year Māldevī died at Jodhpur. Māldevī’s queen Rūṭhī Rāṇī, daughter of Rāval Lūṅkāraṇ of Jaissalmer although she had never lived with her husband in her life, but as soon as the news of his death reached her became Sātī.

Several forts and fortresses constructed by Māldevī exist to this day. Mālkot in Mertā and several bastions of the fort of Vīntalī in Ajmer were constructed by him. Inside the latter fort a wheel to draw water from the well placed there by Māldevī may be seen even now.

Māldevī had 22 sons from whom originated 13 branches: Rām became the founder of the Rāmots; Chandrasena, of the Chandrasenots; Ratansimha, of the Ratansimhots; Bhāna, of the Bhānots; Bhojarāja, of the Bhojarājots; Gopāldās, of the Gopāldāsots; Mahesdās, of the Mahesdāsots; Vikramāditya, of the Vikramāyats; Tiloksi, of the Tiloksiots; Dūngarsi, of the Dūngarots; and Kesarismha, of the Kesarisimhots. A grandson of Māldev, Abherāj the son of Rāimal became the ancestor of the Abherājots; and from a great-grandson of the Rāv, Vīhārīdās, of the Vīhārīdāsots, are descended.

In 1619 V.S. Chandrasenaṇji succeeded his father to the throne.

27. Rāv Chandrasenaṇji. Like his father he possessed a spirit of independence which made him look with aversion to submission to the Emperor; though after the death of Māldevī, Akbar the Great sent Husain Kuli Khān, governor of Ajmer, and Rāv Rām, the

74 Col. Tod (Annals, Vol. II, p. 22) writes. "In 1625, Maldeo . . . . in conformity with the times, sent his second son, Chundersen, with gifts to Akber, then at Ajmēr."
"At the close of life, the old Rao . . . . was obliged to yield homage, and pay it in the person of his son Oodi Sing, who, attending with a contingent, was enrolled amongst the commanders of ' one thousand.'" Also, "he died soon after the title was conferred on his son."

It will appear from the above, that all of these statements are incorrect. Māldev died in 1619 V.S. and after his death Rāv Chandrasenaṇji reigned for three years over Jodhpur.
eldest son of Māldeovji to him commanding him to pay allegiance to
the throne of Delhi. A war ensued and Husain Kulī Khān besieged
the fort of Jodhpur in 1621. After some hard fighting, Chandraseṇa
was obliged to leave the fort and passing through Bhādrājan, he reached
Siwānā.

In 1627 V.S. Emperor Akbar went on a pilgrimage to Ajmer and
therein he repaired to Nāgor. At that time Chandrasenaṇjī was invited
by the Emperor to see him, and he did so. At the same time Udaisimha
(Māldev’s son) from Phalodhi, Rāimal (Chandrasenaṇa’s younger brother)
from Siwānā, Kalyāṇasimha and his son Rāisimha from Bikāner—all
flocked to the Emperor’s presence in the hope of being granted the
Jodhpur State. But the Emperor gave it to none of them; and they
went back to their respective territories except Udaisimha who remained
with the Emperor. Rāv Chandrasenaṇjī now went back to Bhādrājan.
On account of this love of independence an old poem places Chandraseṇa
and Rāṇa Pratāp in the same rank.

“बगदगिया तुरी ऋजला क्षसमर,
चाँकर छोगा न हिमिको चोत।
सारा छोट्कार तमी सिरि,
पालल मे चंसिया प्रवोत्॥”

From Bhādrājan Chandrasenaṇjī proceeded to Siwānā and carried
devastation in the territories which had been occupied by the Mahomed-
dans, so that Šāh Kulī Khān of Ajmer and Rāisimha of Bikāner sur-
rrounded the Rāv in Siwānā. The Rāv found the Mahomedan army too
strong for him and leaving the garrison in charge of a Rāṯhor soldier
named Pattā, himself retired into the hills. Finding that the Mahomedan
army had concentrated all their attention upon Siwānā, Chandrasenaṇa’s
nephew Kallā (Rāimal’s son) occupied Nāgor which had been left
practically defenceless. The Mahomedan army had now been engaged
in the seige of Siwānā for about five years; yet, there was no sign of its
coming to an early end. Moreover Nāgor had, in the meantime, passed
out of the Mahomedan hands. Akbar found it expedient to despatch
a new and strong army under Baksī Šāhbāz Khān who speedily brought
the Rāṯhors under subjection. Nāgor and Siwānā were occupied. Strong
garrisons were now placed in important centres, and Chandraseṇa was
now cooped up in his mountain refuge. Later on, he picked up courage
and with a raiding party looted Ajmer. While retreating to his forest
abode he was followed by Pāindah Khān, Kāsim and other Mahomedan generals. Chandrasena with great hardship, made his way back to his shelter where he died in 1637 V.S. Five of his wives followed him on the funeral pyre. An inscription of Chandrasena bearing date 1637 V.S. (not yet published), has been found at Sāraṇ in Sojhat district. His descendants known as the Chandraseṇot Jodhās now occupy certain parts of Ajmer. The rājā of Bhīṇāya in Ajmer is one of them.

Chandrasena had 3 sons—Rāisimha, Ugrasena 75 and Āskaraṇa. The eldest of these Rāisimha accepted service under the Mahomedan Emperor and was sent along with the imperial forces to Kābul. After Chandrasena’s death, the tilaka was made on Āskaraṇa—his elder brother being away in Kābul, and Ugrasena 76 in Bāndī. When the news of Chandrasena’s death reached Ugrasena he came to Mārwār but owing to a difference which arose about the partition of the paternal lands, he put his younger brother Āskaraṇa to death. The partisans of the latter retaliated and Ugrasena died at their hands. An inscription of Āskaraṇa dated 1638 V.S. has been found at Sāraṇ.

The two brothers having thus died, the Rāṭhors of Mārwār wrote to Kābul requesting Rāisimha to return to his country and accept the gādi. The latter accordingly came back to Mārwār. The Emperor also gave him a Jāgir in the district of Sojhat where he settled down.

Emperor Akbar had rewarded Jagmāl (Maharāṇā Udaisiṁha’s son) with the Jāgir consisting of half of Sirohī. At that time Rāisimha was with the Emperor at Fatehpur Sikri. He was sent along with Jagmāl to take possession of the Sirohī Jāgir on behalf of the latter. Accordingly both of them advanced on Sirohī. A battle took place at Dattāṇi with Rāv Surtān of Sirohī in which Rāisimha and Jagamāl were killed in 1640 V.S.

Māhārājā Udaisiṁhāji received from the Emperor the following tracts in Jāgir in 1640 V.S.: Jodhpur with its five districts, one district in Hāḍotī and one in Chamāri. While his father was alive he had also obtained Phalodhi from him. At that time some quarrels arose between the Bhāṭṭis and the Rāṭhors. All trade with Sindh and Thaṭṭā passed at that time through Bikupur which was then a possession of the Bhāṭṭis. But then Udaisiṁha wanted to divert this traffic to Phalodhi, so that he might

75 Col. Tod holds Ugrasena to be the eldest son, but he was the second.
reap a good income from the custom duties. As we have already seen Udaisimha, along with his brothers, had taken service under Akbar. There, through the exertions of Muhatā Bhīm, the misunderstanding which had arisen between the brothers was removed. Udaisimha remained with the Emperor and went along with Sādik Khān. When the imperial forces were sent against Madhukar Shāh, the ruler of Orchhā in Bundelkhand, Udaisimha displayed much bravery in this expedition and the conquest of the fort of Narwar was due to his heroism. Later on, he was despatched to quell some Gūzar freebooters who had their seat at Samāvalī in Gwalior State. Udaisimha was successful in this task and soon brought them under subjection. The Emperor, satisfied with the services rendered, awarded the title of Rājā upon him and seated him on the gādi of Jodhpur. Rājā Udaisimha sent for his family and retinue who were then at Samāvalī and had them brought over to Jodhpur.

The Rāṭhor rulers of Mārwār prior to his time had been known as Rāvs, but henceforth they came to be styled Rājās. In the year 1641 V.S. Akbar despatched Abdu-r rahīm Khān-Khānān against Muzaffar, the last independent ruler of Guzerāt, and along with him Rājā Udaisimha was also sent. As a result of the battle which took place at Rāj Pipīlī with Muzaffar, the latter being defeated took to his heels and victory crowned the imperial standard.

We have already noticed that the ruler of Sirohī, Rāv Surtān, had inflicted a defeat on the forces of the Emperor. To avenge the defeat, Rājā Udaisimha was sent along with Jāmbeg Paṭhān of Jālor against Rāv Surtān. The latter finding it hard to cope with the imperial forces at once submitted and gave two lacs of Ferozi coins, thirteen horses as well as two hostages.

In 1644 V.S. the Emperor awarded the state of Sirohī to the Devdā chief Bijā who was a rival of Rāv Surtān and asked Rājā Udaisimha to obtain that principality for Bijā. Udaisimha, accompanied by Jāmbeg, fell upon the village of Nītoḍā in the same year, plundered it and encamped there. Rāv Surtān at once fled to the hills followed by Devdā Bijā and Paṭhān Jāmbeg. When Surtān came to know that Bijā was following him, he retraced his steps and met the latter at the village of Vāsthānji. In the battle Bijā lay dead on the field and Jāmbeg's brother was wounded. Rāv Surtān then again fled to the hills near Ābu. Rājā Udaisimha now
seated Rāv Kallā on the throne of Sirohī, in accordance with the desire of the Emperor, and returned to his capital.

We have already seen that Raṭhor Kallā had taken possession of Nāgor, while the imperial forces were hemming Chandrasena in Siwānā. Soon after Nāgor was re-conquered by the Mahomedans, Kallā accepted service under the Emperor and was stationed at Lahore. There he entered into a quarrel with a Mahomedan officer and put him to death. Thereafter he fled to Mārwār and took refuge in the fort of Siwānā. The Emperor asked Rājā Udaisimha to deal severely with Kallā. Udaisimha ordered his son Kunwar Śārsimha and Bhandāri Mānā to proceed at once to Siwānā and act in accordance with the Emperor's desire. The prince however deputed some brave officers, like Bhupālsimha and others, to the task. The latter besieged Kallā in the fort of Siwānā. In this situation, the parties remained for a few days; when, one night, Kallā suddenly sallied out of the fort and fell upon the besieging force. Many of the brave soldiers were killed and the rest fled in all directions. This news having reached the Emperor, he asked Rājā Udaisimha to proceed personally against Siwānā. Accordingly with a large force the Rājā went there; but in spite of his attempts, the fort remained unconquered and the Rājā had recourse to a stratagem. He bribed a barber of the fort named Poliā to his side, and with his help got himself acquainted with the internal condition of the place. Some soldiers were taken inside the fort by means of a rope. Kallā, finding the enemy already inside the fort, determined to sell his life as dearly as possible; but considering lest his family might be roughly handled by the enemy killed all the women with his own hand and rushing forward sword in hand against the enemy, was soon overpowered and slain.

Towards the close of his life, Udaisimha became enormously fat. He was unable even to ride upon a horse or any animal. The Emperor in recognition of his services and with a reference to his corpulence rewarded him with the Mansab of one thousand horse and the title of Moṭā Rājā. He occupied the gādi for eleven years and died in 1651 V.S.

He had 17 sons; of them the third, Śrājsimha, succeeded his father. Another of his sons, Dalpat, served the Emperor with much credit and received the fort of Jālor in Jāgir. It was Ratnasiṃha, a grandson of this Dalpat, who was rewarded with a Jāgir in Mālwa by Emperor Śāh Jehān and founded the city of Rutlām there, after his
own name. Ratanasimha’s descendants still rule over that principality. Ratanasimha was in the ranks of Mahārājā Jasavantsimha of Jodhpur, when the latter fought the battle of Ujjain against Aurangzeb. In the thick of the battle he placed himself in the position of his leader, Mahārājā Jasavantsimha, and was among the slain. Still another son of Udaisimha, Kṛiṣṇasimha by name, received a Jagīr in Ajmer from Emperor Jehāngir and founded there a city named Kṛiṣṇagadh. The descendants of Kṛiṣṇasimhaji are still ruling over that principality.

Nine branches of Rāthors originated from Udaisimha’s sons—from Sagatsimha, the Sagatsimhots; from Bhopālsimha, the Bhopatots; from Narhardās, the Narhardāsots; from Mohandās, the Mohandāsots; from Mādhosimha, the Mādhosimhots; and the Sujānsimhots; from Dalpat, the Dalpatots; and from Ratansimha, the Ratanots and the Govindasots.

At the time of his father’s death Sūrajsimhaji was away at Lāhore. He was installed on the gādī in 1651 when he was granted 16 districts by the Emperor—nine in Mārwār, five in Guzerāt, one in Mālwā, and one in the Deccan. Shortly after he was appointed a temporary Subedār over Guzerāt. While there he received orders from the Emperor to join Śahzādā Dāniyāl and Abu-l Fazl in their campaign in the Deccan and displayed much bravery in the capture of Nāsik and other places. The Emperor, pleased with his deeds, gave him the title of Savāi Rājā. Later on, Śahzādā Dāniyāl and Nawāb Khān Khānān were surrounded by the enemy; but Sūrajsimhaji, who was close at hand rushed upon the latter and drove the enemy (Amara Champu) away. For about ten years Sūrajsimha, remained on deputation in the Deccan entrusted with the work of subjugating the enemy and when he returned to Mārwār at the close of that period, he stationed Bhāṭṭī Govindadas as his representative in the Deccan. On his way back to Mārwār he passed through Sirohi and brought Rāv Surtān into subjection.

76 Col. Tod says, “Nurudas, Sukut Sing, Bhoput had no issue attaining eminence.” The Sakatsimhots are however at the present time rulers of Kharwā in the Ajmer district.

77 Rulers of Junīs (Ajmer). Tod’s statement that Maldev’s son Asharana’s descendants are at Junīs is a mistake.

78 Col. Tod puts the name as Amara Bālisā. But, nowhere do we find mention of any Bālisā ruler as having governed a tract as far as the Narabādā. The Bālisās are a branch of the Chauhāns, and at the present time they possess lands in Godwād and on the boundary between Mewār and Mārwār.
On the death of Akbar in 1661 V.S., Sūrajśiṁha was for a second time sent to Guzerāt as its Subedār. From Guzerāt he went again to the Deccan, and after having killed a Koli ruler of the name of Lāl seized his principality, Mándwa. He returned to Mārwār in 1671 V.S. In that year Sāhāzādā Khusrū was despatched against Mahārāṇā Amarasimha of Mewār and Sūrajśiṁha joined in the campaign. After a hard struggle of nine years, the Rāṇā sued for peace through Sūrajśiṁhajī and offered to serve the Emperor with 1,000 cavalry. Peace was accordingly concluded. Sāhāzādā Khusrū, thereupon, reinstated the Rāṇā on the throne of Chitor which had been given over to Sīsodiyā Sagar, and made him a Mansabdār of 5,000 cavalry. On the return of Sūrajśiṁhajī, he also was raised to be the Mansabdār of the same rank. While he was encamped at Puśkar, his minister Bhāṭṭī Govindadās was murdered by Kṛṣṇasimhajī, the founder of Kṛṣṇagad, to avenge the murder of Gopāldās, Kṛṣṇasimhajī's cousin, by Govindadās. This being a direct insult to Rājā Sūrajśiṁha, the latter was obliged to put Kṛṣṇasimhajī to death, though he was his step-brother. After this incident Sūrajśiṁhajī returned for a short time to Jodhpur, from which place he again proceeded to Delhi taking his son, Gajasimhajī with him. While there he was asked by the Emperor to go for a third time to the Deccan, where he died in 1676 V.S.

Although a large part of his life was spent in the Deccan in subduing the enemies of the Emperor, nevertheless it was owing to his intelligence and capacity that he raised the State of Jodhpur to its pinnacle of glory. All the parts of the administration received his attention. His name stands commemorated in the celebrated tanks Sūrajkundā and Sūrasāgara which are named after him. The palace situated on the bank of the Sūrasāgara now contains the Sardār Museum and the Sumer Public Library. Emperor Jehāngīr speaks in the following terms of this Rāṭhīr ruler in his personal Memoirs: "In A.H. 1208 (V.S. 1676) I received the news of Mahārāṇā Sūrajśiṁhajī's

79 Cf. the following extracta from the Khyāta of Mūhanot Nensī:—


death in the Deccan. He was grandson of Rāv Māldev and acquired for himself much renown and a good position. His kingdom under his rule improved a great deal more than in the times of his grandfather or father. His son is Gajasimha who had been placed in charge of the administration by him in his lifetime."

At the time of his father’s death Gajasimhajī was at Burhānpur (Deccan). The Emperor of Delhi sent the customary paraphernalia of installation to that place and Nawāb Khān Khānān was deputed to instal him on the gādi on behalf of the Emperor. At the same time 17 districts were allotted to Gajasimhajī by Jehāngir—8 in Mārvār, 7 in Guzerāt, one in Jhīlāya and one in Masūdā. Gajasimha received the title of Rājā and was made an imperial Mansabdār of 1,000 horse besides a personal allowance equal to the pay of 2,000 cavalry. He was also allowed to use a particular emblem called Nejā upon his elephant. Rājā Gajasimhajī’s younger brother, Sabalsimhajī, was awarded with a Mansab of 250 horse and a personal allowance amounting to the pay of 500 cavalry and a Jāgir in his own district.

Even during the lifetime of his father, Gajasimhajī had taken possession of Jālor from the Behāri Pathāns.

An old couplet says:—

"पिता तपस्ये खााँटियो, ते जालोर निरंतर।
कोई दसरथ तपस्ये गंजन, रामज खााँटी लंक।"

Soon after he was enthroned, Rājā Gajasimhajī was sent with the imperial forces to Māhakar, at that time an important station in the Deccan, as a subordinate officer to Nawāb Durāb Khān, son of Khān Khānān, the commander-in-chief of the imperial forces. Gajasimha occupied a place of honour in the army, as he was in the vanguard. Shortly after, Nizāmshāh Amara Champu suddenly fell upon the imperial camp and surrounded it. Several skirmishes took place and the imperial forces remained in that position for three months, at the end of which Rājā Gajasimhajī defeated and drove the enemy away. During all this period Gajasimhajī remained firm in the vanguard. His courage acquired for him the title दलधमण which means "the pillar of the forces."

"महान विनायक, कार भेंड़ा बिरियां।
पत्नारी हरकुं पत्र, तो दलधमण नाम।"

At the same time his Mansab was raised to that of three thousand cavalry, with a personal allowance amounting to the pay of 4,000 horse.
On the death of Akbar in 1661 V.S., Sūrajśimha was for a second time sent to Guzerāt as its Subedār. From Guzerāt he went again to the Deccan, and after having killed a Koli ruler of the name of Lāl seized his principality, Manḍwa. He returned to Mārwār in 1671 V.S. In that year Śāhzādā Khusrū was despatched against Māhārāṇā Amarasimha of Mewār and Sūrajśimha joined in the campaign. After a hard struggle of nine years, the Rāṇā sued for peace through Sūrajśimhājī and offered to serve the Emperor with 1,000 cavalry. Peace was accordingly concluded. Śāhzādā Khusrū, thereupon, reinstated the Rāṇā on the throne of Chitor which had been given over to Sisoḍiyā Sāgar, and made him a Mansabdār 79 of 5,000 cavalry. On the return of Sūrajśimhājī, he also was raised to be the Mansabdār of the same rank. While he was encamped at Puṣkar, his minister Bhāṭṭī Govindādās was murdered by Kriṣṇasimhājī, the founder of Kriṣṇagad, to avenge the murder of Gopālās, Kriṣṇasimhājī’s cousin, by Govindādās. This being a direct insult to Rājā Sūrajśimha, the latter was obliged to put Kriṣṇasimha to death, though he was his step-brother. After this incident Sūrajśimhājī returned for a short time to Jodhpur, from which place he again proceeded to Delhi taking his son, Gajasimhājī with him. While there he was asked by the Emperor to go for a third time to the Deccan, where he died in 1676 V.S.

Although a large part of his life was spent in the Deccan in subduing the enemies of the Emperor, nevertheless it was owing to his intelligence and capacity that he raised the State of Jodhpur to its pinnacle of glory. All the parts of the administration received his attention. His name stands commemorated in the celebrated tanks Sūrajkunda and Sūrāṣāgara which are named after him. The palace situated on the bank of the Sūrāṣāgara now contains the Sardār Museum and the Sumer Public Library. Emperor Jehāṅgīr speaks in the following terms of this Rāṭhor ruler in his personal Memoirs: “In A.H. 1208 (V.S. 1676) I received the news of Māhārāṇā Sūrajśimha’s

---

79 Cf. the following extracts from the Khyāta of Mūhanot Nensi:

"मंवत् १६७१ पत्रवर्त जाहिमन खान खान काजम फ्री खान फ्री खान उदेशपर खान. तत्र राणौ काजमथ खान मिनियव. कसमा रस सं चाकर बल्ल कर. तरे मेबाङ्दु पाठ खान हसर मिनियव. संग मु रावताई दीवी."

"मंवत् १६७२ राणौ काजमथ मानकाजै खान मिनियव. तत्र पक्के राणौ काजमथ उदेशपर खान. तत्र यापी राजशाह उदेशपर क्रमे. राणा सं बाल खाई. तद मेबाङ्दु जर पाँच काजार आत पाँच बाज खानम बाल महत्म दीवी."
death in the Deccan. He was grandson of Rāv Māldev and acquired for himself much renown and a good position. His kingdom under his rule improved a great deal more than in the times of his grandfather or father. His son is Gajasimha who had been placed in charge of the administration by him in his lifetime."

At the time of his father’s death Gajasimhājī was at Burhānpur (Deccan). The Emperor of Delhi sent the customary paraphernalia of installation to that place and Nawāb Khān Khānān was deputed to instal him on the gādi on behalf of the Emperor. At the same time 17 districts were allotted to Gajasimhājī by Jehāngīr—8 in Mārwār, 7 in Guzerāt, one in Jhilāya and one in Masūdā. Gajasimha received the title of Rājā and was made an imperial Mansabdār of 1,000 horse besides a personal allowance equal to the pay of 2,000 cavalry. He was also allowed to use a particular emblem called Nejā upon his elephant. Rājā Gajasimhājī’s younger brother, Sabalsimhājī, was awarded with a Mansab of 250 horse and a personal allowance amounting to the pay of 500 cavalry and a Jāgir in his own district.

Even during the lifetime of his father, Gajasimhājī had taken possession of Jālor from the Behārī Pathāns.

An old couplet says:—

"पिता तपते खाटियों, ते जालोर निरंजङः।
ब्रजों दसरथ तपते गजन, रामज खाटी जंक।"

Soon after he was enthroned, Rājā Gajasimhājī was sent with the imperial forces to Māhakar, at that time an important station in the Deccan, as a subordinate officer to Nawāb Durāb Khān, son of Khān Khānān, the commander-in-chief of the imperial forces. Gajasimha occupied a place of honour in the army, as he was in the vanguard. Shortly after, Nizāmshāh Amara Champu suddenly fell upon the imperial camp and surrounded it. Several skirmishes took place and the imperial forces remained in that position for three months, at the end of which Rājā Gajasimhājī defeated and drove the enemy away. During all this period Gajasimhājī remained firm in the vanguard. His courage acquired for him the title दलवंभम् which means "the pillar of the forces."

"गजवंधो बालौवियो व भेला विर्याम।
पतसातो राखु व पगी, तो दलवंभमः नाम।"

At the same time his Mansab was raised to that of three thousand cavalry, with a personal allowance amounting to the pay of 4,000 horse.
In 1679, Sāhzādā Khurram proceeded to the Deccan where, through the efforts of Rājā Gajasimhājī, peace was concluded with Amara Champu. Two years later Sāhzādā Khurram raised the standard of revolt against his father who sent Sāhzādā Parvīz and Mohabat Khān to subdue him. In the imperial army Rājā Gajasimhājī's force formed an important contingent. A battle took place at Hajipur Paṭnā between the two parties in which Rājā Gajasimhā took a prominent part. The battle resulted in the defeat of Khurram. Prince Khurram fled from the battle-field pursued by Rājā Gajasimhā and Hāḍā Ratan who followed him through his flight in Bengal and the Deccan. Rājā Gajasimhājī at last encamped at Burhānpur where Khurram surprised them, but was himself defeated. A short time later Mohabat Khān left Parvīz and joined forces with Prince Khurram. Thereupon, Gajasimhā's son Amarasiṁhā was awarded a Jāgir in Guzerāt and a Nakkārā (a drum as an indication high honour) and was ordered, to follow Mohabat Khān in pursuit. After the death of Jehāngīr and his son Parvīz in 1684, Khurram became Emperor and adopted the title of Sāh Jehān. Rājā Gajasimhājī was at this time with Khān Jehān Lodi, the Subedar of Mālwa. Gajasimhājī left Mālwa and proceeded to his own principality; but on the way he thought it better to pay his respects to the new Emperor and so went to Āgrā. There he received from the Emperor marks of high dignity such as Nejā, drum, elephants, horses, sword and a khillat. In the following year Khān Jehān Lodi who had been transferred to Khāndesh as its Subedar raised the standard of rebellion. The emperor sent against him Irādat Khān accompanied by Rājā Gajasimhājī as well as the rulers of Būndi and Bikāner. The campaign lasted for two years when Khān Jehān was killed along with his supporters. This was the last campaign in which Gajasimhājī took an active part, for after this war Gajasimhājī sent his son Amarasiṁhājī in all military activities as his representative.

In 1694, Rājā Gajasimhājī went to Āgrā along with his younger son Jasavantsimhā with the intention of securing the succession of the latter to the gādī after his death. While at Āgrā, Gajasimhājī died in 1695 80 after a reign of nineteen years.

80 Col. Tod says Gajasimhā died in a war in Guzerāt. But there is nothing to corroborate this statement. Moreover we know that he was not engaged in any military expeditions during the latter part of his reign.
On the death of Gajasimha, for succession to the throne his elder son was passed over in favour of his younger son Jasavantsimha. The reason why the legal rights of the elder son were overlooked is thus given in *Badshahnamah Sahadehni* by Maulvi Abdul Hamid of Lahore:

"On Muharram 20, A.H. 1048 (1695 V.S.) Raja Gajasimhaji died. He had been reckoned as the most important of all the Rajas of India, thanks to his competence, heroism as well as the large number of soldiers he commanded. On his death, Emperor Suh Jehan bestowed upon his son, Jasavantsimha a khillat, a weapon called jamadhar, a Mansab of 3,000 horse and a personal allowance equal to the pay of 4,000 cavalry together with the title of Raja—all of which had belonged to his father. While the Raja presented a tribute of 1,000 mohurs, 12 elephants and jewelled weapons. Raja Jasavant's elder brother Amarasisimha, who had been ordered to accompany Suhzada Sujah to Kabul, received from the Emperor a Mansab of 3,000 horse, a personal allowance of 3,000 cavalry and the title of Rav. This title was assumed by the Rathor ruler of Marwar in old times. But when Suraissimha's father Udaisimha paid submission to and accepted the service of the Emperor Akbar, the latter granted him the title of Raja and declared that henceforth the ruler of the Rathors would on their accession to the gadi be styled Rajas, but if the younger brother came to the throne, the elder brother should receive the title of Rav."

We come to learn from the chronicles of Marwar that when Gajasimhaji was on his death bed, the Emperor came to his place and inquired what his dying wish was; whereupon the Raja desired that Jasavant should succeed after him, for his mother was the favourite of the Raja. After Gajasimha's death, the Emperor came personally to the deceased's residence to sympathise with his family. There the Emperor asked Amarasisimha to supply him with the names of his ancestors. The latter proceeded with the enumeration of the names of Raja Gajasimha, Raja Suraissimha, Raja Udaisimha, Rav Maldev and so on. The Emperor bearing in mind the personal wish of Raja Gajasimha replied to Amarasisimha, "It appears to me the title of Rav is superior to that of Raja. I therefore confer upon you the title of Rav and upon your younger brother Jasavantsimha that of Raja." Amarasisimha retorted that a mere title without lands to support it was no good. Thereupon Rav Amarasisimha was rewarded with the Jagir of Nagor.
As the boundaries of the districts of Nāgor and Bikāner had not then been settled, constant skirmishes took place between the respective forces over the boundary question, till a sanguinary battle ensued between them over a melon plant which had sprang up on the boundary. Both the sides lost many brave soldiers. Salābat Khān, the commander-in-chief to the Emperor, assisted Karaṇasimha of Bikāner and in the Durbār of the Emperor scolded severely Amarasiṃha who stabbed him to death then and there. Amarasiṃha's descendants form a branch of the Rāthors known as the Amarasiṃhot Jodhās.

Jasavantsimha j ascended the gādi in 1695. Born in 1683 at 31. Māhārājā Jasavant-simha j. Burhānpur, he was only twelve years old when he was installed personally by the Emperor Śah Jehān in 1695. He received the full support of the Emperor and after his accession his Mansab was raised to that of 5,000 horse by the Emperor who took him to Kābul along with him. That the personal affairs of the Rājā might not suffer during his absence, Śah Jehān sent Rājasimha, of the Kūmpāvat branch and a Mansabdār under him to Mārwār to look after the administration of that province. Rājasimha 31 performed his duties satisfactorily. He was clever and faithful. There is a story that Rājsimha sacrificed his own life to a demon so that his master, Rājā Jasavantsimha j, might be spared. As Rājasimha lost his life in the capacity of a chief minister, his descendants, the Sardārs of Asop, took an oath that none of them would ever accept such a post again—a promise which they have maintained to the present day. After Rājasimha's death, Mahesdās Rāthor was appointed in his place. Mahesdās was the grandson of the Motā Rājā, Udaisimha, and the father of Ratansimha, the founder of the celebrated city of Ratlam in Mālwā. On this occasion Mahesdās received from the Emperor a Nansab of 2,000 horse and a personal allowance for the same number of cavalry.

We have already seen that Rāv Amarasiṃha stabbed to death Salābat Khān Bakṣi in the presence of the Emperor. Immediately after, Khalilullā Khān and Amarasiṃha's brother-in-law Arjuna God,

31 Tod puts the name Nāhar Khān in his place. In truth Nāhar was the son of Rājasimha, and it was the latter who sacrificed his own life for the sake of Māhārājā Jasavantsimha. A commemorative temple containing his image and an inscription bearing the date V.S. 1697 is yet to be found in Kāgā Bāgh, Jodhpur.
killed Amarasiṃhajī on the spot. While the dead body of the Ṛāv was being conveyed out of the durbār his followers picked up a quarrel with the sentinels in which several of the imperial guards were killed; but they were soon overpowered and despatched by other forces. On enquiries into the cause of this incident it was found that a quarrel had subsisted for some time past between Amarasiṃhajī and Ṛāv Karanasiṃha of Bikaner owing to a boundary question; and that Salābat Khān had on behalf of Karanasiṃhajī applied for and had been permitted to take an Amin of the Emperor to Nāgor to confiscate that principality. After Amarasiṃha’s death, his son Rāisiṃha received the Jāgir of Nāgor from the Emperor. Rāisiṃha’s son Indrasiṃha 52 was deprived perforce of this tract by Māhārājā Ajitsiṃhajī.

In 1702, Emperor Śāh Jehān granted to Jasavantsiṃhajī a Mansab of 6,000 cavalry, a personal allowance amounting to the pay of the same number of horsemen as well as the title of Māhārājā. Such distinction had not been bestowed upon any Rajput prince prior to this time.

In 1706, Rāwal Manohardās, the ruler of Pokaran, breathed his last; after which the Emperor granted that principality to Māhārājā Jasavantsiṃhajī. The latter sent his soldiers to that place and brought it under his own control.

In 1714, Śāh Jehān was taken seriously ill and a scramble for the empire at once ensued among his sons. Māhārājā Jasavantsiṃhajī took up the cause of Dārā, the eldest and rightful heir to the throne. Aurangzeb and Murād, the viceroy of the Deccan and Guzerāt, combined their forces and were proceeding towards Delhi to take possession of the capital. In this emergency, Emperor Śāh Jehān sent Māhārājā Jasavantsiṃhajī along with several other Mahomedan generals such as Kāsim Khān and others to Mālwā, to intercept their progress. The Māhārājā on this occasion received the subdārship of Mālwā and a mansab of 7,000 cavalry. Besides, he received a gift of one lac of Rupees and was made the Commander-in-chief of the imperial forces. The Māhārājā was on this expedition accom-

52 Col. Tod holds Indrasiṃha to be the fourth in descent from Rāisiṃha: "his Rāisiṃha’s son Hāti Sing, his son Anop Sing, his son Indur Sing"—Vol. II, p. 35. But Haṭiṣiṃha and Anopsiṃha were nephews of Rāisiṃha; while "Indur Sing" was his son.
pained by 22 Umarās, of whom 15 were Mussalmān and the remaining seven Hindu. The astute Aurangzeb adopted a stratagem and was successful in winning over the Mussalmān Umarās to his side. At the village of Billochpur (modern Fatehābād) near Ujjain, the two opposing forces came in sight of each other and a battle ensued which lasted for about six hours. Although the Mussalmān Umarās had already deserted the ranks of the Mahārājā, Jasavant aided by his Hindu nobles fought valiantly against Aurangzeb and Murād. "Ten thousand Moslems," says Col. Tod, "fell in the onset, which cost seventeen hundred Rāthors, besides Gehalotes, Hādās, Gores and some of every clan of Rajwādā." Before the two parties met in combat, Kāṣim Khān along with his forces stood aloof from the imperial forces which were commanded by a Hindu chief. This treachery on the part of the Mussalmān section of the imperial forces weakened Jasavantsimhāji to a large extent, and was mainly responsible for the defeat which he sustained at the hand of the rebel princes. Jasavantsimhāji and his steed Māhībb were covered with blood and the Mahārājā looked like a famished lion. Thinking it unsafe for the Mahārājā to stay longer on the field, the Sardārs induced him to leave it at once and repair to his principality of Mārwār. But the Sardārs themselves were resolved not to yield to the enemy. They set up at once the Mahārājā's friend Ratanasimhā, 55 the Rāthhor ruler of Ratlām, in his place and engaged in battle. Ratnasimhā was ably assisted by a Sisodiyā Sujānsimhā, Rājā of Shāhpurā. These two princes rushed upon the artillery of the enemy and were about to make themselves masters of that sector after having killed its general Murād Kuli Khān and his assistants, when Aurangzeb personally assumed charge of it. By that time Murād Bakā who had been placed on the right of the army turned to his left and fell upon the Rājputs. Though vastly outnumbered, Sujānsimhā and Ratanasimhā fought bravely till they were killed. The battle resulted in the defeat of the imperial forces which took to their heels. The traitors, Kāṣim Khān and others, made their way to Āgrā.

The Mahārājā retreated to Mārwār through Sojhat. The result of the battle and the consequent retreat forced upon him gave a great shock to Jasavantsimhā, who said that there had been no ruler in the

55 Ratanasimhā's inscriptions, V.S. 1709-1711.
illustrious Rāṭhor family of Jodhpur who had ever retreated from the field of battle. The news of the defeat of the imperial forces reached the Emperor, who at the same time was made aware of its cause, namely the treachery of Kāsīm Khān and his party. The Emperor thereupon sent a fresh order to Jasavantsimhā with a remittance of 50 lacs of Rupees from Sāmbhar asking the latter to muster his forces and proceed at once to Āgrā.

The Maharājā accordingly started on his journey; but before he began his march he made over the administration of his kingdom to Mūhaṇot Nensi. On his way, he stayed for a month at Ajmer, after which he joined Dārā Śikoh near Āgrā. A second battle with Aurangzeb took place at Dholpur, in which the imperial party was defeated and lost its commanders Rustam Khān, Satrusāl, ruler of Būndi and Rūpsimhā, the Rāṭhor ruler of Rūpnaigar. Aurangzeb was victorious. Jasavantsimhā retreated to Mārwār. After his success at Dholpur, Aurangzeb at once marched upon Delhi, threw his old father into prison and usurped the throne. Murād Bakš, with whose help Aurangzeb had gained such success, proved a thorn on the side of the new Emperor, who was not satisfied with the imprisonment of his brother but found an opportunity to put him to death.

Of all persons who had fought against him, Maharājā Jasavantsimhā alone remained. But he was too powerful for Aurangzeb who regarded him with the utmost fear. Aurangzeb, consequently, thought of winning him over to his side by peaceful means. He sent Mirzā Rājā Jaiasiṃhāji of Amber to Jasavantsimhā and on the latter’s arrival at Delhi peace was concluded between them.

At this time, Śāh Śūjā was marching to Delhi from Bengal with the intention of contending for the throne. Aurangzeb sent his eldest son Sultān Muhammad and Jasavantsimhā against Śūjā and himself followed them there. Maharājā Jasavantsimhā proceeded to Allāhābād and reached Khajuā—a place situated about 30 miles north of Allāhābād. Śūjā had already arrived there. The two armies remained opposed to each other. Jasavantsimhāji sent a private message to Śūjā saying that he had made up his mind not to join in the combat and that the prince might do as he liked with Muhammad. In the night, Jasavantsimhā plundered the camp and having become master of a good booty; the Maharājā at once marched
towards Mârwar. Soon Aurangzeb re-established order in the imperial forces, which attacked and defeated Šûja.

In the meantime Dârâ Šikoh who had fled to Sindh came to Ajmer in the hope of getting succour from Jasavantsinhaji. The latter proceeded to join him and reached as far as Merto within 40 miles of Ajmer. Aurangzeb tactfully handled the situation and remembering how very dangerous his position would become if he allowed Dârâ and Jasavantsinhaji to unite, sent Jaisimha, Râjâ of Amber, to the Râthor ruler holding out high hopes to him should he desert Dârâ. Jasavantsimha fell into the snare of the Emperor, and deserting his ally retraced his steps to Jodhpur. Though this act of the Râthor led to the undoing of Dârâ, the latter's habitual idleness contributed not a little to his destruction.

In 1716, Aurangzeb confirmed the Mansab of 7,000 cavalry, which had been conferred upon Jasavantsimha by Šâh Jehân and appointed him Subedâr of Guzerât. Two years later the Mahârâjâ had to join Nawâb Šâista Khân in an expedition in the Deccan against the famous Marâthâ leader Šivâji. Aurangzeb was at this time bent on destroying Šivâji's power, but this intention was not liked by Jasavantsimha who saw in the Marâthâ the hope of Hindu regeneration in India. Consequently, the Mahârâjâ sent one of his trusted followers Rânchkoḍdâs, son of Râthor Govindadâs, to Šivâji's son. On the latter's arrival, the plan of Aurangzeb was unfolded to him and he was asked to take every precaution against the tactics of the Emperor. The affair having reached the ears of Šâista Khân, he wrote to the Emperor that Jasavant was plotting with the Marâthâ leader. During all this time Šivâji was not idle. Having ascertained that he would get every encouragement from Jasavantsimha, Šivâji fell one night upon Šâista Khân who through good luck escaped with his life. Aurangzeb now recalled Šâista Khân and the Mahârâjâ from the Deccan; and sent Prince Muazzam and Jaisimha, Râjâ of Amber, in their place. It is well known how Jaisimha prevailed upon Šivâji to come to Delhi and pay his respects to the Emperor. But as Aurangzeb planned to keep Šivâji a prisoner at Delhi, the latter contrived to escape to his country. During this negotiation Jaisimha had returned to Delhi.

Mahârâjâ Jasavantsimha was sent for a second time to the Deccan with Prince Muazzam and remained there for four years. There he
poisoned the cars of Muazzam against his father, but before his scheme could take any definite shape Aurangzeb sent Mahābat Khān as the Subedār of the Deccan in place of Muazzam. Jasavant now returned to Mārwār and after a short time went to the imperial court along with his son Prithvisimha.

In 1727, Mahārājā Jasavantsimha was for a third time sent as the Subedār of Guzerāt, where he spent three years. At the end of that period, he was sent to Kābul to assist the Subedār of that province against the invasions of the Paṭhāns. The Mahārājā rendered splendid service there and the Paṭhāns were driven back. Jasavantsimhajī was now stationed at the important station of Jamroj on the Indian frontier where he passed the remaining days of his life.

On the eve of his departure to Kābul, Mahārājā Jasavantsimhajī left the administration entirely in the hands of Prince Prithvisimha. Col. Tod on the authority of the chronicles tells us how Aurangzeb demanded the presence of the Rāṭhor prince at the imperial court. With unusual cordiality, the Emperor grasped firmly his folded hands and asked “What can you do now?” With the usual Rajput dignity, Prithvisimha replied, “God preserve your Majesty, when the sovereign of mankind lays the hand of protection on the meanest of his subjects, all his hopes are realised; but when he condescends to take both of mine I feel as if I could conquer the world.” Upon this the Emperor exclaimed “Ah, here is another kuṭṭan.” This term he always applied to Jasavantsimha who always tried to avoid the snares of the Emperor and paid him back in his own coin. Aurangzeb, “affecting to be pleased with the frank boldness of the prince’s speech ordered him a splendid dress which, as customary, he put on.” But shortly after he was taken ill and expired. His death is attributed to the poisoned robe of honour presented by the Emperor. Some of the chronicles, however, affirm that his death was due to an attack of small-pox.

When the news of this premature end of the young prince reached his father, he was overwhelmed with grief; and while pouring out the libation of water to the memory of his son, he exclaimed “This libation is not meant for you, but for Mārwār as well,” meaning that he would never take part in any affairs of his principality.

The Subedār of Kābul was always at war with the Paṭhān tribes, who though defeated in battle always sought opportunities for plunder. In one such skirmish an imperial Mansabdār was killed and his army
took to heels. Mahārājā Jasavantsimhā who was close at hand sent forces to the assistance of the retreating army. A second action now took place between the Paṭhāns and the Mahārājā, in which the latter, though having lost some of his best warriors, was able to drive the enemy to their mountain abodes. After this incident the Paṭhāns were so much afraid of the Mahārājā that, it is said, they would tremble with fear even when they heard the name of Jasavantsimhājī. For five years the Mahārājā stayed at Kābul, and through his endeavours and prowess peace was everywhere restored in this principality.

His second son Jagatsimhājī, too, died in his father's lifetime. Shortly after, he followed his sons to the grave in the year 1735 at Jamroj in Kābul.

If a life extending over fifty-two years, the Mahārājā passed the first twenty years in peace and tranquility, during the reign of Šāh Jehān: while the same number of years, though passed during the reign of Aurangzīb in an atmosphere of mistrust and treachery, was spent creditably with rare courage and intelligence. Far-sighted, politic and clever as he was, he was versed in the literature and the Vedānta as well. In literature he has rendered his name famous by writing a book called Bhāshabhūshāna, while books on Vendānta like Svātmānubhava and others proclaim his keen intellect in the domain of philosophy.

The last years of his life were spent in the far off north-western frontier of India. The shrewd Moghul Emperor had some definite motives in sending this powerful Hindu prince to such a distant place. He found that the presence of Jasavant on the frontier of India would ensure the safety of his kingdom from the inroads of the Paṭhān tribes who were as troublesome in those days as they are now. Should however the Hindu prince die in the discharge of this onerous duty, the Emperor could not but be pleased at his kingdom being rid of one of the powerful vassals, who used to raise up his head whenever he liked. Moreover, the Rājpūt prince would get the assistance of none of his brethren, should he raise the standard of rebellion, in such a distant place. These were the intentions which influenced Aurangzīb, when he sent away Jasavant to protect the frontier.

Mahārājā Jasavant fully understood the tactics which Aurangzīb adopted to get rid of his enemies and he was always on the alert. The Mahārājā was a sincere patron of his religion. There is a story that once when, through bigotry, Aurangzīb destroyed several Hindu temples
and built mosques in their place; the Mahārājā, then in Peshāwar, caused an assembly consisting of both Hindus and Mahomedans to be held. In the open meeting he declared, that should the Emperor persist in his policy of persecution, he himself would carry on a counter-persecution by the destruction of mosques. Thereupon, it is said, some well-wisher of the Mahārājā told him that if his words reached the ears of the Emperor the latter would be indignant with him. "This is just the reason," replied the Mahārājā boldly, "why I have declared my resolution in an open meeting."

Three months after the death of the Mahārājā, his two queens Jādamjī and Narukijī gave birth to two posthumous sons named Ajitāsimhā and Dalthambhana respectively in the city of Lāhore. But Aurangzeb declared them to be illegitimate and in consequence, forfeited the principality of Mārwār for want of legal heirs.

In order that Ajitāsimhā, the elder son of Mahārājā Jasavantsimhā might succeed his father, the Rāthors wrote from Kābul a letter to that effect to the Emperor. But Aurangzeb refused as the heir was still a baby of three months, and he ordered that the infant prince should be sent to his court. He took Ajitāsimhā under his care, so that he might not be carried away to Mārwār. As the Rāthors found Aurangzeb was not favourable to their proposal, they came in person to plead their cause at Delhi. To their dismay, they found that the infant prince was very strictly guarded by the Emperor; and they planned to steal away their ruler to Jodhpur. At this time it so happened that the wife of the Sardār of Borāwar, on her return from a pilgrimage to the Ganges, had come to Delhi. The Rāthors saw it was a good opportunity to carry out their design. So on Durgādās’s advice, they had both the infant princes sent to the Sardārni at the hands of Khichī Mukundadas who was disguised as a Sādhu. Prince Dalthambhana died on the way, while Ajitāsimhā was brought to Balūndā under the protection of the Sardārni, and from there was sent to Sirohi. Here he was placed with a Brāhman Purohit named Jaggu under the supervision of Mukundadas. The Emperor came to know that Mahārājukumār had been taken away from him, so he ordered that the infant should be brought back to him. The Rāthors prepared to fight for their prince, the Emperor took up the challenge. They killed the two wives of Jasavantsimhā and drowned their bodies in the Jamunā. A battle took place between the imperial
forces and the Rāṭhors in Delhi in 1736 and there Jodhā Ranchhoddās and Bhāṭṭī Raghunāth were killed, while Rāṭhor Durgādās though wounded escaped.

The Emperor granted the State of Jodhpur to Indrasimha, the grandson of Amarasimha, who established his authority all over Jodhpur, though Chāmpāwat Sonag and Durgādās continued to fight on behalf of Ajitsimha. At last Sonag and his party including Durgādās left Jodhpur and went away to Mewār. Mahārāṇa Rājasimha protected them. At this time Aurangzeb went on an expedition to the Deccan. This was a favourable opportunity which was seized by the Rāṭhors who defeated and drove away the imperial officers from Mārwār. The latter hastened to the Emperor at Ajmer and described to him all the violent acts committed by the Rāṭhors. Aurangzeb sent his son Prince Akbar to Jodhpur to bring the Rāṭhors to obedience. Durgādās seeing that force would be of no avail to him, tried to win over Akbar by diplomacy to his side, by tempting him with the offer to place him on his father's throne. Akbar was only too willing to imitate his father's example, and he soon threw in his lot with Durgādās. They together advanced with 100,000 men against the Emperor, who had barely 10,000 men with him at Ajmer. Seeing his critical condition Aurangzeb at once sent word to Muazzam to come immediately to Ajmer. This Prince, after his return from Ujjain, was encamped at Udaipur near the Udaisāgar lake. No sooner had he received his father's order, than he came to Ajmer, while Akbar and his Rāṭhor allies were only four miles from that place. Zāhid Khān and other commanders deserted Akbar's side and went over to the Emperor. Only Tāhir Khān, the Commander-in-Chief of Akbar's army, remained faithful to Akbar; but even he was tempted by Aurangzeb to leave the prince. Unsuspectingly at midnight he deserted Akbar and prostrated himself at the imperial feet. But he was killed by a mace at Aurangzeb's order. At these numerous misfortunes, Prince Akbar lost heart. Khāfi Khān and other Mahomedan historians are of opinion that Aurangzeb very cleverly had a forged proclamation distributed in Akbar's army and it fell into Rāṭhor hands. The proclamation stated that Akbar had cleverly brought the Rājputs with him, now they should be placed in front while he should station himself in the rear. The Rājputs placed between two fires could be easily destroyed by Aurangzeb's army in front and Akbar's force in the rear. No sooner did the Rājputs come to know of
this proclamation than they separated from him. Akbar had no other alternative but flight. Prince Muazzam and Abu-l Kāsim were sent after him. All the baggage of Akbar's force was captured and his personal attendants were put to the sword. In spite of his distress, Akbar was still more anxious for the fate of his children and knew not where to shelter them. Durgādās offered to place the children under the care of his family and asked Akbar to accompany him. The Prince had full confidence in the Rāṭhor chief and entrusted his children to Rajput protection. Durgādās sent them with a favourite of his to his zenānā. Taking Akbar with him, they went to the Deccan by way of Rājpipīlā. There Sambhājī and Akbar were brought together, so that Aurangzeb was compelled to turn his attention southwards.

In the meanwhile, Sonag and his party were killed in a fight with Etikād Khān, son of Aṣraf Khān. Other Rāṭhors went and plundered Pur and Māndal, in Mewār, where Mānsimhā, the Rājā of Kṛṣṇagāth was commanding the imperial forces. Afterwards they went away to Sirohi, where their infant king Ajitsimha was in hiding. In 1742, the Rāṭhors laid siege to the fortress of Siwānā where its commander Purdil Khān Mevāti was killed. Two years later, Hāḍā Durjānāsimhā who had been driven away from Būndi and had joined the Rāṭhors in their plunder of Pur and Māndal, was killed by the Mahomedans.

In 1745, the idea occurred to some of the Rāṭhors that they had seen nothing of the ruler for whom they were fighting and suffering so much. So they must see him with their own eyes and afterwards they could bear any suffering for his cause with equanimity. So they appointed Chāmpāwat Udaisimhā, son of Lakhdhīr, and Mukundadās, son of Sujāṃsimhā, as their spokesmen. These two pestered Khīchī Mukundadās and even threatened him with death if he refused to show to them their ruler; especially as some of the Sardārs were beginning to doubt whether their ruler was alive or not; and if alive, they were asking for his whereabouts. But Khīchī Mukundadās replied that as he had been entrusted with the care of the Mahārājā's person by Durgādās; and as the latter was away in the Deccan, he could not bring out the Mahārājā without Durgādās's consent. But as the chiefs insisted on the matter, he had to give way and they with their young ruler went away to the hills and from there carried on a guerilla war for eighteen years.

In 1751, the Mahārājā was married to a daughter of the Rānā of Udaipur. Aurangzeb had so far suspected that Ajitsimhā was a
mere pretender; but seeing that the Rāṇā had given his daughter in marriage to the Rāṭhor, he was convinced that the latter must be the real son of Jasavantsimha. But now the Emperor began to be anxious about the fate of his grand-children,—the children of Prince Akbar—who were being brought up in the zenānā of Durgādās. Aurangzeb was very much afraid lest they might be forced to marry into some common Mahomedan family which would be a degradation to their imperial rank. So he asked Durgādās to give these children back to him. Seeing a favourable opportunity the Rāṭhor chief sent them away to the Emperor by means of Šujāt Khān, the Subedār of Guzerāt. Aurangzeb was very much pleased with Durgādās and granted to him Mertā in Jāgīr and made him the commander of 2,500 Jāts and of 2,500 horsemen. On Durgādās’s request, he granted to Ajitsimha Jālor and Sāchor. Mojāhid Khān, who was hitherto the ruler of Jālor was given in compensation Pālanpur, where his descendants are reigning to this day as the Nawābs of Pālanpur.

In 1759, two princes were born to Ajitsimha. Four years later, on hearing of the news of Aurangzeb’s death, the Mahārājā immediately attacked Jodhpur and took possession of the city, defeating Nājim Kuli, the imperial commander, who fled away. Later he conquered Sojhat, Siwānā and Pāli. Emperor Bahādur Šāh, Aurangzeb’s successor, invaded Jodhpur, because of Ajitsimha’s unauthorised action in taking possession of his ancestral kingdom. The Emperor had also to chastise Jaisimha, the Rājā of Āmber, as the latter had helped Prince Azam in his attempt to obtain the imperial crown. Bahādur Šāh came up to Ajmer and ordered Jodhpur and Āmber to be confiscated and thereupon both Ajitsimha and Jaisimha came to the Emperor and from there went to Delhi. They were ordered to accompany the imperial forces which were sent to the Deccan to quell the disturbances there. But both the dispossessed Rājās went as far as the Narbadā river and from there turned back. They went to Udaipur and following the Rāṇā’s advice, drove out the imperial forces from Jodhpur. For six months Jaisimha stayed in Jodhpur then seeing a favourable opportunity, he took possession of his patrimony at Āmber. After some interval, the two Mahārājās and Durgādās took possession of lake Sāmbhār, which was a part of the imperial territory. Ajitsimha and Jaisimha divided up their new possession between themselves, but Durgādās also claimed some share of the spoil; but Jaisimha tauntingly said that to obtain a share of lake
Sāṁbhar, one must be born of Jasavantsimha’s family. Naturally Durgādās felt aggrieved.

In 1766, Bahādur Šāh, visited Ajmer. Jaisimha and Ajitsimha met him there. Bahādur Šāh, recognizing accomplished facts, granted an imperial farmān investing both the Mahārājās with the territories which they had usurped by force. The Emperor needed very badly peace in Rājputānā, as the Sikhs were becoming very turbulent in the Punjāb and he was planning an expedition against them. At this time, Amarasiṃha of Udaipur was conspiring against his father Rānā Jaisimha in order to usurp the gādi. The Rānā demanded help from Ajitsimha at this critical juncture; and the Jodhpur Mahārājā finding it was an excellent opportunity to be rid of Durgādās sent him away to Udaipur to settle amicably the dispute between the father and son. Durgādās was successful in his mission, the rebellious Amarasiṃha was appeased by the grant of Rājnagar, which yielded an annual revenue of three lacs. The Rānā was so pleased with this Rāṭhor Sardār, that he kept him at his court. When nearing his death, Durgādās went to Ujjain and died an exile on the bank of the Siprā. In his memory a chhatrī has been erected and is now called the Rāṭhor chhatrī. For his unwisdom, in giving up such a loyal and devoted servant as Durgādās, a poet wrote as follows:—

“इस घर वे अंक्रिय हो, दिंगो समथा दासियों।”

A century later, another Mahārājā of Jodhpur, Mānsiṅha confiscated the estates of the Sardārs who had helped him before. The couplet was written at that time, and means that in this (Jodhpur) family, it is customary to be ungrateful, as Durgā was burnt on the Siprā river.

Bahādur Šāh died in 1769 and he was followed by two ephemeral emperors, Jahāndār Šāh and Farrukh-siyar. At the coronation of Farrukh-siyar, Ajitsimha was not present. To avenge this slight the Emperor sent Saiyid Husain Ali Khān, his Commander-in-Chief, to Jodhpur. But the Mahārājā came to terms with him and in his company came to Delhi. To please him, the Emperor appointed him commander of 6,000 Jāts and 6,000 horsemen and made him the Subedar of Guzerāt. For six years, Ajitsimha remained in Guzerāt and became very friendly with the two Saiyid brothers—Saiyid Abdullah Khān, the Vazir and Saiyid Husain Ali Khān, the Commander-in-Chief—who were all-powerful in the Empire and are known in history as the Saiyid King-Makers. Ajitsimha entered into a conspiracy with these two brothers and the Emperor
was imprisoned and killed by them. On the vacant throne, another puppet prince Rafi-ad-darajat was made Emperor, and in four months he was succeeded by Rafi-ad-daula. In 1775, on the coronation Rafi-ad-darajat, the Emperor, acting on Ajitsimha’s suggestion, abolished the jizya tax, which was imposed on all the Hindus in the imperial territory. As the ally of the Saiyid King-Makers Ajitsimha became very powerful at Delhi, and the trio managed the imperial affairs just as they liked. They decided to place Rošan-akhtar, one of the grandsons of Aurangzeb, on the vacant throne. The new Emperor assumed the name of Mahomad Šāh and with the help of Nizām-al-mulk had Saiyid Abdullah Khān imprisoned and Saiyid Husain Ali Khān killed. Ajitsimha wisely remained all the time in his dominions. As the Moghul power was visibly declining, the Mahārājā took advantage of this opportunity and captured Ajmer and placed Údāwat Amarasiṁha, the Ṭhākur of Nimbāj, in command of his new possession. But another imperial force was sent for the recapture of Ajmer, and after a bitter struggle with Amarasiṁha, Ajmer became once more an imperial possession. As Jodhpur was becoming powerful, both Jaisimha and the Emperor were becoming jealous of Ajitsimha’s rise. Jaisimha advised Mahomad Šāh to have the Mahārājā killed by his young son Abhaisimha, who was residing with the Emperor at Delhi. So once the Emperor and Abhaisimha went on an excursion on the Jamunā river. While they were in the middle of the river, Mahomad Šāh asked Abhaisimha to kill his father, and threatened to drown him in the river if he refused to carry out his suggestion. In terror of his life, Abhaisimha consented and wrote to his younger brother Bakhotsimha to murder their father. Bakhotsimha carried out his brother’s plan. Ajitsimha was murdered in 1781. About this sad incident, a poet has written the following verse:

"बख़्ता बख़्त बाहिरै, तैं माधुरी बजनमाल।
खिरदांगी रो सवरौं, तुरकांगी रो शाल।"

O Bakhatā! thou of evil omen, thou hast killed Ajitsimha, that Ajitsimha, the beloved of the whole Hindu world, and the target of all Mahomedan spears.

From the time of his birth to the day of his death, Ajitsimha experienced many a vicissitude of fortune. In the care of Durgādās and other Rāṭhor chiefs, he spent his early and impressionable years. When he came to know who he was, he went through many dangers to obtain
his ancestral kingdom, and did not rest till he was successful in his aim. When he ascended the gādi, he made himself so very powerful that he imprisoned Emperor Farrukh-siyar and had him killed, four Delhi sovereigns owed their throne to him and for a considerable time he made and unmade Emperors at his own will. A poet has well said:—

“अज़ी दिलो रो पातमा, राजा वो श्रवणाथ ||”

Ajo (Ajitsimha) was the real Emperor of Delhi, and, his minister Raghubunāth wielded powers like a Rājā. European writers have styled Ajitsimha as a King-Maker. A very lofty temple was built on the spot where Ajitsimha was cremated. It was begun in 1856 by Bhūmsimhāji and was finished in 1860. Ajitsimha had thirteen sons, of whom Abhaisimha became the Mahārāja of Jodhpur and Aṇandasimha the ruler of Īḍar.

Abhaisimha succeeded his father to the gādi of Jodhpur in 1781. At his coronation, Emperor Mahomad Śāh gave him the title of Rājrajeswar and granted him in jagir Nāgor which was then in possession of Indrasimha, the grandson of Amarasisimha. Abhaisimha gave Indrasimha some other jagir and handed over Nāgor to his younger brother Bakhatsimha. Later the Mahārāja invaded and defeated the Rāv of Sirohi to teach him a lesson. To check the tide of Marāṭhā invasion in 1783, Sarbaland Khān was made Subedar of Guzerāt and he was sent there with a powerful Rajput force including the Jodhpur ruler, Kachhawā Chhatrasimhāji and the Mewār contingent. A battle between the Imperial and Marāṭhā forces took place near Delhi, the Marāṭhās had to flee and the imperial authority was re-established.

As the Delhi authority was becoming gradually weaker, the Subedārs of Oudh and of the Deccan proclaimed their independence in 1787 and Sarbaland Khān, the Subedar of Guzerat also followed their example. Mahomad Śāh made Abhaisimha Subedar of Guzerāt, and he invaded his new Subā accompanied by his brother Bakhatsimha. At Ahmedābād, the Mahārāja and Sarbaland met in battle and after five days’ stubborn fighting, Sarbaland had to acknowledge defeat. The victory was mainly due to the bravery of the Nāgor contingent led by Bakhatsimha. The rebel Subedar was allowed to retreat with all his baggage. He then fled to Delhi and persuaded the Emperor that he had to fight Abhaisimha, as his troops whose pay was in arrears would have
murdered him if he had submitted. Mahomad Śāh believed this palpable falsehood and made Sarbāland, the Subedār of Kāśmir. Considerable booty fell into the hands of Abhaismīha and some of the artillery then captured is still to be seen in the Jodhpur fort. A year later the new Subedār of Guzerāt drove away Bāji Rao Peshwa who had penetrated into Guzerāt as far as Barodā. Abhaismīha remained for a long time in Guzerāt. As his younger brother Anandasiṁha was without any jāgir, he began to plunder the Mārwār possessions, and to put an end to his forays Abhaismīha wisely made him the ruler of Īḍār.

About this time a quarrel arose between Bakhatsimīha and Zorāwarsimīha, the Mahārājā of Bikāner over the possession of Kharbūji district. Bakhatsimīha was victorious and annexed the district to his territory. Abhaismīha also espoused his brother's cause and invaded and besieged Bikāner. Zorāwarsimīha protested against Abhaismīha's action, as he had already surrendered the land in dispute to Bakhatsimīha, and on the latter's suggestion demanded help from Jaisimīha, the Mahārājā of Jaipur. Jaisimīha marched immediately on Jodhpur. Abhaismīha was compelled to raise the siege of Bikāner and to retreat to Jodhpur. Bakhatsimīha was asked by his elder brother to come to his help and fight against Jaisimīha. He immediately marched against the Jaipur ruler and reached Gagavāṇā (near Ajmer). There a battle was fought. Out of the 5,000 men of Bakhatsimīha all were killed except a bare 60. With this handful of men, Bakhatsimīha rushed on the place where the Jaipur flag was flying, thinking that Jaisimīha must be near about there, and the Jaipur ruler frightened at his approach fled from the battle-field. Thus with but 60 men, the Nāgor ruler defeated the Jaipur forces and checked the invasion. Abhaismīha, although he very cordially thanked his brother for his help, blamed him for his rashness. About this battle a poet has sung:—

"एक कटारी व्यागरे, छर वाणी ब्रमरेः।
मगवाणा रे गोरेः, खग वाणी वचतेः॥"

Amarsimīha thrust his dagger with terrible effect at Āgrā, in the same way Bakhat used his steel at Gagavāṇā.

After the battle of Gagavāṇā, at the intercession of the Rāṇā peace was brought about between Jaipur and Jodhpur. In the same year 1795 Nādir Śāh Durānī invaded and plundered Delhi.
In 1804, Emperor Mahomed Šâh died and he was succeeded by Ahmad Šâh. The new Emperor appointed Bakhatsimha as Subedâr of Guzerât. Abhaisimha died in 1805 after a reign of twenty-four years. He was a brave man and he was always victorious in battle. He left only one son Râmsimha.

The new ruler ascended the gâdi in 1805. Owing to his ill-temper, many of the Râṭhor Sardârs left him and joined with Bakhatsimha. Only a few loyal Sardârs, including the Sardâr of Mertâ and Purohit Jaggu, remained faithful to Râmsimha when Bakhatsimha invaded Mertâ. A battle was fought in 1807 outside the Jodhpur gate, and after much slaughter the Nâgor ruler was victorious. After his defeat, Râmsimha sent an envoy to Mâdhoji Sindhiâ demanding help against his uncle. Before the Marâṭhâ chief could come to Râmsimha's help, Bakhatsimha marched to Jodhpur and drove away his nephew, who had to fly to Mâlwâ. Although at first with the Marâṭhâ help, he harried and even conquered a large part of Mârwâr territories, but in the end Râmsimha was given the Sâmâbhar district by his uncle. In 1829 Râmsimha died in Jaipur.

After a successful rule of seventeen years in Nâgor, Bakhatsimha became the ruler of Jodhpur after driving away his nephew in 1808 in the month of Šrâvaṇa. Mâdhoji Sindhiâ, as requested by Râmsimha, was on his way to invade Mârwâr, but hearing of the many brave deeds of Bakhatsimha, he prudently retreated. But the new ruler thought that the Marâṭhâs, although for the present they had gone away, would surely come back and ravage Mârwâr; so he prepared a large army to chastise them. With this force Bakhatsimha took possession of Ajmer and then marched into Jaipur. He encamped at Sindholyâ. The then ruler of Jaipur, Mâdhosimha, saw that his kingdom would soon become the battle-field between the Râṭhors and the Marâṭhâs. In this crisis he turned for help to his wife, who was a niece of Bakhatsimha, and as such she alone could draw him out of the difficulty. He explained the whole position to his Râñî and said that the only solution of the difficulty lay in the death of Bakhatsimha. He gave a poisoned dress to his wife, who sent it to her uncle out of obedience to her husband’s will, together with some ornaments and gold. The Jodhpur Mahârâjâ was in need of money and very gladly put on the poisoned dress. In a couple of hours the poison
penetrated into his system and he died in Sindholya, in 1809, after a short reign of thirteen months. At their leader's death his army became discouraged and retreated. A temple has been built at Sindholya in memory of Bakhatsimha by his son Bijaisimha in 1822.

Col. Tod, in his Annals, writes that it was Iswarisimha's wife who sent that poisoned dress to Bakhatsimha. But in 1809, Madhosimha and not Iswarisimha was on the gadi of Jaipur, and the latter had died in 1808. So it could not be Isvarisimha’s wife who had sent the fatal dress to Bakhatsimha.

Moreover Col. Tod writes: "During his three years of sovereignty, Bakhta had found both time and resources to strengthen and embellish the strongholds of Marwar. He completed the fortifications of the capital, and greatly added to the palace of Jodha from the spoils of Ahmedabad. He retaliated the injuries of the intolerant Islamite, and threw down his shrines and his mosques in his own fief of Nagor and with the wrecks restored the edifices of ancient days. It was Bakhta also who prohibited, under pain of death, the Islamite's call to prayer throughout his dominions, and the order remains to this day unrevoked in Marwar."

Bakhatsimha was a brave, political and learned ruler. He was very keen on dealing out justice to his subjects. The Jodhpur wall which is still intact was completed by him within the short space of six months. The work had begun as early as the first decade of the seventeenth century, in the reign of Maldev; but it was only by Bakhatsimha's zeal and persistence that the wall was finished.

Bijaisimha was the only son of the late ruler and he was installed on the gadi in the district of Maroth, east of Jodhpur. Emperor Ahmad Sah sent him the customary presents. In 1811, Raimsiha, the dispossessed ruler of Jodhpur, invaded Marwar with the help of Appaji Rao and Madhosimha of Jaipur. Gajsimha, the Maharaaj of Bikener, and Bahadursimha, the Maharaaj of Krisngadh came to the rescue of Bijaisimha. A battle was fought at Merta. At first the Jodhpur ruler was victorious, but later on he was defeated. Bijaisimha fled to Nagor. The Marathas under Appaji Rao followed him and besieged Nagor. The Jodhpur Sardars sent two men, one belonging to Khokhar branch of

36. Maharaaj Bijaisimha.

As a matter of fact he reigned only for one year.
Rāṭhors and the other to the Gehalot clan, to kill Appāji Rāo. These two men disguised as bāniās entered the Marāṭhā camp and began to quarrel among themselves. They therefore carried their complaints before Appāji Rāo, and then seeing a favourable opportunity they pierced the Marāṭhā chief with daggers. In the confusion caused in the Marāṭhā camp by the death of their commander, the Khokhar managed to escape and was given a Jagir. About this incident a poet has made the following couplet:

“कोखर बड़ो खराबो, खाधी बापा मरखो डाको।”

The Khokhar was a terrible eater, as he swallowed a goblin like Appāji. In spite of Appāji’s death Rāmsimha managed to obtain possession of a considerable portion of Mārwār, but his rule lasted only for a short time. Taking advantage of the quarrel between the two cousins, Rāmsimha and Bijaisimha, the Sardārs managed to usurp a good deal of power and caused much trouble to the ruler. Bijaisimha engaged a mercenary force to keep his turbulent jāgirdārs in awe. The Sardārs incensed at this step left the darbār and went away to Visalpur, 18 miles to the east of Jodhpur, and on the suggestion of Khīchī Gordhan, Bijaisimha went to Visalpur and persuaded them to return. Shortly afterwards Ātmārām, the Mahārājā’s guru, died in the Jodhpur fort and Bijaisimha himself performed his funeral ceremonies. Many Sardārs came to the fort to attend the funeral and taking advantage of this, Bijaisimha had them all seized and imprisoned them for life. About this incident there is this following couplet:

“केशर देवी कृत्सी, दक्षो राजकुमार।
मरते मोड़ मारिया, चोटीवाला चार।”

The shaven one even while dead killed four men with tufts of hair. The shaven one refers to Ātmārām who as a spiritual teacher had his head shaved, while the four jāgirdārs as men of the world kept their hair. These four Sardārs were Chāmpāwat Devisimha, the Thākur of

---

55 Col. Tod says that he was an Afghān, but this is not corroborated by the Khyātās.
56 Col. Tod says that the number was six. But the couplet above cited cites only four names, and the Khyātās also mention only four Sardārs.
57 Col. Tod writes: “The chief of Pokaran . . . adopted a son of Rājā Ajit [of Jodhpur] as their chief; his name was Devisimha” and continues that the adoption was taken “not improbably at the suggestion of the dying chief . . . having no sons of his own.” There are several inaccuracies here. Devisimha was neither the son of Ajitsimha, nor was he given by his father to be adopted by the chief of Pokaran. He was in fact a son of Mahāsimha of Pokaran who is said by Tod to have died childless.
Pokaraṇ; Kūṁpāwat Chhatrasimha, the Thākur of Āsop; Īdāwat Kesrisimha, the Thākur of Rās and Īdāwat Daulatsimha, the Thākur of Nimbāj. The first three died in a short time in prison; while the last named was released. Devisimha of Pokaraṇ had become very powerful and used to say that the kingdom of Jodhpur lay in his scabbard; when he was seized he was taunted about his statement and he retorted that the scabbard was now with his son Sabalsimha. Sabalsimha on hearing of his father’s death rebelled and plundered Pāli but while attacking Visalpur he was killed. As he had subdued all his rebellious chiefs, Bijaisimha’s power was firmly established. The Jodhpur ruler was a Vaiṣṇavite of the Vallabhāchārya school and as such he prohibited sterily the use of meat and intoxicants in his dominion. If a Sardār dared to consume wine and meat, he was immediately exiled from Mārwār. So great was the awe in which he was held by his subjects that it was a common saying at the time that in Bijaisimha’s reign the tiger and the lamb used to drink water from the same pool.

In V.S. 1827 a quarrel broke out in Mewār between Rāṇā Arisimha and his Sardārs about the district of Goḍvāḍ. The Rāṇā asked for help from Bijaisimha and with his help put down the turbulent chiefs. As the Rāṇā had no money to pay the Mārwār ruler for his help, the Goḍvāḍ district was given to him as compensation and to this day it belongs to the Jodhpur State. About this time the plunderers of the Sarāi caste became troublesome and a force was sent to Úmarkot to suppress them. In that place the Soḍhās (a sept of Parmārs) were the rulers. They were driven away by the Tālpurās of Sindh. Vijād, the Tālpurā leader, was defeated by Bijaisimha and his territory was annexed to Mārwār. In 1844 as the Marāṭhās were preparing to invade Jaipur, its ruler Pratāpsimha asked for help from Bijaisimha, because Jaipur formed the bulwark of Rājputāṇa against the Marāṭhā aggression and should it succumb, Jodhpur would also fall under Marāṭhā domination. The Jodhpur Mahārājā immediately rushed to the defence of the Jaipur territory and a battle was fought between the Rājputs and the Marāṭhās at Tūṅgā, and it was mainly owing to the Rāṭhor bravery that the Rājputs were victorious and the Marāṭhās were driven away. On their return from Jaipur, Bijaisimha seized Ajmer. To avenge his defeat, Mādhojī Sindhiā prepared another trained force within four years and invaded Mārwār. Bijaisimha called the Mahārājās of Bikāner and of Kṛṣṇagadh to his help. They joined the Jodhpur forces at
Mertā. The Marāṭhā forces came to the Lūni river, and while they were there De Boigne’s artillery stuck fast in the mud. Some of the Rāṭhor chiefs advised immediate attack, but owing to internal disunion the opportunity was soon lost. The Mahārājās of Bīkāner and Krīṣṇagāḍh withdrew their forces, as they were needed for the defence of their own territories against the impending Marāṭhā attack and the Rāṭhor force was left alone to fight De Boigne. Owing to some confusion, the Rājputs attacked their own artillery mistaking it for the enemy’s. Taking advantage of this mistake, the Marāṭhās dashed on the Rājputs and defeated them completely. Bijaisimha fled to Mertā and from there to Nāgor. Mādhojī Sindhiā seized Ajmer. Fearing the continuance of the Marāṭhā invasion, Bijaisimha soon made terms with Mādhojī. The terms were necessarily severe. The Mahārājā had to pay 60 lacs of Rupees and to give up Ajmer. The tribute hitherto paid to the Dehli Emperors was to be paid hereafter to the Marāṭhās. As the Jodhpur State was too poor to pay 60 lacs in cash; jewels, some cash and a few hostages were given in security.

Mahārājā Bijaisimha had a Jāṭ mistress (पत्नी) named Gulaibrāi, who for a long time was his chief favourite. So great was her hold on the Mahārājā that she even interfered in state matters. The Sardārs naturally resented this intrusion of an upstart woman in politics. A conspiracy was formed against her under the leadership of Savāisimha of Pokaran, grandson of Devīsimha, and Gulaibrāi was murdered. The conspirators even tried to dethrone Bijaisimha and place his grandson Bhīmsimha on the throne, but the attempt failed. The Mahārājā survived this event by a few months only and he passed away in the month of Asad, 1749 after a reign of forty years. Although the end of his reign was feeble, Bijaisimha for the greater part of his rule gave complete peace and order to his kingdom. He was a devoted follower of the Vaiṣṇvīte sect, and built several temples, the most famous of which the Gangaśāmīji temple is still extant. He converted several palaces of his exiled chiefs into temples by depositing idols in them. In honour of his mistress Gulaibrāi, he built the Gulabsāgar tank, the Kuṇjabihāari temple, Girdikoṭ and Manahlībāgh where now the Saddar hospital is situated.

After Bijaisimha’s death, Bhīmsimha, the son of Bhomasiṃha and the grandson of the late Mahārājā, who was then in Jaissalmer hastened to Jodhpur and ascended
the gādi. It was the wish of the Bijaisimha, that his younger son Zālimsimha should succeed him; but owing to the help of Savāisimha of Pokaran and of the Thākur of Āuvā, Bhīmsimha became the ruler of Mārwār. During his father’s lifetime Zālimsimha was granted the jāgir of Goḍvāḍ, but his nephew when he became the Mahārājā sent a force against him and Zālimsimha had to leave his domain and died in exile in Mewār. Bhīmsimha lived on bad terms with his brothers and nephews. The reason for this enmity seems to be due to the evil influence which Savāisimha had on his ruler. The Thākur of Pokaran was a bitter foe of Bijaisimha who had killed his grandfather; and when he obtained power in Mārwār in Bhīmsimha’s reign he pursued relentlessly all the survivors of the late ruler’s family. The only member of the royal family who managed to escape was Mānsimha, a cousin of Bhīmsimha.

With his usual foresight, Bijaisimha had granted to his grandson Mānsimha the jāgir of Jālor, so that he might be out of his cousin’s power. When Bhīmsimha ascended the gādi, he sent a force against him. A struggle went on between the cousins for some time. In 1857, Mānsimha because of his straitened circumstances plundered Pālī and on his return, he came across Bhīmsimha’s force at Sākdaḍā. He was on the point of being made prisoner, but was saved by the Thākur of Āuvā, who carried him safely to Jālor. The Mahārājā tried in vain to oust his cousin from that place. Bhīmsimha sent a large army with Bhandārī Gangārām, Singhi Vanraj and Singhi Indrarāj to besiege Jālor. The siege was very vigorously pursued and Mānsimha was compelled to think seriously of leaving the fort. It was about the time of the Divālī festival. He asked for advice from his guru Āyas Devanāth. His teacher advised him to wait for four or five days before abandoning the Jālor fort. And it so happened, that on the fifth day after Divālī, Bhīmsimha died suddenly in the month of Kārtik, 1860. When this news reached the besieging force, Bhandārī Gangārām and Singhi Indrarāj saw that as Bhīmsimha was childless, Mānsimha was the inevitable successor. So they offered their allegiance to Mānsimha and recognised him as their ruler by giving to him nazar and performing nichhrāval. Mānsimha thereupon made his state entry into Jodhpur at the head of his forces. Bhīmsimha reigned for eleven years. During his reign there was not a single famine in Mārwār. He had a very high idea of his royal dignity. It is related that once when out riding his whip fell down from his hands, and it was given to him by one of his
syces. That such a man as his syce should presume to give him the whip was looked upon by Bhïmsimha as an insult to his royal dignity. When he came to the fort, he performed a purification ceremony and made some offerings to Brâhmans to wash out his sin. Bhïmsimha was however of a cruel temperament and vindictive towards the members of his family.

Mahârâjâ Mânsimha was the grandson of Bijaisimha and son of Gumânsimha. He was installed on the gâdi in the month of Mâgh, 1860. The first two years of the new reign passed in peace and harmony, but the seed of future troubles was already laid. Savâisimha of Pokaran announced that the wife of Bhïmsimha was about to become mother; and he expected to be the regent if the child happened to be a son. Mânsimha declared that, if a son was born he would resign the gâdi in his favour, but if the child happened to be a daughter she would be married into some royal family. In any case, the expectant mother should be placed under his care. But Savâisimha had Bhïmsimha’s râni sent away to Pokaran, and shortly afterwards announced that a son was born and gave him the name of Dhoûkalsimha. Mânsimha declared that Dhoûkalsimha was only a supposititious son of Bhïmsimha and refused to acknowledge him as the Mahârâjâ. Savâisimha sent away the queen mother and her child to Khetdi.

During the late Mahârâjâ’s lifetime, a marriage was arranged between Bhïmsimha and Kriûnkumâri, a daughter of Mahârânâ Bhïmsimha of Udaipur. But after Bhïmsimha’s death, negotiations began between Udaipur and Jaipur for the hand of the princess. Mânsimha forbade Jagatsimha of Jaipur to marry Kriûnkumâri, as he had a prior right to her hand. But Jagatsimha refused to pay any heed to this advice. The Mahârâjâ led a large force to invade Jaipur and encamped at Álanîyâvâs, near Mertâ. There he heard that bridal presents (tikâ) were being sent from Udaipur to Jaipur. Mânsimha sent a force and prevented the bridal party from going to Jaipur and it was made to return to Udaipur. He also called Jasavant Râo Holkar to his help and the Marâthâ chief met him near Ajmer. Jagatsimha of Jaipur thought it prudent to make peace with Mânsimha; and both the Mahârâjâs met at Puûkar, and a two-fold marriage alliance was arranged between them. But peace between Jaipur and Jodhpur was of short duration. Savâisimha of Pokaran, thirsting for revenge against Mânsimha, stirred up Jagatsimha by recalling to him the insult given by.
Mānsimha in forcibly preventing his marriage. The Jaipur ruler allowed himself to be won over by Savāisimha, and he resolved to fight with Mānsimha. As the town of Khetḍi; where Dhoṅkalsimha, the suppositious son of Bhimsimha, was living, was in Jaipur territory Jagatsimha could very well take up the rival claimant’s cause. A large Jaipur force was being prepared to invade Mārwār. Owing to Savāisimha’s diplomacy, Suratsimha of Bikāner also joined Jaipur. While Jaipur and Bikāner were preparing to invade Jodhpur, Mānsimha and his army took up their position at Mertā, and he immediately wrote to Jasavant Rāo Holkar whose wife and family he had protected when Holkar and the English were fighting. The Marāṭhā chief came as far as Harmāḍa (near Ajmer), but being bribed by Jagatsimha he went back. Both the Jodhpur and the Jaipur-Bikāner armies were encamped at Gīṅgōlī. Once more Savāisimha played havoc with Mānsimha’s force by his diplomacy. He won over to his side good many Sardārs of the Jodhpur army, and twenty-two of them deserted Mānsimha, either going away to their homes or joining the invading armies. In spite of his hopeless position, the Jodhpur ruler was determined to fight out the matter, but Mertiā Zālimsimha, Thākur of Mīṭhaḍī and Mertiā Sivnāṭhsimha of Kuchāman and others persuaded him to retreat, and Mānsimha was brought back to Jodhpur in the month of Fālgun, 1863. The invading forces soon captured Mertā and rapidly overran Nāgor, Pāli and Sojhāt and arrived at Jodhpur which was besieged. Mānsimha was quite unprepared to meet the Jaipur-Bikāner forces. The invaders entered the city in the month of Chaṭtra, only the fort remained with Mānsimha. The enemy now prepared to besiege the fort.

In the fort of Jodhpur, Singhi Īndraraṇj, the former commander of the army, was a prisoner. He offered to help Mānsimha in his difficulty, if he was given freedom. So the Mahārāṇjā released him and he managed to escape through the besieging forces and to reach Mertā. He met Mertiā Sivnāṭhsimha of Kuchāman and they prepared an army to invade Jaipur. About this time Mīr Khān, the Pindāri chief, was fighting on the side of the Jaipur forces at Jodhpur; but a quarrel broke out between him and Jagatsimha over the question of payment, and in anger he withdrew his forces from Jodhpur and went away to Mertā. The Marāṭhās, under Bāpūjī Sindhiā and Jān Butīsī, came to Jodhpur to assist Mānsimha and were advancing towards Mertā. To arrange
some terms with Mīr Khān, Śīvlāl, the commander of the Jaipur forces, and Savāīsimhā of Pokaraṇ came to Mertā, but they failed to placate the Pindiāri leader. But they managed to persuade the Marāṭhās to go away from Mertā by bribing them. On the other hand, Śivnāṭhsimhā of Kuchāman won over Mīr Khān to the side of Jodhpur, by an immediate payment of one lac of Rupees and a promise of four lacs later. Śivnāṭhsimhā and the Pindiāries then invaded Jaipur. The Jaipur forces under Śīvlāl and the Jodhpur-Pindiāri forces met at Fāgi and in the battle, the latter were victorious and captured considerable booty. Śīvlāl fled and was pursued by Śivnāṭhsimhā. The Jodhpur forces harried the Jaipur territory and then returned again to Jodhpur. Jagatsimhā when he came to know of the havoc wrought by Śivnāṭhsimhā in his dominions, withdrew his forces from Jodhpur in the month of Bhādrapad, 1864. The Bikāner forces also retreated and the siege of Jodhpur was raised.

Mānsimhā was now determined to take revenge on his disloyal Sardārs, especially on Savāīsimhā who had troubled him all through his reign. So the Mahārājā entered into a plot with Mīr Khān. It was arranged by the two conspirators that Mīr Khān should pretend to retire from the Jodhpur service, on the ground that he was ill paid and fly to Pokaraṇ, and having won Savāīsimhā’s confidence kill the Thākur at a favourable opportunity. Mīr Khān played the part assigned to him. In anger he withdrew his forces from Jodhpur and encamped at Mundai—10 miles to the south of Nāgor. There he began to abuse Mānsimhā, Savāīsimhā believing that the enemy of his enemy was his friend wanted to win over the Pindiāri chief to his side. Mīr Khān promised on the Qurān to be faithful to Savāīsimhā. The latter invited him to his palace where some ceremony was going on. While the Pokaraṇ Thākur was enjoying the festivities in a tent; the ropes were, by Mīr Khān’s order, cut and the tent fell down. Savāīsimhā was buried under the debris and his head was shown to Mānsimhā by Mīr Khān. Three other chiefs were killed at the same time, Chāmpāwat Gyānsimhā, Thākur of Pāli; Jetāwat Kesariśimhā, Thākur of Bagḍī and Kümārpāvat, Bagsirām, Thākur of Chandāval. Their heads also were carried to Jodhpur and were thrown down from the fort and there burnt. As a reward for this service Mīr Khān was given a jāgīr yielding a revenue of 30,000 Rupees, including the villages of Mundai and Kuchērā and a daily allowance of 100 Rupees.
In 1865, Mir Khan with the Jodhpur forces was sent against Bikâner as its Mahârâjâ had helped Savâisimha in 1860. The Bikâner forces were defeated and Suratsimha had to pay a fine of 3,00,000 Rupees and give back the district Phalodhi which was in his possession. A year later Mânsimha sent Mir Khan to Udaipur asking the Rânâ, that as the hand of his daughter Krîṣṇâkumâri had been promised formerly to a member of the Jodhpur family, she should not be married anywhere else. Some authorities relate that Rânâ Bhîmsimha seeing that this affair might lead to further complications, administered poison to his daughter as the best way out of his difficulty; others relate that the daughter herself drank poison to save her father.

Mir Khan, seeing how indispensable he had become, wanted to take possession of Mertâ and Nâgor in addition to Mûndwâ and Kucherâ which had already been given to him in jâgir. Mânsimha raised no objection to Mir Khan’s ambition; but his minister, Singhi Indrarâj, refused to allow this addition to the Pindâri power. Mir Khan joined his forces with Muhtâ Akhechand, a bitter enemy of the minister, who promised to give the Pindâri chief seven lacs if he could kill Indrarâj. Some Pindâri soldiers went to the Jodhpur fort to claim their pay from the minister and Ûyasa Devanâthji—Mânsimha’s old guru—who were carrying on the administration of the State. A quarrel arose and both the minister and the guru were shot. Mânsimha took the death of his two friends very much to heart and went into retirement, and in the month of Vaiśâkh, 1873 entrusted the affairs of the kingdom to his son Chhatrasimha with Muhtâ Akhechand as his minister. Mir Khan had also to leave the Márwâr territory and he later founded a principality in Tonk Râmpurâ (in Jaipur territory). For some time Mânsimha lived in strict seclusion and paid not the slightest heed to the state affairs. His only friend at that time was Beûn, his tailor, with whom alone he used to talk.

In 1874, a treaty was entered into between Jodhpur and the East India Company. The heir-apparent Chhatrasimha was represented by Byâs Bisanrâm and Byâs Abhairâm, and the Governor-General, the Marquess of Hastings, by Col. Metcalfe. The main conditions of this treaty were that the British Government undertook to protect Jodhpur, while in return Jodhpur promised to pay a tribute to the Company and to furnish 1,500 horse for the service of the British Government when required. The Mahârâjâ promised not to enter into any negotiation
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with any ruler without the sanction of the British Government. Similar treaties were entered into at different times with the other Rājput States. In 1860, a treaty had been entered into between Jodhpur and the Company. It was signed by the Marquess of Hastings; but as it was not ratified by Mānsimha it was of course not valid. In that very year Chhatrasimha died. Muhtā Akhechand and Chāmpāvat Sālimsimha, the Ṭhākur of Pokaraṇ administered the State, while Mānsimha continued to be in his seclusion.

When the Marquess of Hastings came to know of the death of Chhatrasimha he sent his agent Munšī Barkatali to ascertain whether Mānsimha was fit to reign or not. The Munšī found out that the Mahārājā was only waiting for a favourable opportunity to resume his active life; and was willing to come out of his retirement, if the Company promised not to interfere in Jodhpur. Mr. Wilders who was also sent by the Governor-General saw that Mānsimha was not at all insane, as he had been represented, but only feigned insanity. The Company gave the required promise and once more Mānsimha began to administer the state affairs and he inspired so much confidence and trust, that even those who had wronged him felt themselves quite safe. He pleased all the Sardārs by granting them various offices, while those who were office holders were confirmed in their positions. The Mahārājā thus completely won over the trust of all his chiefs.

Mānsimha had adopted this policy of conciliation only in order to lull the suspicions of his foes, so that he might deceive them with greater ease. In 1876, Muhtā Akhechand and eighty-four of his companions were seized by the Mahārājā, as they had helped Chhatrasimha when he was the virtual head of the State. Eight of these, including Akhechand were forced to drink poison in the Jodhpur fort. The ex-minister promised to pay Mānsimha twenty-five lacs if he was released, but Mānsimha refused to grant his request. Jośī Śrī Kiṣṇa also was poisoned, and while dying, he gave to the Mahārājā the curse that as he was dying childless, his ruler should also die without issue; and so it happened. Owing to this high-handed action his Sardārs sent a vakil to the Agent to the Governor-General at Ajmer, asking for the British help in their difficulties. The Agent promised to bring the matter to the notice of Mānsimha. Owing to the representations of the Agent, Mānsimha pacified for the time being his rebellious Sardārs, by granting to them various jāgirs.
In 1880, owing to the depredations of the hilly tribes—the Mers and the Minās—the district of Merwārā which is 32 miles to the west of Ajmer was brought under the control of the English Government for eight years, and the period was later extended to another nine years. Mr. Dixon, the Commissioner of Ajmer, founded a city—Navōsahar—in that district, which was later permanently annexed to the Company’s dominions. About the same time the Sardārs and Jāgirdārs of Māllāni began to plunder that district, and the English Political Agent for the time being took up the administration of the locality, paying 4,000 Rupees a year to the Mahārájā. The district was ceded back to the State under the reign of Jasavantsimha II. When the English annexed Sindh, Mānsimha asked the Company to give him Úmarkot which belonged formerly to Jodhpur, but was conquered by the Tālpurā armies in 1869. But the Company refused to accede to this request, but as compensation gave to Mānsimha 10,000 Rupees annually, the estimated revenue of Úmarkot. As Mānsimha had promised to pay a tribute of 2,23,000 Rupees, he had now to pay only 2,13,000 Rupees.

The frontier between Sirohī and Jodhpur was in a disturbed condition owing to the depredations of the Bhils and the Minās. Mānsimha was asked to place a force of 600 horse in the locality and thus re-establish order; otherwise the Company would have to encamp its troops there. But as the administration of the State was becoming slack under the ascendency of Bhumnāth no steps were taken; and the English sent up their troops to the disturbed locality, and thus was established the Eranpurā camp which still exists. Madhurājdev Bhoṅsle of Nāgpur fled from his territories and took refuge at Jodhpur. The English asked Mānsimha to give up the refugee, but the Mahārājā evaded the request stating that a prisoner in Jodhpur was equally a prisoner in the British territory. A darbār was held at Ajmer by the Political Agent and all the rulers of Rājputānā were invited to come, but Mānsimha did not attend the darbār.

While there existed several sources of friction between the Company and the Jodhpur State, another good reason for the English interference in Mārwār was furnished by the slack administration of the State. For some time everything went on quietly; but once more the guru Bhumnāth and his disciples interfered in state matters, and the Mahārājā out of his devotion to his teacher did not wish to go against them. So affairs went on as badly as before. Jāgirs were confiscated,
and once again the Sardārs brought their complaints before Mr. Sutherland, the Company’s Agent at Ajmer. In the treaty of alliance between the British and the Jodhpur State it was arranged in 1891, that instead of furnishing 1,500 horse for the service of the Company, the Mahārājā might pay annually to the English a sum of 1,15,000 Rupees. Further it was stipulated between the two parties that the tribute of 1,08,000 Rupees paid formerly to the Marāṭhās should be paid to the Company. Thus Jodhpur had to pay every year a sum of 2,23,000 Rupees to the English treasury. But under the ascendancy of Bhīmnāṭh no money was being paid by the State. Mr. Sutherland asked Mānsimha to assume the control of affairs, but so great was the ascendancy of his guru that the Mahārājā paid no heed to this suggestion. The Agent at last made up his mind to interfere and to put an end to the disorders in the State. In 1896, he went into Jodhpur with a small English force, accompanied by all the vakils of all the Rājput States and the dispossessed Jodhpur Sardārs including Bhāṭṭī Saktidān, Thākur of Sāthīn. Mr. Sutherland was given to understand that so long as the English wanted to re-establish order in the State, the Sardārs would be on his side even if it came to fighting; but should any harm be done to Mānsimha himself, their loyalty to the Mahārājā would induce them to take up his side.

On hearing of the arrival of Mr. Sutherland, Mānsimha left Jodhpur and received him at Baṇāḍ, eight miles to the east of the capital. The Agent asked the Mahārājā to give up the possession of the Jodhpur fort to the English, and Mānsimha surrounded by the disaffected Sardārs readily consented. It was agreed that the fort should be given back after six months. After a short interval, the English returned to Ajmer. As regards the Sardārs, Mānsimha asked them to go back to their jāgirs, in the hope that they would be too busy fighting among themselves to interfere in state matters. Even now the supremacy of the Nāṭhs was unchallenged, the English seeing that order would not be restored so long as the Nāṭhs remained in the State; seized the leaders, some of whom were taken to Ajmer and others fled away to their estates. Śravaṇanāṭh was exiled and Lakṣmīnāṭh of Mahāmandir retired to his estates in Bīkāner. After the downfall of the Nāṭhs, Mānsimha ceased to take any interest in state affairs, he took up the garb of a Sannyāsi and left the Jodhpur fort and took up his abode at Māndor. He designated as his successor Takhatsimha, son of Karaṇasimha, Rājā
of Ahmednagar. In 1900 on the ekādaśī day, Mānsimha passed away.

Mānsimha was a ruler of considerable political ability, but owing to his dissensions with his Sardārs and his excessive obedience to the Nāṭhs, he could not administer the State as he really wanted. He experienced considerable vicissitudes of fortune during his time; and of his long reign of forty years, very few were passed in peace. He was personally a learned man and a poet of no mean order. He had a very keen appreciation of the abilities of paṇḍits, poets and musicians, and he welcomed them all to his court, which during his reign became the centre of intellectual and artistic culture. As a poet has well said:

"जोधी कौंथों ओघपरः, व्रज कौंथों व्रजपाल्।
लखनेंजः क्षिप्रों गमर, मान करो नेपाल॥"

Jodhā founded Jodhpur: by propagating Vaiṣṇavism and building several temples of Viṣṇu, Bijaisimha (Brajpāl) made Jodhpur another Maṭhurā (Braj); Mānsimha by bringing together musicians, paṇḍits and yogīs made Jodhpur another Lucknow, Kāśi and Nepāl combined.

As Mānsimha had died childless, Mr. Sutherland placed on the vacant gādi Takhatsimha of Ahmednagar, who was descended from Ajitsimha, and was designated as his successor by the late ruler. The Rāṇīs of Mānsimha, the Sardārs and the officials agreed to recognise him as their ruler. Takhatsimha, accompanied by his son Jasavantsimha, arrived in Jodhpur in the month of Kārtik, 1900. The new ruler re-established order and the disloyal Sardārs had to retire to their estates. Soon peace and quiet reigned in Jodhpur. Takhatsimha wanted to keep possession of Ahmednagar also, but as his son was with him at Jodhpur, Ahmednagar became united to Iḍār. In 1904, the two famous dacoits, Śekhāwat Dūṅgī and Javārājī, who had been imprisoned by the Company in the Āgrā fort, escaped from their prison and fled to Nāgor. They were seized and handed over to the English by the Mahārājā, as an evidence of his friendship.

In 1914, the Indian Mutiny broke out. At that time a small force of sepoys came to Āuvā, and the Sardār of the place gave them asylum in his fort. The Political Agent requested the Mahārājā to help him with some Jodhpur troops to chastise the Sardār of Āuvā. Takhatsimha sent a force under Rāv Rājmāl and Killādār Anādsimha to Āuvā. The place was besieged; and the sepoys and the Sardār were
driven away. Some of the English who had fled into Jodhpur to escape from the fury of the sepoys were given protection by the Mahārājā. A force was sent from Jodhpur to help the Company and it went as far as Nārnol. But in the meantime the Mutiny was quelled. In recognition of the considerable help he had given to the English, Lord Canning made Takhatsimha a G.C.S.I. Some of the Sardārs, whose estates had been confiscated during the Mutiny, had fled to Bikāner and from there were ravaging the Mārwār territory. At the suggestion of the British Government, they were reinstated in their estates.

The first twenty years of his reign were passed in peace. But in 1922, party strife began once more in the State and Takhatsimha began to change his diwāns in rapid succession. Mr. Taylor, a retired British officer, was appointed Diwān, but he soon resigned; and he was followed by Hájí Mahomed Khān who was murdered in 1923. He was succeeded by Munši Mardān Ali Khān. Some jāgirdārs became disaffected towards the new minister and left their jāgirs. In 1925, came the great famine and many people left their houses and fled eastwards towards Mālwā. People died in large numbers or else became homeless. In those times the following song was sung:

“पचौसा काहु चे निवेदन”

“O famine of 1925, may you never return to this simple world.” Bājrā, which was formerly sold at twenty seers a Rupee, was sold at the rate of three seers a Rupee. The darbār used to give cooked food to the starving people and especially Rāṇi Jádechi, one of the wives of Takhatsimha, earned great fame for her liberality and bounty in feeding the hungry multitude.

In 1927, a treaty was entered into between the British Government and the Jodhpur State as regards the salt produced in the Sāmbhār district. The salt produced there was to be taken by the English, but in return they were to pay to Jodhpur 1,25,000 Rupees. A similar treaty was also concluded with Jaipur. Similar arrangements were entered into with regard to the salt produced in Nāñwā and Guḍā. In the same year Lord Mayo held a darbār at Ajmer, at which all the rulers of Rājputānā were present. No proper arrangement had been made as regards the seats to be allotted to the different rulers. Takhatsimha went to Ajmer; but thinking that he had not been given in the darbār the proper precedence due to him, he did not present himself in the assembly,
and went away without seeing the Viceroy. Lord Mayo looked upon this incident as an insult to the British Government, and the Imperial authorities decided to diminish his salute from nineteen guns to seventeen.

As often happens in absolute monarchies, when the sovereign becomes old the administration of the State becomes slack; so it happened also in Jodhpur. When Takhatsimha had passed his fiftieth year, the feudatory Minā tribes began to harry the Goḍwāḍ district, to curb them and to restore peace in those territories the heir-apparent, Mahārājkumār Jasavantsimha was sent against them. Some Minās were executed and their heads hung in the trees, others fled; and thus the district was pacified. About this time the question of succession came to the front. The Mahārājā had ten sons, of whom the three eldest were Jasavantsimha, Zorāwarsimha and Pratāpsimha. Although Jasavantsimha was the eldest, he was born when his father was merely the ruler of Ahmednagar; while Zorāwarsimha, though second, was born after Takhatsimha had become the Mahārājā of Jodhpur. So, on this ground Zorāwarsimha claimed the gādi and he was supported by several of the Sardārs. In 1928, he took possession of Nāgor, as its impregnable fort gives its owner the command over all the neighbouring districts. Jasavantsimha with an army went to Nāgor to drive away his brother from there. A civil war seemed about to break out. The Mahārājā saw it was high time to intervene, and accompanied by the British Resident he went with an army to Nāgor to drive away Zorāwarsimha from there. He pursuaded his second son to come with him to Jodhpur. As Takhatsimha was suffering from phthisis, he handed over the administration of the State to his eldest son, Mahārājkumār Jasavantsimha, and withdrew from active life. The British Government also thought highly of the Mahārājkumār because of the ability with which he had pacified the Goḍwāḍ district. Jasavantsimha was given the title of Yuvarājā and carried on the administration of the State. A year later Takhatsimha died in the month of Māgh, 1829.

During his reign, Takhatsimha had conferred many benefits on his people. It was customary for the Chārans, the Dholis and the other border tribes to harass the Sardārs by demanding exorbitant sums from the Jāgirdārs at their weddings. To prevent this system of blackmail, Takhatsimha fixed a proportionate amount, varying according to the annual revenue of the Jāgirs to be given to these people at the weddings
of the Sardārs. Sometimes it happened in the Rājput families, that new-born daughters were occasionally killed by their parents as it was often difficult to find for them suitable bridegrooms. To prevent this inhuman practice, the Mahārājā sternly ordered that no daughters should be killed; and this order was carved on stone slabs which are still to be found fixed on the gates of forts and offices in all the districts of the kingdom. When the Rājputānā-Mālwā railway line was laid, Takhatṣimha gave the land for it free of charge to the Company. Formerly custom duties were levied on all articles passing through the Mārwār territory; but the Mahārājā gave up his custom rights as far as the articles carried on this railway were concerned. In 1922, at a darbār held at Āgrā, an attempt was made to enforce the Arms Act in Rājputānā also. But it was owing to the skill and diplomacy of Takhatṣimha that this policy was not enforced. On the whole, Mārwār prospered during this reign, although the revenue of the State was small. Takhatṣimha was a great builder. Many granaries, parks and factories were then constructed. Several schools and hospitals were also opened. Personally he was of a brave and charitable disposition.

The new ruler ascended the gādi in the month of Fālgun, 1929. That year bumper crop was produced and this was regarded by the people as an auspicious augury for the coming reign. In 1930, a civil court, a criminal court and an appeal court were established, and a Legislative Council (Mehakmā Khās) was also set up for the general supervision and administration of the State. In this Council some Sardārs and a few higher officials were appointed members, and Bhaiyā Faizullā Khān was made the chief minister. The new Mahārājā was keen on the spread of education and enlightenment in Mārwār. A high school was established in Jodhpur, and later the Jasavant College was founded in which education up to the B.A. standard is given. A girls’ school was also set up. Takhatṣimha had given a donation of one lakh Rupees towards the foundation of Mayo College at Ajmer. Jasavantṣimha gave 36,000 Rupees for a boarding-house—to be called the Mārwār Boarding House, and promised to give free of charge all the Makrānā marble necessary for the construction of the building. When a Memorial Church was erected at Cawnpore in honour of those slain in the Mutiny, some marble was needed; and the Mahārājā agreed to supply all the quantity required and sent it from his State to Cawnpore at his own expense. This gift
of his was meant to show his gratitude for all that the English had done in 1914.

Jasavantsimha was of an extremely liberal disposition, and his chief minister was equally charitable; and so in two years a debt of 20 lakhs was accumulated. A loan of 24 lakhs was also taken from the British Government, and this sum was spent on a pilgrimage to the Ganges river to throw the ashes of the late Mahäräjä. In 1932, Lord Northbrooke paid an official visit to the Jodhpur State and he was given a magnificent welcome. All the Jägirdärä of Märwär with their retinue were invited. The whole army, with armour on, lined the street for four miles. Next year the Prince of Wales came to Jodhpur, and once more Jasavantsimha showed his princely hospitality. The royal visitor with his own hand invested the Mahäräjä with the insignia of G.C.S.I. Although Jasavantsimha was personally of a charitable nature, it should have been the duty of the minister to see that the expenditure did not exceed the revenue. So the inevitable result followed, debts began to accumulate. Faizullä Khän was dismissed from office, and the work of the ministry was entrusted to Pratäpsimha who was then at Jaipur. In 1934, famine occurred in the State and to relieve the hardships of the people, the price of corn was fixed in the kingdom. It was ordered that corn should not be sold at a higher rate than eight seers per Rupee. The order was on the whole well obeyed and thanks to it the people passed the famine year without much difficulty.

Some of the Sardärärs had left their estates in anger, and were ravaging the territories of their neighbours. The leader of this band was the Sardär of Lohiyanä. An expedition under the command of Pratäpsimha was sent against them, and after a few skirmishes, all the rebel Sardärärs were punished and once more peace was restored in the kingdom. The British Government seeing that the administration of the State was carried on very efficiently, granted back to Jodhpur the district of Malläññi which had been occupied by the English during the reign of Mänsimha. Only the criminal cases of the district were still to be under the control of the Resident.

In 1938, it was decided to lay down railways in the State, and for that purpose Mr. Home was called from England. There had always been boundary disputes between the different villages of Märwär; and to settle the matter once for all the services of Capt. Lake were lent by the British Government to arbitrate in the matter. The whole kingdom
was surveyed; and for payments in kind, as had hitherto been the custom, payments in cash (bighori) were substituted. To organise the Customs Department Mr. Hewson's services were utilised, but he died shortly after he came to Jodhpur. To perpetuate his memory, the Hewson Hospital was erected. Both Mr. Hewson and Mr. Home devoted all their abilities to their respective duties; and it is because of Mr. Home that Mārwār possesses a net work of railways, and for this boon the people of Jodhpur still bless the memory of Jasavantsimha and his descendants.

Owing to the exertions of Mr. Powlett and Pratāpsiṃha, acting of course at the suggestion of the Mahārājā, the whole administration of the State was put on a modern basis. The old regime passed away, and the new era began. New books on law and customs were issued, and the administration was carried on according to the lines laid down in them: Jāgirdārs of the first class were given civil and criminal powers in their estates. The Forest and the Public Works Departments were organised; for the sale of liquor and opium, a previous license was made necessary. Municipal Committees were set up for the purpose of sanitation. The one great reproach often levelled against the fair name of Jodhpur was that it was the haunt of plunderers like the Bhīls, the Mīnās, etc. A special department was established to deal with these freebooters; and many of them gave up their lawless habits, and adopted the peaceful calling of agriculturists. Later, when all the Bhīls and the Mīnās had become respectable citizens, this department was merged into the Police Department.

Tanks were constructed, and wells were dug in the desert portions of the territory. Two regiments of the Imperial Service Corps were formed to serve under the British Government.

Jasavantsimha passed away in 1952, after a reign of twenty-three years. He was of such a genial and loving disposition, that it was impossible to become his enemy. The enmity between Mārwār and Mewār was of long standing. But this Mahārājā ended this hereditary ill-feeling between the two premier States of Rajputānā by his charm and tact. The Mahārāṇā of Udaipur visited Jodhpur and stayed there for a month, and Jasavantsimha paid a return visit to Udaipur. The newly-established friendship was further strengthened by a marriage alliance between the heir-apparent of Jodhpur and the daughter of the Mahārāṇā. The Mahārājā was very keen on the spread of education
in his dominions. He also established a special Historical Department to study the inscriptions and the historical records of the State.

Mahārājā Sardārsimha, the only son of the late Mahārājā, succeeded his father; but as he was only sixteen years old, a council of regency under the presidentialship of Pratāpāsima was set up to carry on the administration of the State. Two years later the new ruler assumed the reins of the State in his own hand. Sardārsimha began his rule by founding a Female Hospital and a school for the education of the sons of Rājputs. The school is situated at Chōpānsī, six miles from Jodhpur. The Mahārājā carried on very efficiently the work of the State, and the British Government gave back to him the jurisdiction of the criminal cases of the Mallānī district, which had hitherto been in the hands of the Resident. Sardārsimha gave repeated proofs of his attachment to the British Government by always sending his forces to fight for the cause of the English. In 1954, in the Tirah expedition, a Jodhpur contingent served on the frontier; three years later in the Chinese War, the Jodhpur forces were equally conspicuous.

In 1956, a terrible famine visited Jodhpur, and at that time he spent thirty-six laes in relieving the distress of his people. He also had some wells dug and tanks constructed. Railway lines were laid all over the country, in the west as far as Sindh, in the north as far as Bhatinda, in the north-east as far as Hānsi-Hissār. In the city stone-paved roads were laid out and a clock-tower was erected, round about which a hundred and fifty shops are to be found, and the place is now known as the Sardār Market. A Registration Department was established and the Police Department was organised. Sardārsimha was very keen on military matters and had a course of training at Dehra-Dun, and was made a member of the Imperial Cadet Corps. He was unrivalled in polo, and this was due to the fine training given to him by his uncle Pratāpāsima. The Mahārājā was very fond of foreign travel, and once made an extended tour in England, France, Switzerland and Austria. Owing to his delicate health, Sardārsimha used to stay in Pachmari (C.P.), and the supervision of the State was entrusted to Mr. Jennings, the Resident; because Pratāpāsima’s services could no longer be utilised as he had now become the Mahārājā of Īdar. Sukhdev Prasād continued to be the minister.

His long stay in Pachmari improved his health considerably, and on
his return, the Maháràjá once more took charge of the administration; and for a time Jodhpur experienced an era of peace and prosperity. But unfortunately Sardàrsimhà passed away in 1967, and was mourned by all his numerous subjects. The late Maháràjá had a very tender heart. Under his reign, the custom of making some grants to all the pândánaśin ladies and children of Mārwār in straitened circumstances was begun, and this charitable practice is continued to this present day. Formally a poll-tax was levied on the lower castes like Ghāńchi, Teli, Kumhār, etc.; but this tax was abolished by this ruler. On the spot where his father was cremated, he erected a magnificent marble temple (thaḍā), which is one of the sights of Jodhpur.

The late Maháràjá left three sons—Sumersimhà, Umedsimhà and Ajjitsimhà. Sardàrsimhà was succeeded by his eldest son, Sumersimhà, in 1967. As the new ruler was thirteen years old, once more a regency council was formed and Maháràjá Pratâpsimhà became the regent, assisted by five other members. Many changes were made in the personnel of the State. The whole administration was overhauled and reorganised on a better basis. Another welcome change was made. Only those who had gone through a proper course in law were allowed to practise as vakils in the courts of law. The young ruler was sent to England for a proper training and he remained there for two years. On his return home, the Great War broke out. Maháràjá Pratâpsimhà immediately prepared to go to the front, and Sumersimhà asked permission of the British Government to accompany his grand-uncle. The permission was granted and with his army he went over to France. After two years' active service, he came back to Jodhpur to arrange for his marriage. Sumersimhà was married in 1972. As he came of age in 1973, he was entrusted with the administration of the State and Mr. Pestonji was appointed minister.

About this time electric installation was set up in Jodhpur; and in the fort, in the city and in private houses, electric lights and fans were introduced. A special department was established for the supervision of temples, and when necessary even special grants are made to them. There was no one fixed standard of weight in Mārwār; in some places one seer was equivalent to the weight of 80 Rupees, in others to 60 Rupees. To put an end to this variation, Mr. Śāmbihārī Misser, then revenue member, wanted to introduce everywhere one uniform standard of weight,—one seer to be equivalent to 80 Rupees. But this innovation
brought about many complaints from the people, and they laid their grievances before the minister. The Mahārājā advised the minister to yield to the wishes of the people, and this wise decision increased immensely the popularity of the young sovereign. This little incident shows how much did Sumersimha love his subjects. He was fortunate in having in Mr. Pestonji, a minister who shared with his master love for the people. Unfortunately the minister did not remain long in Jodhpur, as his services were required by the Jām of Jāmnaqar who had lent his services to this State. Chhajurām, a Gauḍ Brāhmaṇ, was appointed minister. In 1974, plague visited Jodhpur and the people wanted to leave the city and to go out in the country. With his usual generosity and love for his people, the Mahārājā placed Rāikā bāgh—the palace of Jasavantsimha,—the military quarters and state buildings at the disposal of his people, where anybody could stay. In that fatal year only one-eighth of the normal population remained in the city, the rest had fled outside. To preserve order and justice in the deserted capital, the Mahārājā sent his cavalry to patrol in Jodhpur. Thanks to these prompt measures, the life and property of the people were saved. Unfortunately for Mārwār, this young ruler died the next year at the early age of twenty-one to the grief of the whole State.

As Sumersimha had died without leaving any sons behind him, he was succeeded by his younger brother Umedsimha, who was then sixteen years old. Once again there was a minor on the throne of Jodhpur, so for a third time a council of regency consisting of four members was instituted. Mahārājā Pratāpsimha became the regent, and his younger brother Zālimsimha was made the vice-president of the regency council. The young ruler is at present being educated at Mayo College, Ajmer. Owing to the efficient administration of the regent, the revenue of the State has increased from one crore to a crore and a half, and there is no State in Rājputānā which enjoys such a large revenue. In territorial extent Mārwār comprises 37,000 square miles, it is the largest State in Rājputānā. In numbers the Rāṭhlor clan exceeds all the other clans. The family goddess (कुष्ठदेवी) is Nāgāṇecheiyā. Once she assumed the form of a hawk (कृत्तिल) to protect the clan, so she is called राठसभाना or राठसम. For this reason in the Rāṭhlor flag there is a hawk with the following motto रण वंका राठोर (Rāṭhors, skilled in war).

Mahārājā Pratāpsimha is the regent of Jodhpur at present and
has acted so twice in the past. He is the great-uncle of Umēṣṭha, so no account of Jodhpur would be complete without some account of this great man. Mahārājā Pratāpsimha was born in 1902. From his very childhood he showed signs of unusual activity and ability. When Mahārājā Jasavantsimha ascended the gāḍī in 1929, he had several Mahomedan favourites around him; and Pratāpsimha displeased with their conduct left the Jodhpur State and went away to Jaipur. There he was initiated by Mahārājā Rāmsimhāji into administrative and state affairs. When owing to mal-administration debt was increasing in Jodhpur, on Rāmsimhāji’s advice, Pratāpsimha was called back to Mārwār. Order was at once introduced in the State, guilty officers were dismissed and the whole State was placed under his supervision. About the same time Mr. Powlett was appointed Political Agent at Jodhpur, and he helped considerably Pratāpsimha in organising the State on Western lines. So for this reason he remained in Jodhpur for twelve years, an unusually long period for a Political Agent. Under the aegis of Mahārājā Pratāpsimha, the administration of the State was carried on very efficiently. Dacoits were suppressed. Once Lord Roberts, then Commander-in-Chief, visited Jodhpur, and while out on hunt a wild hog attacked Pratāpsimha, and as his horse was wounded he had to alight on the ground. The hog attacked him, and in a hand-to-hand fight that ensued though his thigh was pierced, he stabbed the animal with a hunting-knife. Owing to his bravery and administrative talents the Government of India conferred on him in 1943, the insignia of K.C.S.I. In 1944, on the occasion of Queen Victoria’s Golden Jubilee, Pratāpsimha went to England as the representative of Jasavantsimha. Her Majesty was pleased to appoint him as an Honorary Lieut.-Colonel of the British Army and also to make him one of her A.D.C.’s.

Mahārājā Pratāpsimha is a great expert in all military matters and in all martial exercises. In polo and peg-sticking, he was in his time regarded as unrivalled. Once more in 1954, on the occasion of the Diamond Jubilee of Queen Victoria, he went over to England as the representative of Sardār Simha. In the royal procession, Pratāpsimha was on his horse in the full glory of his oriental costume. The *Pall Mall Gazette* stated that Sir Pratāp’s dress and horsemanship were unrivalled. He was the cynosure of all eyes. At this time the insignia of G.C.S.I. was conferred on him, and the Oxford University made him an LL.D. In 1956, in the Chinese War, the Mahārājā went with his contingent to
the front, and being highly pleased with his valour, the British Government presented four guns to the State. As the Mahārājā of Iḍar had died without issue, Pratāpśimha succeeded the vacant gāḍi there. King Edward VII made him his A.D.C. and conferred on him a C.B. and later on a G.C.V.O. On the death of Mahārājā Sardārsimha, in order that the administration of the State might not go to pieces under the minority of Umēdsimha, he wished to undertake himself the work of the State. But the difficulty was that being the ruler of Iḍar, he could not administer two States at the same time. To overcome this difficulty, Pratāpśimha handed over the control of the Iḍar State to his nephew Daulatsimha, and then became the regent of Jodhpur. In 1970, the Great War broke out, and once more Pratāpśimha went to the front with his army, and owing to his bravery and experience, he was made the Commander-in-Chief of all the Indian forces in France. He remained at the front up to the conclusion of armistice. On the death of Sumersimha, once more he had to take charge of the Jodhpur State. Although he is seventy-six, he preserves all the vitality and the energy of a man of fifty. Jodhpur owes everything to his rule, and under his vigilant rule the prosperity of the State has increased by leaps and bounds. May he live long is the prayer of every true son of Mārwār.  

89 Since this paper was written, Mahārājā Pratāpśimha has passed away.
Genealogical table showing the different offshoots of the present ruling family of Māruār.

1. Yaśovigraha.


24. Sūjā.

Bāghā.

25. Gāṇgā.


27. Chandraseņa. His descendants are now ruling over the petty State of Bhisāya in Ajmer.


Mahesdās.

30. Udaiśiṁha. Rām, founder of the Āmjherā (in Mālwā) branch of the Rāthor princes. The estates possessed by this branch were confiscated by the British Government after the Mutiny of 1914.


32. Ajitasiṁha.


34. Bhomasīṁha. Gumāṃśiṁha.


36. Māṃśiṁha.

37. Bhimsiṁha

38. Takhaṭsiṁha (adopted son, descended from the Iḍār line).

39. Jassavantsiṁha II.

40. Sardārsiṁha.

41. Sumersiṁha.

42. Umedsiṁha.
THE E AND O VOWELS IN GUJARĀTI.¹

R. L. TURNER, M.A. (Cantab), I.E.S.,
Professor of Comparative Philology in the Benares Hindu University.

1. The existence in Gujarātī of open e and o sounds beside the closed has been recognized for a considerable time. Lists of words with open e and o have been given in the Nārmakoś and other dictionaries. The latest lists appear in the Linguistic Survey of India.² Here however the open e is characterised as being only short, whereas actually there is a long open e, just as there is a long open o. A further step was taken by Mr. N. B. Divatia,³ who drew attention to the fact that Gujarātī possesses both long and short open e and o, as well as short e and o intermediate in quality between the open and the closed and found in final syllables. These last sounds he called 'ardhāvīrta.'

2. These differences of quality are not usually shown in the Gujarātī script. Mr Divatia's use of the inverted mātrā for the open sounds is perhaps the best way of marking these sounds in the nāgarī or connected alphabets, and is certainly superior to Dr. Tessitori's suggestion of using the double mātrās, which should be reserved for the diphthongs ai au. These diphthongs actually exist in Gujarātī (not to speak of other modern Indian languages) in words of the type bhāī śau which are sometimes written and normally pronounced bhai saw.

In writing of these sounds and in quoting Gujarātī words below I have made use of the following symbols: — ē ē long close vowels; e o short close vowels; ē ā long open vowels; ē o short open vowels.

3. As to the origin of these open sounds, Mr. Divatia pointed out their descent from Old Western Rājasthānī (OWR)⁴ ai aū, and compared them with the similar sounds of Mārwādī. His phonetic account of the development, namely that ai aū > aya ava > ay av > ē ē,⁵ and his contention that these groups became the open vowel only

¹ Contributed in February 1920.
³ Indian Antiquary 1915, pp. 17-19.
⁴ For an account of Old Western Rājasthānī see Dr. Tessitori's articles I.A. 1914-1916.
⁵ I.A 1917.
when a bore the accent, were rightly called into question by Dr. Tessitori, who pointed out that where in Old Western Rājasthānī aya ava are written for ai aʊ it is a case of writing only, not of pronunciation. There is moreover no phonetic necessity or even justification for the supposition of the stage aya ava. The normal course would be ai aʊ > the diphthongs ai au > ə ɔ. Dr. Tessitori however was wrong in proceeding to say that so far from ai aʊ passing through the stage of aya ava. OWR aya ava became in Gujarātī not ə ɔ, but ə ɔ. Dr. Tessitori also went astray in saying that the quality of the vowels in modern Gujarātī must be determined, not by the ear as Mr. Divatia most rightly maintained, but by the spelling of their Old Western Rājasthānī equivalents

An attempt is made below to account in full for the origin of both ə ɔ and ə ɔ in Gujarātī, and to clear up some of the points that still remain uncertain after the work of Mr. Divatia and Dr. Tessitori.

4. The tendency towards samprasāraṇa, or the absorption of a short a by a preceding av or ay, was at work early in the history of the Indo-aryan languages, and already in Pāli we find Sanskrit aya ava represented by ə ɔ, which in their subsequent history converge completely with Middle Indian whether representing Primitive Indian ə ɔ or ai au. It must be noted that there can be little doubt that aya ava passed through the stages ai au, ə ɔ before becoming ə ɔ.

Samprasāraṇa was continued in the MI period after intervocalic p, still maintained in Pāli, had become v: e.g. əsaraī (apasarati) əsara- (*apavāsa-) əhattha- (*apahasta-). ep. G. ət (apavrtti-) khōvu (ksapana-).

Since however this MI ə ɔ is represented in Gujarātī by ə ɔ and

5 I.A. 1918.
7 I.A. Sept. 1918. Mr. Divatia summed up his arguments in a paper read before the Oriental Congress at Poona in 1919. I cannot but feel that in part at least the dispute between Mr. Divatia and Dr. Tessitori was due to the use of the nāgārī alphabet which is unsuitable for the discussion of phonetic problems.
8 I use the term Primitive Indian (PI), or if necessary to distinguish from other Indian languages Primitive Indo-Aryan, to denote that stage of the Indo-Aryan languages before the setting-in of the sound-changes which clearly differentiate Pāli and the Prākṛtis from Sanskrit. PI corresponds roughly to the stage of the language represented in the Rigveda. Middle Indian (MI) denotes the stage up to the time of the simplification of double consonants, say about 1200 A.D., when the Modern Indian (ModI) begins. Under MI therefore is included Pāli, the Prākṛtīs, Apabhraṇīsa.
9 Pischel, Grammatik der Prakrit-sprachen, § 154.
yet Skt apa appears in some Gujarātī words as ə, we must suppose that apa was re-introduced, as a literary loan, at a later period into the spoken language: e.g. ṭāraṇ (apasarati beside Pkt. ṭārāṇ which would give *ṭāraṇ in Gujarātī); or that under certain circumstances as, e.g. when PI apa was followed by two or more consonants, it remained as ava through the MI period: e.g. kaparde- (R.V. kapardin-) Pkt. kavād-
dā OWR kaũḍi G. kōḍi.

5. There was a similar early tendency towards contraction of two vowels in contact. This is seen in the sandhi of Sanskrit and in the earliest contractions of MI due to the loss of intervocalic y or v. In later Middle Indian, when through the disappearance of intervocalic stops large numbers of vowels came into contact, this tendency towards contraction seems to have fallen into abeyance for a long while, to reassert itself again in the modern period. Pischel, it is true, quotes a number of examples where vowels of like quality coming into contact in Prakrit have contracted.11 But for the most part vowels in contact, and particularly the groups ai aũ, maintained themselves throughout the MI period.

In the PI group ayũ (where ũ formed an interior syllable) on the loss of y aũ contracted to ə: Pā. mōra- G. mōra (mayũra-).

Similarly in the PI group avi on the loss of v (under conditions not yet specified) ai contracted to ə: Pā. thēra- (sthavira-).

Otherwise MI ai aũ, due to the loss of intervocalic stops, were maintained separately till the OWR period.

6. During this period late Middle Indian ava aũa (< PI apa ama) become aũ aũ, which converge with MI aũ (< PI a+stop+u). Later aũ aũ, became the diphthongs ai au, which remain in many of the modern languages, but in Gujarātī and Mārwāḍī have become ə ə. In Nepāli these sounds before nasals or when nasalised have developed even further, becoming first e o, then i u: e.g. N. kun (H. kaun) N. kičnu (H. khaicnā) N. sūpmu (H. saũpmā).

This same tendency which produced close PI ə ə from Aryan ai au, and MI close ə ə from PI ai au, ava ava, is still to be seen in the tendency in Gujarātī to make ə ə more close, and in the failure to distinguish between ə ə and ə ə, particularly in the unaccented syllables. Mr. Divatia, as noted above, calls these sounds 'ardhavīrta'; and

11 Pischel, §§ 165-168.
although I have failed to hear the difference myself, I would not contest his view. But in any case, the sounds in question being more like the close than the open, I have notified them, with Mr. Divatia, as e o. It should be noticed that this earlier narrowing of the open vowels in absolute finality continues the tendency which formerly narrowed MI final -ə -o to -i -u, while ə and o were still preserved in the body of the word.

7. The question of the origin of ə o in Gujarāṭi is further complicated by dialectal differences within Gujarāṭi itself, and by dialectical forms which have entered the literary language.

(i) In Kathiawar and Surath o is replaced by ə, as e.g. in sōn ghōdō sōhi.\(^{12}\)

(ii) In northern Gujarat ā is regularly replaced by ə and i by ə.\(^{13}\)

(iii) There seems also to be a variation between a and o, and between a (when followed by original i in the next syllable) and e, which I have not been able to assign to any particular district. In these cases where dialectical e o have entered the literary language in accented syllables they have been lengthened to ə o.

(iv) Lastly, there is variation between u and o on the one hand, and between u and ə on the other.

I proceed now to discuss the Gujarāṭi sounds in detail.

8. Both ə and o, but particularly the latter, are pronounced more open when followed by y / d or r. In some cases particularly in unaccented syllables, it is hard to distinguish whether o or ə has been spoken; nevertheless the difference of sound does serve to distinguish difference of meaning in pairs like mör 'peacock'; mör 'tree-blossom,' gōl 'round': gōl 'treacle.'

\(\hat{e}\)

9. ə is a long close vowel in quality like French ê. It is found only in accented syllables. Before or after ə s becomes s

\(\hat{e}\) is derived from:

(i) Pl ai, ə, aya > MI ə or e before a consonant group.  
ai: kēsudā (kaimăyika-) gērū (gaśikā) tēl (*taśλyā-: taśla-).  
ə: khēt (kṣētra-) chēdo (chēda-) jēth (jāśtha-) dēs (dēsā-) nēdo

\(^{12}\) My informant is Mr. Desai, of the Ahmedabad District, to whom I am indebted for help.

\(^{13}\) LSL IX 2, p. 329.
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(sneha-) mēvlo (megha-) sēth. (śrēṣṭhin-) pēkhvū (prēkṣatē) bhēv (bhēda-).

aya: dēvū (Pā. dēti < *dayati: dadāti).

(ii) MI ē representing an unexplained early contraction of aī. kēł (Pkt. kēlī < *kadīlī?: Skt. kadāli) hētho (Pkt. hettha < *adhiṣṭha- cp. Skt. adhastāt).

(iii) Contraction of a MI group containing ē.
   (a) MI ēā: dēhrū < *devaharaū *devaghara- (devagṛha-).
   (b) MI ēu: bēhu < *bēuho (dvē ubhau).
   (c) MI aē: anērū (Ap. anāṅerāu < *anya-kāria-) and after this ghāṅerū bhalērū, etc.

(iv) MI ē of unknown origin, but corresponding to ē in other Mod I languages: chēkvū tēkvū pēt vēcvū hērvū.

(v) ē of loanwords.
   (a) Sanskrit tatsamas: mēgh sēs kēs, etc.
   (b) English [ei]: jēl (jail) rēlve (railway).
   (c) Portuguese ei: rēs (reis).

(vi) In some causatives from verbs containing radical a, on the analogy maḷvū (milati): mēlvū (mēlayati).

thērvāvū dhērvāvū phērvāvū sērvāvū.

(vii) Dialectically for Gujarāti ē: nēk=nik, pēdhi (pītha-), lēlī (: lilū), sēsphul (: sīs), bhēkh=bhikh, vēnā=vīnā.

vēlū=vālū (vālukā) is perhaps due to the influence of rēti 'sand' ts. rēnū 'dust'.

e

10. e is a short vowel slightly more open than the corresponding long. It is almost equivalent to the English [e] in met. It occurs in both accented and unaccented syllables. Before and after e s becomes š.

e is derived from:—

(i) Preaccentual MI ē: jēṭhānī (: jēṭh) petāro (: pēṭ) ēwāl (śaivāla-)

vehwāi (vaivāhika-)


14 As noted above, § 6, this sound is said by Mr. Divatia to be intermediate between e and ē.

(b) Postaccentual a followed by i in the next syllable: sātem or -am (saptāmi) sāpen or -an (sarpīṇi) gōpen f. or -an.

(iii) MI ē in unaccented words. This shortening had taken place in OWR where the sound is written ī (=close e) em kem jem OWR imā kima jima: Ap. eha- keha jeha; OWR bi beside be (dvē) G *be (as in beāni): here e being more open than ē, when itself again lengthened, appears as long open ē in G. bē.

(iv) e or i in loanwords.

(a) English [e]: pen (pen) pensil (pencil).
(b) Arabic and Persian i: eltemās (A. āltimās) esak (P. isak) ehsān (A. ihšān) košē (P. kōṣi) dedār (P. didār) pherist (P. firhist) bēmr (P. bimār) mehr (P. mihār) lebās (A. libās).

(c) English [i]: geņi (guinea).

(v) Dialectically Gujarāti i: hēt=hit, pēto (pīṇḍa-).

11. ē is a long open vowel equivalent to French ē. It is found only in the accented syllable. Before and after ēs remains unchanged.

It is derived from:—

(i) MI āi; pēsvū (praviṣati) bēsvū (upaviṣati) pēhrvū (OWR pahirai) bēhr (badhira-) bēn (Pkt. bahīṇī : Skt. bhāgini) bhēs (mahīṣī) chē (Pā. acchati) sē OWR sāi for *sāi Ap. saāi Skt. satāni under influence of saū (Skt. satam).

MI āi: pēthū (praviṣṭa-), bēthū (upaviṣṭa-), pēhlū (Ap. pahillaū), gēlū < *gahillaū (grathila-).

MI āi: ghērū (gabhira-).

(ii) MI āi of unknown origin where other ModI languages have āi: khēcū (H. khaicnā), gēdo (H. gairā), thēli (H. thaili), bēl (H. bail), mēlū (H. mailā), pēdāl (H. pedal), etc.

(iii) Pkt. aya in loanwords either from literary Jaina Prakrit or from a dialect which avoided hiatus between a a by -y-: reṇ (OWR rauṇi Skt. rauṇi) vēṇ (OWR varaṇa Skt. vacana-) sēṇ (OWR savaṇa Skt. svajana-).

(iv) āi aya in loanwords.

(a) Sanskrit tatsamas: vēr (vaira-) bhērav (bhairava-) vērāṇ (wairinī); nēṇ (nayana-) bhē (bhaya-) khē or kē (ksaya-).
(b) Arabic and Persian ai: ēn (A. ain) ēs (A. ais) kēd (A. qaid) gēbī (P. gaibī) phēslo (P. faisala) bēdū (A. baid) ēb (A. aib) gēr (A. gair) nēh (P. nai).

(v) yā in tatsamās: vēkaraṇ (vyākarana-).

(vi) (a) MI ah: kēhvū (kathayati) sēhvū (sahatē) vēhvū (vahati) rēhvū (H. rahnā) lēhr (lahari).

(b) ah in Arabic and Persian loanwords: jhēr (P. zahr) nēhr (A. nahr) sēhr (A. sahr) mēhl (A. mahall).

(vii) MI ā followed by ē in the next syllable.

(a) MI ari arē: ghēr < ghari *garhē, ghērvū (*garhati or *garhayati: qēghāti)

(b) Gujarati āri: tērikh = tārikh.

(c) MI a followed by i: kēd = kaḏ, f. (kaṭi-) mēs, f. (maṣi) hēḏ, f. (hāḏi- in Dīvyāvadāna) khēl, f. (M. khal) cēl = caḷ, f. pēr, f. (N. pari) tēd, f. (tata-) nēl = nāl, f. (nala-) sēr = sar, f.

(viii) Gujarati ā after a palatal: cēpvū = cāpvū.

ε

12. ε is the short open vowel corresponding to ē, and is closer than the English [æ] in hat. It is found in both accented and unaccented syllables. Before and after ε s remains unchanged.

ε is derived from:—

(i) Preaccentual Gujarati ē: bēsādvū (: bēsvū).

(ii) Preaccentual yā in tatsamās: vēpār (vyāpāra-).

(iii) ya before two consonants in tatsamās: jēṣṭikā (yāṣṭikā).

ō

13. ō is a long close vowel like the French close o. It occurs only in the accented syllable.

ō is derived from:—

(i) PI ō au ava > MI ō.

ō: kōthī (kōthā-) kōs (krōsa-) gōthvū (gōṣṭha-) gōt (gōtra-) gōršī (gōrasa-) gōh (gōdhā) chōdvū (chōṭhayati) thōḍū (stōka-) dōr (dōra-) dōhvū (dōhayati) ghōḍo (ghōṭaka-) kōhvū (kōṭhayati) cōkhū (cōkṣa-) cōli (cōla-) tōlvū (tōlayati) kōi (kōpī) bhōi (bhōjīn-).

au: gōrū (gaura-) cōr (caura-) dhōvū (dhautī) mōṭī (mauktikā-) pōṭhi (*paustaka : pustaka-) bhōm (bhauma-) pōḷi (*pauli : pulikā) kōḍ(h) (kaustha-).
ava: hōvī (bhavati) oś (avaṣyā) ośiyālū (avaśīn-) oṭhū (avacchitā-) oḷābo (avalamba-) kōṇyo (kavaḷa-).

(ii) PI apa > MI ō: ōī (apavṛtti-) khōvī (kṣapana-).

(iii) MI ō representing an early contraction of aū: mōr (Pā. mōra- 
Skt. mayūra-).

MI ō in G. bōḍā (Pkt. bōra-Skt. badara-) is unexplained.

(iv) Contraction of a MI group containing ō.

(a) MI ōa: sōṇū (Pkt. sōañña-Skt. sauvarṇa-) kōṅī (kōph-ani-).

(b) MI ōī, where a Gujarāti syllable follows: jōśī (jyotiṣin-).

(c) MI. aō when not final: pōl (pratōli).

lun (lavona-) is perhaps a loanword from a dialect where, as in Nepāli, ō before a nasal becomes u, e. g. N. sun (sauvarṇa-) jum (jyōṭmā).

(v) MI ō of unknown origin but corresponding to ō in other ModI 
languages: chōi dōi.

(vi) ō in loanwords.

(a) Sanskrit tatsamas: krōḍh (krōṭha-) gōtar (gōtra-), etc.

(b) Persian: gō (gōst) jōr (zōr) tōp (tōp).

(c) English [ou]: bōt (boat) nōt (note).

(vii) Arabic and Persian u in the accented syllable: tōbro (P. 
tubar) bō (P. bu) sōbat (A. suḥbat).

(viii) In causatives from verbs (a) with radical u: jhōlvū: jhulvū, 
dōlvū: dūlvū, tōdvū: tuṇvū, phōdvū: phuṇvū, bhōtvavū: bhulvū, etc.,
(b) with radical a: aḥōlvū: aḥalvū, thōbhvū (: stambh-).

(ix) Dialectically Gujarāti u in the accented syllable: ṭalakhvū= 
*ulakhvū (upalakesatē) bhōṭhū=bhūṭhū, perhaps mōṭ (mustā).

14. ō is the short close vowel corresponding to long ō. It occurs 
in the accented syllable before two consonants, otherwise only in the 
unaccented.

ō is derived from:—

(i) Preaccentual MI ō: sohāg (saubhāgya-) ochāḍvū (avachādaya-
ti), given as o in L.S.I. but cp. below § 15. ix.

(ii) Postaccentual MI aō aū > ō > o > o:—3rd sing. imperat. -o 
(-atu) 2nd pl. pres. -o (Pkt. -ahō < *athah) nom. sing. masc -o (Pkt.-aō 
Skt. -akah).

16 Given as pōl in L.S.I. probably mistakenly for the half-open ō before l.
It should be noted that final -aũ becomes still more closed and results in -ũ: neut. sing. -ũ (Ap. -aũ Skt. -akum).

In compounds the accent of the first member was retained. This is shown by the OWR forms, where the second member is weakened, a long vowel or consonant being shortened: e.g. Ṛāthāūḍa (Ṛaṭṛakūṭa-) Cītuṇḍa (Citrakūṭa-) Sīhāturā (Sīnha-putra-) Kasaṭāthi or kasaṭī (kasa-paṭṭikā), etc. In these words, then, as with final -aũ OWR aũ ava appear as o: Ṛāthoda Cītoḍ Sihot Lāhor (OWR Lāhaūra < lābhapura-) kasaṭī dēsōto (OWR dēsavatāũ) Phalodhi (OWR Phalavadhī < *phalavardhikā) bāroṭ (OWR bāravatā) karot (OWR karavata). For Ṛāthoda Cītoḍ: see § 8.

(iii) ū in loanwords.

(a) Sanskrit tatsamas: ottam (uttama-) ottar (uttara).
(b) Arabic and Persian ū before a consonant group or before the accent: oḍdhō (A. uhdah) ostād (P. uṣṭād) bokhār (A. bukhār) lobān (A. lubān). In the accented syllable before a single consonant o is lengthened: see above § 13, viii.

(iv) Dialectically Gujarāti ū: okhānũ=ukhānũ (upakhyāna-) odhār =udhār (uddhāra-) kodālo=kudālo (kuddālā-). In the accented syllable this o is lengthened: see above §13, viii.

5

15. 5 is a long open vowel. The lips are more rounded than for English [ɔː] in horse: it is therefore less distinct from ō. It occurs only in the accented syllable.

5 is derived from:—

(i) MI aũ: nōliyo (nakula-) pōhlũ (prthula-) bōhlũ (bahula-) lōdo (lakula-) hōn (adhumā) chō (acechatu) tā (tataḥ) pōhr (OWR pahura ts from prahara-) bōh (bhaya- m. in Lexicographers) vōh (vaha-) sō (OWR sā Skt. sata-).

cōbo (catureśa-) is shown by its b to be a loanword.

MI aũ: cōth (caturthī) cōk (catuska-) pōnũ (pādaũna-) sōphā (ṣata-puspa-).

(ii) (a) PI apā avā ama > MI ava ava > OWR aũ aũ.
apa: osarvũ (apasarati) ṗgalũ (*apagalati) ŏr (apara-) nōkhũ (anyapakṣa-)
kōn (OWR kauñna kavaṇa Skt. kō punah) kōḍi (kaparda-).
apā: ōro (apāra-).
avā: gōkh (gavākṣa-),
ama: ṣoghū (samargha-) after which also mōghū (mahārgha-) sōpvū (suvarpayati) ṣōgū (samānga-) sōdhā (samagandha-).

jāl (yamala-) is a loanword on account of the loss of postaccentual -m-. nām < naumī MI navamī reformed for *nāmī (PI. navamī) after nav (nava).

(b) PI api > MI avi > OWR aū: kōthū (kapithha-) kōlū (kapila-).

(iii) MI aū of unknown origin but corresponding to au in other Mod I languages: dōdvū (H. daurūna) cōdvū (H. caurū) pōhevū (H. pahūcnā) lōdvī (H. laundī).

(iv) MI ōā: vōhro (vyavahāra-) unless this is a tatsama.

(v) MI ōy. ōi + vowel, final-ōi > ōy: kōyal < kōyīla- (kōkila-), sōyo < sōi + o (saucika-) after which sōy for sōi, hōy < hōi (bhavati) and nōy < na hōi. Words like bhōi where i represents MI -iō -iu remain dissyllabic.

(vi) au ava in loanwords.

(a) Sanskrit tatsamas: gōrav (gaurava-) dhōlvū (dhavala-).

(b) Arabic and Persian au: ōjar (A. auzār) ōrat (A. aurat) tōjī (A. tawjīh) dōlat (P. daulat) nōkar (P. naukar) phōj (P. fauj.) mōlvī (A. maulawi) sōkh (A. sauq).

(c) English [au]; ōcar (voucher).

(vii) Dialectically for Gujarāṭī

(a) ā: chāl = chāl (challi) phūm = phām (A. jahm) mōg = māg (mārga-) sōt - sāt(h) (sārtha-) mōn = mān, cōp = cāp, ēplī (ts. āpatti-) sōgan (P. sāgand) sōlēvū = sā - (sant-).

(b) a in accented syllable: ghōn = ghan (ghanā-) pōn = pan.

(c) ē: see above § 7. i.

(d) u in accented syllable: gūl (guda-) ts gōr (guru-.)

16. o is the short open vowel corresponding to ə. It is nearly the same as English [o] in hot, but the lips are a little more rounded.

It is derived from:

(i) Preaccentual MI aū: ca-māsū (caturmāsā-) cāspāi (catuhyāda-) and other compounds containing PI catur-, mōsā (mātursālā) bhōjāt (bhṛāturjāyā) mōvālo (mrdu-).

(ii) Preaccentual au in loanwords: ts. sōbhāq (saubhāqya-).

(iii) English [ə]: kolērā (cholera) kolam (column) bōyū (buoy).
(iv) Dialectically:—

(a) Gujarāṭī u: ts. ṭechav (utsava-), ṭcaravū=ucarvū (uccarati) odhār=odhār udhār (uddhāra-) kodālo=kodālo kudālo (kuddāla-) dhoriyo (dhur-).

(b) Gujarāṭī a: acambo=acambo (H. acambā).

In the accented syllable it is lengthened; see above § 15. viii.
THE ORIGINAL ŚĀKUNTALA.

DR. S. K. BELVALKAR, M.A., Ph.D. (Harvard),
Professor of Sanskrit, Deccan College, Poona.

It is well known that the text of Kālidāsa’s Abhijñānaśākuntala has come down to us in four distinct recensions: the Bengali, the Kāshmirī, the Devanāgarī, and the Southern. The play was first known to the West and was first published in India in the Bengali recension. Boehtlingk was the first (1842) to publish the Devanāgarī recension on the basis of notes and collations prepared by Brockhaus, Westergaard, and others; and being shorter, it was at once hailed as the truer recension of the play, particularly as it was also adopted by Indian commentators like Kāṭayavema, and above all the learned Rāghava-bhaṭṭa. One voice alone—that of Stenzler (Hallische Literaturzeitung), 1844—was raised in favour of the Bengali recension; but until the appearance (1870) of Pischel’s Inaugural Dissertation entitled De Kālidāsae Ākuntali recensionibus the cause of the Bengali recension remained almost without a staunch advocate. Weber, who was one of the Judges for the Dissertation in question, raised his powerful voice against Pischel’s view, and with that the battle of the wits began and has continued in one form or another to the present day, the important landmarks in it being: Bühler’s discovery (1875) in Kāshmir of a recension more or less allied to the Bengali (which was transcribed in Roman characters and published by Burkhard, 1884), and Reverend T. Folkes’ publication (1904) of “A complete collection of the various readings of the Madras manuscripts” of the play, rendered necessary by the discovery (1874) of a fourth or South Indian recension of our play, which is more or less allied to the Devanāgarī. Unhappily death has prevented Pischel from having his last say in the controversy in the light of all the fresh evidence, and although a number of Indian as well as European editions of the play take up this question of the original text of the play, to my mind the attempts seem to be more or less of a partisan nature and so lacking in finality. It is of course easy enough to say that a particular
addition or elaboration is the production of a later unpoetic pedant, or that a particular condensing is dictated by stage necessity, or that a specific modification is due to some defect or ignorance in the scribe; but we can accept only that as conclusive where both the internal (subjective) as well as external (objective) tests yield more or less identical results. A mere *a priori* judgment and a refusal to weigh and consider all the available evidence is not the way to arrive at scientific conclusions.

In the sequel I intend presenting a few cases where, in spite of the pronounced difference of reading in the several recensions, it has become possible to reach acceptable and probable conclusions. Thus, in the first Act, I choose the following two cases:

(i) The song of the Naṭi in the Prologue. The MSS. of the Devanāgarī and Southern recensions invariably give the first quarter of the Āryā as—

\[ \text{Isi[Isu, Isisi] chumbiāṁ bhamaṛiṁ} \]

but no reading satisfies the requirements of the metre. The Bengali MSS. generally render the quarter as—

\[ \text{Khanachumbiāṁ bhamaṛiṁ uaa[uaḥa, suaa, suaṁh]} \]

the last being the reading of the Kāshmirian MS. Here too the metrical requirements remain unsatisfied, since it is inconceivable that Kālidāsa should have been detected nodding in composing his favourite Āryā metre. The Sanskrit rendering of the last word in the Bengali recension is given as *subhaga* (which is a synonym for *sukumāra*, the next word), or as *ūhata=tarkayata*, but more correctly by Pischel as a Desī form for *patyata*. Now our tendency in a case like this is naturally to avoid the reading with the difficult word (which after all does not remove the metrical defect) and to choose the easier one. But I am convinced that the true reading here lies on the side of the Bengali recension. For if we only assume that *uaa* is a result of dittography for an original *ua* (the singular of *uaaS*) the metrical difficulty vanishes altogether, the full line then reading as—

\[ \text{Khanachumbiāṁ bhamaṛiṁ ua suumārakesarasihāṁ}. \]

The second line similarly should be read according to the Bengali recension as—

\[ \text{Avamāṁsanti sadaṁ sirisakusmāṁ pamādāo} \]

which does away with the awkward necessity of admitting two forms
for the nom. plu. fem.—pamadā and daamāṇāo, or pamadāo and daamāṇā—in one and the same sentence. The age and general reliability of the MSS. that actually give or vouch for the reading above adopted also tend to the same conclusion. Thus far what are known as the external proofs. The internal proof is still more conclusive. For, in regard to the sentiment of the song the question to be asked is, "What is the motive for the sympathy of the maidens with the śirīṣa blossoms?"

Surely it cannot be the fact of their being kissed by the bees, for, that is their life-purpose. Nor can it be remorse for the pain caused in the act of plucking; for that remains unconnected with the first half. It must therefore be the fact of their being—not gently, but rather fitfully—kissed: kissed only for a moment and then forgotten altogether. Does not the song so interpreted gain a new significance? For we must not forget that throughout the play the bee motif is consistently used to describe the relation of Duṣyanta with Śakuntalā. Compare for instance the stanza Chalāpāṅgām dṛśīṁ, etc., where Duṣyanta envies the bee his lot, or the song Aśīvaṃaṇahuloluo, etc., in Act v, or lastly the bee in the picture (in Act vi) whom Duṣyanta administers his dreadful poetic rebuke. The song in the Prologue accordingly suggests the fate of Śakuntalā including her rescue at the hands of her mother and mother's friends. The same Prologue also hints at the fate of the hero including his forgetting an earlier incident and his being put in mind of the same. Compare in this connection the words of the Sūtradhāra—

Ārye, samyaq anubodhito 'smi. Asmin kṣane vismṛitaṁ khalu mayā tat.

The Bengali-Kāśmirī reading as emended above is therefore consistent with the intentions of the poet, and satisfies all the canons of textual and higher criticism; and this goes to prove that it is possible to constitute a single unified text of the play even in cases where the manuscripts consistently maintain a difference in reading between the several recensions.

(ii) The next case I take up for consideration is a bit complicated and perhaps unsuited for detailed presentation in an essay like this; but it is chosen because it brings out a point of view which is somewhat novel, and we must in my opinion learn to appreciate a drama from that point of view primarily. The passage or rather passages to be considered are the several speeches of Śakuntalā and her friends up to the point where the bee emerges from the water-basin, their number and their order. For purposes of comparison I give first the longer
recension as given by Pischel (using abbreviations very freely and not paying much attention to the exact wording or the correct spelling of the Prākrit)—

नेपथ्य—इत्यदि इत्यदि पियासहिष्ठे।

राजा—चः दलितियोऽस्तास्तामकस्यां... | चः मधुरसास्तां दशनम् |

युधानन्दुर्जभिवंद्यो भयो वासवामासिंह...।

रक्षा—हला सङ्गमवेत्ति ततो वि...अङ्गवालपुर्यो गिरावता।

श्रुकुलला—हला गा केवलं एव। [इति द्वासुसेचनं नागायति।]

प्रियवंदा—सहि सङ्गमवेत्ति उदवं लिम्बदं...धमो भविष्यदि।

श्रुकुलला—सदृश रमणीयचं मनोसि | [इति भूयो द्वासुसेचनं नागायति।]

राजा—कालिः सा कामवदुहिता...साधारणीययो... इतं किलायाजमनोहरं

etc. | भवतु प्राध्यान्तारं।....

श्रुकुलला—हला चावलयय अविगाहेण... | [चन्द्रचं शिलिवलिन।]

प्रियवंदा—सद्य दास प्रथोपशे एव।

राजा—समयियमाशं। इदमेश्वरिंशुच्छं। etc. | अधिवृत्तं तु पुनर्ज्ञानरं न

पुष्णाति। कृत्त। सरस्यानुपन्नं। etc.।

श्रुकुलला—वार्त्तिद्वयपशंकूलोधि...वृद्धकल्प्यो। तता जाव गा संभावितं। [इति

तथा करते।]

प्रियवंदा—...इध्येव मुख्यन्तं विवर्धु।

श्रुकुलला—किष्ठारमित।

प्रियवंदा—...लकासाध्यो व्यथं अथं चुदस्दल्प्यो...।

श्रुकुलला—अर्बे ज्ञेव। etc.

राजा—अवित्यमाशं... | अधरः किस्मायर्गं। etc.।

चन्द्रचं...सर्ववंङ्ग...गोमालिब।

श्रुकुलला—...रमणीयो...विद्वेषरो...। इतं गावकसुसमजोधवसा...अथं पि...

उपवाश्यक्ष्मो।....

प्रियवंदा—...जागारसि किष्ठारमित।...

चन्द्रचं...गा दलु...

प्रियवंदा—जधा... अवगाहं वरं...।

श्रुकुलला—एस...दे महारेगो। [इति चलामायं अज्ञाति।]

चन्द्रचं...इन्द्र...माहावलदा। इतं विसुमनिर्दासि।
It will be easily seen that there are many things in this recension that need explanation. Thus it is inconceivable that at the very sight of the pious maidens of the hermitage Duṣyanta would immediately indulge into sentiments as in the stanza—śuddhāntadurlabhām, etc. Secondly, what can be the precise point in making the mango-tree invite the heroine? Surely it cannot be merely the subsequent comparison with the creeper. Thirdly, why is the Mādhavīlātā introduced at all, and particularly her blossoming out of season? The longer text as Pischel gives it seems therefore to be an utterly unmotivated elaboration of a shorter text. Let us next consider the shorter text as given by Cappeller. In an abbreviated form it runs thus—

नेपथे—इदो...।
राजा—वचे दितिने...। एतासपि...। वचे महुर...। सुहातां
etc. || चावदिमां...।
श्रुकुलाल—इदो इदो...।
वश्युसा—इता...।
श्रुकुलाल—गा केवलं...।
राजा—कथितं सा...। इदो किलावज्ज etc. || महुर...।
श्रुकुलाल—...महिमषासिंधु...।
Even this text does not explain our first difficulty, and does not furnish any answer to the second question. The Mādhavilatā incident, however, it conveniently omits altogether. As between these two recensions therefore we have nothing to choose. The Southern recension does not differ much from the Devanāgari. As a last resource we turn to the Kāshmiri recension, where fortunately most of our doubts are solved. It reads thus—

नेपछ—इतो इदो......
राजा—चावे दज्जोगो...... एताल्पपिखा...... चाहो मधुर...... यावदेत क्राहा......
वनसुया—छला सउतलिने। परिम्बिव......, गिंप्पा।
श्रकुल्ला—सङ्गि गा केरवो...... [कर्मसंगिक निर्धारित]।
उभे—छला सउतलिने। उदाहर लभिदा...... चम्मि भविष्यदि।
श्रकुल्ला—[नाशेन निर्ख्युति।]
राजा—[निविध श्रकुल्लाम्।] कानिमय सा कामदुर्दुष्टिता। ब्रह्मण्डः इत्येव।
In appreciating the full value of this recension the following facts ought to be clearly noted. Duṣyanta is entering the Āsrama from without while the maidens are stepping into the garden from their Āsrama. Naturally the king and the ladies are at opposite ends of the stage. The king sees the ladies occupied in their task from a distance and the whole scene strikes him as enchantingly beautiful. Consequently in his first speech an idea like that in the stanza—Śuddhāṇ타다urlabham, etc., is altogether undignified. On the other hand the idea is quite in place when Duṣyanta knows the heroine and has opportunity afforded him to observe her uncommon charms. This is just how the
text is arranged in the Kāshmiri MS. and this further explains why Duṣyanta is tempted to remain where he was and commit a piece of un-gentlemanly eaves-dropping. Then again the three ladies, we must remember, were all this while together; but now the poet wants to give the hero an opportunity of viewing the heroine more closely by making her approach the Bakula tree under the shade of which, on the other side, Duṣyanta was probably standing concealed. Observe in this connection the stage-direction—Rājñāḥ saṁnikārṣam āgachchhāti. Thus the speech in which the Bakula is said to be inviting Sākuntalā becomes eminently justified. We may add that there is perhaps some point in making Anāśūyā loosen the tight valkala just in this place and at this juncture and not earlier; and in any case, if Duṣyanta is close to the Bakula tree, only then is revealed the full suggestiveness of Sākuntalā being compared to a creeper by its side; and in order just to motivate this adequately, Priyāṁvadā first asks her friend to advance towards the Mādhavilātā and then stops her in the middle. Only thus is the introduction of a second creeper by the side of the Naivamālikā explicable. That the story of the blossoming of that creeper out of season is a deliberate though skilful interpolation is also proved by the renewed reference to Mādhavi in place of Naivamālikā in the stanza—Saṁkalpitam prathamam eva, etc., in Act iv. The same can probably be said of an earlier reference to aññahisandhi-garuvo dhammo, but of that I feel less certain. The reference to Naivamālikā and her union with the mango tree is of course most poetically conceived. Please note in this connection Sākuntalā’s ideal of a happy marriage: yauvana and upabhoga. It is entirely sensuous and it is just from this circumstance that Sākuntalā’s subsequent suffering gets its moral or psychological justification.

As this last point is perhaps not likely to be fully appreciated, we take the liberty of dwelling longer upon it. The Prologue has already alluded to imam eva achira-pravṛttam upabhoga-kṣamaṁ griśmartum as the background for the commencement of the play, and we have seen the heroine using just the word upabhoga in describing her aspirations in life. That marriage involves responsibilities; that pleasure can never be made an adequate goal for life; that love is chastened by suffering; these are ideas as yet foreign to this daughter of the nymph Menakā. The Mahābhārata [Ādi-parvan, Kumth. ed. Chapter 89ff.] introduces Duṣyanta also in the full pride of youth and power and his is also a
purely sensuous ideal: compare, Vyayam tattvâneśāṁ madhukara hatāṁ twām khalu kṛti. Duṣyanta’s love-lorn condition in Act ii, and the marriage in Act iii are conducted on the same lower level. The infuriated elephant that breaks upon us towards the end of Act i may be thus said to typify the whole spirit of the Act.

Mere impulsive passion must normally bring suffering in its train. This is just what explains the tragic element in a play like Romeo and Juliet; and this also accounts for the intrusion of the sage Durvāsas, who is always reputed to bring true happiness under the mask of sorrow. Corresponding to the change in their outlook on life that is to be produced in the hero and the heroine by the terrible ordeal of suffering through which they have to pass, Kālidāsa has most artistically introduced a changed background in Act vi and especially Act vii. The comparison can be worked out to the most minute details (compare for instance the descriptions of the gardens and also the sentiment satāṁ hi saṁdehāpadeśu, etc., and that in Ahanyahanyātmana eva, etc.): but that is hardly necessary for our purpose. We can accordingly conclude that where the merely textual criticism fails, higher criticism can enable us to arrive at a unified text, which may usually lie along the line of the longer text, but which can yet pronounce many a passage in the longer text as spurious. As a drama is meant primarily for the stage, a recension that yields such extraordinary adaptability to the requirements of the stage carries its genuineness almost on the face. And we must not only not ignore the stage point of view but always endeavour to bring it in and give it the greatest possible weight.

(iii) Next I am taking up a case where we have to omit a passage given by all the recensions without exception because of the requirements of higher criticism. The passage is from Act iv where the suptotthita disciple announces the arrival of Kaṇva and ascertains kiyaṇa avaśīṣṭam rajanyā iti. The verses Yātyekatostabikham and Antarhita kāsini are given by all the four recensions; while after these in the Bengali, and before these in the Kāshmiri recension, only are given the verses Karkandhunāṁ upari and Pādanyāsaṁ kṣitidharaguror mûrdhni. Which of these formed part of the original Sakuntala? Those common to all the recensions, would be our first answer; but the facts probably are otherwise. For it is unthinkable that a sage like Kaṇva would be in bed at a time when there was the rising orb of the sun on one side and the setting orb of the moon on the other, and more, that the pupil
of the sage—after spending another gratuitous five minutes in expressing his sympathy for the fading Kumudvati—would then go to announce *upasthitām homavelām* unto his preceptor, who would then prepare himself for the morning fire-worship! Surely the sage knew better than that when to offer oblations into the fire! Then as to the *Kumudvati* stanza, even though we explain the theme as an involuntary anticipation of the fate of Śakuntalā, by what canons of criticism can we accept a fearfully padded line like—*Dukkāni nānaṃ atimātrasudus-sahāni* as really coming from Kālidāsa? Neither of these two verses is quoted as his in any of the anthologies. On the other hand the remaining two verses are so quoted, and they—or at any rate the first of them—formed part of the original play, the *penchant* for alainkāra of latter-day writers being probably responsible for the introduction of the other two, which have become so familiar and which have so successfully driven the true coin out of the market.

(iv) By way of a contrast I now take a case where a reading not given in any of the printed editions of the play has nevertheless to be accepted as genuine. Its existence is vouched for by the Kāshmiri MS. and some three or four Bengali MSS. It occurs in Act v. Śakuntalā has discovered to her utter consternation the loss of the ring; but as becomes the daughter of the dauntless Viśvāmitra, she does not lose heart but tries to awaken the King’s slumbering memory by narrating the story of the foster-deer. But that produces no result; on the other hand Gautami’s attempted intercession brings down the King’s taunt—

*Strīnām asikṣitapafutvam amānumīśu*
*Kaṇḍriyate kimuta yāh pratibodhayatvāh;*
*Prāg antarikṣagamanāt svam apatyajātam anyair dvijaḥ parabhritāḥ kila poṣayanti.*

We do not know whether the full significance of this verse is correctly understood by all. Kālidāsa has here used his words very judiciously, with the result that they produce on the mind of Śakuntalā an impression altogether unexpected by the King. For she understands in the verse a veiled allusion to and a direct slur upon her mother and the circumstances of her own birth. Note in this connection the words *amānumīśu, antarikṣagamanāt, dvijaḥ,* and *parabhritāḥ,* which suggest the heavenly *apsaras* Menakā and her going away to heaven abandoning her child to be reared up by the Brāhmaṇa sage Kaṇva—Menakā who in status is a courtesan fed by and feeding upon others. As Dusyanta
evidently had knowledge of the circumstances of her birth, argues Śakuntalā, and as this knowledge he obtained only in the Garden scene (where, besides, in describing her charms the King had used just the word (a-)mānuṣīṇu), Śakuntalā thinks herself justified in concluding that Duṣyantā was here telling a deliberate lie. Naturally she gives up her meekness and rates the King soundly. When, however, the King has the face to say—Bhadre, prāhitam Duṣyantacharitam prajāsu; tathāpi idam na lakṣaye.—is it conceivable that the daughter of the fiery Viśvāmitra would tamely pocket the insult? The printed editions however make Śakuntalā weep at this stage, paṭāntena mukham āvritya! In fact however the poet makes Śakuntalā give a reply which does credit to her womanhood. The reply is in Prākrit, and we know how Prākrit passages got mingled and maltreated at the hands of copyists and even Pandits. It runs thus—

_Tuḥme Ṛyeva pamānanām jāṇadha dhammatthidīm cha loassa;_  
_Lajjāvinījśidāo jāṇanti hu kim na mahilāo?_  

Freely translated it means: “Think ye then that men alone have the right to pose as judges of truth or to ascertain what is conducive to the welfare of the world; and that woman—the modest and lowly woman—has no right to know thereof?” Can the modern champion of women’s rights desire anything better? But note again that after this sally Kālidāsa does make Śakuntalā weep in a truly woman’s fashion. He has not entirely unsexed or unaryanised her. When some of the very best MSS. vouch for this reading I am loath to father its authorship upon an illiterate or unpoetic interpolator.

It is perhaps needless to multiply instances of which I can cite dozens, and I have purposely abstained from referring to the śringāric elaboration in Act iii where I have not been yet able to reach any clear-cut conclusion; but enough has been given above to prove the possibility of arriving at the true and the original Śākuntalā by a rigorous and unprejudiced application of the scientific principles of textual criticism—principles which have been elaborated and successfully tested by the Classical scholars of the West during the last century and more, and which therefore it is waste of labour to seek to doubt or independently deduce. The final text naturally belongs to no particular recension. I have been for some time working at its constitution and I am glad and grateful of this opportunity of giving a foretaste of some of the probable conclusions to the world of scholars.
THE RĀMĀYĀṆA AND THE MAHĀBHĀRATA:
A SOCIOLOGICAL STUDY.
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Historic Value of the Epics.

It would need a great scholar and an even greater artist to recon-
struct the World which lies fragmentarily scattered in the two Epics of
India, and as the present writer does not claim to be either the one or
the other, he will not attempt it. All that he may hope to do here is
to indicate briefly the lines on which enquiry may be directed to this
end by those really capable of undertaking it. But why, one may ask,
need anyone take at all the trouble of reconstructing the world of the
Indian Epics, if it had no more substantial existence than in the imagi-
nation of the poets? Had the main story of these Epics, the Rāmāyāṇa
and the Mahābhārata, any counterpart in history? Had they better
foundation in fact than the stories, for instance, of "Hamlet" and of
"The Merchant of Venice" told by Shakespeare? To these
questions, the reply of course is, that a poet even when he is building
on old traditions and legends, and beyond question when he is relying
entirely on his own creative imagination, must people his stage with
beings and frame his background out of institutions and things drawn
from the living world around him. The manners and customs of the
times in which the poet lived would be caught and become embedded,
unconsciously more often than consciously, in his writings with more or
less fidelity and amplitude of detail. It is immaterial therefore whether
Rāma and Rāvana or Drupada and Duryodhana were real beings or
figments of the poet's imagination. The Rāmāyāṇa and Mahābhārata
undoubtedly deal with a state or states of society which in point of
fact did once exist. The really difficult question to decide is, whether
the Rāmāyāṇa and Mahābhārata depict society at the same or different
stages of evolution, and if the latter be the truth, which of them
represents the earlier stage? Or is the society described in the one,
notwithstanding numerous common elements, essentially different from
that delineated in the other? Having regard, too, to the composite authorship, at any rate, of the *Mahābhārata*, may not one expect to find different stages in the evolution of ancient Indian civilisation represented in different portions of that Epic? If this surmise be the correct one, it should be possible by comparing the materials presented by the *Mahābhārata* and tracing them to their sources in still older literature to build up an account of the genetic development of that civilisation from the Vedic to Buddhistic times.

*Data bearing on the relative ages of the two Epics and other contrasting characteristics.*

Apparently there is here a vast field for scientific research and an almost unlimited one for quasi-, or more strictly perhaps, pseudo-scientific speculation. European savants, for instance, have not hesitated to suggest that the age of the *Rāmāyaṇa* must be later in point of time than the age of the *Mahābhārata* on the grounds, amongst others, that the *Rāmāyaṇa* depicts a civilisation and a culture superior to that described in the *Mahābhārata*. To that Indian scholars consider it a sufficient reply to say that the tradition round which the *Rāmāyaṇa* was built was unquestionably common property when the Mahābhārata came to be written. It would indeed be hypercritical to question this statement.

The leading figures in the narrative of the *Rāmāyaṇa* are men, monkeys, bears and rākṣasas, whilst those of the *Mahābhārata* are men only, the rākṣasas evidently coming in only to enhance the stage effect, the man-like monkeys and bears having disappeared completely. On the other hand, gods and other denizens of the upper and nether worlds (apseṣaṛas, gṛndharvas, yaksas, brahmaśis, nāgas, etc.) flit in and out of the scenes of the *Mahābhārata* with embarrassing ease and frequency, and the human actors on the stage also gain admittance into those regions, upon invitation sometimes, but not rarely also by accident, whereas Rāma, in spite of his divinity, remains of the earth, earthy throughout. Wonder-working weapons and accoutrements of warriors abound in the *Mahābhārata*, though they are by no means unknown in the *Rāmāyaṇa*. The *Mahābhārata* literally revels in absurd and impos-

---

1 This reason, given in some English text-books, is more intelligible than any given by Weber in his *History of Indian Literature*, pp. 191-194.

2 The force of this very obvious circumstance is, I am glad to note, fully appreciated by Macdonell, *History of Sanskrit Literature*, p. 306.
sible incidents. In fact, poetical licence which is kept within more or less fair limits in the Rāmāyana passes all bounds in the Mahābhārata. The poet of the Rāmāyana no doubt does not fail to endow his monkeys and rākṣasas with fabulous powers, but Hanumān on the Rṣhyamukha hills and apparently also the superior rākṣasas of Lankā are able to speak classical Sanskrit correctly according to grammar and are steeped besides in Sanskrit culture. The poetry of the Rāmāyana is without question superior to that of the Mahābhārata and is redolent of the forest. The poet of the Rāmāyana is more completely en rapport with Nature than the poets of the Mahābhārata. The impression left on the reader—it may be an impression only—is that there are more kings, more states, more cities, more places of pilgrimage and more civic life generally in the country of the Mahābhārata whilst there are more woods and forests, and more unbeaten tracks generally and more intimate communion with Nature in the land of the Rāmāyana. The men and women of the Rāmāyana are on the whole gentler and more humane, less passionate and more companionable than those of the Mahābhārata.

Grounds for supposing that the Mahābhārata represents a later epoch than the Rāmāyana, and, owing to foreign irruptions, a more barbaric stage of Indo-Aryan Culture.

What do all these indications, and others too numerous to set out in detail, point to? The society of the Rāmāyana is, within its geographical limits, more settled than that of the Mahābhārata, and within those limits there is less of strife. But the civilisation of the Mahābhārata, such as it is, is geographically wider-spread. There are, as already stated, fewer unbeaten tracks in it than in the Rāmāyana. There seems to be no reason for doubting that there was in fact a kernel of truth within the plot of each Epic, though no doubt in neither has the poet hesitated to adapt and embellish his theme, as all poets must, to suit his special purposes: and indeed no pretence is made in either Epic to disguise the fact that this was being done. Without doubt, the events which form the basis of the plot of the Rāmāyana were of a date much anterior to those upon which the Mahābhārata

---

4 R., Kieśl., iii. 28–29; Sund., iv. 13, xxx. 18. The references to the text of the Epics as given in this paper are to those published by the Bangabasi Press, Calcutta.
was founded. But the crucial question is, was the Rāmāyaṇa composed before or after the Mahābhārata, or were they composed at substantially the same time? Or, as a third possibility, was one composed so long after the other that they must refer to different stages of social development? My own surmise is that both Epics represent developments of the same Indo-Aryan culture, but at different places and in widely differing environments. The Rāmāyaṇa must have been written long before the events of the Mahābhārata. Otherwise, the absence of any allusion in the Rāmāyaṇa to Hastināpura, Dvāravatī and the many other principalities which figure prominently in the Mahābhārata would be inexplicable. A long interval of time must have elapsed to permit of the spread of Aryan civilisation over the greatly enlarged area which came to be called Bhāratavarṣa in the time of the Mahābhārata. But there must, in the meanwhile, have been tremendous upheavals, due evidently to repeated foreign irruptions. The civilisation of the Mahābhārata appears to bear to that of the Rāmāyaṇa a relation somewhat similar to that borne by the civilisation of the Holy Roman Empire to the Roman. If the Rāmāyaṇa represents the classic epoch of pre-Buddhistic Indian culture, the Mahābhārata represents its subsequently supervening barbarian epoch. Mleechas, Yavanas, Śakas, Hūṇas, Cinas and others possessing cultures of types which are uncompromisingly non-Aryan inhabit different parts of the country and it is found impossible to lump them up together with the Niśādas and Caṇḍālas, who had a place at least on the outskirts of the Aryan fold, or to account for their existence by some ingenious theory of varṇa-saṅkara, or descent from a mixture, in various proportions, of the four original castes, which were created by Brahmā out of his body. They live too

4 Cf. M., Śānti, ccvii. 42-45.

5 It is a characteristic of the Indo-Aryan intellect (and one that leads it into innumerable absurdities) not to leave a single fact which came within its ken, without an explanation or an attempt at one, and sometimes more than one. In the Anudāpana-pātra of the Mahābhārata, it is solemnly affirmed that the Śakas, Yavanas, Kambojas, Drāviḍas, Kalindas, Pulinda, Usīnara, Kolisarpas, Mahiṣakas, Lātas Pounḍras, Kannāsiras, Saṃpṛjās, Dāradas, Darbas, Cholas, Śabaras, Barbaras and Kirātas were Kṣatriyas who had ceased to be such through want of association with Brāhmaṇas (Anudāpana-pātra, xxxii and xxxv; Cf. Manu, X, v. 44). The fact appears to have been that they refused to accept the place which Brāhmaṇa culture was prepared to concede to them and defied the Brāhmaṇa dispensation. In the Karṇa-pātra, Karṇa gives a less prejudiced account of these Barbarians. "The Mleechas and Yavanas," he says, were men of culture (sāraṣajā) and powerful people, who observed dharmas of their own invention.
in such close proximity that it is impossible by any feat of poetical licence to endow them, as the poet of the Rāmāyaṇa was able to endow Hanumān and the Rakṣasa chiefs, with expert knowledge of Sanskrit grammar and with Sanskrit culture. The civilisation of the Rāmāyaṇa is more purely Aryan than that of the Mahābhārata. There is a distinct strain of barbarism in all that appertains to the latter. Mark the difference in the methods respectively employed for the winning of their brides by the Princes of the Kośalas and the Kuru Chieftains. The birth of Kṛṣṇa Dvaipāyana, the reputed author of the Mahābhārata, of Dhṛtarāṣṭra and Pāṇḍu, the marriages of Śāntanu and Satyavatī, of Draupadī with her five husbands, of Arjuna with his cousin Subhadra, the leadership in the councils and the wars of Duryodhana of the professional charioteer’s son, Karna, are symptoms showing that the civilisation was, from the purely Aryan point of view, a good deal “out of joint.” Mleecha, Yavana and non-Ksattriya princes are respected and even favoured in Duryodhana’s court. The Kuru princes apparently even learn foreign languages, for Vidura, for greater secrecy, affects to communicate to Yudhiṣṭhira his suspicions concerning Duryodhana’s plans to kill the Pāṇḍavas by setting fire to their residence at Bāraṇaṭā, in some foreign language. The civilisation no doubt is still Aryan, but it is shot through and through with barbarism.

The culture of the Epics pre-Buddhisitic.

I would not venture to fix the dates of the Rāmāyaṇa and the Mahābhārata taken either separately or together, even in a rough manner. So free, however, are both Epics from any Buddhistic strain that it may be safely assumed that they register the civilisation of an age anterior to that of the Buddha (Gautama) of Kapilavastu or at any rate of an age in which Buddhism had as yet made little headway as a rival system of culture. The single reference to “Atheists of the Buddhistic persuasion” in Rāma’s exhortation to Jābali is obviously not to this Buddha. These two chapters of the Ayodhyā (sva-sahāya-nigata, as opposed evidently to the scriptural dharma of the Indo-Aryans).

M. Karna, xlv. 35.

6 M., Adi, cxiv. 20.

7 The conclusions above recorded however do not prevent me from recognising that many of the older legends incorporated in the Mahābhārata embody material of older date than the Rāmāyaṇa.

8 R., Ayodh., evili, cix.
Kāṇḍa, moreover, to my mind, bear unmistakable internal evidence tending to show that the whole episode of Jābāli must be a later interpolation.

The material side of this culture and enquiries relevant thereto.

The civilisation of the age of the Epics like all civilisation, had a material as well as a moral side. It is in no spirit of flippancy that I put the questions: What did these people, Aryans and others, eat and drink? Whether they were fond of wine or were as a rule abstainers? How did they build their houses and of what material? What did they wear? What were the special costumes favoured by the Brāhmaṇas, the Kṣatriyas and the rest, both men and women? How did they satisfy their economic wants and necessities? What arts and crafts were pursued in their towns and villages? What were their notions of the luxuries of life? How did they amuse themselves?

The moral side of this culture and enquiries relevant thereto.

On the moral side, one would like to know what value this civilisation placed on men's souls, meaning by men not the Brāhmaṇas and Kṣatriyas alone (those joint, and as regards the rest, exclusive possessors of political and social power) but also those belonging to the other castes and orders, who at the date of the Mahābhārata were so numerous that the time-honoured classification of the people into the four occupational castes broke down and the grotesque theory of Varnasāṅkara was propounded to explain their origin. What facilities, or otherwise, did it offer to the lower orders to rise in the scale of culture? Were there educational institutions of any sort for any of the classes, and if so what and for whom? What were the relations between the classes inter se, and of the individuals to the class to which they belonged, and the relations of each class and the individuals composing it to the State? Were all the castes bodies corporate, and if not all, which of them? What was the Aryan state? What in the state

9 Speaking subject to correction, I find it impossible to hold that this classification ever corresponded completely to the actually existing caste-organisations. It was a classification by scholars and in the main notional and not descriptive. Their could never have been, for instance, a single Vaiśya caste, and that the Śudras ever had any distinct communal organisation is unthinkable. But the Brāhmaṇas and Kṣatriyas certainly appear to have been classes by themselves, though apparently unincorporated.

10 M., Anuśā., xlvii.
was the position of the King? How was the Aryan state organised and to what end? What were the relations between state and state? Was there any ruling idea which governed these relations? Was there anything in pre-Buddhistic India which corresponded in any degree to that Imperialism and Internationalism of which we hear so much in these days?

In what sense was Indo-Aryan culture spiritualistic? How many participated in the Brahmanic sumnum bonum of holy life?

We hear it repeatedly affirmed by Indians and foreigners alike that this Indian culture was deeply spiritualistic. Religion was without doubt the dominating motive in the life of the Brāhmaṇas who unquestionably constituted a class by themselves. Similar, too, was the case with the Kṣatriyas, and since all the three āśramas except brahmacarya had been open to them from the beginning, and later on they had been admitted to the brahmacarya āśrama also, they too had the possibilities of a religious life open to them, though their pre-occupation with their specific dharma, viz, war and administration, must have in the case of most of them proved too absorbing to permit of their pursuing the holy life. But what about the rest—the prākṛtas—the common herd? What was their dharma? The Epics tell us abundantly what dharma was sedulously preached to them. The Rṣhis knew better than to prescribe the attainment of the Brahmanic sumnum bonum of holy life as the common goal to be pursued by Brāhmaṇas and non-Brāhmaṇas alike. Who did in fact pursue it?

(i) Amongst the Brāhmaṇas.

So long as religion was a matter mainly of Vedic rites and ritual, it was of course the Brāhmaṇas. But Indo-Aryan religion had long ceased to be a mere matter of rites and ritual. It had developed, in the Vedānta i.e. the (Upaniṣads), a philosophy of religion which, though ostensibly subordinated to the traditional ritualism, really transcended it. The Vedas with the Vedānta must have proved far too strong intellectual meat for any but the most intellectual, and the conditions of extreme self-denial under which the goal of spiritual life had to be pursued must have greatly reduced the number of men, even amongst the Brāhmaṇas,
who could practise to the full the Varṇadharma prescribed for them. Those who could not, found more congenial occupation in service under the King as Rāja-purohitas (royal chaplains), Amātyas (ministers), Sabhāsadas (councillors), or they engaged in what constituted the learned professions of those days e.g. physicians, surgeons, prefects of towns, astronomers and village priests. A Brāhmaṇa was indeed free, for the sake of a livelihood, to follow the occupations of a Kṣatriya or even of a Vaiṣya.

(ii) Amongst the Kṣatriyas.

The principal function of the King and the Kṣatriya warriors under his command was to protect the population from foreign aggression and maintain and even compel them to observe their respective Varṇadharmas. A Kṣatriya was in no circumstances to follow the occupation of a Vaiṣya (which was to produce wealth without limit by fair means under the aegis of the King), nor could he take to mendicancy like Brāhmaṇas. In return for the services performed by him for the community as a whole, the King had authority under the law to appropriate a sixth portion of the wealth of everyone except of those Brāhmaṇas who strictly observed their Varṇadharma, out of which he was to maintain virtuous Brāhmaṇas who were too proud to beg (by grants to them of annuities), his ministers and other officers and his army of warriors, and spend the residue in giving alms and performing yajñas. As I have already stated, all the ākramadharmanas except, at first, brahmacarya, and later on that also, could be practised by a Kṣatriya, who was thus entitled to study the Vedas and the Vedānta and to follow the spiritual life, if he so desired, but the pre-occupations of his special dharma must have left him little leisure or inclination to do so. When, at the conclusion of the war of Kurukṣetra, Yudhiṣṭhira, being deeply affected by the extermination of his relations and other Kṣatriyas, and the lamentations of their womenfolk, desired to retire into the forest and adopt sannyāsa, Kṣatriyas and Brāhmaṇas alike (including great Rṣis) prevailed upon

---

him to assume charge of the Empire, and earn untold religious merit by practising the raja-dharma, which since it maintained and established all the other dharmas was declared to be superior to all the other dharmas. He was reminded that by practising the raja-dharma, the King became entitled, according to the Sāstras, to a fourth share of the religious merit acquired by all orders of his subjects, and that a like share in the sins which they, the subjects, incurred by deviating from the paths of dharma through the failure of the King to exercise his danda (governance) similarly enured to the King.

(iii) Amongst the Vaiśyas and Śudras.

Though neither Brāhmaṇa nor Kṣatriya was absolutely precluded from engaging in the pursuit of wealth, that according to the Sāstras was the special dharma of the Vaiśyas. It was degrading for a Vaiśya to perform menial services, that being the special dharma of the Śudra. It was indeed the wealth of the Vaiśyas which provided the economic support to the whole elaborate structure of “Spiritual Life” which is alleged to have been the dominating motive of Indo-Aryan culture. The Vaiśyas appeared for a long time to have had no right to study the Vedas and perform yajñas. But to keep wealth eternally under the heels was an impossibility even in the golden age of Indo-Aryan culture. Hence like the Kṣatriyas they too in course of time became entitled to enter all the āśramas (brahma-carya included), and thus towards the end (and perhaps at the date of the war of Kurukṣetra) the Vedas with the Vedānta ceased to be a sacred book to them. But the Śudras do not appear at any stage of this culture to have acquired this right. The story told of the Śudramuni Śambuka in the Uttara-kāṇḍa of the Rāmāyana and the Śudramuni-Saṃvāda related in the tenth chapter of the Anukūlana-pāra of the Mahābhārata are highly significant in this context. For a Śudra to perform tapasyā was treated by Rāma as a capital offence and was summarily punished by him as such. But in the Śaṅti and Anukūlana-pārvas, it is repeatedly stated that the bhikṣya or sannyasa dharma was open even to a Śudra and to women, who, to whatever order they might have belonged, were like the Śudras precluded from participating.
in the Vedic Saṃskāras. There is a passage in the Śāntiparva, which says that a Vaiśya or a Śūdra might practise sannyasa dharma, but not without previous sanction obtained from the King. Thus, while adoption by members of the higher orders, of the occupations of the lower, was viewed with disapprobation but tolerated (being expiable by suitable prāyascittas), a similar adoption of the Brāhmaṇa’s dharma by the Kṣatriya was discouraged, and the adoption of the Brāhmaṇa’s dharma by Vaiśyas and Śūdras restrained and in the earlier stages, in the case of the Śūdras at any rate, punished as a capital offence. It is stated in the Śāntiparva, that all varṇas (including Vaiśyas and Śūdras) might and should take up arms for the preservation of the Brāhmaṇaṇas, and it is expressly related in the Karnaparva that warriors of Vaiśya and Śūdra extraction (not to speak of Brāhmaṇaṇas and Kṣatriyas) participated in the battles of Kurukshetra.

Moral and material suppression of the Śūdras.

However, the cruelest restraint imposed on the Śūdra was that which prevented him from gaining wealth, which he could not do for himself except with the sanction of the King and unless the object was to spend it on religious ceremonies which of course would have to be performed by Brāhmaṇaṇas and would be attended by donations of da-kṛṣṭṇas to Brāhmaṇaṇas. Whatever wealth a Śūdra earned beyond what might be necessary for the bare maintenance of himself and his dependents passed to his employers; although the Śūdras as a class, at the period neither of the Rāmāyaṇa or of the Mahābhārata, appear to have been slaves. The Śūdra might satisfy the cravings of his soul by listening to the Purāṇas, but the Brāhmaṇa who initiated a Śūdra in the esoteric doctrines of the Vedas and Upaniṣads incurred sin for which he expiated by being reborn in a lower order. In the age of the epics, teaching (adhyāpyana) was, of course, a monopoly of the Brāhmaṇaṇas. Neither a Kṣatriya nor a Vaiśya nor a Śūdra was able, by the practice of tapasyā, to attain Brāhmaṇaṇahood, at least in that existence. The exceptional instances of Viśvāmitra and Viṭhāhavya, who though Kṣatriyas attained Brāhmaṇaṇahood in the same existence, are explained in the Anuśāsanaparva as having been due

31 M., Śānti, cxcviii. 14, cxxviii. 34, cxxlili. 15.
32 M., Śānti, lxviiii. 27.
33 M., Śānti, lxviiii. 12.
34 M., Karṇa, xlvii. 18.
35 M., Anuśā., x.
37 M., Śānti, lxiii. 12-15.
38 M., Śānti, lx. 27-28.
39 M., Śānti, lx. 27-28.
40 M., Vīr., 1, 5.
to the special favour of the Brāhmaṇas. The utmost concession that the leaders of Indo-Aryan culture in the age of the Epics was prepared to make was to admit that by leading the life of a tāpasa or sannyāsin in one existence, a Kṣatriya, a Vaiśya or a Śūdra qualified himself for re-incarnation as a Brāhmaṇa in the next.

Common dharma of all Vārṇas.

The four denominations of castes affiliated within the Aryan fold did not, as I have previously stated, exhaust the whole population. Of the dharma prescribed for others, I shall speak later on. The epics speak of a general (or sārva-varṇika) dharma of all vārṇas which was: to forswear anger, hatred, jealousy and cruelty, to be forgiving, to give every one his due, to speak the truth, to offer oblations to ancestors, to procreate issue on the body of one's lawfully wedded wife, to honour one's parents and to maintain one's dependants.

Indo-Aryan culture aimed at the holy life for the few at the expense of the many.

The sum and substance of all this is that Indo-Aryan culture in its golden age was spiritual in this sense, that it was calculated to provide facilities to a very few to attain the holy life at the expense of the vast majority of the population. So far as the latter were concerned, it was, not a culture of spiritual advancement, but rather of spiritual suppression. As will be shown later on, so far as the Kṣatriyas were concerned, it put a premium upon the practice of war for mutual extermination and despoliation. So far as the Vaiśyas were concerned, the ideal was grossly materialistic. As for the Śūdras, they were ruthlessly held down to forced physical and moral servitude. The Indo-Aryan culture was a spiritual hydraulic press, with this difference that the pressure was applied on the wider
in order to procure an elevation at the narrower end.\textsuperscript{46} I am not sure this will not be found to be the history of culture at all times all over the world.\textsuperscript{46} But nowhere apparently was it practised with

\textsuperscript{46} The sketch given above shows beyond doubt that there was a very gradual amelioration of the condition of the lower orders. The solvents which softened the rigidity of the \textit{Varnāśrama} hierarchy were, first, the \textit{Vedānta} (\textit{Upaniṣads}) which, placing \textit{Jānaka} above \textit{Yajña}, at once made it possible for the \textit{Kṣatriyas} (amongst whom according to Deussen and others, the \textit{Vedāntas} originated) to enter into the spiritual aristocracy without the necessity of an intimate acquaintance with Vedic ceremonial, which in the beginning was apparently denied to the \textit{Kṣatriyas}. The Brāhmaṇas compromised with the \textit{Kṣatriyas} by according scriptural authority to the \textit{Vedānta} and admitting \textit{Kṣatriyas} to the study of the Vedas but tried to exclude the other orders from the spiritual world of \textit{Jānaka}, subordinating the \textit{Vedānta} to the Vedas and making the whole thing esoteric exclusively amongst the Brāhmaṇas and \textit{Kṣatriyas}. But the \textit{Vaiśyas} necessarily got in after they became participants in the study of the Vedas and Vedic \textit{sāṁskāra}. The solvent which secured the much more qualified admission of the \textit{Śūdras} was the \textit{Śāṅkhyya} philosophy and the cults which grew round it, which condemned the killing of animals to satisfy the Gods in whose divinity they did not believe and decried the observance of the meaningless ceremonies of the Vedas as the one road to \textit{Mokṣa} (see \textit{M., Śānti}, cxxxi, cxxii, cxxiii). Only qualified approval was accorded to the \textit{Varnāśramadharma} as providing convenient but by no means essential stages on the way towards \textit{Mokṣa} (\textit{M., Śānti}, cxxiv). The Brāhmaṇas compromised with the \textit{Śāṅkhyya} philosophy just as they did with the \textit{Vedānta} and conceded that \textit{Śūdras} (and even women) had access to \textit{sāṁkhyasūdharma} (\textit{M., Śānti}, cxxv, cxxvi, cxxvii, cxxviii) but that their attainment thereby of equal status with the Brāhmaṇas was postponed till their next reincarnation (\textit{M., Anuśāsana}, cxxix, cxxx). There were however radicals even amongst Brāhmaṇas and to \textit{Vaiśnavaśākhya} the \textit{Śāntiparaśa} attributes the following revolutionary doctrine nowhere else repeated in the \textit{Mahābhārata} : "All \textit{Varṇas}," he said, "are derived from Brāhma. Therefore all \textit{Varṇas} can be counted as Brāhmaṇas and all \textit{Varṇas} invoke Brāhma" (\textit{M., Śānti}, cxxx). Note also that as the \textit{Upaniṣads} occasionally send Brāhmaṇas to learn the true doctrines of religion to \textit{Kṣatriyas}, so in the \textit{Mahābhārata}, Brāhmaṇas sometimes go to \textit{Vāṇikas} (\textit{M., Śānti}, cxxix) and even to \textit{Vaiśyas} and in one case to a woman (\textit{M., Vana}, cxx) for the same purpose. The practical philosopher of the \textit{Mahābhārata} was \textit{Vidura}, the son of a Brāhmaṇa father by a \textit{Śūdra} mother. Buddhism challenged the whole doctrine of caste supremacy and the subjection of women, but the \textit{Purāṇas} replied by boldly affirming that the \textit{Śūdra} attained the salvation, which the twice-born won only through the laborious processes of \textit{karma}, \textit{yajña} and \textit{tapasyā}, by wholeheartedly serving his twice-born patron, and the same goal was confidently held out to be the portion of the woman who effaced herself in the service of her husband (see \textit{Viṣṇupurāṇa}, part vi, ch. 2).

\textsuperscript{46} Thus of Athenian culture, Pericles boasted: "We aim at a life beautiful without extravagance and contemplative without unmanliness: wealth in our eyes is a thing not for ostentation but for reasonable use, and it is not the acknowledgment of poverty we think disgraceful, but the want of endeavour to avoid it." But, as I have pointed out elsewhere (\textit{Comparative Administrative Law}, pp. 27-28), "the beautiful life at which the State aimed did not exist for the large slave population who toiled for the
the cold calculating purpose one finds exemplified in the *Varṇāśrama-dharma*. I do not say that even so this culture was not in its time and place a great and even necessary civilising agency. But one ought not for that reason to shut one’s eyes to its more sinister elements, if only to demonstrate its utter incompatibility with modern requirements, specially when one hears so much said to-day of the absolute superiority of this culture, and the duty is dinned into every Indian’s ears, in season and out of season, by Indians and Foreigners alike, to revive once more and restore to India this ancient culture in its pristine purity and efficacy.

*The Brāhmaṇa and Kṣatriya partnership in moral and political ascendancy.*

The Indo-Aryan culture of the Epics, I repeat, was grievously one-sided. As it stands confessed in the pages of the Epics, it aimed at maintaining the moral ascendancy of an intellectual class (the Brāhmaṇas) with the aid of the strong arm of the Kṣatriyas. "The Brāhmaṇa preserved society from invisible and the Kṣatriya from visible dangers." 47 Since the latter was the *sine qua non* of all ordered existence and Brāhmaṇism could not flourish except within the "Peace" of a King who would enforce *Varṇāśrama-dharma* in all its stringency, Rājadharma was superior to all other dharmas. 48 But the King must remember that the Brāhmaṇa was created first; and could he not render all the efforts of the King barren of fruits by imprecations made a hundred-fold more efficacious by *tapasya*? 49 "The Kṣatriyas must therefore reserve the best of what they got for the benefit of the Brāhmaṇas." 50 The Brāhmaṇas were the brains as the Kṣatriyas were the arms of the pre-Buddhistic Aryan State. 51 The nature of the partnership between the two orders is pithily expressed in the following amongst citizens on the estates; nor, since the City at the date of the speech was an Empire City, was it for participation by the citizens of the allied cities. The ‘life beautiful’ was made possible by the labour of slaves more numerous than citizens and by tributes exacted from the allies." Culture, it seems, has ever been parasitic and has never as yet been broad-based.

47 M., Sānti, lxxiv. 2.

48 M., Sānti, lvi. 3 lxiii. 24–30, lxiv. 5.

49 M., Sānti, lxiii. 7, lxiii 30, Anuśā, xxxiii, Sānti, cccxii.

50 M., Sānti, lxiii, particularly v. 81, and lxiv.

51 M., Anuśā, xxxiii–xxxv.
many maxims that lie scattered throughout the Mahābhārata. "Let the Brāhmaṇa continually offer oblations (udaka) and the Kṣatriya be ever ready with his weapons, and the world is theirs." 52

Other-worldliness of Indo-Aryan culture, not singular. The doctrine of expiation its concomitant.

But it is said, the "spirituality" of Indo-Aryan culture lay in its other-wordliness. The Brāhmaṇa himself believed and had persuaded the other orders to believe that the soul of man (and not of men only but of all sentient beings) was immortal, that it passed from body to body, its location at any stage being determined by the merits and demerits acquired by it in its previous incarnations. But this other-worldliness was by no means the exclusive property of the Indo-Aryan. It dominated equally the European Christian of the Middle Ages. Curiously enough, the doctrine of expiation serves in both systems to rid the doer of the consequences of his acts on the way. 53 The Kṣatriya expiated his sins by dying on the battle-field, 54 and Duryodhana, for all his iniquities, was led into Heaven by chanting Gandharvas and Apsaras. 55 The thief expiated his sin on the block or transferred it to the King's shoulders, if the latter unjustly let him off. 56 So in the Middle Ages of Europe, the heretic was humanely burned in order that by atoning for his false opinion on the stake, he might find the gates of Heaven, which ordinarily opened only to the true believer, not unceremoniously shut on his face.

Indo-Aryan culture one of severe all-round discipline. The position of the Indo-Aryan King a difficult one, requiring high qualities of character.

The Brāhmaṇic culture was undoubtedly a culture of severe all-round discipline, lighter on the Brāhmaṇa so far as the political sanction was concerned, 57 but severe enough as regards even him in other respects. 58 The Aryan King who sought to discharge his duties conscientiously did not by any means have an easy time of it. The Indo-Aryan conception of a community without a King was not unlike the

52 M., Śānti, lxxiv. 22, also Vana, xxvi.
53 M., Śānti, xcviii. 45-48
54 M., Śānti, lxxxviii. 18-20, Ādi, ccxii. 1.
55 M., Śānti, lvi. 22, 31; lxv.
56 M., Śānti, lxvii. 9.
57 M., Śānti, lxvii. 9.
58 M., Śānti, lxvii. 9.
Hobbesian. "As in water, the bigger fish eat up the smaller, so if there be no King, the more powerful begin to eat up the weaker subjects." It could not antecedently have been an easy task to maintain the complicated *Vṛ Yaşrane-dharma* amongst a people naturally so inclined. Besides, as will be explained in another place, the Aryan King had no lack of external enemies. The success of the *Vṛ Yaşrane* scheme of polity depended thus entirely on the personal vigilance and industry of the King. The King was in fact, as in theory, the pivot of this society. What, if a King proved a failure? Cast him out, unhesitatingly said the Indo-Aryan lawgiver. "If the King is incapable of protecting his subjects, if he obtains revenue by oppressive means, if he has no far-sighted counsellor, let the subjects unite and destroy that cruel, virtue-destroying abomination of a King." "The King who having undertaken the task of governance shows indifference in its discharge should by all means be destroyed like a rabid dog." On the other hand, when a community has been left without a ruler, "let the subjects go forth in a body and welcome the first powerful person who offers to establish *Vṛ Yaşrane-dharma*, and instal him—and this even though he might be a Śūdra.

_Need of self-discipline, not however amounting to self-abnegation._

The personal factor was therefore all-important. The successful Indo-Aryan King had need, as indeed he is repeatedly adjured, to be the master of his senses and faculties: "Conquer yourself and then proceed to conquer your enemies." "You cannot dispense justice in anger, nor if you are overcome by avarice, nor if blinded by prejudice." The ideal King must be a perfect embodiment of ever-watchful and sustained self-discipline.

_Diversions of Princes in Epic India._

But he had no need, on that account to be an ascetic. "To speak courteously, to overcome indolence and avarice, to subdue the senses, and to enjoy things that are fit to be enjoyed," are amongst the in-

---

59 M., Sānti, lxvii. 16; lxviii. 8, 19-21. 60 R., Ayodh., xiv. 54-55; lxvii. 9-36.
61 M., Anuśā, lxi. 32. 62 M., Anuśā, lxi. 33, Sānti, xiiii. 9.
63 M., Sānti, lxvii. 7. 64 M., Sānti, lxvii. 35-40.
65 M., Sānti, lxix. 4. 66 M., Sābdhā, v. 91.
dispensables enjoined upon the King. Thus the King was expected to patronise the arts and sciences, and although a Kṣatriya had, first and foremost, to be a warrior, he was free to cultivate the gentler accomplishments. Yudhiṣṭhira could play a game of dice when occasion required, and though he was no match for Śakuni and in consequence lost an empire, he did make his mark in it in the Court of Viśā, during the ajñātaśā of the Pāṇḍavas.\(^8\) Bhīma appropriately became the Court chef,\(^9\) and Arjuna who had been taught music and dancing by the Gaṇḍharva King Citrasena found ready employment as a teacher of those arts to the royal princesses, one of whom was destined later on to be his son’s wife.\(^10\) Nakula and Sahadeva took charge respectively of the King’s horses\(^11\) and horned cattle\(^12\), the latter (the better to preserve his incognito) having previously learned the patois of the cowherds, whilst ex-empress Draupadi proved an expert lady’s maid to Queen Sudeśā, in spite of all the latter’s nervous fears on the score of the extreme attractiveness of the fascinating stranger, who alone and unattended and meanly clad traversed the streets of the capital in search of service and could scarcely persuade her royal mistress that she really was what she pretended to be.\(^13\) The Kṣatriya warriors had to be, one may suppose, expert charioteers, but Krṣṇa, Śāya, Uttara and the mythical Nala appear to have done even better than professionals.

These tastes, however, might be carried too far, as both Yudhiṣṭhira and Nala found to their cost. Nor, as we have seen, was self-abnegation in Kings commended when pushed to extreme limits. Not only was Yudhiṣṭhira not suffered, as he anxiously desired, to abandon the world to become a sanśī, he was roundly accused by his brothers and his wife of being unmanly for entertaining this wish.\(^14\) Veḍavyāśa tells him: “God has created you for work and work you must. You have no right to renounce the world,”\(^15\) and Bhīma takes him to task for his mildness (mrdutā) which made him suffer in point of prestige in the eyes of his subjects.”\(^16\)

\(^8\) M., Vīr., vii. \(^9\) M., Vīr., viii. \(^10\) M., Vīr., xi. \(^11\) M., Vīr., xii. \(^12\) M., Vīr., x. \(^13\) M., Vīr., ix. \(^14\) M., Sānti, viii-xiv. \(^15\) M., Sānti, xxvii. 34. \(^16\) M., Sānti, lxxv. 19. In the whole range of poetical literature, it is difficult to find two more pathetic figures than Yudhiṣṭhira and Sītā. As the whole burden of the plot of the Rāmāyaṇa story falls on poor, helpless, submissive Sītā, so does that of the Mahābhārata press with its whole weight on the unworliday-minded Yudhiṣṭhira. Each in his and her way was tenderness itself, but the spirit in neither ever failed to respond
Bhāratavarṣa of the Epics a conglomeration of small independent States.

As I have stated, the external features of the world of the Rāmāyana were not quite the same as those of the world of the Mahābhārata and, as previously outlined, the composition of the population differed materially, in the two epochs. The world, however, as depicted at both the epochs was composed of a vast number of independent States, each consisting of one or more cities, rural areas and forest tracts, the last inhabited by persons who had renounced the world and who were, equally with others, subjects of the King and entitled to his protection.

The Indo-Aryan State. An unconstitutional personal Monarch governing through a personally supervised bureaucracy.

The Chief Town where the King resided had to be strongly fortified; and the Treasury, the Army, the Royal Court and the Judicial Tribunal were located there.78 Other cities and the outlying areas were governed from the capital through a hierarchy of Royal Agents. In the ideal State pictured by Bhīṣma in the Śāntiparva,79 there were Governors of single villages, above them Governors of groups of ten villages and above them again in succession Governors of a hundred and a thousand villages. Each lower denomination of Governor handed over his surplus revenue to the Governor placed immediately above him. A Governor of a thousand villages might have his seat in a tributary town (Śākhānaqara) and appropriate the receipts thereof as his own remuneration. The work of these Governors had to be ceaselessly watched and supervised by Ministers and Inspectors. At the head-quarters there was a body of Ministers, of whom four were Brāhmaṇas, eight Kṣatriyas, twenty-one wealthy Vaiṣyas, three chaste and modest Śūdras and one an accomplished Sūta—all of course nominated by the King. None of these should be less than fifty years of age. Of these, eight—viz. the four Brāhmaṇas, three Kṣatriyas and the one Sūta—constituted the King's Advisory Cabinet and assisted him in framing ordinances.80 The making of laws proper was beyond the competence of the King and Cabinet alike. The Prime Minister shared

to the seemingly crushing demands of duty at each successive call made upon it. The poets, it seems, had not the heart to see them die the death of mortals, and surely as poetical creations, so heroic and yet so pathetic, they are deathless.

78 M., Sānti, lxxxvi. 79 M., Sānti, lxxvii 80 M., Sānti, lxxxv.
in the innermost counsel of the King, but his functions too were advisory, to warn but not to command.\(^{31}\) Besides the Cabinet just mentioned, there was a larger sābhā, the members of which had to be modest, truthful, straightforward, possessed of self-control and who were, above all, good speakers.\(^{32}\) But all these various parts of the structure were as loose stones laid one above or by the side of the other without any cement. This last was supplied by the personality of the King, who set them working and co-ordinated their efforts, and who kept constant watch upon them by personal vigilance or through spies, for a King might not trust implicitly even his own son,\(^{33}\) not to speak of Ministers. The King, in short, was an unconstitutional sovereign and the instrument of his rule a highly centralised bureaucracy.\(^{34}\)

**No trace of self-government in the Indo-Aryan State.**

Neither the Rāmāyana nor the Mahābhārata discloses the existence of a single institution possessing an appreciable measure of autonomy or self-rule. That of course does not prove that gilds and other associations did not exist in Aryan India. But the evidence furnished by the Epics militates against any assumption that such associations, if any existed, had the slightest influence on the determinations of the King in the domain of politics.\(^{35}\) To protect the subjects from thieves,

\(^{31}\) *M., Sānti, lxxvii, lxxiii.*  
\(^{32}\) *M., Sānti, xxxv, 33; lxxix, 8-9.*  
\(^{33}\) As in the case of Varāhārama-dharma, what is stated in the Mahābhārata of Rājadharma is to a large extent made up of the commonplaces of the Sāmhitās (see footnote 41 above). But here again the account of the Mahābhārata is more concrete and therefore more suitable for historical treatment than the compilation of abstract propositions in the Sāmhitās.  
\(^{34}\) Gilds and Associations in India. There are in the Mahābhārata casual references to sennīyes and ganās which have been sought to be identified with "gilds" and "local corporations." They no doubt were associations of men within the Indo-Aryan State, but the importance assigned in the same passages to sennīmukhyas and ganamukhyas leads one to suspect that these associations themselves were monarchical or at least aristocratically organised, and were not "communities" in the proper sense. The tendency all the world over and at all times has been for the State-organisation to reproduce itself in the smaller associations, and Aryan India could hardly have been an exception to this rule. The Indo-Aryan government, from the evidence furnished by the Epics, the Dharmasūtras and the Dharma-sāmhitās, appears to have been a centralised monarchy. This form of government is however hardly anywhere the earliest form of government to be met with in any politically organised community. It seems invariably to have been preceded by scattered self-governing tribal associations grouped round chiefs who led more than they governed. As in other parts of the world, the Indo-Aryan mon-
cheats and robbers within his jurisdiction and to assess the taxes payable by traders and craftsmen after careful computation of their incomes and outgoings, their working expenses and the requirements of themselves and their families were amongst the bounden duties of the King. The King was advised to recover taxes from the subjects in a variety of ways, but so as not to exhaust them.\(^{36}\) The King must not kill the goose that laid the golden eggs, and therefore had to see that the Vaiśyas came to no harm. "It should not be difficult", says the Mahābhārata, "to please the Vaiśyas, and nothing is more praiseworthy."\(^{37}\) The share of the subjects' wealth which a King could take as taxes was fixed by law, "but it was no sin when the treasury was empty to take money from them unlawfully and oppressively;" and the sin thereby incurred was capable of expiation after the stress was over.\(^{39}\) In normal times, however, the King was counselled to draw his revenues from his subjects "after the manner of the leech, unperceived".\(^{39}\)

archy imposed itself in the first instance upon tribal groups so constituted, and its general tendency, here as elsewhere, was no doubt to progressively displace the self-rule of the original tribal organisations. But this tendency does not appear to have been pushed in Hindu-India to its extreme logical limits—to the destruction, namely, of all self-existing associations—a result which was successfully attained in the later stages of the Roman Empire and in the post-Feudal Monarchies of Continental Europe. So far from this being the case, within the limits imposed by the Varnāśrama-dharma, Indo-Aryan polity appears to have been one of great tolerance and almost absolute laissez faire. Having regard to the heterogeneous materials upon which it had to work, the Varnāśrama-dharma would have been still-born if it had not known how to let a great many things well alone. Gilds and associations, governed in their internal relations by customary rules emanating from within themselves, thus survived and were tolerated but only because and in so far as they did not interfere with Varnāśrama-dharma. It would, in this view, be a great mistake to regard these gilds and associations as parts of the Varnāśrama polity and as being organically connected with it. They lived on, in fact, where they did, in spite of Varnāśrama-dharma and not on account of it. In later ages, in India as in other countries, these and other associations amongst the people sprang into fresh life or declined in proportion as the central authority was contracted or expanded. The problem of reconciling local autonomy with central control is indeed a very modern one, and still awaits satisfactory solution.

I ought to add here that having examined ch. cvii of the Santiparva of this Mahābhārata from every possible point of view, I am still unable to discover any trace of republican institutions in any of its verses or in all of them taken together.

\(^{36}\) M., Śānti, lxxxvii. 12-16.
\(^{37}\) M., Śānti, lxxxvii. 40.
\(^{38}\) M., Śānti, cxxx. 12-17, 26.
\(^{39}\) M., Śānti, lxxxviii. 5-8.
Relation between the King and his subjects was personal.

It was, on the other hand, the duty of the subjects to give their all into the treasury to save the king. This was because, it was said, the King’s power rested on his treasury, upon the King’s power depended dharma, and if dharma was not maintained, there would be anarchy and the subjects would be ruined. It was equally unwise for the Rājā to be oppressive without necessity. The King who so acted acquired ill-fame in this life and was damned in the next. On the other hand, if the King was a respecter of persons, bountiful and courteous, men would come to regard his misfortunes as their own, and would risk their lives to repel them. Apart therefore from the religious sanction, the foundation of righteous conduct on the part of the King and of loyalty on the part of the subjects was enlightened self-interest.

One need not be surprised therefore at the exaggerated importance attached in the Epics to the penal sanction (daṇḍa) in the maintenance of dharma and the occasional glorification of royal power (bala), it being placed even above dharma. “If”, says Bṛhīma, “daṇḍa had not flourished in this world, people would have oppressed each other. It is through being protected by daṇḍa, that the subjects exalt the King, therefore daṇḍa is superior to all. It is daṇḍa which makes men pursue the path of virtue. It is daṇḍa which incarnated as Kṣatriya and remaining ever wakeful preserves the subjects.” Bala is superior even to dharma, for dharma rests on bala.

The King not a national King and his subjects not a nation.

The relation between the King and his subjects was thus entirely personal. The King was not a national King and his subjects were not a nation. They were merely so many Brāhmaṇas Kṣatriyas, Vaishyas, Śūdras and others living within the jurisdiction (adhiṅkūra) of this or that King. A King could stake his kingdom (even as he could himself, his brothers and his wife) on the issue of a game of dice. Whether it was Yudhīṣṭhira or Duryodhana who won, what did it matter to the subjects, if the treatment they received from either was the same? On the eve of Dhrītarāṣṭra’s retirement into the forest, the

\[90\] M., Śānti, cxxx. 31-35.  
\[91\] M., Śānti, xcii. 16-17.  
\[92\] M., Śānti, cxxi, 34-40.  
\[93\] M., Śānti, cxxxiv. 6.
assembled subjects declared: "Your son, Mahārāja Duryodhana, had looked after the kingdom in the same manner as in former times did Mahārāja Śantanu, your father Vieitravīrya and Mahātmā Pāṇḍu. We suffered not the slightest harm from Duryodhana." As to Duryodhana having dealt unfairly towards his cousins and grossly maltreated their wife and his being the cause of the destruction of his kindred and other warriors and the exhaustion of the royal treasure in an iniquitous war, that was not their concern.

*Indo-Aryan society of the Epics, like modern society atomistic and individualistic and in the bulk materialistic.*

Society in its composition was, so far as the Epics show, atomistic and thoroughly individualistic (in the sense of being self-interested). There is, as I have already said no trace in the Epics of a communal life of any sort having any influence on the methods of government. The Brāhmaṇas, really so called, each looked forward to attaining his own personal salvation without being in other people's way. Even the āśramas of the Rṣis were organised on monarchical lines. The Kṣatriyas, like the "comitatus" of Germanic chiefs, were the servants of the King, apt like them, unless carefully handled to get out of hand, but constituting in essence, for all that, the personal retinue of the King. The Vaiśyās were human cattle (the metaphor is not mine) who were to be treated with kindness and consideration on account of the sustenance that could, with a certain amount of tact, be extracted out of

---

96 M., *Śānti*, xvii. I have excluded from my consideration the *Harivanśa* which I do not think can be regarded as an integral part of the *Mahābhārata* or even contemporaneous with it. I consider it, however, only right to state here that the description of Indo-Aryan polity given above may not apply in all particulars to the Yādava league which appears, at the time of the Kurukṣetra war, to have grown out of the coalescence of a number of independent fighting clans thrown together by pressure of external aggression and welded into one at this period by the genius of Kṛṣṇa. Kṛṣṇa himself appears to have fully appreciated the inherent weakness of the Yādava league and preferred to it the benevolent autocracies of the Middle East, and was mainly instrumental in establishing the hegemony of Yudhiṣṭhira. Before the Rājasūya of Yudhiṣṭhira, he secured the willing submission of the Yādavas to Yudhiṣṭhira (M., *Sabhā*, xxxii). See in this connection *Śānti*, lxxxi, which is extremely instructive. It is worthy of note that according to the *Mahābhārata* (*Śānti*, ccxxxix. 99-161) and the *Purāṇas*, the destruction of the Kṣatriyas at Kurukṣetra and of the Yādavas at Dvārakā was deliberately procured by Kṛṣṇa, for the relief, of an oppressed world. Why? Was it for the establishment of a monarchy after his own heart?
them. The revenue they paid was *quid pro quo* for the protection they enjoyed. The Śūdra was hardly any better than a slave, though if he was virtuous he was to be respected, and was to be treated with kindness and consideration in any case. But as previously stated, he must not accumulate wealth, lest, as the *Mahābhārata* is careful to explain, he might through it obtain ascendency over members of the superior orders. Whatever surplus out of his earnings remained after meeting the necessary charges of maintaining his family went to his master. In a society so constituted, patriotism must have been a sentiment unknown to King and subjects alike. There could be no principle of life and growth within such a society. It was not an organism. It worked, as all bureaucratic machines must work, by impulse imparted to it from without. This is one of the secrets of the striking "modernity," of the characters of the great Epics (as compared, for instance, with those of Homer), notwithstanding the seemingly archaic background against which they move. Modern society too is atomistic and individualistic, and until very recently, the only conceivable bond which could keep the social fabric from dissolution into its component monads was the power of the King or of a class which had possessed itself of that power. Society has no doubt in recent times begun dreaming of a new communal life which it fondly names "democracy"—a word borrowed from the political philosophy of the Greeks, amongst whom it appears to have been something more than a dream. Some modern nations have even persuaded themselves that by the special favour of Providence or owing to the native genius of their race, "democracy" with them is, and for long centuries has been, a reality, so that democracy is for them only, whilst autocratic governance is the eternally ordained destiny of the rest of mankind. But this, it is easy to demonstrate, is a grotesque illusion. The modern man has obtained a completer mastery, based on knowledge, over the forces of nature, and is without doubt less superstitious, if at the same time

97 M., Śānti, lxxi. 16-17; lxxxiv.
99 M., Śānti, cxxiiii, cxxvi.
100 M., Śānti, lx. 30-37.
101 I wish it to be distinctly understood that I am here stating a fact and not passing a moral judgment. The *Varnāśrama* polity, I say, was not a community, but a school, almost a laboratory to manufacture citizens of the right kinds, according to a number of patterns, but all parts of a well-conceived scheme, thought out *ab extra* by men who were in it, but not *of* it. As a school it was, as I show later on (notwithstanding serious drawbacks), in several respects, a great success. See note 108 below.
more supercilious. But he is by no means as yet a better man individually or in association than the Indo-Aryan.

But Indo-Aryan culture more human than the modern.

But society in the days of the Great Epics was unquestionably inspired by a larger humanitarianism than is to be met with in the modern world. No animal was to be killed except as offering to the Gods, and to the Kṣatriyas only (who, by the way, were great meat-eaters) was grudgingly conceded the privilege of killing animals by way of sport and eating undedicated meat. But even the Gods, it was frequently stated, preferred vegetable to animal sacrifice, and Vedic texts enjoining the sacrifice of animals (aja or goat) were sought to be explained by tricks of fanciful etymology as really meaning not sacrifice of animals but of plants. Mrgayā (hunting) is repeatedly reprobated in the Mahābhārata (never in the Rāmāyaṇa). The cow, in particular, was made immune by being raised to the rank of a divinity and ahimsā and anṛṣamsatā towards men and animals alike were inculcated in all sorts of contexts and in all varieties of languages. Not to speak of the Gītā, the modern man, whatever his station in life, can extract from the Epics, whole codes of injunctions for regulating his daily acts and thoughts and be all the better for such regulation, and Western civilization has yet to evolve a scheme for ordering individual lives at all approaching in intrinsic grandeur that of the four āśramas, with its “series of gradually intensifying ascetic stages through which a man more and more purified from all earthly attachment should become fitted for his ‘home.’” There is much in the Epics that is childish, even grotesque, but these sink into insignificance by the side of the vast mass of precepts of benevolence, kindliness and forbearance, which must have been an integral part of the life of the population towards the end of the epoch.
The "Good Life" of the age of the Epics due to Brähmanic discipline imposed from without.

But, as I have said, the "good life," of which the Epics furnish such abundant evidence, did not evolve in this society from within. It was imparted from outside. What was the external impetus that brought it into being? It was from first to last Brähmanic culture or rather Brahmanic discipline. There were, as I have said before, numerous small States, but the culture that dominated them was one. How it originated and how it spread until it covered the whole continent from the Himalayas to Cape Comorin and even passed beyond must, if all its secrets should ever be unfolded, form a highly instructive and engrossing chapter of human history.¹⁰⁹

The Varnāśrama-dharma which was of the essence of this culture appears, in the longer perspective from which we are able to view
duct and patient endurance under trying misfortunes. See Deussen, Philosophy of the Upanishads, pp. 314, and 307.

¹⁰⁹ I have in the body of the article refrained from speculating on the origin of the Varnāśrama-dharma. It had, of course, according to the Mahābhārata, a divine origin. If to-day we must refuse to accept this explanation as conclusive of the question, we can with still less justification assume it to be the deliberate invention of a scheming individual or class. Its basic elements must, to my mind, have developed before the division of the people into a hierarchy of castes could have proceeded very far. The beginning of Varnāśrama-dharma is to be sought in a form of polity which grew up naturally amongst the Aryan invaders, at that time consisting of tribes of warriors amongst whom certain priestly families enjoyed a sort of pre-eminence not on the ground of birth and colour, but because they were specially conversant with the sacred hymns and rituals which, according to a belief shared by all primitive people, were of prime importance in securing the health and well-being of the community in all its relations, natural as well as supra-natural. It is clear from the Vedic literature itself, that the ideas which formed the ground-work of Indo-Aryan polity and philosophy developed within a number of priestly schools amongst whom, however, there was a constant interchange of thoughts and marked agreement in fundamentals, due in the main no doubt to the possession of a common scripture. The task of organising Indo-Aryan society in consonance with traditional ideas and beliefs thus fell early into the hands of associated bodies of leisureed experts. The necessity of incorporating the Vaiyāyas and Śūdras into the Indo-Aryan polity must have put the political capacity of these experts to the severest strain. But they apparently rose equal to the task. But the resulting polity, in view of its heterogeneous composition and the complex political, social and economic environment in which it came to be placed, could not but be artificial. This artificial character of Indo-Aryan polity grew with the growth in complexity of the society, until a point was reached when breakdown was inevitable from want of real adjustment. See also footnote 153 below. As to the probable origin of castes, see footnote 164, below.
it to-day, narrow, rigid, selfish and bigoted. It is certainly out of date in these days of rapid communication and unrestricted international competition.

It tamed the Kṣatriyas.

But that in its time it was a great civilising agency, it would be folly to doubt or deny. It tamed the turbulent, fighting, meat-eating, wine-drinking Kṣatriya and converted him from being the natural enemy into the willing and effective instrument of a civilisation which made for humanity as no civilisation originating in Europe ever succeeded in doing in the same degree. The Brāhmaṇas succeeded in India where the Church apparently failed in Europe.

Secret of Brāhmaṇa ascendency over Kṣatriyas.

The Varnāśrama-dharma could succeed only by maintaining Brāhmaṇa ascendency. This ascendency, so far as the Kṣatriyas were concerned, was maintained not by force, nor entirely by fraud, but in the main by force of example, aided no doubt by an abundant employment of the psychology of advertisement, the value of which the Brāhmaṇa thoroughly understood. The Epics never tire of preaching the superiority and divinity of the Brāhmaṇas. They take rank with the cow above the lesser gods. The Brāhmaṇas were specially favoured by the law. But the legal and social privileges of the Brāhmaṇa were purchased in the main by unparalleled self-abnegation in regard to things material. He had to condemn himself to perpetual poverty and mendicancy, in order to conquer the high intellectual and moral pedestal from which he ruled and which the other Vāraṇas appear on the whole to have willingly conceded to him.

Brāhmanic culture originally a proselytising culture, and Rṣis advance guards of this culture in Non-Aryan land.

The Rāmāyana furnishes interesting evidence of the proselytising methods of the Brahmana, for Brahmanic culture in the beginning was

---

109 M., Anuśā, cli-clii.
110 It is not necessary to subscribe to all the charges levelled against Brahmanism by the sceptical school of Čārvāka, for the view that a certain element of charlatanism went to make up the practices by means of which the Brāhmaṇas made good their position as authorised intermediaries between the gods and men. It is obvious however that this position could not be maintained for any length of time by charlatanism alone; and the holiness of the Brāhmaṇas in the age of the Epics was, as a whole, far from assumed.
unquestionably a proselytising culture. The Aryan States were surrounded by a belt of forests inhabited by man-eating rākṣasas. It is to these forests that the Rāsis chose to betake themselves for completing the final stages of their penances. Naturally they interfered with the aboriginal denizens of the forests and the latter interfered with them. Complaints of maltreatment were duly conveyed to the Rāja, whose bounden duty it was to secure the safety of the Brāhmaṇa hermits. This ended in the clearing of the jungles of the savages and a progressive enlargement of the Aryan "pale." Those of the aborigines who acquiesced in the new regime became Niśādas and Cāṇḍālas and were thus absorbed within the folds of Aryanism, though no doubt they were assigned a very low place in the Varnāśrama scheme.\(^{111}\)

_Brahmanic culture one, though States many. Unity maintained by travelling Rāsis and universally resorted to tīrthasthānas._

It was the Rāsis too who carried about and kept alive Brāhmaṇic culture within the "pale," irrespective of political boundaries. The whole Aryan land was studded over with tīrthasthānas (places of pilgrimage), and travelling from tīrtha to tīrtha, visiting Kings on the way and holding religious conferences with learned men of their courts, were parts of the preparation of the tāpas on the way to mokṣa.\(^{112}\) The Rāsis in fact did not belong to any particular State; they were honoured and respected by all, and received visits from all parts of the country and from all classes of people. All denominations of men were encouraged to visit the tīrthasthānas, whereby, they were assured, they could cast off their burdens of accumulated sins, and acquire religious merit of great efficacy more easily and expeditiously than by dharma and prāyaścitta laboriously performed at home.\(^{113}\)

_Varṇāśrama-dharma, essence of this culture._

It was thus that unity of culture was maintained, notwithstanding the innumerable fragments into which the land and society were politically divided. As will be presently seen, the relations between King and King were invariably the reverse of friendly. But each King in his place, thirsting eternally to conquer, and if possible exterminate

\(^{111}\ R. \textit{Ādi, xix; Aranyā, i and vi.}\)

\(^{112}\ M., \textit{Śānti, cccxx, cccxxv.}\)

\(^{113}\ M., \textit{Anuśā, xxv; Vana, lxxii-xx.}\)
his neighbours or win Indraloka by death on the battlefield, was still an instrument of the self-same culture represented by the \textit{Varṇāśrama-dharma}.

\textit{Indo-Aryan Imperialism.}

That this unity of culture should often seek to embody itself in a Universal State is what might be expected. To extend his hegemony over the Aryan world was the goal of ambition of every powerful King, and its establishment was signalled by the performance of the \textit{Rājaśīya} or the \textit{Āśvamedha Yajña}.

\textit{Bhāratavarṣa of the Epics compared to Italy in the Middle Ages.}

\textit{Indian Nitiśastras comparable with Machiavelli's Prince, but superior to it.}

The nearest historical parallel to the inter-State relations of Kings to Kings in Epic India that occurs to me is that found in the Italy of Machiavelli; and it is no mere coincidence that in the \textit{Śāntiparva} of the \textit{Mahābhārata}, there should be precepts addressed to Princes which for worldly wisdom and cynicism would cast entirely into the shade the whole body of doctrines lovingly garnered by the shrewdly observant Florentine in his \textit{Prince}. A Prince owed no sort of obligation to his brother Princes, for to him every one of his neighbours was a potential enemy. A Prince therefore, whenever he felt himself to be sufficiently powerful, must try by stratagem if possible (and failing stratagem, by force) to appropriate the land and the treasure of his neighbour. To rob a neighbouring Prince of his treasure, so far from being regarded as a sin, was a specially commended Kṣatriya virtue. To his neighbour's subjects, the King was advised to say: "Let me be your King; I shall protect you most effectively and you in return shall pay me taxes and swear allegiance to me." If they submitted, well and good; if not, they had to be subdued by force. There were of course certain rules of the game to be observed even by Kings towards Kings, but they need never have placed serious obstacles in the way of a powerful Prince straining after suzerainty. "Let him be kind after conquest. All sins incurred in conquest are atoned for by righteous

114 \textit{M., Śānti, xcvii.}

115 \textit{M., Śānti, lxv. 4; lxix, 19-29.}

116 \textit{M., Śānti, xcv. 6; xcvii. 20.}

117 \textit{M., Śānti, xcv. 2-3.}

118 \textit{M., Śānti, xcv. 13-23.}
govemance after conquest." 119 "Forswearing anger, desire and pride, the King shall hourly seek out the weak points of the enemy." 120 "As a fowler decoys birds to death by imitating their notes, so too shall the King appearing to his enemy as his well-wisher circumvent his subjugation or destruction. 111 "When the enemies are numerous it is not safe to attack them all at once. You must avoid doing that even when you have the power. But according to circumstances, by means of treaty (sāma), subsidy (dāna), intrigue (bheda), or force (daṇḍa), subdue them in detail, and then fall upon the few remaining with all your might." 112 One of the most effective methods of weakening an enemy Prince is to deplete his treasury; therefore "encourage him to spend money in expensive yajñas by which means you weaken him and please the Brāhmanas." 113—two birds killed with one stone. "Of three things let no residue be left: debt, fire and enemy." 114 "When you feel disposed to strike another let the castigation be always accompanied by kind words." 115 "It is a wise man's part to shed tears and express sorrow even when you proceed to cut off a man's head." 116 "The King should always raise hopes in the hearts of suitors by promises, but repeatedly put off their fulfilment, always however taking care to cite cogent reasons therefor." 117 "The wise man should be far-seeing as a vulture, immovable as a crane, wide-awake as a dog, fierce as a lion and sharp-witted as a crow." 118 "Try by every means to make others trust you, but never put your trust in others." 119 "Be firm or pliant according to circumstance, for often pliancy will succeed where firmness will fail." 110 It will indeed be no exaggeration to say that from the Śāntiparva alone it may be possible to compile a text-book for rulers, twice as substantial as Machiavelli's Prince and as many times more full of cynical wisdom.

The reason of this superiority is that what appears in the Prince as the observations of a single person had time to develop into a science in Epic India. The condition of things which gives birth to this kind of literature had lasted for such a long time in Ancient

119 M., Śānti, xcvii. 4-9.
120 M., Śānti, ci. 23.
121 M., Śānti, ci. 10-11.
122 M., Śānti, ci. 33-39.
123 M., Śānti, ci. 15-20.
124 M., Śānti, ex1. 58.
125 M., Śānti, ex2. 34.
126 M., Śānti, ci. 62.
127 M., Śānti, ex2. 55-56.
India, that it was possible to develop and systematise the ideas gathered by different observers into a science. The account of the origin of Nitišāstra given in the 59th chapter of the Śāntiparva is, of course, mythical, but it at least demonstrates that the science took a long time to develop and was also developed with care; and because it was developed in schools and not in the brains of an individual politician, much the larger portion of the Indo-Aryan Nitišāstra bears but little resemblance to what may be found in the Prince, being unlike it inspired often by the loftiest moral idealism.

*Weak point of Indo-Aryan Imperialism. It aimed at Feudal suzerainty rather than empire.*

It appears thus that extension of territory and power by fair means or otherwise was enjoined upon every Prince. But the circumstances of the times did not favour the growth and consolidation of territorial empires in the modern sense, and the invariable issue of imperialistic ambition in an Indo-Aryan Prince was the conversion of all but his closest neighbours into feudal tributaries, and that only for the time being. Conquering Princes were indeed advised wherever practicable to establish the son or other heir of an enemy who had been vanquished and killed on the vacant throne as a tributary.181 This, indeed, was the weak point of pre-Buddhistic Aryan imperialism. The hegemony of which every ambitious Aryan King dreamed and which he ruthlessly pursued was necessarily short-lived.182

*Imperial significance of the Rājasūya yajña.*

The attainment of hegemony was signalised, as already indicated by the institution of the appropriate yajña. It was the world-con-

181 Thus after Kurukṣetra Vedavyāsa tells Yudhiṣṭhira, “Now by the strength of your arms, you after vanquishing your enemies have, like Indra, become undisputed master of the Earth and the Oceans. Therefore, visit the countries of the rulers who have fallen in battle and give their brothers, sons and grandsons their respective kingdoms, preserve their issue if still in the womb, and by pleasing the subjects betake to governing the world according to dharma. Give the kingdoms of those who have left no sons to their daughters. Women are by nature fond of enjoying the good things of this world. Therefore, once they are established in the possession of Royal estate, they will give up sorrowing.” (Śānti, xxviii. 42-45.)

182 The fact that the conquered rulers or in case they were killed their family were not dispossessed, explains the readiness with which weaker princes made their submission to the more powerful. It also explains why these campaigns of so-called
queror alone who would be justified in instituting the Rājasūya. "He who is the worshipped of all and is the lord of the Earth, he alone is fit to perform Rājasūya."

The Rājasūya of Yudhishthira.

Yudhishthira, after he had consolidated his rule at Indraprastha, being advised to perform this yajña, took counsel with Kṛṣṇa who pointed out to him that King Jarāsandha of Magadha having subdued all rivals had established himself as the sole ruler of an undivided world. Many Kings, amongst them that powerful King of the Yavanas, Bhagadatta, had accepted him as suzerain. His own people, powerful though they were, had fled their kingdom in Northern India and betaken themselves to Dvārakā on the sea coast, which they had found it prudent so to fortify that even women could fight from behind the ramparts. He warned him that so long as Jarāsandha was alive, it was impossible for Yudhishthira to perform this yajña. Jarāsandha had first to be removed, and removed he was, partly by stratagem, and his son established on his throne as a tributary King. But even then Yudhishthira did not feel justified in undertaking this yajña. His four brothers led out armies in all directions, Arjuna to the north, Bhīma to the east, Sahadeva to the south and Nakula to the west, and the Kings all round were made to submit by force or persuasion, the conditions including attendance by the Kings with rich presents at the yajña. Not all kings, it appears, responded to the appeal of force only. As is well-known, this yajña of Yudhishthira did not pass off very smoothly. Śiśupāla fell out with Kṛṣṇa, greatly resenting the special honour paid to the latter, and declared: "We did not pay tribute to Kaunteya from fear or avarice, nor were we induced to do so by cajolery. It was because we found him intent upon practising dharma and well-versed in imperial governance that we became his tributaries. But he has failed to do us suitable honour."

These yajñas on a large scale, like the Olympic games of Greece, provided unique opportunities for the gathering together of all the leading Kṣatriyas and Brāhmaṇas of Āryāvarta. But it did create

conquest (dīvṛjaya), unless complicated by a family feud, seldom took on the character of a fight to the finish.

133 M., Sabhā, xiii, 47. 134 M., Sabhā, xiv.
bad blood among the more powerful. When Rāma confided to his brothers his plan of holding this *yajñā*, the kind-hearted ascetic prince Bharata dissuaded him because it would provoke feelings of enmity and the desire to conquer amongst the powerful Princes of the world, which would inevitably end in a cruel war of extermination. So although Rāma's superiority over the other Kings was unquestioned, let him, he advised, rather perform the humaner Aśvamedha and save the world from the evils of war. Rāma accepted Bharata's suggestion. It is clear from the *Mahābhārata* itself that when Yudhiṣṭhira lost his empire to Duryodhana over a game of dice, though he was advised that it would be quite in accordance with Kṣatriya *dharma* to re-conquer what he had lost by force of arms, he desisted from trying issues immediately for one reason, amongst others, that there was so much soreness of feeling left in the minds of Kings by the *Rājasūya*, that it would be difficult for Yudhiṣṭhira to collect a sufficient following, and the very much larger army which Duryodhana was able to gather round him at Kurukṣetra was as much owing to his superior diplomacy and tact as to the legacy of jealousy and hatred left by the *Rājasūya* in the hands of its designers. The experiment was not repeated after the Kurukṣetra though the issue of the battle was more decisive than the campaigns of conquest which preceded the *Rājasūya*. Yudhiṣṭhira performed the milder *Aśvamedha*, the ostensible object of which was to rid the king of his sins. Yet as the principal part of the ceremony consisted in a challenge that the King through whose territory the sacrificial horse passed must either give it and its escort free passage or be forced by battle to do so, the issue in either case being his acceptance of an invitation to

137 *M.*, *Sabhā*, xii. 30.
138 *R.*, *Uttara*, xvi.
139 *M.*, *Vana*, xxxvi. The *Vaiśvāna-yajña* of Duryodhana. After the banishment of the Pāṇḍavas following on Yudhiṣṭhira's unlucky game of dice with Śakuni, Karna, in order to emulate the victories of the Pāṇḍavas, undertook by himself to secure the submission of the world to Duryodhana. His plan of conquest having been attended with complete success, Duryodhana mooted the idea of holding a *Rājasūya yajña*, but was persuaded instead to perform the *Vaiśvāna-yajña*. "Let the kings who have become your tributaries," Duryodhana was told, "persuade you, out of gold given by them, to fashion a golden plough and give you leave to drive it across the *yajña* field, and a great *yajña* attended by the distribution of immense quantities of eatables be performed thereon." "This *yajña*," he was assured "was equal to the *Rājasūya*." *M.*, *Vana*, ccliv.
attend at the ceremony of sacrifice, it was indirectly symbolical also of acceptance of vassalage.¹⁴³

Use of the Imperialistic idea by Rāma to justify the killing of Bāli.

An instructive reference to this Indo-Aryan version of Imperialism will be found in Rāma’s elaborate defence of his assassination of Bāli. If the killing of the Śūdra tāpasa Śambuka, described in the Uttarakāṇḍa, be left out of account on the ground of its being an ill-executed graft upon the main story, the removal by Rāma of Bāli is about the darkest blot on his otherwise beautiful character, for his somewhat belated abandonment of Śītā might admit of arguments both favourable and unfavourable, regard being had to the position a King in his age had to maintain in the eyes of his subjects. When Rāma approaches the fallen warrior, Bāli addresses him words which in point of logic appear to be absolutely crushing. “I knew you to be a virtuous prince. But you have proved yourself to be one of those who practise virtue in public in order the better to be able to commit crimes in secret. You never suffered any indignity at my hand, and I have committed no offence in your kingdom or city. The jungles that are my possession could not have excited your cupidity, because they contain neither cultivated fields, nor gold, nor silver. By killing me and thereby establishing friendship with Sugrīva, you hoped to secure an ally who would help you to recover Śītā. But even there you acted foolishly in not seeking rather my alliance. Had you asked me, I could have brought Śītā from the uttermost ends of the earth and Rāvaṇa himself into the bargain alive and with a halter round his neck.” The argument of Bāli would have silenced any one but an Imperialist. But Rāma for the nonce was an Imperialist. “The mountains, the woods and the forests,” said the Prince grandiloquently, “and in fact the whole earth are within the peace (adhiṅkāra) of the Ḡṛṣṇāvāku Kings. They are entitled to punish or do favour to men, beasts and birds of all places. The truth-loving, straight-forward and virtuous Bharata is the Imperial Master of this earth. Nobody in his adhiṅkāra can with impunity violate the dharma. I and other Princes are going about the world under his orders for the purpose of spreading dharma (dharma-santana). Under the directions of our Imperial Master and remaining ourselves in the path of dharma, we punish those who violate the regulations of dharma.

¹⁴³ M., Asvame., lxxii-lxxxviii.
according to law. You are not fulfilling the dharma of a King, therefore you deserve punishment. I found you guilty of a capital crime, viz.: seduction of your younger brother's wife; and I have passed on you the capital sentence according to law. Your sin would have been mine if, knowing your guilt, I, instead of executing on you the proper sentence, had condoned your offence.” It, of course, did not matter—it hardly ever does—that according to their own law—non-Aryan law—seduction of a younger brother’s wife might not have been a capital crime. The “White man” had his “burden” even in the Tretāyuga. Moreover one does not assassinate a culprit in order to punish him. But the Imperialist was not to be silenced by such a plea. Do Kings kill game after notice? And Bāli, a monkey, was good enough game for a Kṣatriya Prince. Says the poet: “When Rāma had said this, Bāli who was well-versed in the mysteries of dharma was overcome by contrition and held his tongue.” But this elaborate sophistry failed to convince future generations, as is testified by, amongst others, Arjuna who was at least equally well-grounded in the knowledge of dharma.

**Enemies of the Brahmana culture within the gate.**

I have suggested before that the Rṣis retiring into forests constituted the advance guard of Indo-Aryan culture, much as the Christian missionaries in recent times have acted as the advance guards of European culture. The arms of the Kṣatriya followed to complete the Aryanisation. Some of the Kṣatriyas apparently entered into the spirit of the game more thoroughly than others, but some did not prove altogether tractable. Traditions of by-gone wars of extermination, between Kṣatriyas and Brāhmaṇas, reverberate through the Epics. Brāhmaṇa culture called for willing Kṣatriya champions to crush enemies within the gate as well as without, even in the age of the Mahābhārata, when surviving all shocks, it appears to have finally established itself as the last word in Indo-Aryan culture.

**Kṛṣṇa the champion of Brāhmaṇa culture in the Mahābhārata.**

The great champion of Brahmanic culture in the Mahābhārata is not Yudhiṣṭhira or any of the other Pāṇḍavas, but Kṛṣṇa. Duryo-

---

141 R., Kīsaki., xvii—xviii.
142 M., Droṇa, excv. 35.
143 M., Sānti, xlix; Aśvame., xxix; Anuṣṭā, clii; Sānti, lxix. 93—94, Harie, v.
dhana (whose rule, as we have already seen, was according to the testimony of the people themselves as benevolent as that of Śāntanu himself) coquetted with the Rākṣasa Rṣi Cārvāka and had numerous Rākṣasa and Mleccha friends who came and loyally fought for him on the field of Kurukṣetra. Duryodhana having done all this and raised a Sūta’s son to the peerage appears to have run counter to the ultimate purposes of Brahmanic culture, though otherwise the methods of his government did not differ materially from those of Yudhiṣṭhira. The poet does indeed try to make out that Duryodhana and his brothers were incarnations of the Asuras, just as the Pāṇḍavas are in the same way sought to be made out as incarnations of the Gods. As a theological effort, this attempt to convert the battle of the Kurus and Pāṇḍavas into one between the Gods and the Demons seems to me to possess but little worth, for many reputed incarnations of the Gods are found arrayed on Duryodhana’s side, Karna, Bhīma and others, and Vikarna, a brother of Duryodhana and a leading Dhārtarāṣṭra, was unquestionably the preux chevalier of the joust.

Historical interpretation of the war of Kurukṣetra.

But the attempt is not wholly without a meaning. Kṛṣṇa favoured Yudhiṣṭhira apparently because he appeared to him to be the one Prince who by inclination and training and also by reason of his unparalleled moral prestige was best fitted to win the Empire and establish the Varnāśrama-dharma on a secure imperialistic footing. The large influx of barbarians and their absolute prevalence in some places which had been brought into intimate political relationship with the Indo-Aryan States (as for instance Prāgjyotisha and Kāmboja) constituted a serious menace to the Varnāśrama-dharma, particularly as there were Princes who (from our modern point of view, not unreasonably) seemed inclined to compromise with these anti-Aryan forces. No one saw through the game which was being played on the arena of Bhāratavarṣa more clearly than Kṛṣṇa and, so far as he himself was concerned, he played his part in it with consummate skill. This champion of Brahmanism was himself always able to rise superior to the narrow injunctions of Brāhmaṇa morality whenever the larger interests of

144 M., Sūnti, xxxviii.
145 M., Udyoga, xix, exxvii.
146 M., Ādi, exxvi.
147 M., Vana, celvi. 27—28.
148 M., Ādi, lxiv—lxvii.
149 M., Sabhā, lxviii.
Brahmanism as an institution seemed to be in danger. He fought his enemies where necessary with their own weapons of circumvention and deceit. Too narrowly examined, his methods often seem dangerously near justifying the means by the end.  

Amongst the most powerful supporters of the Pāṇḍava cause in the battles of Kurukṣetra was Ghaṭotkaca Bhīma’s son by a Rākṣasī and himself by appearance and breeding a Rākṣasa. He performed prodigies of valour on behalf of the Pāṇḍavas in Kurukṣetra and there were times when the latter were saved from defeat by this Rākṣasa placing himself in the breach. His last and most glorious battle was with Karṇa. But when tidings of his death at the hand of Karṇa are brought to Kṛṣṇa, the latter literally dances with joy! This strange behaviour calls for an explanation and this is what is offered: “This last fight of Ghaṭotkaca with Karṇa,” Kṛṣṇa declares, “was specially contrived by him to serve two purposes.” Karṇa had in reserve a weapon of great potency which by divine dispensation was bound to be fatal to whomsoever it might be aimed at. It had been reserved by Karṇa for the destruction of Arjuna. As Yudhiṣṭhira could not win the war without Arjuna and Arjuna had to be saved, Karṇa had to be provoked into spending this weapon upon somebody else, who should be warrior enough to need a lot of killing. So Ghaṭotkaca is put forward at Kṛṣṇa’s instance as Karṇa’s target. But this was only half the explanation. There were other warriors who might have served the purpose just as well. But Kṛṣṇa indeed did not desire that Ghaṭotkaca should live. “This Rākṣasa,” Kṛṣṇa said, “was the enemy of Brāhmaṇa (Brāhmaṇa-videśin), a destroyer of yajñas and dharma (yajña-dvēshin and dharmaśya-loptā), and wicked (pāpātmā). If Karṇa had not put him out of the way, it would have been necessary for himself, Kṛṣṇa, later on to destroy him with his own hand. Jarāsandha and Śiśupāla’s deaths had been compassed by him for a similar reason.”

The Brāhmaṇa rule had to be re-established on a firmer and securer foundation by destroying Duryodhana and installing Yudhiṣṭhira in his place. So behind the personal squabbles of Duryodhana and Bhīma, behind the meannesses and vacillations of Dhṛtarāṣṭra which the righteous counsel of Vidura hardly sufficed to counteract, behind the

150 See in this connection Duryodhana’s catalogue of charges against Kṛṣṇa in M., Salya, lxi.
151 M., Droṇa, clxxviii—clxxix.
unnamable insults and indignities heaped in public upon Draupadi, behind all these lurked a struggle between orthodoxy and dissent, between the conservative and the radical.\textsuperscript{154} For the moment, the conservative and the orthodox, the Sanātana-varṇāśrama-dharma prevailed. But revolt and revolution were already looming on the horizon.\textsuperscript{155} With that, however, I am not concerned in the present discussion.

\textit{Unequal prevalence of Indo-Aryan culture over Bhratavarsha: The testimonies of Karna and Salya.}

That the Aryan culture, though one, did not prevail in equal degree everywhere, even within the Aryan "pale," is brought out distinctly in the exchange of compliments which passed between Sālya and Karna on the assumption by the latter of the office of Senāpati of the Kauravas and the grudging acceptance by Sālya, at the earnest solicitation of Duryodhana, of the humbler office of Karna’s charioteer. Sālya, it will be remembered, was the brother of Mādhri, the mother of the two youngest Paṇḍavas, but he had been tricked by Duryodhana into joining his forces with those of Duryodhana against his own nephews.\textsuperscript{156} But having joined him, he loyally fought for

\textsuperscript{154} Cf. \textit{Srimad Bhāgavata}, Part I, Ch. viii.

\textsuperscript{155} The \textit{Mahābhārata} (Vana, clxxvii), and the \textit{Purāṇas} (which came after it) abound in balsful predictions of the impending Kaliyuga and in places go into details concerning the cataclysmic lapses from dharma which people would exhibit in that degenerate age. The modern reader will of course be perfectly justified in assuming that these passages were written not before but after the inception of the Kaliyuga. The advent of Kaliyuga really stands for the complete breakdown under its own weight of the \textit{Varṇāśrama-dharma}. What is repeatedly stated to be the distinguishing mark of the Kaliyuga is that the Brāhmaṇas and Kṣatriyas would abandon their specific dharmas, the Brāhmaṇas in particular taking to the occupations of the Śūdras, whilst the latter would adopt the śāstras of the Brāhmaṇas and that all Vānas alike would make wealth their principal pursuit. There is no doubt that the breakdown of the \textit{Vāṇāśrama-dharma} which ushered in the dreaded Kaliyuga had the immediate effect of letting in a wave of agnosticism and materialism, in the midst of which people who would not submit to the current dared to look for no secure haven of refuge than the very slippery one offered by Buddhism. Buddhism provided no remedy, hardly even a palliative, for a malady in the body-politic which really consisted in a total want of adjustment (moral, economic and social) between the new realities of Indo-Aryan life and the antiquated theory by which it was sought to be regulated and directed. In so far as it tended to loosen all traditional ties, at the same time that it failed to provide effective substitutes, Buddhism had a pronouncedly anarchistic trend.

\textsuperscript{156} \textit{M.}, Udyoga, viii.
him and succeeded Karna in the command, and with his fall, the battle of Kuruksetra virtually came to an end. Karna was to meet Arjuna. Krsna was Arjuna’s charioteer. Karna needed a princely charioteer like Krsna to match Arjuna and his choice fell upon Salya. At first Salya demurred. He would not admit that Karna was the better warrior. But granting that he was, he, Salya, was a Royal Prince, throned and annointed as such. Was he to serve as a charioteer to this upstart son of a professional chanter? Were not the Sutas, the menial servants of Ksatriyas? Ultimately however he was prevailed upon by Duryodhana to accept the degrading office, but expressly on one condition, viz: that he was to have absolute liberty to speak his mind freely to Karna.

It was not long before Salya exercised this privilege. Karna was a greater warrior even than Arjuna, a loyal servant, a model husband and father, kind-hearted and bounteous, but he was ill-bred and overweeningly boastful. He called loudly to be shown where Arjuna was and offered untold riches—the fruits of his yet to be won victory—to whoever should tell him where Arjuna was. Salya was not slow to warn him that it was too early yet to count the chickens since the eggs had not been hatched, and added with unpardonable malice that he could not believe that a jackal like Karna would succeed in killing two lions like Arjuna and Krsna. Karna was justifiably angry, and ill-bred as he was, fell to abusing Salya and everything that concerned him. But for the squabble thus brought about (or imagined by the poet—it does not matter which) some very valuable chapters in the Mahabharaata on contemporary ethnography would never have been written.

"You Salya," said Karna, "are the King of the Madrakas and as such share to the extent of one-sixth (?) in the merits and iniquities of your people, assuming you do your duty by them as a King, which however you never do and therefore participate only in the iniquities." "The Madrakas, Sauviras and Saindhavas," he said, "are Mleechas and their practices are to the last degree unholy and their country is accursed. Their men and women eat and drink and associate in promiscuity. The Gandharakas are just as bad and the people who inhabit the coun-
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156 M., Salya, vi-vii.
157 See the last chapter of the Bhismaparva.
158 M., Karna, xxxi-xxxv.
159 M., Karna, xxxix.
160 M., Karna, xi, xliiv.
tries of the Aṛaṭṭas, the Vāhikas, Prasthaḷ, Khas and Bosati are no better." The gravamen of Karna’s charges against these people appears to me to have been that they ate prohibited food and their women were, according to approved Aryan standards, immodest and that in general their practices, of both men and women, were outlandish. Apparently the people of the Paṅcanada (the Punjab) observed other customs than those approved by the Indo-Aryans of the Middle East or, what is more probable, followed them but indifferently. Their Kings were Aryans, or else Dhṛtarāṣṭra could not have wedded a Gāndhāra Princess (and Gāndhāri was Indo-Aryan to her finger-tips), nor Pāṇdu a daughter of the King of the Madrakas. But their subjects, if originally Aryans, had apparently failed to keep pace with those of the Kuru and Paṅcāla Princes.\textsuperscript{131} It is stated that among the Aṛaṭṭas, sister’s sons and not sons became heirs, and to Karna, this perversion of the law of succession appeared to be due to one reason and one only, that their women were so unchaste that nobody could be sure as to who might be his son. To us, of course, with our better knowledge of anthropology, this merely shows that the Aṛaṭṭa tribes were matriarchally organised. "The good men amongst the Kurus," Karna goes on, "amongst the Paṅcālas, the Šālvas, the Matsyas, the Naimisās, the Kośalas, the Kāṣapa-pauṇḍras, the Kālingas, the Māgadhas and the Cedīs know all about dharma and act accordingly. In fact even the wicked amongst them are not unequainted with the mysteries of the true faith, and the old men of Northern Aṅga and Magadha follow approved customs though without appreciating their religious motives. But the people of the East behave like Śādras, those of Dākṣinātya are enemies of dharma, the Vāhikas are thieves and the Saurāśtrās half-breds." Elsewhere we find it stated that the people of Vaṅga and Prāgyotisha were Mlechchas.\textsuperscript{132} So much for the practices of the various tribes inhabiting the Aryan "pale." Karna leaves us in no doubt also as to their relative intellectual capacity. "The Māgadhas," he says, "do not stand in need of being spoken to, since signs suffice for their comprehension (in-gitajña). The Kośalas understand what they see, the Kauravas and

\textsuperscript{131} Upon data furnished by the Vedas and the Brāhmaṇas, it appears to be conclusively established that the Vedic rituals and practices had been developed in the country of the Kuro-Pāṅcāla. See Macdonell, History of Sanskrit Literature, pp. 174, 207, 213–214. The conclusion, if corroboration is needed, is amply borne out by Karna.

\textsuperscript{132} \textit{M.}, Droṇa, xcvii, etc.
Pāñchālas before the words have been half-spoken, and the Śāivas not unless the whole thing has been spoken out. The Śibis are like the hill-people, extremely stupid. The Mlecchas and Yavanas, though cultured (sarvajñā) and very powerful, still observe dharma of their own invention (sva-samijñā-niyata, as opposed evidently to the scriptural dharma of the Indo-Aryans), and as for the rest, they learn dharma if taught, the Vāhikas not unless they are castigated, but the Mādrakas are beyond both castigation and instruction." Salya was evidently amused by this outburst; but he replied with becoming gravity and self-restraint: "You will find Brāhmaṇas, Kṣatriyas, Vaiśyas and Śūdras (i.e. Varnāśrama-dharma) and chaste women everywhere. Everywhere men speak with ridicule of other men, and everywhere you meet with men who give free reins to their passions. It is easy, Karna, to discuss other people's faults, whilst you overlook your own. Even when you have come to know your own, you forget them. Everywhere, Kings remaining in the path of their dharma are restraining the wicked. You will find virtuous people in every country. It is absurd to affirm that all the people of a country are wicked. In many places, many people have, by the purity of their character, surpassed even the Gods." 145

The dharma of the non-Aryans and of others partially Aryanised.

I have previously stated that the Aryan culture was a proselytising culture. The following from the Sāntiparva will probably place the matter beyond doubt: Māndhātā asks Indra, "How are the Yavanas, Kirātas, Cinas, Śabarases, Barbaras, Śakas, Tuṅgaras, Kaṅkas, Palhavas, Candras, Mādrakas, Pauṇḍras, Puliṇdas, Ramaṭhas, Kāmbojas, as also Vaiśyas and Śūdras and others who have descended from the Brāhmaṇas and Kṣatriyas, to follow dharma, and how should we (the Aryan Kings) make those Dasyus follow the dharma?" Indra replies, "Mahārāja it is the duty of the Kings by all means to see that the Dasyus serve their parents, their preceptors and the King, that they carry out the injunctions of the Vedas, that they offer oblations to their ancestors, that they dig wells, provide sleeping and other requisites to Brāhmaṇas, forswear cruelty and hatred, observe the truth, maintain their families, refrain from quarrelling, be chaste in conduct, pursue their own betterment and give the daksīṇas of all yajñas to Brāhmaṇas," and so on. "Whatever has been laid down

145 M., Karna, xlv.
previously as the *dharma* for other people, (*sāvajanika-dharma?*) even Dasyus must fulfil that *dharma.*" The Dasyus too appear to have increasingly felt the spell of the Brahmanic culture, and many were content to accept quite a low place in the *varṇadharma* scheme provided they secured admission into the Aryan fold. In chapter cxxxiii of the *Sāntiparva*, the right attitude of the Aryan King towards the Dasyus is indicated. It is pointed out that Dasyus, when kind-hearted, protect innumerable people. They are greatly averse to killing people who are unwarlike, to ingratitude, to robbing Brahmanas of their little all, to depriving people of everything they possess, to stealing girls and seducing married women. This shows that many of the non-Aryan tribes were quite civilised and the King is advised not to dispossess the Dasyus but to subdue them. The Dasyus had besides other uses. "On occasions requiring exceptional efforts, it is possible to get countless soldiers from amongst the Dasyus." Chapter cxxxiv.

164 M., *Sānti*, lxxv. 13-22. This is cited as an old legend and appears to date from a time when the Vaiśyas and Śudras had not yet been completely affiliated as inferior Aryan castes; they were still regarded as Dasyus. Is there not ground for supposing that the Brāhmaṇas and Kṣatriyas were, in the main, a race of pastoral nomads who, like the Semetic conquerors of Sumer and Akkad, imposed themselves upon a more settled and less warlike agricultural and industrial population consisting of a higher order (who subsequently became the Vaiśyas) served in their turn by a caste of Śūdra helots? The aborigines whom the Aryan patriarchs met on the plains of the Punjab appear to have been all that is conveyed by the term Dasyus in the *Rigveda*, but in the valleys of the Ganges and the Yamunā, they must have had to deal with people possessing a culture on some points superior to their own. The conquered Vaiśyas must have been as exclusive as the conquering Aryans to make the barrier of castes impassable as it came to be. Or, it may be, that the Aryan conquerors found the conquered people already divided into an unmixed ruling and a servile class, much as were the population of Sparta and Carthage, and adapted the institution to their own purposes. This last supposition will commend itself to those who cannot persuade themselves that an institution so retrograde as the Indian caste could have originated among a tribe of "the Lord’s elect," the Aryans, without the corrupting example of some baser people. The cult of Śiva, with its accompaniment of phallic-worship must, all scholars agree, be non-Aryan, though Śiva figures in the Vedic hymns as Rudra. Why not attribute the origin of castes also to non-Aryans?

165 The word *Dasyu* is used in the *Mahābhārata* in its older sense of "non-Aryan" as well as in its modern sense of "robbers" in different contexts. But the text appears to have been altered by compilers and annotators who had lost sight of the older meaning, so as to make texts in which the word was used in the order sense bear a meaning consistent with its later sense. Chapter cxxxiii of the *Sāntiparva* an instance in point. In Chapter clxxviii, the same people are indifferently described as Mleccha, Kṛṣṭa or Dasyu.
xxxv of the Śāntiparva speaks of a Dasyu who "habitually practised Kṣatriya dharma, was wise, averse to cruelty, respectful towards Brāhmaṇas and others placed above him, very powerful and a most skillful hunter." This man, being installed by the Dasyus as their chief, is said to have acquired siddhi, by doing good to the good and dissuading the Dasyus from evil. Chapter clxviii speaks of a Mleccha country in the North where there were no Brāhmaṇas. A Brāhmaṇa beggar, Gautama, is there hospitably received by a wealthy Dasyu who "understood the differences between the Varnas, was respectful towards Brāhmaṇas, true to his promises and very charitable." Brahmanic culture had apparently cast its spell even outside the Aryan "pale."

Origin of Brāhmaṇas and Kṣatriyas wrapped in mystery.

But who originally were the Brāhmaṇas and who again were the Kṣatriyas? The only answers the Rāmāyaṇa and Mahābhārata give to these questions is that the Brāhmaṇas were created out of Brahmā's mouth, whilst the Kṣatriyas sprang out of his arms. Their origin therefore, so far as the Epics go, lies shrouded in mystery. What they came to be, we know. The Brāhmaṇas individually were colossal thinkers, the Kṣatriyas unrivalled administrators and fighters. We find the ideal administrator in Rāma and Yudhiṣṭhira; the ideal warrior not in Karna, nor in Arjuna, but in Abhimanyu.

Position of women in the age of the Epics.

There is no lack of material relevant to this topic in the Epics, but the result of their consideration as a whole is to leave the student in a state of considerable perplexity. I think, I shall not be wrong in saying that the position of women in India during this epoch in theory did not differ materially from that outlined in the Mānava Dharmasastra. 165 Like the Śūdras, women of whatever caste could not study the Vedas nor participate in the Vedic Sanskāras,167 but, as in the case of Śūdras, kindness towards women was sedulously preached and practised. 168 From no point of view and for no purpose, however, were women recognised as the equals of men. And yet those of them who

165 Cha. xxxviii—xlili., of the Anuśāsanaparva which constitute a sustained libel on women should not be regarded as typical.
166 M., Śānti, clxiv. 21.
168 M., Anuśā., xlvi.
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did not belong to the servile and venal classes (dāsis and ganikās) were habitually accorded a measure of freedom and respect which would have been envied by their Western sisters in the best days of Feudal chivalry. It is impossible to affirm that the commanding position held in their households by Kausalyā, Satyavati, Gándhāri and Kunti and the deep regard entertained for Sītā by Lākṣmaṇa and Hanumān were purely fortuitous and were not in any measure due to the environments surrounding them. The fact appears to have been that the practices of men in their dealings with women within their own orders had outstripped theory and indeed left it far behind. But there were in Indo-Aryan society facts more stubborn than theories, which the Indo-Aryan woman could neither get over nor conquer. In a society where the possession of numerous wives was a matter of pride for a man, the position of women generally could not have been socially very high. The Indo-Aryan man was under no obligation whatever to be faithful to his wife or wives. The obligation of chastity bound the weaker sex only. A man, it seems, had the free use of the bodies of his wife and of her dāsis. Fidelity to a single wife was no doubt viewed with approval, but it was so rare that the Rṣis did not find it worth their while to appraise its merits in terms of benefits to be enjoyed in the higher worlds. The man who made a special virtue of practising chastity in this world would presumably not need to be recompensed in the next in the manner provided by the Anuśāsanaparvā (cvi–cvii) for those who had performed special penances in the way of fasting. What use indeed would a soul with such a Samākāra have for Apsarases and Devāngana in the world beyond? And is not the use made, by poets, theologians and moralists alike, of the Apsarases in itself eloquent of the position women generally occupied in the social scale in the age of the Epics? I do not complain against the Svargalokas being people

169 Or is it possible that the position of women worsened under the Varnāśrama-dharma, but that practice never came near being as bad as the theory? I strongly suspect this to have been the case. The Varnāśrama-dharma must at many points have remained an unrealised ideal, more than is disclosed in the Epics and the Dharmasūtras. "Do not," says the Viṣṇupurāṇa (Part. III, ch. xi.), "practise dharma which is painful or is hated by the people."

170 Not apparently, if the latter did not consent (see Adiparva, cxvii, and Sabhāparva, lxxi). Cohabitation with another's wife was condemned no doubt because it was an infringement of the husband's rights. But, significantly enough, to be attached to a childless wife was viewed as equally sinful, the measure of the sin being in either case that incurred by robbing a Brāhmaṇa's wealth, (M., Anuśū., cxxix. 2).
by females as well as males. But the Apsaras ever ready to receive and minister to the physical needs of every newcomer do not improve these abodes of bliss artistically or otherwise. The descriptions of water-carnivals in the Mahābhārata leave an impression the reverse of agreeable.\(^{171}\) The extreme pathos of the Strivilāpa-parvādhyāya in the Mahābhārata is marred for the modern reader by the haunting suggestion of women’s inferiority conveyed in every line of Gāndhāri’s heart-breaking lament. All honour therefore to Daśaratha’s sons for constancy to their single spouses. In this they appear to have followed the dharma of the Prākṛtas rather than of Princes—for I would like to believe that in Indo-Aryan society (as in all societies) the position of women among the lower orders was higher than in the households of royal princes.

In this connection should be noted the oft-repeated and curiously sounding maxim: “A woman, a jewel and water are always pure.”\(^{172}\) I have seen it cited as indicative of the chivalrous regard of the Indo-Aryan man for his women! It really signifies, if it signifies anything at all, the contrary. It simply means that a man belonging to one of the higher orders was not degraded by associating with a woman of a lower order. Women who were not slaves were not indeed regarded as chattels. But that there were women slaves and much traffic in women is beyond question. No present or offering of tribute by King to King seemed to be complete unless it included dāsīs decked with jewels, and often whole hosts of them were presented.\(^{173}\) Mahārāja Bhagiratha attained mokṣa by, amongst other meritorious acts, gifts of countless cows, horses, she-mules and maidens decked with gold to Brāhmaṇas.\(^{174}\) What could these maidens be but girls bought and sold as slaves for money?\(^{175}\) Having in view the position of

\(^{171}\) M., Ādi, cexxii.

\(^{172}\) M., Śānti elxv. 32.

\(^{173}\) M., Sabhā, I, II, etc.

\(^{174}\) M., Droṣa, lviii and Śānti, xxix.

\(^{175}\) I do not admit that the position of women in India in the age of the Epics was lower than amongst the Greeks and the Romans. The position of women who constitute the dramatis personae of the two Epics is decidedly superior to that assigned to women in the Greek dramas. The position of women in general in relation to men in neither continent could really begin improving in the sense of attaining equality of status with men until the disappearance of slavery and traffic in girls. It is perhaps necessary to add that nowhere in the world has yet woman become the equal of man except in theory only and this she never will be in fact in any society which has failed to eliminate prostitution in every shape and form. The gotikās were a recognised institution in the Indo-Aryan polity. M., Udyoga lxxxviii, cxvii. 19. Hariv.
subordination to which women were in general relegated in the pre-
Buddhistic Indo-Aryan Society, I confess I draw a great deal of secret
satisfaction from the fact that the heroine of the Mahābhārata, Draupadi,
by sheer force of character, always held her own and in the end had
her way in every matter. The brave woman in the Mahābhārata is
not however Draupadi, but Gāndhārī, and in the Rāmāyaṇa, Sumitṛa,
though she speaks only twice. But womanhood in the higher orders
is perhaps more truly represented by the helpless Sītā than by these
stronger-minded women.

Vishnu P. xxix. 9. But modern societies, more hypocritical, seek to keep it in the back
ground. It is in most modern societies a hidden sore which festers and poisons the
body politic the more it is sought to be put out of sight. The dominating male being
selfish and the women, the minister of his pleasure for money, poor, it is not difficult
to see which way the remedy lies.

176 R., Ayodh., xi, xlv.

177 The Sāvitrī idyll. What, it may be enquired, about Sāvitrī? The story of
Sāvitrī and Satyavān as told in the Mahābhārata is a perfect literary gem, and must have
been composed by one who combined in himself the qualities of a great poet, a greater
Upaniṣad scholar and a master of Classical Sanskrit. The story is woven with mar-
vellous skill round an old legend and might have been written yesterday or the day
before without abating a jot from the sense, sentiment and expression of a single pas-
sage. It stands quite apart from the rest of the Mahābhārata and does not depend for its
effect upon local or contemporary colouring. Sāvitrī as drawn in the Mahābhārata is not
a woman, but an ideal. Not only had she no original in history, there never was a
woman like her anywhere at any time. It would, I think, be a sacrilege to try to view
her through the perspective of history. See M., Vana, cxvii-cxviii.
DECLINE OF BUDDHISM IN INDIA AND ITS CAUSES.

PRABODHCHANDRA BAGCHI, M.A., Research Assistant in Chinese, University of Calcutta.

The main causes of the decline can be distinguished as external and internal. As to external causes we are to enquire how far religious persecution is responsible for the decline of the Buddhist faith. On this point scholars are scarcely agreed. There are many authentic records giving evidence of persecutions of the Buddhist but so great a Buddhist scholar as Prof. Rhys Davids finds reasons to doubt if their motive was precisely religious. Nay, he even goes so far as to doubt if any credence can be given to the accounts of persecutions excepting those which relate to Mihiragula.

In the Divyavadāna, Pushyamitra is the first Hindu king who is represented as a persecutor of Buddhism. This tradition cannot easily be put aside and shelved as a pure invention of the Buddhist monks or a piece of sectarian misrepresentation. That there is a truth behind this tradition would appear to receive confirmation from other circumstantial evidence which is based upon indubitable historical facts.

According to the Purāṇas, Puṣyamitra was at first the commander-in-chief of Bṛhadṛatha, the last Maurya king. It is not known whether Bṛhadṛatha was a staunch supporter of Buddhism like his illustrious predecessor, king Asoka. Puṣyamitra put an end to the remnants of the great Mauryas and laid the foundation of the Suṅga supremacy. He was either a Brāhmaṇa by birth or an orthodox supporter of the Brahmanical cause as may be surmised from the names of his ancestors all of which appear to be Brahmanical, e.g. Sampadi, Bṛhaspati, Vṛṣasena, and Puṣyadharmā, Tārānāth, the Tibetan his-

1 J.P.T.S., 1896, pp. 87–92. 2 Divyavadāna, Ed. Cowell.
3 Pargiter, Dynasties of the Kali Age, p. 31:
 Puṣyamitra tu senānir uddhṛtya ca Bṛhadṛatham, kārayiṣyati ca rājyaṁ.
4 Divyavadāna.
Sampadeḥ Bṛhaspati putro, Bṛhaspatteḥ Vṛṣaseno, Vṛṣasenasya Puṣyadharmā, Puṣyadharmānāḥ Puṣyamitraḥ.
torian, distinctly calls him a Brāhmaṇa king. The performance of the aśvamedha sacrifice by Puṣyaṃitra, as is recorded by Kālidāsa is another bit of evidence which corroborates the Tibetan account. All these go to prove that a staunch supporter of Brahmanism as he was his attitude towards Buddhism could hardly be friendly. According to the Divyāvadāna account and Tārānāth’s history his attitude towards Buddhism was not only unfriendly but positively hostile. Above all, the Japanese Buddhist scholar Mr. R. Kimura informs us that Puṣyaṃitra has been always placed first in the list of religious persecutors by the ancient Chinese and Japanese scholars.

In face of this evidence, supplied by records, Buddhistic as well as Brahmanic, confirming each other, how can the historian be bold enough to say regardless of the motives and consequences that Puṣyaṃitra was not guilty of persecution?

However, the main question remains to be answered whether the motive was political or religious. This depends upon the answer to the question whether the aśvamedha sacrifice is political or religious. The answer we can suggest is that it is both. Puṣyaṃitra came to usurp the throne of Magadha when religion was not only intermingled with morality but also with politics.

Several centuries passed without any persecution. Under the Kushān kings Buddhism gained the status of a State religion. The imperial Guptas, though they styled themselves paramabhāgavatā were not religious fanatics. They never indulged in doing wrong to the Buddhists. Religion enjoyed as complete a toleration as during the administration of the Mauryas and other earlier kings. If tradition is to be relied upon to some extent, some of the Guptas even went so far as to patronise the Buddhists and if the “Balāditya Rājā” of Yūan Chwang’s account can be identified with Narasimhagupta Balāditya we

6 "Brahmanenkönig Puschjamitra," Tārānāth (translated by Schiefner, p. 81).
6 Mālaviyānīmitraḥ, Act. V.
8 Cf. The discussion about the patron of Vasubandhu in conclusion of which Dr. V. A. Smith says, “I therefore conclude that Samudragupta received Vasubandhu, the Buddhist author and patriarch, at court, either as a minister or as an intimate counsellor, with the sanction and approval of his father Chandragupta I. and, further that Samudragupta, although officially a Brahmanical Hindu, studied Buddhism in his youth with interest and partiality.” Early History of India (3rd ed.), p. 334.
have to say that one of the imperial Guptas founded the greatest Buddhist University at Nalanda.  

But circumstances changed towards the beginning of the 6th century A.D. The Hūṇa king Mihiragula appeared on the scene with his mission of persecution. This king, as Yüan Chwang records, "became dissatisfied at the conduct of the Buddhists whom he asked to provide him with a teacher capable of teaching śāstras and who provided him with only a monk of low origin and rank."  

He then began to persecute the Buddhists and slaughtered so many men that the "waters of the Sveti was red with blood." According to another Chinese account of Wang-puh he killed the twenty-fourth patriarch Simha. The Rājatarangini, the Kashmirian Chronicle, also attests the inhuman oppression of the Buddhists by him. That his motive was religious in these acts of oppression is clear from the very statement of Yüan Chwang that "he caused the demolition of 1600 topes and monasteries and put to death nine koṭis of lay adherents of Buddhism." None could have ventured any conclusion on this statement, had it not been corroborated from other sources.

The Rājatarangini lucidly puts forward the fact that it was Brāhmaṇas who enjoyed favour from him. It states that the Hūṇa Emperor "took to piety for the sake of collecting religious merits. Brāhmaṇas from Gandhāra accepted aghaharas from him." Elsewhere the Kashmirian chronicle distinctly attributes to him the foundation of a shrine of Śiva called Mihirēvara at Srinagar, modern Srinagar. Further, almost all the coins of Mihiragula, hitherto discovered, bear the Śaiva legend Śrī Mihirakulaḥ, jayatu Vṛṣaḥ. This legend quite unambiguously points out that Mihiragula was a Śaiva by religion.

That he had leanings towards sun-worship is also evident from the symbols of an eight-rayed sun on some of his coins. Kalhana in his chronicle also states that the king invaded Ceylon and brought for his queen the Yamushadeva cloth "stamped with an image of the sun" which he liked very much. If there is any truth in this statement it is that he had a leaning towards sun-worship. The very first part of

11 J.P.T.S.  
13 Rājatarangini, translated by Dr. A. Stein.  
14 Ibid.  
15 Ibid.
his name, Mihira, which is a name of the sun, is not inconsistent with this. Thus it appears that the king was a professed Sun-worshipper and a Śiva-worshipper throughout his life. Thus being the patron of alien religions and anti-Buddhistic in his attitude it was not at all inconsistent, on his part to begin a campaign of persecution as Yüan Chwang wants to have us believe.

Indirect evidence also supports us. "In Fahien's time Buddhism was still flourishing and there were 500 Sanghārāmas on the Swat river whereas in Hi'uen Tsiang's time all the convents were ruined and desolate, which shows that Mihiragula's persecution during which Sīmha was killed must have taken place after that period." 14 Fa-hien came to India towards the beginning of the 5th century A.D. and Yüan Chwang came towards the first quarter of the 7th century. Such a complete desolation as is spoken of in Yüan Chwang's account could hardly have taken place in the course of only two centuries. Besides, the Chinese accounts tell us that a large number of Indian monks came to China towards the beginning of the 6th century A.D., i.e. towards the time when the Hūna king was ruling in Kashmir. Does it not indicate that something was wrong in the motherland of these newly arrived priests? At least the opinion of such a Chinese scholar as Mr. Edkins, 17 who has ransacked the whole of Chinese literature, supports this conclusion. It will therefore be absurd to assert that Mihiragula was a headstrong king like Muhammad Toghlak, the reputed man-hunter, and that his devastation were due to motives other than religious, as Prof. Rhys Davids contends.

The last controversy centres round the king Śaśāṅka, the king of Ka-lo-na-su-fa-la-na (Karna-Suvarna?) in Bengal. A true historical account of this king is still wanting. But so far it is definitely settled that he was an elder contemporary of king Harṣavardhana and was one of his strong antagonists. The accusation has been categorically brought against him by Yüan Chwang in his records that this fanatic ruler caused the stone with the foot-prints of Buddha to be thrown into the Ganges and uprooted the Bodhi-tree at Bodh Gaya. 18 Besides, "by

16 J.P.T.S. 17 Chinese Buddhism, by Rev. Joseph Edkins, p. 93:
"At the beginning of the sixth century, the number of Indians in China was upwards of three thousand. . . . The decline of Buddhism in its motherland drove many of the Hindoos to the north of the Himalayas. They came as refugees from Brahmamical persecution."

his extermination of Buddhism the groups of brethren were all broken up."

These events took place only a few years before the arrival of Yüan Chwang and there cannot but be a kernel of truth in these statements even allowing sufficient room for exaggeration due to Buddhistic bias and predilection. Numismatic evidence also comes to our help. On his coins we have a representation of Śiva reclining on his bull. Again if Dr. Bühler \(^9\) is right in his identification of Śaśānka with Narendrāditya of several other coins and in his attribution of these coins, which bear the symbols of Nandīdhvaja to Śaśānka there is no room left for doubting that the Bengal king was a devout Śaiva and that consequently the tradition is not inconsistent in attributing acts of oppression of the Buddhists to him.

Lastly, Dr. V. A. Smith \(^9\) maintains that the greatest of the religious persecutors were the Musalmans. It cannot be really denied that wherever they went, they went with the sword in hand. They tried their utmost to extirpate the religions of the alien nations and their attempts mostly met with success. The history of India tells the same tale. Buddhism, already weak on account of its internal degeneration, could not stand against this unexpected inundation and the last remnants of the followers of that universal religion were completely washed away by the Islamic flood. The Muselman persecutions dealt the death-blow to the religion. The furious massacres perpetrated in many places by them were more efficacious than orthodox Hindu persecutions and had a great deal to do with the disappearance of Buddhism in several provinces. Dr. Vincent A. Smith illustrates it thus \(^{21}\) —"The fort of Bihar was seized by a party of only two hundred horsemen, who boldly rushed the postern gate and gained possession of the place. Great quantities of plunder were obtained, and the slaughter of the shaven-headed Brāhmaṇas, that is to say the Buddhist monks, was so thoroughly completed, that when the victor sought for some one capable of explaining the contents of the books in libraries of the monasteries, not a single living man could be found who was able to read them." Thus, "Buddhism as an organised religion in Bihar, its last abode in Upper India, south of the Himalaya, was destroyed once and for all by the sword of a single Muselman adventurer."

\(^9\) Cf. Allan Gupta Coins, Introduction.
\(^9\) Early History of India (3rd ed.), p. 404. \(^{21}\) Ibid., loc. cit.
It is to be admitted, however, that even before the arrival of the Musalmans, the religion was already in its decay otherwise it could have made a stand against this persecution. There were occasional Hindu persecutions even before this time but these could not do any very great harm. It must be noted that there was no regularity in these persecutions and whereas Protestantism in Europe could make a stand against such a strong and systematic persecution as the Spanish Inquisition it cannot be believed that these occasional persecutions were solely responsible for the disappearance of Buddhism in India. But what is certain is that these periodically recurring active persecutions were indications of the gradual loss of State patronage. These indicate a change from favour to disfavour. In Northern India the attitude of the kings towards Buddhism gradually changed. After the death of Aśoka no other king appeared who was as sincere and zealous a patron of Buddhism as he was. His grandson Samprati was a sworn Jaina. The Śunga and Kāñka kings were professedly hostile in their attitude towards the faith and patronised the Brahmanical religion quite ardently. The Kushān king Kaniska certainly did much for Buddhism but this was obviously from political motives. Buddhism was in the ascendant and it was necessary to embrace that religion and to patronise it for getting support from the Indian people. Sober history testifies to the fact that he worshipped a medley of gods. Some of his successors might have favoured the faith, but Vāsudeva certainly was a Bhāgavata by religion as his name suggests. The Śaka rulers of Mathurā were devout Jainas. Of the Gupta kings the majority were paramabhāgavatas. Though they were not fanatics and persecutors of Buddhism yet most of them cared little for the religion of Gautama Buddha. Harṣavardhana himself a great patron of the faith distributed his devotions among the three deities of the family:—Śiva, the Sun and Buddha.22 His successors on the throne of Kāñja—the Gurjaras—probably professed the Brahmanical religion; at least history does not point out any other faith. The Pāla kings of Bengal, who are said to have greatly favoured Buddhism, had in fact strong leanings towards Hinduism. The Pāla inscriptions contain references to the land grants made to Brāhmaṇas and to the respect shown to Brāhmaṇa Ministers. Dharmapāla, one of the earliest of these

22 Ibid., p. 345.
kings, even enjoins in his copper-plate grant in the fashion of a devout Hindu king.—

*bahuksir Vasudhā dattā rājabhīs Sagarādibhiḥ
yasya yasya yadā bhūmi tasya tasya tudā phalum
śaḍī-varṣa-sahasrāṇi svarge modati bhūmidāḥ.*

Does this not indicate that Buddhism was not so high in the estimation even of its royal patrons, not to speak of hostile kings, as it was in the days of Aśoka?

Such are a few of the external causes which contributed to the downfall of the religion. But as we have already remarked these cannot be solely responsible for the decline of the faith. And here Prof. Rhys Davids is right in maintaining that one must "seek elsewhere for the causes of the decline of the Buddhist faith." These causes are, in his opinion, partly "the changes that took place in the faith itself" and partly "the changes that took place in the intellectual standard of the people." Thus we come to another aspect of the question which involves the consideration of the internal causes of the decline.

Of these internal causes degeneration is of the foremost importance. The signs of this degeneration are manifest in the later phases of the faith. What we come to know from the records of Yüan Chwang leads us to believe that the faith had lost its pristine purity. Gods of the Brahmanic pantheon are gradually being incorporated and what can be called a Buddhistic pantheon—an element wholly inconsistent with the teachings of Gautama Buddha—is in the course of formation. The Buddhism taught at the Nālanda University distinctly bears two different stamps. The Buddhism prevalent there is of two aspects— theorised and popularised—one for the learned and the other for the uncultured mass. This popular phase itself evidences the internal degeneration. This aspect of the faith is more Brahmanic than Buddhistic and therefore, shows how Buddhism is losing ground before the rival faiths. Within a century or two the Tāntrik schools like Mantrayāna and Sahjayāna, which are mostly of a degraded type, were founded. They

---

24 Buddhist India, p. 319-20.
26 MM. H. P. Shastri in the introduction to Mr. N. N. Vasu's Modern Buddhism.
represent the last phases of Buddhism, so to say, as an individual entity in the history of Indian religions.

Besides, Śaṅkarācārya, who flourished towards the end of the 8th and the beginning of the 9th century A.D., and visited many places in Northern India, is said to have witnessed the grossest and the most inhuman practices of the Tāntṛik Buddhists on several occasions.

Bhavabhūti records in great detail how Kāmandaki, a Buddhist nun, who is expected to be absolutely unattached to worldly affairs and utterly indifferent towards anything mundane, contrived the marriage between Mālati and Mādhava. Does it not indicate a degrading laxity in the Buddhist church of that time? This certainly bears testimony to a time when there was free and unobstructed license in the church itself and it was thought quite proper for a nun to come down to society to deal with affairs outside the permitted scope of her activities. Bhavabhūti flourished in the 8th century A.D. We may therefore be far from wrong in maintaining that the decline of Buddhism had already begun at a time subsequent to the departure of Yūan Chwang, when the Nālanda University was in its decaying days, when Śaṅkarācārya began his digvijaya and when Bhavabhūti wrote, i.e. in the 7th and 8th centuries A.D. This is not inconsistent with what we know from other sources.

Śilāditya Harṣavardhana was certainly one of the greatest patrons of Buddhism. But yet sober history bears testimony to the fact that even he worshipped the Sun and the God Śiva. Thus when we analyse the faith professed by him it becomes clear to us that it was a mixture of both Hinduism and Buddhism. Buddhism had lost its original purity by that time.

An examination of the Pāla records, as we have indicated above points to the same conclusion. They were professedly Buddhist and patrons of Buddhism but yet they had deep respect for the Paurānic religions.

We are, therefore, on safe ground to maintain that the internal degeneration in the faith became manifest from the 7th century A.D. The decline commenced from that time and continued until the final disappearance of the faith from Indian soil.

The question now comes to this, how this degeneration came about?

27 Mālati-mādhavaṁ.
28 V. A. Smith, Early History of India (3rd ed.).
What are the positive causes that precipitated this inward change of the faith from regeneration to degeneration? It could not have come about in a day. It cannot but be the outcome of a slow but continuous process of retrogressive movement. Let us now consider the causes which contributed to the inward decay.

1) *Inefficient church organisation*. During the lifetime of Buddha his religion did not spread far beyond the limits of the Middle Country. The influence of his inspiring personality was more effective than even the best management in keeping good order in the church. No attempts were therefore made to arrange for good organisation of the church in the future. After the passing away of the Lord the religion spread far beyond the narrow limits of the Middle Country. But there was no supreme head to organise the multitudinous churches and it was possibly deemed sacrilegious to select one, as Buddha had distinctly advised his chief disciples: "Betake yourselves to no external refuge. Hold fast to the Truth as a lamp. Hold fast as a refuge to the Truth." 29

On account of this want of a Supreme Head different communities in different places remained independent of each other with different heads. The local necessities and individual predilections led them to interpret the original doctrines of Buddha in diverse ways. 30 Hence difference in interpretation arose and the original meanings of doctrinal things became ultimately distorted.

We also meet with the conversion of insincere men to Buddhism now and then. 31 These men had no religious tendency at all but entered the church in order to pass their lives in comfort without the molestation of poverty and self-support. These men could not but create a circle of their own in the Buddhist doctrines in explaining them in their own ways

30 I am indebted to my Professor, Dr. B. M. Barna, for this suggestion.
31 Cf. SBE., vol. xiii, p. 172; p 192; pp. 196-7. There was a class of people who had entered the Buddhist community, being urged neither by any religious feeling nor by any deep sense of respect to the founder of the religion. They entered it simply for the maintenance of their livelihood, or for the recovery from diseases or exemption from fighting. These people had faith neither in Buddha nor in Dhamma. How could it be possible for them to have any deep regard for the religion of Gautama Buddha? This uncompromising element of the Buddhist order became the ultimate cause of the future dissension in the church and of its splitting up into a large number of schools—This division in the church rendered any centralization quite impossible—any unity was lost for ever—and consequently it resulted in the downfall.
so that these might not come in the way of their own comforts. A suitable analogy of this can be found in some of the degenerate sects of modern Vaiśṇavas of which the leaders would like to teach their followers that service to the guru, the spiritual preceptor is the only way to salvation—no question about the worth of that preceptor. We cannot logically doubt that such insincere men, of whose intrusion into the church we are quite sure, contributed, at least partially, to the downfall of the faith.

(2). The introduction of notions and rites by foreign nations who adopted or favoured the Buddhist faith, but never completely renounced their old beliefs and habits. It is an open truth that many kings of foreign nationalities who ruled Indian kingdoms from time to time patronised the Buddhist faith as ardently as Asoka. The Greek king Menander, the Kuśān king Kaniska and several of his successors were of this sort. About kings outside India we are not concerned here. These foreign rulers could not certainly do away with their predilections. They could not embrace the faith with open hearts. The stamp of their former religion could not be completely effaced. Thus when they became converts to Buddhism they could not accept Buddhism as it was in its original stage. They made additions and alterations and made the faith to suit their own requirements. The works of the Graeco-Buddhists amply testify to this. The images of Buddhas and Bodhisattvas produced by the Gāndhāra school of artists are only Greek images with Buddhistic touches. It becomes evident from it that the Indo-Greeks though converted to the Buddhist faith could not be Buddhists at heart. They remained essentially Greeks though they were formally converts to Buddhism. The result was that the Greek ideas and conceptions began to be assimilated to the Indian religion quite unconsciously. The same phenomenon occurs with the Kuśāns. Sober history bears testimony to the fact that though Kaniska was a staunch patron of Buddhism he professed the Iranian religion at the same time. His coins are of varied types and the deities depicted on them show that he had respect for a "strange medley of the gods worshipped by Greeks, Persians and Indians." One other thing also should be noted here. These foreign rulers professed Indian religions only from political motives. They would

32 Dr. B. M. Barna, Prolegomena to a History of Buddhist Philosophy, p. 15. He points out the views of Hackmann and Rhys Davids.
33 Early History of India (3rd ed.), p. 265.
do anything and everything for gaining the Indian people to their side. The Indian peoples were essentially religious and they could be won over only through religion. Any superior physical force was quite futile in its attempts to win the hearts of these conservative peoples. Thus the attempts of Alexander the Great and his immediate successors to hellenize India proved to be hopeless tasks. The result was, as the poet beautifully puts it:

The East bowed low before the blast
   In patient, deep disdain;
She let the legions thunder past,
   And plunged in thought again.

But as soon as these Greeks came nearer to the Indians and as soon as kings like Menander showed their fondness for learning Buddhist philosophy from such Indian Bhikṣus as Nāgasena and as soon as Greek ambassadors like Heliodorus began to erect Garuḍa pillars in honour of Devadeva Vāsudeva the Indians had no longer any "deep disdain." They drew themselves nearer to their foreign friends.

Thus it appears to us that the foreign kings got themselves Indianised only to win their Indian subjects to their side in this prudent way and thus only to serve their political purposes. But may it be noted also that the result was quite the contrary. In their attempts to gain the Indian people in this way to their side, the foreigners ran the risk of being completely Indianised and in course of time they were unconsciously assimilated to the Indian population. This was fatal to the interests of Indian religions and especially Buddhism, which was professed by the majority of the foreign people. With this ethical change religious ideas and conceptions of the foreigners along with the deities worshipped by them were incorporated into Buddhism.

3. Buddhism, again, was through and through pessimistic. The cardinal teachings of the great master,—suvam dukkham, suvam anityam, suvam anāmyam—"All is suffering, all is impermanent all is non-soul,"—contributed to the loss of inner vitality in Buddhism. The doctrine, that life on earth is an unmixed evil and that redemption cannot be achieved within a day or two but after the completion of a whole cycle of existences, is a doctrine which can well suit a thoroughly pessimistic philosopher whose mentality is of a higher standard. His thoughts are far-reaching and he can push himself

54 Ibid., p. 113, ftn.
55 Beamagar Pillar Inscription.
towards final redemption steadily, however distant it may be. But that proves to be a hopeless task on the part of an ordinary man. He cannot but work with hopes to be realised in this life. He cannot but be optimistic more or less whatever religion he may profess. Therefore an idealistic religion like Buddhism cannot get a permanent hold on his mind in all its details. The religion undergoes a change at his hands and elements like optimism and theism which suit the requirements of the mass are added to a religion which had no room for these in its pure and original stage. Similar is the case with Buddhism. At the hands of the people new elements, which were originally foreign to the religion and are quite inconsistent with the main teachings of Gautama Buddha, were included in it. The result was that the religion took a new shape and what is called the "popularized Buddhism of the Nālanda period" was ushered in. The Buddhism which is professed in Nepal even in modern times furnishes another very appropriate illustration. The principles on which it is based go against what Buddhism originally was.

"Interesting as it is," says Dr. B. M. Barua, "the history of the four schools of Buddhist philosophy in Nepal conclusively proves that the demands for deity were a world-wide phenomenon."

4. "Failure to furnish the conception of a deity." The inclination of the mass is towards a supreme deity unto whom they can surrender themselves completely in the hope of a speedy attainment of salvation. This was one of the requirements of the mass even in those days. "Buddhism miserably failed to satisfy this demand for a deity so imperiously made!" With the growth of Mahāyānism attempts were made to meet this want by the inclusion of the cult of Bhakti and the Bodhisattva idea. But this fell short of the mark and consequently Buddhism began to lose ground before the growing influence of Vaiṣṇavism, Śaivism and other Paurāṇic religions. In Vaiṣṇavism, which probably attained its culmination in the Gupta period, there were the doctrine of Bhakti and the conception of a supreme deity worked out in their full developments. The doctrine of Bhakti and the conception of a supreme deity, who incarnates Himself for the redemption of the people from their distress and the religion from decline, are the two distinct factors in almost all the popular religions of the world. Buddhism tried to "take away from the nation that eternal God to which

Barua, Prolegomena, p. 18.
Ibid., p. 16.
Ibid., p. 16 (Frazer's suggestion in Encyclopaedia of Religion and Ethics).
every one, man or woman clings so fondly. And the result was that Buddhism in India had to die a natural death." 39 The Paurânic religions came to the forefront and the people embraced these theistic religions with open hearts. The theistic Vaiśṇavism and Śaivism won at last a complete victory over the atheistic Buddhism.

The same phenomenon occurred not only in Northern India but in Southern India also. "The historical manuals of South India," says Dr. B. M. Barua, "throw some light on the precise nature of the movement which was going on in the country since Bhaṭṭa Kumarila, and which resulted ultimately in the complete victory of Theism or Deism over the varying forms of Atheism." There was also a consequent decline in the Buddhistic philosophy for "such philosophies, as those of Śaṅkara and Rāmānuja, which afforded a rational ground for the theistic faith, flourished, while others fell gradually into obscurity."

It might well be asked that if this defective feature of Buddhism contributed to its downfall in India how could its spread and popularity in China be possible in spite of that inherent defect. None can deny that even in modern times Buddhism is more popular in China than the indigenous religions of the land, viz., the religions of Lao-tzu and Kungfu-tzu or Confucius. Yet it is impossible to say that the Chinese Buddhism has preserved all those original features of the religion of Gautama Buddha which existed in the faith 2500 years ago in the land of its birth. Those original features have been much distorted. The popularity of the faith in China is simply due to the sympathetic attitude, which it entertained, towards the indigenous religions of the land. Buddhism, after its introduction in China, did not hesitate to borrow either from Tao-ism or from Confucianism. Regarding the intimate relation of Buddhism and Taoism, Prof. Giles says 41: "Each religion began early to borrow from the other. In words of the philosopher Chu Hsi, of the twelfth century,—'Buddhism stole the best features of Taoism. Taoism stole the worst features of Buddhism. It is as though one took a jewel from the other and the loser recouped the loss with a stone.' . . . . Nowadays it takes an expert to distinguish between the temples and priests of the two religions and members of both hierarchies are often simultaneously summoned by persons needing religious consolation or ceremonial of any kind." 42

39 Swāmī Vivekānanda in Chicago address. 40 Barua, Prolegomena, p. 17. 41 Giles, Ancient Religions of China, p. 63. 42 Ibid., p. 63-64.
In accepting the religion of Śākyamuni, the Chinese people, generally, did not renounce their former beliefs and practices but rather incorporated them into their new faith. Rev. Joseph Edkins has fully illustrated how these foreign beliefs were slowly assimilated to Buddhism in China. Regarding the inclusion of ancestor-worship into Buddhism he says: "The sentiment of compassion for the neglected dead and of ancestors is ingeniously made by Buddhism into an instrument for promoting its own influence among the people. . . . . Buddhism found village processions of a religious character already existing in the country and accepted them so far as seemed fitting." Besides in China, Buddhism created a perfect hierarchy of Buddhas and Bodhisattvas which fulfilled the want of deities quite well.

Thus it becomes clear that Buddhism in China received quite a new shape and did not at all fail to meet the requirements of the Chinese people. This is why that faith still exists in that country and is so popular.

Thus we have succeeded in putting forward some of the most probable causes which made the inward decay of the faith possible. But these are not all. When these inherent defects had rendered the faith weak and when it had become ripe for downfall, at that critical juncture the religious campaigns of Kumārila and Śaṅkara were begun. These thoroughly anti-Buddhistic campaigns dealt another blow which helped the downfall more than any other influence. It has been argued from time to time that these two religious teachers carried on severe persecutions. Colebrooke and Wilson the two great pioneers of Sanskrit studies supported this view strongly on the authority of the Śaṅkara dāśvijaya. Another great exponent of this view Rev. Wilkins maintained, as Prof. Rhys Davids points out: "The disciples of Buddha were so ruthlessly persecuted that all were either slain, exiled or made to change their faith. There is scarcely a case on record where a religious persecution was so successfully carried out as that by which Buddhism was driven out of India." We cannot, however, believe in the truth of this statement literally. Kumārila and Śaṅkara were only religious teachers and great thinkers and nothing else. As such they

43 Edkins, Chinese Buddhism, p. 99.
45 J.P.T.S., 1876, pp. 108-110.
must have condemned acts of violence and it appears rather inconsistent with the vocations of their lives that they preached this act of inhuman violence to their royal patrons. Sober history, again, does not furnish us with the names of any royal patrons, of these two philosopher teachers, who could carry out any persecutinal campaign to a great extent. As far as Śaṅkara is concerned we are on safe grounds; but as regards the association of Kumārila with his great patron, King Sudhanvan, no definite information is still forthcoming. South Indian history has not as yet furnished us with the name of such a king who is said to have carried persecution of the Buddhists so vigorously.

What appears to be the truth is that these religious teachers tried their best to win the Buddhists over to their side and to Hinduise them again. Buddhism was already on its decline. The internal decay had begun. A contemporary work⁴⁶ furnishes evidence to the impious and licentious acts of the Tāntrik Buddhist. It was therefore very natural on the part of Śaṅkara and Kumārila to make attempts to bring about a reformation—strictly speaking a rejuvenation of the religious ideas of the Indian people. Buddhism was going to die a natural death and it was necessary to sow new seeds in the minds of men. Kumārila and Śaṅkara only tried their best in sowing these new seeds and their attempts were successful to some extent at least. The people were long in need of a theistic religion which could provide them with a supreme deity unto whom they could surrender themselves. As soon as Kumārila and Śaṅkara came forward with their new mission the people began to return to Hinduism in numbers. It may be noted, however, that the means, advocated by these two teachers were completely innocent. They tried to win the people over by argument and masterly expositions of philosophical and ethical doctrines in correct ways. They put forward their thesis in quite a clear and unambiguous manner and severely criticised the inherent defects and weaknesses of Buddhism which were manifest in the later phases of the faith. Thus Śaṅkara supplied a rational and theistic basis to his philosophy and condemned the Śūnyavāda of the Buddhists. "The very discovery of the philosophy of Śaṅkara," remarks Dr. B. M. Barua,⁴⁷ "lay in the refutation of the dialectical scepticism of Madhyamika philosophy."

We can therefore be far from wrong in maintaining that the

⁴⁶ Śaṅkaradīvijāyā.
⁴⁷ Prolegomena, p. 20.
campaigns of Kumārila and Śaṅkara were not of violence but rather of non-violence. These consisted in reconciliation and not in the application of physical force. These campaigns of reconciliation facilitated the assimilation of Buddhism to Hinduism.

This assimilation—a "gradual almost insensible assimilation of Buddhism to Hinduism"—is above all the most important cause of the disappearance of the faith from India. External influences like the campaigns of Kumārila and Śaṅkara and the internal decay rendered the existence of Buddhism by itself utterly impossible. It became gradually absorbed into Hinduism. A tendency towards this absorption is manifest even in the Buddhism of the 7th and 8th centuries A.D., when such great patrons of the faith as Harṣavardhana had a leaning towards the gods of the Hindu pantheon and worshipped some of them. That Buddhism was finally absorbed into Hinduism is amply proved by the existence of Buddhistic rites and conceptions in modern Hinduism. A complete analysis of the faith professed by the Hindus of Bengal, which was the last habitat of Buddhists in India will show that it is a mixture of Hinduism and Buddhism to a great extent. Mahāmahopādhyāya H. P. Shāstri,49 and Mr. N. N. Vasu50 have conclusively proved that Buddhistic rites and conceptions are still traceable in Bengal and Orissa.

The Dharma-Thākura-pūjā, the worship of a deity called Dharma-Rāja which is still prevalent among a section of the Hindus of Western Bengal bears a Buddhistic tinge. We cannot do better than quote the invocation51 which is still repeated at the time of the worship for illustrating the Buddhist touch—

\[
\text{yasyānto nādinadhyo na ca karacaranāṁ nāsti kāyānāṁ, nākūram nādirūpaṁ nāsti janma vā yasya.}
\]

\[
yogīndro jñānaṇamyo sakalajanaṇataṁ sarvālokaikānāṁ.
\]

\[
tattvam tānaṁ nirañjanaṁ makhavat pātu nāh śūnyamūrtiḥ.
\]

The word śūnyamūrti undoubtedly bears testimony to the Bud-

49 Early History of India (3rd ed.), p. 368.
49 MM. H. P. Shāstri M.A., Discovery of living Buddhism in Bengal, Calcutta, 1897.
50 N. N. Vasu, Modern Buddhism and its followers in Orissa, Calcutta 1911.
51 MM. H. P. Shāstri, Discovery of living Buddhism, p. 12. His words are worth quoting here:

"This formula is not perfectly grammatical. The word Čūṇyamūrti points to a Buddhistic origin of the deity. The Hindus never believed in Čūṇya as the origin of the world, while Čūṇyatā and Mahāčūṇyatā are the great goals of the Buddhist religion"
dhistic origin of the deity. Sacrifices again are highly condemned by the propagators of this Dharma worship.

The teachings of the Vaiṣṇava reformers of Orissa, as Mr. N. N. Vasu points out, show that the Vaiṣṇavism in Orissa was nothing but Buddhism in disguise. One illustration will suffice. From Viṣṇugarbha, a work of Chaitanya Dāsa, one of the Vaiṣṇavite reformers of Orissa of the 17th century A.D., it is evident that "five extra Viṣṇus are identical with the five Dhyāni Buddhas spoken of in the Buddhistic scriptures of Nepal." The cosmogony discussed therein is also exactly what is propounded by the Mahāyānist teachers. Besides some other works e.g. the Śūnyasamhitā of Achyutānanda Dāsa and Śūnyapurāṇa all contain only expositions of the Śūnyavāda with a Vaiṣṇavite touch.

There can be no denying the fact, therefore, that Buddhism was finally assimilated to Hinduism and this assimilation is greatly responsible for the disappearance of the religion of Gautama Buddha from India.

Above all, it should be remembered that the so-called decline of Buddhism cannot be rightly called a decline. It is a "process of change"—a change necessary for the development of Indian thought. "The decline is merely a suppression by other systems that came forward to meet the demands of the new epoch, and were originally called forth into existence by the same laws of necessity."

When we consider the fact that Buddhism is only a landmark in the unending process of Indian thought, we cannot but call the disappearance of Buddhism only a transformation of the old ideas into a new mould. Buddhism only lost its independent entity in the chain of Indian thought but its stamp on the Indian mind could not be eradicated.

---

32 Ibid., pp. 16 ff.
33 N. N. Vasu, Modern Buddhism, p. 93. The writer quotes in detail the description of the five Viṣṇus as given in Chaitanya Dāsa's Viṣṇugarbha and compares it with the description of the five Dhyāni-Buddhas as given by Oldfield in his sketches from Nepal and concludes thus:—

"Reading together and comparing the account given in Viṣṇugarbha, and the Newar Buddhistic version, of creation, we find the infinite, formless and omniscient Viṣṇu of Chaitanya Dāsa was no other than the Svayambhū or the Ādi Buddha of the Mahāyānist and the subordinate Viṣṇus or the celestial beings, created by Parama Viṣṇu, are but the five Dhyāni Buddhas. It will be clear and evident to all that the subject matter of Chaitanya Dāsa's work was borrowed from the literature of the Mahāyāna Buddhists." Cf. also ibid., pp. 97 ff.
34 Barua, Prolegomena, p. 19.
SOME NOTES ON ANCIENT GEOGRAPHY.

SURENDRANATH MAJUMDAR, ŚASTRI, M.A., PREMCHAND ROYCHAND
STUDENT, PROFESSOR OF SANSKRIT, UNIVERSITY OF PATNA.

(a) VYĀGRATAṬI.

Bengal is traditionally divided into four divisions:—(1) Baṅga, (2) Rāḍha, (3) Varendra and (4) Bāḍi. Baṅga is bounded by the Brahmaputra (W.), the Ganges (S.), the Meghna (E.) and the Khasi hills (N.). Varendra is the tract lying between the Mahānāndā (W.) and the Brahmaputra (E.) and between the Ganges (S.) and Cooch Bihar (N.). The traditional boundaries of Rāḍha are the Rajmahal hills, the Ganges and the Jalinghi branch of the Delta. Bāḍi comprises the Delta of the Ganges and the Brahmaputra.¹

Baṅga or Vāṅga² seems to be mentioned in the Aitareya Āranyaka.³ The Epics and other Sanskrit works refer to it repeatedly. It was also called, at a later period, Harikela.⁴ Rāḍha occurs in its Prākrit form of Lāḍha in the Ājīrāṅga Sutta of the Jainas. It is identical, as Nilakanṭha has remarked, with the Suḥma of the Epics.⁵ Varendra or Varendri occurs in the Rāma[pilā]-charita. Thus we have Sanskrit (or Sanskritised) names of the first three of the four divisions of Bengal and their early uses show the antiquity of those names. But what is the Sanskrit form of the name of Bāḍi and when was it first used? Though Bāḍi was formerly the least important of the four divisions on account of its swampy jungle (the remnant of which is now called the Sundarban), it is now the most important division wherein is situated Calcutta, the second city in the British empire. In order to find out the old name of Bāḍi I began to examine the land grants of the kings of Bengal and strangely enough it is mentioned in the earliest inscription of the Pālas.

² b and v are not distinguished in Bengali script and pronunciation. Skr. works generally spell it with v.
³ Kieth’s Aitareya Aranyaka, 200.
⁴ I-Teišing, p. xlii: Hemachandra’s Abhīdhanacintāmani iv, 23; etc.
⁵ S.B.E., xxii, pp. 84-5; Nilakanṭha’s commentary on the Sabkāpareṇa of the Mahābhārata.
The Khalimpur grant of Dharmapāla records that the king granted the village of Kraunčha-śvabhra in the Mahantāprakāśa vishaya (district) of Vyāghrataṭi ‘maṇḍala’ (division) of Purṇadravardhana bhukti (province).\(^8\)

The inscriptions of the Pālas mention three bhuktis (provinces) of the Pāla kingdom—Srinagarabhukti (Behar), Tirabhukti (Tirhbut) and Purṇadravardhanabhukti. Though Purṇadravardhana was identical with Varendra, the bhukti of Purṇadravardhana seems to have included the whole of Bengal, for we know of no other bhukti which might have included the other divisions of Bengal.\(^7\) Thus Vyāghrataṭi was one of the divisions of Bengal. A village of Vyāghrataṭi is mentioned in a grant of Lakshmanasena also.\(^\star\) The usual Prākrit form of Vyāghrataṭi is Vagghaḍi or Vagghaḍi from which the regular Bengali form expected is Vagḍi, or Vaghḍi. Thus there is no difficulty in taking Vagḍi as the modern equivalent of ancient Vyāghrataṭi. The Delta of the Ganges and the Brahmaputra was called Vyaghrataṭi (“Tiger Coast”), evidently because it was then, as was in very recent times, infested by the ‘Royal Bengal’ tigers.

\(b\) ALEXANDER’S HAVEN AND BARBARIUM.

“... No Indian author, Hindu, Buddhist or Jain, makes even the faintest allusion to Alexander or his deeds.” These are the words with which Dr. Vincent Smith concludes his account of Alexander’s Indian campaign. Though there is no allusion to the deeds of Alexander, is there not a reference to the cities founded by him in India? A careful search ought to be made for them. The hypothetical Sanskrit forms for ‘Ἀλέκκαρδος’ and ‘Ἀλέκκαδεκά’ are, according to the rules of Sanskrit phonetics, Alakṣandraḥ and Alakṣandarā. In the vernacular Alakkhandā or Alasandā\(^9\) are the forms expected. The second form is very nearly identical with Alasanda or Alasada, the birth place of Milinda, which has been identified with Alexandria Opiane at the foot of Mount Caucasian.\(^10\) But this Alasada was not

---


\(^7\) The expression ‘Varendra maṇḍala’ in Purṇadravardhana bhukti in Tarpandighi grant also supports it.

\(^\star\) Anulia grant of Lakshanasena.

\(^9\) As ε was preserved in the Shahbazgarhi, Mansera and Kalsi versions of Asoka’s Inscriptions, we expect to find ε in the early vernaculars of N.W. frontier. As a school of the White Yajurveda pronounced ga as kha, we expect ga for Skr. kṣ. This ε was changed, in the later period, to a.

in India proper. Is there any reference to Alexander's Haven which
certainly bore his name and which was in India proper? Now the
Haven must have been famous on account of its commercial im-
portance. Hence we ought to search for it in works like Kauṭiliya’s
Arthasastra, the Sabhaparvan of the Mahabharata, Rata-sastras and
Vaidyaka Nighantu which mention the products and articles of com-
merce of the various parts of India. And it is actually referred to
in Kauṭiliya’s Arthasastra11 in the expression ‘Alakandaka coral’ (=
Coral of Alakanda). Where was this Alakanda? Kauṭiliya is silent.
The commentator remarks that at the mouth of the river of Barbara,
a river falling in the Sea of Barbara was, according to the same
authority, the River Srotasi mentioned as a source of pearls. A lake
named Śrīghanta in a corner of the Sea of Barbara has also been
mentioned by him.12 The Epics and Purāṇas mention the Barbaras
(or Varvaras) as a northern or north-western people.13 Now by com-
bining these bits of information we find that the country of the Bar-
baras was in the W. or N.-W. frontier of India and that it stretched
up to the [Arabian] sea. Through it flowed a river named Srotasi.
In it was a lake not far from the sea. And Alakanda stood at the
mouth of a river.

The above description of Alakanda fits well with that of Alex-
ander’s Haven. Dr. Smith has shown, on the authority of Major
Raverty, that the large lake at the mouth of the river where stood
Alexander’s Haven still exists and is called Samārāh.14

Identity of name and the above facts lead me to take Alex-
ander’s Haven as the Alakanda of Kauṭiliya.

The Haven must have been a very flourishing city making a
good trade in coral and pearl which were brought thither from
various countries. But why is it that the author of the Periplus
who evidently sailed round the western and southern coasts of India
did not mention it? Had it changed its name or was it deserted on
account of the silting up of the river? The great emporium of
coral trade (for which Alakanda was famous in Kauṭiliya’s time) was
then Barbaricum—the Barbari of Ptolemy. This name is, in the

11 Sanskrit Text, p. 78: English Translation, p. 90.
12 Arthasastra, Eng. trans., p. 86, ftm. 7, 8; p. 90, ftm. 1.
13 Pargiter’s note on the word in his Markandeya Purāṇa.
14 Smith, Early History of India (2nd. ed.), pp. 101-3 and specially the foot-notes.
opinion of Mr. Schoff, the Hellenised form of some Hindu word. We have seen that Barbara was the name of the country in which was situated Alexander’s Haven. Barbaricum is thus connected with Barbara. Barbarika or ‘(the port) of Barbara country’ was probably an epithet of Alexandria itself and it came to be used instead of the name of the port because of the confusion caused by the use of the word Alakanda which was probably used to designate the other Alexandrias also. ‘Barbarika’ as the name of a place is not a theoretical word formed by Sanskritising Barbaricum. It actually occurs in the Dhanvantariya Nighantu, an Ayurvedic work. “White (śveta) and scentless (nirgandha) is the Barbarikacandana. It is pittāśrka-kapha-dāhaghnaḥ kṛmighnān guru rukshamam.” 18 This is the description which the Dhanvantariya Nighantu gives of a kind of sandal called Barbarika-candana. The Rājanighantu also mentions Barbara-candana. Thus Barbara or Barbarika must be the name of a country after which the sandal produced there or imported therefrom was called. Kauṭilya 16 mentions Daivasabhaya, Joṅgaka, Śākala and other varieties of candana and these are epithets derived from place-names. The Rājanighantu mentions the बट्णम and remarks मन्य्याटिसिकोपण्य: पर्यंत बट्णमाको तत्जातं बस्मं पशु बट्णमावध करक्ते। This remark clearly shows that one kind of sandal was named after its place of origin—बट्णमान्, which I take to be the Sanskrit (or Sanskritised Dravidian) form of Mt. Betúgò mentioned in Ptolemy’s geography.17 It may be objected that the sandal-producing Barbarika cannot be identified with Barbaricum, for sandal grows in Southern India only. But such a great authority as Kauṭilya has mentioned sandals of Devasabha (a city and a hill in Western India18), Joṅga (in Assam 19), Śākala (a part of the Punjab) etc. Thus there is no difficulty in identifying Barbarika with Barbaricum.

16 Text, p. 78, translation, p. 90.
17 Pp. 75, 105.
18 Ṭuvamāhaṃ पर्यंत पशुकाल: तन्त्र तुवमम-सुरापत: ....पशुनयं जानपदः: ....तुवमम: ....
19 Kauṭilya’s Amara, p. 93.
19 Ftn., 57, p. 90 of the English translation of Kauṭilya.
THE DRAVIDIAN AFFINITIES OF THE PIŚĀCA LANGUAGES OF NORTH-WESTERN INDIA.

K. AMRITA ROW, M.A., B.T.

The object of the present article is to show the Dravidian affinities of the Piśāca Languages of North-western India, the grammar of which has been dealt with by Dr. Grierson in his monograph. He is of opinion that the Indian nidus of Paiśācī was in the north-west and it will be reasonable to conclude that the languages now spoken on the North-western frontier of India will show traces of its former existence.¹ Professor Konow, on the other hand, thinks that the Paiśācī described by Prakrit Grammarians was based on a dialect spoken in and about the Vindhyaşas and perhaps further to the south and east.

According to Dr. Grierson, "Modern Piśāca" languages are as follows.

Kāfir group:— Baśgāli (B.).
Wai-alā (W.).
Veron (V.).
Paśai (P.).
Gawar-batī (G.).
Kalāśā (K.).

Dard Group:— Śīnā (Ś.).
Kāśmirī (Kā.).
Gārwi (Gār.).
Maiyā (M.).

Khōwār (Kh.).

It is now generally admitted, that the greater part of Northern India was peopled by rude aboriginal tribes, called by Sanskrit writers Dasyus, Niśādas, Mlecchas etc. Dr. Stevenson of Bombay, Mr. Hodgson of Nepal and others suppose that the non-Sanskritic element in the North-Indian vernaculars was identical with the Dravidian speech, which was supposed by them to have been the speech of the ancient Niśādas and other aborigines of India. Brahuī, spoken in the far

¹ Z D.M.G. 1912, Grierson, "Paśācī, Piśācas and Modern Piśāca."
North-west in Baluchistan has been proved to be a Dravidian dialect. It would not therefore be unreasonable to expect to find traces of the Dravidian element in the languages now spoken on the North-western frontier of India.

Dr. Grierson maintains that these languages are connected with Paiśāci Prakrit and are also related to the Eranian languages, and possess phonetic peculiarities which distinctly belong to the Eranian family. But a person acquainted with the Dravidian languages cannot fail to be struck by the fact that both Paiśāci Prakrit and the modern Piśāca languages of North-Western India possess almost the same phonetic characteristic as the Dravidian languages, which do not however seem to have attracted the attention of either Dr. Grierson or Professor Konow. The presence of the traces of the Dravidian element in the languages of the North-Western Frontiers only goes to confirm Dr. Grierson's theory that the home of Paiśāci Prakrit is to be sought for in North-western India and not in the Vindhya mountains as is supposed by Professor Konow.

Paiśāci is a very old dialect. Vararuci mentions only one. Simha-deva-ganin in Vāgbhata-laṅkāra and Namisādhu in Rudraṭa's Kāvyā-laṅkāra call it Paiśācikā. Hemacandra deals with three varieties (counting the two varieties of Cālikā-paiśācikā). Mārkaṇḍeya handles three principal varieties: (1) Kaikeya, (2) Śaurasena, (3) Pāṇcāla, as is evident from the following verse.

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{kaikėyaṃ sāurasenam ca pāncālam iti ca triḍhā} \\
\text{paiśācīya nāgarā yasmāt tenāpy anyā na laksitāḥ}
\end{align*}
\]

An unknown author quoted by Mārkaṇḍeya mentions 11 varieties including Pāṇḍya, Drāvida and the language of the Kānci-desa.

\[
\begin{align*}
kānci-deśya-pāṇḍyē ca pāncāla-gauḍa-māgadham \\
vṛācāḍaṃ dākṣiṇātyam ca sāurasenam ca kaikāyaṃ \\
sābaraṃ drāvīḍam caiva ekādaśa piśācakāḥ
\end{align*}
\]

The following verses enumerating the Paiśāci dialects are found in Saṭbhāṣācandrikā of Lakṣmīdīrha.

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{piśāca-deśa-niṇayaṃ paiśāci-dvītayāṃ viduḥ} \\
\text{piśāca-deśas tu vṛddhairuktāḥ} \\
\text{pāṇḍya-kekaya-bāhlika-sakhya-nepūla-kuntalāḥ} \\
\text{sūdra-bhota-gāṇḍhāra-haiva-kanojanās tathā} \\
\text{ete paiśāca-deśās syus taddeśyas tadguṇo bhavet.}
\end{align*}
\]
Prof. Lassen refers *Pândya* to the north of the Indus or rather the Panjáb, *Sahya* to the south-west coast and *Haiva* to the Tuluva or Kanara country. I think *Pândya* can refer only to the Tamil country, and *Sahya* probably refers to Sahyādri. Pischel says that Lakṣmīdhara’s enumeration points to North and West. From these enumerations we are led to infer that in later times the term Paiśācī had lost its old meaning of a definite dialect and signified incorrect forms of Aryan dialects. We cannot, however, definitely say whether the authors of these verses could recognise the striking phonetic similarities of Paiśācī and the Dravidian languages or were unable to distinguish the Dravidian languages spoken in Kanara and the Tamil country from the Aryan vernaculars.

Höernle (*Gauḍijn Grammar*, XIX) considered Paiśācī to be the low Prakrit spoken by Dravidian aboriginal tribes who fell under the domination of the Aryan immigrants and in whose mouths the Aryan vernacular was distorted into Paiśācī.

Lacôte (*Essai sur Guṇāḍhya et la Brhatkathā*, 58) considers the Paiśācī of Guṇāḍhya to have been based upon an Aryan dialect of the North-west or West, but to have been spoken by non-Aryan peoples.

The Tamil work *Perumkadei*, professedly a translation of *Brhatkathā* which is being edited by Mahāmahopādhyāya Pandit V. Swaminatha Aiyar, a very distinguished Tamil scholar, will, I fondly hope, throw further light on this problem.

If Paiśācī Prakrit is connected with the Dravidian languages as is supposed by some scholars, it is but natural that traces of Dravidian affinities should be found in the Piśāca Languages of North-western India. If, on the other hand, Paiśācī Prakrit is not connected with Dravidian, we have no reason to expect to find any traces of the Dravidian element in the Piśāca languages of North-western India, unless it be that in later times the people of the North-western frontier borrowed Dravidian words, which is however improbable. The presence of these traces therefore only confirms Dr. Grierson’s theory that these languages are connected with Paiśācī Prakrit.

The Piśāca words quoted below are all taken from *The Piśāca Languages of North-Western India* by Sir G. A. Grierson, Chapter IX. ( Asiatic Society Monographs, Vol VIII).*  

* The chief abbreviations used are: Tam(il), Can(aras), Mal(ayalam), Tel(ugu), Dr(avidian), H(indi), Mar(athi).
Ask.—B. W. \(\sqrt{\text{kud}}\); G. \(\sqrt{\text{khud}}\); Š. \(\sqrt{\text{koj}}\), (dial.) khuž. Cf. H. \(\sqrt{\text{khoj}}\); derivation uncertain, possibly Skr. kṣuḍyate, he is agitated or kṣudhyati, he is hungry.

If the series B. W. \(\sqrt{\text{kud}}\), Š. \(\sqrt{\text{koj}}\) (dial.) be compared with the series Av. duṣṭar, Skr. duṣhitar; V. luṣtu, B. jū, ju-k; W. jū, one would be justified in assuming a hypothetical form *\(\sqrt{\text{kul}}\) or *\(\sqrt{\text{kol}}\), which may perhaps be connected with Dr. kē. Cf. Coorumba, kret-ine, kelu; Badaga, kret-ine, kēl; Goṇḍi, keinjana.


Š. kācō may perhaps be connected with Tam. kacāḍu, blemish, fault; Tam. kaca, to taste bitter.

Before; in front.—G. puda-mi; P. pōrā; Kh. pru-śta. Cf. Skr. pravat (Herm.): Sq. prād; Prs. firūd, firū; Cf. Tam. puda-va, door, the way in front of, and leading to a door: Tam. puram, outside, exterior.

Belly.—B. ktol, ktol. Cf. Kurukh, kūl, kt appears to have first become kk, which being initial became simplified to k
For the change of kt to kk, cf. Skr. muktā; Pkr. mukka, mutta.
G. wōr; M. wair. Cf. Tam. vayir, belly; Can. basir, basur, belly.

Bird.—G. pici-n. Cf. Tuļu pijin, ant. For the change of meaning, cf. O. P. muru, Pehl. mūrū, bird; Prs. mor, Pehl. mor, Av. maoiri, an ant; Cf. also Kurukh pōkhā, the green pigeon; pōk, an ant Goṇḍi, patte, an ant; piṭṭe, bird.


Cf. Tam. parvai, bird; parvandu, having flown; Can. pari, paru, to fly. Br. parra, feather.


Bring.—P. rā-val; Cf. Tel. rā-vaḍa-mu, coming.

Bull.—B. aže, ašu; ašu is probably derived from Skr. paśu; Can. hasu, a cow. For the apheresis of p, cf. W. puc. V. uc. B. puc. five. Cf. also Can. pōgu, hōgu, ōgu, to go. P. gō-lāng; Š. (dial.) gōlo; cf. Tam. kūli, kūlam, cow; kālai, a steer, a young bullock. For the change of a to u, ō, cf. Av. xara; V. kōru. K dōn; Š dōnō; cf. Can. dana, cow, from Av. and Skr. dhana, wealth, in Av. and Skr. gō-dhana.
DRAVIDIAN AFFINITIES OF PIṢĀCA LANGUAGES.


Child.—G. pola. Two derivations are probable:
(i) It may perhaps be derived from Skr. bāla. For the change of b to p cf. Ś. būṣi; Kh. puṣi.
(ii) It may be connected with Tam. pilḷai, a child. Tel. pilla. Can. pilla, piḷḷe, a young one, child. Mar. pūla, a young one is evidently derived from Dr. pilla.

W. tana-muneh (apparently, small man). Cf. Tam. tannam, little.
Kā. nyaciw (pron. nēcyw). Cf. Tam. naccu, little, small.
V. kiur, a child; Kā. kīr, a girl, daughter. Cf. Tel. kurra, child; kurra-di, a girl. Tel. and Can. kuru, small.

Come.—B. āčē. W. āčē. Cf. Tam. acai (pron. āṣai) to move.
Ś. aćā. Cf. Tam. ā, come.
Ś. wa-tō, came. Cf. Tam. vantā-n (pron. vandān), he came.
W. āṭ-ō, came. Cf. Can. āṭi, going; Tam. āṭu (pron. āḍu) to move.

Do.—W. cheṛ-am, I shall do. Cf. Tam. ceṣkēn (pron. ṣēṣhēn), I do, I shall do.

W. cāṣt, he does. Cf. Tel. cēṣtā-du, he does.

Dog.—B. kuri, krūi: V. kiru-kh, keru-kh; M. kūsar; Gār. kūcur. Cf. Br. kucak; Tel. kukka; Chent. kukkan; Tam. kurai, to sound.
Tam. kulai, to bark.


Foot.—B. kyurm, kūr. Cf. Tulu, kār; Tam. and Can. kāl, leg.
Ś. (dial.) kūti. Cf. Tam. kuti (pron. kudī) heel.

Go.—P. pō (pres. pōk-am, I go; pāj-ā, he goes). Kā. pak; K. pāi, having gone. Derivation doubtful.
Cf. Tam. pō (pres. pōki-rēn, pron. pōhi-rēn, I go); pōki-rān (pron. pōhi-rān), he goes, pōi, having gone. Tel. pōvu; Can. pōgu, to go.
For the change of ō to ā, cf. Tel. pōyi-nāḍu, pājā (Coll.) he went.

Goat (male).—K. bīra; Gār. bār, bīrā-th; V. beir (a she-goat?).
Cf. Tam. veri; Can piri, a goat.

Great, large.—B āḷ; Kh. lotti. Derivation?
Cf. Tam. āḷam, depth; Can. āḷa, deep; Can. lotta, Tel. lotta, a hollow.
Hair.—(?) G. ĉumu-ťa; Ś. camōye. Cf. Tam. cimili, braid of hair, Konkani, ńurmū-ō.


The change of v to p is characteristic of the Pśāca Languages.

Horse.—W. gur; G. gora; Gār gor; P. gorā; Ks. gura.
Cf. Tam. kurai, kuśirai. Tel. gurra-μu, horse.

House.—B. ama, amu; W. ama; G. āma. Cf. Tam. amai, to dwell, to remain.
V. war-ekh; tar-ekh (spelt tareq). Cf. Tam. urai, to abide, lodge, inhabit; uru, to be, to exist. Br. urā, a house. Tam. tar-i (noun) abiding, tarrying, tari-pu, a lodging, a resting place.

Kid.—B. cō; W. ĉū. Cf. Tam. cōran (pron. ūran), a kid, a lamb.

Mother.—B. nū, nōn; V., Kh. nan. W. oie; K. āya, G. jai; P. āi; Gār. yai; Ś. (dialect) āzi. M. inhāī. Cf. Tam. yāy, annai, āyā, mūy, tāy, āyā-l; Kurukh, ayō; Kui. iyā.

Mouth.—M., Gār. āi; Ś. āi (dialect). Cf. Tam. vāy. Kaikādi, vāi; Kurukh. bai; Can. bāyī, mouth.

P. dōr. Cf. Tel. nūru, mouth. For the change of n to d, cf. Dr. nīr; Br. dir.

See.—B. jwar; W., wēr. Cf. Tam. pār, to see.

Self.—W., G. tanu (own); P. tāni-k; Kh. tan; M. tā; Gār. tanī (own); Ś. tomō. Cf. Dr. tan, self. Br. tan, self.

Shoe.—G. kōš-ay; Kh. kauś; M., Gār. kōś; Ks. kūś. Cf. Tam. kalāi, shoe.

Singing, a song.—B. lālu; V. lo. Cf. Can. and Tel. lāli, a lullaby; Tam. ilāli, praising, singing.

Kh. baśe-ik. Cf. Tam. vāci (pron. vāši), to play on the flute.

Son.—V. piē. Cf. Tam. pāiyān, a boy, son.

Strike.—Ś. kut-istē or kut-istā to strike; M. kuṭa or kuṭa-g-īl, struck.²
Cf. Tam. kultu, kuṭtu; Tel. koṭtu, to strike.

Sun.—Kh. yōr. Cf. Tam. nāyir, sun, Mal. nēr-am. For the change of n to y, cf. Tam. nān, yān. I.

² The Pśāca Languages of North-Western India, p. 54.
MITRA-MIΘRA.

S. K. Hodivala, B.A.

In the first Oriental Conference I had the honour to read a paper on Varuṇa and Ahuramazda, and I had tried to show that these gods, the Asura and Ahura of the Hindus and Iranians, were identical. As Mitra was an intimate companion of Varuṇa, and MiΘra that of Ahuramazda, it is easy to see why these divinities held a very important place in the Vedic and Avestan religions.

So far as the two words Mitra and MiΘra are concerned, it is clear enough that they are not only closely connected but perfectly identical. In our religion MiΘra has been worshipped with Ahuramazda in several places. (Yt. X. 113, 145, etc.). In the Vedas and especially in the Rgveda Mitra has been almost everywhere adored with Varuṇa. In one sūkta of the Rgveda (III. 59) he has been mentioned all alone.

According to the Avesta MiΘra is strong (lauΧma) and very wise (aδ-Χραενα) ruler over the universe and protector of all creations (Yt. X. 54, 61, 65, 141). These are also the attributes which have been applied to Mitra in the Rgveda. He is strong, very wise (सुक्रु ), supreme ruler (सामाराट) and protector of the earth (भुवनस्य गोपा ) (RV. V. 62. 5; 62. 9; 63. 3; 66. 1).

In two places in the Rgveda (III. 62. 16; VII. 65. 4) Mitra and Varuṇa are thus addressed: खा नो मित्रवरस्या छैनेघंग्धितं उ उच्चिलम् (May Mitra and Varuṇa bedew our pasturage with oil). In this passage the word गायौति (pasturage) is important. In the Avesta it assumes the form gaoτyaoiti. This word combining with the word vouru forms the compound vouru-gaoτyaoiti, which is a special epithet of MiΘra, meaning "the lord of wide pastures."

In the Avesta it is stated that MiΘra makes the plants grow and waters move (Yt. X. 61). Similarly, in the Rgveda (V. 62. 4) Mitra and Varuṇa are spoken of as causing the plants to flourish and the rains to spread.

Although Mitra the gracious god is a friend of the people, still
when he is displeased, he becomes angry. Hence a Vedic poet confessing his sin, cries out: "Has the King (Varuṇa) seized us? How have we offended against his holy ordinance? For even Mitra among the gods is angry" (RV. X. 12. 5). In the Avesta Miêra severely punishes those who break contracts (Vendīdād, IV. 5–10).

In both the religions this divinity is the friend of truth, the protector of truthfulness and the destroyer of untruth (Yt. X. 80; RV. I. 151. 1; V. 67. 4). The house of Mitra and Varuṇa is large, tall and thousand-pillared. The house of Miêra is also large, spacious and strong (Yt. X. 44). It is important to note here that Mitra’s palace is spoken of as having thousand pillars. This compound word is the exact equivalent of the Avestan word hāṣaṇastrāna, which is the epithet of the house of the Zoroastrian goddess named Ardvīsīra (Yt. V. 101).

In one passage of the Rgveda (VII. 61. 3) Mitra and Varuṇa are mentioned as having spies, who visit every spot and watch unceasingly. Elsewhere (RV. VIII. 47. 11) we read that the Ādityas, who were the friends of Mitra and whose number was eight in some places, look down upon us like spies. In the Avesta (Yt. X. 45) it is stated that eight friends of Miêra watch the contract-breakers like spies from high places. It may be mentioned that the word for spies is exactly the same in both the languages, namely śāstrā in Sanskrit and spasō in Avesta.

Both in the Avesta and the Vedas Miêra (Mitra) is represented as a strong warrior. (Yt. X. 102, RV. V. 65. 4).

Primarily Miêra is the light of the Sun. Before sunrise and after sunset Miêra illuminates the earth. Being a shining Yazata (angel) and being inseparably connected with the Sun, he is always worshipped with the latter during the day time. In the Hindu scriptures Varuṇa is connected with night and Mitra with day (AV. IX. 3. 18). According to the Taittiriya Samhitā (II. 1. 7. 4; VI. 4. 8. 3) Mitra made day and Varuṇa night. In one place Mitra and Varuṇa are said to encompass the realm of light with their hands (RV. V. 64. 1). In another place Mitra is represented as having covered and concealed the darkness with his light (RV. VI. 8. 3). The Avestan writer says that Miêra gives light just as the moon does (Yt. X. 142). A similar idea is expressed by the Vedic writer who says: "Great is the power of Varuṇa and Mitra who give light like the moon" (RV. III. 61. 7).
In one passage of the Rgveda (V. 81. 4) the Sun himself is said to be Mitra, clearly showing the intimate connection of Mitra with the Sun even in the Indian literature. In our Pahlavi books such as Dādestānī Dinī (XXI. 14) the word Miōra is used for the Sun himself.

Miōra being the god of light, he is naturally said to be watchful with his ten thousand eyes (Yt. X. 141). The Vedie god Mitra beholds men with eyes that close not (RV. III. 59. 1).

As both Miōra and Mitra are celestial gods, we come across similar descriptions of their heavenly cars. In the Avesta (Yt. X. 125, 136, 143) we find it stated that every day Miōra goes out driving in a carriage of one golden wheel, which has four white immortal horses with golden and silver shoes. In the Rgveda Mitra and Varuṇa are said to mount their gold-hued car at break of morning (RV. V. 62. 8). Elsewhere they are represented as ascending their chariot in the sublimest heaven—which chariot is none other than the Sun itself (RV. V. 63. 1, 7).

In both the religions these divinities hold positions of great honour and respect. Accordingly, in the Avesta Miōra is called a quick reciter of Yasna and an officiating priest, who loudly recites the Gāthās. In the Vedas also Mitra has been called an officiating priest (RV. III. 5. 4; White Yajur Veda XXVIII. 19). The words for “officiating priest” is zuotar in Avesta and चौरस in Sanskrit, which are exactly identical.

As the above two gods were not only closely connected but perfectly identical, it is but natural to find the followers of both the religions worshipping them with almost similar prayers and offerings. The Zoroastrians thus worship Miōra: “O brave Miōra Yazata, we worship thee with sacrificial offerings. Thou shouldst be pleased with our worship. Thou shouldest sit near and accept our prayers . . . . That man is a worthy person who, having spread barsom grass, worships thee with Haoma juice made ready” (Yt. X. 31, 32, 91). The Vedic worshipper invokes Mitra and Varuṇa to come near, sit on barhiś grass, drink Soma juice and accept sacrificial offerings (RV. I. 137. 3; V. 72. 3; VII. 66. 19). The barsom grass and Haoma juice were exactly the same as barhiś grass and Soma juice.

When pleased Miōra grants wealth, prosperity, courage, strength, respect, wisdom, protection from evil persons, etc. Similarly, Mitra when satisfied grants riches, prosperity, happiness and protection from
the attacks of enemies (Yt. X. 5. 33, 34; RV. V. 64. 6; 67. 2-3; VI. 67. 2; 68. 3; VII. 52. 2; 62, 3).

The two gods were so very alike in all respects that in view of the irresistible conclusion that both the branches of the Āryans—the Indians and Iranians—were one people in the hoary past, we have no hesitation to say that Mitra-Miśra was one god and that the only difference between the two peoples was the very slight difference in the method of pronouncing his name.
IDOL-WORSHIP: DID IT EXIST AMONG THE ANCIENT ARYANS, AND AMONG THEM, AMONG THE ANCIENT HINDUS OF THE VEDIC TIMES?

SHAMS-UL-ULMA DR. JIVANJI JAMSHEDJI MODI, B.A., PH.D., C.I.E.,
Diplom. Litteris et Artibus (Sweden), Officier de l'Instruction Publique (France), Secretary to the Trustees of the Parsi Panchayet, Bombay.

INTRODUCTION.

In the Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society of England,¹ there was, of late, a discussion between Prof. A. A. Macdonell and Mr. Venkateshwar, as to whether Idol-worship prevailed in Vedic times. The former said that it did not prevail, while the latter said that it did. The object of this paper is to submit a few points for consideration on the subject.

In his paper, entitled "The Development of Early Hindu Iconography" in the Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society,² Prof. Macdonell says: "In the earliest product of Indian literature, the Rigveda, the gods, being largely personifications of natural phenomena, were only vaguely anthropomorphic. To the imagination of the poets of the hymns, the gods were outwardly differentiated mainly by the weapons³ they wielded or the animals⁴ that drew their cars. They were not as

³ As examples of representation by weapons in later times, as illustrated both in literature and sculpture, we find Viṣṇu holding a cakra i.e. a disc or a wheel in his hand as a symbol, and Śiva holding a trisūla or trident.
⁴ For example, Indra is known by his elephant; Śūrya, by the seven horses of his chariot; Gangā and Yamunā (Jama) by the crocodile and the tortoise; and Lakṣmī by two elephants with a lotus between them on which she sits. Cf. the representations in the Avesta, where the Sun haurvatāsta is spoken of as having swift horses, auvresta-aspa (Khurshid Nyāish). Mihr is spoken of as having a chariot (esiga) with a golden wheel (aše castra zaranañam, Mihr Yashti (Yt. X), 136, also 67). In the Avesta, the castra is held to be a symbol of authority or influence (Yt. XIII, 89).
yet iconographically represented. Literary evidence indicates that regular images of gods were not made till the latest Vedic period. They were known in the middle of the second century B.C. to the grammarian Patañjali and most probably also to Panini nearly two centuries earlier."

The evidence from the cases of other Aryan nations. Iran.

I think, that the evidence of what we know about three other Aryan people supports Prof. Macdonell's view, that idol-worship did not exist in India in early Vedic times. The Aryan nations I wish to speak about are: (1) the Iranians, (2) the Scythians, and (3) the Ancient Germans.

(1) The Iranians.

Herodotus thus speaks of the ancient Iranians:

"It is not their practice to erect statues, or temples, or altars, but they charge those with folly who do so; because, as I conjecture, they do not think the gods have human forms, as the Greeks do. They are accustomed to ascend the highest parts of the mountains, and offer sacrifice to Jupiter, and they call the whole circle of the heavens by the name of Jupiter. They sacrifice to the sun and moon, to the earth, fire, water, and the winds. To these alone they have sacrificed from the earliest times; but they have since learnt from the Arabs and Assyrians to sacrifice to Venus Urania, whom the Assyrians call Venus Mylitta, the Arabsians, Alitta, and the Persians, Mitra. The following is the established mode of sacrifice to the above-mentioned deities; they do not erect altars nor kindle fires when about to sacrifice; they do not use libations, or flutes, or fillets, or cakes; but, when any one wishes to offer sacrifice to any of these deities, he leads the victim to a clean spot, and invokes the god, usually having his tiara decked with myrtle. He that sacrifices is not permitted to pray for blessings for himself alone; but he is obliged to offer prayers for the prosperity of all the Persians, and the king, for he is himself included in the Persians. When he has cut the victim into small pieces, and boiled the flesh, he strews under it a bed of tender grass, generally trefoil, and then lays all the flesh upon it; when he has put everything in order, one of the Magi standing by sings an ode concerning the origin of the gods, which they say is the incantation; and without one of the Magi it is not lawful for

\[ J.R.A.S., 1916, p. 125. \]
them to sacrifice. After having waited a short time, he that has sacrificed carries away the flesh and disposes of it as he thinks fit." 8 Again we have the instance of the Persian king Cambyses entering the temple of Vulcan and defiling the image of that God. 7 Xerxes, when he invaded Greece, threw down the images of gods. 9

This long quotation from Herodotus shows that what was the case with India, as pointed out by Prof. Macdonell, was also the case with Iran. There was no idol-worship there from very ancient times. Iran was pre-eminently against idol-worship. In the Hāšōxt Yašt (Yt. XXII, 13) credit is given to a pious soul for disregarding idolatry and for resorting to pure Gādā-singing. In the Vištāspa Yašt (Yt. XXIV, 37), Zoroaster asks his royal disciple, Vištāspa, to keep away from idolatry, which was an evil, an infection from Ahriman. In the same Yašt (59), Ahura Mazda advises the rejection of idol-worship and acceptance of pure and simple Gādā-singing.

The word for idolatry in the above passage is baosu, the Pahlavi rendering of which in the Hāšōxt Nask, is būndak āig shaidā-yazakih 9 i.e. "bundak which is devil-worshipping." The Pahlavi rendering of the word in the Vištāspa Yašt is uydeaspt but parastik i.e. idolatry. 10 Coming down from the Avesta to the Pahlavi books, 11 we find idol-worship run down in the Dinkard, the Bundehish, the Minokherad, the Bahman Yasht, the Virāf-Nāmeh, the Shatroiha-i Airān, the Jamāspī, the Kārnāmek-i Ardešir Bābēgān and Matan-i Shāh Vahārārn Varjavand. As Prof. Jackson says, all Pahlavi writings allude to "the abomination of idol-worship as wholly abhorrent to the pure spirit of Zoroastrianism that is in keeping with its ideal conception of the divine." 12 He further on says: "I must emphasize that the Persians from the earliest antiquity had no idols in the sense of representations of the godhead set up as object of worship; nor does Zoroaster refer to them. If, moreover, Darins and the other Achaemenid kings caused to be carved above

8 Herodotus, Bk. I, 131. 32. Carey's Translation.
7 Ibid, Bk. III, 37.
9 Hāšōxt Nask, II, 13; also The Book of Ardai Virāf, by Dastur Hoshang Jamasp, p. 287.
10 Le Zend-Avesta par Darmanetster, II, p. 653.
11 Bk. VII, Chap. 1, 19; Chap. IV, 72; S.B.E., XLVII, p. 8.
12 Prof. Jackson's article, entitled "Allusions in Pahlavi Literature to the Abomination of Idol-worship" in the Sir Jamshedji Mejihoti Birthcent Jubilee Volume, p. 274. Vide also my notice of the article in the introduction to that volume, pp. xi-xii.
their bas-relief effigies in stone a half-figure representing Aura-Mazda as floating in a symbolic circle and handing to the king a ring as the emblem of sovereignty, it is nevertheless a motive borrowed from Assyrian and Babylonian art and was doubtless chosen for the special purpose of appealing to the non-Persian conquered nations who were more anthropomorphic in their ideals. Nor is any exception formed to the general truth by the fact that there is in Sasanian times a mounted figure of Ormazd (known by his name occurring in the attached inscription) carved in stone Naqsh-i-Rustam to represent the deity in the act of bestowing the crown upon Ardashir. Idolatry played no part in the history of the religion.

One may perhaps point against the above quotations and references from Herodotus and the Avesta and Pahlavi books, the supposed case of the Achaemenian King Artaxerxes Mnemon, who is said by some to have founded the statues of Anahita and Mithra. But here one must remember that the rendering of that portion of his inscription, which is pointed out as referring to this subject, is not certain. The reading of the inscription as given by Dr. Spiegel is:

Anahita uta Mithra vashná Auramazdāha apadānā adam akunavam.
Auramazdā, Anahita uta Mithra mām pātuv.

Spiegel renders this as:

"Durch die Gnade von Auramazda, habe ich Anahita und Mithra in diesen Palast gesetzt (?), Auramazda, Anahita und Mithra mögen mich schützen," i.e. "By the favour of Ahura Mazda, I have put Anahita and Mithra in this palace. May Auramazda Anahita and Mithra protect me!"

Spiegel puts a query mark after the word gesetzt, i.e. "put," thus showing that he has some doubt about his interpretation of the sentence.

Tolman gives the same reading and translates:

Anahita and Mithra ...... by the grace of Auramazda the building I made; let Auramazda, Anahita and Mithra protect me.

The conventionalized form, taken to be thus borrowed from the Babylonians and Assyrians, has been taken by others to be a representation of the frahāši or šarōbar, i.e. the idealized spirit of the King. That it is so, is supported by the fact that the features of both the King and the frahāši are similar. Prof. Jackson differs from this view.

14 A Guide to the Old Persian Inscriptions by Herbert Cushing Tolman, pp. 90 and 158.
Weissbach and Bang's rendering also is similar. It does not point clearly to statues.

Thus, we see that the inscription does not point to the installation of the images of Anāhita and Mithra. What was really meant by the King seems to be that he had patronized and helped some special glorification of the Yazatas, Anāhita and Mithra. Perhaps, he specially founded temples in honour of these Yazatas. Just as we have fire-temples in India specially connected with Varahrān (Behrām), the 20th Yazata, and known as Ātash-Behrām, so there may be some special temples connected with the names of Anāhita and Mithra.

Even if it were supposed that the reference in the inscription is to statues of Anāhita and Mithra, there is not the slightest idea of the foundation of any kind of idol-worship. This appears from the fact that out of the many Yazatas only these two are referred to in this connection. Now these two Yazatas, Mithra and Anāhita, were those whose worship had prevailed among some foreign nations. The worship of Anāhita, known to the Greeks as Anāītis, who, by some, is compared to Artemis and by others to Aphrodite or Urania, was known in one form or another among some western nations. A part of the portrait of Anāhita, as pictured in the Ābān Yašt, is in many points similar to that of the Greek Aphrodite (Urania), and a part is similar to that of Artemis. Again, we know that the worship of Mithra had, from an early time, prevailed in the West. These two worships there may have created the production of statues. So, it is possible that the western method of the worship of the two Yazatas may have reflected itself somewhat in Persia in the later Achaemenian times. Artaxerxes, following the Westerners, may have merely produced these statues from an art point of view. That there was no worship of the statues as idols, is proved from the very fact that, had there been anything of the kind, why should the Iranians have stopped short with these two Yazatas and not proceeded to do the same with other Yazatas? This shows that there may be an attempt only at statue-making but not at idol-worship. We find that the western idea of statues had affected

17 See my Kadim Iranio i.e. Ancient Iranians according to Herodotus and Strabo, p. 18.
18 Ibid, p. 19,
Darius, who, when in Egypt, at one time, thought of erecting his own statue opposite to that of an old Egyptian magnate, but he was dissuaded. The idea seems to have been created that the person, in whose honour a statue was erected, was thereby dignified.

_But-parastish, a later Persian word for Idol-worship._—In later Persian, idol-worship is spoken of as _but-parastish_ wherein the word _but_ has come to mean an idol. This Persian word _but_ comes from the Avesta _būiti_ (Ven. XIX, 1, 2, 43). In the Avesta, _būiti_ is the name of a div. The Pahlavi form of the Avesta _būiti_ is _būt_. We read in the Pahlavi _Bundehish:

_Būt shāeda zak mūnash pavan Hindukūn parastand._ Avash vakhsh pavan zak butiḥā mahman chegūn būt-i asp parastet,²⁹ i.e. the demon _būt_ is one who is worshipped among the Hindus. The increase (of its worship) consists in idols. For example they worship the idol of a horse.

This seems to be a reference to the idol-worship among the Buddhists. Among the Tibetan Buddhists, there is a horse-dragon called _Long-ma._³⁰

_Dislike for idols among Mahomedans, the successors of Iranians in the land of Irān._—The dislike of Mahomedans for idols is well-known. They carried on, as it were, the tradition and the teaching in this matter, of the Zoroastrian people with whom they had come into close contact and whose land they soon occupied.

It seems to be strange that the Mahomedan religion which had its cradle in Arabia, where there prevailed some form of idol-worship,¹⁶ should be iconoclastic. But, this seems to the result of the influence—one of many such influences in the matter of religion—of Zoroastrianism upon Mahomedanism. The great Anusheravan (Noshirvān the Just, Chesroes I.) had a strong hold upon Southern Arabia. So he may have furthered the influence of the Jews and others against idolatry. The Prophet himself is said to have expressed his pleasure and pride for the fact that he was born in the times of a great king like Noshirvān the Just. So, a close observer as he was of men round about him and of their doings, he approved what he thought was good in Zoroastrianism

---

²⁹ Herodotus, Bk. II, 110.
³¹ Vide for his picture, Waddis' _Buddhism of Tibet or Lamaism_, pp. 410-411.
³² According to Maqoudi (Chap. XLIII), at one time, there prevailed idolatry in Arabia. It was the Jewish religion that first began to repress it.
and embodied it in his new religion. Dislike of idolatry may be one of these things, which pre-eminently seems to have appealed to his cultured mind. He was emphatically against any kind of idolatry, even against any form that came nearer to it.

The Mahomedan view against the use of idols is said to have been based on their belief that in idols or images made by men, life will enter on the day of Kiamat, i.e. on the Judgment-day. But those objects, though revived with life, will not possess human or spiritual privileges. That being the case, the life-bearing images and idols will curse their owners. That being the belief, it is said that when the wife of the Prophet, on one occasion, produced for prayers a carpet bearing some pictures on it, the Prophet was much displeased. Again, that being their belief, the Mahomedans at one time did not like the portraits of the kings on their coins. Latterly, in cases where there were portraits, the eyes of the portraits were made so large as to obscure the face of the person. The image of the face being thus imperceptible, the portraits on coins were tolerated to some extent. One can thus understand why certain Mahomedan kings, when they destroyed Hindu temples, and their idols, they destroyed the faces. Without faces the idols would be no idols.

(2) The case of the Scythians.

The Scythians were a chip of an old Aryan stock. As said by Prof. Gutschmid, their deities "have also an Aryan complexion." They also had their gods of the Heaven—the Sun—and the Sea and their goddesses of Earth and fecundity, like the ancient Indians and the Iranians. Prof. Gutschmid says of them that "in true Iranian fashion, the gods were adored without images, altars or temples." 25

(3) The case of the ancient Germans.

According to Caesar, "They (the ancient Germans) reckon those alone in the number of gods, which are the objects of their perception and by whose attributes they are visibly benefited; as the Sun, the Moon and Vulcan." These gods of ancient Germans then are same as the gods of the ancient Hindus,—Sûrya, Candra and Agni—and the same

---

25 Ibid.
26 *De Bello Gallico*, VII, as quoted by Dr. Alkin, the translator of Tacitus, p. 23.
as the Yazatas of the ancient Iranians,—Hvarəšaëta, Māṇha and Ātar. Tacitus says that "they (the Germans) conceive it unworthy of the grandeur of celestial beings to confine their deities within walls, or to represent them under a human similitude: woods and groves are their temples." 47 What Tacitus says of the ancient Germans, is, as it were, a version of what Herodotus says, as quoted above, of the ancient Iranians. It shows that there was no idol-worship among the ancient Germans as there was none among the ancient Iranians.

We thus see that none of the other ancient people—the Iranians, the Germans and the Scythians—who were offshoots of an old Aryan stock, had idol-worship among them. So, there should be no idol-worship among the ancient Hindus also, an old offshoot whose Rṣis sang their songs of Nature in their Hymns of the Vedas.

Arrian on places of worship in Pre-Buddhistic times.

Arrian, referring to Megasthenes, says that there were about 118 Indian tribes who were "nomadic like those Scythians who did not till the soil, but roamed about in their wagons, as the seasons varied, from one part of Skythia to another, neither dwelling in towns nor worshipping in temples; . . . . The Indians likewise had neither towns nor temples of the gods." 48 This is a picture of the very early Aryan immigrants into India.

Idol-worship necessitates the building of Temples.

There is one important thing which we must bear in mind. It is that when a people has idol-worship, it must have temples for locating the idols. Now, it seems that the very early Aryans whose picture we see in the early hymns of the Rig-Veda, were, to some extent, a people not settled in a centre. They were people who moved from place to place and who thus came into contact with Nature. So, they were not in a position to build temples which are the accompaniments of a long settled life in one locality.

Idol-worship in India,—is it indigenous or imported?

If there was no idol-worship in Vedic times, and if it appeared in later times, the question arises, whether it came later on from outside

47 *Germania*, IX, translated by Aikin.
48 *Ancient India* by McFarlane, (1877), p. 199.
or whether it grew up in India itself. There are some who say that it came from outside. Some say that at least a part of the Hindu iconography was the result of Semitic influence. Some say that it came from Greece. It is believed that the Greeks of the Gandhāra School introduced idol-worship into India. Before the time of Asoka, there was no idol-worship. The pād, i.e. the feet, of Buddha were first worshipped. Later on images of Buddha began to be made and the first image made had, as its model, an image of Apollo, the Greek Sungod.

But it seems that idol-worship, though it did not exist in very old Vedic times, originated in the country itself. Foreign influence may have affected the forms etc. of the idols from the point of view of art, but it did not originate idol-worship.

In India, from very ancient times, there was the tendency to idealism. Later on, the idealistic conceptions began to be developed into iconographic works. Art became the co-adjutor of religion. Temples, which were the best specimens of art, became in themselves educative sources. Music, as an art, began to educate by sound. Temples, images, paintings, as works of art, began to educate by sight. Idols began to be an expression of ideals.

*If indigenous, among whom did Idol-worship originate?*

If Idol-worship did not exist in early Vedic times, and if it was not imported but originated at one time in the country itself, among whom and when did it first originate?

Some say that it first originated among the Jainas. The Vedic books speak of sacrifices, among which there were also animal sacrifices. The Jainas, who were opposed to killing animals, replaced this animal sacrifice by the images of their Tirthaṅkaras, so that the attention of their worshippers may be drawn to them in place of the animal sacrifices. The Brāhmaṇas then in rivalry introduced idols in their rituals. They replaced the idols of the Jaina Tirthaṅkaras, Mahāvīra

---

31 The Avesta also refers to animal sacrifices. In Yasna XI (Haoma Yakt, 4; S.B.E., XXXI, p. 245), we read of some such sacrifice of an animal, a particular part of which was offered to Haoma. The use of milk and clarified butter (goshido) in the modern ritual has come down from old times as an improved form of this ancient custom.
and Pārasnāth, by those of their own Rāma and Kṛṣṇa. The Buddhists also had their idols. The Brāhmaṇas, in order to preserve the attachment of the people to their ritual, followed them also and introduced idol-worship.

**Origin of Idol-worship in Persia and Mongolia.**

Various reasons are ascribed to the origin of idol-worship in the world. We saw above how even idealism may lead to it through art, which is a coadjutor of religion. Well-nigh the same cause is attributed to the origin of idol-worship in Persia and Mongolia by later Persian writers.

It is strange that though the Avesta and the Pahlavi literature of ancient Iran speak against idol-worship, according to a later Persian writer, the author of the Zinat-ul-Tavārikh, idol-worship originated in Iran in remote times, in the time of King Tehmurasp (the Taṃmana-urupa of the Avesta), as the result of an extraordinary regard for the dead in the time of an epidemic. "The account of its origin appears very natural. A malignant disease had raged so long in Persia that men, distracted at losing many of their dearest friends and relations, desired to preserve the memory of them by busts and images which they kept in their houses as some consolation under their affliction. These images were transmitted to posterity by whom they were still more venerated; and in the course of time the memorials of tender regard were elevated into objects of worship."

**A similar origin of Idol-worship among the Mongols.**

A similar cause seems to have introduced idol-worship among the Mongols. Malcolm quotes the Travels of William de Rubruquis, a monk who was sent, in A.D. 1253, by Louis IX of France (commonly called St. Louis) to the Court of Mangou Khan, the grand-son of Chengiz. "The monk was told: 'We frame not these images to represent god; but when any rich man among us, or his son, or his wife, or any of his friends dieth, he causeth the image of the dead person to be made, and to be placed here; and we, in remembrance of him, do reverence thereunto . . . . out of regard to their memories.'"

---

33 Ibid, p. 10.
34 Ibid, p. 10, note.
Origin of Idolatry among the ancient Arabs.

Perceval, the modern historian of the Arabs, says that according to some authorities, the early Arabs were free from idolatry. According to others, it prevailed from early times and began with the spread of the Arabs from the Kâbâh. They worshipped at the Kâbâh, and when they began to disperse, they took with them a stone from the vicinity of the Kâbâh as a precious relic (une réliquie précieuse). They put up those stones in their houses wherever they be and went round it as they went round the Kâbâh.

Displeasure against Idolatry carried too far.

Modern critics in their expression of displeasure against idol-worship carry matters very far and treat as idolatry what really is not idolatry. We had an example of this kind recently. In 1916, during the course of the Great War, it was suggested that Crosses or Calvaries may be erected in England on waysides here and there in honour of those who were killed in the war. The Protestant Alliance thereupon protested against the suggestion, and wrote to the Premier that the suggestion may not be followed out. They suggested, in its stead, that the "better way" to show respect to the dead would be to put their names on brass tablets in, or on, public buildings. The Athenæum thereupon said that there was nothing like idolatry in this. It said: "This strikes us as yet another recrudescence of the old iconoclastic spirit, and it is curious to notice that, whether in the eighth or the seventeenth century, whether among Albigenses or English Protestants, it utters always the same peculiarly strident outcry—the burden of which is a horror of idolatory. We doubt whether idolatry—in the sense of definite religious worship offered to a graven image as if it were a divinity—is even possible to a Western European in the twentieth century. Even if it were so, the abuse of a good is not sufficient reason for abolishing its use. The trouble we have to meet in our day and country is not that people fail to practise their religion rightly, but that they tend to have no religion at all. To look for a moment at Christ upon His Cross, remembering as one does so those who have fallen in battle, striving to emulate His spirit of sacrifice, is at least to have a glimpse of them sub specie aeternitatis, as the old phrase has it. Less

than that will hardly satisfy, and we do not think that can be achieved by the brass tablet in a public building."

_Idol-worship, if helpful to the illiterate, may be tolerated._

Various reasons have been preached against idol-worship. One of them, as preached by the Old Testament prophets was that Jehovah or God was jealous and intolerant of such false Gods. But this is not a correct reason. To many worshippers, idol is a symbol. They do not worship God in the idol. Sir Oliver Lodge, one of the best scientists of this day, in his *Man and the Universe*, takes this very sensible view and says: "An idol, to ignorant and undeveloped people, is a symbol of something which they are really worshipping under a material form and embodiment: the sensuous presentation assists their infantile efforts towards abstract thought, as material sacraments help people in a higher stage of religious development. But some of these helps should be out-grown. An adult mathematician hardly needs a geometrical figure, crudely composed of fragments of chalk or smears of plumbago or ink, to help him to reason; and if he uses such a diagram, he is aware that he is not really attending to it, but is reasoning about ideal and unrealisable perfections; he has soared above the symbol, and is away among the cementing laws of the universe. If an image or a tree-trunk or other object helps a savage to meditate on some divine and intractable conception,—if it has been so used by thousands of his ancestors, and has acquired a halo of reverence through antiquity and by the accumulation of human emotion lavished upon it,—a missionary should think twice before he is rude to it, or abuses it or pulls it down. We do not rebuke a child for lavishing a wealth of nascent maternal affection on some grotesque black-Betty of a wooden rag-covered doll; we do not despise, we honour, a regiment content to be decimated so that it may save its flag,—which materially is almost a nonentity. And so, if we send missionaries, we should send competent men, who will gradually educate, by implanting useful arts and positive virtues; and we should tell these messengers, clearly, that negative and iconoclastic teaching may be very cruel. These things depend upon grade attained."

A NOTE ON SANSKRIT COMPOUNDS.

Dr. I. J. S. Taraporewala, B.A., Ph.D., BAR-AT-LAW, Professor of Comparative Philology, University of Calcutta.

The power of making true compounds is taken as one of the distinguishing characteristics of the I.-E.* languages. A true compound should be distinguished from mere juxtaposition. The Semitic languages show a type of "compound" which comes somewhat near the Sanskrit one, i.e. a compound where there is the juxtaposition of two words where one word "governs" the other, standing to it in relation of the genitive case. Such, for example, are the Hebrew "compounds" Ben-Jamin and Beth-Shemesh. But there is one important syntactical difference to be noted between the Hebrew "compound" and the Sanskrit one, namely the word-order. The corresponding Sanskrit would be बेन-जामिन and सीथ-शेमेश respectively, the "possessor" being put first, whereas in the Hebrew the "possessor" comes last. It may also be mentioned in passing that such "compounds" in Hebrew and the other Semitic languages are mostly descriptive proper names, and that these "compounds" are not used in the language as such.

As distinguished from these of the Semitic type are the true compounds of the I.-E. languages. The characteristic feature of a "true" compound is that the sense of the whole is not merely the "sum" of the senses of the two (or more) components, but is something different. The meaning of a true compound is the resultant of the syntactical relations existing between its components, and these relations are not merely those between the possessor and the thing possessed.

The compounds of the I.-E. preserved in the oldest type of the various languages are mostly of two members. In fact in the older literature very rarely shows compounds of even three members. We will chiefly deal with Sanskrit compounds. This restriction to two members is a special characteristic of the Vedic language, and the same is the characteristic feature of compounds in the Avesta. But in the Avesta the compounds are much looser in formation than in Sanskrit. In

* I(ndo)-E(uropean).
Sanskrit, too, the compound began as mere juxtaposition of two words. We have relics of this in the so-called *alūk* compounds where the first member retains its ending, e.g., वैशेषिक, वृद्धिर्भ, etc. The only way in which such *alūk* compounds can be distinguished from two words in juxtaposition is the accent: the compound has one accent, whereas two words in juxtaposition will have, of course, two accents.

The accentuation of compounds throws considerable light on their history. Every word should bear one accent; or to be more accurate one *idea* should have one accent. This in fact constitutes the main difference between two words in juxtaposition and a true compound. The compound represents one idea and hence though made up of several members it should bear only one accent. But there are some remarkable exceptions. The *devatā-devadeva*, as is well known, bears two accents. The reason is not far to seek, the *devatā-devadeva* implies two ideas, the two gods, and therefore it bears two accents. There is also the loose formation known as the *āmreṣṭa*,1 where the word is repeated twice for the sake of emphasis but the two words bear only one accent between them, e.g., ज्ञात्वे परम (slay them each best man), वर्षत्वोऽसः (our very selves), विज्ञात्वाक्षात्मेवतोऽसः पवः विपवर्यि (from every limb, from every hair, in every joint). In a few cases, however, the two words bear two accents, where probably the feeling was lost that this formation was originally a loose type of compound.

The natural tendency in languages of every type is to progress from the synthetic to the analytic type. This is really a movement in the direction of simplification and clearness of expression, and it reflects the growth and development in the mental powers of a people. It has been very clearly seen in the case of languages which are spoken by peoples in a lower stage of civilization. Thus in the Malay-Polynesian family of languages we find that the Polynesian group is almost entirely analytic in structure, and these languages are spoken by the most advanced of the peoples in the Pacific Islands. So also among the American languages we find that the language of the Aztecs, the most civilized nation of ancient America, most closely approaches the analytic structure. Among the Semitic languages the same tendency is distinctly marked, especially in Hebrew, as also among the I.-E. languages. Practically every language of the I.-E. family is at the present day well

advanced on the analytic stage and a few like Bengali, English and Persian are practically become "isolating" in their syntax.

All the ancient languages of the I.-E. family were allowed to grow unhampered in the natural manner. In the case of Sanskrit—the literary dialect of ancient Indian—there was a special check. This was the great grammarian Pāṇini. In all languages the grammarian has occupied the position of one who points out what the structure of that language is. He merely analyzes the language; and Pāṇini, too, called his work an analysis (vyākaraṇa). But so great was his achievement, and so thorough and perfect was his analysis of the Sanskrit tongue, that soon after his time his grammar was taken to be not a mere statement of what existed in the language in his days, but it became an authority as to what the language should be for all time to come. Added to this was of course the fact that Sanskrit embodied the sacred literature of the Vedas. This two-fold reason invested Pāṇini, with an inviolable sanctity; he was elevated to the rank of a Rṣi, and a Hindu would sooner dare to alter the reading of the Vedas than think of disobeying any rule of Pāṇini's Grammar. Pāṇini was certainly fully worthy of all the honour paid to him, for his has been the most perfect analysis (vyākaraṇa) ever produced for any language in the world. But the result of all the honour paid to him has been that Sanskrit was as it were confined within the limits of the several thousand sūtras of Pāṇini. This proved fatal to the subsequent growth of the language. Sanskrit began to die, in other words it gradually ceased to be used as a vernacular dialect. A dialect used by the masses needs must be flexible and unfettered by any rules. After the time of the great Pāṇini all subsequent growth of Sanskrit as a spoken language was completely arrested, and gradually Sanskrit ceased to be spoken by the people at large: it "died." It still possessed vitality enough to carry it on for some centuries after the date of Pāṇini, during which his reputation, too, had time to expand. The earlier dramatists, up to the days of Kālidāsa, use a language which seems quite natural, if not entirely a spoken idiom. We feel when we read, for example, the works of Kālidāsa that the author has had Sanskrit for his mother tongue, it flows so naturally and in such an uninterrupted stream from his pen. We feel that he thought in Sanskrit. We cannot quite make this assertion for the later authors of the

2 From the root kr, with sī and ṣ, "to separate into parts," "to analyse."
"Classical Age," for people like Bhavabhūti and Magha, or even for Bhartrihari. With these later writers the language is distinctly artificial and laboured, and surely no human being can ever think in such a complex and such an artificial language.

When Sanskrit ceased to be the spoken vernacular (to be more accurate, one of the vernaculars) of India, it did not cease to be cultivated by the learned. In fact it is even today the language of the learned, and as such it has profoundly influenced the history of all the vernaculars of the land. The vernaculars were, however, unfettered by any grammar and so they continued to grow and many of them in their turn produced literatures, thus taking the place (of course within very limited areas) which had originally belonged to Sanskrit. These vernaculars, the Prakrits, developed along the natural lines of all languages, i.e. from the synthetic to the analytic structure. The modern vernaculars of India, which have developed out of the Prakrits, have continued further along this line practically unchecked, except for the alternating periods of "Classicism" which have marked the history of them all.

But, as we saw above, Sanskrit continued to be cultivated by the learned all over India and though unable to grow towards the analytical structure as a whole, there still remained one direction in which it could do so, and that too without in the least infringing upon the rules laid down by Pāṇini. And this was in the compounds. Pāṇini had fully analysed the compounds as they existed in his days and he did not lay down any limit to the number of words that a compound may contain. The one characteristic of the compound was that it enabled one to dispense with the *pratyayas* or endings, which formed such a marked feature of Sanskrit (in the synthetic stage), and of which there was such a bewildering store. In other words every compound was an attempt at the analytic construction. When Sanskrit was a living, growing language the compound was not intended to be used extensively for this purpose, for its primary function seems to have been the formation of a fresh idea by combining two or more words. But later

---

1 In this term Pali is also included.
2 Every vernacular literature of India shows alternating periods of "Classicism" and what might be termed "Romanticism." During the former Sanskrit grammar and phraseology rules all the writings produced, during the latter the colloquial is in the ascendant.
on this primary function was almost entirely forgotten, and in the hands of the later Sanskrit writers the compound became the means by which they could avoid the complexities of the synthetic Sanskrit grammar. No doubt the influence of the Prakrits and later on of the modern vernaculars with their ever-growing analytic structure helped greatly in the increasingly apparent tendency to use longer and more complex compounds. For we must remember that the learned men, even though they used Sanskrit very largely in their daily lives, did use the spoken dialects at home, and at any rate heard them all the day from the people surrounding them. As time went on there appeared greater and greater divergence between the learned Sanskrit and the home dialects, and it is remarkable that the size of Sanskrit compounds too increases in proportion to this divergence throughout the Classical period of Sanskrit literature.

The long unwieldy compounds of Classical Sanskrit are, therefore, merely a result of the general tendency of the Indian languages towards analytic structure. These compounds are the wonder and terror of all young students, but looked at from this point of view they are merely attempts to compose Sanskrit sentences in the "isolating" manner. And looking at the general tendencies of linguistic growth at that period in India this is not at all surprising. Luckily there is no rule in Pāṇini which could have prevented this natural tendency from blossoming forth in this wondrous manner. These compounds indicate the direction along which Sanskrit might have developed had the Aṣṭādhyāyī of Pāṇini not been invested with its almost religious sanction. Only, in that case, we would have written the words separately and not as the terrible, long "alphabetical processions" which formed the greatest stumbling blocks during the student days of most of us.

We see a somewhat similar tendency in those of the I.-E. languages which have retained the synthetic structure to a greater or lesser extent to the present day. This is very clearly seen in the case of modern German. As compared with the other languages of the Teutonic branch its structure still retains a great deal of the older synthetic apparatus. Hence it has developed the power of compound building to a very remarkable extent. The German compounds are quite comparable to the Sanskrit ones, and serve much the same

---

8 Mark Twain, *A Tramp Abroad*. He has used this fine phrase to describe German compounds.
purpose in the economy of the language. In contrast to this English shows very few compounds, for the simple reason that there is no need for them in that language, as its structure is such as does not need these "syntactical compounds." The few compounds we find in English are of the nature of the true original compounds of the Indo-European languages.
Pali, Prakrit and Sanskrit in Buddhist Literature.

Sailendranath Mitra, M.A., Lecturer in Pali and Indian Vernaculars, University of Calcutta.

Opinions of modern scholars differ as to the place of Pali in Buddhist literature. According to Mr. G. R. Nariman, "Pali is the hieratic language of the Buddhists of Ceylon, Siam and Burma, who observe a prosaic and more ancient form of Buddhism."¹ Dr. Winternitz, who does not express his views so bluntly as Mr. Nariman, holds that "the language of the Tripitaka is scarcely the same as that of the canon of the third century B.C. The latter could only be the Māgadhi, the dialect of the province of Magadha, modern Behar. It was the home-tongue of the Buddha, who doubtless first preached in this idiom. Likewise the monks who fixed the canon in Paṭaliputra, the capital of Magadha, employed the Māgadhi idiom. Traces of this Māgadhi canon can still be perceived in our Pali corpus. But Pali, the ecclesiastical language of the Buddhists of Ceylon, Siam and Burma, is designated by the latter themselves as Māgadhī, although it essentially differs from the latter which is otherwise known to us from inscriptions, literary works, and grammars. At any rate it corresponds equally little with any other dialect known to us. Pali is just a language of literature which has been exclusively employed as such only by the Buddhists, and has sprung like every literary language more or less from an admixture of several dialects. Obviously such a literary tongue, although it represents a kind of compromise between diverse vernaculars, is ultimately derived from one definite dialect. And this the Māgadhī can very well be, so that the tradition which makes Pali and Māgadhī synonymous is not to be accepted literally, but at the same time it rests on a historical basis ...... The literary language, Pali ......, developed only gradually and was probably fixed when it was reduced to writing in Ceylon under Vattagamini."² The veteran scholars

¹ Literary History of Sanskrit Buddhism, p. 1.
² Winternitz's views on the Pali canon, translated from the German by G. K. Nariman, ibid, pp. 213-214.
of Buddhist Sanskrit literature such as Dr. Rājendralāla Mitra, M. Sylvain Lévi, Dr. Windisch, M. de la Valée Poussin have disputed with strong reasons on their side the Theravāda or orthodox tradition that the Pali canon preserves the original words of the Buddha. No decisive result of this controversy has yet been obtained; on the other hand, the traditional belief that the Pali canon preserves the words of the Buddha has been shaken. We have no definite statement on the point even from such distinguished authorities on Pali literature as Professors Rhys Davids and Oldenberg, although the former has conclusively proved that the Pali canonical books are "North-Indian, not Singhaese in origin," and the latter has rightly claimed that "the Pali replica which is naturally not immaculately correct must however be adjudged as eminently good." This controversy has become all the more absorbing by the recent discovery of numerous manuscript fragments in Khotan and other parts of Eastern Turkestan. The most ancient and important literary document that has come down to us is a Kharoṣṭhī manuscript of the Dhammapada, first edited in 1897 by M. Émile Senart in the Journal Asiatique. The object of this paper is to enquire whether this document throws any new light on the position of Pali in Indian as well as in Buddhist literature.

The text of the manuscript is undoubtedly a recension of the Dhammapa and the language is a Prakrit dialect having a close kinship in orthography and phonetics with the dialects of the Shahbazgarhi and Manshehra recensions of Aśoka's Rock Edicts, which are also written in the Kharoṣṭhī script. The later manuscript fragments found in Khotan, Turfan and other parts of Eastern Turkestan are Buddhist-Sanskrit and Sanskrit texts mostly belonging to the Sarvāstivāda sect. These are all written in the Gupta variety of the Brāhmī script. And what distinguishes these from the Kharoṣṭhī manuscript of the Dhammapada is that side by side with the texts we have translations in local scripts and local dialects. The finds at Turfan which are important to us are the fragments of a manuscript of the Udānavarga, which, in the opinion of Pischel, is a Sanskrit recension of the Dhammapada. A complete edition of these fragments is still a desideratum,
but the specimen that we have of the text in Pischel's edition is enough to show that it is a recension of the original of the Tibetan version, translated into English by Rockhill. There is, according to Rockhill, also a Chinese translation of the same text, the Chui-yau-king or Nidānasūtra, which agrees generally with the Tibetan. Both Beal and Rockhill tell us that the Chinese and the Tibetan versions equally attribute the authorship of the Udānavarga to Dharmatrāta, and the former records that he was the uncle of Vasumitra, the distinguished leader of the Sarvāstivādins in the time of Kaniska.

It appears, therefore, that there are two land-marks of Buddhist literature in the two recensions of the Dhammapada, viz., (1) a Prakrit text, of which a Kharoṣṭhī manuscript was discovered near Khotan, and (2) a text in Classical Sanskrit, of which a manuscript in a Gupta variety of Brāhmi was found in Turfan. In addition to these we have three, more strictly, two, other recensions of the Dhammapada, viz., (1) a Pali recension, of which the manuscripts have been preserved in Ceylon, Siam and Burma, (2) a recension in Mixed Sanskrit, of which a whole chapter, viz., the Sahasravarga, has been quoted in the Mahāvastu, besides sundry other verses from the same recension, and (3) the original of the Chinese translation, the Fa-kheu-king, which agrees, as Beal has shown, with the Pali so far as the title and arrangement of chapters are concerned, differing from it and other recensions in the number of verses, but at the same time containing a strange admixture of matters in different recensions—a feature which makes it difficult at once to ascertain the nature of the original. Thus, in all we get four well-defined land-marks, which may be arranged provisionally in the following order:

(1) The Pali Recension,
(2) The Prakrit,
(3) The Mixed Sanskrit,
(4) The Sanskrit.

Of these No. 1 has been incorporated in the Pali or Theravāda canon; No. 3 has been expressly quoted in the Midland Recension of the Mahāvastu and singled out therein as the first book of the

---

6 The Udānavarga.
7 Rockhill's Udānavarga, Intro., p. x. The point has, however, been disputed in our Prakrit Dhammapada, which has been published by the Calcutta University.
Vinaya-Pitaka belonging to the Lokottaravādins, the dissenters from the Mahāsanghikas⁹; and No. 4 may be said to be a work of the Sarvāstivādins on the ground that it is ascribed to Dharmatrāta, a name which, be it noted, can alternate with "Dharmarakkhita." As regards No. 2, we are not in a position to associate it with any particular sect. But considering that the text has been found in the Gandhara regions (which, as a linguistic area, can be said to include the Indian colonies of Khotan¹⁰) and that all the other older texts found in Eastern Turkestan belong to Sarvāstivāda (including the Dharmagupta and other offshoots), we may be justified in ascribing the Prakrit text to the same sect.

The difficulty is great regarding the chronology of the Dhammapada text, and in the present circumstances it can be partly obviated from the dates of the Chinese and Tibetan translations.

There are altogether four Chinese versions of the Dhammapada which are as follows: (1) the Fa-kheu-king, of which the original is ascribed to a Dharmatrāta¹¹ and tentatively identified by Beal with the Pali Dhammapada, and said to have been carried over from India in A.D. 223, (2) the Fa-kheu-pi-u, which consists of the text of Fa-kheu-king and some illustrative fables and is dated A.D. 265–313, (3) the Chu-yau-king, which, according to Rockhill, shows a close agreement with the Tibetan Udānavarga and is dated A.D. 410, (4) the fourth version, which remains un-named, is dated A.D. 800 or 900. We learn from the translators' preface to the Fa-kheu-pi-u that they were acquainted with three Dhammapada texts, one consisting of 900 verses, another of 700 and another of 500, and that the text most popular in their time was the one with 700 gāthās. The text with 500 verses is no other than the original of the Fa-kheu-king carried to China in A.D. 223. The Tibetan version of the Udānavarga consisting of 989 verses was made by Vidyāprabhākara in A.D. 817–842. In the absence of detailed information it is not easy to establish any relationship between the originals of the Tibetan version and the fourth Chinese version, although their dates run close to each other.

⁹ Cl. Mahāvastu, I, p. 2: "āryamahāsanghikānāṁ lokottaravādināṁ madhyadesi-kūnāṁ pāṭhena vinayapitakasya Mahāvastu eddi."

¹⁰ Literary History of Sanskrit Buddhism, p. 238.

¹¹ There is another Chinese version of a Dhammapada, of which we have no other information from Chinese scholars than that its author was Dharmatrāta.
Now, relying upon Rockhill's authority as to the general agreement of the Tibetan with the third Chinese version (A.D. 410), we might perhaps assume that the original of these two versions is no other than the text with 900 verses known in the third century A.D. to the authors of the Fa-kheu-pi-u. Seeing that the Udānavaṅga found in Turfan agrees so closely with the Tibetan version, we venture to say that the Sanskrit recension may be identified with the Dhammapada of 900 verses. But there are 989 verses in the Tibetan version. The difficulty is how to harmonize this difference in number. We can, however, partly reduce the number of verses in the Tibetan by the fact that in two instances a verse which is counted as one in the Pali Dhammapada has been counted as two in the Tibetan (e.g., Ch. III, 12-13 and Ch. XXXIII, 82-83) by omitting six repetitions noticed by Rockhill. There are, besides, a number of mechanical multiplications of verses without any justification, which have a marked tendency to swell the volume without bringing out any new idea (e.g., Ch. XXXII, 58-63, 65-69). But how far this process of reduction can proceed it is difficult to say. At any rate we may be sure that, of the Sanskrit Dharmapada text, there were more redactions than one, made at different times with slight variations in regard to the succession of chapters and the number of verses. The question of these redactions and their differences cannot be finally settled until the Indian originals are all discovered. In this state of uncertainty, the utmost we can do is to attempt to fix a chronology of the four Dhammapada texts which we find preserved, in part or in entirety, in the original, by a comparative study of their language and contents.

If we examine the arrangement of chapters in these texts, we shall find that—

(1) The Pali Dhammapada consists of 26 chapters and 423 verses, the succession of the chapters being as follows: Yamaka (20 verses), Appamāda (12), Citta (11), Puppha (16), Bāla (16), Paṇḍita (14), Araṁanta (10), Sahassa (16), Pāpa (13), Daṇḍa (17), Jarā (11), Attā (10), Loka (12), Buddha (18), Sukha (12), Piya (12), Kodha (14), Mala (21), Dhammattha (17), Magga (17), Pakinnaka (16), Niraya

14 This presumption is borne out by Prof. Pischel's comparison of the number of verses and chapters of the Sanskrit Dharmapada and its Tibetan translation—see his Turfan Recension, p. 973.
(14), Nāga (14), Taṇhā (26), Bhikkhu (23) and Brāhmaṇa (41).

(2) The Prakrit text, as found in fragments, contains the following chapters\(^{13}\): Maga (30), Apramāda (25), Cīta (5 only survive), Puṣa (15), Sahasa (17), Panita (10), Bala (8 only survive), Jara (25), Suha (20 only survive), Taṣa (6 only survive), Bhikkhu (40) and Bramana (50).

(3) The Mixed Sanskrit in Mahāvastu quotations contains: Sahasra (24) and Bhikṣu (15 only survive).

(4) The Sanskrit contains 33 chapters in the following order: Jarā (41), Kāma (20), *Tṛṇā (20)\(^{14}\), *Apramāda (35), Priya (27)\(^{15}\), *Śīla (20), *"Virtuous Conduct" (12), Vācā (15), *Karma (19), *Śraddhā (16), *Śramaṇa (16), *Mārga (20), *Satkāra (17), *"Hatred" (18), *Śmṛti (28), Prakīrṇaka (24)\(^{16}\), *Water (12), *Puṣpa (26)\(^{17}\), *"The Horse" (16), Krodha (22)\(^{18}\), *Tathāgata (15), *"The Hearer" (19), *Ātmā (21), *Sahasra (34), *Bala (25), *Nirvāṇa (33), *"Sight" (37), *Pāpa (41), Yuga (57)\(^{19}\), Sukha (51 or 52)\(^{20}\), Citta, (60)\(^{21}\), *Bhikṣu (77), *Brāhmaṇa (91).

The chapters common to the above four texts, taking the Tibetan version to represent its Sanskrit original, are two, viz. the Sahassa-vagga and the Bhikkhu-vagga. But we had better leave the Bhikkhu-vagga out of account, because the chapter, as found in the Mixed Sanskrit text, is incomplete. Comparing, then, the number of verses under the Sahasra group in the four texts, we get the following:—

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Pali</th>
<th>Prakrit</th>
<th>Mixed Sanskrit</th>
<th>Sanskrit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16 verses</td>
<td>17 &quot;&quot;</td>
<td>24 &quot;&quot;</td>
<td>34 &quot;&quot;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^{13}\) The chapters are un-named in the extant Kharoṣṭhī manuscript. The names have been supplied by us.

\(^{14}\) The asterisk (*) denotes that the chapter occurs in the Tibetan translation and is missing from the MS. fragments of the Sanskrit text.

\(^{15}\) The Tibetan translation has 28.

\(^{16}\) The Tibetan has 23.

\(^{17}\) The Tibetan has 27 including a repetition.

\(^{18}\) The Tibetan has 21.

\(^{19}\) The Tibetan has 59 including four repetitions.

\(^{20}\) The Tibetan has 53.

\(^{21}\) The Tibetan has 64 including a repetition.
The table shows that the number of verses go on increasing in the order in which the texts are mentioned.

Again, if we compare the number of verses in the chapters which are common to three texts—Pali, Prakrit and Sanskrit,—the same will be the result in almost all cases, as will be evident from the following table:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chapters</th>
<th>Pali</th>
<th>Prakrit</th>
<th>Sanskrit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Āppamādavagga</td>
<td>II. 12</td>
<td>II. 25&lt;sup&gt;22&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>IV. 35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pupphavagga</td>
<td>IV. 16</td>
<td>IV. 15</td>
<td>XVIII. 26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bālavagga</td>
<td>V. 16</td>
<td>VII. 8 (surviving)</td>
<td>XXV. 25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jarāvagga</td>
<td>XI. 11</td>
<td>VIII. 25</td>
<td>I. 41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sukhavagga</td>
<td>XV. 12</td>
<td>IX. 20 (surviving)&lt;sup&gt;42&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>XXX. 51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bhikkhuwavagga</td>
<td>XXV. 23</td>
<td>XI. 40</td>
<td>XXXII. 77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brāhmaṇavagga</td>
<td>XXVI. 41</td>
<td>XII. 50</td>
<td>XXXIII. 91</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Looking into this table and the previous one, it becomes quite clear that the Prakrit text stands closest to the Pali in point of number of verses and arrangement of chapters. Further, there is, as appears from the wide divergence of the number of verses, a link missing between Prakrit and Sanskrit, and the first table suggests that the needed link can be supplied by Mixed Sanskrit. Taking the first table as providing a standard ratio of the verse-numbers in the four recensions and the total number 423 of Pali verses as the minimum, the Prakrit, the Mixed Sanskrit and Sanskrit may be expected to contain roughly 449, 635 and 899 verses respectively. Now, if we remember the Chinese translators’ information about three Dhammapada texts, severally containing 500, 700 and 900 verses, then the results just arrived at would approximately tally with them, that is to say, the Prakrit text would very nearly equate with the original of the Fa-kheu-king, the Mixed Sanskrit with the text of 700, and the Sanskrit with that of 900 verses.

Now, if we look into Beal’s table<sup>23</sup> of the chapters and the

<sup>22</sup> The numbering of the chapter is according to the arrangement followed in our edition of the Prakrit Dhammapada, which is in the Press. A few chapters are missing from the existing fragments, which makes it difficult to arrange it as it was in the original. The same holds good of the numbering of the remaining Prakrit chapters.

<sup>23</sup> But the chapter seems to be complete.  
original of the *Fa-kheu-king*, we cannot fail to notice that it was a text somewhat different from the Prakrit and that it stood nearer the Pali. For convenience' sake, we had better tabulate the results of the comparison:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pali.</th>
<th>Original of the <em>Fa-kheu-king.</em></th>
<th>Prakrit.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I. 20</td>
<td>I. 22</td>
<td>.......</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II. 12</td>
<td>II. 20</td>
<td>II. 25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III. 11</td>
<td>III. 12</td>
<td>III. 5 (surviving)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV. 16</td>
<td>IV. 17</td>
<td>IV. 15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V. 16</td>
<td>V. 21</td>
<td>VII. 8 (surviving)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VI. 14</td>
<td>VI. 17</td>
<td>VI. 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VII. 10</td>
<td>VII. 10</td>
<td>.......</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VIII. 16</td>
<td>VIII. 16</td>
<td>V. 17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IX. 13</td>
<td>IX. 22</td>
<td>.......</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X. 17</td>
<td>X. 14</td>
<td>.......</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XI. 11</td>
<td>XI. 14</td>
<td>VIII. 25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XII. 10</td>
<td>XII. 14</td>
<td>.......</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XIII. 12</td>
<td>XIII. 14</td>
<td>.......</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XIV. 18</td>
<td>XIV. 21</td>
<td>.......</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XV. 12</td>
<td>XV. 14</td>
<td>.......</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XVI. 12</td>
<td>XVI. 12</td>
<td>IX. 20 (surviving)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XVII. 14</td>
<td>XVII. 26</td>
<td>.......</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XVIII. 21</td>
<td>XVIII. 19</td>
<td>.......</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XIX. 17</td>
<td>XIX. 17</td>
<td>.......</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XX. 17</td>
<td>XX. 28</td>
<td>I. 30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XXI. 16</td>
<td>XXI. 14</td>
<td>.......</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XXII. 14</td>
<td>XXII. 16</td>
<td>.......</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XXIII. 14</td>
<td>XXIII. 18</td>
<td>.......</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XXIV. 26</td>
<td>XXIV. 32</td>
<td>X. 6 (surviving)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XV. 23</td>
<td>XV. 32</td>
<td>XI. 40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XVI. 41</td>
<td>XVI. 40</td>
<td>XII. 50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total No. of verses:** 423 502 275 (surviving)

Let us now proceed to enquire if these results are also borne out by other evidences. First, the date of the *Fa-kheu-king* is given as 221 A.D., that is to say, its original must necessarily be dated earlier, and if Dharmatrāta or "Dharmarakkhita", the putative
author, be an uncle of Vasumitra, a contemporary of Kanîśka, the original should be placed in the first century B.C., as Beal is inclined to think. We know that the documents in Kharoṣṭhī from the Gandhara regions date from King Aśoka (or, from the 3rd cent. B.C. to 3rd cent. A.D.) The date, therefore, of the Kharoṣṭhī manuscript of the Dhammapada falls within this period. The manuscript has been found in the part of Khotan which, according to a tradition in the Divyâvadāna, was colonised by the exiles from Taxila who were banished by King Aśoka on account of the blinding of his son Kunāla. That this tradition has an historical basis is borne out by the very dialect of the Prakrit text, which in orthography and phonetics has so close a resemblance with the dialects of Aśoka’s Rock Edicts at Shahbazgarhi and Mansehra. That the dialects of these Rock Edicts belong to the Gandhara regions and to no other, is evident from several recensions of the Rock and Pillar Edicts, which are invariably written in dialects adapted to the local varieties of speech. For instance, if we follow the inscriptions from Kalsi to Dhaulī and Jangada, i.e., from modern Dehra Dun to the Orissa and Ganjam districts, we cannot fail to notice that the dialects gradually change, as we proceed to the south-east, to Magadhī, and a general linguistic affinity is noticeable in the inscriptions found in Northern and Southern quarters of India which lie outside the Gandhara region (considered as a linguistic area), bounded on the south-east by Dehra Dun, on the south by Kathiawar and extending beyond the Himalayas through a north-western route as far as Khotan. The prominent features of orthography which provide a common linguistic bond to the dialects of the Prakrit Dhammapada and Aśoka’s inscriptions of Shahbazgarhi and Mansehra are the absence of long vowels and the use of three sibilants $s, z$ and $s$, and certain conjunct consonants, e.g. $rd, rv, tm$ and so forth, and some characteristic phonetic changes, such as dhamatrakehi for dharmatarkai, druracha for dūraksyam, answering to Dhrama for Dharma, Priyadraśī for Priyadarśī of Shahbazgarhi and Mansehra. And the decisive trace of Iranian influence upon the dialect of the Prakrit Dhammapada as well as on the Girnar or Kathiawar recensions of Aśoka’s Rock Edicts is the substitution of $p$ for $v$, e.g., viśpasi (Prakrit Dhammapada) standing for Sk. viśvase. But this is not to deny

Nariman, Literary History of Sanskrit Buddhism.
See Kunāla-Avadāna
in toto all vestige of the Magadhi element in the dialect of the Prakrit text, and no less in the dialects of Shahbazgarhi and Manshehra edicts. The case of the latter can be explained by the fact that the mandate was issued by the Emperor himself from Pataliputra, the capital of Magadha. In one respect the dialect of the Prakrit text differs from the dialects of Shahbazgarhi and Manshehra edicts, viz., that while the latter consistently use the same forms of expression, the former uses variants; cf. sarvi, savi for Sk. sarve, Pali sabbe; savruto, samento for Sk. samyrtab and Pali samvuto. The inference is that the compiler of the Prakrit text could not be a native of the Gandhara region but surely had much to do with Magadha or some other part of the Buddhist Midland where the dialects were consummated in two such literary languages as Ardhamagadhi and Pali. All this lends support to the assumption that the Prakrit text was a Gandhara recension of the Dhammapada compiled in a dialect intelligible to the locality.

Let us next proceed to enquire whether the compiler had any model before him. That there was some sort of model before the compiler there can be no doubt. A comparison of the Prakrit verses with their Pali counterparts would disclose that the verses in the Pali are loosely grouped, irrespective of their real bearing on the main theme which the chapters purport to suggest. For instance, the verse—

"aciram vaṭāyam kāyo pathaviṁ adhisessati
chuddho apetaviṁnāno nirattham va kalindraram"—

has been grouped under the Cittavagga, evidently with no justification but merely on account of an occurrence in it of the word viṁnāna, which is a synonym of citta, mind. The Prakrit counterpart of the verse, embodying as it does a pessimistic reflection on decay and decrepitude, has rightly been grouped under the Jaravarga, the chapter on Decay,—an arrangement which is also to be met with in the Udānavarga. In such scientific and logical arrangement of verses, the Prakrit text is conspicuous to a nicety, and it shows a decisive improvement upon a compilation like the Pali text where sense has in numerous instances been sacrificed to sound. Looking into the verses dealing with jarā, for instance, we find that the Prakrit has brought together not only all the relevant verses lying promiscuously scattered throughout the Pali text under the different vaggas, but also similar verses, as much as could be available, from other
Nikāya texts, mostly from the Saṁyutta, the Suttasutta of the Suttanipāta, the Majjhima, the Ayoghara-jātaka (No. 510), the Dasaratha-jātaka and the Mupppakkha-jātaka (illustrated in the bas-relief on the railing of the Bharhut Stupa). Moreover, verses, of which the counterpart are not to be found in the Pali Dhammapada, can be traced to two chapters, one dealing like the Pali with jara, and the other, an additional chapter, dealing with Impermanency, both being comprised into one chapter of the Udānavarga. The jara verses are found in the opening chapters of the Udānavarga and the Chinese Fa-kheu-kiing, while, as we have noticed, the opening chapters of the Pali and the original of the Fa-kheu-kiing do not deal with "Decay" (but with "Mind" or the Will-factor in Faith), which, however, is relegated to a later chapter—i.e., Chapter XI. Now, the opening chapter of the Prakrit text differs from those in the others in that it emphasises the importance of the Buddhist Path. It differs also from both the Pali text and the original of the Fa-kheu-kiing in that it brings into clearer relief the optimistic views of Happiness by juxtaposing its Suhavaga to its Jaravaga, which contains pessimistic reflections on Decay, and the verses are so arranged as to ultimately lead up to the idea of Happiness.

We have dealt with particular chapters of the three texts, and we should like to see what results the examination of particular verses may yield.

Let us consider the following set of verses:

1. yān' imāni apatthāṇi alāpūn' eva sārāde
   kāpotakāṇi aṭṭhini tāni disvāna kā rati.
   (Pali Dhammapada, Jaravaga.)

2. (a) (yanimani) avathani a(lav)u . . .
   (saghavana)ni ñisani tani diśṭani ka rati.
   (b) yanimani prabhaguni vichitani diśodiśa
   kavotaka. aṭṭhini tani diśṭani ka rati.
   (Prakrit Dhammapada, Jaravaga.)

3. (a) "Old and feeble, with exhausted powers—what good can
survive anxious thought.

(b) When old, like autumn-leaves, decayed and without
covering, life ebbed out and dissolution at hand, little
good repentance then!"
   (Fa-kheu-pi-ū, "Old Age"—Beal’s translation.)
Cf. 4. (a) ānīmāny apaviddhāni vikṣiptāni diśo dāsa |
kapotavānāny āsthiṇi tāni śrīṅgeva ka ratīḥ ||
(b) imāni yāny upasthānāni alāburīva sarabe |
saṅkhavārṇāni śirshāni tāni śrīṅgeva ka ratīḥ ||

(Dīvyāvadāna, p. 561.)

It is clear that in place of one verse in the Pali Dhammapada we have two verses in each of the Prakrit and the original of the Fa-kheu-pi-u. It is also to be noticed that the Prakrit has driven two lines in between the two lines of the Pali, making four lines altogether. The order in Prakrit is not followed in the Divyāvadāna, but inverted; but the arrangement in the latter is on a par with that in the original of the Fa-kheu-pi-u, as appears from Beal’s translation of it quoted above (No. 3). We cannot determine the order of verses in the original of the Fa-kheu-king from the order of verses in their later Avadāna form in the Fa-kheu-pi-u, considering that Beal’s translation of the latter does not indicate that this commentarial text has faithfully preserved all the verses in the original of the former. It will be safe to say that whatever the original of the Fa-kheu-king, the Divyāvadāna verses are quotations from an older Avadāna text similar to some original of the Fa-kheu-pi-u. Now, the Pali verse cannot be traced in any other canonical text. The only source of this particular verse that we can hit upon is a certain section of the Satipaṭṭhāna discourse and a Buddhist version of the atheistic doctrine of Ajitakesakambala, both forming stock passages which can be regarded, after Prof. Rhys Davids, as the pre-Nikāya materials of the Buddhist canon.27 We meet with the expression “kāpotakāni atṭhīṇi” in Ajita’s passage.28 But the source of the reflections of the entire verse are to be found in the Satipaṭṭhāna section, which gives a vivid description of the process of decomposition of a dead body in a charnel field.29 And the same is the source of the expressions as well as reflections of the two verses, whether from the Prakrit or from the Divyāvadāna. Compare, for instance, the expressions diśāvidiśa vikkhittāni (of the earlier prose discourse) versus as vichitani diśodiśa in the Prakrit, and as vikṣiptāni diśo dāsa in the Divyāvadāna; similarly, saṅkhavatunāpamānibhāṇi versus as saṅghavanani śiśani in the Prakrit and saṅkhavartāṇi

27 Buddhist India, p. 188.
28 Majjh., I, p. 58; also, Dīgha.
29 Dīgha., I, p. 55.
śīrśāṇi in the Divyāvadāna. Though the earliest source of these verses in the Prakrit can be traced in prose to the Satipatthāna, we cannot account for the poetic mould and the simile contained therein unless the model of the Pali verse be brought to intervene. But even then the direct source of Prakrit verses would not be fully determined; for, there are very many dialectical forms in the Prakrit transliteration which have a tinge of Mixed Sanskrit. We are led to the same conclusion by the verse quotation from the Divyāvadāna, which is seemingly derived from an older Avadāna text, referred to above as the original of the Fa-kheu-pi-u. But, at the same time we cannot hold that the Prakrit had drawn upon this Avadāna original, because the order of the Prakrit verses, betraying the process of their growth from one verse to two by the thrusting of two lines into it, has been inverted in the arrangement found in the Divyāvadāna quotation. Failing to obtain in the Avadāna original the much-needed order for the Prakrit, we cannot but fix our attention upon the original of the Fa-kheu-king, presupposed by the former; and we believe that the Fa-kheu-king, when it is translated, may verify this hypothesis.

Again, if we examine (from the Prakrit Dhammapada) the set of four verses 30 which immediately follow the one just considered, we notice that their counterparts are not to be found in the Pali Dhammapada, though a counterpart of the 4th verse can be traced in the Theravīṭṭha, v. 32:

\[
\text{ajaraṁ jirāmānena tappamānena nibbutim}
\]
\[
nimmissaṁ paramaṁ santim yogakkhamaṁ anuttaram.\]

With regard to the construction of the first three verses, we are reminded of the first line of a Samyutta verse—

\[
iminā pūtikāyena bhindanena probhaṅgunā
\]
\[
attiyāmi hariyāmi kāmataṇḍhā samūhataḥ—\]

30 (a) imina putikaena atureṇa pabhāguna
\[nicaśaḥaviṣṭinena jaraḥamena s(ava)su\]
\[\text{(nimē)dha parama śodhi yokachemu anutara}.\]
(b) imina putikaena viśvarena ............
\[nicaśaḥaviṣṭinena ............\]
\[\text{(nimē)dha parama śodhi yokachemu anutara}.\]
(c) imina putikaena viśavatena putina
\[nicaśaḥaviṣṭinena jaraḥa .............\]
\[\text{(nimē)dha parama śodhi yokachemu anutara}.\]
(d) ayāra viyamaneṇa dajjhamaneṇa niyutī
\[nimedha parama śodhi yokachemu anutara}.\]
of which the first line seems to be the basis of the first lines of
the three Prakrit verses. With regard to the third line, common to
all the three Prakrit verses, we are reminded of the second line of the
Theragāthā verse quoted above. The second and third lines being
common, the difference between the three Prakrit verses hinges on
their first lines, which slightly vary from each other but seem on the
whole manipulations on a common model, which is to be found in
the Samyutta verse. The third line of the first three Prakrit verses
seems to be a later addition; the three verses appear to be variations
of one model verse, of which an idea can be had from a parallel in
the additional section (Sec. 1) of the Fa-kheu-pi-n, which reads in
Beal’s translation as follows:

"What use is the body when it lies rotting beside the flowings of the Ganges? It is but the prison-house of disease, and of the pains of old age and death. To delight in pleasure, and to be greedy after self-indulgence is but to increase the load of sin, forgetting the great change that must come, and the inconstancy of human life."

Verse 37 in the Tibetan version of the Udānavarga, Ch. I, tallies
exactly with the Samyutta verse quoted above. All these make us think
that the four Prakrit verses had grown out of the permutation and
combination, so to say, of three verses which must read in Pali:

1. iminā pūtikāyena bhindanena pabhāgūna
   attiyāmi hariyāmi kāmataṁhā samūhata.

2. iminā pūtikāyena āturena pabhāgūna
   nicasubhāvijānena jarādhammena saṁvāso.

3. ajaram jiramānena tappamānena nibbutim
   nimissam paramāṁ santiṁ yoģakkhemaṁ anuttaram.

Again, if we care to trace these ideas to their first source, we
come face to face with the same Satipatthāna section which moralises
on the decaying process of a dead body in a charnel-field. And this
source is reached through an intermediate stage represented by such
poems as the Vijayasutta incorporated in the Suttanipāta and the
psalms of Sumedhā and the like in the Thera-therī-gāthā. The variants
such as āturena in the place of bhindanena, ājhamanena in the place of
tappamānena, paraṁ sūdhi in the place of paramāṁ sāntiṁ suggest
the existence of Mixed Sanskrit counterparts of the Pali gāthās. These
facts disclose the growth of the Pali canonical texts side by side with a
Mixed Sanskrit stream. It will not be out of place here to point
out that the above-mentioned section of the Satipatthāna discourse
can in its turn be further traced to a cruder stage as represented by a passage in the Maitrāyanī Upaniṣad (I. 3). \(^{31}\) Now, coming to the chapter on Apramāda, in the Prakrit text, we meet with a set of five concluding verses (of which no counterparts can be traced in the Pali canon) which are made up clearly by thrusting eight lines into one original, of which the Pali counterpart, traceable to the Dhammapada, Theraṅgathā and other Nikāya texts, reads:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{appamāde} & \text{ pamajjeyya mā kāmaratissathavaṁ} \\
\text{appamatto hi jhāyanto pappoti vipulāṁ (or paramāṁ) sukham.}
\end{align*}
\]

It is evident that the intervening eight lines of the Prakrit text consists of set Buddhist expressions which can be traced to the Appamāda verses of the Pali Dhammapada and similar other gāthās in other Nikāya texts. The Prakrit lines \(^{32}\) which answer to the two lines of the Pali gāthā also contain a few dialectical forms and variants which cannot be explained without presupposing a direct source in Mixed Sanskrit, and here, too, we think that this source is the original of the Fa-kheu-king. We need not multiply instances. The net outcome of our dissertation is that the Prakrit presupposes a Dhammapada text in Mixed Sanskrit which stands, in point of date, contents, arrangement of chapters and number of verses, very close to the Pali, and that that text can be connected historically with the undiscovered original of the Fa-kheu-king. The facts disclosed by our investigation may be briefly stated thus:

There is a number of verses in every Dhammapada text which cannot be traced to the Pali canon. There are numerous instances where the verses have been multiplied quite mechanically by changing one or two words or by the permutation and combination of certain set expressions, and it is generally found that the number of these verses is the least in Pali and the most in Sanskrit. There are, besides, many special verses in the texts other than the Pali Dhammapada which can be traced, in part or in entirety, to the Nikāyas and, particularly to the Jātakas mentioned on the railing of the Bharhut Stupa and to the Avadānas which are post-Asokan compositions. Of the extant Dhammapada texts, one belongs to the Pali or Theravāda

\(^{31}\) See the edition of the Nīząyasāgara Press.

\(^{32}\) The corresponding Prakrit reads:

\[
\begin{align*}
apramadā & \text{ promodita ma gami raisabhamu} \\
apramato hi jhāyatu pranoti paramu sukhu.
\end{align*}
\]
canon, one has been preserved partly in quotations of the Midland recension of the Mahāvastu (the first portion of the Lokottaravāda Vinaya), and the remaining ones appear to belong all to the Sarvāstivādins including the Vaibhāśikas, their later off-shoot. The Gandhāra recension of the Dhammapada is the only ancient Buddhist text in Prakrit, i.e., in the local dialect, raised to the status of a literary language, and it must be assigned to a post-Aśokan but pre-Gupta date. Examining the Dhammapada literature of the Sarvāstivāda sect, the fact stands out that a Mixed Sanskrit, deviating at a certain point from the Pali, passed through different stages and culminated in Classical or pure Sanskrit in the latest recensions of the Dhammapada. The Lokottaravāda recension supplies a link in the chain.

To conclude, the Pali Dhammapada and its Sarvāstivāda counterpart have a history of their own, which can be traced in the gradual evolution of two series of Buddhist canonical texts, particularly the five Nikāyas or Āgamas as referred to in the Divyāvadāna. By "Sarvāstivādins" the historian understands a number of Buddhist sects which are all said to have seceded directly from the Orthodox. We know of no other sects who have preserved the five Nikāyas. The Abhidhamma Piṭaka of the Theravāda canon exists only in Pali. There are five recensions of the Vinaya Piṭaka belonging strictly to three sects, viz., the Theravādins, the Sarvāstivādins and the Mahāsaṅghikas. These texts have many points in common and were written, as may be judged from the Pali edition and the manuscript fragments found in Eastern Turkestan, in slightly different dialects. The same fact is brought home to us by the study of certain common verses in the Pali Suttanipāta (belonging to the Theravādins), the Lalitavistara and the Divyāvadāna (belonging to the Sarvāstivādins), and the Mahāvastu (which is claimed by the Mahāsaṅghikas). These common verses have for their theme the legendary life of the Buddha and cannot be dated within a century of Buddha’s death: they can reasonably be assigned to a pre-Aśokan period, the period covered by the rise of the early Buddhist sects. The contributions of schismatics to the growth of the Buddhist canon have yet to be determined. But it can safely be presumed that the sects have drawn upon each other. The rehearsals of the sacred texts in the three Orthodox Councils—convened, according to tradition, at intervals of a century more or less—imply three recastings
of the materials which accumulated during the life-time of the Buddha, and we cannot but endorse the view that the canon fixed at one Council differed in contents from the one fixed at an earlier Council. But it will be certainly wrong to presume that the old texts were completely destroyed or transformed. So far as the history of the Pali canon—the most complete and ancient of all—is concerned, the utmost we can say is that with each new redaction new materials were incorporated or new texts or compilations were recognised as canonical, but not that any conscious change had been made in regard to language. It may be shown, by instances such as the Padhānasutta, the Ratana-sutta, the Uragasutta—all incorporated in the Suttani-pāṭa—that Pali expressions were modelled on originals in Mixed Sanskrit. The same can be noticed in the case of the Dhammapadā verses. But it is no argument to say that Pali language as a whole is younger than Mixed Sanskrit, of which so many different types of dialects are still preserved in the Buddhist Sanskrit texts belonging to Buddhist sects other than the Theravādins. By "Pali" is meant the language in which the Theravāda canon has been preserved and was rehearsed when several redactions of it were made. There is absolutely no evidence that the Theravādins had adopted a different idiom than that of the Pali canon, now preserved to us by the Bhikkhus of Ceylon, Siam and Burma. Nor can it be borne out by the evidence, either of inscriptions or of tradition or by the internal evidence of the canon itself, that the Singhalese Bhikkhus, whose mother-tongue was quite different from Pali, had the genius or courage of inventing a new language at the Vaṭṭagamini Council in which the canon was committed to writing. Proceeding from the canon—fixed once for all at this Council—back to the three earlier redactions in the Councils held in Magadha, we perceive a many-sided growth of Buddhist thought and of Buddhist literature. At a certain point we are confronted with a divergence in ideas, theories, expressions and so forth among the Buddhists, and this, as traditions unanimously support, coincides with the first schism dividing the Buddhist brotherhood into two strong rival parties, viz., the Theravādin or the Orthodox and the Mahāsaṅghika or the Democratic. This schism was followed by many other schisms and expressed itself in so many different ways, bringing about violent changes in matters of language and literature of the Buddhists. The processes of the growth of the different dialects and different texts among the
different Buddhist schisms have been graphically described in a few verses of the Dipavāmaṇka.²³

We must remember that behind the rise of the schisms there is a history of not less than a century and a half, covering the long forty-five years of the ministry of the Buddha and the formation of the

²³ Chap. V, 31–50:—

Mahāsāṅgītikā bhikkhū vīlomaṁ akāśu sānam, bhīnditeśa mūlasaṅghānī aññāṁ akāśu saṅghāhanī, aññatthasaṅghānī suttan aññatthakārikassu te, attaṁ dhammaṁ ca bhīndīmagu ye nikeyesa pañcasu. pariṣīyadesitaṁ cāti ato nipariṣīyadesitaṁ niśattho c' eva neyyatho añjaniśaṁ bhikkhavo aññāṁ sandhyāya bhuṇṭaṁ aññatthāṁ ṭhapaythuṁ te, bhayaśanaṃcādyāya te bhikkhū bahu attaṁ vināśayuṁ, chaḍḍetvā ekadesanī ca suttanvinayuṁ ca gambahrahā pariṣīpam suttavimayam taṁ ca aññāṁ karīsmu te, pariṣīwanī attadhikārāṁ abhiddhammapakaranāṁ paṭisambhidānī ca niddesin ekadesanī ca jātakaṁ etakam vissajjethaṁ aññāñī akāriśu te.

nāmaṁ liṅgam pariṣīpam aññāṁ ukappakaranāṁ ca pakatiḥbhāvam vijāhetuṁ taṁ ca aññāṁ akāśu te.

pubbaṅgamī bhinnavuddā Mahāsāṅgītikurākā, tesaṁ ca anukāreṇa bhinnavuddā bahu aññāḥ. tato aparakkālaṁ hi tasmāṁ bheda ajāyatha:

Gokulikā Ekabhājava duvidhā bhijjitha bhikkhavo. Gokulikānaṁ dev bheda aparakkālaṁ hi jāyatha:

Bakussutakaṁ ca Paṇñatti duvidhā bhijjitha bhikkhavo. Cetiya ca punavaddi Mahāsāṅgītibhedakaṁ.

pañca vadda ime sabbe Mahāsāṅgītimulakaṁ attaṁ dhammaṁ ca bhīndīmaṁ ekadesanī ca saṅghāhanī, ganthiṁ ca ekadesamhi chaḍḍetvā aññāṁ akāśu te.

nāmaṁ liṅgam pariṣīpam aññāṁ ukappakaranāṁ ca pakatiḥbhāvam vijāhetuṁ taṁ ca aññāṁ akāśu te.

evaddhakathavaddo hi puna bheda ajāyatha:

Mahīnūnakaṁ Vajjiputtakā duvidhā bhijjitha bhikkhavo. Vajjiputta avaddo hi catudhā bheda ajāyatha:

Dhammuttariṇikā Bhaddayūnikā Čanduṛṇikā sa Sammiti Mahīnūnākānaṁ deva bheda aparakkālaṁ hi jāytha.

Sabbathavādā Dhammaṅgutūduvidhā bhijjitha bhikkhavo. Sabbaṁthavādā Kassaṅikā Kassapikkā Sambbantikaṁ, Suttaṅgapālataṁ taṁ aññā anupubbeni bhijjitha, ime ekādaśa vadda pabhinnā theravaddo
tato attaṁ dhammaṁ ca bhīndīmaṁ ekadesanī ca saṅghāhanī, ganthiṁ ca ekadesamhi chaḍḍetvāna akāśu te.

nāmaṁ liṅgam pariṣīpam aññāṁ ukappakaranāṁ ca pakatiḥbhāvam vijāhetuṁ taṁ ca aññāṁ akāśu te.
schools of Rehearsers—the Bhāṇakas. The texts accumulated during this period must have had a language of their own, which cannot be what is called "Māgadhi" by the Singhalese of the 8th cent. A.D. We mean that the language of these texts was neither identical with the local dialect of Magadha or of Kośala, nor a mere combination of several dialects of the Buddhist Midland. On the other hand, it was a highly artificial language, quite peculiar to a powerful religious community, of which the component elements can be found on analysis to consist of several dialectical forms, Sanskrit words and—what is most important—a rich coining of innumerable new words and technical expressions unprecedented in the history of Indian literature. To understand the nature of this new literary idiom one must, in the first instance, fix one’s attention upon the pre-Nikāya materials comprising many commentarial fragments such as the tract on Śīla incorporated in the first thirteen suttas of the Dīgha Nikāya, the Satipatṭhāna, the Saccavi-bhaṅga discourses of the Majjhima. It matters little in what language the Buddha himself or his disciples preached. The growth of the first literary medium of the Buddhists cannot be intelligible without its important factor, the language of these commentarial fragments, which had their origin in the literary efforts of Buddha’s disciples in the different centres of the Midland to digest and interpret Buddha’s discourses and reduce them into a systematic order.
LAND- SA LE DOCUMENTS OF ANCIENT BENGAL.

Radhagovinda Basak, M.A., Professor, Rajshahi College, and Hony. Secretary, Varendra Research Society, Rajshahi.

Within the last three-quarters of a century epigraphic records of various nature belonging to the different periods of Indian History have been discovered and explained. According to their subject-matter, especially in consideration of the motive that prompted the authors of these epigraphs, they may be classified into two heads, spiritual and temporal. It must be kept in mind, however, that incidentally we obtain from some of the records of the first division many items of historical materials that belong strictly to the domain of the second and vice versa. In the present contribution we have to deal with some ten documents which, roughly speaking, fall under the second category, but are of a very unique character and form. These are two sets of four and six copper-plate records about thirteen to fifteen hundred years old. Some plates of the first set, discovered about a quarter of a century ago, were not published before 1910.¹ One in the second set, though published in 1909,² could not be properly explained before the discovery in 1915 of the five sister plates,³ the work of decipherment of which rendered it necessary for the writer not only to revise the reading⁴ of the former (lately contributed to the Epigraphia Indica) but also to study with care and scrutiny all the four records of the first set. The first set was found in the district of Faridpur in East Bengal and with the exception of Plate D which is now preserved in the Daecca Museum, it is the property of the Asiatic Society of Bengal, Calcutta. Plate No. 1 of the second set comes from the Nattore sub-division of the Rajshahi District and the remaining five from the district of Dinajpur in North Bengal, and they are all preserved in the Museum of the Varendra Research Society, Rajshahi. A hot controversy⁵ regarding the genuineness of the four Faridpur grants

¹ Indian Antiquary, 1910. ² JASB., 1909.
³ Epigraphia Indica, Vol. XV, Part III.
⁴ Sāhitya, Bengali Magazine of Calcutta, 1323 B.S. ⁵ JASB., 1914.
was for a long time going on between Mr. F. E. Pargiter and Mr. R. D. Banerji of the Archaeological Department till just five months before the five Damodarpur grants of the Gupt period belonging to the second set were discovered. These latter plates have and must have now set at rest that controversy, making it quite evident that the view held by the late Dr. Bloch and Mr. Banerji that the four Faridpur grants were spurious is untenable and that Mr. Pargiter was quite right in holding the view that they were genuine. It is mainly on account of the peculiar nature and the subject-matter of them in which they differed wholly from the majority of copper-plate grants already discovered that Mr. Banerji declared them to be "ancient forgeries." But it may now be said with some degree of definiteness that it is for that very reason that they and the six other grants of the second set are so very important in the inscriptive literature of India. It cannot be said, however, that we have yet discovered every kind of inscribed transaction that was current 1500 years ago.

Records of ordinary royal donations from the greater portion of the inscribed deeds of ancient India. But the documents which form the subject-matter of this paper were not like these ordinary grants executed for the purpose of making gifts to Brāhmaṇas or dedicating land to gods; in other words, they are not like the common Brahmadeya or Devottara records. They form a peculiar type of sale-deeds recording the state-confirmation of the sale of land transacted between Government or Government and the village and district authorities on the one hand, and the purchasers on the other, whether the latter be officials or private individuals, who buy land at the rate prevalent in different localities. They remind us at once of the definition\(^6\) of "a deed of purchase" given in the law-book of Brhaspati, regarded by Professor Jolly as having flourished in the 6th or 7th century A.D., which runs as follows: "When a person having purchased a house, field or other (property) causes a document to be executed containing an exact statement of the proper price paid for it, it is called a deed of purchase."\(^7\) Almost all these East and North Bengal records are of this description. Such purchases of land were generally made in order to make a free donation thereof to temples, individual Brāhmaṇas, or Brahmanic settlements. Hence these documents may more properly be called combined deeds of purchase and gift. It is very probable that these documents were first

---

\(^7\) Ib., VIII, 6, op. cit. p. 395.
drawn up in the Government office and then copied on copper and afterwards issued to persons concerned, and as such they are like registered title-deeds or certificates with the Government seal attached to them, as is clear in some plates wherein the seals are preserved. It may be hoped that such land-sale documents or other varieties of them will hereafter be discovered in other parts of India also. But although we are not aware of the discovery of transactions exactly of a similar nature in any other part of India, a very clear instance of an actual land-sale is mentioned in a Buddhist cave inscription\(^8\) in Western India belonging to the first half of the second century A.D. In it we find that Uṣavāda, son of Dinika, and son-in-law of the Kṣahanāta king, Kṣatrapa Nahapāṇa, is described as making a gift of a field (kṣetra) purchased from a Brāhmaṇa at a price (mulena) of 4000 Kārṣapana coins, from which food is to be procured for all monks (bhikkusagha) dwelling in his cave. References to land-sale are not wanting also in the old literature of India, such as the Arthaśāstra, Dharmasūtras and Dharmasāstras. In the Arthaśāstra of Kautilya we have a separate chapter\(^9\) on the sale of holdings of all kinds, fields, gardens, lakes, etc., called Vāstu-vikraya, wherefrom we learn that such a sale must take place in the presence of kinsmen and neighbours and that the proposed vāstu must be sold to the highest bidder who has to pay a toll to the State on the value offered for the sale.

From a comparative study of the two sets of sale-deeds referred to above, we propose first to convey an idea of their peculiar nature and form and then to discuss, so far as it is possible, the procedure of land-alienation transactions prevailing during the 5th, 6th and 7th centuries in India, especially in Bengal, without however dealing with the other very important materials for the political history of the period that can be gathered from them. The form of these documents—a

---

\(^8\) Nasik Buddhist Cave Inscription, No. 10 (Epi. Ind., Vol. VIII, p. 78). The passage here runs thus (11, 4–5): data cānena kṣetram brāhmaṇas ca Vārūhiputrama Aśviḥutiḥ bathe kiniṣṭā mulena kārmaṇasahāsekti ca tabhi 4000 ya Saptasraka. M. Senart took the passage to mean that the Brāhmaṇa Aśviḥuti was made a representative of his father when the latter’s field was sold to Uṣavāda. But it may also be suggested that the field which belonged to Aśviḥuti’s father who himself sold it to Uṣavāda for the specified price, may have been placed (data) in the heads of Aśviḥuti who was probably made a trustee to look after the management of the same for the maintenance of the congregation of monks from all quarters.

typical specimen of which will shortly follow—has, roughly speaking, six different sections in it.

The first section contains a petition of the applicant who has to address the local government and sometimes also the village and district authorities, mentioning the supreme rulers of the country, his viceroy in the province and their subordinates in the district. In some cases (as in the North Bengal plates) this section contains also the date in year, month and day. The second section declares the object for which the applicant wants to purchase land and refers to the prevailing local custom of buying arable or waste land on payment of price (in current coins, gold dināras in these cases) at a particular rate. The third section contains the report of the record-keeper on the application submitted after due reference to his archives and his subsequent approval of the proposed sale. The fourth section embodies the actual state-permission for selling the land on receipt of the proper price and severing it from other plots of land by proper boundary-marks on survey made according to a particular standard of measurement in the presence of the village and district elders and other important village officers and private persons. The fifth section has reference to the gift of the purchased land made by the applicant purchaser or, on his behalf, by the selling party, to a grantee or grantees on certain conditions. The sixth and last section mentions the merit and demerit respectively of protecting and confiscating such land-grants ending with quotations of the useful imprecatory verses. This section may also contain the date (as in the case of the East Bengal plates). The seal of the local government is also attached to them perhaps as a mark of their having been duly registered.

1. Form of land-sale documents in North Bengal during the 5th and 6th centuries A.D.

[Seal.]

—Ihotvarśādhīstānādhikaraṇasya.

II. Iha viṣaye samudaya-bāhy ṛṣiḥata-khila-kṣetrāṇāṁ tridinārikya-kulavāpa-vikrayo'nverītaḥ
tilo ichāmy ahāṁ... (itīdikam) karttim kārayitum vā, tad aratha yathā-kraya-maryādayā matto
dinārāṇ upasamgrhyā apradā-dharmena nīri-dharmena vā dātum iti

III. Etañ viṣṇāpyam upalabhya pustāpāla-(Amukāna Amukānā vā) avadhāṛtaṁ, 'yuktaṁ anena viṣṇāpitam asty ayaṁ vikrayamaryādayā
prasāṅgas tad diyaṭām amsai'

IV. Pustāpāla-(Amukāsa Amukānānā vā) avadhāṛanāyā etasmād
(viṣṇāpakāt) dinārāṇ upasamgrhyā etāvat-samkhyakāḥ(ōkāh vā) kulyavā-
pāh(ōpāh vā) aṣṭaka-navaka-nalabhya apaviṇcchāya apradā-dharmena
dattāḥ(śtāḥ vā).

V. Anenaṁ viṣṇāpakena (viṣṇāpyamanēna vā) Amukā-kāryārtham
Amukāya (Amukā-devāya vā) dattāḥ (śtāḥ, śtam vā).

VI. Uttarākālam samvyavahāribhir deva-bhakty ānunamantavyam
uktāṁ ca Vyāsena (athavā, api ca bhūmi-sambaddhāḥ ślokāḥ) ityādi:

2. Form of land-sale documents in East Bengal, during the 6th and 7th centuries A.D.

(SEAL) —Vārakamandalaviṣayādhiśāhikanāsya.

I. Mahārājādhirāja-ṛṣi-(Amukē),... tat-prasāda-labdhaśpadasya
(Amuka-ṛṣhe) mahārājya-mahāpratihiṃśa-uparika-(Amukāsa) adhyā-
sana-kale, (Amuka-visaye) tad-viniyuktaka-visayapati-(Amukāsa)
samvyavaharatāḥ, (amukēna) sādaram abhigamy āyeṣṭha-kāyastha-
(Amuka)-pramukhāṁ adhikarayām visaya-mahattarāḥ (Amukē) anve ca
pradhāna vyavahārinā ca visaya-mahattara-(Amuka)-puroghah prakṛtyayaṁ
cā viṣṇapāth

II. Ichāmy ahāṁ bhavatāṁ prasādāt (śakāśad vā) arghena
bhavadbhyāḥ kṣettrakhaṇḍaṁ kṛśtvā (Amukēya) pratipādayit tum, tad
aratha mātī mūlaṁ gṛhitvā viṣaye vibhayā dātum iti

III. Etañ abhyarthanāṁ adhikṛtaṁ pustāpāla-(Amukēna) avadhāṛtaṁ
astiha viṣaye prāk-samudra-maryāda caturdīnāriko-yā-kulavāpēna
kṣetraṁ viṣayāmānākānānti

IV. Pustāpāla-(Amukāsa) avadhāṛanāyā avadhāṛtaṁ asmābhih
(Andukē) dinārāṇ adāya pratita-dharmmaśīla-(Amuka)-hastāṣṭaka-
navakamalenā apaviṇchāya (Amukēya) kṣetra-kulavāpāḥ (ōpāh vā)
tāṃrapattā-dharmmeṇa viṅkṛtāḥ (śtāḥ vā)
V. Anenāpi krītvā (Amukāya) putra-pautra-kramaṇa vidhinā tamrapaṭṭikṛtya cauḥ-simā-liṅga-nirdiṣṭaṁ kṛtvā tat pratipatitam | Iti simā-liṅgāni cātra . . .
VI. Āgāmi-sāmanta-rājaiś ca . . . . . . bhūmi-dānam sutarāṁ pratipālanīyam iti || Bhavanti cātra dharmma-sāstra-sōkāḥ . . . . . . . . . . . . . Samvat . . . . . māse . . . . . . . dine . . . . .

In illustration of the above specimen forms, I now give a summary of the contents of all the ten documents in their chronological order, so far as it has been possible for me to ascertain it. I shall refer to the North Bengal plates as Nos. 1 to 6, and the East Bengal ones as Nos. A to D.

No. 1.—Dhānāidaha (mutilated) copper-plate inscription of the time of the Gupta Emperor Kumāragupta I., dated Gupta Era 113 (A.D. 432-33).

A person (probably an āyuktaka, a royal officer) approached the chief village householders (kuṭumbins), the village elders (mahattaras) and the aśṭakulādhikaraṇas of the villages and also perhaps the local government of the district (visaya) and expressed his desire for purchasing one kulyavāpa of cultivated land (kṣētra) on payment of price at the usual rate (anuvṛtta-marīyāda) prevalent in the district (visaya) of Khāda-(tā ?)pāra. It seems from the use of the word nividharma-kṣayena that the intending purchaser wanted to buy land by destroying the condition of non-transferability of it, that is, to buy it with the future right of alienation. However, his prayer was granted after the record-keeper had confirmed (avadhirṭam) the sale, and land was severed for him by proper measurement (aśṭaka-navaka-nalābhyaṁ apraviṇṭhya) and duly transferred to him. He again made a gift of the purchased plot to a Sāmavedin Brāhmaṇa named Varāhasvāmin.

No. 2.—Dāmodarpur copper-plate inscription of the time of the same monarch (as in No. 1), dated G.E. 124 (A.D. 443-44).

A Brāhmaṇa, named Karpāṭika, applied before the local authorities of the capital-town (ādhiṣṭhāna) of the district (visaya) of Kōṭivarṣa in the province (bhukti) of Purdvavardhana for a transfer to him, according to nivēdharma, i.e., with no right of alienation, of one kulyavāpa of unsettled (aprada), untilled (aprakata, land not then under the plough) khila-kṣetra for convenient performance of his aṇvihotra rites on payment of price at the usual rate of three dīnāras for each kulyavāpa (tri-dīnārikya-kulyavāpena). His prayer was granted by the local
administration and land measuring one <i>kutya-vāpa</i> of a particular site was ordered to be given to him for continuous use by himself and his descendants on receipt of the actual price, after, of course, the record-keepers (<i>pustapaḷas</i>) had determined the application and the sale as proper.

No. 3.—Dāmodarpur copper-plate inscription of the time of the same monarch (as in No. 1), dated G.E. 129 (A.D. 448–49).

A person (whose name is undecipherable) approached the same authorities as in No. 2, and applied for the transfer of some land to him on receipt of price at the above-mentioned rate for the maintenance of his five daily sacrifices (<i>paṇca-mahāyaḍīnas</i>). It seems doubtful whether this applicant wanted the land on the nullification or continuation of the condition of non-transferability—the word <i>aprada-kṣaya</i> admitting of an interpretation applicable both ways. However, his prayer was granted and a plot of land measuring five <i>drōnas</i> was made over to him on price received after the determination of the record-keepers (<i>pustapaḷas</i>).

No. 4.—Dāmodarpur copper-plate inscription of the time of the Gupta Emperor, Budhagupta, date and year lost.

The <i>grāmika</i> (village headman) of the village Caṇḍagrāma, named Nābhaka, approached the provincial government of Puṇḍravardhana <i>Bhukti</i> with a prayer for purchase of revenue-free (<i>samudaya-bāhya</i>, i.e., beyond the pale of government revenue) non-settled (<i>aprava</i>) waste land (<i>khila-kṣetra</i>) for the purpose of settling (<i>pratīvāsāyitum</i>) some Brahmanas therein. The <i>maḥattara</i>, <i>asṭakulādhikaraṇas</i>, the grāmikas, the <i>kuṭumbins</i> (householders) of Palāsāvndaka (perhaps, the head-quarters of the Provincial Governor, <i>Uparika-mahārāja</i>, Brahmadatta) informed the chief householders—the Brāhmaṇas and the Āryyas of Caṇḍagrāma —about the application of Nābhaka for purchase of land on payment of price in accordance with the custom of sale prevailing in the different

---

10 It may be noted here that Kumārāmātya Vetravarman, the district-officer (<i>vishaya-pati</i>) of Koṭivarṣa, who was appointed by the provincial governor of Puṇḍravardhana Bhukti named <i>uparika</i> Cīrātadatta, himself placed there under the favours of the Imperial Ruler (<i>Pṛthivī-pati-paramadaiasta-paramabhāṭṭāraka-mahārājīdīdhīrāja</i>) Kumāragupta, carried on the administration (<i>samudrayavīharayati</i>) of the town with the help of a Board or Council consisting of the representatives of the four following interests of those days, viz., the <i>Nagarārśṭhins</i> (mercantile communities), the <i>Sārthavāhas</i> (guilds of traders dealing also with foreign countries), the <i>Kulikas</i> (the artisans) and the <i>kāyasthas</i> (writers, very likely the Government office-assistants).
villages (grāmānukrama-vikrayamaryyādayā). His prayer was granted and land measuring one kulyavāpas was severed by the customary nalas (aṣṭaka-navaka-nalābhyām apaviṇchya) under the inspection of the mahattaras, the adhikaraṇa and the chief householders and given to Nāgadeva, a Brāhmaṇa, on behalf of the applicant, grāmika Nābhaka, who paid two dināras (Nābhaka-hastād dināra-dvayam upagṛhya) as the price. The record-keeper (pustapāla), Patradāsa, had to determine that the application was proper and that such a customary rate was prevalent in that locality (yuktam anena vijñāpitam asty ayaṁ vikraya-maryyādaya-prasāṅgah).

No. 5.—Dāmodarpur copper-plate inscription of the time of the same monarch (as in No. 4), date and year lost.

Rbhpāla, the nagaraśreṣṭhin (a member of the Board of Council of the town administration) approached the local government of the capital-town (adhiṣṭhāna) of the district of Koṭivarṣa in the province of Puṇḍravardhana governed by Uparika-mahārāja Jayadatta and applied for transfer to him on sale of some kulyavāpas of field-land with building site (vāstunā saha) on receipt of price at the usual rate (yathākraya-maryyādayā). The purpose of this purchase was the erection of two temples and two store-houses to be dedicated to the two gods, Kokāmukhasvāmin and Śvetavarāhasvāmin, to whom, on a former occasion he had already made a gift of eleven kulyavāpas of kṣetra land, four to the first and seven to the second god as apradas (inalienable endowments) in village Doṅgāgrāma in a place called Himavacchikhara. His application was sanctioned after the record-keepers (pustapālas) had approved of the application and corroborated the statement of the applicant about his previous gift of eleven kulyavāpas to the two gods, and land was then sold to him at the prevalent rate of three dināras for each kulyavāpa (anuvṛttapiro-dinārikya-kulyavāpa-vikraya-maryyādā). This plate has a seal with legend most indistinct, which seems to be similar to the one attached to plate No. 6 below, with the legend Koṭivarṣadhiṣṭhānādhikaranasya, i.e., the seal of the court of the capital of Koṭivarṣa.

No. 6.—Dāmodarpur copper-plate inscription of the time of Gupta Emperor Bhānu(?)-gupta, dated G.E. 214 (A.D. 533–34).

Amṛtadeva, a nobleman (kulaputra) hailing from Ayodhyā, approached the local government in the district-town of Koṭivarṣa of which Svayambhūdeva was the Visayapati under the provincial govern-
ment of Puṇḍravardhana Bhakti, during the reign of Imperial Ruler, (Paramadaivata-parama-bhaṭṭāraka-mahārājādhirāja) Bhānu(?)-gupta, and prayed that he might be granted by means of a copper-plate document (tamrapatīkṛtya), in accordance with the custom known as apra-śādarśāna (permanent endowment), the transfer of some pieces of rent-free (samudaya-bāhya), untilled (aprahata) waste-land (khila) on receipt of price at the usual rate of three dināras for each kulyavāpa which was prevalent in that district (iha visaye samudaya-bāhyāprahata-khila-kṣetraḥm tri-dinārikya-kulyavāpa-vikrayo 'nuvṛttah). The object of the purchase is to provide for the repairs etc. of the temple of the god Śvetavarāhasvāmin and for the perpetual performance of the bali, caru, sattrā and other rites of the god. His prayer was granted and fallow-land with some building sites, measuring five kulyavāpas in four different tracts, was dedicated to the eternal enjoyment of the god Śvetavarāhasvāmin by government on behalf of the purchaser, Amṛtadeva, from whose hands fifteen dināras were received after the chief record-keepers (prathama-pustapālas) had determined the sale. As referred to above, this plate has the seal of the Court of the district-town of Koṭiavarṣa.

No. A.—Faridpur copper-plate inscription of the time of King Dharmāditya, dated in his regnal year 3.

In the reign of Mahārājādhirāja Dharmāditya, when Mahārāja Sthāṇudatta was the governor in the province of Navyāvakāśika (vide Nos. B and C) and under his appointment the Visaya-pati Jajāva was administering the state business in the district (visaya) of Vārakamanḍala, a person named Vataabhōga, a sūdana (probably, a military officer) approached the local district administration (adhikarana) and the people (prakṛtayaḥ) headed by the leading men of the district (visaya-mahatāra) and applied for a purchase from them (bhavatām sakāsēt upakriya) of a plot of cultivated land (kṣetra-khaṇḍam) by offering the due price (mūlyam gṛhitva). On submission of this application (abhyaarthana), the record-keeper first determined the matter and made a report that in that district (iha visaye) the custom prevailed of selling cultivated land by means of copper-plate documents (tāmrapatita-dharmena) at the rate of four dināras for each kulyavāpa (catur-dinārikya-kulyavāpena) and that the state was to receive only the sixth part of the price according to law in such transactions (Parama-bhaṭṭāraka-pādānām atra dharma-śaṭbhāga-lābhah). The applicant’s prayer was then granted and on deposit of twelve dināras
by Vatabhòga, cultivated land measuring three kulyavāpas was sold to him (tāmraptāṭa-dharmena vikritaṁ) after severing it according to the standard measure of eight by nine reeds (aṣṭaka-navuka-nalenāpaviṇācchya) by the hand of Śivacandra. The purchaser again made a gift of this plot of land to a Bhāradvāja Brāhmaṇa named Candrasvāmin. The four boundaries of the plot sold were very clearly mentioned in the document, certainly with a view to avert any future dispute or litigation that may arise. This document has a seal attached to it bearing the emblem of Śrī or Lakṣmī with a legend which, though indistinct, should be read as—Vārakamaṇḍalaviśayādhi karanaṇasya, i.e., the seal of the Court of the district of Vārakamaṇḍala.

No. B.—Faridpur copper-plate inscription of the time of the same king (as in No. A), undated.

When Gopālasvāmin was in charge of the administration of the district of Vārakamaṇḍala under Mahāpratihāra-uparika Nāgadeva, the governor of the province of Navyāvakāṣika, a person named Vasudevasvāmin approached the district government (of which the Chief Secretary, jyeṣṭha-kāyastha, was Nayasēna) and the leading men of the district headed by Somaghoṣa (Somaghoṣa-purassaraḥ visayānām mahattarāḥ) and applied for purchasing from them cultivated land by offering the proper price, to enable him to make a meritorious donation of the same to a Lauhitya-sagotra Brāhmaṇa named Somasvāmin. According to the determination of the record-keeper, Janmabhūti, land was sold to them to the applicant on receipt of two dīnāras at the usually prevalent rate in that district of selling such land at four dīnāras for each kulyavāpa, after severing it by the standard measure of eight by nine reeds by the hand of the famous (pratīta) and upright (dharmāśīla) Śivacandra. The document does not, however, in its fifth section mention whether Vasudevasvāmin afterwards granted the purchased plot to Somadevasvāmin as referred to in the main part of his application. Or, it is not unlikely that the selling party might have done it on his behalf (as in the Dāmodarpur plate No. 4 above). This deed also has a seal attached to it with the same emblem and legend as in plate No. A.

No. C.—Faridpur copper-plate inscription of the time of king Gopacandra, dated in his regnal year 19.

In the reign of Mahārājādhirāja-bhaṭṭāraka Gopacandra, when Mahāpratihāra-kumarāmātya-uparika Nāgadeva was the Governor of the province of Navyāvakāṣika and under his appointment Vatsapālasvāmin
was the administering agent for the viṣaya of Vārakamaṇḍala, this district officer himself approached his own government (of which the Chief Secretary, jyeṣṭha-kāyastha, was Nāgasena) and the leading men of the district and other chief business-men (pradhāna-vyāpāriṇāḥ) and intimated to them his desire to buy through their favour (bhavaṭām prasādāt) land by offering proper price at the usual rate and to make a gift of the same to a Brāhmaṇa named Gomidattavāmin. After the determination of the pustapāla Nayabhūti that the rate of price in such a sale of cultivated land was four dināras for each kulyavāpa, the local government of the district (visayādhi karana) appointed some karaṇikas (officers) as kulavāras (perhaps, referees, in cases of possible disagreement, as supposed by Mr. Pargiter) and transferred one kulyavāpa of cultivated land to Vatsapālasvāmin, the district officer, after severing it according to the standard measure of eight by nine reeds by the hand of the famous and upright man, Śivacandra. This purchased plot was then made into a gift by the district officer (purchaser) to Gomidattavāmin with the right of enjoyment by his successors,—sons and grandsons (putra-pautra-kramaṇa). The boundary marks were distinctly stated in the document which also contains the same emblem and legend as in Nos. A and B.

No. D.—Faridpur (Ghāgrāhāti) copper-plate inscription of the time of the king Samācārādeva, dated in his regnal year 14.

In the reign of Mahārājādhirāja Samācārādeva, when the Antaraṅga-uparika Jivadatta was the governor of Navyāvakāśika (with headquarters at Survarṇāvīthi) and under his appointment Visayapati Pavitraka was administering the state-business of the district of Vārakamaṇḍala, a Brāhmaṇa named Supratīkasvāmin approached the local government (of which the Chief Officer, Jyeṣṭhādhi karana, was Dāmuka) and the leading men of the district (visayamahattarāḥ) and many other administering agents or business-men (vyavahārīṇāḥ) and prayed for the favour of having from them a plot of land which was for a long time in a fallow condition (ciravasanna-khila-bhū-khandalaka), to enable him to perform therewith his Brāhmanic duties, by means of the execution of a copper-plate document.

On receipt of this application all the above-mentioned men and the vyavahārins conferred together and decided after referring it to a committee of some of the Karaṇikas (officers) as referees (kulavārāṇ prakalpya) to make over to the applicant by means of a copper-plate
charter a portion of land in a region, the rest of which had already been made into similar grants. A clear statement of the four boundaries of the granted land was entered in the document. It appears that this is not exactly a land-sale document like those numbered A, B and C, but the procedure of execution is almost the same. The district government and its leading men and other chief business-people made by this document a grant gratis to the applicant.—hence the record-keepers were not called to determine the transaction, for they were required to be consulted about the prevailing rate of price in the case of a sale of land. In this case, there was no necessity of measuring the plot—as it formed the residue that was left from a big region already made into gifts by previous charters.

These are some of the earliest copper-plate documents which record both a purchase of land and its gift. From the analysis it will be found that in some plates (Nos. 1, 4, A, B and C) the intending purchasers, official or non-official, not excepting the district officer himself (as in No. C) and the village headman (as in No. 4), had to address in their application for purchase not only the administrative functionaries of the province (bhukti) and the district (visaya), but also the leading men or elders in the same, as well as the other rural officers, e.g., aṣṭakulādhī-karaṇās, grāmikas and the chief house-holders (kuṭumbins), while in others (Nos. 2, 3, 5 and 6) the purchasers approached with their application the administrative machinery of the district town which had a Board or Council attached to it consisting of the representatives of the four important interests of those days, viz., the mercantile, the trading and the artisan communities and the writer-class, probably representing the Government Secretaries. In the case only of No. D, the district administration, its leading men and other chief business-people were approached by a Brāhmaṇa wanting some land free by means of a copper-plate grant, for religious purposes. In five of these documents we have marked the seal of the two Government Courts, viz., that of the district of Vārakamāṇḍala and of the district town of Koṭivarṣa. It has also been noticed that the land for sale was sometimes cultivable field (kṣetra) and sometimes waste land (khaṇa-bhū). The state of affairs thus revealed by these documents naturally suggests the question as to whom these lands belonged. If we assume that they belonged to the State, the question that is sure to be asked is why it could not alienate them without the consent or approval of the people’s representatives, the
mahattari and other business-men (vyavahārin) of the province and the district, and sometimes even the common-folk? Why is it that Government did not take upon itself the whole responsibility of transferring to others by sale hitherto unassessed, untilled khās land? One way of answering these questions may be that these lands belonged not to the State but to the whole village or the village- assemblies, and hence their transfer could not take place without the consent or approval of the latter. Neither the State nor the village elders could sell them singly—but the presence and permission of both were necessary in their disposal. In one of these documents (No. A) we have seen it mentioned in very clear terms that one-sixth of the sale proceeds in these transactions will go to the royal exchequer according to the law, Paramabhatṭāraka-pādānāmatra dharma-sadbhāga-lābhaḥ, 1. 13). It seems very clear then that the remaining five-sixths of the price, at whatever rate it may be estimated, used to go to the funds of the village-assemblies. Is it then a sort of joint-ownership of land by both the State and the people? Again, one may argue that these lands, in the sale of which the State-confirmation could be obtained by crediting one-sixth of the price and getting the State-seal attached to the documents, belonged absolutely to the State, and that the latter had only to await the approval or assent of the representative men and other rural functionaries in the district, on the authorities of the Arthaśāstra and the Smṛtis which clearly enjoin that disputes about landed property were settled on the evidence and decision of the neighbours and the senior inhabitants of the district. But such an argument seems to be weak for a course like this could only be followed in the case of ordinary grants of land made by the king from landed property which was absolutely in his own possession. In such donations, one of the oldest of which belongs to the fifth century A.D. (G.E. 156, A.D. 475-76), during the

11 The most important dictum in the settlement of disputes concerning all sorts of vāstu is Sāmanta-pratyaya vāstuucudā as laid down by Kauṭilya (Arthaśāstra, second edition, p. 166). This view was literally followed by the Manu-saṁhitā which says (Ch. VIII, 262) that in such dispute appeal to the neighbours was the rule. Yajnavalkya (Ācārādhyāyu, Section IX, 150-151) is of the same opinion, and Nārada (Ch. XI, 2) and Brhaspati (Ch. XIX, 8) (see SBE., Vol. XXXIII) are very explicit on this point and say that decision rests in such disputes with the neighbours and the elders of the district.

12 Fleet, C.I.I., Vol. III, No. 21. Other similar royal grants of land of the same and the next centuries belong to the other feudatory chiefs, Saṁkṣobha, Jayanātha and Sarvanātha (Ibid, Nos. 22-31.).
reign of the Gupta-feudatory in Central India, King Hastin, we find that the donor-king only informs the people of the neighbourhood, and sometimes his own officers too, that he was making such and such a grant to a Brāhmaṇa or an institution, so that they might henceforth deal with the donee with regard to the transfer of the various royalties, viz., the bhāga, bhoga, kara, pratyaya and so forth, which would now go to the latter. Moreover in such an argument we cannot answer for the disposal of the other five-sixths of the value obtained from the sale of land.

Although we do not have, from the various literary and epigraphic sources, so much of the excellently developed village-assemblies or corporations in Northern India as in the South, where the most important aspect of Dravidian civilisation is the most perfect organisation of these democratic bodies, yet quite a good glimpse of the spirit of village administration can be had from the North Indian epigraphic records under discussion. Prof. K. Aiyanger 13 in his Ancient India and Rao Saheb H. Krishna Sastri 14 in his article on “The Fiscal Administration of the Early Cholas” in the Sir R. G. Bhandarkar Commemoration Volume have most clearly shown that in the deliberation of the meetings of the village-assemblies consisting of the village elders and other elected members, the king’s representatives, the local officer and the agents of the parties interested in the business of the day were present and the learned scholars have proved, moreover, that the village-assemblies had the power of selling or purchasing lands on behalf of the whole village or temples of the village. Dr. R. C. Majumdar 15 of the Dacca University also in his book on the Corporate Life in Ancient India, while dealing with the nature and duties of the village-assemblies, the village-headmen and the villagers themselves, has most successfully proved that “the essence of the institution was that the affairs of the village were transacted by the villages themselves,” with, of course, “the ultimate right of supervision by the king.” Discussing on the state of the village-assemblies in the South, Dr. Majumdar has stated (on p. 69 of his book) that the village corporations “were practically the absolute proprietors of the village lands, including the fresh cleanings, and were responsible for the total amount of revenue to the Government. In case the owner of a plot of land failed to pay his

13 Aiyanger, Ancient India, pp. 163 ff.
15 Dr. R. C. Majumdar, Corporate Life in Ancient India, pp. 37-85.
share it became the property of the corporation which had a right to dispose of it to realise the dues." As regards "the relation between the village corporations and the paramount ruler," my learned friend has shown (p. 81 of his book) that "the corporations possessed absolute authority over the village lands subject to the payment of royal revenue, and were generally left undisturbed in the internal management of the villages. The royal officers however supervised their accounts from time to time. . . . . On the other hand the village-assembly could bring to the notice of the king any misdoings of the servants of any temple within the area of the village. Some of the regulations which it passed required the sanction of the king. . . . .

Again in the inscription No. 9 at Ukkal we have a royal charter according sanction to the village-assembly to sell lands of those who have not paid taxes. On the other hand any royal charter affecting the status of the village must be sent for approval to the village-assembly before it is registered and sent into the record office." It may be hoped that the above quotations from Dr. Majumdar's book with reference to South Indian village activities of a period somewhat later than that of our documents may very aptly form a commentary on our own inferences from the sale-deeds before us as to why along with the Government, the village elders and others concerned with the village affairs were also applied to by intending purchasers of land and why those popular representatives actually formed a party with Government in granting their prayer for purchase. So it seems clear that one-sixth of the price of the sold land went to the king, perhaps because he was the protector of the realm and that the remaining five-sixths went to swell the local funds of the village-assemblies.

Another most interesting but old, difficult and controversial question may here be referred to, viz., the question of the ultimate right of proprietorship of land in India, i.e., whether in old times absolute ownership of land in India was recognised as belonging to the State or to the people. A short treatment of this question is all the more important here because in some of the sale-deeds under consideration we are confronted with the disposal of lands which seem to have never been settled before (aprada) and assessed for Government revenue (samudaya-bāhya). It is therefore in the method of disposal by sale of such lands that a clue to their absolute right of ownership may be hoped to be obtained. It only appears to me that all lands
belonged in primitive days absolutely to the people and that during the centuries with which we are concerned their absolute ownership might have only been begun to be ascribed to the State. Even when the institution of kingship was being introduced in the very early days of civilisation in this country, the king was not probably regarded as the absolute owner of all land over which he had to rule. In a country like India, either on the theory of the social contract or on that of the divine origin of kingship, the ancient śāstras and literature dealt with several kinds of limitations of the king’s power, as has been lucidly treated in his Carmichael Lecture by Professor D. R. Bhandarkar.¹⁴ We cannot, therefore, imagine that the people of ancient India could recognise the king as the absolute proprietor of all land. The origin of paying revenue to Government must be traced to the idea of the people that they are protected by the king from foreign enemies. The king’s due on land is to be attributed to his offering protection to the people, to whom land really belonged. But, we think, the crown began later on to be recognised as absolute owner of all land. The presence of the people’s representatives along with the king’s agents at the time of the sale transactions under notice and their approval in the matter may be traced to the old popular right of proprietorship in the soil. In the much later period of the history of India, e.g., during the rule of the Pāla and Sēna kings of Bengal, we find that even while making royal grants of land to Brāhmans, the kings most anxiously used to take the popular assent by such phrases as matamastu bhavatām—“may it meet with your approval.” This practice is perhaps a reminiscence of early popular right on land. This discussion of the ultimate ownership of all land may be concluded with the following observation ¹⁷ by Professors Macdonell and Keith: “It is not denied that gradually the king came to be vaguely conceived—as the English king still is—as lord of all land in a proprietary sense, but it is far more probable that such an idea was only a gradual development than that it was primitive.”

A few lines will not be out of place here in discussing the functions of the various officers, Government and private, urban and rural, mentioned in these documents and also for adding short notes on some of the

¹⁴ Professor D. R. Bhandarkar, Carmichael Lectures (Calcutta University), First Series, 1918, Lecture III, pp. 114-139.
technical terms used in them. The larger provinces such as Puṇḍra-
vardhana in North Bengal and Navyāvakāśika in East Bengal were
ruled by Governors appointed by the supreme monarchs of the country.
These Governors generally had the titles of Mahārāja and Uparika
(probably the superior head) and sometimes they also had the title of
Mahāpratihāra (Chief Warden). Under these government officers—of
the rank of the present-day Divisional Commissioners,—were the
Viṣayapatis (the district officers), such as those of the district of Kōṭi-
varsha in North Bengal and Vārakamandala in East Bengal. These
officers had sometimes the title of Kumārāṃātya13 (which literally means
"a minister to the princes," or "one who is a minister from boy-
hood") which was often applied to feudatory chiefs also. The district
officers had their adhikarana (administrative machinery) headed by
Jyeṣṭha-kāyaśtha or Prathama-kāyaśtha (the Chief Secretary). In the
case of the Kōṭivaśa district, it has been said before that it had its
head-quarters in its adhiṣṭhāna (town) the court of which had a Board
or Council of administration consisting of members representing the
various interests of those days. As regards the term mahattaras,
mentioned both as viṣaya-mahattaras and simply as mahattaras, they
were undoubtedly the leading men, the elders or seniors, as we call
them, of the district or the village. It may not be quite unreasonable
to suppose that they were the representative members in the village-
assemblies referred to above and held a most responsible and important
position in society. These men were held in high esteem by Govern-
ment and they co-operated with it in transacting much of the state
business. The other important officers, probably rural, that have been
mentioned, are the aṣṭakulaḥdikaraṇas who seem to have been ap-
pointed over eight kulas, a technical term used to denote inhabited
country, especially as much ground as can be cultivated by two ploughs,
each driven by six bulls. Then for the word grāmika used in one of
these documents, we may note that he was the head-man of the village
whom, perhaps, the village-assemblies entrusted with many important
executive and civil, and perhaps also military, authority over the
affairs of the village. The village-headman under the various names of
grāmani, grāmika, grāmabhajaka occur in both Vedic and post-Vedic
literature (Sanskrit and Pāli). It is stated in Manu (VII, 116-118)

13 Vide Kullukas commentary on Manu, VII, 119, and Carmichael Lectures (First
that the grāmika had the right to enjoy several privileges, e.g., to use the king's dues received from the villagers. He had also to refer cases of criminal offences to his immediate superior, the head-man of a group of ten-villages (dāśi). Another term used in some of these sale-deeds is kuṭumbins, which undoubtedly refer to ordinary householders or family-men, i.e., men having kuṭumbas, families. Some scholars think of taking this word kuṭumbins, as used in inscriptions of later period, to mean only the cultivating people—but it does not seem to be fully correct. These house-holders had often to be present along with the mahattaras and aṣṭakulādhikaraṇas for the inspection of the actual execution of the sale-transaction and the survey or division of the purchased plot of land. Next comes the most important body of officers who went by the name of pustapālas (who seem to have been in later times called akṣapajjalikas). They were record-keepers (pusta—books), and their duty was to preserve the records containing reference to the title, boundaries and demarcations of all lands already settled and held under tenure. It is these officers who were aware of the title to all lands. It is quite probable that they were officers under the village-assemblies. We have observed that without their determination (avaḍhayaraṇa) no land-sale transaction could ever take place. They had to report to Government and the village elders and other inspecting bodies about the propriety of the application made by intending purchasers of land. In one of our documents (No. 5), the applicant mentioned in his application of a previous gift made by him of eleven kulyavāpas of land to two gods and that he now wanted to purchase fresh plots. The record-keepers were referred to for corroboration and they certified the truth of the reference, stating clearly that the applicant had actually purchased and made a donation of as many kulyavāpas previously and so his new application might be entertained.

As regards the nature and quality of land purchased by means of these documents, we find mention of three varieties, kṣetra, khila and vāstu land. Kṣetra refers to a field which is meant for cultivation. Khila land is treated as synonymous with aprahata (untilled land) in Amara (II, 10, 5) and Halāyudha (233), meaning waste or fallow.

19 Indian Antiquary, 1919, p. 80, where Professor D. R. Bhandarkar discusses the economic significance of this word as used in the inscription of the Kṣatrapa and Kṣaharāta dynasties.
land. Professor Oldenberg was quite right when he thought (vide \textit{Vedic Index}, Vol. I, p. 216) that such land need not be deemed to have been unfertile as Professor Roth supposed. The \textit{Nārada-smṛti} (which may now be regarded as almost contemporary with the time of our documents) clearly defines (Ch. XI, 26) that \textquotedblleft a tract of land (which has not been cultivated for a year is called \textit{ardhā-khila} (half-waste). That which has not been (under cultivation) for three years is called \textit{khila} (waste).\textquotedblright\ Vāstu land is dwelling site and is quite different from cultivated or waste land.

Another important fact revealed by these documents is that different rates of price for land were prevalent in different parts of old Bengal. In almost all the North Bengal records we have reference to the established rule (\textit{marṇyadā}) fixing the price of one \textit{kulayavāpa} of land at three \textit{dīnāra} coins, whereas in the East Bengal ones we have seen that four such coins were charged for the same area. Only in plate No. 4, we find one \textit{kulayavāpa} sold for two \textit{dīnāras}. Perhaps this somewhat lower rate was prevalent in the villages of that locality only (\textit{grāmānukrana-vikraya-marṇyadā}) for selling unassessed fallow land. There was again no difference in the rate in North Bengal for the purchase of either \textit{khila} land or such land along with \textit{vāstu} plots (vide No. 6). The gold coins \textsuperscript{10} of the Gupta period were mentioned in many inscriptions by the names of \textit{dīnāras} as well as \textit{suvarṇas}. The term \textit{dīnāra} is a European word, i.e., the \textit{dinarus} of the Romans. It has been remarked by Professor Jolly in his Introduction \textsuperscript{11} to the \textit{Nārada-smṛti} that \textquotedblleft the first importation of gold \textit{dīnāras} into India cannot be referred to an earlier period than the time of the Roman Emperors and the gold \textit{dīnāras} most numerous found in India belong to the third century A.D."\textquotedblright\ Both Nārada and Brhaspati give the statement of the value \textsuperscript{12} of a \textit{dīnāra}, as being equal to twelve \textit{dhānakas}, each of which is equal to four \textit{aṇḍikās} which again are each equal to one \textit{kārsāpana}, a coin made of one \textit{karsha} of copper. According to \textit{Amara} (III, 3, 14) one \textit{dīnāra} is equal to one \textit{nīska} which, however, is mentioned as equal to four \textit{suvarṇas} (Brhaspati, X, 14).

It is difficult to ascertain the exact area of each \textit{kulayavāpa} of land, which seems to have been the unit of area in land-measurement of the

\textsuperscript{10} Allan, \textit{Indian Coins, Gupta Dynasties}, Introduction, p. cxxxiv.
\textsuperscript{11} SBE., Vol. XXXIII, Introduction, p. xviii.
\textsuperscript{12} Ibid, \textit{Nārada} (Appendix, V. 60) and \textit{Brhaspati} X, 14-15.
period. Mr. Pargiter has attempted tentatively to fix the area of one kulyavāpa as having contained a little more than one acre of land. According to Sanskrit lexicographers a kulya is a measure equal to eight dronas. The word drona, ordinarily regarded as a measure of capacity (=four āḍhakas), was also used as a measure for measuring fields, as is still to be found in some parts of Bengal. There is use of the word drōṇavāpa in connection with a grant of land in one of the Asrafpur (in Dacca District in East Bengal) copper-plate inscriptions of the 7th or the 8th century A.D. It can be explained that a drōṇavāpa and kulyavāpa denote areas of land in which seed measuring respectively one drona and one kulya in volume can be sown.

There is evidence in Vedic literature also that fields were properly and carefully measured. In some of our deeds, especially those from East Bengal, we have observed that land was measured by means of nālas (reeds), and perhaps each kulyavāpa of land (the unit of area) contained an area measured and surveyed by eight reeds in breadth and nine in length (aśṭaka-navaka-nala). The exact length of such a standard nala (reed) of those days cannot, however, be known. Perhaps the length varied in different provinces and localities as now. In the provinces of Navyāvakāśika in East Bengal, the nala had, in some cases, connection with the cubit-length of the famous and trust-worthy Śivacandra (pratīta-dharmaśīla-Śivacandra-hasta). But we are not told anywhere in these documents as to how many cubits' length by this person's hand the reed contained.

The lands under discussion were sold and granted as gift according to a custom called as nīvīdharma in some and as apradā-dharma in other documents. This custom refers to the fact that the purchasers and the grantees had no right of destroying the perpetuity of the grants by any subsequent alienation. It has elsewhere been shown by the present writer that "to make a gift of land or money according to nīvīdharma is to give it on condition that the endowment is to be maintained as perpetual, and in cases of aksayanīvī also, the grantee could not destroy the principal (original), land or money, but had to make use of the income accruing from it." Purchased and endowed land, according to this custom, remained beyond the scope of further transfer in future.

Appendix.

A note on the age of the four Faridpur grants.

Although we do not endorse all what Mr. Pargiter, following Dr. Hoernle, has said about the exact date of these plates, it can, however, be inferred that palaeographically these documents belong to the latter half of the sixth and the first of the seventh century A.D. They cannot be placed before the period of the downfall of the imperial Gupta dynasty which I have attempted to show in my paper on "the five Dāmodarpur copper-plate inscriptions of the Gupta period" as having been brought about by Yasodharman about A.D. 540. These Faridpur plates may, therefore, be ascribed to the period between the breakdown of the imperial Gupta rule and the rise or reign of King Harṣavarman (A.D. 606–648). We know that the people of East Bengal (Vaṅga) encountered a defeat at the hands of Candragupta I, the first imperial Gupta ruler, when that king began to establish the Gupta empire by making new conquests. We also know from the Allahabad Pillar Inscription of Samudragupta's time that the semi-independent kings of Samatāta acknowledged the suzerainty of that Gupta monarch and paid him certain tributes, etc. Perhaps this relation of the Samatāta kings with the Gupta empire commenced from the first conquest of Vaṅga by Samudragupta's father, Candragupta I, if, of course, we regard Vaṅga and Samatāta as identical and forming parts of South and East Bengal, i.e., portions of the modern districts of Jessore, Khulna, Bakarganj, Faridpur, Dacca and Comilla. If the provinces of East Bengal continued to retain this relation of subordinate alliance with the Gupta rulers of the imperial line, their semi-independent kings to whose family the kings of the Faridpur grants, viz., Dharmāditya, Gopacandra and Samācāradēva may have belonged, reverted to full independence after the total decadence of the imperial power of the Guptas. It is then and then only that they might have assumed the supreme title of Mahārājādhīrāja in East Bengal. But they followed in their administration the same system as was adopted by the imperial Gupta rulers themselves, as can be ascertained from a comparative study of the

---

* Epigraphia Indica, Vol. XV, Part III.
texts of these inscriptions on the one hand and the North Bengal ones on the other. If, again, it can ever be proved that these provinces in East Bengal were brought after Samudragupta's reign under the direct jurisdiction of the Gupta empire, as the North Bengal provinces always were, and were ruled by Governors appointed by the imperial rulers, it may be supposed that such governors probably declared themselves independent after the down-fall of the imperial Gupta line, and the three kings of the Faridpur grants named above might have belonged to their families.
THE THEORY OF THE CONSTITUTION IN HINDU POLITICAL PHILOSOPHY: A STUDY IN COMPARATIVE POLITICS.

Benoy Kumar Sarkar, M.A.

1. The Doctrine of Saptânga (Seven Limbs).

The seven categories, svâmin (sovereign), amâtya (minister), suhrt (ally), kośa (finance), râstra (territory), durga (fortress) and bala (army), constitute the basis of all political speculation among Hindu philosophers. They form the saptânga\(^1\) or the "seven limbs" of the body politic. The theory of the constitution is epitomised in the doctrine of saptânga. An analysis of each of these seven constituents of a State as well as of their mutual relations is the specific theme of all Niti-śastras, from the Arthā-śāstra of Kauṭilya (cir. B.C. 300) to the Yukti-kalpa-taru of Bhoja (cir. A.D. 900). Necessarily subsumed under this fundamental investigation is the discussion of samaya (compact) as the origin of the State, dharma (droit, Recht, justice, law, duty, etc.), as the end of government, bali (offerings) as the rationale of taxation by the State for its services to the community, aparodha (expulsion of tyrant), maṇḍala and other concepts of political science in Sanskrit literature.

Now, to modern historians of political science, single phrases—even single words—of Plato and Aristotle loom unduly large. This extravagance of interpretation is not without its justification. Every age interprets its past in the light of its own experience and conscience. Classical Hellas has thus been re-born in the modern West, since Aquinas (1225–1274)\(^2\) raised his theological superstructure on Aristotelian foundations, almost as many times as there have been Machiavellis, Bodins and Montesquieus\(^3\) to consult the ancient ency-

---
\(^1\) Vîṣṇu, iii, 33 (Eng. trans. in the S.B.E.); Sukra, i, lines 121, 122; v, 1, 2 (Sarkar’s trans. in the Panini Office Series, Allahabad); Kâmundaka, i, 16; iv, 1 (M. N. Dutt’s trans., Calcutta).


\(^3\) Bluntschli, Geschichte des allgemeinen Staatsrechts und der Politik, pp. 6-16, 258-276.
clopædias of culture. The values of every political thinker and theory in Europe have in this cumulative way been fixed definitely and in relation to one another. And the momentum is being accelerated with the sundry new experiences of recent times from Hegel and Austin to Liebknecht and Duguit, the two poles of the theory of sovereignty. The political futurists of today are indeed awaiting the issue of Bolshevik versions not only of the Plato-Sâṃhitā but even of the Aristotle-Niti to meet the demands of the new Novum Organum of the current régime of the "discredited state".

It is not intended here to apply this "right of interpretation" to the doctrine of saptāṅga or to the other auxiliary doctrines of the Niti-śāstra, whether from the conservative, liberal or radical viewpoint. Only a few dicta are being gleaned at random from the texts bearing on the theory of the constitution, without any comment as to its impact, if any, on Realpolitik. These would be enough, however, to bring out, first, that if man is a "political animal," he is equally so in the East as in the West, both in ancient and modern times. inspite of the differences created by steam, electricity, and air-navigation, and secondly, that notwithstanding the diversity of technical terminology, it is well-nigh impossible to distinguish the methods and results of Hindu Aristotles, Senecas, Alcuins and Hobbeses from those of their western colleagues.

But it is necessary to remember at the outset that in the whole range of Hindu political thought there is to be found no trace of theocracy as embodied in the social philosophy of Augustine's De Civitate Dei or of Aquinas' De Regimine Principum. For no period could the political ideas of the Hindus be treated as a branch of ecclesiastical history as Figgis considers it right in regard to European political speculation during the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries. No Śāstra-writer ever preached that some "high priest", or even

1 Modern French Legal Philosophy (Fouillée, Charmont, Duguit and Demoguе), ed. by Spencer (1916); Laski, Studies in the Problem of Sovereignty, pp. 20-21, 65-68, and Authority in the Modern State, pp. 133-114, 363; Barker, article on the "Discredited State" in the Political Quarterly (London), February, 1915; Duguit, Transformation du Droit publique.

2 Gierke, Political Theories of the Middle Age, 104-115 (notes); Bluntschli, Geschichte der neueren Staatswissenschaft, pp. 3-7; Poole, Illustrations of the History of Medieval Thought, pp. 220-233; McCabe, Augustine and His Age, pp. 375-410; Taylor, Medieval Mind, Vol. i, pp. 61-67.

3 From Gerson to Grosius, p. 31.
the king, is God’s viceroy on earth, or that the religious association, e.g., a saṅgha or temple-government, is a “self-sufficient” sva-rāj, independent of, or co-ordinate with, nay, superior to the secular organisation of the rāstra (res publica). There is no touch of the conflicts between canon law and civil law in the treatises on Nīti (statecraft) and Dharma (droit) or Smṛti (tradition), and the doctrine of sapṭāṅga is absolutely undisturbed by the rivalry of the Byzantine conception (Justinian’s) of the Church as subservient to the State with the antithetic Gregorian doctrine of the supremacy of sacerdotum over imperium.

2. A Moslem Review.

In the sixteenth century Abul Fazl, a Muhammadan minister of Akbar the Great, compiled an Imperial Gazetteer of India in Persian under the title of Ayin-i-Akbari, the “Institutes of Akbar.” He devoted certain sections of his book to Hindu laws and customs (byehr, i.e. vyavahāra), and gave a summary of current political notions.

“The monarch should be ambitious,” according to the traditional rāja-nīti (statecraft), “to extend his dominions. No enemy is so insignificant as to be beneath his notice.” A wise prince, as we read in the Persian resumé, should banish from his court all corrupt and designing men. The king’s functions are described as being “similar to those of a gardener,” who plucks up the thorns and briers and throws them to one side, whereby he beautifies his garden, and at the same time raises a fence which preserves his ground from the intrusion of strangers. Accordingly, the king should “detach from the nobles their too numerous friends and dangerous dependants.” An important maxim teaches, besides, that “in affairs of moment it is not advisable to consult with many.”

In these political recipes we have the German idea of “self-defence,” the American conception of “preparedness,” the Greek theory of “ostracism,” and the universal custom of deporting undesirables. And those who are familiar with the “secret clauses” of all

1 Woolf, Bartolus, p. 14; Carlyle, Medieval Political Theory in the West, Vol. ii, p. 94.
2 Woolf, op. cit., pp. 55, 60; Figgis, From Gerson to Grotius; Carlyle, op. cit., Vol. ii, pp. 148, 198.
3 V. Smith, Akbar the Great Mogul, pp. 4, 459.
treaties, and who watched the course of events leading to the Great War of 1914 as well as to its close, would surely ditto the Hindu dictum: "In affairs of moment it is not advisable to consult with many." For even today, in spite of universal literacy, power of the press, manhood suffrage, referendum and ministerial responsibility to the people, all nations do really

Leave all God gave them in the hands of one,—
Leave the decision over peace and war
To king or kaiser, president or czar.

The Persian synopsis of the Sanskrit texts has something to say on international relations. According to Hindu statecraft, if any monarch is more powerful than oneself, one should continually strive to sow dissension among the rival's troops, and in case of failure, should prudently purchase his friendship. "The prince whose territory adjoins to his," Abul Fazl tells us further, obviously reproducing the Kautiliya doctrine of maṇḍala, "although he may be friendly in appearance, yet ought not to be trusted; one should be always prepared to oppose any sudden attack from that quarter. With him, whose country lies next beyond the last-mentioned, he should enter into alliance." In these remarks there is nothing essentially Hindu, oriental or mediaeval, nor anything distinctively Machiavellian or Bernhardian. It is substantially on this elementary psychology of international relations that the ententes, conventions and interchange of diplomatic visits in the modern world are based.

"Human, all too human" are these precepts of the Arthaśāstra popularised for the "sons of Adam" through the Manu Samhita, (A.D. 150), and they did not need the special pleading of a Nietzsche's Will to Power to make them current coin for the present generation of statesmen.

Among other Hindu ideas the following is quoted by Abul Fazl: "If he finds it necessary to attack his enemy he should invade the country during the time of harvest." This was Napoleon's military method too. He wanted the war to pay its own way as far as possible. And of course strategic necessity and considerations of

---


12 vii, 158 (Eng. trans. in the SBE.).
high politics” may justify any measure from the desecrating of the tomb of Al Mahdi in Egypt to the declaration of war by Germany against neutralised Belgium.

We shall now proceed to single out a few of the more important tenets in the Niti-śāstras,18 without attempting, however, to be either comprehensive in treatment or exhaustive in reference. The object is only to throw light on the trend of political thinking among Hindus in the perspective of Eur-American speculation. The “personal equation” of the theorists as well as the differences in the milieu will be ignored in the present discussion. It is evident that no “historian” of political theory should be excused who passes without comment from the Sabhā-parva to the Sānti-parva of the Māhabhārata (cir. B.C. 600–A.D. 200), and from either to the Śukra-nīti (cir. A.D. 800), or from Kauṭilya to Manu as if he were moving in the same world and speaking of the same age. But, for some time yet indology will have to content itself more with the psychological analysis of the categories and concepts of political science than with the historical presentation of the growth of doctrines. The following sections are being offered, therefore, subject to the fundamental fallacy implied in this “limiting condition” of archaeological data.

3. The Prakṛti (people) and the State.

John Stuart Mill, in his Representative Government, has discussed the characteristics which make a race fit for the popular institutions of self-government. One of his criteria is that the people must be able not only to appreciate and profit by such institutions, but must have to be actively interested in all that relates to public life. Śukra also is strongly of opinion that it is the duty of the prakṛti, the people, not only not to commit certain

18 For a brief account of the Niti-śāstras vide B. K. Sarkar, Positive Background of Hindu Sociology, Vol. i, pp. 7-15 (Panini Office, Allahabad, 1914); D. R. Bhandarker, Ancient History of India, pp. 87-113 (Calcutta, 1919); and Narendranath Law, articles in the Modern Review (Calcutta) for 1916-1917. Jolly’s Recht und Sitte gives a comprehensive view of the Dharma-śāstras or law-books. Aufrecht’s Catalogus Catalogorum may be consulted for the names of all books on Hindu polity. The Sanskrit text of Yuktikalpa-taru has been edited by I. C. Shastri (Sanskrit Press Depository, Calcutta, 1918). Vide also the present author’s paper on “Hindu Political Philosophy” in the Political Science Quarterly (Columbia University), December, 1918, for a preliminary study.
wrongs, but also to hand over to the police or otherwise disclose to
the State the existence of the men who are in any way un-
desirable to the society. The whole community is thus enjoined to
be an information and vigilance committee and an association for
public safety. The demands of the State on the prakyaṭi are neces-
sarily manifold in Hindu thought.

In Kaunṭilya’s analysis of the duties of the people we are fami-
liar with the notion that the citizens should be on the look-out
in the streets as to whether a trader has paid the toll on his com-
modities at the custom office. This principle of active co-operation
with the State, as contrasted with the passive obedience to and
observance of the laws promulgated by it, is laid down in the Śukra-
niti in such general terms as the following: “You should never
keep screened, or give protection to, men of wicked activities,
thieves, bad characters, malicious and offensive persons as well as
other wrong-doers.” More comprehensive touch of the people (i.e.
the “society”) with the State is indeed contemplated by the theorist.
For the Śukra polity is essentially an omnipresent all-inclusive agency
for the advancement of human welfare—a Kulturstaat, in short.
The kāla, i.e.; age or epoch (Zeitgeist) is as much the making of
the State as its fundamental function is the promotion of dharma (law, justice, duty, culture, and what not), i.e. the “virtue” of the
Greek theorists, which is as all-embracing or extensive as life itself.

Such doctrines of the Niti-śāstras have important bearings on
the problems of political philosophy in regard to the limits of state
control or the sphere of governmental activity. The new type of 100
per cent socialist state in Bolshevik Russia is undoubtedly bound to
have a deep influence on the theory of the proper functions of the
State. But it is questionable if Sidgwick’s “individualistic minimum”
of state interference may not still be regarded as the last word,
audemically speaking, on rival claims between the two extremes
that may be urged for the State and for the Individual. So far
as pure theory is concerned, the issues between laissez faire and
intervention may indeed be taken to have been finally settled in

14 Indian Antiquary, 1905, p. 45.
15 Ch. i, lines 505–506.
16 Ch. i, lines 43–44; iv, i, 116–7.
17 Ch. i, 45–51; iv, iii, 849; cf. Chinese and Japanese conception of “Virtue” in
Asakawa’s Early Institutional Life of Japan, p. 325.
Mill's *Liberty*. Now, the Hindu thought on the subject is quite elastic. It is not a minimum-functioned State that Kauṭilya and Śukra have before their imagination. The Hindu theorists are no doctrinaire individualists. As champions of *dharma* they have extended the functions of the State so wide as to include whatever should be deemed expedient according to social needs, as readers of the *Sabhā-parva* (Canto on "Council") of the *Mahābhārata* are aware.

The theory of old age pensions is not indeed stated by the Hindu theorists. But the widows of soldiers killed in battles are to receive pension according to Vasiṣṭha (cir. B.C. 350). The *Mahābhārata* suggests that the State should support the wives and children of men who have sacrificed their lives for it or otherwise been in distress while serving it. Protection of the weak and afflicted persons is insured in the *Artha-śāstra*.* Kauṭilya would legislate also to forbid trade in dangerous goods, as he would likewise forbid "profiteering", high rates of interest and so forth. The social and economic legislation recommended in the Śukra-niti is sweepingly vast and wide. It leaves very little to the caprices of the individual's civic sense and patriotism. Tanks, wells, parks and boundaries must not be obstructed by the citizens. Nor must the use of religious houses, temples and roads be hindered in any way. The movements of the poor, the blind and the deformed similarly call forth the solicitude of the Śukra legislators.

Besides, among the *śāsanas* or "positive laws" conceived by Śukra we read that without the sanction of the State the following things are not to be done: gambling, drinking, hunting, use of arms, sales and purchases of cows, elephants, horses, camels, buffaloes, men, immovable property, silver, gold, jewels, intoxicants and poisons, distillation of wines, the drawing up of deeds indicating a sale, gift or loan, and medical practice. The important professions and economic activities which involve public safety and the future interests of the individuals concerned are thus not left to the discretion and common-sense of the *prakṛti* (the society). In Śukra's conception

---

1[9] xix, 20; in the *SBE.*
5[9] Ch. i, lines 587-626.
6[9] Ibid., lines 601-602. The "recent" changes in the general conception of the state functions are summarized by Leroy-Beaulieu in *L'état moderne et ses fonctions*, pp. 27-48.
7[9] Ibid., lines 603-608.
the State has to function as the Platonic "guardian" even of the citizen's self-interest.

Municipal by-laws and regulations relating to patents, licenses and charters are in this way provided for in the theory of the Niti-sūtras. The logic of such control exercised by the "dharma-states" over the economic and social life of the people is essentially the same as that at the back of German state socialism and modern "nationalisation" schemes culminating in the "public ownership" movement. And this is all the more evident in the enumeration of the crafts and industries that the Śukra state seeks to encourage. The list of productive and aesthetic arts that demand the "developmental" attention of the government according to the Śukra-niti—together with the schedule of duties that Kautilya, Manu and the Mahābhārata recommend for the king—furnishes the Hindu theory of "enlightened despotism" with its hydra-headed bureaucracy. Whether the prakṛti exercise the initiative and sense of responsibility for their material and moral development or not, the state of the Niti-sūtras must address itself to the problem of national culture. As the promoter of dharma, and the creator of kula, the State is necessarily the organiser of patriotism and the pioneer of civilisation,—indeed, the chief dynamo of social engineering.


While "L'état c'est moi" embodied the prevailing shibboleth of European despots from Alexander and Augustus Caesar to Louis XVI, the political philosophers were adumbrating the gospel of justice, natural equality, and sovereignty of the people. Mediaeval political theory in the West, as one can gather from Gierke's and Poole's investigations and the more "intensive" researches of Carlyle, Figgis and Woolf, was essentially a philosophy of "pious wishes," no matter whether conceived by the Stoics, the Roman Lawyers or "civilians," or Church Fathers and canonists. It is interesting to observe that

18 Ch. i, lines 734–741; Ch. ii, lines 390–411.
19 Mbh., Sabhā, Ch. v, (whole), 53, 76–79. Vide the references in Narendranath Law's article in the Modern Review for February, 1917. The distinction between the sphere of the State and the sphere of the society that is suggested in Mookerji's Local Government in Ancient India (pp. 3–7) as the characteristic of Hindu polity cannot be borne out by the political theory of the Niti-sūtras or by the evidence of actual institutional development.
such "ideals" found expression also, though under different categories, in the śāstras (sciences) on Niti and Dharma from Kauṭilyya to Bhoja.

The poet's definition of the king as one who ministers to the well-being of the prakṛti was lifted up by Śukra into a plank of radical philosophy. In one passage of his Politics about the position of the king we seem to read the Bolshevik lines of Robert Burns:

The rank is but the guinea's stamp,

Though hundreds worship at his word,
He's but a coof for a' that.

For, "does not even the dog look like a king," asks Śukra, "when it has ascended a royal conveyance? Is not the king justly regarded as a dog by the poets?" The sentiment is certainly much more extremist than that in the cry of the first English socialists, the Lollards:

When Adam delved and Eve span,
Who was then a gentleman?

Śukra wants us to understand that the king is great only from his station, but that as an individual he is just a mortal among mortals. The office of kingship, if anything, may be conceded to be sacred, but not the person who happens to hold it. As a human being he is not distinct from other men. In order that the king can command awe and reverence of the people, he is therefore advised by the philosopher to be attended by his retinue of officers. Verily, the regal insignia and paraphernalia, the royal seal, and not the king himself, is the real sovereign. American individualism does not go any further.

This conception of the dignity of man is evident again in the principles of recall and plebiscite that the Śukra-niti advocates. In cases of conflict between the king's officers and the subjects the king is advised to take the side of the people. He is to "dismiss the officers who are accused by one hundred men." The truth vox populi vox dei was thus known to Hindus also. They have here given expression to the Confucian mores preserved in the Shū-king. "The great God," said the Superman of China, "has conferred even
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on the inferior people a moral sense, compliance with which would show their nature invariably right."

The supreme importance of the prakṛti is never lost sight of in the speculation of Śukra. The king is a master only in the sense that he is to protect the people's interests and punish the offenders. Like Seneca, the Stoic philosopher of the first century A.D., the Hindu theorist would accordingly exhort the ruler to remember his responsibility as "one out of all mankind who has been chosen to act in the place of the gods." The king is therefore not to enjoy any prerogatives or treat the people in any way he likes. In all Niti-śāstras, as in the writings of Alcuin and Jonas, the rationale of kingship is the promotion of dharma or justice. This dispensing of justice is to be administered by the king not only between subject and subject, but also between himself and his subjects. He is to appoint spies as much to get secret information about the people's activities as also against his own conduct. He is to find out in what light his policies are being taken by the prakṛti. And if the unpleasant truth comes out—i.e., if his intelligence department tells him: "People dispraise you, O King"—it would be "unkingly" or "unphilosophic," as Plato would have remarked, to get angry and punish the persons who condemn him. Rather, he should follow the ideal of the Rāmāyaṇa and the spirit of Kālidasa's Rasau-vānsha (cir. A.D. 425) or that of the French epic of the twelfth century, Le Couronnement de Louis, which taught in quite the niti style of the Hindus that the purpose of God in making the king is not to enable him to satisfy his appetite but that he should tread down all wrongs under his feet. Śukra certainly goes far beyond the poets, when he declares categorically that the king's position is really one of dāsatva, i.e., servitude: "The ruler has been made by Brahma (the highest God) a servant of the people. His revenue is the remuneration for his services. He is sovereign or master solely in order that he may protect." The king of the Niti-śāstras is thus a trustee for the prakṛti. He is a mere wage-
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earner in Baudhayana’s Institutes (cir. B.C. 450) also, and is logically liable to fines according to Manu, for his duty is, as Hinemar (805-882) would say in Carolingian Europe, to “govern according to laws.” This conception is the farthest removed from the message of Bodin and Bossuet with their doctrine of absolute monarchy as a gouvernement de droit divin.

Quite consistently with the position of the king as a dāsa or servant is the right of petition by the subjects postulated in Hindu thought. The king, says Śukra, must personally inspect every year the villages, cities and districts. “He must investigate which subjects have been pleased and which oppressed by the staff of officers and deliberate upon matters brought forward by the people.” Altogether, then, the State of the Śukra school of politics is a people’s state under royal supervision. The majesty of the people is their political slogan. Such ideas about the dignity of the prakṛti or droits de l’homme bear apt comparison with those of Azo (1150-1230), the Italian jurist, who in spite of the autocratic milieu of the Middle Ages wrote on the sovereignty of the populus or universitas.

5. Ministry, the Pivot of National Life.

The doctrine of the sovereignty of the prakṛti is in the thought of the Niti-śāstras invariably connected with that of the anātya (ministry) as a check on the possible autocracy of the svāmin. One of the earliest landmarks in the history of this doctrine is to be noticed in Vedic writings (cir. B.C. 1000), the Aitareya Brāhmaṇa and the Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa. In that body of literature the people are “worshipped” by the king at “election” in and through their representatives, the Ratnins, among whom the head of the village elders is one. The Mahābharata maintains this tradition in so far at least as it considers
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the priests to be the "non-official" mouthpieces of the people, and the councillors as their "natural leaders." Finally, in a discussion of the Arthaśāstra it is even established that the State has its "sole prop" in the ministry (mantri-pariṣat). The amāṭya of the Kautiliya theory is in essence an instrument through which the will of the people can be brought to bear on the constitution.

In a very elementary manner the Agni Purāṇa and the Matsya Purāṇa advise the king "not to decide on the policies alone." The arguments against one-man rule or exclusive "personal" government are based in the Śukra-nīti on the conception that the monarch is not infallible. "Even if the work be a trifling one," argues Śukra, "it can be done with difficulty by only one individual." "What can be performed by an unfriended person for a kingdom that is considerable?" is therefore his natural query. Hence his deliberate advice that "even the king who is proficient in all the sciences and a past-master in state-craft should never by himself study political interests, i.e., without reference to ministers." The wise ruler, the ideal "philosopher-king," should ever "abide by the well-thought-out decisions of councillors, office-bearers, subjects, and members attending a meeting,—never by his own opinions."

This hypothetical case of an "all-knowing" sovereign is well known to students of European political philosophy, from Plato to Mill. But the utilitarian creed of the "greatest happiness of the greatest number" on which is erected the legislation of the present day is not prepared to trust itself to the discretion of such an omniscient benevolent individual. For according to modern political conscience the physical magnitude, if not anything else, is too much for one man. The logic of the Śukra-nīti is thus essentially modern. Besides, Śukra is conscious also of the complexity of moral and social relations, as well as of the diversity of intellectual attainments among the members of a community,—facts which make it all the more improbable that any single intellectual giant should be competent enough to manage a whole state.

These are also some of the considerations on which Kauṭilya, Kāmandaka (cir. A.D. 300), Manu and others seek to institute a council of experts as the permanent advisory instrument of monarchical politics.
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And in regard to their position in the state Śukra's idea is definite and clear. "If the king fears their control," says he, "they are good ministers." It is inconceivable to him that "there could be prosperity in a territory where ministers are not feared by the king." 51 The ānātīyas in constitutional theory are thus not more "king's men" like the ministers of England before the introduction of the cabinet system. They must have a individuality and independence of character in order that they may control the whims and caprices of the monarch and systematically govern the course of the State. Nay, by the strength of their wisdom they are expected to deliver a king who has gone astray. 52 And the acid test of their statesmanship is the "improvement of the state in extent, population, efficiency, revenue and administration." 53

The Nīti philosophers have not neglected to consider the other side of the shield. The contingency of an arbitrary Charles I, the Chow of the Mencian radicals in ancient China, the Vena of Hindu tradition, has not been ignored either by Kauṭilya or by Śukra. The evils of "personal government," with their natural and necessary reactions, have been discussed in all the śāstras. 44 If the monarch follows his own will, against the advice of Yājñavalkya 55 (cir. A.D. 350) or of the Purāṇas, he will tend to be the cause of miseries, says the Śukra-nīti. 56 He is likely to "get estranged from the kingdom and alienated from his subjects," in other words, to provoke a revolution. Indeed, he is no longer a "legitimate" king, for by ignoring or defying the counsels of ministers he has made himself into a "thief in the form of a ruler," an "exploiter of the people's wealth," a persecutor, a tyrant. 57 In all respects, both negatively and positively, the ministry is thus a constitutional check in the Hindu theory of monarchy.

6. Right to Revolt.

The limitations of the king as ruler are fully admitted in the theory of the Nīti-śāstras. Kāmandaka, 55 Manu, 59 and Śukra 47 are never tired of moralising like Elyot in his Gouvernour as to the failings to which the monarch as much as all other human beings is naturally liable, especially because of his high position. Moreover, the restraints

53 Ibid, line 166. 54 Kauṭilya, Book i: Kāmandaka, ii, 60, 64, 71, 73; xi, 75.
44 i, 312. 55 ii, lines 7-8. 56 Ibid, lines 515-516.
55 i, 23, 37, 56-57; iv, 46, 48; xiii, 19; xiv, 1. 57 vii, 39-41; 45-53.
40 i, lines 181, 183-185, 197-198, 243-244.
on his authority implied in the conception of kingship as a public service and in that of the ministry as a body of overseers and controllers are the two checks that the philosophers offer to the doctrine of the saptânga state. It has to be observed that both these restrictions are distinct from and in addition to the moral and spiritual checks that are binding upon all men as men according to normal Hindu pedagogies. The king, therefore, is not sacred. As a consequence, Hindu thought does not seem to have ever recognised any "divine right" of kings, just as Hindu history does not know of any theocratic state, except in the Khalsa of the latter-day Sikhs (seventeenth and eighteenth centuries).

The secular idea of monarchy is not, however, inconsistent with the conception of the ruler as a "god in human form." The divine character of royalty is described in the Manu Sainhitâ and the Mahabharata and is stated also in the Śukra-niti. Royalty is indeed superhuman energy embodied in a human institution, exactly as every activity and ēlan or ṣakti of life is godly or divine in the mythological imagery of Hindu henotheism. But the king is not "vicar of God" as understood by mediaeval western philosophers, imperial as well as anti-imperial. The divinity that hedges the monarch is the glory and importance of the functions that he has to perform as svāmin. By analogically comparing the marks of sovereignty with the attributes and ṣakti of the gods (or powers of nature) Śukra wants the people to understand nothing more than the fact that kingship consists in protection of person and property, administration of justice, diffusion of culture and dharma, philanthropy and charity, and last but not least, realization of revenues. Not even the thinkers of Manu's school by any means contemplate the "patristic" dogma of the state or the monarch as divine in a theological sense. Their metaphor is meant only to bring to the forefront the supreme character of Bodin's majestas as an abstract attribute in civil society. In order to appreciate Hindu political theory it is essential to remember this materialistic view of sovereignty which, so far as Eur-America is concerned, is absolutely un-Christian or pre-Christian, i.e., "modern" and Greek.
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In any case, the metaphorical sacredness of sovereignty does not carry with it, according to Nīti philosophers, the infallibility and inviolability of the holder of the scepter. Not any prince and every prince is "made out of the permanent elements" of the gods of fire, air, water, light, wealth and so forth. It is "only the king who is virtuous that is a part of the gods." How to know such a ruler? The marks of the "god in human form" are fully described in the Kāmadakī-nīti, Śukra-nīti and the Manu-Saṁhitā. He must practise self-restraint and be valorous and skilled in the use of arms and weapons. He must be well up in statecraft and diplomacy and must be able to crush the foes. He must be learned in the arts and sciences. And he must have long-sighted statesmanlike views. But "otherwise (i.e., if he happens to be the enemy of dharma and oppressor of the people), the king is a part of the demons." Such notions are diametrically opposed to the creed of St. Augustine that even Nero was ruler by divine right.

One must not consequently look for a Gregory the Great in India to preach on the exemplary conduct of a "good subject" like David who would not criticise the tyranny even of a Saul. The radical tendencies of the Nīti-sāstras are developed on postulates which are as the poles asunder to the axioms of the Church Fathers. In Nīti thought the king can do wrong as any other mortal. The person, property and family of the ruler are, therefore, not exempt from punishment by the people, e.g., the fine of the Manu Samhitā. The bed-rock of Hindu political philosophy in the analysis of kingship is accordingly furnished by the differentiation of the king as "a part of the gods" from the king as "a part of the demons," This is the basis of the distinction between "legitimate kingship" and its contrary, i.e., tyranny. In the treatises on Smṛti and Nīti kingship automatically ceases to be legitimate as it ceases to promote justice (dharma), and the drastic remedy suggested is revolution and tyrannicide.

Kauṭilya observes that prakṛti-kopa hi sarvokṣepbhyo garivāna, "the wrath of the people is the supremest or most dangerous of all wraths." This is the Hindu counterpart of the Confucian proverb: "Of all who are to be feared, are not the people the chief?" In other words, the
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fear of the people is the wisdom of the Lord." Like Mencius,⁶¹ the Rousseau of ancient China, and Manegold of Lautenbach, the most radical anti-imperialist of mediaeval Europe, Manu has described in no uncertain terms the form generally taken by this "wrath of the people."

"The king who through foolishness arbitrarily tyrannises over his own state is very soon deprived of his kingdom and life together with his kith and kin. As the lives of living beings perish through torture of the body, so the lives of kings also are lost through torturing the kingdom."⁶⁶ Such a "torturer" or persecutor is known as "ruiner" or "destroyer" in the Mahābhārata. And according to its teachings he is to be executed (nihantavaya) by the people.⁶⁹ It is thus not the Gregorian doctrine of non-resistance championed by Hobbes in the Leviathan or by his junior French contemporary, Bossuet, in the Politique that could have found an echo in Hindu political thought. The Stuarts of England and le Grand Monarque would have been thoroughly disappointed with the Niti theory in regard to the status of the king. The right of resistance to the king's "demonical," i.e., autocratic and arbitrary, rule is taken for granted, and the doctrine of expulsion of the tyrant one of the elementary facts recognized in Hindu political Weltanschauung. The student of the Niti-kāstras is thus constantly reminded of Languet's (1518–1581) queries in the Vindicis contra Tyrannos⁷¹ as to whether it is "lawful to resist a prince who violates the laws of God and lays waste his church" and "whether one might resist a prince who oppresses and ruins the state, and how far."⁷² And the conclusion that is advanced by the European advocate of tyrannicide is identical with that of the protagonists of dharma.

The Tyrannos of the Western political theory is the "mere fellow" (and not a "sovereign") of the Chinese Mencians and "the monarch who follows his own will," is "a thief in the form of ruler," and "the enemy of virtue, morality and strength," etc., of the Hindu radicals. The Śukra-niti is quite at one with the Politica of Aristotle in its investigation of the "abuses" to which monarchy degenerates under "abnormal" conditions. And neither Isidore of Sevile under the influence prob-
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ably of Stoic teachings, nor John of Salisbury in the *Policraticus* makes out a more pronounced antithesis between the king and the tyrant than Manu or Śukra. The unequivocal enunciation of the doctrine of resistance, i.e. of the rights of the *prakṛti* as against the "demon" in human form is as manifest in Śukra as in Manu. Quite in keeping with the spirit of the *Mahābhārata*, Śukra gives the verdict that the people should "desert the tyrant as the ruin of the state." The "alienation from the subjects" because of "repression" leads ultimately to his ruin. The "discontent" may assume larger proportions and "destroy the monarch with his whole family." The overthrow and execution of Vena and Nāhuṣa, the tyrants of Hindu legends, are therefore justified as a matter of course. Only the Śukra-niti and the *Manu-Saṁhitā* are not explicit as to the methods of doing away with tyrants, if, for instance, as approved by the author of the *Policraticus*, the poisoning of a Tiberius could be resorted to by the people.

As a natural corollary, however, the right to "cashier kings for misconduct" is in Śukra's theory backed by the right to "elect" a ruler. In the place of the deposed tyrant the priest, with the consent of the ministry should install one who belongs to his family and is qualified. This advice of the Hindu philosopher is of a piece with Mencius' commendation of the conduct of the rebel minister I Yin, and is organically related to the general theory of popular sovereignty in Asian political philosophy.

7. *Taxes* (bali) as *Wages and Prices*.

The right of the *prakṛti* to revolt is essentially derived from the conception of *samaya* or compact, and this again is integrally connected with the theory of *kosa* or public finance. On election, according to the *Mahābhārata*, the ruler makes a *pratijñā* (vow or oath) that he will
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protect the people, and the people reciprocate by promising to help him with the "root of the army," i.e., the "sinews of war," or les nerfs de la république, to use Bodin's expression. Kingship is by its very nature a public office, and the masters of the king are the people who have the power of the purse. From the standpoint of the sovereign, then, as Šukra makes it clear, the revenues are but the wages for his labor, and from the standpoint of the people they are the price offered for the service of protection. Taxation, according to this theory, is the "cash nexus" binding the king and the people in the state. It represents, in reality, the material basis of the contract between two parties in regard to so much remuneration for so much benefit rendered. The right to levy a tax is dependent on the duty of protecting the people. Should, however, the taxes be ever so unjust in the realization or in the disbursement, the "discontent of the people would destroy the king with his whole family." The right of resistance is a natural weapon of the people in Šukra's theory of finance. Recourse is had to it as the ruler ceases to discharge his functions according to the terms of the compact.

For normal times however, i.e., as long as the people are paying the piper and the piper is willing to play the tune called for, Kāmandaka and other Hindu theorists have made provision for a considerable amount of revenue. It is not a slight Theocritean burden of taxation that the Niti-śāstras have in view, for the state conceived by them is not a primitive polity with functions of an idyllic character. Manifold are the services, as we have seen, rendered by the state in Hindu theory; the revenues (bali), i.e., wages are therefore necessarily varied and considerable." Manu and Šukra recommend a levy on almost every taxable resource of the people. Indirect taxes on commodities are to be paid by traders. No sale is to be left unassessed from cattle and gold to fruits and flowers. Land, of course, contributes its quota. The right of pre-emption is also to be enforced. One day's service per month and per fortnight the state is allowed by Manu and Šukra respectively to exact from artists, craftsmen, menial workers and independent laborers. The only limit that the Manu-Saṁhitā knows is the absolute subject may be seen in Kumaraswamy's "Hindu Theories and Social Compact" in the Hindustan Review (Allahabad), May-June 1918.
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limit furnished by the sound economic doctrine, "as far as the market will bear." It lays down the golden rule of realising the maximum possible without inflicting the least annoyance. For the state that shears the sheep to the skin really kills the goose that lays the egg. In Manu's language "excessive imposts" would lead but to the "destruction of one's own roots." We are told indeed that the levy is to be alpālpa, i.e., in small quantities. But the camouflage of these alleged negligible doses cannot impose on anybody, for the theorist takes care to point out that the people are to be sucked dry in the manner in which "leeches, calves, and bees" help themselves with regard to their food. The process of steady and patient, although slow and imperceptible, drain is thus suggested. Statesmen are, in short, to be guided by the principle analogous to the one well known in the investors' world, viz., that of "small rates" but "quick returns."

We find this hint of Manu's fully elucidated in the Arthaśāstra. "Just as fruits are gathered from a garden," says Kautilya, "as often as they become ripe, so revenue shall be collected as often as it becomes ripe." This principle of continuous levy might be indiscriminately observed in a suicidal fashion. Hence the sober advice that collection of revenues or fruits must not be allowed "while they are unripe," for there is a danger lest their "source be injured" to the immense peril of the state. In the phraseology of the Mahābhārata the rāstra must not be "over-milked."

The fear of injuring the source or killing the goose, or "spoiling the market" as economists would say, haunts likewise the financiers of the Śukra school. The cultivator is to pay the dues to the state but the state must take care that he "be not destroyed." Land revenue is to be realized, as we read in the Śukra-nīti in the fashion of the "weaver of garlands" and not of that of the charcoal merchant. The latter sets fire to the woods make charcoal and thus destroys the whole property. But the weaver of garlands plucks from the trees only such flowers as are full blown and then preserves the rest as well as the trees for future use. Fortified with this much discretion the finance minister is to test the "faculty" or taxability of the people at every conceivable point. He is to "enjoy fruits everywhere" and "collect funds by hook or by crook."
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No resource is then left untapped in Hindu fiscal thought, and "taxes, more taxes, still more taxes" appears to be the slogan popularized by the Kāmandaikiya-niti. But the theory of such a heavy assessment is redeemed by the postulate that the people are normally in a position to bear the burden and maintain the "root of the army." The philosophers of finance have therefore seen to it that the state promotes by all means the economic prosperity of its members. The Sabhā-prava of the Mahābhārata is explicit about the development of agriculture by the government to such an extent as to render it independent of the monsoons. Kāmandaka wants the state to patronize the commercial classes. The people's interests are looked after in Śukra's suggestion that if "new industries be undertaken or new lands brought under cultivation" no taxes are to be demanded until the new ventures "have realized profit twice the expenditure." Such remissions of taxes or suspensions of revenue for certain periods are, however, not to be permitted by Kauṭilya on doctrinaire grounds. The difficulties in the improvement effected by the peasants are to be carefully considered in fixing the rate of remission. Likewise is the wealth of the land sought to be augmented by protective duties, e.g., on foreign salts and wines. Kauṭilya would also recommend legislation against "profiteering." Consumers may thereby be protected from ruinously high profits and a general level of moderate prices would encourage saving. But, on the other hand, Śukra does not want to be unjust to the seller. The excise on sales is not to be realized if the trader receives what is less than or just equal to the cost.

Development of national resources being thus provided for in diverse ways, the Hindu theory of taxation automatically finds its own safety-valve. This principle of replenishment or recuperation is clearly stated by Śukra in the dictum that the "collector of taxes is to be like the gardener who plucks flowers and fruits after having duly nourished the trees with care." Kāmandaka's idea is similar.

The financiers' solicitude for the people's material prosperity is brought out in bold relief by the special arrangements they seek to devise for "hard times" in state-housekeeping. Emergency finance is treated
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by them as something distinct from normal finance. Fines, land revenues, excise etc., must not be enhanced, says Śukra.¹⁰⁹ in normal times. Nor should holy places, religious establishments or properties consecrated to the gods be assessed as sources of public income under peace conditions. Extraordinary duties and fines may be levied when the State is preparing to maintain an army on war-footing.¹¹⁰ While the community at large is to be drawn upon for war-finance by regular enhancements of the rates, the pressure of the State is to be borne more distinctively by the rich. And the doctrine is laid down that loans are to be floated by the government to which the wealthy classes should be invited to contribute. The "public debt" is to be redeemed, however, with interest when the national danger is over.¹¹¹

8. Militarism and Pouvoir (Śakti-yoga).

"A joy is it to be killed in war," says the Mahābhārata,¹¹² "painless is the soldier's death, and heaven is his goal." The poets of the Great Epic were but continuing the tradition of the vedas pervaded as they had been by śakti-yoga, the spirit of pouvoir or Machtpolitik. For, nothing short of a world-conquest was the ideal of young India of the Vedic period. "Mighty am I," as the earliest Hindu political philosophers (cir. B.C. 1000) set the creed of life for man, "Superior by name, upon the earth, conquering am I, all-conquering, completely conquering every region."¹¹³ Thus began the conception of war as a "categorical imperative" in Hindu thought, which found its most complete expression in the doctrine of niskāma karma preached by Krishna in the Gīta¹¹⁴ (cir. B.C. 200) and was further popularised by works like the Agni Purāṇa¹¹⁵ for mediaeval India.

Manu also is a champion of this Kṣatriya spirit or militarism of the Hindus. But probably modern war-lords would recognize in the Indian Śukra their own kin. "Even Brāhmaṇas (the most intellectual order of people)," says he, "should fight if there have been aggressions on women and priests or if there has been a killing of cows."¹¹⁵ According to the Śukra-nīti, the death of Kṣatriyas (warriors) in the
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bed is a sin. The man who gets death with an unhurt body by excreting cough and bile and crying aloud is not a Kṣatriya. The military morality is categorically stated thus: "Death in the home except in the fight is not laudable. Cowardice is a miserable sin." And "the Kṣatriya who retreats with a bleeding body after sustaining defeat in battles and is encircled by members of the family deserves death." Further, what is there to regret in the death of the brave man who is killed in battle? It is a blessing in disguise. For, "the man is purged and delivered of all sins and attains heaven." Nay, who would not invite such a death? For, "the Apsaras (heavenly maidens) vie with one another in reaching the warrior who is killed in action in the hope that he be their husband." Nothing indeed could be more tempting in view of the notion that "the rascal who flies from a fight to save his life is really dead though alive, and endures the sins of the whole people." The "sanction" inculcated here would be called Bushido in Japan. Does this not seem to be a chip from the Lycurgan creed followed in the public barracks of Sparta? Or is it a spark from the Politics of Heinrich von Treitschke?

Let us now look to the other side of the shield. The international jurists of the world and peace-propagandists of America have of late been devising ways and means to render warfare more humane and less barbarous. On several occasions before the outbreak of the Great War, resolutions were passed by the "Concert of Europe" at the Hague Conferences regarding the kind of arms and ammunitions to be avoided out of consideration for human suffering. But the Hindu thinkers of Manu's school have handed down a tradition of chivalrous "ideals" probably as old as the sixth century B.C. The "resolution" in Manu-Samhitā reads thus in verse:

Let the soldier, good in battle, never guilefully conceal,
(Wherewithal to smite the unwary) in his staff the treacherous steel;
Let him scorn to barb his javelin—let the valiant never anoint
With fell poison-juice his arrows, never put fire upon the point.
In his car or on his war-horse, should he chance his foe to meet,
Let him smite not if he find him lighted down upon his feet.
Let him spare one standing suppliant, with his closed hands raised
on high.
Spare him whom his long hair loosen’d blinds and hinder from to
fly.
Spare him if he sink exhausted; spare him if he for life crave,
Spare him crying out for mercy, “Take me for I am thy slave.”
Still remembering his duty, never let the soldier smite
One unarmed, defenceless, mourning for one fallen in the flight;
Never strike the sadly wounded—never let the brave attack
One by sudden terror smitten, turning in base flight his back.

These sentiments and “pious wishes” may be useful even today.
We notice once more that the mentality of Hindu political thinkers is
quite of the same stuff as that of the modern Eur-American phrase-
makers. For the Orientals also knew how to lecture on making the
“world safe for civilization and humanity.”


The gospel of puissance and militarism is not intended exclusively
for the so-called military (Kṣatriya or Samurai) caste. In Hindu thought
army service has always been held to be national, i.e., the duty of every
order of citizens. Brāhmaṇas or priests can be soldiers according to the
Mahābhārata, as well as according to the lawbooks of Gautama (cir. B.C. 550) and Vasiṣṭha. The Manu Saṁhitā also recommends recruitment from the priestly caste. And, as noticed above, Śukra’s opinion is quite clear. Baudhāyana is in favour of enlisting the Vaiśya or the so-called artisan and mercantile classes. They are eligible as soldiers in the Mahābhārata also.

No distinction is likewise made in the Arthaśāstra between castes
or hereditary and personal occupations in the matter of inducing troops
for national defence. The regulating principle is nothing but fitness or
qualification as fighting material. In Kautilya’s book there is a dis-
cussion as to the relative bravery of the different castes. “My teacher
says,” as we read, that “of the armies composed of Brāhmaṇas, Kṣatri-
yas, Vaiśyas or Śudras (lower orders), that which is mentioned first on

125 Sānti, ch. lxxviii, 34.
124 vii, 6.
125 ii, 22.
126 xi, 81
127 Śukra, iv, vii, 599, 604-667.
128 ii, 2, 4, 18.
129 Karna, xlvii, 19; Sānti, clxv, 34.
account of bravery is better to be enlisted than the one subsequently mentioned." But to this Kautêlyya makes an objection on the ground, rather too idealistic for his usual Realpolitik attitude, that the Brâhmaṇas might be won over by prostration, because as priests, they are likely to be sentimentally weak to those who are submissive. Hence the army of Kṣatriyas trained in the art of wielding weapons is better, or the army of Vaiśyas or Śūdras having greater numerical strength. Thus while Kautêlyya does not make the calling of army the exclusive preserve or monopoly of any section of community, he would exempt the Brâhmaṇas, if at all, on the sole ground of relative military incompetency.

The theory of national service on the question of castes is explicitly stated in the Śukra-nīti. According to this treatise, caste is to play no part in the consideration of a person’s qualification for officership. No officer in the army hierarchy from the ayutika (general in command of ten thousand troops) down to the gaulmika (head of thirty) and pattipāla (head of five or six) is to be selected from any privileged class, tribe or race. Only such persons as are well up in Niti-śāstras, in the use of arms and ammunitions, the manipulation of battle arrays, and in the art of management and discipline, as are not too young but of middle age, as are brave, self-controlled, able-bodied, always mindful of their own duties, as are devoted to their superiors and hate their enemies, should be made commanders and soldiers, no matter whether they are Kṣatriyas, Vaiśyas or Śūdras, or even descended from Mlecchas (unclean barbarians).

But since the warrior caste is likely to specialize in valour, and in the art of war, Śukra-nīti would give the preference to a Kṣatriya, and failing him to a Brâhmaṇa. As a rule, it would not confer commission on the mercantile or agricultural classes, the Vaiśyas, because their service is needed in other fields. They cannot be spared from attending to the normal economic interests of the State. And as for the Śūdras, they are usually to be held incompetent or unfit to take the lead, because like the ancient Greeks the Hindu thinkers also postulated the existence of a class of "natural" slaves, born only to serve. Under ordinary circumstances, therefore, a Śūdra is not to be in command of troops. But even these conventional arguments against Vaiśyas and Śūdras are over-ridden by the supreme consideration of valour. Since

180 Bk. ix.  181 ii, 276-285.  182 ii, 865-866.  183 Manu, viii, 413-414.
fighting is treated as "the duty of the four pure as well as of mixed castes." 134 The commander may be selected from any caste, 135 for, after all, says Śukra finally, it is bravery that is to be looked for in a commander. The only persons against whom the theoretical injunction is absolute are the cowards, even though they be Kṣatriya by caste. 136

This principle of indifferentism to caste regulates Śukra's thought not only in regard to the officers and privates of the army but to every branch of the public service. As usual, the Śūdra is normally declared ineligible for a seat on the council of ministers, and the traditional preference is accorded to the Brāhmaṇa, 137 failing him to the Kṣatriya, and failing that, to the Vaiśya. But this stereotyped order of selection for the ten prakṛtis or councillors is thrown overboard in the general discussion on the subject. We are told that only those who are versed in politics and are men of good deeds, habits and attributes, and who are gentle in speech and old in age "should be made members of council irrespective of caste." 138 In making appointments to offices "one should not notice only the caste or race or only the family," 139 though the "accident of birth" is of course an important consideration. "Work, character and merit,—these three are to be respected—neither caste nor family. 140 Neither by caste nor by family can superiority be asserted." The importance of caste is relegated in the Śukra-niti only to social functions, such as marriages and dinner-parties. 141

Further, among the six officers 142 to be appointed in each village as representatives of the crown, it is interesting to observe that the chief executive may come even from the priestly caste, and that even the warrior caste can contribute men to the department of revenue. 143 Thus according to Śukra the Brāhmaṇa need not always have to pursue the religious avocation, nor the Kṣatriya always to be a soldier. In political theory, therefore, caste is not the supreme factor in an individual's occupation or professional activity as it has been alleged to be by the scholars in indology. 144

Incidentally, it may be pointed out that the Hindu theory of

social orders did not treat the castes as water-tight compartments even in regard to marital relations. Inter-caste marriages were held valid by Kautilya, Manu, Yājñavalkya, and Viśnus.\textsuperscript{145} (c. A.D. 250.) Race-fusion or blood-intermixture, both horizontal and vertical, was, therefore, accepted as a normal phenomenon, in the legal investigations of sociologists bearing on the problems of inheritance, succession, and partition of property.\textsuperscript{146}

\textsuperscript{145} Kautilya, ixiv; Mbh., Anuśāsana, xlvi, 17, 28, xlviii, 4, 7, 8; Manu, iii, x, 6-7; Viśnus, xxiv, 1-4; Baudhāyana, i, viii, 2-6; i, ix, 3-5; Yājñavalkya, i, 57, 91, 92, ii, 125. These references are borrowed of Vanamalī Vedāntatīrtha's Bengali article in the Prabāsi (Calcutta) for Vaishākha 1326 (April 1919).

\textsuperscript{146} Enough data are not available yet for an epigraphic study of the caste system. But already it might be shown that the rājās of the ruling dynasties and of the gaṇas (republics) belonged very rarely to the so-called Kṣatriya caste, as the theory of water-tight compartments would lead one to presume. Similarly, generals and officers of the army were contributed by the priestly, trading and Śūdra classes; cf. Mookerji, pp. 59-62; Majumdar, Corporate Life in Ancient India, pp. 146-149, 160, 164, 171, 172. A "military interpretation" of Hindu history with special reference to the ethnic elements has been suggested in Sarkar's Chinese Religion through Hindu Eyes, pp. 195-208 ("A Melting Pot of Races").

Note the cephalic index tests as well as legends and inscriptions on the strength of which Rama Prasad Chanda maintains that Brāhmaṇas of the "outer countries" were "outlandic" in stock, and that Brāhmaṇas and non-Brāhmaṇas are of common origin (The Indo Aryan Races, 163, 167, 180, 182, 188, 191, 194.)
Probable Plan of the Land System.
THE LAND-SYSTEM AND AGRICULTURE OF THE VEDIC AGE.

KISHORI MOHAN GUPTA, M.A., Professor, Sylhet College.

In an economic history of Ancient India and in conformity with the Hindu Science of vārtā or Political Economy,¹ the land-system forms the subject of primary consideration. The land forms the foundation of the whole social economy of the Vedic Āryas—evidently an agricultural people. They appear to have utilised the land under their occupation in at least four different ways, namely, the habitat or the villages (grāma, loka, jana), the arable land (urwara, kṣetra), the pasture land (vraja, goṣṭha, suyavasa, khila or khilya), and the forest land including the waste land (arānyā).

The villages of the Āryas as opposed to the scattered homesteads of the Dāsas.

The villages are copiously referred to in the Vedic literature.² During the age of the Rgveda the grāma of the Āryas appears to have stood in contrast to pūr or pura of the Dāsas. The two words pūr and pura occur more than sixty times in ten mañḍalas of the Rgveda. Sāyaṇa explains the words as meaning nāgara or city. But his interpretation is not beyond doubt; and it would be proper here to determine the real nature of the pura on the evidence of the Rgveda.

It appears that India of the age of the Rgveda contained innumerable puras belonging to the Dāsas³ or their chieftains. The most important and powerful of these chieftains was Śambara, son of Kulitrā,⁴ who is credited with the possession of at least one hundred

¹ Arthaśāstra, Book I, Chapter 4: कथितम् नुपाते वाशिचा च बाचाः | See Mr. Law’s "Vārtā," in the Indian Antiquary for September, 1918.
² See Rgvedaṇām Anukramaṇīkā for grāma, loka and jana.
³ Rgveda, VIII, 5, 31; III, 12, 6; I, 103, 3; etc.
⁴ Rgveda, IV, 30, 14: जन दार्श कौलिनिः च चबन: प्रवतादधि ज्ञातारिन्द्र सम्राहः |
puras.\textsuperscript{4} He had an immense following\textsuperscript{4} and probably ruled over a region called Udavraja along with another ruler named Varci.\textsuperscript{7} It was the Arya king Atithigva Divodāsa who defeated him,\textsuperscript{3} evidently in one of his hill-forts or pura\textsuperscript{8} and captured his ninety-nine puras. Another dāsa chieftain named Vaṅgrda possessed one hundred puras.\textsuperscript{10} The Rgveda mentions the names of several other chiefs\textsuperscript{11} who probably possessed such puras.

That the puras were often, if not generally, situated on hills, is clear from the fact that Sambara was thrown down from such a place.\textsuperscript{12} The Panis and their probable leader Vala\textsuperscript{13} appear to have had their strongholds on hills.\textsuperscript{14} The puras are spoken of as having been made of āyas or Iron\textsuperscript{15} and of āsman or stone.\textsuperscript{16} Even if we entertain

\textsuperscript{4} Ibid., VI, 31, 4: लं श्रमर्य शबरसारा पुरसा अवच्छाथाचारित दुष्या। चक्रिता यज्ञ गाठ श्रमर्यारित दुष्या। द्विनार्थम् सुनसे सुसंस्करणाय स्त्रयं सज्जन।

\textsuperscript{5} Ibid., VI, 47, 2: भयो in pura स्वरुपवर्षीिति ताल भवमानका पच्छाय समाहार। पुष्पः वर्णालं सम्मान वि तत्त न च भास्करृतः।

\textsuperscript{6} Rgveda, VI, 47, 21: दिवेदिवो सदहोरसमि धरणा समबधय गमयो जा। शहदाया पृथ्वीव वस्त्रयोरसने सर्वत्र समाहारः।

\textsuperscript{7} Ibid., I, 130, 7; IV, 26, 3; IV, 30, 20; IX, 61, 2.

\textsuperscript{8} Ibid., I, 139, 7: भिन्नवत्रि नार्तितिर्ध्वु पुरसे दिवेदिवाय सन्ति दाढ्ये तनं वृक्षेण दाढ्ये तनं। नरितितिताय शराय विविधादशा।

\textsuperscript{9} Ibid., I, 53, 8: Atharavaveda, XX, 21, 8: लक्ष्मी करवसु पवित्र वर्तराजार्थानिर्दिष्टम्य स्त्रयं नानुः। वुष्णुवाच श्रमर्यानिष्ठाने नानुः।

\textsuperscript{10} For example, RV I, 103, 8 mentions Śuṣaṇa, Pipru, Kuyava and Vṛtra. Śuṣaṇa and Kuyava submitted to the Arya king Kutsa, and Pipru was defeated by Rjīśā (RV II, 19, 6; IV, 16, 12; IV, 16, 13). Cumūrī and Dhumī were defeated by Daḥhitī (RV VI, 18, 8; VI, 26, 6; VII, 19, 4). Śruta, Kavaṣa, Vṛddha, Druhyu were defeated by the Arya king Sudāsa (RV VII, 18, 12; VII, 18, 11), who is also said to have defeated another chieftain named Anu, and 600 and 6,066 followers of Anu and Druhyu (RV VII, 18, 14): न वि यवधिवः दशकमानि पुस्तः श्रमर्यानि नानुः। पुरसायानि विनिसमितिः कालमानि।

\textsuperscript{11} RV I, 130, 7 (quoted already). Cf. VII, 18, 20.

\textsuperscript{12} Ibid., VI, 30, 2: पच्छिमानि पर्यथिनिः अत्यधितिनिनिक्षमयुज्जानाः। द्विनार्थम् वि सक्षम शामन पवित्रसमितिरिव योगद्विः। Cf. VI, 18, 5. That the Panis were dasyus or dāsa is further clear from VII, 6, 3. As to the Puras belonging to the dāsa, cf. III, 12, 6; IV, 32, 10: X, 99, 7.

\textsuperscript{13} RV X, 103, 7: स्वयमर्य नार्तितिति श्विन्धर्य शिविन्धर्यविनिलिप्तम्। रचनीति ते पश्चाया वेद प्रमोदवेदाय जातमाः।

\textsuperscript{14} Cf. also X, 67, 5.

\textsuperscript{15} Ibid., VII, 15, 14: चाद्यां मधी न च अच्छा ना चूढा चापोष्यं पूर्वमा नमस्तः। Cf. also VII, 3, 7; VII, 95, 1; VIII, 100, 8; etc.

\textsuperscript{16} Ibid., IV, 30, 20: आयमानायानि पुरसायाः। Cf. X, 68, 4.
doubts as to the utilisation of these two materials at that remote age, it follows at least that the puras were made of very strong materials. They are referred to have gates or doors (dura); and in them were hoarded the wealth of the Dāsas or Dasyus, consisting chiefly of cattle. The *Rgveda* does not tell us whether they were large enough to contain homesteads within. They are evidently forts or defensive strongholds often situated on hills and served as the residence of the dāsa chieftains and as repository of the wealth of the dāsa people.

It is indeed an interesting feature of the *Rgveda* that the puras are mentioned only in connection with the Dāsas, and grāma, jana, loka in connection with the Aryas. In about three places however Agni, the Fire-god, is invoked to protect the worshipper within a pura. This may only go to show how much the puras were valued by the Aryas as defensive strongholds. Evidently the composers of the Vedic hymns made a distinction between the dāsa pura and the Arya village; and it naturally follows that the Dāsas had no compact organisation of habitat like the Arya “nucleated” village system, and had only scattered homesteads with defensive strongholds here and there mostly in possession of their chiefs. The difference in the organisation of settlements accounts to some extent for the success of the Aryas over the dāsa people in spite of the numerical strength of the latter. Though the puras taken by themselves were probably better adapted than the villages for defensive purposes, their capture unlike that of a village meant the conquest of a vast tract of land of which they formed the strongholds.

The “nucleated” village system of the Aryas was conducive to the growth of corporate life and division of labour, or in other words, to the growth of the village community among them. At the same time

---

17 *Rgveda*, VI, 18, 5: नमः प्रवः मण्डः मण्डः पुरः द्व्या वर्णः श्रवः निर्मितः।


19 Zimmer, in translating hymn 1, 103, 3 uses the word “Burgen” for pura (Altindisches Leben). According to Pischel the puras were towns with wooden walls and ditches, and according to Macdonell and Keith they mean ramparts, forts or strongholds. (See *Vedic Index*; pūr.)

20 Compare *Rgveda*, III, 12, 6; IV, 32, 10; X, 99, 7.


22 *RV*. VII, 15, 14; VII, 3, 7; VII, 16, 10.
time the *pura*-system of the Dāsas were being gradually incorporated with those villages which were growing in importance on account of their population, trade, commerce and administrative value. This probably accounts for the rise of so many cities and the growth of urban life in the Buddhist age. We may in this connection take into consideration the hill fortress of Girivrajā,²³ which appears to represent such an incorporation. Another stage in this process of absorption of the *pura*-system into the village system is probably indicated in Kautilya’s *Arthasastra*, Book II, Chapter I, where we are told that a *sthāniya* fortress should be built in the centre of 800 villages, a *dronāmukha* in the centre of 400 villages, a *khāravatika* in the centre of 200 villages and a *saṅgahaṇa* in the midst of a collection of ten villages.²⁴

The Vedic Aryas, however, like the Teutonic settlers of Britain, lived in villages, and the whole aspect of the economic and social life of the Vedic age was purely rural. This is further manifest from the picture depicted in the *Gṛhya-sūtras* which, though of later date, preserve nevertheless the Vedic tradition. They are most valuable for giving us an idea of the method they followed in selecting sites for dwelling purposes and for giving us a description of house-construction at that remote age. The Āśvalāyana *Gṛhya-sūtra* lays down that the ground selected for constructing a house must be non-salinous and should have herbs and trees.²⁵ Gobhila tells us that the soil should be “compact, one-coloured, not dry, not salinous, not surrounded by sandy desert, not swampy.”²⁶ Āśvalāyana further goes on: “The householder should dig a pit knee-deep and fill it again with the same earth: if the earth reaches out of the pit, the ground is excellent: if it is level, it is of middle quality: if it does not fill the pit, it is to be rejected; again, after sunset he should fill the pit with water and leave it so through the night: if in the morning there is water in it, the ground is excellent: if moist, it is of middle quality: if dry, it is to be rejected.”²⁷

²³ See Rhys David’s *Buddhist India*, page 37.
²⁴ *Ādhyatmikā* मध्ये साधीय चुनुमता स्थानांतर जित्यान्यात ज्ञातीत्वं दश्यामीभज्जे मध्यर्थत उपायते।
²⁵ H, 7, 2, 3: जस्मुनेवविविषाणुमुष। जीविषाणसमातिवरुणु। (Jivānanda’s edition). The translation followed is that of the *Sacred Books of the East*.
²⁶ IV, 7, 8 (SBE.).
²⁷ H, 8, 2, 3, 4, 5: जस्मानांतरं बाला तरंग पारं पृथ्विं प्रविष्वर्तत। चिथि के प्रशस्न समे वासं मने भवितम्। आचायते पारंपुरं परिवर्त्येन्। मात्रेक प्रशस्तमिर्वान सारं गच्छसि गच्छितम् चेत
The villages were not probably much isolated from one another, and they were connected by a net-work of roads and cross-roads, which were no doubt occasionally used as chariot-roads.39 That these roads encouraged inland trade is apparent from a hymn of the Atharva-veda.39 Indra is invoked to confer blessings and success on the devotee-trader who has traversed a long distance: “I stir up the trader Indra . . . . . The many roads travelled by the gods that go about between heaven and earth . . . . let them enjoy me with milk, with ghee, that dealing I may get riches . . . . This offence of ours mayest thou, Agni, bear with what distant road we have gone. Successful for us be bargain and sale: let return dealing make me fruitful . . . .” 39

The Arable land (kṣetra, urvara).

The compactness of habitat necessarily involved the existence of the arable land outside the villages. Unlike the Teutonic system there appears to be no communic ownership of the kṣetra and no annually variable assignment of land to individuals for tillage. Who then cultivated the soil, and who possessed absolute property in soil?

39 The Gṛhya Śūtras tell us of the crossing of four roads: Gobhila, IV, 6, 14; Hirayakaśīna, 1, 5, 16, 8; Khādira, IV, 3, 10. The Sādhbhagya speaks of chariot-roads in IV, 7, 30.

39 Atharva-veda, III, 15:

39 Whitney’s translation.
From *Rgveda*, hymn I, 100, 18, it appears that the Aryas after conquering the lands of the Dasyus used to divide them amongst themselves. Measurement for the purpose of division of soil is referred to in another hymn. There are other Vedic texts too which go to show that the fields were cultivated if not owned by individuals or probably individual families. But nothing definite can be ascertained from the *Rgveda* as to the exact nature of the rights of the individuals, such for instance as rights of alienation, gift, etc. In hymn VII, 6, 5, King Nāhuṣa is said to have forced his people to pay taxes in X, 173, 1, the king is installed into the throne of the kingdom and in X, 173, 6, Indra is invoked to make the viśāl or the commonalty pay tribute to him. The payment of bali or tax by the people might not imply absolute property of the king in the soil at that remote age, but might mean only a kind of personal tax paid out of field-produce—the idea of tribal

---

51 द्वायुण्डमयृष्टिपुष्करनहेरवेदविषयमांशमां निवर्जितः।
समन्यमण्डिनिंशिक्तंभवास्मियः समन्यमण्डिनिः सुखाः।

Rgveda, I, 110, 5: चेतवन्ति वि मनुष्यलोकं न कस्मु पश्चादश्च वेदविशाम्।
उपशानं तथा माधवामां अन्यंतयं तथा रख्माणाः।

52 Rgveda, X, 33, 6: यथा प्रसादस्व धर उपशानस्वं भृगु: चेतस्मु न देवसुद्धुः।
Cf. also Rgveda, VIII, 91, 3, 6:
रमाश्च वीषिणिनिधिः मानिन्द्रिः वि रोपितेऽ
मिरा विभिन्नार्तावर्मातिदयः विपोरे।
वशेषि च वा न वेजरार्द्धिः सन्ता मम।
क्षोषयमा वियुक्तेऽणो तत्रो रोचना काले।

See also Vedic Index (Maodell and Keith): vṛtā and kṣetri.

53 यो द्वायुण्डान्याश्च चेताधिकारायामां
स्मिन्धृतं न जयो यस्मो अतिविधयते बलिदान: सविभिः॥

Sāyaṇa explains बलि: in this passage and in X, 173, 6 as कर्षण अद्वी। The *Arthaśāstra* of Kauṭilya explains Bali as a kind of religious tax in Bk. II, Ch. 6. Cf. the word वालिके in the Rumindei Pillar Inscription of Āsoka.

55 यथा साहसविनादिपरीत्वते विवणातरे विवणात:।
विग्रहायस्य वार्ता वाज्यमा व जनाधिपतिभवतिः।
Sāyaṇa comments: वे राजा न नामाधिपेमहासम्राजिकाः सामाजिकाः। म समाराजस्य मध्य प्रथमच। कामो च म्

56 प्रवृत्तवेद चविद्विद्यमानो मध्यान्वितः।
क्षोषये न दृष्ये कृत्वान्वित्विन्तु विनिःशस्तकम्॥

57 Cf. a custom that was in vogue about 500 or 600 B.C. The *Kurudhamma Jataka* (No. 276, Fausbôlli) tells us that a man after carelessly taking a handful of rice from a paddy field remarks remorsefully: दम्भ का केदार्र मया रक्षा माहो दानामो। विदिद्वाहार्तो वेद च ने केदारस्तो अकिंशोमुखं माहार्थानि।
leadership might not have been strongly associated with the idea of territorial sovereignty. But in the age of the Brāhmaṇas the Rājanya or the Kṣatriya kings were undoubtedly overlords with reference to land as well. The Satapatha VII, I, 1, 8, refers to a Kṣatriya prince granting a settlement to a man. In the Aitareya too the Kṣatriya king is enjoined to grant cultivable fields to the Brāhmaṇa who conducts the coronation ceremony, and a reference is made to the Vaiśyas paying taxes. In the Śāṅkha-yana Gṛhya-sūtra a reference is made to grant of villages by a prince to the priest who conducts the marriage ceremony. From the above it would thus appear that from the age of the Brāhmaṇa at least, if not from an earlier date, absolute property in soil rested with the king or the tribal chief in places where the monarchial form of government prevailed. It is however probable that at the time when all had to fight equally against the Dasyu enemies,—when there was no such division of the people as the Rājanya (or fighting princely class) and the viśāḥ or the commonalty, the conquered lands were divided amongst, and owned absolutely by, the individual conquerors. It is therefore also probable that in regions where republican institutions prevailed such as the land of the Uttara-Kurus and Uttara-Madras whose political institutions were called vairaiya or “kingless states,” absolute property in soil rested with the individual. Both these customs as to property in land are recorded in the Manusamhitā,—thus showing their prevalence in subsequent times. Thus we are told that the king was the “Lord paramount of the soil,” and that “land is the property of him who cut away the wood.”

SBE.

Aitareya-Brāhmaṇa (translated into Bengali by R. Trivedi), Ch. 39, Sec. 6.

Ibid., Chap. 35, Sec. 5.

1, 14, 14 (SBE.).

Aitareya, Ch. 38, Sec. 3. Cf. Pāgini’s notice of tribal republics in आधुनिक सभ्यता के सामाजिक-राजनीतिक तत्त्व (V, 3, 14); नागिनीय राजनीति (V, 3, 117); दास्यता (V, 3, 116) etc.; etc. Cf. also Arthāśāstra, Bk. XI, Ch. 1 (कमीज़-सुप्राचार्य, बालस्मायक, नित्यांकित-शिक्षक-संग्रह-संक-कुरु-कुरुक्षेत्र डोट्सवा राजदेशीत्यक). See Mr. Jayaswal’s “An Introduction to Hindu Polity” in the Modern Review for May–September, 1913: also Mr. Mukand Lal’s contribution in the Modern Review for January, 1926.

Manu, VIII, 39: विषोग्नाति पूर्वाः कामवामेव य नित्यं।

Virāṭā रक्षावासा मुखर्थिपतिः म: ||

Ibid, IX, 44: विषीयोम्यो शरीरां भाग्यं बृहविर्तिः विदु:।

वानुष्कुप्रयं केदारसाय: ||
Tillage and crops of the kṣetras.

The fields were furrowed with a plough pulled as now by an ox or a pair of oxen. Later on elaborate ceremonies grew up around the various stages of agricultural operations. The Sānkhyāyana Gṛhya-sūtra, for instance, enjoins that when the plough is being first put into motion a Brāhmaṇa should touch the plough reciting RV. IV, 57, 8. Seeds were then sown and when crops ripened harvesting was done with a sickle (ṣrī). That the seasonal rainfall primarily served the purpose of irrigation is evident from the copiousness of hymns offered to Parjanya (rain-god). Though there are a few references to wells or reservoirs for irrigation or other purposes and to manure, intensive cultivation does not appear to be much advanced and was undoubtedly incipient. The Vedic age, as will be shown later, represents that stage of cultivation in which the extensive and the intensive methods were combined.

 Contrast the subsequent developments as described in Arthāṣāstra, II, 24.

 Otherwise sterility of kṣetra would not have been referred to in Rgveda, VIII 3, 6 (quoted at footnote 33, p. 530). — See also Sāyaṇa's commentary.
As to crops raised, in the Rgveda we come across only two names, namely, yava and dhānā. In the Atharvāra we find another name in addition, namely, māśa; and the maximum number of crops raised is given in the Vājasaneyi Samhitā: “Rice, barley, beans, sesameum, kidney-beans, vetches, millet, Panicum Miliaceum, Panicum Frumentum, wild rice, wheat and lentils.” The Taittirīya Samhitā further tells us that there were two harvests every year, and describes the time best suited for sowing and harvesting. Thus we are told: “Barley ripens in summer (being no doubt sown in the winter); medicinal herbs in the rainy season; rice in autumn (being sown in the summer or early rains); and beans and sesameum in the hemanta and śāśira (winter), being sown in summer or in the rainy season.” From the above it is clear that the advantages of a rotation of crops were fully realised. Thus a season of barley (yava) would be succeeded by one of vṛihi (rice), bean (mudga or māśa) and sesameum (tila). Besides these other varieties of crops mentioned in the Vājasaneyi Samhitā were also sown on the principle of rotation. All these facts are quite in conformity with what is noticeable during the age of Kauṭilya. Thus the Arthasastra tells us that panic seeds, Paspalum Scrobiculatum, Phraselous Trilobus are to be sown before or at the commencement of the rainy season (śāli-vṛihi-kodrava-tila-priaṅgu-dārakāvarakāḥ pūrvavāpāḥ); Phraselous Mungo, Phraselous Radiatus and śāibya in the middle of the season (mudga-māśa-śāibya madhyavāpāḥ); safflower, masūra, kuluttha (Dolichos Uniflorus), yava (barley), godhūma (wheat), kalāya (leguminus), atasi (linseed) and mustard are to be sown last, i.e. in any suitable time after the rainy

41 I, 23, 15; II, 5, 6; V, 85, 3; etc. See Rgvedapadānām Anukramanikā.  
42 I, 16, 2; III, 35, 3; etc. See Rgvedapadānām Anukramanikā.  
43 VI, 140, 2; XII, 2, 53. See Atharvavedapadānām Anukramanikā.  
44 वृष्टियः ने काव्येः मे काव्येः मे नित्यों मे गुरुम मे श्रीम मे प्रवेशव येव ये मे शामाकाच मे नीवाराय मे गोपवाराय मे यज्ञ जन्य अलकाम्। Vājasaneyi-Samhitā (Jivānanda’s edition), XVIII, 12. Griffith’s translation has been followed.  
45 द्विघातमा ग्राभ्यम् ग्रहन्. Taittirīya-Samhitā (Mysore Government publication), V, 1, 7, 3.  
46 श्रव्योपदीपिक्षप्रबोधी नीलिंघरे मधूसिद्ध भूममन्दिराय आभार्यो वा दन्द.... Taittirīya, VII, 2, 10, 2.  
See also Vedic Index, I, 182.  
47 Cf. Gobhila, I, 4, 29 and Khādira, I, 5, 37: “From the rice (harvest) till the barley (harvest); or from the barley (harvest) till the rice (harvest) he should offer the bālīs or sacrificial rites.”  
48 Bk. II, Ch. 24.
season (kusumbha-maśūra-kuluttha-yava-godhūma-kalāya-atasī-sarṣapāh pabhādvāpāh).\textsuperscript{46}

**Seasons of the Vedic age.**

As the Vedic seasons do not exactly coincide with ours, a short note on them here would not be out of place. In a hymn of the Rgveda three seasons are mentioned, namely, spring, (vasanta) summer (grīśma) and autumn (śarad).\textsuperscript{48} Elsewhere the rainy season (prāvrṣ) and the winter (hemanta, hima) are mentioned.\textsuperscript{41} The Brāhmaṇas too knew of these five seasons, and in addition another season, śiśira.\textsuperscript{42} The Śaṅkhāyana Gṛhya-sūtra, however, mentions only five seasons.\textsuperscript{45} It is probable that during the age of the Rgveda the year of twelve months \textsuperscript{44} was generally taken to be divided into five seasons only,\textsuperscript{45} though a sixth season is recognised in at least one of the Brāhmaṇas, -hemanta and śiśira being probably identified as one season. According to the Arthaśāstra the six seasons were thus distributed:

\[ \text{varsā (rainy season) comprising Śrāvana and Proṣṭhapāda} \]
\[ (\text{mid-July to mid-September}) \]
\[ \text{śarat (autumn)} \]
\[ (\text{mid-September to mid-November}) \]
\[ \text{hemanta} \]
\[ (\text{winter}) \]
\[ \text{śiśira} \]
\[ (\text{mid-November to mid-January}) \]
\[ \text{vasanta (spring)} \]
\[ (\text{mid-January to mid-March}) \]
\[ \text{grīśma (summer)} \]
\[ (\text{mid-March to mid-May}) \]
\[ \text{Caitra and Vaiśākha} \]
\[ (\text{mid-May to mid-July}) .\]

\textsuperscript{46} Mr. Shamasaastry's translation has been followed.
\textsuperscript{48} Rgveda, X., 90, 6: यदृः द्वशप्त प्रविष्ट द्रवा द्वाशान्तम्।
\textsuperscript{41} Cf. also VII, 103, 9. X., '61, 4: गतं जीव श्रव्दे वधमानं गतं रेश्माष्टतम् गमनान्।
\textsuperscript{42} Cf. also VII, 2, 10, 2 (quoted at foot-note 56, page 533).
\textsuperscript{45} Sāṅkhāyana (SBE.), IV. 18, 1.
\textsuperscript{44} See Tilak's *Arctic Home in the Vedas*, page 183; Zimmer, *Altindisches Leben*, 373-4; and also Vedic Index, I, pp. 110-11.
\textsuperscript{45} Bk. II, Ch. 10 (Shamasaastry's translation).
The Pasture land (vraja, gośtha, suyavasa, and khila or khilya).

The next use of land was of course as pasturage of the cattle of the community. The generic terms implying pasture is vraja, gośtha, suyavasa. It included firstly the aranyakas or forest lands and waste lands, and secondly a class of land known as khila or khilya.

There are disputes with regard to the meaning of khila or khilya. The word occurs twice in the Rgveda—in VI, 28, 2, and X, 142, 3. The interpretation of Śāyana is quoted with the original in the foot-note. The AV, IV, 21, 2, quotes RV, VI, 28, 2; and here, the scholiast gives a slightly varying rendering for khilya. In explaining Atharva, VII, 120, 4, he explains the word as vraja. According to Roth these terms denote the waste land lying between cultivated fields; but he admits that this sense does not suit the passage of the Rgveda (VI, 28, 2) in which it is said that the god places the worshipper on an unbroken khilya (akhinne khilye), and he accordingly conjectures the reading akhilye bhinne, "land unbroken by barren strip." Pischel thinks that the meaning intended is broad lands, which were used for the pasturing of the cattle of the community, and were not broken up by cultivated fields. Oldenburg, however, points out that the sense is rather the land which

47 RV, I, 10, 7 and 92, 4; IX, 94, 1; etc. See Rgvedapadānāṁ Anukramanīkā.
48 Or गौस्था. RV, VIII, 43, 17; X, 160, 4 and 191, 4; etc. See Rgvedapadānāṁ Anukramanīkā.
49 RV, VI, 28, 7; VII, 18, 4; VII, 99, 3; etc. See Rgvedapadānāṁ Anukramanīkā.
50 RV, X, 146, 3: तस्मा गवः दृव दन्तत्व वेगमय इति. |
51 उस चर्चासम न यथ शक्तोसरिव भावति. |
52 Cf. also Rgveda, IV, 1, 15.
53 दस्तो शरीने प्रश्ने च भिष्मपुंवददानि न थ मुषायति. |
54 भुवो भुवो रथविभद्यं धवीधोधारिष्ठि विचारय न दधाति दृवयू. |
55 Śāyana—यप्तितव मुषाय तेन विचारो. | अंविन्द्यमज्ञकैवकाः न दधाति नाति. |
56 तस्मा उपयुगैतिष्ठि वाह्यवर्षेऽष्टप्रम स्थाव. |
57 उप श्रीश्च वेगाधराम भवति स मेतेच तवस्रि चुतकाम. |
58 Śāyana—वश्यतः भृमव उधरः. | सामायम ममविन वदेना: विचारो: प्राणिभिसेः |
59 योग्यम भवति. |
60 Śāyana explains विचारो as जयपतिन स्वामि: |
61 नो धना ऊष्णा विचारो मा विचित्राः दृव | रमन्त शुभा बलात्मकः परप्रेता कामोन्द्रम. |
62 Śāyana—नष्ठा विचारो त्वे विचित्राः विशेषेऽस्मृतिं समुक्षिता. |
lay between cultivated fields, but which need not be deemed to have been unfertile, as Roth thought. This agrees with the fact that in Vedic times separate fields were already known."

It appears that all the scholars from Sāyana down to Oldenburg have been confounded as to the real meaning of the word. It is evident, however, from their interpretations that khilya implies (a) a piece of waste land lying between cultivated fields, (b) which was used for the pasturing of the cattle of the community, and (c) which need not be deemed unfertile. The expression abhinne khilya proved a stumbling-block in their comprehension of the real meaning. Had the word been studied with special reference to the agricultural methods of the age, the sense would have been clear. The expression under question means nothing but an unfurrowed (न+भिस्त्र+ख) plot of land, or land which has not been taken up for cultivation, used figuratively in the sense of distant or unapproachable place or a plot of virgin soil which will bring an enormous yield. The existence of khilas shows that in the Vedic age the Field-grass or Pasture or Two-field System, as well as the Three-field system was still in vogue.

*The Two-field and the Three-field Systems of the Vedic age.*

Under the Two-field System there would be two plots of land, one remaining under cultivation in any particular year or season, and the other lying fallow (khila) after the last harvest. In alternate years or so the fallow lands serving temporarily as pasture land would be brought under cultivation. At a time when intensive cultivation was still in incipience, this method would enable land to recover fertility easily. Sterility of kṣetras or cultivable fields owing to repeated cultivation is probably referred to in the *Rgveda.*

In very early times when the number of crops did not exceed one or two, the system was simple: one plot of land would in the particular season remain under cultivation, say of *yava* (barley) only, while the other would remain fallow, say after the rice harvest. But when the number of crops raised increased and the *kṣetrapati* (owner of fields) sowed and reaped more than two varieties in rotation, the system followed must have been a Three-field System, three or four

76 See *Vedic Index* : under khila.
77 VIII, 91, 5, 6 (quoted at foot-note 33, page 530 ; see also Sāyana’s comments).
78 Vājasaneyi, XVIII, 12, seems to corroborate this.
varieties being raised in two of the fields every year and the third lying fallow once in every three years. The "ideal system" that would work may be thus indicated:

Let A, B, C be the three fields: then in the—

1st year, A would produce B similarly 
tila or C lying fallow.
in rotation, say, 
māṣa and godhū-
yava and vṛhi, 
ma or maṣura, 71

2nd .. A would be culti-
vated intensively for one or 
two crops,
B lying fallow, C producing two crops.

3rd .. A would lie fallow, B would produce like A of the 2nd 
C would produce like A of the 1st 
year, or 2nd year. 79

The origin of the word suyavasa also points to the existence of the Field-grass system. The word is certainly cognate with yava (स + ववस्), one of the crops raised in very early times. After the last harvest the kṣetras were abandoned for pasturage, whence the word is later used in the general sense of pasture or grass. The words khila and khilya are not very frequently mentioned owing to the fact that a piece of land did not lie fallow for a long time and that the generic terms vraja, gosṭha or gosṭha, and suyavasa are used instead.

The Two-field and Three-field systems seem also to have survived much later. Thus, the Yuktikalpataru advises us to resort to this method when the fields lose their natural fertility owing to repeated cultivation. 80

The Field-grass or the khila System would prevent two main defects. First, it would prevent compactness of the cultivable fields, rendering ploughing troublesome; and secondly, the growing crops of the fields, if not protected by fencing, would be liable to damage by the cattle grazing in the khilyas. Besides, the system rendered fencing,

71 Compare Vaiśasanyi, XVIII, 12; Tatātiriya, VII, 2, 10, 2; and Arthasastra, Bk. II, Ch. 24.
79 If B produces one crop, C produces two, and vice versa.
80 Yuktikalpataru (edited by Iśwarachandra Śāstri), p. 6: नया वष्णु वष्णु 
कार्यादिनकाळम्। रक्षां गुष्ठीभिः रक्षितशत्कार्यभूतम्। ॥ ॥ ( "दृतमः वक्रमेरादक्षिणाः" 
अध्यामि ).
if there was any at all at that remote age, not only highly scattered but also expensive. To remedy these defects the pasture-land, with the exception of the aranyakas or forests, seems to have been differently organised later on during the age of Kauṭilya, if not during the Vedic age as well. The Arthaśāstra tells us that at a distance of one hundred dhanus an enclosure of timber-post shall be constructed for pasturage.

The Forest lands (aranyakas).

The aranyakas including waste-lands were of great economic value to the Aryas. Hymn X, 146, Rgveda, clearly emphasises the manifold uses of the forest lands. First, they served as natural pastures. Secondly, they were utilised as burial places, and probably in some cases as cremation grounds too. Thirdly, the produce of the aranyakas supplied beyond doubt an essential part of the economic needs of the community. They provided the householder with materials for construction of houses, chariots, sacrificial implements and the like. Above all, they were a constant source of fuel for the community. Every householder of the Vedic age appears to have exercised the Right of Common or Estover over the woods and forests, like the tenement-holder of pre-Norman England. With the rise of a

---

81. Instances of fencing fields are at least observable as early as 6th century B.C. Thus says Śilī-kedāra Jātaka (Faursbøll, No. 484): ‘नव औष्णिसिनिनो नाम मानिन्दित्वाती दार्षयूर यथासम-करोववसार्य भूबि गद्धि लाभित स्थितम वपायिम।’ उलित श्राथ्य वतिस धिरम कारिला कशस्वति पणातकारी परिवारम्।।

82. Arthaśāstra, III, 10: ‘नव औष्णिसिनिनो नाम मानिन्दित्वाती दार्षयूर यथासम-करोववसार्य भूबि गद्धि लाभित स्थितम वपायिम।’

Cf. Yajñavalkya, II, 167: ‘धनुश्यं मरिकार्यो रामर्येवार्यो महत्।’

83. Arthaśāstra, III, 10: ‘नव औष्णिसिनिनो नाम मानिन्दित्वाती दार्षयूर यथासम-करोववसार्य भूबि गद्धि लाभित स्थितम वपायिम।’

Cf. also Manu, VIII, 237: ‘धनुश्यं मरिकार्यो पाणियो स्त्रयो महत्।’

श्यामावताल्लो वायि विक्रुण नसग्रह तु।

84. RV. X, 146, 3 (quoted at foot-note 70, page 11).

85. RV. X, 18, 4, 10, 12: ‘दस बाजीयः परिभृति द्वारि मेंण्या नु गद्धपौरो अक्षमिन्त।’

86. RV. X, 18, 4, 10, 12: ‘दस बाजीयः परिभृति द्वारि मेंण्या नु गद्धपौरो अक्षमिन्त।’

87. RV. X, 18, 4, 10, 12: ‘दस बाजीयः परिभृति द्वारि मेंण्या नु गद्धपौरो अक्षमिन्त।’

88. RV. X, 18, 4, 10, 12: ‘दस बाजीयः परिभृति द्वारि मेंण्या नु गद्धपौरो अक्षमिन्त।’

89. RV. X, 18, 4, 10, 12: ‘दस बाजीयः परिभृति द्वारि मेंण्या नु गद्धपौरो अक्षमिन्त।’

For example, in places where there was no river.

Cf. Rgveda, X, 146, 4: ‘सापश्येच्छातिक्तित्व द्वारिश्च आपायवती।’

वस्त्र्यनवार्य: मासमण्डिति समायी।
highly centralised autocracy under the administration of Chandragupta Maurya however such state of things came to an end, and the forests became state-monopolies.  

* Arthaśāstra, Bk. II, Ch. 2 and 17.
GANGAIKONDA CHOLA.

S. KRISHNASWAMI AIYANGAR, M.A. (MADRAS), PH.D. (CAL.), M.R.A.S.,
F.R. HIST. S., Professor of Ancient Indian History and Archaeology,
University of Madras.

The Imperial Cholas.

The year A.D. 1000 opened for south of India with the Cholas in the flood-tide of their imperial career. Rising from the wreckage of an older dynasty of the Cholas a little more than a century before this year, the new dynasty had forced its way to dominance in south India by acquiring the Chola country proper, and proceeding onwards to a conquest of the Tondamanadalam territory dominated by Kâñchî. During the century following they made an effort at the conquest of the Pândya country and undertook successful invasions even of Ceylon. Immediately after, came a period of great struggle with the Râstrakûtas, the hereditary enemy of the Pallavas, whose successors the Cholas had become by conquest of their territory. With the advance of the Râstrakûtas came a period of storm and stress for the Cholas till the Râstrakûtas themselves were overthrown in the seventies of the tenth century by the rising power of the Châlukyas. The removal of the overshadowing power of the Râstrakûtas in the north opened the way for the Cholas who then were passing under the leadership of one of their greatest sovereigns Râja Râja I., a contemporary of the English William, the Conqueror's predecessor. He possessed the rare combination of qualities which distinguished all builders of empires. As a great conqueror he exhibited in a remarkably high degree the genius for organisation, both civil and military, that marked him out for an imperial position. He succeeded an uncle of his on the Chola throne about the year A.D. 985, and had been already ruler of the Chola kingdom for 15 years by A.D. 1000. Almost the first achievement of his was a stroke of diplomacy which brought into permanent alliance the Eastern Châlukyas, probably after a demonstration of power. A marriage cemented the alliance, Râja Râja giving his daughter by name Kundavvai to the Eastern Châlukya Vimalâditya.
The importance of the Chālukya alliance.

During the period of Rāṣṭrakūṭa power the Eastern Chālukyas and the Rāṣṭrakūṭas were constantly at war along the common frontier. Successive rulers of each dynasty give themselves credit for some achievement against their dynastic enemy. The overthrow of the Rāṣṭrakūṭas and the consequent rise to power of the Chālukyas would certainly have thrown the Eastern Chālukyas into alliance with their cousins of the west. Such a combination of the two branches of the Chālukya family would have been detrimental to the imperial interests of the Cholas and might even have endangered their position in the Tamil country. The permanent acquisition of power over the Eastern Chālukyas was a matter of vital importance to the Chola in the coming struggle against the Chālukyas of the west which Rāja Rāja apparently anticipated. The importance of this alliance in shaping the course of the imperial history of the Cholas will become clear as the history of the conquests of Gaṅgaikonda Chola unfolds itself.

Rāja Rāja's empire.

Rāja Rāja I had a long reign of more than 30 years. We have records of his 29th year in which he gives himself credit for a naval victory against the Cheras at Kāndalūr.¹ The next item is

¹ Modern Trivandrum, as identified by the late Mr. Gopinatha Rao, who made an attempt to explain Kāndalūr sālai to mean feeding houses at Kāndalūr, a part of modern Trivandrum; and the "taking of Kāndalūr sālai" is interpreted by him as putting an end to the free feeding houses. This interpretation is hardly acceptable. The whole expression is Kāndalūr sālai kalam iruttaruli, "having broken or destroyed the kalam at Kāndalūr sālai." Mr. Rao was at great pains to show that sālai means a feeding hall. There is hardly any doubt about it; sālai means a feeding hall as well as various other kinds of hall. The actual word which contains the ambiguity, if any, is the word kalam. This word he interprets as meaning plates, and assumes that in the feeding houses food was served to Brahmans on plates, a feature exceedingly unlikely in itself. Kalam in the sense of ships is a very ordinary and well-worn term in Tamil. The Tamil classics often refer to kalam kalanem meaning carriages and ships by means of which articles are brought for trade. There is besides the feature that no Indian monarch is likely to take credit for himself having put a stop to feeding houses. Mr. Rao gets round this difficulty by saying that he put an end to the feeding only to reinstate it in his own name. Nobody that knows Tamil will accept this interpretation of the term, iruttu. There is besides the feature that in referring to Kāndalūr the inscriptions of Rāja Rāja as well as those of Rājadhiraja give the attribute Vīlai kēlu meaning "of high waves." This feature would be out of place in connection with putting a stop to feeding-houses. The late Dr. Vincent Smith has accepted Mr. Gopinatha Rao's interpretation, which has no legs to stand upon.
his conquest of Vengainādu, i.e., the coast country of the Eastern Chālukyas; then follows Gaṅgappādi (sometimes also written Taḍigaivāli); this refers to the country including eastern Bangalore and the continuous tract to the east and north of it, as Nelamangalam and Bāṇāvara are stated to be in this division; then Nolambappādi, the Tumkur and Chittaldurg districts in Mysore, perhaps also a certain amount of adjoining territory; Kuḍamalainādu the western hill country of Coorg; then follows Kollam (Quilon) capital of north Travancore; then comes Kaliṅgam (the country of Orissa) followed by Īlamanḍālam (Ceylon); and then follow Raṭṭappādi 7½ lakhs and "the 12,000 old islands of the sea." Raṭṭappādi 7½ lakhs was the country till a few decades before under the rule of the Raṣṭra-kūṭas, and now in those of the Chālukyas; and the islands referred to are apparently the islands along the coast in the Arabian sea. These are the only conquests that the inscriptions of Rāja Rāja claim for him. In this recital there are one or two points that require to be explained. Taken as a whole, this would include all the Tamil country and Ceylon, the whole of the present day Mysore and Coorg, all of the Madras Presidency north of Madras to the frontiers of Bengal, including Orissa, the islands of the western sea and Bombay Presidency south of the Vindhyas, and the western half of the Nizam’s dominions. Of these Raṭṭappādi comprising within it the Bombay presidency south of the Vindhyas and the western half of the Nizam’s dominions could not have been acquired by Rāja Rāja although a victory against the ruler seems possible; and all the rest of them are places which were either directly under his rule or under rulers who acknowledged allegiance to him. Taḍigaivāli, it has been pointed out, had included in it perhaps the larger half of the Bangalore district with a portion of Kolar adjoining this. Taḍigaippādi seems to have been, in his time, composed of two divisions one of which extended into the Bellary district to take in the modern ruins of Hāmpī, the famous Vijayanagar of later history. So the territory actually under Rāja Rāja had for its boundary the Tungabhadrā in the north till it joins the Krishna and included the territory along an irregular frontier proceeding northwards from somewhere near Kurnool to the frontiers of the Orissa. This must be noted carefully to understand the wars and conquests of his son.

8 Ep. Ind., XIII, pp. 186-7; Ind. Ant., 1901, pp. 110 and 266.
Rājendra's Conquests in the Dekhan.

When his son Rājendra, the Gaṅgaikonda Chola succeeded to the throne he had to begin his career of conquest from this northern frontier. He was, during the last five or six years of his father's reign, associated with him as the heir-apparent, and actually did the work of conquest for the father. He seems to have played an important part, and got his training in these wars. Among the records of his reign we do not see that he gives himself credit for any new conquest or achievement of his till we come to his sixth year. As a matter of fact one record of his third year is actually in continuation of that of his father and raises the presumption that perhaps up to his sixth year he did what he had done as his father's deputy. Records of his sixth year add to the conquests, Iḍaitturainādu (lit. country between rivers). This was hitherto understood to mean the Yedatore 2,000 in Mysore. That could hardly be a new conquest and the late Dr. Fleet's identification of this district with the Raichur Doab* satisfies the conditions quite well. Having mastered possession of this debatable frontier of all south Indian history he proceeded northwards into the southernmost districts of the Rāstrakūṭa country. This territory was known as the Vanavāśi (Kan. Banaṇvase), the territory associated with the rule of the Kaḍambas with two capitals Goa and Hangal. The next item in his list of conquests is Kolliippakkai. This has recently been identified with Kulpak in the Nizam's dominions described in Kannada inscriptions as the "bolt of the south".* This is a place of strategic importance a little to the north-east of Hyderabad and a greater distance south-west of the later capital of Warangal. Next comes Maṇṇaikkaṭaham. This was identified by Mr. Rice with Maṇṇe in the Nelamangala Taluk of Mysore, one of the Ganga capitals. Taḍigaippāṇḍi included within it Nelamangala and Bāṇāvara, the railway station from which one proceeds to Nelamangala. This could hardly be a new conquest. Kaṭaham is the Tamil for kaṭaka of Sanskrit, and kaṭaham is a term generally used for a fortified city, generally a royal capital. Ibn Batuta uses the word kaṭaka with other descriptive epithets for Dēvagiri, itself. This

* Elliott, History of India as told by her own Historians, III, p. 598.
Mannaikkadaham therefore is the Tamil representation of Manyakheta, the Mankir of the Muhammadan historians. The first part, manya, would be written manne in Kanarese, and should be mannavi in Tamil. This is described as of unapproachable strength and that is the strength of the fortress that was built by the Rastrakutas, in the building of the walls of which the Eastern Chalukyas were compelled to assist after defeat. Then comes a reference apparently to a new invasion of Ceylon, the carrying away of the crown and jewels of the king and the queen of Ceylon, and those of the Pandya left there for safety, and the conquest of the whole of Ceylon. We shall revert to this later. He had also to attack the king of Malabar again and take possession of the crown and treasures likewise. Records of his eighth year merely add the island of Parashurama by name Santhimat with the adjoining islands. Leaving for the moment the conquest of Ceylon and Kerala, this series of conquests of Rajendra advances him one step farther than his father, and brings him into touch with the Western Chalukyas along the whole length of the frontier across the peninsula. This line has no natural frontier to mark it and could be held only by holding the frontier fortresses and by constant wars. Records of his tenth year describe accordingly a war with the Western Chalukyas whose ruler Jayasimha he defeated and put to flight at a place called Muyangi. This must be the same name as Masaangi or Maski where an Asoka Inscription was found. The record further states that he captured Rattapadi 7½ lakhs, and "the mountains containing the nine kinds of wealth." Rajendra's achievement probably did not go beyond the defeat of Jayasimha. The capture and possession of his country is a mere hyperbole. His conquests just short of this may be taken to be real as we find his sons advancing therefrom for further conquests, the Chalukyas sometimes advancing as far south as the Pallar across the whole of the modern Mysore territory.

Rajendra's Invasion of Kalingam.

A record of his thirteenth year claims for Rajendra conquests right up to the banks of the Ganges and across the Bay of Bengal in Burma also.

The Tirumalai inscription and others of that date, among which


A 35.
No. 44 from Kolar is of special value, recite his conquests in the following order:

Śakkarakoṭṭam "belonging to brave warriors", Maduraimandałam "whose fortresses carried their old flags", Nāmanakkōnam "surrounded by dense groves", Pañjapallī "of the brave bowmen" and Māsunideśam "surrounded by green fields." These records claim for him a victory over Indraratha "of the old-dynasty of the moon" in a battlefield at Jātinagar "of old or undiminished fame." He captured Indraratha with numbers of people and a vast mass of his wealth. He then took Odha Viṣaya "which was surrounded by an unapproachable forest", and Kośalainādu "asylum of Brāhmaṇas." He then won a victory over Dharmapāla and took Daṇḍabhukti "surrounded by groves, the habitat of bees." He then acquired fame which spread in all directions by valiantly attacking Raṇaśūra and taking possession of his kingdom of Daḵṣīṇa Lāda. He then compelled Govindachandra to get down from his elephant and flee, and took his territory of Bengal where the monsoon never ceases. He then reached the mouths of the Ganges and, having frightened in the field of battle Oṭṭamayīpāla, he took his elephants, the camp of his women and Uttara Lāda washed by "the great sea bearing pearl." He also took the good water of the wave-throwing Ganges. The reaching of the Ganges brings his conquests to a close according to his records up to the thirteenth year.

Rājendra's Overseas Conquest.

No. 84 of Channapatna in the Bangalore district, however, also of the thirteenth year, adds other details which bring into the record the whole of his over-seas conquests. The inference therefore seems warranted that the overseas conquests of Rājendra Chola took place in his thirteenth year. Apparently very soon after the conquest of Uttara Lāda and the bringing of the Ganges water to Rājendra, then encamped on the Godavari, he is said to have sent out a fleet of ships into the middle of the ocean against Saṅgrāmavijayottungavarma, the king of Kaḍāram. He captured him with all his fighting elephants and took from him his royal wealth. He obtained possession of Śrī Viṣaya in the midst of which was set the triumphal arch, Vidyādharatōraṇa, with its great doors set with jewels and trap doors. He then took the seaport of Paṇṇai, Malaiyūr "of ancient fame having for its ramparts many hills", Māvirudhingam "which had for its moat the
deep sea”, Laṅkāsokam “with its impenetrable fortifications”, Māppappālam “surrounded by deep waters let in for defence”, Mēviliṅgam “with well-defended fortress walls”, Vilaippaṇḍur “provided with weapons of defence”, Takkolam “celebrated by the learned”, Mādamālingam “of great defences”, Ḫāmuridēsam “defended by a strong fleet of ships”, Mānakkaṇṭāvāram “surrounded by groves containing honey-bees”, and Kadāram “defended in great strength by the sea which touches it.” This recital of his oversea exploits would bring under his control the whole of South Burma and the Malaya peninsula, perhaps including parts even of Siam.

The Distinct character of the Campaigns according to the Tiruvāḷaṅṟavu plates.

The conquests of Rājendra detailed above from records of his thirteenth year fall into two campaigns as distinct as the two campaigns already discussed before. After the war against the Rāṭṭappāḍi of the Western Chālkukyas he must have returned to his headquarters. If the Tiruvāḷaṅṟavu plates, just since published by the epigraphist, is to be taken as stating facts as they occurred, he definitely returned to his capital after the victory at Muyangī and the taking of the mountains containing the nine kinds of wealth, wherefrom he set out on an expedition northwards with the specific purpose of bringing the water of the Ganges, in order that he might make his own country as holy in orthodox estimation as that of the region watered by the “holy Gaṅga.” Hence the inference has been drawn by the late Mr. Venkayya that the expedition was no more than a royal pilgrimage to the Ganges, and that by deputy. The inscription on the Tiruvāḷaṅṟavu plates apparently is a composition which treats of the achievements of Rājendra as a Dīvāṇjaya (conquest of the quarters) of the conventional kind, and describes the whole series of his historical achievements in conventional epic manner. It is hardly possible even after making allowance for the author’s sense of epic propriety to regard the campaign as a mere act of pilgrimage even by deputy. Rājendra seems to have been an imaginative individual, with a great deal perhaps of the knight-errant in him, though the knight-errant part of his nature was
kept well under control both of the conqueror and the statesman as we shall show presently. The notion of the Ganges water must have got into him from the knowledge of the achievements of an early Tamil ruler Śeṁkuṭṭuvan Śēra 10 (Chera), the hero of the Śilappadhikāram who brought a stone from the Himālayas, had it bathed in the Ganges and brought it over to his capital Vaṇji on the west coast for making the image of the “Chaste Goddess” (Pattini Dēvi) in addition to having given his mother a bath in the Ganges. This Chera ruler’s grandfather and a distinguished ancestor of Rājendra Chola himself, the great Chola Karikāla is credited with having gone as far north, and to have obtained gifts from an ally, a treaty power and one who was a “negligible” neutral respectively of Vajra (the country on the banks of the Son), Magadha and Avanti 11 (Malva). All the three sovereigns, Chola, Chera and Pāṇḍya alike of ancient fame, lay claim to having cut out their emblems on the face of the Himālayas. There was precedent for imitation as one of the early Pallava rulers lays claim similarly, may be fictitiously, to having similarly cut out his emblem on the Himālayas in obvious imitation of the achievement of these predecessors of his in the south. 12 Rājendra, the “Pandita Chola” 13 as he is called, apparently read of these achievements and obviously wished to make a point to his credit similarly. The diplomacy and the warlike exploits of his father had brought him into touch with Kālinga (Orissa) in the north, and the Western Chāḻukyas along a somewhat irregular frontier extending from the region of Central India to Dharwar in the south of the Bombay Presidency. By the first two campaigns Rājendra had secured his position both in the south in his rear and along this doubtful frontier. The next campaign seems to have had for it the definite object of bringing Kālinga, to the conquest of which his father’s records vaguely lay claim, really under the Chola rule for which purpose we can give something of a potent reason presently. It will conduce however to clearness to take the two distinct campaigns of the records of the thirteenth year separately, and see what exactly we can make out of the recital of the specific details given in these records.

10 Śilappadhikāram, cantos 26 and 27. 11 Ibid, canto 5, ll. 99-104.
12 Amaravati Inscription of Sinhavarmman. South Ind. Inscri., I., p. 27, l. 33.
13 Kaliṅgattupparani, canto 13, l. 62; South Ind. Inscri., III, ii, p. 127; also ASR., 1911-12, p. 176. Manuscript authority, since made available, seems to cast doubts upon the reading of verse giving authority for this inference.
The First Campaign.

Referring back for a moment to the Tirumalai inscription, we find among the places mentioned Śakkarakkoṭṭam, Maduraimanḍalam, Namanaikkonam, Pañjapaḷḷi and Māsuṇīḍēsam. These are all places of importance, or fortresses, which Rājendra Chola's general is said to have taken. Then comes a victory against a certain "Indraratha of the dynasty of the Moon" in a battle field at a place which has hitherto been read Ādinagar, and which in one of his records is written "Śādinagar." These records describe the victory at this place decisive enough to give him possession of Oḍḍa-visaya and Kośalaināḍu. That is one definite part of the campaign. Reverting to the details the farthest place in this direction Rājendra had advanced before starting on this campaign was Kollippākkai in the Nizam’s Dominions. I have pointed out already that Kollippākkai is satisfactorily identified with Kulpak almost half-way between the present day Hyderabad and Warangal, the later Kākatiya capital. The campaign apparently began from there, or from somewhere not far off. The first place to find mention is Śakkarakkoṭṭam. The name of this place is found associated with the early campaigns of Kulottunga Chola with another place Vairāgaram, and the achievements, specifically associated with the two places, of that monarch are the taking of the former and the capturing of elephants in true Kedda fashion in the latter. The researches of Pandit Hira Lal of Nagpur have satisfactorily identified the latter with old Bastar near Jagdalpur in the state of Bastar, and the latter in the same vicinity. Cakkarakūṭa is pointed out as the place referred to as Śakkarakkoṭṭam, which seems quite a satisfactory enough equation. The rulers of this locality were Nāgavanaṁśis at a particular time. The territory ruled over by the Nāgavaṁśis may be translated Māsuṇīḍēsam in Tamil, māsuṇam in Tamil meaning "snake." The other three places Maduraimanḍalam, Namanaikkonam and Pañjapaḷḷi must be places in the vicinity. Maduraimanḍalam may be the Maduban, one of the Orissa tributary states. Names of places terminating in pälli seem common enough in that region. One of these states is called Daśapalla, and there is a place referred to as Vaṭapalli in one of the inscriptions of the locality. So probably all these are places which were in the

14 Ep. Ind., IX, p. 179.
15 ASR., 1911-12, p. 174.
same vicinity and were places of some importance in the territory of one ruler, each one of these being either important from a military point of view or because it was the head-quarters of one of the number of feudatories that held the territory among them. It seems to me that Indraratha was the dominating ruler of the whole region, and these were places of importance in his territory; and Indraratha must have belonged to the dynasty of the Somavamśis of Cuttack, a ruler who has not yet come within the ken of the epigraphists though no doubt the late Professor Keilhorn noted an Indraratha among those defeated by King Bhoja of Dhāra. His capital Śādinagar (Śādinagar of Tamil, hitherto read Ādinagar, Jajnagar of the Muhammadian historians) is no other than Yayātinagar, believed to be the foundation of one of the early Kēsari kings of Orissa. This Yayātinagar is identified with a place called Binka (Sonpur Binka of the maps) on the river Mahānadi by Pandit Hira Lal.17 Sonpur Binka is on the high road leading from the south towards Gaya and Patna, and on the road almost at right angles connecting Nagpur and Puri. The north-south road, apparently was the main road of communication between India south of the Vindhya and the north, where the obstacle of the mountains was not so great and that of the rivers was probably not altogether impossible to overcome. As a matter of fact the Tiruvāḷangāḍu plates do describe in clear terms that Rājendra's army crossed these rivers making use of the elephants as a bridge. The wording of the Tamil records makes it clear that the defeat and capture of Indraratha and his people enabled Rājendra to take not merely the Oḍḍa-viṣaya which apparently was his direct territory, but also enabled him to bring under his control the whole of Kośalaināḍu, the Mahākośala country of the central provinces which then had become the asylum of the Brahmans. The reason for this last statement is not very far to seek. We are in the year 1025–26 and some years before this Mahmud of Ghazni had attacked Kanouj and had carried his campaign quite far into Bundelkhand. The Brāhmaṇas therefore of the "holy land of India" must have found reason to regard those places as not safe for their residence. We do find a number of records of rulers of the Kosala regions making grants and bringing in Brāhmaṇas from various localities to reside in the district. Hence the clear inference seems to be that Indraratha was the

17 Sirpur stone Ins., Ep. Ind., XI, No. 19.
overlord of the regions of this part of Kaliṅga, and the definite defeat of him brought under the rule or political influence of Rājendra the whole of the region, Mahākosalā. This perhaps would exclude the coast regions of Orissa as we shall see presently. Hence it is that the Tiruvālaṅgādu plates describe in some detail, in verses 114–115, of the defeat of this Indraratha, which is metaphorically described as the fall of the lunar race itself from its height of glory.

The Invasion of the territory beyond Orissa.

This done, Rājendra’s general marched forward apparently in the direction of the Ganges, which could be reached either by marching straight north, or north-east, or east as the conquest of Mahākosalā and the hinterland portion of Oḍḍa viṣaya brought him almost to the frontiers of Chota Nagpur. According to the Tamil records he advanced against Dharmaṇāla, and after defeating him took Daṇḍabhukti, “surrounded by groves, the habitat of bees.” Here the Tiruvālaṅgādu plates differ from the Tamil records. The general is there made to defeat Raṇaśūra, the same apparently as the Raṇaśūra of the Tamil records, whose territory was according to this latter Takkana Lāḍa (Dakṣiṇa Lāḍa). Whether it was Daṇḍabhukti that was first conquered, or Dakṣiṇa Lāḍa would be a matter of some importance in the marking out of the route of the invasion. Necessarily therefore we shall have to settle what Daṇḍabhukti was, and what Dakṣiṇa Lāḍa before we can arrive at a definite conclusion in regard to which of the two was first attacked.

The Two Lāḍas, North and South.

To the solution of this geographical puzzle Mr. R. D. Bannerji has contributed the most. He quotes a Jaina inscription of the year 62 of the Kushana era referring to the country of Rāḍha, from which the Jaina monk, who was responsible for the record, came. He quotes two other records of more modern times. One of them, of the time of the Sēna king Veḷḷāla Sēna, is a record found in a village in the Burdwan district which states that the village granted, which is named, was situated in north Rāḍha (Uttara Rāḍha maṇḍale). The other record is of Narasimha II. of Orissa with date equivalent to A. D. 1296 and refers clearly to Rāḍha and Varēndri as well-known divisions of Bengal.¹¹ A direct

reference having been found to Uttara Rādhā there is a very strong presumption that there was at that period a Dakṣiṇa Rādhā or Southern Rādhā. The Chola record first refers to Takkana Lāḍam (Dakṣiṇa Lāḍa or Lāṭa), and then to Uttara Lāḍam (Uttara Lāḍa or Lāṭa). Lāḍa was equated with Lāṭa, quite correctly from the phonetic point of view, and taken to mean the country of Gujarāt of which two divisions were known, northern and southern. It was the late Mr. Venkayya that changed the equation from Lāṭa to Virāṭa. He did not make the change on the basis of any real phonetic equivalent. It would be easy to point out authoritative usage for Virāṭa being written Viraḍa in Tamil, as Mahāraṭṭa is written Māraḍa and Lāṭa is written Lāḍa. Mr. Venkayya’s only authority for the equation was in a record which refers to a feudatory of the early Chola Āditya Karikāla as belonging to the Sagara-Virāṭa dynasty. The Tamil part of the record puts in Lāḍa where the Sanskrit has Virāṭa. Hence his equation Tamil Lāḍa equals Sanskrit Virāṭa. In itself it is far from satisfactory as it is apparently due perhaps to the ignorance of the writer of the Sanskrit record. Sagara is never connected with Virāṭa, and this association ought to have indicated that the Virāṭa, of the Sanskrit record is no other than Rāḍha, the existence of which as a division of Bengal the writer of the record apparently did not know. The connection with Sagara would refer the individual perhaps to a family of Bengal. The equation between Lāḍa and Virāṭa therefore has no basis in fact, and the apparent equation would perhaps support the conclusion that Lāḍa actually stands for Rāḍha. We are indebted to Mr. Bannerji for the equation of Lāḍa with Rāḍha in Bengal, and the discovery that a division of Bengal was known by the name Rāḍha, as else the inscriptions of Rājendrā would have lost the character for an accurate historico-geographical disposition. The two Lāḍas of the Tamil records

19 Kalingattupparani, XI. V. 19.
21 The Lāḍa that figures in the story of the Bengal Princess the mother of Sinha Rāhu, the father of Vijaya, founder of Ceylon, is this Rāḍha or Lāḍa, and has nothing to do with Gujarāt at all. There are references to Rāḍha in the Jaina Bhagavati Sūtra and the Aguranga Sūtra. This is described as territory into two divisions Vajjhabhumi and Sabhabhumi, Vajrabhumi, and Śvabhabhumis, hard rocky land and wiry. The Tamil commentator Adiyarkunallar know Vajra as the country in the basin of the Son river. The region was noted for diamonds from the days of Ptolemy to those of Tavernier. (See Ball’s Tavernier, II, app. iii.)
are therefore an equivalent of the two divisions Rāḍha, the southern and northern.

Their Position relative to Daṇḍabhukti.

If northern Rāḍha corresponded to the Burdwan district of Bengal and the region immediately round it, southern Rāḍha must be the portion of Bengal immediately adjoining Burdwan in the south or southwest. It may even possibly be that between the two divisions came in some other territory. So much, however, is certain that southern Rāḍha must be south of Burdwan (northern Rāḍha) in point of bearing. The doubt actually arises whether there was any division of Bengal between the two because of the discrepancy in the order of the names between the Tamil records of Rājendra Chola and his Tiruvālaṅgādu plates which can hardly be regarded sufficient to definitely postulate intervening territory. The two Lādas being parts of Bengal we would be justified in looking for the other division Daṇḍabhukti not very far from either. In regard to this particular, the Tiruvālaṅgādu plates are certainly of great assistance. As we have already noted the Tamil records state that Rājendra’s general first defeated Dharmapāla and took his territory of Daṇḍabhukti, defeated Raṇāśūra of southern Rāḍha and took his kingdom before putting to flight Govinda Chandra and entering his kingdom of Bengal. The Tiruvālaṅgādu plates on the contrary state clearly that Raṇāśūra was defeated and his territory taken before the general reached the territory of Dharmapāla whom he ultimately defeated also. The following slokas of this record say in more detail what is stated in this sloka itself, \(^{44}\) that the general reached the banks of the Ganges after defeating Dharmapāla and having subdued the princes who were ruling the territory on the banks of the Ganges, he got them to carry for his master Madhurantaka the holy water of the Ganges. This may or may not be historically a fact. The description apparently is a copy of the achievement of the famous ancienṭ Chera king Śeṅkutṭuvan (Red-Chera), who got the stone from the Himalayas carried by the defeated princes. That is only by the way.

Daṇḍabhukti identical with Bihar.

Rājendra himself had advanced apparently with a reserve force as far as the Godaveri, where the general brought him the water of the Ganges after having overcome on the way Mahīpāla and taken from him “his fame and his royal wealth”. We shall come to this detail later.

\(^{44}\) Sloka 113.
What is to the point here is (1) that according to the record southern Rādhā was first conquered before the general reached Dharmapāla’s territory, and (2) that the conquest of Dharmapāla’s territory brought the general to the right bank of the Ganges. It must be remembered that before entering Rādhā, wherever that was, the general had come in the course of his successful career of conquest to the northern frontier of the territory of Kośala and the hinterland of Orissa, wherefrom he started in his further march to the Ganges. If we could assume that the two Rādhas were adjacent to each other, say north-east and south-west of each other, southern Rādhā and Daṇḍabhukti could be equally open to entry from his base. In such a case southern Rādhā would correspond to Midnapur and the territory of Bengal and possibly even a part of Bihar set over against the tributary states of Orissa at the present time. Daṇḍabhukti then would have to be immediately adjoining it, and capable of being entered into by a hostile force either after subduing southern Rādhā or without it. As a matter of fact the roadway seems to proceed through the tributary states to Ranchi and Gaya, and therefore it is possible the Tamil records are correct that he entered Dharmapāla’s Daṇḍabhukti first, and either after defeating the ruler or in the course of the war itself he had to attack and defeat Raṇaśūrā of southern Rādhā on the flank. In either case he could not have marched to the banks of the Ganges leaving his flank open to attack by a hostile power like the ruler of Rādhā. We are inclined to agree therefore with Mahamahopadhyaya Hara Prasad Sastri that Daṇḍabhukti corresponded to the modern province of Bihar minus Orissa. This arrangement would be exactly that suggested by the reference in the Rāmapāla Carita to a Lakṣmiśuṣra, who is described as a king, contemporary of Rāmapāla “who was the head jewel of all feudatories of forest lands” (Samastātavika-sāmanta-cakrapuḍāmanik). The territory of this ruler according to our arrangement must have been quite on the marches of Bengal on the south-west and in continuation of the forest tracts of the hinterland of Orissa, and quite within the limit of the great forest (mahākāntāra).

Daṇḍabhukti: a military seif.

Coming to Daṇḍabhukti, the name seems to suggest that wherever it was geographically, it was the territory given over to somebody and
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enjoyed by him as a military fief (Dandaśabhukti). When and in what circumstances could this part of the country between the Ganges, say from Allahabad to Bhagalpur, and the present day frontier of the Central Provinces and Orissa, have become such a fief? There are a few interesting details that Mr. Bannerji himself provides for explaining this position. He gives a number of interesting details of a Rastrakuta family in Magadha and their connection with the Pālas of Bengal. In fact Rāmapāla’s mother was the sister of Mahana who played an important part in his reign. He further gives reference to a Jayasimha as lord of Dandaśabhukti and identified Dandaśabhukti with the district of Midnapur 11 which would certainly go against the course of Rājendra’s campaign according to his records. We need not go into the details of this reference so far as they are connected with Rāmapāla and his time. For our present purpose all that we require is the fact that there was a family of Rastrakutas in Magadha. When did they come there and why did this particular territory get to be called Dandaśabhukti? The Mahamahopadhyaya identified Dandaśabhukti with Bihar on the ground that the Tibetans called the town Ottantapuri, and the Muhammadans called it Advand Bihar. Mr. Bannerji would controvert this position by quoting the Rāmacarita where a feudatory of Rāmapāla by name Jayasimha, ruler of Dandaśabhukti, defeated Karnakēsari, king of Orissa, at the time. Hence he would place Dandaśabhukti somewhere near Midnapur. The defeat of the king of Orissa by a ruler of Dandaśabhukti does not necessarily involve that the attack must have been delivered from the north-eastern frontier of Orissa. It would depend upon what the actual extent of the Orissa territory was, and Orissa could be attacked straight from the north in behalf of Rāmapāla as from the north-east.

Bihar a military fief of the Rastrakutas.

That Bihar was Dandaśabhukti would rest upon other considerations. As the name itself indicates Bihar must have been on the frontier of some important empire or kingdom, which on that side required protection against a powerful enemy. A chieftain or a family of chieftains must have been placed there in special charge of this military duty, and the province given to him as a military fief which gives for the province itself the name Dandaśabhukti. The

11 "Pālas of Bengal," pages 88–89; also Ep. Ind., IX, 322.
existence of a family of Rāṣṭrakūṭas in the region of Magadha in the days of Rāmapāla, the last great Pāla ruler, would seem to offer the explanation. What had the Rāṣṭrakūṭas to do with Bihar, when did they come there and what was their position with respect to the Pālas of Gauḍa, the Gurjjaras of Kanouj and the Rāṣṭrakūṭas of Malked? The answer to these questions would at once explain the position of the Rāṣṭrakūṭa Karnāṭas in Magadha, and why Magadha came to be called Daṇḍabhukti. Two inscriptions of Govinda III state that the Rāṣṭrakūṭa Dhrupa (cir. A.D. 780-800) "Quickly caused Vatsarāja, intoxicated with the goddess of the sovereignty of Gauḍa that he had acquired in the east, to enter upon the path of misfortune in the region of Maru."

That means the Rāṣṭrakūṭas intervened with effect against the Gurjjaras conquering and taking effective possession of the country of Gauḍa (north Bengal), and confined them to their own territory in the desert regions of Rajputana extending to modern Gujarat. The Rāṣṭrakūṭa Karka II, A.D. 812-13 claims in the Baroda grant to have made his arm "the door bar of the country of the Lord of Gurjjaras, who had become evilly inflamed by conquering the Lord of Gauḍa and the Lord of Vaṅga." This means again that this feudatory of the Rāṣṭrakūṭa perhaps took part in the same campaign to prevent the Gurjjaras conquest of Bengal, north and south.

**A Rāṣṭrakūṭa Family of Central India.**

As against these must be noted the Paṭhāri stone inscription of Parabala of date A.D. 861. Parabala’s grandfather was Jejja, and the record states that an unnamed elder brother of his acquired Lāṭa Rāṣṭra by defeating a very large number of Karnāṭaka troops. In the words of the late Professor Keilhorn "his elder brother, having defeated in battle thousands of Karnāṭaka soldiers, whose might was increased by arrays of enemy’s elephants, obtained the broad Lāṭa kingdom." This cannot refer to the Gujarat Rāṣṭrakūṭa Karka, or his father. Neither of them won victories against the Karnāṭakas who at that time could have been no other than the Rāṣṭrakūṭas themselves. Jejja and his elder brother alike belonged according to the record to the Rāṣṭrakūṭa family. The record itself is found in

---

16 *Ep. Ind., IX, No. 34, V. 7, pp. 252 and 255.
the north-western corner of the Central Provinces and almost in the north-eastern corner of the territory of Bhopal in Central India. This family of Rāṣṭrakūṭas in Central India at the time must have fought against the Rāṣṭrakūṭas themselves of the imperial family or of their relatives of Gujarat;27 and if so, it probably was in behalf of the Gurjjaras. Where would the Lāṭā kingdom then have been, "the broad Lāṭā territory"? Would it not be the two Rāḍhas rather than the Lāṭā (Gujarat) where there was another dynasty of rulers at the period and which could not be held by two dynasties at one and the same time? It was Karka II of Gujarat that defeated the rebel Rāṣṭrakūṭa. The record next proceeds to state that Jejja's son Karka (not the Gujarat Karka) defeated in battle a certain Nāgāvalōka and "caused him quickly to turn back." The late Dr. Keilhorn was inclined to identify this Nāgāvalōka with Nāgabhaṭa, the Gurjjara. The title Nāgāvalōka, however, has a family likeness to the Rāṣṭrakūṭa title such as Khadgāvalōka, and the reference in the record itself to the rows of "pālidhvaja banners" fluttering over the army that Karka defeated is a clear indication that the enemy defeated was the imperial Rāṣṭrakūṭa of the south, or his Gujarat feudatory. Next we come to his son Parabala. We find him already entering into a family alliance with Dharmapāla of Bengal, who married Raṇnādevī daughter of Parabala, the Rāṣṭrakūṭa who had been wrongly identified with Govinda III.28 This was about the end of the 9th century A.D., the inscription being dated in 861.

The rise of the Chandels moves the Rāṣṭrakūṭas into Magadhā.

The position of Paṭhāri and the assertion of the independence of the Rāṣṭrakūṭa governors thereof would warrant the inference that this family of Rāṣṭrakūṭa feudatories in Central India became feudatories of the Gurjjaras, and by fighting successfully against the imperial Rāṣṭrakūṭas, made for themselves an independent position by transforming the military fief that was conferred upon them either by the Rāṣṭrakūṭa emperor, or the Gurjjara ruler, into an independent kingdom of their own, in the century immediately following and amidst the innumerable changes of fortune between the Gurjjaras and the

Rāṣṭrakūṭas. This feudatory family played their part apparently so well that they removed themselves to the eastern part of their territory to be a little aside of the field of war. They quietly pursued their fortunes peacefully and created for themselves a kingdom in Magadha which bore the name Daṇḍabhukti as forming either a part or the whole of their former fief. As the late Dr. Hoernle points out, the end of the 9th century and the first decade of the 10th century find the old powers and the rising ones arranged in a kaleidoscopic pattern somewhat in this wise. The family of Chedis in Bundelkhand that was rising into importance had involved itself in a quarrel with the ruling prince of the Gurjjaras and got into an alliance with their enemy the imperial Rāṣṭrakūṭa. The immediate neighbour of Chedi, the Chandel chief Yaśovarman who was rising into importance just then, had allied himself with the ruling Gurjjara. Almost about the same period we find the Rāṣṭrakūṭas of Magadha allying themselves with the Pālas of Gauḍa. The reference in the inscription of Krishna III that the Gurjjaras lost the hope of ever taking Kalaṇjara and Citrakūṭa is the result of this position. It seems therefore likely that Bihar was granted by the Gurjjaras or the imperial Rāṣṭrakūṭas in the first instance as Daṇḍabhukti to a family of Rāṣṭrakūṭas settled in Central India, who had so far developed this fief as to become in the generations immediately following almost an independent kingdom of their own.

*The Pāla ruler of Daṇḍabhukti.*

The ruler of Daṇḍabhukti, contemporary with Rājendrā Chola is stated in all his records alike to be Dharmapāla. About this time apparently Mahipāla ruler of Gauḍa or Northern Bengal, had so far asserted his authority over the Karnaṭa territory of Bihar, the ruler of which must have suffered a crushing defeat, possibly at the hands of the Gurjjara Mahipāla and his feudatory allies rising in the immediate frontier, as to drive the Rāṣṭrakūṭa dynasty into an eclipse. Dharmapāla ruling over Daṇḍabhukti therefore was apparently like the two others Sthirapāla and Vasantapāla who have left records in Benares, a relative of Mahipāla governing for him the territory of Daṇḍabhukti at the time. The defeat of the Karnaṭas by Mahipāla, the Pāla king, and his

* JRAS., 1904, p. 648.
conquest of the territory in consequence, are just possible on this basis, but it would, in the actual circumstances in which the fact is mentioned, be better to refer the defeat of the Karnāṭakas to Mahīpāla, the Gurjara. Commenting on the failure of Rājendra's general to cross the Ganges and attack Mahīpāla of Gauḍa, Mr. Bannerji has the following: "Curiously enough he (Rājendra Chola) did not attempt to cross the Ganges to the other side. The Tirumalai inscription being a prakasti does not mention such details, but the desired details are supplied by an ancient manuscript discovered by Mahamahopadhyaya Hara Prasad Sastri and now in the Library of the Asiatic Society of Bengal. In 1893 the Mahamahopadhyaya published notes on a find of ancient Sanskrit manuscripts, among which was a drama named Caṇḍa Kaṇṣika by Ārya Kṣemiśvara. This play was enacted before the king by his order, and it contains a verse in which the king Mahīpāla I. is compared with Chandragupta and a people named Karnāṭakas to the Nandas. So this contemporary work gives the credit of defeating the Karnāṭakas to Mahīpāla. The Karnāṭakas seem to be the southerners, who invaded Bengal under Rājendra Chola. It appears that though Mahīpāla I. was defeated by Rājendra Chola when he crossed into Rādhā from East Bengal, he prevented him from crossing the Ganges into Varṇendra or Northern Bengal, and so the Chola conqueror had to turn back from the banks of the Ganges. The manuscript on which Mahamahopadhyaya Hara Prasad Sastri relies is not a modern one as it was copied in 1331 A.D. The invasion of the Chola king did not change the political divisions of the country, but had left one permanent mark in the shape of a body of settlers, who occupied the thrones of Bengal and Mithila as the Sena and Karnāṭa dynasties during the latter days of the Pālas."

**Examination of Mr. Bannerji's views.**

In this rather lengthy extract from Mr. Bannerji's paper there are a number of points connected with the Chola invasion of Bengal which require detailed consideration. The points which call for remark are (1) whether the drama Caṇḍa Kaṇṣika was a play enacted before Mahīpāla of Bengal; (2) whether there were any Karnāṭakas in the army of Rājendra Chola for him to leave behind as a colony in Bengal which in the following century according to Mr. Bannerji rose to be rulers of Bengal itself; (3) whether the Chola conqueror turned back from the banks of the Ganges because he was defeated by the ruler of
the territory on this side of the river. I shall take them in the order in which I have noted them above. In regard to the drama *Candra Kauhika* the particular *sloka* concerned is set down below for ready reference. This verse is described in the prose passage preceding it as "apraakasti gāthā (stanza in praise) which embodies the matter as those proficient in the knowledge of the past (purāvidah) knew." Looking into the *gāthā* more closely the following facts stand out clear. As history knows Chandragupta adopted the policy of Chānakaśya, uprooted the Nandas and occupied the throne at Pātaliputra by taking possession of the capital as well as the territory, Magadha, of the Nandas. This is the first part of the *gāthā*. The second part says Chandragupta is born now as Mahipāla, in order to uproot the Nandas who at the time had come into the world in the shape of the Karnātās. There are two points of the four-footed comparison in the first part that do not come in for specific mention in the latter part of it. First there is no mention of the policy of Chānakaśya or anything similar; and secondly there is no mention of Magadha. As regards the first of these two defects the prose passage introducing this *gāthā* refers to it indirectly by saying that Mahipāla was a king who was not to be restrained by the evil counsels of his ministers. The second point, Magadha is certainly not specifically mentioned, but is obviously implied in the *sloka*. There will be no point in the comparison if the Karnātās could not be referred to the Rāṣṭrakūtaśas who were the only reigning Karnātās of the time, and the feudatory families from among themselves that they sent out as was pointed out above to govern distant provinces. It seems therefore warranted that the statement in the *gāthā* involves the conquest of Magadha and implies the extinction, at any rate a suppression for the time being, of the ruling dynasty of Magadha, the Karnātās in this particular context. This leads us on to the second point of Mr. Bannerji’s argument that the Karnātās were the garrison, or something similar, left by Rājendra Chōla in that region. It is impossible that any part of Rājendra Chōla’s army could be considered Karnāṭa in the ordinary sense of the term. It seems equally unwarranted to assume

---

30 *Yah savasṛtya prakṛtigahānāmareya Cānakaśa-nitin jiteśa Nandāṇa Kusamanevaram Candraścīto śivaḥ.*

Karnātāram dhruvamupagatānadvatānena kantuṃ
dorrāpaḥbhauk sa punarabhūtanah chrese Mahipāla devaḥ.

31 ādiṣṭōmaśu devatāmatya buddhi vīgura alaṅkhyā śivaharaśhasāḥ Šrī Mahipāla
devas.
that Rājendra ever had in mind occupation of enemy country. The purpose of the whole of his invasion was at the very most to compel the rulers of Bengal on this side of the Ganges to acknowledge allegiance to him. His real object such as we could infer from all that is known of this invasion will appear later. Granting that there was a contingent of the Karnāṭa soldiers in the army of the invading Chola it seems at the very best doubtful that he would have left a distant province like Magadha in charge of what to him must have been a foreign contingent. Coming to the third point there is nothing in the evidence exhibited by Mr. Bannerji in this paper on the Pālas of Bengal, nor in the records available to me on the Chola side, to warrant any defeat inflicted by the ruler of Bengal upon the Chola. The limit of the Ganges seems to have been imposed upon the general by his own master. The real object of the invasion, apart from the epic motive, seems to have been the thorough conquest of Kaliṅgam which then, as traditionally before, was divided into three sections the Trikaliṅgam, and which his father Rāja Rāja claims to have brought under his influence.38

The Karnāṭas of Canḍa Kauśika.

The conclusion therefore seems inevitable that the Karnāṭa dynasty referred to in the gāthā of the Canḍa Kauśika is an older dynasty of Magadha which must have existed in that locality long anterior to the date of the Pāla king Mahīpāla. It would seem much better to refer the Mahīpāla of the Canḍa Kauśika to the Gurjjarā king Mahīpāla of Kanouj. According to the investigations of the late Mr. Jackson, Prof. D. R. Bhandarkar and the late Dr. Hoernle, the Gurjjaras and the Rāṣṭrakūṭas were the hereditary enemies of each other, and at the commencement of the 9th century the Rāṣṭrakūṭas had the upper hand of it in Central India and asserted their authority so far as to drive Vatsarāja from the occupation of Bihar and Bengal into the deserts of Rajaputana itself. The Paṭhāri inscription of Parabala makes the point clear that Parabala and his father were influential rulers in the region, and perhaps the
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38 There is distinct reference to a Vaḍa-Kaliṅgam (North Kalinga) in the Kaliṅga-tattva-panaṇa. It is the failure of this ruler to pay tribute as distinct from that of Katak (Cuttack), that brought on the great Kaliṅga War of Kulottuṅga I., Canto XI, St. 27. There are numbers of reference to the seven Kaliṅgas in the course of the work.
region adjoining in Magadha. Hence the explanation of the marriage alliance between Parabala's daughter Rāṇādēvi and Dharmapāla the Pāla king of Bengal. With the accession to power of Mihira Bhoja of the Gurjjaras, the Rāṣṭrakūṭa influence in Central India undergoes a visible decline. Bhoja and his successor Mahēndra Pāla extended the power and territory of the Gurjjaras to such an extent that Dr. Hoernle regards that the power of the Kanouj Gurjjaras reached its zenith under Mahēndra Pāla. According to the Bagumra grant Dhruva Rāja II. of Gujarāt, for whom the date A.D. 866 is available, claims, "that, unaided, he easily put to flight the very strong army of the Gurjjaras which had been reinforced by his kinsmen; and that he defeated a powerful king called Mihira," Mihira Bhoja obviously. It was in the period immediately following that the Rāṣṭrakūṭas of Central India perhaps moved farther east, and the relative position of the allies indicated in a previous section came into active working to maintain the balance of power. It seems to be about that time that the Chedi rulers and the Chandels came into prominence in the region of Bundhelkhand and Central India, and that the Rāṣṭrakūṭas found it necessary to get into alliance with the ruler of Bengal. What exactly it was that brought about the change of relationship between the Gurjjaras and the Rāṣṭrakūṭas of Magadha is not clear unless it be the alliance between the Chandels and Mahīpāla, the territory of the former a great deal overlapping that of the Rāṣṭrakūṭas of Central India. Hence it seems a proveable hypothesis that the Karṇāṭas of Magadha that figure in the records of the Pāla kings of Bengal were the Rāṣṭrakūṭas who settled themselves in Central India, and cutting off political relationship with the mother dynasty made for themselves a kingdom first in Central India and subsequently in Magadha. It is the ascent to power of Mahīpāla, the Gurjjara, that brought them under a political eclipse so effectively that we lose sight of them altogether all through the tenth century. It is this fact that seems to be preserved in the gāthā of the Cauḍa Kauśika. There is no need therefore to postulate a Karṇāṭaka contingent in Rājēndra Chola's army, and of its being left behind to hold the territory of Magadha in behalf of Rājēndra Chola.

34 JRAS., 1904, pp. 647-8.
The General's tribute of Ganges water.

The Daṇḍabhukti of Dharmapāla therefore is Bihar from which the Chola general turned against Raṇaśūra and took his kingdom of Dakṣiṇa Lāḍa. He then marched east or north-east against Govinda-
chandra of Bengal of whom we know as yet nothing. Turning from thence towards the mouths of the Ganges he took Uttara Lāḍa having fright-
ed in the field of battle "Oṭṭa Mayipāla". The general took the holy water of the Ganges and brought it down to his master who was then on the banks of the Godavari apparently on the march himself in support of his general, it may be for a further campaign overseas.

The tracing of this route of march for the general of Rājendra becomes possible on the clear indication given by the Tiruvālaṅgāḍu plates that at least one of the main objects of the invasion was the bringing of the Ganges water. If this were all that was expected to be accomplished, it is apparent there is no particular reason that the general should have made any effort to cross the Ganges at all. The real object of the invasion seems, however, to have been the clearing of the flank for the over-seas expedition for which, for some reason or other, it was felt necessary that the whole of Orissa should be brought under Chola influence. Thus then Rājendra's invasion of the north was to make an impression of his power upon the rulers on this side of the Ganges extending from perhaps Allahabad or Benares down to its mouth. Hence after leaving Daṇḍabhukti he had to attack Bengal, at least one part of it, then march southwards towards the Ganges-mouth attacking and putting under tribute probably the ruler of Rāḍha or Burdwan and going to the mouths of the Ganges, return towards the Godavari by way of the coast.

Who was the Mahipāla attacked by the General?

Śloka 119 of the Tiruvālaṅgāḍu plates states in clear terms "having defeated Mahipāla and having taken possession of his fame and his jewels, the general brought to his master the water of the Ganges." The statement seems explicit that a Mahipāla was defeated. In śloka 116 this record states clearly that Dharmapāla was defeated meaning apparently the ruler of Uttara Rāḍha. Then come in the details about the fetching of the Ganges water in the two ślokas following. Then occurs the mention of the defeat of Mahipāla. The following śloka (120)
states that Rājendrā Chola himself captured a large number of elephants of the monarch of Orissa whom he killed in battle along with his brother and his army. It is in the course of this battle that Rājendrā Chola performed the feat of striking down dead a mad elephant furiously charging his own. Then having conquered by the great army that he sent forward, Kāṭhāha, he brought "the whole of the earth" under his authority and protected it for a long time. He then returned to his capital and set up there a "pillar of victory" made of the water of the Ganges which became famous in the world under the name Cholagāṅgam. For my present purposes the points to be noted in this account are (1) the conquest by the general of the region intervening the mouth of the Ganges and perhaps Orissa proper, defeating Mahipāla there; (2) his joining forces with his master and going forward to attack the king of Orissa who was defeated and killed in battle; and (3) the sending of the naval invasion after these two events. In regard to No. 1, the Tiruvālaṅgādu plates are explicit, and the Tamil records properly understood would be equally clear; but hitherto the Tamil records have been somewhat misunderstood owing to imperfections in the writing, and this misunderstanding has been fruitful of errors in respect of the identification of the Mahipāla of this campaign with the Mahipāla of Gauḍa or Bengal. When first the Tamil records were published the record was apparently read Mahipāla of Saṅgukkottam. This misunderstanding arose from the fact that the inscription actually contained the expression Saṅgottamahipāla. The reading actually is, in the Tirumalai inscription, Vaṅgala-dēsumundaṅgalar-valaṅgottan-Mahipalanai. The variant is given in a footnote Toḷu-galar-valaṅgottal. It is this reading that led to the inference of a place Saṅgukkkottam of which Mahipāla was the ruler. The same expression is given in the inscription 7-A of Nalamaṅgala taluk, Bangalore district, as Toḷu-kadār-Saṅgotaḷ-Mayipālalai. It is apparent that in this particular reading the last letter is an error for nai. So it is likely that the l at the end of the word previous is a mislection also. Turning to 84 of Channapāṭha in the same district you have the reading Toḷu-kadār-Saṅgamoṭṭa-Mahipalanai which gives apparently the correct reading. Accepting this reading, the meaning of the whole expression would be that the

person referred to is "Oṭṭa-Mahipāla of Saṅgama which touches the sea." The first three words in full in Tamil would be Toḍukāḍar-Chaṅgamam, which means the river mouth which touches the sea. This gives altogether a different significance to the whole expression. It means nothing more than that the particular Mahipāla's territory was on the sea-shore beginning with the mouth of the Ganges. The word Oṭṭa, the Tamil for Odā, placed before Mahipāla defines the position of the ruler more closely than even the geographical adjuncts preceding. The word Mahipāla is capable of being rendered merely king. It can also be a proper name Mahipāla. As it occurs in the Tiruvālaṅgāḍu plates the rendering that Mahipāla was the proper name would be more acceptable. In the generality of the Tamil records either of the renderings will do equally well. Whether the word actually stands for a person Mahipāla, or merely the king of the locality, it must be an Odā or Orissa king, and not Mahipāla king of Bengal under any circumstances. The distinct personality of the ruler of Vāḍa-Kaliṅgam (North Orissa) in the Kaliṅgattuparāṇi would warrant a distinct ruler for the coast portion of Kalingam, extending from the Mahānadi or Vaitaraṇi to the mouths of the Ganges. It is apparently the king of this north Kaliṅgam that is referred to in the inscriptions as Oṭṭa Mayipāla. It seems clear therefore that Rājendra's general did not come into direct contact with Mahipāla of Bengal at all, unless it be through Dharmapāla of Daṅḍabhukti; and that the Mahipāla who actually finds mention in the inscriptions is Mahipāla of North Orissa. The conclusion indicated previously seems therefore warranted that the object of Rājendra's invasion was limited to this side, on the nearer bank of the Ganges, and that therefore the assumption of any battle between the Chola army and the army of the Pāla king of Bengal is on the facts available unwarranted.

The Object of the Conquest of these Regions.

The second point: that the general brought the Ganges water to the Chola monarch on the banks of the Godaveri, the marching together of the monarch and the general into the territory of Orissa and the definite defeat of the king of Orissa with his brother in battle, are incidents that are described clearly only in the Tiruvālaṅgāḍu plates. The other inscriptions mention the defeat of Orissa in general terms, and pass on to the details of the overseas expedition. The
additional details given in the Tiruvālaṅgādu plates make the object of this invasion very clear, that is, the conquest of the whole country of Orissa, namely, the coast region and the country set over against it in the interior reaching up to the banks of the Ganges. Possibly it gives us an indication of what exactly is to be understood by the several references in the Tamil work Kalingattuparani of the seven Kaliṅgams (Saptakaliṅgam). The invasion therefore had no further object apparently than the complete subjugation of Kaliṅgam. This was particularly necessary in view of the overseas expedition that must have become necessary for some reason or other, and it will appear in the course of the narrative of that expedition that the Kaliṅgas were possibly rivals in the oversea empire in connection with which the overseas expedition was actually undertaken. All Rājēndra’s records uniformly state that, having reached the mouth of the Ganges and having defeated the ruler there and brought Orissa under subjection, the expedition set forward in ships which drew out to mid-sea and set sail from there. The actual starting point of the expedition therefore was in the coast region of Kaliṅgam. Would the inference then not be warranted that the fleet of ships was got ready and the expedition set forward from Pālūr, the “Apheterion” of Ptolemy? This Pālūr, Col. Gerini locates on the banks of the Ganjam (or Rṣikulya) river and has satisfactorily identified it with Pālūr bluff of the sailors, which is near Pālūr village, which again is not very far from the present day port of Gopalpūr.\textsuperscript{36}

\textit{The overseas expedition: its objective.}

According to these records of Rājēndra, a fleet of ships was got ready which drew out to sea and set forward from there against a king of the name Saṅgrāmavijayottungavarman of Kaḍāram. The Tiruvālaṅgādu plates do not give the name of the king, but mention the country as Kaṭāha. Before proceeding to consider the details of the expedition we shall have to settle what exactly the country was against the ruler of which Rājēndra sent out the expedition. The mention of the name Kaḍāram in the form Kaṭāha in the Tiruvālaṅgādu plates would make the two places the same and establish the equations, Sans. kaṭāha equals Tam. kaḍāram. This place, the Kaḍāram of the inscriptions,

had hitherto been identified with Burma, and of the other places mentioned in connection with this particular invasion the only place that was at all satisfactorily identified was Takkola. The identification of Kaṭāram with Burma stands upon a very slender footing as it seems, and cannot be held to be at all satisfactory. The large Leiden Grant of the year A.D. 1006 which made a grant of land to the Buddhist Vihāra at Negapatam, at the instance of the ruler of Kaṭāha gives a certain number of details regarding the monarch and his country. The Sanskrit part of the charter describes the ruler as Śrī Māravijayottungavarman son of Cūḍāmanivarman. He is said to have belonged to the Śailendra Vamśa (the dynasty of Śailendra), and was the Adhipati (ruler) of Śrī Viṣaya ruling over Kaṭāha. The Tamil part of the same charter describes Cūḍāmanivarman as the Rāja of Kaḍāram. We find again here Kaṭāha equated with Kaḍāram, and the ruler is described alike as the ruler of Kaḍāram and Śrī Viṣaya. So whatever country Kaḍāram may be identified with will have to answer the other details as well. The ruler of Kaṭāha was also the ruler of Śrī Viṣaya. The one may be the capital city and the other the name of the kingdom. It might just as well be that these two may be two parts of the territory ruled over by this dynasty of rulers. The identification therefore is of the utmost importance. To make confusion worse confounded we get another name in Tamil literature which in spite of apparent confusion does seem to throw some light actually. The early classical Tamil poem Paṭṭinappālai refers to the wealth of Kāḷaham among the imports into Kāvēripattanam. The commentator, who must have lived sometime about the thirteenth century, equates Kāḷaham with Kaḍāram. Among the places from which imports are referred to in this particular connection the imports from Kāḷaham are described in general terms as "articles of consumption", the last word being used in the technically economic sense of the term. Noting this point we have arrived at this that Kāḷaham and Kaḍāram are Tamil variants of the same name, or at least two names of the same place, the corresponding Sanskrit name for the locality being Kaṭāha.

33 Paṭṭinappālai, line 191, and Nachchinārkiniyar's comment thereon. Mah. Svāminathaiyar's foot-note giving Burma as its equivalent is based on the epigraphist's identification.
Identification of Kadāram.

The records of Rājendra makes it clear that the invasion was undertaken against the ruler of Kadāram. It would be necessary, first of all, therefore to settle where Kadāram was, and then, who the ruler of the locality was against whom Rājendra felt it necessary to send an invasion. Reference was already made to the ruler of Kadāram who was on terms of alliance apparently with the great Chola Rāja Rāja, father of Rājendra. The Kadāram under reference therefore is apparently the same Kadāram whose ruler applied for and obtained permission to grant a benefice to the Buddhist Vihāra in Negapatam. To identify Kadāram with Burma, there is perhaps very little ground, and the details in the inscription of Rājendra would make it clearly impossible that Kadāram could refer to a country like Burma. The older epigraphists were led to the identification by the mention of the name Śrī Viṣaya which was equated with the name Śrī Kṣetra the name of the ancient capital of Burma, old Prome. This place is not reachable except by sailing up the river Irawady for a very considerable distance from its mouth. Such a position is hardly tenable when the Kaliṅgattupparāṇi describes it as Kadāram "with its surrounding vast waters" which Kulottunga is said to have destroyed "on a previous occasion", an occasion previous to the conquest of Kaliṅga celebrated in the poem. Kadāram therefore must of necessity be an island, or at least a coast country, and we shall have to find a place accordingly. The researches of Col. Gerini upon the geography of Ptolemy leads him to the possibility of the identification of Kadāram or Kaṭāha with one of three places: first Kortatha of Ptolemy, which he identifies with a place of that name in East Borneo among certain alternatives; second with Akadra or Kadrānja on the east shore of the Gulf of Siam; and lastly with Kerti, more anciently Katarai or Katre, on a river of the same name in the north coast of Sumatra. He seems apparently to reject the identification with Kattigara of Ptolemy, which is, according to him, Canton in China. There are various other places which he refers to incidentally as being possible of identification with this, and concludes by saying "in the absence of more particulars the final solution of the puzzle had best be left to Indianists who, after an examination of all the information available in South Indian records on Kadāram, should be able to decide with

38 Canto 6, St. 8, 18, 25. 39 Note 1, page 568.
which of the places we have suggested above it should be preferably identified." Accepting the responsibility thus thrown upon the Indianists, we shall identify Kadāram with the Katrea on the north coast of Sumatra, and explain our reasons presently. We have already pointed out that Kulottunga’s (A.D. 1070–1118) poet laureate Jayan gonḍān refers to a destruction of Kadāram by Kulottunga in the war poem Kalingattuparani. The commentator Nachchinārkiniyar who must have lived not very long after him identifies Kālaham with Kadāram, and refers to her articles of consumption among the imports into the Chola capital Kāveripatam. Among the articles the various missions from San-fo-ch’i took to the court of China occur a number such as rock-cystal, petroleum, ivory, olibanum, rosewater, dates and flat peaches, white sugar, finger rings of rock-cystal, glass bottles and coral trees, medicines, perfumes, drugs, etc. There was also some quantity of cotton cloth apparently. These could be described as articles of consumption. The Kadāram known to south India therefore was presumably the place of similar name in Sumatra as San Fo-ch’i is located in Sumatra. It was already pointed out that in the large Leiden Grant the Raja of Kadāram is associated with a place Śrī Viṣaya. This latter is written Śrī Viṣaya in Sanskrit; but several of the Tamil records of Rājendra Chola write down the place as Śrī Viṣaya. There are some of them however that write it down as Śrī Vijaya. Vijaya and Viṣaya could be considered equivalent in Tamil; the j of the first word being a grantha letter which could be represented in Tamil only by the ḍ. So far as the Tamil records are concerned, therefore, there is no difficulty; but the Sanskrit Viṣaya introduces a difficulty in regard to the equation. This wrong equation may be merely due to the rendering of the Tamil word Viṣaya into Sanskrit Viṣaya without any attempt at giving the exact Sanskrit equivalent to the name, a feature that one very often meets with in the Sanskrit rendering of vernacular names. If Śrī Vijaya could be satisfactorily located it would in itself give the clue to the exact identification of Kadāram. Old Prome was called Śrī Kṣetra, and this might be taken to be what was in the mind of the writer of the document where the name is given as Śrī Viṣaya. That equation may now be dismissed as untenable as at least in the century immediately following the period with which we are directly concerned.

that part of the country was known by the name Ramaññadēśa. Therefore that was not apparently the place from which the embassy came to Rāja Rāja. There is a Śrī Vijaya in Lower Siam at the head of the Gulf of Siam. That may suit if we can take Kaḍāram as the equivalent of Akadra. For the other details this might do except that it involves sailing round the Malay peninsula, or getting across the Isthmus of Kra, for either of which there is no warrant in the records of Rājendra as we have them. Among the number of places mentioned in connection with Śrī Vijaya, and those rather closely connected with Kaḍāram itself as a country, occur places like Takkolam, Ilāmuridēśam and Mānakkāvaram. Leaving aside the other places for the present these seem to be identifiable without error. Mānakkavāram is undoubtedly the great Nicobar islands; Takkolam is the port of Takopa, not far from the river Takopa in the Malay peninsula set over against Sumatra. Ilāmuridēśam is the exact Tamil equivalent of the Arabic Lamēri, sometimes written as Lambri, in the northern extremity of Sumatra. These occur in intimate connection with Kaḍāram among the places that Rājendra took in the course of this invasion. That leaves us in little doubt that Kaḍāram was a place in Sumatra, and as such Śrī Vijaya wherefrom Rājendra carried off the triumphal arch must be the Capital of the ruler of Kaḍāram, or at least the headquarters principality of the ruling dynasty. According to Abu Zaid the Maharaja of Zabej ruled over a large number of islands stretching for a distance of 1,000 parasangs (2,400 miles or more). Among his possessions are mentioned Sarbaza or Serboza equivalent of Śrī Bhoja on the east coast of Sumatra, modern Palembang; Rami equal to Bambri or Lameri, and Kālah in the Malay peninsula just opposite ruled in the time of Abu Zaid by the Jabha prince of India. Śrī Bhoja had the alternative name Śrī Raṣṭra which may be rendered in Sanskrit, Śrī Viṣaya. The State of Palembang in Sumatra was known up to the middle of the eighth century to the Chinese by the name Shiā-li Fo-shī in T'ang history. When the State appears again in the Sung annals in the second half of the tenth century it is referred to in the form San Fo-ch'ī (San Fō-tsai; San Fūt-zai). The first name is phonetically the equivalent of the Sanskrit Śrī Bhoja; the second (San Fūt-zai) seems to come near to the Sanskrit Śrī Vijaya. Śrī Bhoja to Śrī Vijaya is a transformation that one

could understand when the state of Palambang rose to some kind of importance and built up for itself an empire in the period intervening the eighth and the tenth centuries. It would be ordinary vanity in the ruler to give his territory, preferably the capital city in it, the name Śri Vijaya if he conquered and brought under subjection the neighbouring territory of the Tamil colonists and others. That seems what exactly is reflected in the change of the name for an analogy to which we might take the name Vijayanagar the name of the great mediaeval empire of India, the city being called Vijayanagar in preference to Vidyānagar as a result of the vast conquests that those responsible for the new foundation made in the first period of its existence.⁴⁴ Śri Vijaya therefore would thus be the eleventh century name for the state of Palembang which at the time had apparently conquered the neighbouring states in Sumatra as well as in the Malaya Peninsula opposite, and this is what we find stated by Mas'udi where he speaks of the empire of the Maharaja being conterminous with India. This position of Kaḍāram as essentially the island state of the empire would justify the attribute, already referred to in the Kaliṅgattupparāṇi, that Kaḍāram was washed by the sea, and would warrant the expression used in Rājendra's inscriptions that he sent his fleet of ships "across the middle of the sea lashing with waves." If Rājendra's fleet set sail either from Pālūr, the modern Gopalpūr, or from any where near the mouth of Ganges it must have had to sail amid sea to go to Kaḍāram, and the sending out of the fleet of ships in the middle of the sea would be just the expression to describe it. This has no reference to any peaceful mission, but is a continuation of the war against Orissa the causes of which are not explained to us though we can see exactly what they must have been. Kaḍāram then is Kerti on the north-east coast of Sumatra, and Śri Viṣaya is Śri Vijaya of this period, and Śri Bhoja of an earlier: in either case equivalent to the modern Palembang.

**Historical Evidence.**

About the middle of the tenth century, the Empire of Śri Bhoja (Vijaya) apparently underwent an expansion. Mas'udi says as was already pointed out, having reference to A.D. 943, that the empire of the Maharaja was conterminous with India, meaning apparently, India on the farther side of the Ganges, referring to Pegu and Burma. His

⁴⁴ viṣītyā viśevam Vijayaḥbhidhūnāṃ viśevītāram yo nāgarīṁ vyadatta.
palace is described as having been built upon the edge of a tank, wherein, according to tradition, he caused a gold ingot to be cast every morning. Hence the tank came to be called "gold bars pond." Serira or Sarirah (Śrī Raṭṭa or Śrī Rāṣṭra) was one of the islands among his possessions; others being, as was already pointed out, Zanj or Zanej (Zabej?), Ramni, etc. Therefore then, about this period it underwent an expansion which implied the passing under the rule of this Mahāraja of the possessions immediately adjoining, of which perhaps a considerable number were Tamil colonies and settlements. Embassies from San Fo-ch'i begin to appear in the court of China from this time onward at frequent intervals. About the end of the century there was a war between San Fo-ch'i and a state She-p'o. Tidings of these hostilities were received in China and even an application was made for Chinese intervention. During this period Sarbaza was the island on which the Maharaja resided according to Al-Faras. This statement is confirmed by Abul-Feda, who says that the largest of the islands forming Zabej is called Sarirah, 400 miles north a蒲d south, and 160 miles across, containing the capital town in the middle. The further details given by this writer who quotes Ibn-Sa'id (A.D. 1274), make us understand that at the time of the latter Zabej was the name applied to the whole island Sarbaza or Serirah being alternative names of its capital. Hence it is clear that the island was under a dynasty of rulers, who extended its territory to occupy all Sumatra, the adjacent islands and a considerable portion of country on the peninsula set over against it. We have next a reference which leads to the identification more closely. In A.D. 1003 two envoys arrived at the Chinese court from a king Sz-li Chu-lo-mu-ni Fu-ma-t'iau-hwa. The embassy relates to the construction of a Buddhist temple, and applied for the exhibition of the emperor's benevolence by the giving of a suitable name to the temple and the presentation of bells. The name thus written is rendered by Col. Gerini as Śrī Cūḍāmāni Bhumyadēva, or Bhūpa-dēva; the latter part of the name seems however to be the Chinese transliteration for Varma-dēva, the whole name reading Cūḍāmāni Varma Dēva. In the year A.D. 1021 this Cūḍāmaṇivarman Dēva's son Māra Vijayottungavarman sent an embassy to the Chola king Rāja Rāja I requesting his sanction to the gift of the village of Ānaimangalam to the Cūḍāmaṇi Vihāra in

48 Gerini, op. cit., p. 572.
Negapatam built in the name of his father Čudāmaṇivarma. Is not this Čudāmaṇivarma the father of Māra Vijayōttunga, the Čudāmaṇi varma of this embassy to China in A.D. 1003? There is another reference in Ma Tuan-lin to a mission to China from the Chola himself in the year A.D. 1015. The Chu-lien king is named there Lo-ch’a-lo-ch’a, clearly Rāja Rāja (A.D. 985–1016).²⁴ The next Chinese reference we come to is in the Sung-shi quoted by Professor Hirth and referring to two missions from Chu-lien one of date A.D. 1033 from Shih-li Lo-ch’a Yin-to-lo Chu-lo, and the other in A.D. 1077 from Ti-wa-ka-lo.²⁵ The learned Professor, however has gone wrong altogether in identifying Chu-lien with Orissa, and equating the ruler’s name with members of the Kēsari dynasty. The first of the two names given above is unmistakably Śrī Rāja-Indra-Chola, and the second name is the exact equivalent of Dēva Kula. The full name of the latter ruler must have been Rājendradēva Kulōttunga, of which the terminal syllable of the first word and the first syllable of the second seem all that are written in Dēva-Kula. The other details given in Chau Ju-kua’s record work out quite well for the Chola country and the imperial Chola dynasty. Among the names that he transcribes in the course of this article he refers to a certain number of divisions ending in a word which he equates with the word pura, and he is in doubt whether he should equate them with towns or with wards. The reference is to 32 puras (pulo of the Chinese) which undoubtedly means the principal towns in the empire, and that is made absolutely clear by what he himself says in the note containing the list. That four of them end in pātam (Ch. p’u-teng), and as many as 12 of them end in maṅgalam (Ch. mung-ka-lan, equated wrongly with Mangalore), is the clearest possible indication that it refers to the Tamil country and to the Chola empire proper.

The second mission was composed of 72 ambassadors and carried a variety of articles as tribute, “glass-ware, camphor, brocades (called kim-haw, kincob?), rhinoceros horns, ivory, incense, rose-water, putchuck, asafetida, borax, cloves, etc.”, for which they received as a return gift 81,800 strings of copper cash, which according to Professor Hirth is of the value of about as many dollars. This list of articles would more suitably be the articles sent by a state from the East

---

²⁴ Gerini, op. cit., p. 609
Indian Archipelago somewhere rather than from India. The inference therefore seems warranted that it was a mission sent by the imperial Chola monarchs in behalf of their possessions in the East Indies. If so the expansion of the kingdom of Śrī Bhoja necessarily meant the coming of the kingdom into hostility with the overseas possessions of the Cholas. Hence the expedition of Rājendrā Chola, which, perhaps for nautical as well as for political convenience, set sail from somewhere in the Gangetic gulf after king Rājendrā and his general had successfully brought under control the rulers of Kaliṅga whose alliance with Śrī Bhoja was probably anticipated by this move. Rājendrā’s invasion is dated A.D. 1025 and was directed against Sangrāmavijayōttunagravaran of Kaḍāram. Almost 20 years before Māravijayōttunagravaran was on terms of friendship with Rāja Rāja, and just a few years before that the rulers of Śrī Bhoja had built or endowed the Buddhist Vihāra in Negrapatam. Hence Rājendrā’s enterprise was not a mere mission of peace to the East Indies, although the mission to China certainly must have been of that character.

Other Details.

From the Chola records themselves we obtain the names of three successive rulers of Kaḍāram, namely, Čudāmaṇi-varman, his son Māravijayōttunagravaran, and his successor Sangrāmavijayōttunagravaran. The information available to us from Chinese sources seem to give us the name Čudāmaṇi-varman with date A.D. 1003 as was already indicated. We have record of another mission of date 1008 from a king whose name is written Sz-li Ma-lo-p’i which Col. Gerini attempts to render Śrī Maruvi or Mallāvi or Maruppiya. It looks, however that the name is somewhat contracted from the second name of the Chola records, Māravijayōttunagravaran. It could be rendered, I think, Śrī Māra correctly enough. It is only the last group of sounds p’i that is not rendered. Can it be the first syllable of the word vijaya? If that should prove correct, we get the second name from Chinese sources also. Another mission is under reference with date A.D. 1017 and the name of the king is there given as Hsia-chih-su Wu-ch’ia-pu-mi which Col. Gerini again renders Adhi-su-Bhoja-bhūmi. This seems to be the rendering apparently of another name of the king (Śrī Vijayavarman ?), whoever he be. The next mission which falls within the period of Rājendrā Chola is of date A.D. 1028.
from a king Sz-li Tiej-wa, which is rendered Śrī Deva which could mean no more than the king, although it is just possible it could be the actual name of a ruling sovereign. Then follow a number of very interesting references which refer to Chu-lien, the Chola country, having become tributary to San Fo-ch’i (Śrī Bhoja). They are of dates ranging from A.D. 1077 to 1106, all of which fall within the reign of the great Chola Kulottunaga, who is credited, as was pointed out already, with the destruction of Kaḍāram. The inference that the Chu-lien of these references in the Chinese records is the Chola empire on the continent of India is entirely unsustainable by what we know of the history of that empire under Kulottunaga I. His was a reign of great prosperity, and expansion during which another great conquest of Kaliṅga took place, and, except the allusion to the destruction of Kaḍāram already referred to, we have no positive evidence of his empire having expanded overseas either to the islands round Sumatra or to the Malaya Archipelago. It seems as though the outlying imperial possessions of the Chola in the regions of the Malaya Peninsula fell off from allegiance to the great Chola some time during his reign. The cause of this may well be the activity of the rulers of San Fo-ch’i who extended their own kingdom, by occupying the outlying possessions of the Cholas, and the statements contained in the Chinese historians probably refer to this transfer of the Chola possessions in this region to the government of Śrī Bhoja, and the Chu-lien of those references could at the very best refer to the Chola possessions in the East Indian Archipelago and no more. The so-called smaller Leiden Grant of the year A.D. 1090 (20th year of Kulottunaga) refers to a grant made with the sanction of the Chola king by the ruler of Kiḍāram. The name of this ruler is not specifically given in the grant, but he is specifically stated to have built or repaired two Vihāras one of them called after the name of Rāja Rāja and the other after the name of Rājendra Chola, apparently the two great Cholas, Rāja Rāja the Great, and Rājendra, the Gaṅgaikonda Chola. Of these two, the Vihāra, Rāja Rājapperumpalī appears from the record itself to be another name of the old Vihāra built in the reign of Rāja Rāja himself and called formally Śrī Śailendra Cudāmanivarman-vihāra, this

\[43\] This destruction might, after all, be an achievement of Kulottunaga, as a Prince when he might have accompanied the expedition sent by his grandfather, as his own inscriptions seem to imply, though A.D. 1025 would seem too early a date for this assumption.
renaming clearly indicating the recognised subordination of the rulers of Kaṅṛaram. Two of the ambassadors of the king are named, one of them Rāja Vidyādhara and the other Abhimānottuṅga. On their application and with the approval of the Chola foreign minister Rāja-vallabha Pallavaraiyan the grant of land was ordered to be made. It is clear from this series of references that the great Cholas had the oversea adjunct to their empire which was brought back into allegiance as a result of the invasion, apparently of Rājendra Chola, and remained in that allegiance till sometime in the reign of the great Chola Kuloṭtuṅga. The rulers of Śrī Bhoja were able gradually to absorb these into their own kingdom, the imperial Cholas neglecting to re-assert their authority. The expedition of Rājendra Chola across the seas was a warlike act and not a mere peaceful mission sent out towards the east.

Other places mentioned in connection with the invasion.

Among the places mentioned in connection with this invasion we have already identified Kaṅṛaram with Kerti in Sumatra applied almost to the whole kingdom; Mānakavāram with the great Nicobars; Illamurīḍēśam with Lameri or Lambri in the north-west coast of Sumatra; Takkolam with the ‘Takopa’ of Ptolemy, the port of the Takopa district in Malaya Peninsula. The other places may tentatively be identified as follows—Mādamālingam with Balonka or Kāmalanka on the Malay Peninsula, set over against Sumatra in a direction north-east from the northern extremity of the island; Mēvilibāṅgam with Phang-nga, another port of the Takopa district in the same region; Māpappāḷam with Papera, Laṅkāśopam (for which there is the variant in the inscriptions themselves of Laṅkāśokam) may safely be identified with Langsuka in the interior of the Malaya Peninsula; Māyiruḍīṅgam may be Besinga (Ṛṣi-ṛṅga), the modern Rangoon; Malaiyūr is in all probability the Malayu or Malaya in the extremity of the peninsula. Two places for which I am not able to suggest satisfactory identifications are Paṅṇai and Vilaippaṇṭūr. The first would seem to answer for Pani⁴⁹ on the east coast of Sumatra; but so much seems clear, that all these must be looked for in the region round the island of Sumatra and along the western face of the Malaya Peninsula without getting into Pegu or Burma.

The titles of Rājendra Chola.

Rājendra Chola assumed a large number of titles, most of which occur in his records. Several of them are names and titles that other Cholas had assumed either before him or after, such as, for instance, Madhurāntaka, Uttama Chola, Vikrama Chola, etc., but some of them are peculiar to himself alone and indicate the special achievements in consequence of which, he assumed those particular titles. Of these the first and most important is that of Muḍikonaḍa Chola. This title of Rājendra occurs frequently in place names and even in the names of irrigation canals. I know at least of one branch of the Kaveri which goes by the name Muḍigonaḍan. I believe there is a village of the name also. This was a title that he assumed because he took possession as spoils of war of the crowns and crown jewels (1) of the Pāṇḍyas that they left in Ceylon for safe custody; (2) of the Ceylon King, Queen and Prince along with the royal regalia; and (3) the crown and the crown jewels of the Kēraḷa ruler kept for safety in a western island. Of these three it is only one for which we can look for confirmation. The Ceylon chronicle confirms in every detail Rājendra’s capture of the jewels alike of the Pāṇḍyas as well as of the Ceylonese. There is a slight discrepancy in the detail. This achievement of Rājendra, he is given credit for in his inscriptions before his sixth year. The actual event therefore must be referred to his fourth or fifth year. That would mean about A.D. 1014–15 or thereabouts; whereas according to the Ceylon chronicle it is precisely referred to the year A.D. 1037, thus making a difference of 22 years. Dr. Hultzsch, who studied the two histories comparatively, points out that this difference does occur between the two histories and suggests that the mistake must have arisen in the period of interregnum that preceded the advent of the Chola power in Ceylon. The name Muḍigonaḍa Chola was perpetuated in the royal palace that he constructed in Madura after his second conquest of the country and apparently on the occasion of the appointment of a Chola Prince as Viceroy with the special designation “Chola-Pāṇḍya.” That prince was given charge of Kēraḷa also, taking in that particular capacity the title “Chola-Kēraḷa.” Śoḷa-Pāṇḍya and Śoḷa-Kēraḷa occur as names of halls in temples in various places. The greatest monument of all that took this name is the royal city of Gaṅgaikonḍaśoḷapuram itself, which had the alternative name Muḍikonaḍaśoḷapuram according to the Tiruvāḷaṅgāḍu plates. The next
title of importance is that of Gaṅgaikonda Chola, the Chola that brought the Ganges. The third of the wars described above has reference to this particular achievement, and hence the title Gaṅgaikonda Chola. Almost every Maṇḍapa of a particular character in a large number of temples round Kanchi go by the name Gaṅgaikondammanḍapam. There is one village in Tanjore, and one in Tinnevelly which go by the name Gaṅgaikonḍan. Another one which occurs in epigraphical records and which unmistakably was a title of Rājendra also was Kaḍāraṅgoṇḍan. This title has been handed down to us in the name of a village which goes by the name Kaḍāraṅgoṇḍan in the Tanjore district, and also in the more abbreviated introduction to his inscriptions which merely state Pūrvadēṣamum Gaṅgaiyum Kaḍāramuṅkonḍa Köpparakēṣari Varmā referring to Rājendra. The first part of the expression Pūrvadēṣamum used generally to be interpreted as the eastern country. The Chattisgarh division of the Central Provinces, the part of Mahākośala of old, appears in certain inscriptions as Pūrvarāṣṭra. Pūrvadēṣam seems to be a Tamil rendering of this Pūrvarāṣṭra. The taking of Pūrvadēṣam therefore would not be the vague conquests of the east, but may refer to the actual reduction to subordination of this part of Mahākośala country.55 The taking of Kaḍāram has already been shown above to be a historical achievement. It is this that is reflected in the inscriptions of his son and successor who claims having had under the shadow of his sole umbrella the Ganges in the north, Lanka (Ceylon) in the south, Mahodai (Tiruvanjikulam in Cochin) in the west, and Kaḍāram in the east which had been taken, by means of his army, by Rājendra Chola, his father, meaning apparently that that was the recognised limit of the Chola empire in the days of Rājadhārāja. That it was not altogether a fictitious kind of conquest is in evidence in the alliances and the exchange of amenities between the rulers of Kanouj and the Chola country in the generations following. We have already adverted to another title of Rājendra Chola namely, Paṇḍita Chola. He was apparently a scholar and a man of a considerable amount of imagination who gives a new character of learning to the charters that issued from the court of the Chola. He seems to have been largely responsible for the introduction of a number of colonies of Brāhmaṇas from the north and of a new form

of Śaivism. A quotation from the commentary Siddhānta Sārāvalī of Trilōcana Śivācārya states clearly that on the occasion of his visit to the Ganges to bathe there he saw the holy Śaivas, and on his return brought a number of them and settled them in his own country.

*A great work of public utility.*

Of the administrative achievements of the Gaṅgaikōnda Chola we cannot take space on this occasion for any elaborate description. One or two points, however, deserve treatment in this connection. The great invasion to the banks of the Ganges and the bringing of the Ganges water, vainglorious and imaginative as they may appear at first sight, were turned to practical public benefit. The Ganges water was brought and run into the water of the Kaveri so that the whole new region round his new capital, probably only very recently reclaimed for cultivation, might not seem a novel imposition. He constructed for himself a “pillar of victory” made up entirely of the Ganges water, according to the Tiruvālaṅgādu plates. The meaning of this is that he brought the Ganges water and let it in into the huge irrigation tank that he constructed in the capital, the overflow of which in those days went to make up the present day Virānām tank with 71 sluices, one of the biggest irrigation tanks in the South Arcot district. The tank bed alone is left nowadays of this magnificent work of public utility, and the people of the locality call it Ponnēri which received its water supply from a channel specially brought into it from the river Coleroon. There is a well in the temple at the place the top structure is of the form of a lion, a feature that one often meets in various big temples of South India. The Ganges water was put into that well in the first instance and that well was connected with the tank by an underground sluice. Meaningless as it may appear to us, it perhaps served in those days to remove objections to new settlers coming into the locality irrigated by the tank, and thus served the useful purpose of supplying the much needed agricultural labour to transform the comparatively barren country into a cultivated district. The vast wealth that he brought in as conqueror was utilised not merely to adorn his great capital, which in the first instance was built for strategical reasons, but was also liberally used for the purpose of transforming the uncultivated waste into an agricultural district with a plentiful supply of water.
Promotion of Education.

His anxiety for ministering to the public good did not stop here. Like his predecessors he was also liberal in his gifts to temples and institutions connected with them. That a considerable portion of these grants were turned to useful purposes of education, and education of an organised character, is evidenced in a few grants that have recently been brought to light.

An inscription of this Great Chola from a village in the South Arcot District called Eṇṇāyiram makes provision for an educational institution attached to the temple in the locality. In regard to the provision for education, we have hitherto had a very large number of references to provision made for items of learning which would be of the nature of a grant to the individuals for acquiring some kind of "Holy Writ" generally. There are a number of references to such provision made for the recitation of Hymns of Tēvāram, of parts of Tiruvādac̄am and of either part, or the whole of the Vaishnava Prabandham called generally the Nālāyira Prabandham. There are also records of similar provisions for the reading of Rāmāyaṇa and Mahābhārata generally in temples. There is a recently discovered inscription of the tenth century which makes provision for the propounding of the Prabhākara in the Nāgēśvarā temple at Kumbakonam. There is an inscription, in Tiruvoṇṭiyur where a large provision is made for the maintenance of a pavilion called Vyākaraṇa Maṇḍapam which seems to be as much for the celebration of the festival of Śiva’s gift of grammar to the grammarian Paṇini, and for the study and teaching of grammar, apparently Sanskrit grammar. There is another record in the same place which provides for the teaching of Śiva Dharma and Siddhānta both meaning of course the teaching of Śaiva theology generally. But none of them makes any provision, so far as we have information at present, for any regularly organised institution such as a college for imparting instruction in such learning as was followed in those days. The new record from Eṇṇāyiram (No. 333 of 1917) exhibits in full detail, provision that was made for what would perhaps nowadays be described as a theological college attached to the temple at the place. It was composed of a college and a hostel for Vedic study. The record begins with an introduction describing the great invasion of the north, and of the splendid return of the conqueror from this great invasion of Uttarāpatha.
He is said to have built a hall called Gaiṅgaikonḍa-śōlan apparently in the temple. In another connection, a palace with a similar name Mudigonḍa-śōlan is said to have been built in Madura by this monarch, "by the weight of which even the earth became unsteady." The record at Eṉṉāyiram was apparently indited at the instance of the assembly of Rāja Rāja Caturvēdimaṅgalam ordinarily known by the name of Eṉṉāyiram. This assembly made the following provision to the Paramāsvāmin (the Supreme Lord) in order to secure success to the arms of the king. The God is described as standing "with a fierce appearance." The charity makes provision, as was already said, for a hostel and a college for Vedic study. The staff of the college was composed of:

1. Four professors for the recitation of the Tiruvāyoli, the hymns of Nammāḻvār, in the temple,
2. Three professors to teach the Rg-Veda,
3. Three to teach the Yajur-Veda,
4. One professor for the Chāndogya (Sāma-Veda),
5. One for the Talavakāra (Sama-Veda),
6. One for the Vājasanēya (White Yajur-Veda),
7. One for teaching Baudhāyaniya Grhya Sūtra, the Kalpa Sūtra and the Kāṭhaka.

There was also a teacher for expounding the Rūpāvatāra, one for teaching Vyākaraṇa; and another for expounding the Prabhākara; last of all came a professor for expounding the Vēdānta. Thus there were fourteen professors, each of them on an average receiving one kalam of paddy a day. The Vyākaraṇa professor received a little more than others while the Rūpāvatāra lecturer was valued at only one quarter of the rest of them. They received in addition a money payment also, which is put down as \( \frac{1}{2} \) kalanjus of gold each, it may be, monthly. The Vyākaraṇa professor getting a preference even here of 8 kalanjus of gold.

The number of students that were educated in this college fall into two grades; one group of a lower standing whose business was probably to get by heart the Vedas and the Sūtras. These were distributed as follows:—75 were studying Rg-Veda, 75 Yajur-Veda, 20 Chāndogya Sāma, 20 Talavakāra Sāma, 20 Vyākaraṇa, 10 studying the Atharvā, though no separate professor is provided for this, and 10 the Baudhāyaniya Grhya, Kalpa and Gana. There were besides 40 students
studying Rūpāvatāra, thus making a total of 270. These were young bachelors (brahmacārīnes) for whom the daily provision was six nāli of paddy.

The more advanced students were 70 in number of whom 25 were learning grammar (Vyākārṇam), 35 were learning Mīmāṃsā Philosophy (the Prabhākaram) and 10 were learning the Vēdānta Philosophy. The grand total of students was thus 340. These were all fed in the Gaṅgaikonda-śoḷan-maṇḍapam and were apparently taught in various other parts of the temple.

The total annual expenditure upon these institutions was 10,506 kalams of paddy and 61½ kalanjus of gold. The kalanju is probably the weight of gold which appears to have answered for a certain multiple of the current coin. At this time, the kāśu, the gold coin of the Cholas, was perhaps, a quarter of the kalanju. To provide for this income both in coin and kind, 45 vēlis (vēli=6½ acres) of land was set apart in two villages in the same district. Having given these detailed directions to the assembly, King Rājendra ordered "in the presence of Kāli Ėkāmranār, the head of the village, that they should not show in the account books, any more taxes than ½ Mā and one Padākku against the persons residing in the said two villages and cultivating the 45 vēlis of land." This grant of land indicates the existence of organised institutions for the purpose of imparting instruction.

From the point of view of our times the instruction imparted may be regarded as one-sided; but the grant is to a temple and the arrangement is in connection with the temple. The instruction would naturally partake of the character of religious instruction, and the institution that of a theological seminary. The inference, would seem, however, to be unwarranted that this was always the character of provision made for these institutions. Another record in the same place is available in an imperfect condition, and shows that provision was made for feeding five hundred and six Brāhmaṇas among whom were Brāhmaṇas versed in the Vedas, Brāhmaṇas in general and Śrī Vaishṇavas. Whether these five hundred and six included the three hundred and forty students is not clear. It is just possible that the number included those who were appointed for the chanting of the Tiruvāymoli, the Tiruppadigam, the Tiruppugal, and those who uttered the Saṇṭ Yajñam. There is a peculiar gift mentioned as Jātaka Dakṣinā which meant the presentation of a gold flower and a gold ring on the day of the
birth of Krishna (Jayanti Ashtami), to those Brāhmaṇas who completed
the study of the Rg, the Yajur and the Śāma Vedas, in token of con-
ferment of the degree. The provision that was made for this seems to
have been made over to the merchant class of the city whose duty it
was to supply excellently husked rice at the hostel at the rate of "two
to five of paddy" for fifty Brāhmaṇas. The daily supply of fire-
wood was looked after by the village provision-committee (ārvāryam).
The body of merchants who received this money in trust are described
as "the Brāhmaṇa and the Valanjiya (Banijaga) merchants who traded
in the South Bazaar", who agreed to supply sugar and other require-
ments in lieu of the interest on the sum lent. All the excess ghi,
milk and curds received over and above the requirements of the temple
were to be made over to the hostel. Here again it is the Brāhmaṇa
that comes in for the gift. Another record of the year, however makes
provision for conducting a hostel (śalai) which fed daily fifty Brāhmaṇas
and ten Śiva-yogins who were also supplied with oil for bathing.
This record makes further provision for a free-school (Dharmapalli).
It also provides for three water-sheds.

This gives us clearly to understand that institutions whose object
was education—such as education was understood to be about eight
hundred years from our date—did exist and something like even free-
schools were known in those days. It may be noted that Rājendrā
Chola’s reign extended from A.D. 1011 to A.D. 1042, and possibly A.D.
1044. That this was not a mere isolated special arrangement is evi-
dent from the following which shows a continuity of policy in this mat-
ter both under his son and successor Rājādhirāja, and another son who
succeeded him later Vira Rājendrā.

Rājādhirāja’s Foundations.

Inscription No. 176 of App. C. comes from a place Tribhuvani in
the South Arcot District. The full name of the place is Tribhuvana-
mahādevi-chaturvēdi-maṅgalam and is dated 30th year of Rāja Kēsari-
varaman Rājādhirāja, A.D. 1018–1055. The record is actually of date
A.D. 1048. On Wednesday the 2nd March of that year the great
assembly of the village met together in the pavilion constructed by
Śembiyan Umbalanṭṭuvēlar, and made the full transactions necessary
for the establishment of the charity named Rājendra-Śoḷan-uttamāgram
in the temple. This charity was made by the Chola Commander-in-Chief
Rājendra-Śoḷa-Māvali-Vānarājan "in order to secure the health of king Rājendra Chola." This last name in the form Vijaya-Rājendra-Śoḷa was assumed by Rājādhīrāja, and hence apparently this designation. The assembly purchased 72 vēlis of land yielding 12,000 kalam s of paddy, and made provisions with the annual income of the 12,000 kalam s for an educational institution attached to the temple. The grant provides for a number of festivals in the Vishnu temple of Vīranārayanaṉinagar, the name apparently of the Vaishnava ward. Besides these festivals provision was also made for the feeding of Vaishnavas for the recitation of the Tiruvāyōmbi. The total annual requirements for these miscellaneous items of expenditure being 2,475 kalam s of paddy. Apart from these the grant made provision for:

1. Three teachers of the Rg-Veda and three of the Yajur-Veda, one each of Chândogya-Sāma, Talavakāra-Sāma, Apūreva, Vājasanēya, Baudhāyanīya and Satyaṣṭa-(ādha) Sūtra; thus making a total of 12 professors with a daily allowance of 4 kalam s of paddy.

2. One professor each for expounding the Vēdānta, Vyākaraṇa, Rūpāvatāra, Śri-Bhārata, Rāmāyaṇa, Manu-Sāstra and Vaikhānasa-Sāstra.

3. For 60 students each of the Rg-Veda and Yajur-Veda, 20 of Chândogya-Sāma and 50 of other Śāstras; thus making a student roll of 190 persons with a daily ration allowance of 11 kalam s, 10 kurūnis, 4 nālis.

4. For 70 other students of the Vēdānta, Vyākaraṇa and Rūpāvatāra.

The total quantity of provision required for the whole establishment detailed above is stated to be 9,525 kalam s of paddy. This provision together with the allotment for the festivals etc. comes up to 12,000 kalam s which was the contracted amount to be made over from the produce of 72 vēlis of land by the holders. This quantity of land was purchased and put on the terms of a permanent contract with the holders with the special stipulation that not even the class to which the lands belonged should be revised even when general revision of classifications should be undertaken. This land was besides free from all taxes or obligations excepting Ėri-āyam, Pādikkāval and Ėri-amanji. The professors and the students were also declared exempt from certain payments and obligations. It will be found, on comparison with the previous institution of the father, that there was a standard
set up for these institutions which was adopted as a general rule. We might pass on with pleasure to a record of this Chola’s younger brother Vīra Rājēndra which makes an interesting provision for a hospital.

_A Medieval Hospital._

Another interesting record referring to the reign of another of the great Chola rulers of the eleventh century, Vīra Rājēndra Dēva, gives the details of the provision made for a hospital, a school and a hostel from the funds assigned to a temple in the first instance. Vīra Rājēndra was a son, possibly a younger brother, who came after the great Gaṅgaikonda Chola and succeeded to the throne about twenty years after him. He had to battle hard on the north-western frontier against the great Chālukya Somēśvara and entered into a marriage alliance with his son giving one of his daughters in marriage to the Prince. He had to be active also on the east of this frontier where there were disturbances against him in the Vengi country. A number of great battles were fought by him against these two states the eastern and western Chālukyas at a place called Kūḍal Saṅgamam till recently identified with Karnul, but more recently with a place high up the Krishna near the frontier of the Kolhapur State, by the late Dr. Fleet. The decisive battle against the eastern Chālukyas was fought by charging across the river Krishna at Bezwada (the Vijayavāḍi of those days). His period of reign was the seventh decade of the century, and in the year A.D. 1067 he issued a grant to the temple of Mahāvishnu at Tirumukkūḍal in the Madhurāntakam taluq in the Chingleput district. A village named Viyalaikkāvūr, a free gift to this temple (devadāna) used to pay the sāla of that temple 75 kalanjus of gold. This payment had been stopped since the second year of his predecessor who is described as having conquered the western Chālukya country, defeated Āhavamalla twice, and brought peace and prosperity to the world. This description refers to his immediate predecessor Rājēndra Chola who ruled from A.D. 1052 to 1062. This lapse was reported to him while he was seated on the throne called Rājēndra-Śoḷa-Māvali-Vaṇarājan in his palace called Śoḷa-Kēralan at Gaṅgaikonda Śoḷapuram.

The king taking the matter into consideration was pleased to order not only the 75 kalanjus of revenue referred to above, but also the other taxes of the village for meeting the expenses
of the temple of Mahāvishnu at Tirumukkūḍal. These taxes include eleven items of which some of them are of the nature of profession-tax, and others, taxes on land and goods of various kinds. The order was communicated by a set of Secretariat Officers who are described as Udan Kūṭṭam (which might mean officers in personal attendance) and Viḍayil (office for despatch of orders); the former are stated to have been six and the latter thirty three. At the time the order was communicated there were present ten officers of the Puravuvvari-Tiṇaiikkalam, the officer in charge of Varipottagam (register of taxes), and various others. The total revenue of the village is assigned as 75 kālanjus of gold of the vari account (book of taxes), and 72 kālanjus and 9 manjādis of aḍangal including pāṭtams (rates and miscellaneous cesses) making together a total of 147 kālanjus and 9 manjādis of gold. This was converted into grain at 16 kalam of paddy of the Rāja Kesari measure for each kālanju. The other miscellaneous heads of income in gold amounted to 216½ kāṣus and two mā (twentieth). This total provision was made for the several services in the temple of which some of course went to meet the expenses of an annual festival on the birthday of the king, and an annual festival on the birthday of a Vaiśya, Mādhava, who revived the charities in the temple and made additions to the building, and for the regular recital of the Vaishnava scripture Tiruvāynoli.

Among the structures added to the temple by this Vaiśya Mādhava was the Jagannātha Manḍapa in which was located the school for the study of the Vedas, the Śastras, Grammar, Rūpāvatāra, etc., and a hostel for students and a hospital. The students were provided with food, with oil for bathing on Saturdays, and with oil for lamps. The hospital was named Vira-Śoḷan apparently in the name of the king and provided fifteen beds for sick people. Among the staff of the hospital, provision is made for one doctor, “in whose family the privilege of administering medicines was hereditary”, one surgeon, two servants to fetch drugs, supply fuel and attend to other menial duties, two maid-servants for nursing the patients and a general servant who attended the hospital, school and hostel. Provision was also made for the supply of a regular quantity of rice, and supply of medicine was laid in stock for a year, of which as many as eighteen items are given, composed of drugs, and prepared medicine under
the ordinary Indian pharmacopoeia. A regular supply of cow's ghi was assured, and provision was made for burning one lamp throughout the night. The inmates of this hospital were to be supplied with water brought from Perambalūr "scented with cardamoms and khas-khas roots."

This eleventh century organisation for a hospital is illuminating and it gives us, however imperfectly, a little more of insight into the actual administration of the funds which were in the first instance, ostensibly made over for the benefit of a temple. That educational institutions required to be provided with a hospital as well as an attached hostel would at first sight seem quite a modern idea. That the need was felt in the eleventh century and some kind of provision was made for it so early is to the credit of the organisers of these institutions in that comparatively early period.

It is impossible in the limits of a paper to discuss the whole of the administrative organisation of the imperial Cholas, which requires to be dealt with separately and elaborately, but a contribution on the great Chola Gaṅgaikōndān to a volume which is intended to be intimately associated with the University of Calcutta would be incomplete if not defective, without a reference to these educational foundations. Hence, these few particulars alone from the administrative achievements of Rājendra Chola and his sons are incorporated in this paper. Such as they are, they give an insight into the civil organisation of the eleventh century, which judged even by quite modern standards would be considered highly enlightened in its general character.
THE SARVĀSTIVĀDA SCHOOL OF BUDDHISM.

NALINAKSHA DUTT, M.A., Lecturer in Pāli, University of Calcutta.

Buddhism has at present two principal divisions, namely, Hīnayāna and Mahāyāna, the former being subdivided into Vaibhāṣika and Sautrāntika, and the latter into Mādhyamika and Yogācāra. Each of these four schools has its origin in the teachings of one great teacher, promulgated over 2,000 years ago, and has developed in its own way through several centuries. The present monograph aims to unfold the history of one of them, the Vaibhāṣika, formerly known as the Sarvāstivāda school, the appellation of Vaibhāṣika having been given to the school by Hindu philosophers in view of the fact that its doctrines were based upon the Vibhaṣa-sāstras compiled at the council of Kanishka.

Almost all the treatises dealing with the schools exclusively or inter alia record their number as eighteen as traditionally fixed, affiliating them to one or other of the two primitive schools, Sthaviravāda and Mahāsāṅghika. Deviations from this sort of classification are found in the Tibetan work Bhikṣu Varhagrabrāhma and the Records of I-Tsing. They affiliate the eighteen schools to the four original ones, viz. (1) Ārya-sarvāstivādina, (2) Mahāsāṅghika, (3) Ārya-sammatiya, (4) Ārya-thavira. The duration of existence of these four as independent schools was comparatively longer, and the number of adherents larger. Other schools were short-lived, or coalesced into one another in spite of their points of difference. The most primitive school was the Sthavira-vāda, the doctrines of which have been fully preserved in the extant Pāli literature. The school that can claim priority in age and preservation of pristine originality next to the Sthavira-vāda is the Sarvāstivāda. Its literature is vast but to our misfortune, the whole

1 For the tenets of the four schools, see Mahāmahopādhyāya Dr. Satis Chandra Vidyābhūṣaṇa’s Indian Logic, (1st edn.), pp. 66 ff.
2 Dr. S. C. Vidyābhūṣaṇa, op. cit., p. 66.
3 Rockhill, Life of the Buddha, p. 180, ftn.
4 Prof. Takakusu, I-Ts’ing, pp. 7-8.
5 JRAS., 1891.
of it is yet in manuscripts, some of which are in Buddhist Sanskrit and the rest in Chinese and Tibetan. The two schools mentioned above were associated with the names of two great emperors, Aśoka and Kaniṣka, through whose effort and patronage, they gained ground and produced a rich and extensive literature. The principal seat of the Theravādins was Magadha while that of the other was Kashmir in conformity with the location of the courts of the respective sovereigns from whom each drew its support.

Council of Kaniṣka.

An account of the Council of Kaniṣka is furnished by the Chinese traveller Yuan Chwang. It was held in Kashmir about 400 years after the death of Buddha at the instance of Kaniṣka. The king evinced interest to learn the truths of Buddhism but he was perplexed by the variant interpretations given of Buddha's teachings by the monks. In concert with the head of the Buddhist church Pārśva, the king convened a council with the view to record the different interpretations and selected Kashmir as the place of meeting. Five hundred arhats were culled out for membership, the Sarvāstivādins forming the majority. The President of the meeting was Vasumitra who was also a Sarvāstivādin believing in the realism of material existence in the past, present, future, and composing the two Abhidharma pādās (supplements) of the school. Pursuant to the resolution of the council, were compiled the Vibhāṣās (commentaries or discussions) being the opinions of the different schools on the Sūtra, Vinaya, and Abhidharma, known respectively as the Upadeśa Sūtras, Vinaya-Vibhāṣā Śāstra, and Abhidharma-Vibhāṣā Śāstra. But as the decisions

---

6 A few of these MSS. in Buddhist Sanskrit are deposited in the Library of the Asiatic Society of Bengal. Efforts are being made by Sir Asutosh Mookerjee, whose zeal for extending the bounds of knowledge is well known, to have them edited and translated by competent scholars and made accessible to the public.

7 Watters, Yuan Cheuang, Vol. i, pp. 270, ff. In later Tibetan works the Council is referred to and some particulars are also given but they do not agree in details with Yuan Chwang's account. See Ibid, p. 278 (citing Tārānāth, 58) and Vasubandhu-chuan, (No. 1463), Wassiliou, Der Buddhismus, p. 283 ff.

8 The modern N.-W. Frontier Province and Gândhāra were inhabited by many sects of Hindus and Buddhists. Kashmir was the stronghold of the Mahāsāṅghika and Sarvāstivāda Schools. See Watters, Yuan Cheuang, Vol. i, pp. 292, 283.


10 Abhidharma Prakarana Pāda and Abhidharma Dhātulkāya Pāda: see below.
of the disputed points rested on the President, the accepted version should naturally be in most cases that of the Sarvāstivādins. It is for this reason that the Vibhāṣa denoted the literature of the Sarvāstivādins and specially the Abhidharma commentaries, and the appellation Vaibhāṣika was given them by later writers.

**Duration of existence of the Sarvāstivāda or the Vaibhāṣika School.**

It was only after this Council that the Sarvāstivāda School rose to its highest importance. But the seed sown before the reign of the great Buddhist emperor Aśoka when the activities of the school were confined within the limits of the Prācya-deśa only, now grew into an extensive foliage sending forth its branches beyond these limits under the fostering care of Kaniṣka. This is inferred from the fact that Moggaliputta Tissa, the President of the Third Council convened by Aśoka, took notice of the doctrines of the school and tried to refute them in his Kathāvatthu from the standpoint of a Theravādin. With the spread of Buddhism into Kashmir by the first Buddhist missionary Majjhantika sent by Aśoka under the advice of Moggaliputta Tissa, the Sarvāstivādins thought it advisable to depute their representatives to Kashmir in view of its growing importance as a proselytizing centre. Yuan Chwang also tells us that Aśoka not only sent Buddhist monks but also built monasteries at that place. Now as the school of Buddhism planted here came from Pāṭaliputra and through the members of Moggaliputta’s church, it would naturally follow that the first church founded in these places was that of the Theravādins. With the growing importance of the place as a centre of Buddhism, other schools also made their way to Kashmir, and it is not unlikely that Sarvāstivādins owing to their closer connection with the Theravādins would follow next. But it should be remembered that the Sarvāstivāda school of Kaniṣka’s time brought in further changes in the doctrine for which it has been distinguished from the older school, which was named the Ārya-Sarvāstivādina. However,

12 V. A. Smith, *Early History of India*, pp. 267, 268. Smith is of opinion that the Council was of the Sarvāstivādins and the literature written at that time, viz., the Mahā-Vibhāṣā, belonged to this school.
15 Rockhill, *Life of the Buddha*, pp. 133 ff., quoting *Bhikkhu Varhāraprastha* which
the original Sarvāstivāda school had its birth before Aśoka’s Council (3rd century B.C.) for the Kathāvatthu which obtained its final shape in this council takes notice of same for refuting its tenets. The school does not seem to have gained much importance at this time or a century later, as the Sanchi or Bharhut inscriptions did not mention it or any other schools which abounded in the later inscriptions. About the beginning of the Christian era, it came to be recognized as one of the principal schools not only in Kashmir and Gandhara but also in Central India. The adherents of this school began to be the recipients of donations in the shape of monasteries, images, etc., from monks, laymen, kings and queens.

Fa-hien (A.D. 319–414) noticed the existence of this school in Pāṭaliputra and China while Yuan Chwang (A.D. 629–645) found it “chiefly in Kashgar, Udyanā, and several other places in the Northern Frontier, in Matipura, Kanauj, and a place near Rājagṛha in Northern India and also in Persia in the West.” Since this time the geographical expansion of the school continued further until in I-Ts'ing’s time the adherents of the school were also found in Lāṭa, Sindhu, Southern and Eastern India, Sumatra, Java, China, Central Asia, and Cochin China. Saṅkarācārya (eighth century A.D.), set himself to refuting the doctrines of the Sarvāstivādā from the standpoint of a Vedāntin, while Mādhavācārya in the fourteenth century tried to give an exposition of the doctrines of the Viśhāśīka, by which title the Sarvāstivādins were afterwards known. Thus we see that the school originating in the third century B.C., attained its highest development in the reign of Kaniṣka and lasted up to the fourteenth century, and counted as among the four premier schools of Buddhism, it stood on the same level with one of them, namely, that of the puts Mūla-Sarvāstivādā as one of the four schools seceding from the Ārya Sarvāstivādā.

Mrs. Rhys Davids, Points of the Controversy, Intro., p. xix.
JRAS., 1892, p. 597. (Bühler’s letter.)
Prof. Takakusa, J.P.T.S., 1904-5, p. 71 citing Legge’s Fa-Hian, p. 99; JRAS., 1891, p. 420; and I-Ts’ing’s Record, pp. xxii–xxiv.
Sarva-darśana-saṅgraha (translated by Cowell and Gough), Ch. II. See also Saṅga-darśana-saṅgraha, and Advaita-brahma-siddhi, pp. 67 ff.
Theravādins, who, by being compelled by force of circumstances to take shelter in Ceylon, have survived up till now.

Language used in the works of this School.

Wassiljew on the authority of the Tibetan sources makes the statement that the literature of this school was in Sanskrit. The later works of this school, composed or compiled after the Council of Kaniṣka, were no doubt in Sanskrit, but the earlier works seem to have been written in a Prākrit dialect. This can be inferred from the following considerations. The Council of Kaniṣka was held in Kashmir, the literary dialect of which at this time was Sanskrit. Though the Vibhāṣās compiled at this Council have not come down to us, yet the fact that they were composed at the place inhabited by people among whom Sanskrit was prevalent as the literary language, and to whom, in a large measure, the Vibhāṣās were intended to appeal, is a strong reason for supposing that they were most probably compiled in that language. To this should be added the consideration that all the seven titles of the seven works on Abhidharma of the Sarvāstivādins in their Chinese version have been restored by Prof. Takakusu to Sanskrit originals. The names of those works appearing in the list furnished by Mahāvyutpatti and Abhidharma-koṣa-vyākhyā are also Sanskrit showing a great probability of the compilations of the works in Sanskrit.

The discovery of manuscripts in connection with the excavations in Central Asia under the supervision of Dr. Stein lends support to the view and rouses the hope that more light would be forthcoming upon these obscure points. The order, in which, roughly speaking, Sanskrit and Prakrit alternated as the literary medium in N.-W. India, seems to my mind to be that in pre-Buddha period Sanskrit was generally used as this medium, but with the movement initiated by Buddha and afterwards taken up by Asoka for spreading Buddhism, involving the necessity of appealing to the religious sentiments of the masses through a medium easily intelligible to them, the existing literary works began

22 Wassiljew, Der Buddhismus, p. 294. I am indebted to Dr. B. M. Barua, M.A., D. Litt., for this information and a few other suggestions here.
23 See Hoernle's Manuscript Remains of Buddhist Literature, etc., p. 106.
24 Published in the Bibliotheca Buddhica: see nrt. Āparāsa.
25 Kūrikā III, cited by Prof. Takakusu in the J.P.T.S., 1904-5, p. 73, fn. 1; see also p. 70, fn., for the titles as restored from the Tibetan sources.
the original Sarvāstivāda school had its birth before Aśoka’s Council (3rd century B.C.) for the Kathāvatthu which obtained its final shape in this council takes notice of same for refuting its tenets. The school does not seem to have gained much importance at this time or a century later, as the Sanchi or Bharhut inscriptions did not mention it or any other schools which abounded in the later inscriptions. About the beginning of the Christian era, it came to be recognized as one of the principal schools not only in Kashmir and Gandhara but also in Central India. The adherents of this school began to be the recipients of donations in the shape of monasteries, images, etc., from monks, laymen, kings and queens.

Fa-hien (A.D. 319–414) noticed the existence of this school in Pātaliputra and China while Yuan Chwang (A.D. 629–645) found it “chiefly in Kashgar, Udyana, and several other places in the Northern Frontier, in Matipura, Kanauj, and a place near Rājagṛha in Northern India and also in Persia in the West.” Since this time the geographical expansion of the school continued further until in I-Tsang’s time the adherents of the school were also found in Lāṭa, Sindhu, Southern and Eastern India, Sumatra, Java, China, Central Asia, and Cochin China. Saṅkarācārya (eighth century A.D.), set himself to refuting the doctrines of the Sarvāstivādā from the standpoint of a Vedāntin, while Mādhavaśācārya in the fourteenth century tried to give an exposition of the doctrines of the Vaibhāṣikas, by which title the Sarvāstivādin were afterwards known. Thus we see that the school originating in the third century B.C., attained its highest development in the reign of Kaniṣka and lasted up to the fourteenth century, and counted as among the four premier schools of Buddhism, it stood on the same level with one of them, namely, that of the

puts Māliga-Sarvāstivādāna as one of the four schools seceding from the Ārya Sarvāstivādāna.

14 Mrs. Rhys Davids, Points of the Controversy, Intro., p. xix.
15 JRAS., 1892, p. 597. (Bühler’s letter.)
19 Saṅga-dārśana-saṅgraha (translated by Cowell and Gough), Ch. II. See also Saṅga-dārśana-samuccaya, and Advaita-brahma-siddhi, pp. 67 ff.
Theravādins, who, by being compelled by force of circumstances to take shelter in Ceylon, have survived up till now.

*Language used in the works of this School.*

Wassiljew on the authority of the Tibetan sources makes the statement that the literature of this school was in Sanskrit. The later works of this school, composed or compiled after the Council of Kaniska, were no doubt in Sanskrit, but the earlier works seem to have been written in a Prākrit dialect. This can be inferred from the following considerations. The Council of Kaniska was held in Kashmir, the literary dialect of which at this time was Sanskrit. Though the Vibhaṣas compiled at this Council have not come down to us, yet the fact that they were composed at the place inhabited by people among whom Sanskrit was prevalent as the literary language, and to whom, in a large measure, the Vibhaṣas were intended to appeal, is a strong reason for supposing that they were most probably compiled in that language. To this should be added the consideration that all the seven titles of the seven works on Abhidharma of the Sarvāstivādins in their Chinese version have been restored by Prof. Takakusu to Sanskrit originals. The names of those works appearing in the list furnished by Mahāvyutpatti and Abhidharma-koṣa-vyākhyā are also Sanskrit showing a great probability of the compilations of the works in Sanskrit.

The discovery of manuscripts in connection with the excavations in Central Asia under the supervision of Dr. Stein lends support to the view and rouses the hope that more light would be forthcoming upon these obscure points. The order, in which, roughly speaking, Sanskrit and Prakrit alternated as the literary medium in N.-W. India, seems to my mind to be that in pre-Buddha period Sanskrit was generally used as this medium, but with the movement initiated by Buddha and afterwards taken up by Aśoka for spreading Buddhism, involving the necessity of appealing to the religious sentiments of the masses through a medium easily intelligible to them, the existing literary works began

---

22 Wassiljew, *Der Buddhismus*, p. 294. I am indebted to Dr. B. M. Barna, M.A., D. Litt., for this information and a few other suggestions here.

23 See Hoernle's *Manuscript Remains of Buddhist Literature, etc.*, p. 166.

24 Published in the *Bibliotheca Bodhivcica*; see *Buddh. Ayana*.

25 *Kārikā III*, cited by Prof. Takakusu in the *J.P.T.S.*, 1904-5, p. 75, fn. 1; see also p. 76, fn., for the titles as restored from the Tibetan sources.
to be rendered into the Prakrit versions and new Prakrit works began to be composed. The prevalence of Prakrit as the literary medium lasted for a long time and this was followed by a period when Sanskrit re-asserted itself as the medium for literary uses. The factors which contributed to these changes are many, of which only one or two are patent to us and the rest are either obscure or stand even beyond the range of guesses. The only inferences that we can draw in these circumstances are from the fragments of facts that are coming up into view at times, giving rise in our minds to hypotheses which fit in best with the bases of our present knowledge of Buddhistic history of the times; these provisional inferences will have to be modified in the light of facts that future may reveal.

_Literature of the School—(1) Sūtras._

The translation of six hundred and fifty-seven Buddhist canonical works from Sanskrit into Chinese is attributed to Yuan Chwang. Sixty-seven of these works make up the Sūtras, Vinayas, and Śāstras of the Sarvāstivādins. In Nanjio’s Catalogue under the heading Hinayāna Sūtras, the four āgamas, viz., dīrghāgama, madhyāgama, ekottarāgama, and saṃyuktāgama corresponding to the four Pāli Nikāyas, have been mentioned and the contents of the first three āgamas have also been given. By comparing the contents with those of the Pali recensions of those works it becomes evident that the Chinese translations were made from an original which is not identical with texts as represented in the Pali recensions. The differences are not merely in texts but also in the number and arrangement of the sūtras. In spite of the differences, however, the names and the subjects of the sūtras are identical with those in the Pali works. The other Chinese works placed under the aforesaid heading (Hinayāna Sūtras) seem to be separate translations of the important sūtras comprised in the four āgamas. In the Mahāvyutpatti, the four āgamas bear the identical titles and to them a fifth āgama is added, namely, the Kṣudrakāgama. The Chinese translators do not expressly mention the school to which these āgamas or sūtras belong as they

---

26 Watters, Yuan Chwang, Vol. i, pp. 20, 21; Sūtras here refer to the Abhidharma-piṭaka.


28 Mahāvyutpatti, Art. Āgama.
have done in the case of the Vinaya and the Abhidharma except in the case of the translation of the Buddhacarita and Abhinibramaṇa Sūtra, in which the translator remarks that five different schools named the Life of Buddha in different ways:—

(1) Mahāvastu of the Mahāsāṅghikas,
(2) Mahāvyūha or Lalita-vistara of the Sarvāstivādas,
(3) Buddha's former Nidāna or Avadāna of the Kāśyapiyans,
(4) Buddhacarita of the Dharmaguptas, and
(5) Vinaya-piṭaka-mūla of the Mahiśāsakas.

The Chinese translators used, as a rule, to mention the name of the school to which the works translated by them belonged. Want of this indication in the case of the āgamas leads us to infer that the various schools were at one in their acceptance of the texts of the āgamas. It is natural that it should be so in view of the sanctity and reverence attached to Buddha's sayings which none of the schools dared to alter without committing sacrilege and, therefore, the differences were confined to the doctrines only, originating in the divergent interpretations of the same texts as also in variations in the stress laid on particular aspects of their meaning. The collection of these sayings varied in number in different schools, and this accounts for the varying number of sūtras on the same subjects in the compilations of the different schools. Though the Udānavarga and the Dharmapada are in verse, their Theravāda and Sarvāstivāda recensions agree in the main substance of the sayings versified in them, though they disagree as to the length and arrangement of their respective treatments of those sayings. The Kathavatthu collecting the doctrines of different Buddhist schools makes it clear that though the doctrines differ, they all refer to the same piṭakas as their authority, which goes to support the inference. Further, in the Kathavatthu, the authorities cited in support of the doctrines of each school have been traced in the Pali piṭakas, proving thereby that there was no variation in the main substance of the sayings though there might have been in recension. The Prātimokṣa Sūtra of the Sarvāstivādins, and the fragments of the Nīkāyas and the Vinaya found in Eastern Turkestan also corroborate the above inference.

9 Nanjio's Catalogue, col. 163. 50 Rockhill's translation (Trübner series).
31 In the Kharoṣṭhī recension (ed. by Dr. Barua and Mr. Mitra).
32 Hoernle, Manuscript Remains, etc., pp. 166, 168, 173.
(2) The Vinaya of the Sarvāstivāda School.

The Vinaya unlike the Sūtrapitaka experienced a very different treatment in the hands of the bhikkhus. We learn from the Chinese translations that there were four Vinayas belonging to four different schools, viz., Sarvāstivāda, Mahiśāsaka, Dharmagupta and Mahāsāṅghika. There were constant disputations among the bhikkhus on account of disagreement regarding minor rules of discipline, e.g., cutting and wearing of robes, inclusion of meat and milk in the articles of food, residence in monasteries within towns and cities, worship of caityas and images, etc. To ghten the importance of the rules adopted by each school, it invented, to adapt to its own purpose, episodes in the life of Buddha to serve as the basis of those rules. This accounts for a good many differences among the rules of several schools, but, besides, there were other causes such as divergences in the circumstances and surroundings that were also responsible for the like differences. Though there were alterations in the supplementary portions of the Vinaya as adopted by the schools, viz., in the Mahāvagga and Cullavagga, the original Pātimokkha seems to have remained the same in all of them. It is evident from the Prātimokṣas of the Sarvāstivāda, the Dharmagupta and the Theravāda schools that the differences between them are negligible. Dr. Oldenburg has advanced his arguments to prove the Pātimokkha to be the oldest part of the Vinaya. The frequent mention of the Pātimokkha in the Nikāyas shows beyond doubt that this formed one of the earliest compositions of the Buddhists. Dr. Oldenburg after a comparison of the Vinayas of three schools Mahiśāsakas, Theravādins, and Sarvāstivādins arrived at the conclusion that all the Vinayas were fundamentally the same though later additions were made to some of them.

The Tibetan version of the Vinaya, an analysis of which is

33 Nanjio's Catalogue, col. 246 ff. Besides the complete Vinaya of the above mentioned schools, there were supplementary treatises dealing with portions of the Vinaya text.
36 Vinaya Piṭaka (ed. by Oldenburg), Intro., p. xxxvii.
furnished by Csoma Korösi was based according to Wassiljew, on the Sarvástivāda recension of the Vinaya. This inference finds support in the fact pointed out by Csoma Korösi that a picture representing Buddha in the middle with Sāriputra and Rāhula on his two sides appears on the first leaf of the Tibetan manuscript. The significance of this picture from our point of view lies in this that Sāriputra and Rāhula were the special objects of worship of the Sarvástivādins. Rāhula, a disciple of Sāriputra has been mentioned by Chinese authorities as the founder of the Sarvástivāda school. It also appears from a passage in the manuscript that the Tibetan rendering was made by an inhabitant of Kashmir who was a follower of the Vaibhāṣika school which is nothing but a variant appellation of the Sarvástivādins.

Thus, we see that the Sarvástivādins had a complete Vinaya in all its divisions, viz. (1) Vinaya-vastu, (2) Prātimokṣa sūtṛā, (3) Vinaya-vidhāga, (4) Vinaya-kṣudraka-vastu and (5) Vinaya-uttara-grantha. Prof. Csoma Korösi's analysis of the Tibetan Vinaya furnishes details of the first part of the book only, i.e., the Vinaya-vastu.

By way of illustration of the degree of similarity and dissimilarity existing between the Tibetan and Pali versions of the Vinaya, I give here a rough sketch of the inferences that may be drawn from a comparison of the two versions of the first part of the Vinaya, viz., the Vinaya-vastu. I should mention at the outset that throughout the Vinaya we see as a rule that particular events are taken up by Buddha as the subjects of anecdotes pointing to a moral, which has been reduced by him into rules for the guidance of his disciples; and thus the Vinaya naturally divides itself into two portions one giving the anecdotes and the other the rules though, of course, the former are in every case followed by those of the latter to which they appertained.

In the two versions of the Vinaya there is very little disagreement as to the rules but it is found that the same rule has been elicited from different anecdotes. As for example, in the Pali version, the rule that

---

37 Asiatic Researches, Vol. xx.
38 Wassiliew, Der Buddhismus, p. 96.
40 Corresponding with Mahāvagga of the Pali Vinaya-piṭaka.
41 & 42 Corresponding with Sutta-vibhaṅga of the Pali Vinaya-piṭaka (including Pātimokkha).
43 Corresponding with Cullavagga.
44 Corresponding with Parīcāra.
a person cannot be ordained unless he has obtained the permission of his parents has been educed from the ordination of Rāhula, who had not taken his mother’s consent. In the Sarvāstivāda version appears the same rule but the occasion is differently stated, viz., a young man leaves his home secretly and joins the order without the knowledge of his parents.

It may also be mentioned as a distinctive feature of the Sarvāstivāda version of the Vinaya that it is more diffuse at places than the Pali version. Another distinction lies in the fact that certain points occurring in the former are altogether absent in the latter. In leaf 195 of the second volume of Vinaya-vastu, reference has been made to the abstract meditation carried to excess by the priests of the Śākya clan, and explanations given of the terms relating thereto. In leaf 20, of the same volume, five sorts of qaṅgis (plates of metals) are mentioned as required at the time of prayer and the recitation of the Pratimokṣa. The fourth volume of this book contains 470 leaves in which a complete life of Buddha has been given embodying accounts beginning with the origin of the Śākya race and ending with Devadatta’s (Lhas-byin) efforts to injure Buddha and cause divisions among his disciples. The subjects of the third volume, are not found in the Pali Vinaya, but appear in its Sūtra-pitaka. Thus, the Sarvāstivādins mixed up the Sūtra and Vinaya while the Theravādins kept them separate. The belief current up to now that the one is a redaction of the other is baseless. Both have come from a common source, and by reason of development in different centres, minor accretions have grown round them creating differences in their exterior. The commonness of the names of places, where the various scenes mentioned in the Vinaya are laid, supports the above inference while the mention of Kashmir in connection with its conversion to Buddhism found only in the Sarvāstivāda version speaks a good deal in favour of the aforesaid probability of the existence of a close connection between this school and Kashmir.

45 Dr. Oldenburg, Vinaya, Vol. i, p. 83, (i, 54, 6).
46 Asiatic Researches, Vol. xx, leaf 115 of the Tibetan Dulea.
47 Such as, Rājagrha, Śrāvasti, Sāketa, Vārānasī, Vaiśali and Champa. Asiatic Researches, Vol. xx, p. 44.
48 Some points of agreement between the two versions: Vinaya-vastu, Vol. i, leaves 1-198, contain the subject of entering into the religious order—Pravrajita-vastu corresponding with the Mahākhandhaka paṭhama of Pali Vinaya, Vol. i, p. 98.
Yuan Chwang informs us that the Sarvāstivādins of some places allowed the use of the three kinds of pure flesh and the drink of grape-syrup as an orthodox beverage which was contrary to the principles of Mahāyānam of which he was an adherent. In the Vinaya of the Sarvāstivādins as well as the Theravādins the eating of meat with some restrictions was considered as orthodox. The Sarvāstivādins had a peculiar mode of wearing and colouring their robes not approved by the followers of several schools.

(3) The Abhidharma of Sarvāstivādins.

It is the Abhidharma literature of the Sarvāstivāda school that deserves special attention. Prof. Takakusu has rendered valuable service by furnishing us with the contents of the seven abhidharma books at present unique and preserved in the Chinese translations.

The number of books in this collection is just the same possessed by the Theravādins, the difference being that the latter collection consists of seven independent works while the former of one principle treatise the Jñānaprasthāna Sūtra of Kātyāyani-putra with its six pādas or supplements. They are—

1. Saṅgiti-paryāya of Mahākausthila,
2. Dhātu-kāya of Pūrna,
3. Prajñāpti-sāra of Maudgalyāyana,
4. Dharma-skandha of Sāriputra,

Leaves 193–357 contain “the description of the confession or self-emendation, and general supplication” corresponding with the Pali Uposatha Khandhaka.


Leaves 378–408 (end of this Vol.) and leaves 1–10 (of the next Vol.) “on the subject of leather and skin” corresponding with Cunnakhandhakam pañcamam (Ibid, Vol. i, p. 158).

The second volume of the Dulva contains the chapter on medicaments (leaves 11–78) and garments of priests (leaves 78 ff.) corresponding with Bhesajjakkhandhakam (Vol. i, p. 251) and Kathinakhandhakam and Civarakkhandhakam (Ibid, pp. 265–310).

42 Watters, Yuan Cheang, Vol. i, pp. 63, 60; Korösi’s analysis in the Asiatic Researches, Vol. xx, p. 67 and Vinaya, Mahāvagga, vi, 31. 14. The admissibility of grape-syrup as a drink is found only in a quotation by Dr. Watters. See Watters, op. cit., pp. 237 ff.


45 J.P.T.S., 1904–5, pp. 74f.
(5) Vijñāna-kāya of Devasarman, and
(6) Prakaraṇa-pāda of Vasumitra.

Prof. Takakusu on a comparison of the Abhidharma works of the two schools comes to the conclusion that the "two sets have no real connection." Though there is no apparent connection between the two sets, yet it is clearly noticeable that most of the subjects treated in the two sets are found in the Sūtra-piṭaka but the mode of treatment in one is different from that of the other. The first pāda reveals a close relation of the Abhidharma works of the Sarvāstivādins to the Sūtras of the Theravādins. Prof. Takakusu hints that the first pāda, Saṅgiti-paryāya, has been modelled on the Saṅgiti-suttanta of the Dīgha-Nikāya. He remarks that "the contents...of the ones, twos, threes, etc., (in the suttanta and paryāya) are usually different." But it should be pointed out that the contents do agree with one another except that the instances of ones, twos, threes, etc., as given in the Pali text exceed greatly those of the other as explained below.

If a text on account of its pithy baldness be considered earlier than another on an identical topic presented at length with much elaboration of details, then the Pāda should be regarded as anterior in age to the Suttānta. The statement of Prof. Takakusu giving an earlier origin to the Suttānta cannot from this standpoint be regarded as

63 Dīgha Nikāya, Vol. iii, Suttanta No. xxxiii.
64 E.g. (1) Section on Eka-dharmas :
   All beings live on food, etc., Prof. Takakusu's contents.
   Sabbe sattā āhāraṇaṭṭitikā.
   Sabbe sattā saṅkhāraṇaṭṭitikā. (Dīgha Nikāya, Vol. iii, p. 211.)
(2) Section on Devi-dharmas :
   Mind and matter (nāma-rūpa).
   Means for entering into meditation and coming out of meditation, etc., corresponding with Nos. i and ix of the Saṅgiti Suttānta, I, 9. The Suttānta enumerates 33 Devi-dharmas.
(3) Section on Tri-dharmas :
   Prof. Takakusu's list can be identified with the following numbers of the Suttānta, i, ii, iii, v, vi, xi, xxvi, xxviii, xxxvi, xxxvii, lxvii, except the three āpattiyānūthānas. In the former list, the total number is 36 threes whereas in the Suttānta, it is 60.
(4) Section on Catu-dharmas :
   Prof. Takakusu gives us only seven fours out of the total 21 fours, 5 of the fours correspond with the following number of the Suttānta i, ii, vi, xv, xlvi and the number of fours in the latter is 50.
   In this way all the ten dharmas can be traced but it will be noticed that the Suttānta list is much longer than the Pāda list.
unimpeachable. His next remark that the "work was compiled after
the council of Vaisālī which was held chiefly for suppressing the ten
theses of Vajjian bhikkhus," based on a passage of the Pāda referring
to the Vajjian bhikkhus of Pāva, does not rest on a sound basis. Mr.
Wogihara was right in rendering the passage to the effect that it was
Nighanta Naṭaputta of Pāva and not the Vajjian bhikkhus. The
Vajjian bhikkhus, again, were inhabitants of Vaisālī and not of Pāva
the residents of which place, namely, the Mallas were partly followers
of Nighanta Naṭaputta and partly of Buddha. The object of Sāri-
putra in putting the dhārma as the summation of a few metaphysical
and religious truths for its followers was to avert the danger of a split
in the Buddhist church as had happened in the Jaina saṅgha just at
that time. The close correspondence between the Suttanta and
Paryāya specially in their introductory and concluding passages
shows that one is based upon the other and that the author is the same
for both. Prof. Takakusu preferred the tradition which ascribed the
authorship to Mahākaushṭhila but the coincidence of the other tradition
(ascribing it to Sāriputra) with that of Sangiti Suttanta leads us to
infer that Sāriputra was the author of the work.

The fourth Pāda, the Dharmasūkha, is said in the colophon
to its Chinese translation to be "the most important of the Abhī-
dharma works, and the fountain-head of the Sarvāstivāda system."
The subjects treated contain nothing which can be claimed by the
Sarvāstivāda system as its own. They constitute the essence of
Buddhism and if the claim of the Sarvāstivādins be admitted, that
of the Theravādins of a similar nature cannot be denied an equal force
on the same ground. It is only natural that, as Prof. Takakusu points
out, the Sangiti-Paryāya should often quote this book, traversing
as they do the same ground.

Thirteen sections, again, of the above book are found in the
seventh section of the Prakaraṇa pāda, "Discussions on one thousand
questions," the author of which is Vasumitra. I think that as
Vasumitra was a Sarvastivadin, the section was meant to be a supple-
ment discussing the expositions embodied in the Dharmasūkha.

The composition of the second pāda, Dhātu-kāya, is attributed
to either Vasumitra or Pārna according to different traditions.

57 J.P.T.S., 1904-5, p. 115.
58 J.P.T.S., 1904-5, p. 106.
Preference should be given to the former tradition in view of the fact that this *Pāda* is only an enlarged treatment of the topics contained in section 4 of the *Prakaraṇa-pāda* of Vasumitra.

The fifth *Pāda*, *Vijñāna-kāya*, is said to have been the work of Deva-śarmā, an arhat of Viśoka (near Kausāmbi) who lived sometime before the 5th century after Buddha. Yuan Chwang informs us that Deva-śarmā refuted the views of Moginlin (Moggallāna) who denied the reality of past and future⁴⁹ one of the chief principles of the Sarvāstivāda doctrine. This remark of Yuan Chwang finds support in the fact that the first section of this *Pāda* records the opinion of Maudgalyāyana about *pudgalas*, *indriyas*, etc., the next section containing *inter alia* a discussion of the theory of *pudgala*⁵⁰ (soul). This work was highly appreciated by the Vaibhāṣikas who gave it a canonical position which was denied to it by the Sautrāntika.⁵¹

The third *Pāda*, *Prajñāpti-sāra*, gives an account of the life of Buddha and its authorship has been ascribed to Mahā-Maudgalyāyana.⁵²

---

⁵⁰ J.P.T.S., 1904-5, p. 108.  
⁵¹ Watters, op. cit., p. 374.  
⁵² J.P.T.S., 1904-5.
CONTAMINATION IN LANGUAGE.

DR. I. J. S. TARAPOREWALA, B.A., PH.D., Bar-at-Law, Professor of Comparative Philology in the University of Calcutta.

Modern Linguistics takes into consideration all the subtle psychological processes that influence human speech. We cannot obviously frame "laws" for this aspect of language just as we do, for instance, in the case of Phonetics. But we can trace the probable causes which give rise to a particular linguistic result observed. Neither can we clearly classify the various observations under several distinct headings, because, depending as these do on mental processes, these would tend to overlap each other.

Contamination is one special type of phenomenon observed in all languages, which is the result of subtle and delicate psychological adjustments in the brain of the speaker. We must never forget, while dealing with linguistics, that behind the language there is the human being that is speaking. Paul, perhaps the greatest living authority on the psychological aspect of language, thus defines "Contamination":—

"We call the process 'contamination' when two synonymous or similar-sounding forms or constructions force themselves simultaneously, or at least in the very closest succession, into our consciousness, so that one part of the one replaces, or, it may be, ousts a corresponding part of the other; the result being that a new form arises in which some elements of the one are confused with some elements of the other." ¹

To this definition I would add contamination of ideas as well.

In certain respects it is very hard to distinguish between

¹ The above definition is from the English version of Paul's book by Strong, Logemann and Wheeler. The actual definition, as given in Paul's own words in the 4th edition (1909), is as follows: "Unter Kontamination verstehe ich den Vorgang, dass zwei synonyme oder irgendwie verwandte Ausdrucksformen sich neben einander ins Bewusstsein dringen, so dass keine von beiden rein zur Geltung kommt, sondern eine neue Form entsteht, in der sich die Elemente der einen mit Elementen der andern mischen."
contamination as defined above and "Analogy." Still, a few points of difference may be noted.

1. Contamination is essentially an individual peculiarity and also momentary. Often it takes the form of a *lapsus linguæ*, as far as word-contamination is concerned. Hence such instances are not necessarily repeated by others and they do not acquire a permanent place in the language and become "usual" as analogies tend to do.

2. Contamination may take place between one word and the meaning of another word which has a somewhat similar sound.

3. Contamination also takes place in sentence-constructions. Here, too, the result of the mix-up may give such an odd type of sentence that it is effectively prevented from becoming "usual" in the language. Sentence-contamination, however, tends to persist much more than word-contamination, because "two sentences rolled into one" give a degree of facility of expression which is valuable in speech and writing. Hence sentence-contamination tend generally to become "usual."

4. In analogy the alteration of one form is due to a more or less conscious compliance with a rule abstracted from other examples of a group to which the new form does not, strictly speaking, belong. Contamination does not take cognisance of any special rule. One single more or less similar or synonymous form may suffice.

**Word-Contamination.**

If we consider how words are contaminated, we need not be surprised to know that comparatively few contaminated words can become permanent or "usual." "The very grotesqueness of the result would probably bar the way to the spreading of the word." We may, however, try to arrange them in various classes, though it must be remembered that such a classification is by no means exhaustive nor does it avoid overlapping:

1. A great many cases are due to a *lapsus linguæ*. Such, for instance, are what are known in English as *Spoonerisms*, where two

---

2 "Auch dieser Vorgang ist natürlich zunächst individuell und momentan." — Paul.

3 So named after Dr. Spooner of Oxford, who did suffer from a tendency to "slipping of the tongue." A great many of the Spoonerisms are however later inventions—such, for example, as refers to the one to which the Doctor is said to have owed his matrimonial felicity. The story says that once at a tea-party he, at the command
consecutive words mutually exchange letters or syllables; e.g., soy and jorrow (joy and sorrow), or Iceland’s greasy mountains (Greenland’s icy mountains). Of course these can never become “usual,” but may serve as jokes; one of the best quoted is that fathered upon Dr. Spooner of Oxford, that his luggage consisted of two rags and a bug (two bags and a rug).

2. Another type of word-contamination is where synonymous forms near enough in sound are mixed up together. These very often have a good chance of surviving side by side with the other form, most usually with a change of meaning. For instance, O. Eng. byrën (a load) became burthen and was confused with burden (the refrain of a song) which is from O. Fr. bourdon. So also in the Gujarati proverb नेच्छि मासा करतो काठा मासा सारा, the word काठा was originally काठ (one only in name) and was confused with काठा (<Skt. काठ: one-eyed), and now the proverb is explained as meaning “an uncle with one eye is better than no uncle,” while the real meaning is that “an uncle in name is better than no uncle.” Another good example is the new-coined word used in India mainly by Indian writers, the word cowshade. Here the shade is evidently the result of a confusion with shed, doubtless under the influence of words like sunshade. Such words arise mainly on account of a misunderstanding of synonyms by half-educated people or by foreigners. Another good example from English is shamefaced for the original shamefast.

3. Malapropisms. These are also due to a confusion of words, but here the confusion is due to just a bare resemblance in the sound and none in the meaning. Sheridan has used this very effectively in his wonderful character sketch of Mrs. Malaprop, whence the name. Thus, from Mrs. Malaprop herself, we hear of the “allegory (alligator) on the Nile.” Other instances (within my own personal experience) are “He is a stamina (stigma) to the family”; “He standards (tenders) his apology.”

The queer word allegator (one who alleges) also is an example, which may become “usual” in comic writing; but generally these words have no currency beyond a limited circle of friends who have known the original joke.

of the hostess, approached the young daughter of the house in order to request her “to make tea,” but his actual words were: “Miss, will you kindly take me?” And she did!

Some very fine instances are found in Sir A. Quiller-Couch’s entertaining little book, Troy Town.
4. Portmanteau-words. This is the name given to those words which have "two meanings packed up in one word" like a portmanteau. They are formed of two words syncopated or fused into one by the loss of certain letters or syllables from each. The talented and eccentric author of Alice in Wonderland, Lewis Carroll, has given a very fine set of such words in his poem on the "Jabberwock." These words too are more or less ephemeral, but sometimes they are catching and are definitely accepted into the language. Two at least of Carroll's portmanteau-words deserve to be permanent acquisitions in the language. These are slithy (lithe plus slimy) and galumphing (galloping plus triumphing). Such words become "usual" and are accepted in the language very often, but there seems to be no fixed rule which may be formulated with regard to the conditions of their acceptance beyond the whim of the public. As examples of accepted portmanteau-words may be quoted: Fr. oreste (orage plus tempeste), and in English, cameleopard (camel and leopard), anecdotage (anecdote and dotage), electrocution (electric execution), Bakerloo (Baker Street and Waterloo), and the quite recent Americanisms, cinematinées (cinema matinées) and filmads (film-advertisements). There is also the remarkable word govertisement, quite recently coined by a very clever person during "the universal eruption of posters to subscribe to the War-Loan," and "indicating the emergence of a new art—that of Government by advertisement." Residents of Calcutta are also familiar with the firm of Carnobis (Carr and Mahalanobis). To this same type may belong the words made up of initials of several words, such as, Cabal the name of a notorious ministry of the reign of Charles II of England, whose members were Clifford, Ashley, Buckingham, Arlington and Lauderdale. The Great War has also given us the immortal Anzac (Australia and New Zealand Army Corps) and the much maligned Dora (Defence of the Realm Act).

5. Confusion of words and grammatical inflections is a fruitful source of contamination. These words are often found in standard

---

5 Through the Looking-glass and what Alice found there.

6 This was the name suggested for a new underground route started in London, being composed of the names of the two terminal stations. It was a remarkable circumstance that though this name was acceptable to the public, the name suggested for another such route and composed on the same principles was rejected.

7 The accidental resemblance to the Hebrew word kabal (secret) gave added pique to this name.
literature and are hard to distinguish from analogy. The only point of distinction between these and analogy seems to be that these former do not become "usual" but are mere sporadic curiosities of literature. Examples are Vedic स्रभाव (for स्रभाव—स्रभास)⁸ and forms, which Whitney called barbarous, like पचलितराम्, पचलितमास्, अल्पमलराम् etc.⁹ So also the form मात्र (RV., x. 35.2),¹⁰ which is contaminated by पत्र.⁶

6. Another case of contamination which is hard to distinguish from analogy is what is called "double terminations." This happens when a speaker forgets that a word has already got a grammatical ending and, therefore, adds another ending to it of a similar signification, e.g., worser, leastest, most unkindest, and in Skt. पश्वल्लना.¹¹ देवा (देवा plus यस्),¹² अथुतम, etc. When in the course of development of a language the older terminations are forgotten such forms with double endings become "usual"; e.g., songstress (where the -ster is an old fem. ending),¹³ children (childer was the old plu.).¹⁴ The अथुतम from Skt. has also tended to become "usual," in other words, the old superlative अथ्य is felt to be a positive form. Sometimes we get a queer double working of contamination and analogy together. The word aftermost seems to be a superlative with the ending -most. But really the word was in M.Eng. aftermeste < O.Eng. aftermost, which latter itself has got the double ending -ter-mest. Goth. shows a similar form with a double superlative termination, astumists (af-tum-aists). The -most in the Mod. Eng. form is doubtless due to analogy.

**Sentence-Contamination.**

Contamination, however, plays a far more important part in the building up of sentences. Here the origin is to be traced to a confusion of two sentences while writing or speaking. Many such contaminated sentences, by their very force and pithiness, tend to become "usual."

---

⁸ Whitney, Sanskrit Grammar, § 732.
⁹ The tara and tama are perhaps here words meaning "better" and "best." In Av. we find the peculiar form taraśātō (better created).
¹⁰ Instead of the regular मात्र.
¹¹ RV., iv. 54. 3 and v. 48. 5.
¹² Cf. Av. daśatīha.
¹³ Cf. spinster, lit., "the woman who spins."
¹⁴ The plu. in Ger. is Kinder, showing the -er suffix.
and become regularly accepted as standard. We may also attempt to classify sentence-contamination.

1. Putting together as co-ordinate two entirely different ideas, which have no connection logical or otherwise, forms one type. The putting together is due to the two sentences having several words in common. Jane Austen and Dickens are very fond of such constructions. The effect is quite startling and novel, hence these tend to become accepted, e.g., "She was roused from her seat and her reflections"; "Miss Bollo went home in a flood of tears and a sedan-chair." In both these examples we see that the predicate part is common to both the parts which make up the full sentence. The principle is the same as in the case of "portmanteau-words" and we may with justice call these "portmanteau-sentences." The technical name for these is *Zeugma*.

2. The above mentioned variety is not defective grammatically. But in other kinds of sentence-contamination we have a result which is obviously defective in grammar. These are allied to the "slips of the tongue" in word contamination. There is a mental slip, and the author or speaker begins with a sentence of one type and ends with another quite different. We find such constructions even in the best authors but very few of them become "usual" in the language. Thus in Shakespeare we read:

Why do I trifle thus with his despair
Is done to cure it. (Lear, iv. 6.)

This is a mixing up of "Why I trifle is to cure" and "My trifling is done to cure." 15

The RV., too, has got quite a number of examples of this sort. Thus, in the cases where the vocative is conjoined with the nominative we have a contamination of this sort; e.g., in इन्नक्र नोम पिवल ठहसुते, we see that the sentence is made up of इन्नक्र मोम पिवल and लं च ठहसुते नोम पिवल. Similarly, in विषय देव यज्ञांनाच मोदता, we have a confusion of the same type. In cases like नोम मन्यते पिवलान, there is also a combining of two constructions. Strict grammar would require the word पिवलान (as may be seen in यज्ञां रिवल रिवल). Undoubtedly the confusion is due to the subject being unexpressed, and therefore the

15 Abbot, *Shakespearean Grammar*, § 411: the whole of the section entitled "Irregularities" (pars. 406-418) may be read with advantage in this connection.
nom. प्रत्ययान्त refers to the subject. The सोमम् too adds to the confusion. In some cases the cause is "case-attraction," as in इत्येत्र विद्विन्ये ब्रवो: (Taitt. Sam.) where the subject इत्येत्र has attracted the object into the nom. case. A very remarkable case is the phrase कामोऽर्थं कल्प (Taitt. Sam.), which is a combination of the two कामोऽर्थं कल्प and कामोऽर्थं मूला. Whitney explains this as a "pregnant construction" with a "predicate nominative instead of an objective predicate in the accusative." All "pregnant constructions" are, of course, the result of contamination.

Another construction of this type is found in Skt. with the indeclinable इति. Here we often get a nom. case used before the इति, which is grammatically unconnected with anything else and the word logically connected with this nom. may be in any other case. Thus, खर्मेऽलोक इति येन वदल्ल्य (AV.). Phrases like अमुक इत्येत्र प्रकाशितम् are common in Skt. and we find similar phrases in Marathi; अमुक यानुष्प्रकाश वेले, in both of which the pronoun is more or less redundant.

3. One very fruitful source of contamination is the loose use of the negative. This is very often done by uneducated people for the sake of emphasis, e.g. "I never said nothing to nobody". The same desire for emphasis is responsible for the double negatives found in good literature, especially when other words intervene: thus, "No son . . . . might not marry" (Ascham). In Skt. we find double negative prefixes (an-a), as in अनविनिधक. Sometimes the outward form shows only one negative, but this is due to the fact that one other word has got a negative significance. In such cases the confusion is even more natural, e.g., "You may deny that you were not the cause."

Sanskrit shows a very noteworthy use of the negative particle न, the इवार्थे न,17 or the negation used as a particle of comparison. It has been very ingeniously explained as being due to a very special mental process. The two things may be so similar that, in order to distinguish the one from the other, we have to say that "this one is not that"; thus the sentence खङ्गा वल्ले न रामो वसिन्दस्म् (RV., vii. 86. 5), if the above explanation is correct, may be explained as being made up of खङ्गा रामो

---

16 § 268a.
17 Peterson, Hymns from the Rigveda (1st series), p. 65: see also the St. Petersburg Dictionary, under न.
In Vedic Skt. this construction has become quite "usual."

4. Closely related to these are double comparatives and superlatives, one or two of which have been already instanced above. These are partly due to a desire for emphasis, and partly due to the fact that an original comparative or superlative form has ceased to be felt as such owing to phonetic decay or some other cause. But a more strange form is the confusion of comparative and superlative constructions: e.g. in the very common constructions "the best of you two" or "the better one among you all." Similarly, from Sanskrit we may quote अश्रम: अश्रमाणि घारिणो वदा (Mbh.). Closely akin to this type is the following example from a recent writer. "Mr. Stanley was the only one of his predecessors who slaughtered the natives of the region he passed through." This sounds quite "Irish", but it has a magnificent Classic precedent, the beautiful lines of Milton:

Adam the goodliest man of men since born
His sons: the fairest of her daughters Eve. (Par. Lost, iv. 324–25.)

5. The last two instances might almost be explained as due to a confusion of the time element. This arises from the idea of the past time rising into the mind simultaneously with that of present time. As an example we may quote from Shakespeare,

These dispositions which of late transform you
From what you rightly are. (Lear, i. 4.)

In Latin there is a similar construction used in the special case of the present imperative with the adverb iamdudum to mean past time, as in:

Iamdudum sumite poenas (Thou shouldst have submitted to the punishment immediately). (Virgil, ii. 103.)

This is a confusion between "Submit thou immediately" and "Thou shouldst have submitted long ago." A similar construction of the "historical present" in Skt. with the particle खः is another example of

19 In fact only two "degrees of comparison" (not three) are needed, if we are quite logical. Languages, as they progress, definitely move in this direction. This is evidenced by the French mode of forming the "degrees of comparison"—by prefixing plus and le plus,—and in Persian by the suffixes تار (tar) and تارین (tarin), with very slight differences between the two, as it were, indicating their essential similarity. In Bengali and other Aryan Vernaculars of India usually there is no difference made between the comparative and superlative; e.g., राम गोबिंद चेये बड़ and राम सब सब ोजे बड़.
this sort of confusion and is very probably due to a vivid imagination. The narrator in these cases, as it were, actually sees the events passing before his eyes and expresses them just as if they were happening at the moment of speaking. The present and the future are also thus confused similarly in all languages; here also the imagination leaps forward into the future. Thus we say: "I am going to Benares next month." The so-called First Future (the Periphrastic Future) in Skt. has evidently arisen by exactly this process of confusing the present and the future. गन्ताकिम गन्ताकिम means literally "I am a goer" (i.e. "I am going"), in other words, "I will go." The early use of these forms indicates this confusion clearly for the forms bear either tense value, e.g., ठुना यो ठुन सबि- लील वाण दता मधानि (RV., iv. 17. 8), where either बाणि or मधानि may be taken as being understood.¹⁹

6. Among verbal forms there is often a confusion of moods as well. The three moods, subjunctive, optative and imperative, are very frequently mixed up in actual usage. They merge so insensibly and gradually into each other that, though broadly speaking they are distinct enough, there is inevitable confusion in many cases. In Skt. this confusion has led to the almost complete suppression of the subjunctive as an independent mood. The 1st person forms in the Imperative in Classical Sanskrit are in form the same as the subjunctive and very often they are subjunctive in meaning also. As an instance we may quote from the Hitopadeśa: कथनेत्व मुग्द्वत्त विषयनाम् (How may they be made good?), and from the Atharva Veda we get a sentence where all the moods are co-ordinated together and have exactly the same meaning: इयमेव नारी पति विदेश...तुवान् पुजतामस्वि भवावि गव्या पति सुभगा विराघ्नि (O Agni! may this woman find a spouse; giving birth to sons she shall become a chieftainess: having attained a spouse let her rule in happiness). In the sentence किं करेतु म् (What shall he do?) the confusion is between the interrogative and the imperative.

7. The inability, clearly to distinguish between the exact senses of various forms leads to what is called a "pregnant construction," where one form contains within itself the significance of another. The contamination of moods as mentioned above may also be regarded as a type of pregnant construction. Another variety of this is to be found in Skt. in the confusion of cases. Here, too, the line of

¹⁹ Whitney, §§ 271d and 942-947.
demarcation being vague, there is a great lot of overlapping. This takes place in Skt. most often with the genitive case. The sūtra संरेण्यमानाय the यथा is necessarily so vague that confusion is bound to arise. Such, e.g., is the genitive of the recipient—राजा निवेदितम् (communicated to the King,—and made his in consequence). Similarly the partitive genitive is a pregnant construction of another type. निश्चतिः (drink—a portion—of the Soma). The same idea lies at the root of the partitive genitive in French. This shades off by imperceptible degrees into phrases like "a drink of water" or the Skt. ददात नोगुम्तस्य, which may be called the "objective genitive." Another type is the "genitive of authority or rule," e.g. रेणिश्च वस्तुगम् (RV., i. 170. 5), यातायंस्या निरांजानि (AV). Here the confusion seems to be between the two ideas, "to rule over" and "to be master of." In a few cases the genitive is used for the ablative, as in, यो राजा: प्रविष्णालि नुस्च (whoever receives from a greedy king), the confusion being between the ideas "receiving from the king" and "receiving that which is his." In the phrase यथा में (hear from me) परम वचः a similar sort of confusion has arisen. Other cases have also become similarly confused and this confusion and the consequent overlapping have been mainly responsible for the reduction in the number of cases in the modern I.-E. languages. The two prepositions सन्धि and विना when strictly applied should be used with the instrumental and the ablative respectively, but owing to the confusion of ideas and also to "analogy by contrast" we get strange phrases like: विकृतियुता (separated from the calves), वयमेकपदे तया वियोगः प्रवचया (this sudden separation from her, the beloved). 69 We may compare with these the English phrases "part with" and "part from" and the colloquial "differ with." The ablative used for the genitive, as in स्मिथापेन्द्र जगान is due to an obvious confusion. A construction of this type with the locative may be instanced in प्राम भेदिशाम (he fell—so as to be—upon the earth); and also in स इतिवेदुगृष्ण (RV., i. 1. 4) the locative implies that the offering goes unto to the gods and stays there.

8. In Skt. some very quaint constructions with numerals may be quoted which are due to contamination, though the exact process of their origin is not quite clear. Thus द्राक्षरम शुतास् means 112, but the accent of द्राक्षरम shows that it is an adjective. 71 The literal sense of

69 Note that in these instances the preposition as such is absent.
71 Whitney, § 479, the numeral would be accented द्राक्षरम.
this phrase seems to be "one hundred characterised by (an increase of) twelve." This can be understood in this manner, but there are some phrases with a "wholly illogical construction" to be found in the Brāhmaṇas, which are almost impossible to explain. Thus देवे जनमित्वः श्रेष्ठः is not as we may expect $2 \times 134 (=268)$ but 234, and चौरणी जनमित्वः श्रेष्ठः is not $3 \times 160 (=480)$ but 360. We may here explain the जनमित्वः as being influenced by case-attraction, but even then this is not a sufficient explanation. Similarly in the Gujarati multiplication tables we get phrases like वैधीवि (234) and वैधवि (360) which form almost exact parallels.

9. Another well-marked variety of contamination is called "attraction" where a word takes a wrong case or number owing to the influence of a neighbouring word. The double dual in the devata dvandva compounds where each member is in the dual, e.g. मिन्नारस्वा. So also in the sentences वासवल्क्को दो प्रायो चक्षूसमि, इत्यष तै देवा रेखाय नातिजय, यथा महाय प्रभुरात्तमोभिः प्रभुविवेशः प्रभुः प्रभुः उ (RV., x.126.6).

In English we frequently get a confusion of numbers owing to proximity, as,

Equality of two domestic powers
Breed scrupulous faction. (Ant. and Cleo. i. 3.)

The use of the form ending in -s is also a notable feature in Shakespeare, e.g.:
These high wild hills and rough uneven ways
Draws out our miles, and makes them wearisome. (Rich. II ii. 3.)

Abbott regards these as examples of the early northern plural in -s, but these may also be due to the attraction of other words in -s in close proximity. Thus,

The imperious seas breeds monsters. (Cymb. iv. 2.)

10. There is often a redundant pronoun (mostly in the accusative case) which is used as it appears for the sake of emphasis or clearness. We find a large number of cases in Shakespeare and other older writers, e.g.:

We'll hear him what he says. (Ant. and Cleo. v. 1.)
Mark King Richard how he looks. (Rich. II, iii 7.)

In Skt. also we get phrases like परी नो पार्ष्व यज्ञन्म्, where there is the redundant relative. This construction is extremely common in the Avesta. We may also mention here phrases like स यथः, सोंश्रमस्, स वमस्, etc., and the vulgar English "this 'ere."

22 Cf. Gujarati वीरांगो, भण्डो, etc. 25 Abbott, Shakespearian Grammar, § 333.
11. Sometimes it happens that a word mentioned earlier in the sentence is forgotten and is, therefore, repeated without any reason. Of course, if the sentence is long and involved, or if there is any special need for the repetition, it is justifiable as a rhetorical device. Prepositions in English very often suffer from this sort of needless repetition. Thus even from good writers we get:

To what form but that he is, should wit larded with malice and malice forced wit turn him to? (Tr. and C., v. 1.)

I bemoan Lord Carlisle, for whom, although I have never seen him and he may never have heard of me, I have a sort of personal liking for him. (Miss Mitford.)

In Skt., too, this device is to be noted with prepositions, chiefly for the sake of emphasis; e.g., अधिष्ठाय वर्षसाधनानां (AV.), उदेननुसारं नय (AV.).

12. Change of thought is also largely responsible for contamination and this approaches closest to our definition of contamination. A very good instance is:

One of the prettiest touches was when at the relation of the queen's death .... how attentiveness wounded his daughter. (Win. T., v. 2.)

Here the confusion of thought is responsible for the change from time to manner in the adverbs.\(^2\)

Another example is:

Rather proclaim it, Westmoreland, through our host
That he which hath no stomach to this fight
Let him depart. (Hen. V., iv. 3.)

Here the diction of the proclamation suddenly changes under the influence of indignation to command.

13. Change of thought in the working out of a metaphor may result in a grotesque mixed metaphor, which is popularly called a "bull." Serious writers and speakers have made such "bulls" but they are only to be quoted and never become "usual." Examples:

Mr. Speaker, I smell a rat, I see it floating in the air, but I shall put salt upon its tail and nip it in the bud.

The scourge of tyranny had breathed his last.
This pillar of the state,
Hath swallowed hook and bait.\(^3\)

14. One fruitful source of contamination is the influence of foreign languages. This is specially noticeable in India where the English-educated imitate English syntax in writing in the Vernaculars. This

\(^2\) Abbott, op. cit. § 415.
\(^3\) King's English, p. 204.
gives rise very often to very strange sounding Vernacular sentences, when the writers happen (as is but too often the case) to be worse educated in their mother-tongue than in English. Thus, in the very common phrase, तो जो के used by Parsi writers, for the English "although" the first word is quite redundant. Such sentences become accepted after a while in the Vernaculars as quite correct. The Latinisms in English writers, especially like those in Milton, are of this type.

15. Very often writers join together two phrases or idioms which may have some words in common; but the whole combination sounds quite incongruous. For example:

The railway has done all and more than was expected of it.
Things temporal had and would alter.

To the same type belong two sentences joined together which do not seem harmonious together. These are styled unequal yokefellows, a very appropriate name: 26

Its hands require strengthening and its resources increased.

* Which * differs from * that * and * who * in being used both as an adjective as well as a noun. 27

16. Wrongly used idioms, misquotations, anachronisms, pleonasmata, tautology, etc., may also be regarded as contamination; e.g., the famous Bengali version of the well-known English idiom, "To set the Hugli on fire." 28

My publisher was not like Shakespeare's Cassio strictly 'an honourable man.' 29 (Should be Cassius.)

But they had gone on adding misdeed to misdeed, they had blundered after blunder. 30

It remains to be seen whether . . . the footing which she (Germany) has won will form the starting point for further achievements or will merely represent . . . the end of the beginning. 31

Petty spites of the village squire. (The true quotation is: "Pigmy spite of the village spire.")

Dr. K. admitted that his opinion had been consulted (confusing "Dr. K. had been consulted" and "his opinion was taken"). 32

26 Ibid. pp. 311 ff.
27 This is from the late Prof. Henry Sweet. Even Homer nods!
28 Of course the Hugli is used for "the Thames" in the original. Undoubtedly the name Hugli gives local colour!
30 Marie Corelli. 30 L. Courtney. 31 Perhaps this is an intentional blunder.
32 This and the other instances have been quoted in King’s English and in G.C. Whitworth’s Indian English, both extremely fine books.
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THE INFLECTED PASSIVE IN BENGALI.

Primitive Indo-European does not seem to have possessed a passive conjugation. In the Aryan (Indo-Iranian) period the passive developed out of the middle or reflexive, but it was confined to the present stem and to the third person singular of the aorist only. The distinctive affix of this inflected passive was -yā- in the present stem, and the personal terminations of the middle voice were employed. Old Indo-Aryan (Vedic and Sanskrit) has preserved this passive. In Middle Indo-Aryan (Old, Middle and Later or Apabhramsa Prakrits) the conjunctival system underwent the greatest decay imaginable, but the passive was retained, being found in the present indicative and the imperative. The -yā- affix occurs as -ijja- > -ija- or as -iā- in Middle Indo-Aryan (“Prakrit” and Apabhramsa), or is assimilated with a preceding consonant. The middle inflections of course are changed for those of the active; and the passive is extended to a number of neuter roots, forming deponents, in Prakrit and Apabhramsa. The New Indo-Aryan languages inherited the -ijja- > -ija- or -iā- passive from Apabhramsa, but it is not preserved in all of them. Early in the history of the New I-Ar. tongues, the analytical mode of expressing the passive came into being, and in most of them the old inflected passive fell into desuetude. The languages of the West have preserved it, but those of the Midland, the South and the East have either entirely lost it, or has retained it as an obsolete or archaic form. Western Panjabi, Sindhi and Rajasthani, for instance, employ -īj- or -ī to form the passive: e.g. W. Panjabi mārdā < mārānda- striking, mārīndā being struck; cāhdā wanting, cāhindā being wanted; padhē reads, padhīē is read; Sindhi karijē is done, padhijē is read; Marwari karanō doing, karijanō being done. Modern Gujarāti has ī only in -ie, a 3rd sing present passive form which is used in a reflexive sense as a
substitute for the 1st plur. active [e.g., hū karū I do = aham karōmi, but amē karē we do = asmābhīh kriyate instead of vaiyam kurmah]. and in all other cases substitutes the potential passive in ā.1

The western languages are thus more or less conservative in the matter of preservation of this inherited form. The Midland languages, Brajbhakha (and Awadhi) for instance, have curtailed the old passive, but relies do occur: e.g. Bras. māraj strikes, māriyaj is struck. Bhandarkar and Tessitori have given instances 2 from the Middle Awadhi of Tulasidasā. The modern Hindi respectful imperative or prepositive forms like kijiyē or kariyē please do have in all likelihood been influenced by the passive, if it is not of passive origin.3 An expression like kapadā cāhiyē ‘cloth to sell’ is undoubtedly a passive one, where cāhiyē = is wanted: compare the Bengali cāi in fē 饬 ki cāi what do you want? literally what is-wanted! hōmer ala cē tōmār āsā cāi you must come, literally your coming is-wanted: Bengali cāi, Hindi cāhiyē are from a Middle Indo-Aryan passive form *cāhia(d)i = Old Indo-Aryan *ca(g)h- yatē. Compare these with fē 饬 ki cāō what do you want and tū m āsāt tumi āsītē cāō you must come, where cāō = fē cāhā, 2nd pers. (plural), present and imperative = cāhaha (Skt. -atha and -ata). However, the -ī- or -īja- -īja- affix for the passive is quite common in the language of the Prākṛta Paṅgala, which represents the stage immediately before Modern Hindi; and the loss of this affix is quite a remarkable feature in Hindi when compared with Rajasthani. The -ī- passive was also quite frequent in Early Marathi, as Bhandarkar has noticed it4; but it seems to have died out in Modern Marathi.

It would be interesting to see how far the inflected passive is preserved in Old and Middle Bengali and in other Magadhan languages. Till recently, we had no materials for the study of Bengali prior to the 16th century. But with the publication of the 47 Cāryāpaḍas in

---
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Mahamahopadhyaya Hara Prasada Shastri's Hājār Bacharēr Purāṇa Bāngalā Bhūṣāy Baudhā Gān Ō Dōhā ¹ (Buddhist Songs and Couplets in Bengali Language a Thousand Years Old), and of the Śrī-Kṛṣṇa-Kirtana ² of Cauḍīdāsa under the able editorship of Babu Basanta Ranjan Ray, students have been provided with texts of unique importance in the study of Old and Middle Bengali. The Baudhā Gān Ō Dōhā contains the following texts: (i) the Cavyā-cavya-viniścaya, consisting of a number of mystic songs (Cavyās) of a late Mahāyāna Buddhist (the Schajiya) cult, with a Sanskrit tīkā: the language of these songs, showing New I-Ar. simplification of Prakrit double consonants, is Old Bengali ³; (ii) and (iii) Dōhākōśas by Sarōjā-vajra and Kṛṣṇa-pāta, consisting of distichs

¹ Published by the Vangiya Sahitya Parishad in the Bengali year 1323.
² Doubt has been expressed by some scholars as to the Bengali character of the language of the Cavyāpadas. The text has been received in a very corrupt form, but certain peculiarities which are preeminently Bengali are noticeable in the language and spirit of the poems. Bengali traits in the grammar are: use of -e, -ē for the nominative, and for the instrumental, -ka, -re in the dative, -ta, -e in the locative, -ra, -era in the genitive, in the declension of nouns; -il- -ib- (not -al- -ab- of Bihari) for the past and future bases of the verb; -i̯a for the conjunctive historical, and -ile for the conjunctive conditional; and verbal noun in -ana. The above are most noteworthy in morphology. All other grammatical peculiarities can be explained in the light of historical grammar, with reference to forms actually existing in Middle Bengali and in Modern Bengali, standard and dialectal. The Bengali character of the vocabulary has been thoroughly discussed by the editor. Some of the idioms are peculiarly Bengali. There are parallel passages to and echoes of some of the lines in later Bengali literature. The local colour of many of the songs (e.g. the frequent reference to boats) is quite characteristic of Bengal; and there are some references to Vanga or East Bengal. The Sahajiyā tradition, moreover, with similar poems, was carried on in Bengal only; and later Vaishnavi and other developments, religious and literary, seem to have some Sahajiyā background. From a careful study of the language, the present writer is convinced that it is Old Bengali, and not a mixed jargon or a Māgadhī Apabhraṃśa.

There are however, especially in some of the poems, a number of forms which are not Bengali or Magadhan, but are peculiar to the Sauraṣēṇī Apabhraṃśa: e.g. nouns and passive participles in -u, -iu. pronominal forms like jō, sō, tāsu, etc. A Western Sauraṣēṇī dialect, as a precursor of Bajpbhakha and (Modern) Hindostani, was current in the Magadhan area, as a vernacular of culture, and people in Eastern India used to compose in it (e.g. Sarōjā, Kṛṣṇa and other Buddhistic writers, and Vidyāpati, who wrote both in their vernaculars, Old Bengali and Maithili, and in this Western speech). It would not be strange that there would be some influence of this Western speech on Old Bengali, especially when the former had a greater and more ancient literary prestige. Moreover, the MS. of the Cavyāpadas was written in Nepal: the scribe apparently did not know the language, and the substitution of forms from the more familiar Sauraṣēṇī speech was easy. (Professor Hermann Jacobi of Bonn has recognised that the language of the Cavyā is Old Bengali: Sanatkumārcaritam, Munich, 1921, pp. XXVII, XXVIII.) The Cavyā songs would seem to represent Old Bengali of 950-1200 A.C.
and poems in a Western Apabhramsa dialect based on the Śauraseṇi Prākṛta, with a Sanskrit commentary; and (iv) the Dākāryāvaca, which contains verses in Sanskrit and a very debased kind of Apabhramsa, which has not been identified or explained. The language of the Dōhākōṣas, a Western Apabhramsa with a slight Eastern influence, presents a stage earlier than that of the Čaryāpādas, which, according to their discoverer and editor, is Old Bengali of the 10th–11th centuries.

The Śrī-Kṛṣṇa-Kīrttana is our earliest Middle Bengali text; and fortunately for us, it has been preserved in a MS. which is, according to expert opinion, contemporaneous with the author (Caṇḍidāsa, second half of the 14th century). The phonetics and morphology of the languages of the Čaryās and of the Ś.K.K. bear testimony to their genuineness and antiquity; and, until further texts of similar antiquity come to light, they will have the same place in the study of the Bengali speech the languages of Layamon, Orm and Chaucer which, as well as Old English, have in the study of English.

The language of the Dōhākōṣas shows some cases of the -i- or -iija-, -ija-, as well as the assimilated passive, e.g. Bauddha Gāṇ Ō Dōhā—

p. 89, purāṇe vakkhānijjai
   It is described by the Purāṇa;

p. 103, sō ē māi kahiajē
   That has been declared by me;

ibid., sō paramesuru kāsu kahijjai
   For whom is that supreme lord (to be) described?

p. 105, visaya ramanta na visaa vilippai (=vilippai)
   Enjoying the world, yet the world is not attached to him;

p. 106, dēva pi (=vi) jjaī (=jai) lakṣa (=lakkha) vi disai,
   apyaṇu (=appyaṇu) mārī sa [ki] karīaī?
   If the deity is seen face to face, self becomes dead: he
   (=by him) what can be done?

p. 107, jāva na disai
   Until it is seen:

1 Rai Bahadur Yogesh Chandra Ray Vidyanidhi has called into question the genuineness of the Śrī-Kṛṣṇa-Kīrttana on linguistic and other grounds in an article to the Journal of the Vangīya Sahitya Parishad (Vol. 26, No. 1). I believe that this great and versatile scholar is wrong in his conclusions, and this has been shown in the pages of the Journal referred to by Babus Satish Chandra Ray and Hasanta Kumar Chatterji, but the present occasion is hardly suitable for a detailed study of the question.
p. 109. kāsu kahijjai
   To whom is it (to be) declared?

p. 129. aīsō sō nibbāṇa bhanijjai,
   jahi mana māṇasa kim pi na kijjai
   Nirvāṇa is described to be such that there nothing is done
   of the mind or of the qualities of the mind;

p. 130. jai pavana-gamana-duārē [didha] tālā vi bhijjai,
   jai tasu ghōrāndhārē mana diva hō kijjai
   If the strong lock at the door for the passage of the wind is shut
   (bhijjai, cf. Bengali root /'bēj bhēj to shut=Skt.
   abhy-ajyatē ?); if in that, in the deep gloom the mind
   is made as a lamp: etc., etc.

In this Western Apabhramṣa dialect, the -ijjai- affix is more common
than the -i-, and it is in full force as a passive form. The Old Bengali
of the Cārāpadas has some instances of the inflected passive, but the
affix is -i-, not -ijjai- or -ija-; besides there are a few of assimilated yā-
forms: e.g._--

Cārā No. 1, समल स[mana]हिं न काहि करिअहे
   saala sa|mā|hia kāhi kariai
   What is attained by all samādhī?

No. 6, हरिनार हरिनिर निलाच न हाली
   harinā harinira nilaa na jāni
   The abode of the Stag and the Doe is not known:

ibid., हरिनार खुर न बिलास
   harināra khura na disaa (=disai)
   The Stag’s hoof is not seen;

No. 26, पाविए पाविए is obtained; भाविए भाविए is thought of;

No. 33, दुहीः duhīē is milked;

No. 46, च्छिज च्छि च्छि cchijai =chidyatē is cut.

The analytical passive with root /'jā jā to go following the verbal
noun in -ana has already become established in the language of the
Cārāpadas; and the analytical /'jā- passive seems to have been
influenced by, if not actually developed out of, the older inflectional -ij-
form, in New Indo-Aryan.

It would seem that in Māgadhī Apabhramṣa, the source of Old
Bengali, the two forms -ia- and -ijjai- occurred side by side. -ia- seems to
be the genuine Magadhan affix, and -ijjai- borrowed through the influence
of the Western speeches, and not native to the East. The -ia- was
preserved, although as an obsolete form, in Old and Middle Bengali, but its real nature seems to have been lost to the speakers quite early.

The examples of the -ia- passive in the 47 Caryapadas are not so few, there are some twenty. In Middle Bengali literature we find similar relics of the inflected passive—a linguistic survival which seems not to have been noticed before. The affix loses its prominence as the language progresses, and is ultimately merged into the 1st and 3rd personal affix; and in this way the passive verb is transformed into an active one.

There are numerous cases of the passive in -i(a)- in the Śrī-Kṛṣṇa-Kīrttana: for instance—

p. 19, হত নামায় কলা পান করপূর সব পেলাইল পায়।
उत্ক্রণ। ক্ষজ্জি রাধাকৃষ্ণ বুঝত—হেন কাম না করিএ।
jātā nānā phulā pānā kārāpurā sābā pēlālā pāē.
uthiā Bādāyī Rādhā-kā builā—'hēnā kāmā nā kāriē.'
All the various flowers, betel leaves and camphor and all she threw away with her foot. The Old Lady got up and said to Rādhā, 'you should not do so' (lit. such a deed should not be done: kāriē).

p. 57, আইহানার বার তিনি নেকে ভালে জানী।
Āihānā bīrā, tinā lōkē bhālē jānī
That Āihana is a hero is known (jānī) well in the three worlds.

p. 59, দান সাধিয়ে রতি পতিতাশে।
dānā sādhīē rati-patiāsē
The toll is demanded (sādhīē) with the expectation of dalliance (with thee).

p. 118, ভুক্তিল হযিলে কাঁপারি’ হুঁর হচ্ছে না পাইএ।
bhukhilā hāyilē, Kānhaēnī, duī hāthē nā khāiē
When one is hungry, O Kānha, one should not eat (lit. it should not be eaten: khāiē) with both hands.

p. 137, আপানা রাজিয়ে অপানে।
āpanā rākhīyē āpanē (=ātmā rakṣyatē ātmānā)
Self is to be preserved by self.

p. 145, নামের আন্তরে গেলী চম্পাকী রাহী।
তার পাচে আর হত গোঞ্চিমী সহ।
কথা দুরে গিফ্কা দেখিএ একাদিন নামে।
সহর হল্লিয়া রাহী তার পাচে যাে।
nāērā āntārē gēlī cāndrābālī Rāhī
 tārā pāchē ārā jātā gōālini sāhī
 kāthō dūrē giā dēkhīē ekā-khāīī nāē
 sātwārā hāyīā Rāhī tārā pāsā jāē

In search of a boat went Cāndrāvalī Rādhikā;
After her, all her milk-maid friends;
Having gone some distance, a boat is seen (dēkhīē).
Quickly Rādhikā goes to its side.

p. 184, bōlē cālē nā pāīē pārārā rāmānī
Another's wife is not won (pāīē) by (mere) talk and (gallant) ways.

p. 185, gōpēt kāṛa tā kāḷārīdī hū āḍhī bārā

gōpātā kājā-tā, Kānḥānī, chāyā ākhi bārī
In a secret deed, O Kāṇha, six eyes are barred (bārī).

p. 236, tīkāvā rāgā rāgā ḍhōṅā ḍhōṅā

tribhubānā-nāthā tōmē hārī

prābhū hāyīē hēnā nāhī kārī

You are Hari, the Lord of the three worlds; being the Master,
you should not do so (lit. it should not be done: kārī).

p. 289, pūṁbēr cāmā rōṃgā rōṃgā ḍhēsē ḍhēsē rāmān lē

punāmērā cāndā tōmhārā bādānā ghusiē jāgātā-jānē, lā
O, your face is proclaimed (ghusiē) by the people of the world
as the moon of the full-moon night.

p. 367, gōgā ḍhāṃrīē cāē ōpāē ḍhōṅā ḍhōṅā tāgāē

puṅkā nēhā ḍhāṃrīē ḍhōṅā kāhār bāgē

sōnā bhāṅgīlē ācē ūpāē, judīē āgunā-tāpē

purusā-nēhā bhāṅgīlē, judīē kāhārā bāpē ?

If gold is broken, there is a way—it is joined (judīē) by the
heat of fire; but if a man's love is gone, whose father
(= what man) will restore it?

There are numerous other instances of a similar type in the Šrī-Kṛṣṇa-Kīrttana. The general tendency will be to explain the forms in ḍhē-īē as being in the indicative present, the ḍhē-i- being regarded as identical with the ḍhē-i of the first person, and the ḍhē-e only as a final lengthening for reasons of metre. But pāīē, kāṛē pāīē, kāṛē, etc., are real passives, and it will be seen that in the instances quoted above, the passive construction gives a truer explanation of the passages than the
active first person: পাইত, করিত etc., thus represents the Caryā forms like পারিত, করিতেই পায়ীত, কারিতেতে—Sanskrit prāpyate, kriyate. The passive was already decaying in Old Bengali; and in Middle Bengali it would be easily confused with the active first person from similarity in form. We may recall as a parallel instance the Gujarati use of the passive third person singular as the first person plural active: amē utārī, amē cālī, etc., have been explained as being really passive forms (see ante). The passive in its origin is connected with the reflexive, and the transition to the active is always easy.

There was, again, in the early periods of Bengali, a confusion between the instrumental and the nominative, from which the language even now is not wholly free. To give the instance of the pronouns: the old nominative was *হাই, হাই, *হাই, হাই for the first person singular (=aha-ka-m < aham, found as hakam in the Orissan inscriptions of Asoka): this is preserved in Gujarati and Brajhhakha as hū, hāi. হই, হাই hāi, hāi occur in the Old Bengali of the Caryāpadas; and it was added to the past and future passive participles, to form active past and future tenses in Early Middle Bengali: করিত + হই kārilā + hāi = done + I > করিত + হই kārilāhō (Śrī-Kṛṣṇa-Kīrttana) > করিতীল kārilō > করিতুল kārilū > করিতুল kārilum > করিতুল kūrlum, also kōllum I did; করিত + হই kāribā + hāi = to be done + I > করিতাহো kāribāhō (S.K.K.) > Standard Colloquial kōrbō I shall do. Eastern Bengali *করিমে kārimō > করিম kārimu > kārim kārim, kārim kūrmu etc. But the nominative hāi = hāi = hāi = hāi was curtailed even in the Old Bengali period by the instrumental mē. মে mē, māi = Middle and New Bengali মুই mui = Skt. mayā + instr. -ēna; and this instrumental singular form became the ordinary nominative one, side by side with the plural form আমি, আমি amāhī (< ambhēhi=asmābbhiḥ) in Middle Bengali. So too, with the second person tū = Skt. tvam, instrumental তুই, তুই tū, tūi = Skt. tvayā + -ēna. As in other modern Indo-Aryan languages, the inflected past of the active verb did not occur in Bengali in its earliest period. The past form of the transitive verb was the passive participle (adjective) qualifying what later became the object, and it was governed by the subject in the instrumental.

The future tense in the Eastern group of languages was also a

\* This is a prominent feature in the Magadhan languages, and the influence of Tibeto-Burman on these languages at their formative period may have something to do with it. Cf. H. A. Jaeschke, Tibetan Grammar (London, 1883), § 30.
passive participle governed by the instrumental nominative. And the distinction between the nominative and instrumental affixes in Māgadhī 
Apabhramśa and Old and Early Middle Bengali was very slight—both ended in ī, ē, and the instrumental only had nasalisation originally, which was frequently dropped. In fact the nominative, the accusative and the instrumental were all confused as to their forms in Early Middle Bengali. The transition from the decaying passive, which was less and less perfectly understood, to the active was therefore very easy, was indeed quite a matter of course. The passive use of the neuter verb is also common in Old and Middle Bengali: e.g., Śrī-Kṛṣṇa-Kīrttana—

pūṇā kāle śvāga jāne, nānā upābhōgā päie (=gamyatē, prāpyatē)

Practising virtue, heaven is attained, and many enjoyments obtained.

Examples of the inflected passive are frequent in Middle Bengali literature. A few are given, taken from Rai Sahib Dinesh Chandra Sen’s ‘Typical Selections from Bengali Literature’ (Vaṅga-Sāhitya-Paricaya, Calcutta University, 1914):

From Vol. II.—Poems by Caṇḍīdāsa, pp. 968 ff.:

नील दुक्तार हार मनोहर शोभित देखिए गले।

नील(ाः) mukutār(ā) hār(ā) mānohār(ā) sōbhītā dēkhiē gāle

A charming necklet of blue pearls is seen handsome in her neck.

अबला पराणे एत कि सहित।

ābālā pārānē ēt ki sāhiē

Can so much be endured in the life of a weak woman?

कुरेर उपर राधर बसति, नड्डते काटिए दे।

ksurēr(ā) upār(ā) Rādhār(ā) bāsati, nādītē kātiē dē

Rādhā’s abode is on (the edge of) a razor, her body is cut at the (slightest) movement.

माहे एम ग्रेम कोखा ना पूनिए।

mānuṣē emān(ā) prēm(ā) kōthā nā sunīē.

Such love in man has nowhere been heard of.

From the Caitanya-caritāmṛta of Kṛṣṇa-dāsa Kavirāja, p. 1223:

śanātana kāle ēkāh bhāgavatārāte।

भक्ति-भक्त-कृपकार जानि वाह! रहिए।……..

ḥariḥkṛṣṇa-bēlās ēkāh kāle vāṁ ṣ Çokār।

vāṁbērē kāḥkāh bāh! pāhiē pār।
Sānātān(ā) kajā grānthā Bhāgābātāmṛtē
bhākti-bhāktā-Kṛṣṇā-tāttvā jāni jāhā hāitē
dhāri-bhākti-bilās(ā) grānthā kajā baiṣnāb(ā)-ācār(ā)
baiṣnābēr(ā) kārttābyā jāhā pāiyē pār(ā)

Sanātana made the book Bhāgavatāmṛta, from which are known
the doctrines of bhakti and bhakta, and the nature of Kṛṣṇa; he
made the book Hari-bhakti-vilāsa, on Vaiṣṇava ritual, in which
the duties of a Vaiṣṇava are made to cross over, as it were (i.e.
described in detail).

Bhāgavata, by Daivāki-nandana Simha, p. 844:

Bhāgavata, by Daivāki-nandana Simha, p. 844:

Instances like the above are fairly common in early Bengali litera-
ture, and it is not necessary to give further quotations. Maithili and
Oriya, too, show similar forms, e.g.—

Maithili—Vidyāpati (Vangīya Sahitya Parishad edition):

p. 6,

lakhai na pāria, jētha kanētha
Cannot be distinguished, whether old or young.

p. 9,

jata dēkhalā, tata kahahi na pāria
All that has been seen cannot be described.

p. 19,

padhahi na pāria ākhara-pāti
The rows of letters cannot be read.

p. 21,

sē nahi dēkhala je diya upāmā
That has not been seen with which a comparison can be made.

p. 30,

saba taha sunia ājīsana bēwahārā
That such is his behaviour is heard from all.

p. 39,

Madhū-ripu sama nahi dēkhia sohāwana,
jē dia tanhika upāma rē
Nothing handsome like the Foe of Madhu is seen,  
With which his comparison can be made.

p. 44,

na jāniya kiya karu mōhana cōra  
What this charming scamp may do is not known.

p. 499,

kajjala-rūpa tua Kāli kahiao ... Ganga kahiē pānī ...  
Bramhā-ghara Bramhānī kahiē, Hara-ghara kahiē Gaurī  
In favour like lamp-black, thou art called Kāli; she is called  
Gāngā when in watery form; in the home of Brahmā, is  
called Brahmānī; is called Gaurī in the home of Hara.

Oriya—From Jagannātha-dāsa’s Dhruva-caritra (Contai edition):

p. 5,

kāmpii (—kampyatē) tāhārā nijā dēhī  
Her own body trembles.

p. 33,

dēhā mānā disāi, khājrurā-brkśā-prāyā  
His body’s measure is seen, like a date-palm.

p. 11,

dāsā-disi āndhākārā, kichi hi nā disi  
The ten quarters are dark, nothing is seen.

The older literatures of Oriya and Maithili will undoubtedly demonstrate the presence of the inflected passive, as a decaying form, no doubt, but still existent.

The so-called middle-voice (karma-kārya-vācyā) of Bengali, which we find in impersonal constructions, seems originally to have been this inflected -yā- passive: e.g. কলসী ভবে, kālāsi bhāre, the jar becomes full;  
কাপড় ছেড়ে, kāpōd chėde, the cloth gets torn; বই কাটে, bāi kātē, the book  
sells; বাঁশ ভাঙে, bāś bhāngē the bamboo breaks; শাখা বাঙে sākh bājē the  
conch-shell is sounded; ভবে, ছেপে, কাটে, ভাঙে, বাঙে, etc., are to be explained  
as passive forms, derived from forms like ভারিষী bhariai >ভারিএ bhāriē,  
ছিঙিএ chindīaï >ছিঙিএ chindī, কাটিএ kātiai > কাটিএ kātiē, ভাঙিএ  
bhaMJiai, or ভাঙিএ bhangiai >ভাঙিএ bhāngiē, ভাঙিএ bājiaï > ভাঙিএ bājīē  
etc., of Old and Early Middle Bengali. A similar use of the passive is  
known also to Sanskrit.

The inflected passive is also preserved in a curious idiomatic usage  
in Modern Bengali, in which both its form and nature are disguised.  
We have expressions like একাজ করে নাē kāj kārē nā shouldn’t do this,
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রবিবার বিন মাটি খায় না। rābibār-din māch khāy nā shouldn't eat fish on Sundays, অর হ'লে নায় না jwār hōlē nāy nā shouldn't bathe when suffering from fever, etc., etc., where the forms করে, খায়, নায়, etc., are used with the negative particle, and are apparently 3rd person indicative present, the subject, however, being difficult to find; and such expressions have a general prohibitive imperative force. In Middle Bengali there are instances of this construction: cf. Śri-Kṛṣṇa-Kīrttana: p. 236, ব্রহ্মা সৃষ্টি হন না kāri prābhuvā hiṃśa nā kāri shouldn't do so, being the Master; p. 185, লোভ হয়েছে কাশীলো আর না kāri lōbhā hāyiē Kāhānī ārāti nā kāri O Kānha, shouldn't yeare (too much) although there is desire; p. 257, কেহ তার না kāhiē mārānē none should speak of his death, etc., etc., The Middle Bengali forms in না-i-, না-I- indicate that this construction is a passive one originally; একাদিতে বলে না, ē kāj kārē nā is really ētāt kāryaṃ na kriyate: kriyate would be করিয়েছি, করিয়ে, করিয়ে, কারিয়ে, kārī in Middle Indo-Aryan (Prakrit) and Old and Middle Bengali. As in the other cases, the passive nature of it was lost, and the active form, only apparently so, came in. Probably there was the influence of the similar imperative use of the optative, active and middle, and passive of Sanskrit. General statements in which the subject is not definite or important, are in the third person. But it is just likely that there was the passive originally in such popular expression as—

জামাইয়ার জুন্য মারে হাস | ওঘুয়া-শুঁ খায় মাস ||

jāmāyēr jānyā māre hās | gusthī-suḍḍhā khāy mās

The goose is killed for the son-in-law, and the meat is eaten by the whole family;

এক দেহ বর দেখে | আর দেহ তর দেখে ||

ēk dē (dāy) bār dēkhē | ār dē (dāy) ghār dēkhē

(The daughter) is given (in marriage), taking into note (lit. seeing) either the bridegroom or his family;

and similar proverbial couplets.

In the Śri-Kṛṣṇa-Kīrttana, there is a form in ইউ -iū which is rather puzzling. This is illustrated by the following examples:—

p. 140, নানা বাড়িতে নিঃশেষ করিয়ে বতনে nāa bāndhitē giśa kāriū batonē

Let us make an attempt to build (lit. bind) the boat.

p. 141, আরে সকল সবিস্তারে মেলা করিয়ে যুগতি |

ānāhā sākālā sākhi-jānā, mēli kāriū jugāti.
Bring all girl friends, let us hold a consultation together.

p. 141, পলার সজিউ দাধি হচ্ছে, সেসি জীবাণু উপাত্ত।
pāsārā sājīū dādhi dudhē, sē-si jībārā upāē
Let us arrange our milk and curds for sale, that indeed
is the means of livelihood.

p. 204, নানা কুল ফুটিলেহ মাক বুদ্ধানে।
tāk śiṃdhi mokhaik kariū gamnē
nānā phulā plutiilā-chē mājhā Brndābanē
tākā pindhi Māthurā-kā kariū gamnē

Flowers of many kinds have blossomed in the middle of
Vṛndāvana;
Wearing these, let us go to Mathurā.

p. 253, জামনা-কাজাইু রাধা, লায়িা সাক্ষী-গানী।
Jāmunā-kā jāiū Rādhā, lāyiā sākhi-gānē
Let us, O Rādhā, go to Yamunā, taking (her) girl-friends.

p. 270, দধি বিকে জাইু মথুরা।
dādhi bikē jāiū Māthurā
Let us go to Mathurā to sell curds.

p. 292, সংহরু রাধা নহি জাইু খর।
sātwarē Rādhā lālā jāiū ghārā
Let me take Rādhā quick to her home.

p. 310, বাঁশী চোরারিকে করিউ ঘটনৈ।
bāśī cōrāyite kariū jātanē
Let us make an effort to steal the flute.

p. 345, বারবা পুচীলু রাধা সথ জন খানী।
bārātā puchiū Rādhā sābā jānā thānē
Let us ask for news, O Rādhā, from every body.

p. 347, কলম্বতকে জাইু চিতের হরিদে।
kādamā-tālā-kā jāiū cittēhā hārisē
Go to the foot of the Kadamba tree, with joy in mind.

This ইউ -iū form appears to be an equivalent of the passive imperative: in meaning it is always optative or imperative. In an example like বাঁশী চোরারিকে করিউ ঘটনৈ, করিউ ঘটনৈ is in all likelihood from a form in the passive=Skt. kriyatām yatnāḥ; জাইু=cf. gamyatām; বারবা পুচীলু =vārttā prcyatām. The above instances in ইউ -iū probably represent a mixed form, with the old ই-i- infix of the passive plus a new
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The inflected passive is a fossil in Bengali: the living method is analytical and periphrastic. The following are the ways in which the passive is formed in Bengali:

1. I am seen—(1) আমি দেখা যাই, āmi dēkhā jāi, (2) আমাকে (আমার, আমারে) দেখা যায় āmāke (āmāy, āmarē) dēkhā jāy, (3) আমাকে (আমার, আমারে) দেখন যায় āmāke (āmāy, āmarē) dēkhān jāy, 4) আমি দেখা পড়ি আমি dēkhā pādi (5) আমাকে (আমার, আমারে) দেখা হয় āmāke (āmāy, āmarē) dēkhā hāy, (6) আমি দৃষ্টি হই āmi drṣṭā hāi.

Of these (1), (4), and (6) are true passives (karma-vācyā), and these correspond to the passive forms of English, French and other Modern Indo-European languages. The other forms, (2), (3) and (5) are instances of the neuter construction (bhāva-vācyā) in Bengali. All the above forms are used in Bengali, but there are slight shades of difference in their meaning.

(1) আমি দেখা যাই āmi dēkhā jāi I am seen is best explained as being composed of the past participle adjective in আ and জাতi to go, which assumes the function of the substantive verb. But this form, though allowable, would not ordinarily be regarded as very idiomatic or natural in Bengali: the passive proper, with the object in the nominative, would not be regarded as a construction natural to the language, especially when the nominative is a definite person. But an indefinite and general statement can be easily made with an impersonal construction in the passive: e.g. দেখা যায় dēkhā jāy (subject ইহা this, it understood) it is seen; যদি বলা যায় yādi bālā jāy if it is said; বোধ করে তোকে or যাকে sōnā jáitēchē, jācchē it is being heard. In the passive construction, the mind of the speaker is loth to forget that what is the grammatical nominative is the real object, and hence the feeling of
the native speaker has this preference for the neuter construction, with the nominative-object in the dative, e.g. আমাকে দেখা যায় or আমাকে দেখা হয় অমাকে দেখায় হয়। The conscious use of the passive would bring in a certain amount of emphasis; and to make a statement emphatic or definite, the dative with কে -কে is preferred to the accusative or nominative without any inflection, when we are speaking of a sentient or animate being: for instance, সুঁটি ডাকে mutে dâkâ call a porter, but সুঁটি কে ডাকে mutে-ke dâkâ call the porter, or সুঁটি কে পায়সা dâo give the porter his hire; গোরু চরার gôru cărây tends kine, but গোড়কে হাস,দাও gôruke ghâস dâo give the cow grass. So আমাকে (আমারে, আমায়) দেখা যায় অমাকে (আমারে, আমায়) dėkhâ jây would be preferred, as the idea is definite so far as the object of sight is concerned, to আমি দেখা যাহি amî dėkhâ jâi where আমি amî, although formally nominative, is in sense really the oblique or accusative. Names of inanimate objects as a rule do not take কে -কে when they are in the objective or dative: hence ঘর দেখা যায় gār dėkhâ jây the house is seen (not ঘরের-কে, where ঘর gār can be easily parsed as being the subject of the passive sentence. (This reminds one of the ‘high-caste’ and ‘caste-less’ nouns of Dravidian.) আমি দেখা যাই amî dėkhâ jâi, however, would seem to be the older form, and আমাকে দেখা যায় amâkė dėkhâ jây later. আমি করা যাহি amî kârâ jâi I am done would be bad Bengali, because here the first personal pronoun would require the কে -কে as it is very definite, and করা যাওয়া kârâ jâoэ is rather vague: the passive would not be used when both the subject or object and the verb are so very indefinite, and therefore the construction would be regarded as clumsy. But আমি ধরা যাই amî dhârâ jâi I am caught would be quite correct, as ধরা dhârâ refers to a definite action.

(2) আমাকে (or আমারে, আমায়) দেখা যায় amâkė (আমারে, আমায়) dėkhâ jây I am seen, or, with a slight potentiality implied, I may be seen (=they can see me). There is a difficulty in explaining দেখা dėkhâ. Generally it is looked upon as a verbal noun in আ -ায়, derived ultimately from the passive participle in -tâ- of Indo-Aryan, the nominal use of which is also quite common in Sanskrit. It would thus be explained as meaning with regard to me, a seeing goes on (or takes place). The occurrence of (3) আমাকে দেখধান যায় amâkė dėkhân jay, with regard to me, a seeing takes place would lend countenance to the above explanation. But it would seem that in an expression like আমাকে দেখা যায়, দেখা is really a passive participial adjective, and the whole construction is in the impersonal,
which is so characteristic of the Western and Southern Indo-Aryan languages. आय देखा दाय would be best explained as being, literally, with regard to me, it is seen.

If we had evidence from Old and Middle Bengali remains on this point, we might expect a solution of the difficulty. But the passive with the past participle in আ  was not at all a popular form, and rather rare is its occurrence in the plain direct narration of Middle Bengali verse. Stray instances in the Śrī-Kṛṣṇa-Kīrttana like তোম যাইবি মার তোমায় যাইবি মারাত =যারা, যারা, মারাত, মারাত, মারাত; Modern দ্বারা (মারাত + আ affix, pleonastic, মারাত <মারাত + আ ) you will get killed (p. 33), যাহিল জাই বাংলিল জাই becomes tied up, is put in bonds, (p. 71)—where we have the old passive participle adjective in হল -য়া, which has now become obsolete in the literary language, but is occasionally heard in the dialects, and is quite a common form in Middle Bengali, e.g. হেল রাত্রি গেলারাত্রি last night =হত রাত্রি গাতারাত্রি, হংসাদিল হংস জুদাহাল উদ্ধ মিল that is cooled, হসিলামান সুতিলামান মানুস sleeping man, হসিলাভীনী ভুকিলাভীনী ভাগিনী  ফমিশেস কিংগ্রেস in Kavikānaka, হসিলাহু হুদিলাহু দুহিলাহু দুদু যুক্তিলিত milk that is drawn in the Caryā 33, etc., etc.) indicate that the passive participle is the form associated with this construction. We can also compare the Caryāpada expression বড়িল হলমাস (আই) bad-hila jāi (33. 2) increases, where apparently বড়িল bad-hila =বাংলিল bādhila =বাঙ্কি baddhila, that is, বাঙ্কি +ঈল avidhita +ঈল, a passive participle, with  যাই jā. The transition from the real passive made up of the participle and the verb, with the object proper in the nominative, to the neuter construction with the nominative-object in the dative and the participial passive in the impersonal, would be very easy; and such a state of things has its parallel in the other cognate languages.

The origin of this আ or আ jā passive has undoubtedly been influenced, as Beames had suggested, by the old -ijja- passive of Apabhramsa. We have the -ijja- forms in Prakrit and Apabhramsa on the one hand, and the যা jā forms in the modern languages on the other: the middle is blank, and these two must be linked together by a transitional state of things not represented in linguistic remains, when the -ijja- was slowly assuming a new role as a root—when it was merging into the jā root, as it were. It would seem that the neuter passives (deponents) like marijjaí=mriyātē dies first took up an analytical form; because

marjjaɪ is equivalent in meaning to maraɪ or märe, and the -jjaɪ could easily be regarded as a form of jāɪ from ʃ/ʃaɪ, giving rise to the analysis mari jai (=মরিয়া দাহ) = being dead, goes. The occurrence in the speech of the compound verb would help such an analysis. Once this analysis was established, there would not be any bar in forming other tenses and verb forms from ʃ/ʃaɪ. In Middle Bengali, analysed forms of the above type (an indeclinable in ʃ-i or ʃey -iy pathogens, mostly with neuter verbs) are very common; e.g. in the Šrī-Kṛṣṇa-Kirttana, cāli kāhe cāli jāiha depart; pādi ṣe kāhe pādi gēla dithī, the sight was cast; ṭaṅgī ṣe ṭaṅgī bhangi jāi gets broken; mōra māji gēla mānē, my mind became attached; pādiyā kāhe pādiyā jāibē, you will fall; māriā kāhe māriā jāiḥi will die, etc., etc. An Old Bengali instance is abasar jāɪ ʃasūriṣhī avasarījjaɪ, deponent of ava+ ʃsr = move, in the Caryāpadas (32. 4). The modern passive or neuter with the ʃ-ā particle would seem to be of later origin. The potential sense which one can attach to the passive in ʃ/ʃaɪ, and which is never present in the passive with ʃ/ʃaɪ hā, seems to point at the -ijja- origin of the former: for the old potential or optative had -ejja- in Prakrit, and the confusion between the passive and the optative, already noted, might just be continued in the analytical form.

As has been noted above, the -ijja- form seems to have been foreign to Magadhi Prakrit and Magadhi Apabhramsa, the source of Bengali; because no -ij- forms are found in the relics of the inflected passive preserved in Bengali and other Magadhan languages, only -i- forms. The formation of the analytical passive with -jā- may thus have been brought about in Old Bengali through contact with and influence of Western dialects having -ijja- > -ij-, -i-.

(3) আমাকে দেখে যায় আমাকে দেখান জায় I am seen, I may be seen, lit. with regard to me, a seeing goes on or takes place. This form of passive is one of the oldest constructions in Bengali: it occurs in the Caryāpadas, and it is quite plentiful in Middle Bengali, e.g. (Caryā 2) dhran na kāi dharaṇa na jāi cannot be held, (35. 1) kharṇ na kāi kahana na jāi cannot be described, ṭepana jāi, (4. 3) is entangled or smeared; Šrī-Kṛṣṇa-Kirttana, p. 38, lālātā likhitā khāṇḍānā nā jāe that which is written on the forehead cannot be averted; p. 58, prāṇā dhrānā nā jāe life cannot be endured, etc. Instances from other Middle Bengali works need not be given: they are fairly common, and may be found in any page of a Middle Bengali book.
In Modern Standard Bengali, this construction is falling into disuse, but it is fully preserved in the East Bengal dialects. The employment of this অন - আন + জা passive is impersonal, and it is on the lines of (2). It would seem to have originated from an unconscious analysis of the verbal adjectives, passive, in -aniya(ka): the line of development was probably karaniyaka > karanjja(y)a > করণি জাে * karani jāé > করণ জাে kārānā jāé; so pathaniyaka > padhanijja(y)a, Padhanijja, padhan (পড়ন) জাে, *padhani jāe, pād(h)ānā jāé etc. The intermediate form in this process of analysis, karani jāe, padhan jāe, is not preserved in Bengali, but it is represented, doubtless, by Old Baiswari forms like barani jāya, kahani jāi etc. in Tulasidāsa. We may note that an expression like না ঘড়ন কছন nā jāyā kāhānē would be quite natural in Middle Bengali, and the এ -ে in কছন kāhānē might be a reminiscence of the older form in ই -ি. The analysis into a noun in অন + জা - আন + জা took place before the Old Bengali period: and once this analysis became accepted, the transposition of the noun and the verb, and the insertion of the negative particle না, between the noun and the verb, which is so frequent in negative constructions of this type in Middle Bengali, became easy: সহন না ঘড়ন sāhān nā jāy, না ঘড়ন sāhān nā jāy sāhān it cannot be borne; but curiously enough, সহন sāhān is not found, although সহন sāhān nā is commonly met with in modern speech: the reason being probably that না nā which qualifies the verb must not be separated from it by the noun.

In Middle Bengali we have a few cases where there is apparently a verbal noun in অ -া: e.g., নির্বার না ঘড় বৃন nibārā nā jāyā rē cannot be prevented (Vanga-Sāhitya-Paricaya, p. 981); so বোল না ঘড় bōlā nā jāyā cannot be described. There is no form in Modern Bengali corresponding to it: the absence of the -ন(গ) -nā(-nā) in such cases is in all likelihood due to haplogy.

(4) আমি দেখা পড়ি অমি দেখা পড়ি I am seen, I happen to be seen, lit. I fall seen. This construction, apparently an old one, is essentially idiomatic, and strictly speaking it should come under the consideration of the characteristic ‘compound verbs’ of Modern Indo-Aryan. The use of the পড়ি পাদ is restricted to a few verbs only, and as Beames has fully noticed it, it indicates accidence as well as finality more than anything else. সেথা দেখা, etc. is best explained as a passive participial adjective. The modern Dravidian employment of a root pad, to form the passive, has been noted by Beames and others, but it would seem that it is a matter of coincidence. The old Dravidian speech did not possess a
passive form, but the employment of obviously the same root in the
two groups of Indian speeches, Aryan and Dravidian, is interesting;
and it is only one of numerous points of similarity which demonstrate
the fundamental agreement between the speakers of the languages of the
two groups in their habits of thought. The impersonal construction
with ।pad (e.g. আমাকে দেখা পড়ে আমাকে দেখায় পাদে) is unknown.

(5) আমাকে দেখা হয় আমাকে দেখায় হয় I am seen (i.e., they see me); lit.
with regard to me, a seeing takes place (or there is a seeing). Here we
have apparently a verbal noun (we never say আমি দেখি হয় আমি দেখায় হয়
where আমি is the nominative). The action indicated by the verb is the
important idea in this construction: compare for instance, মারা হয় মারা
জায় or মারা পড়ে মারা পাদে, gets struck or killed, dies, which states just a
fact, without any emphasis on the actual act, but মারা হয় মারা হয়,
lit the striking or killing takes place; দেখা হয় দেখা গেলা came in
sight, but দেখা হইল দেখা হাইলাং a seeing took place. This construction
seems to be a modern one. (The root ।hā in Bengali, as used here,
really represents two roots, as and ভূ (of Skt., which have merged
into one.10)

(6) আমি দেখে হই আমি দ্রষ্টা হাই I am seen is a learned form and has a
modern look too, and it is found in high-flown speech only. It looks
like a translation of the English passive, employing the Sanskrit passive
participle to avoid any ambiguity that might result if the native passive
participle in আ-ায় were employed. It would not be remarkable, however,
to find it in Middle Bengali, as Sanskrit passive participles have
been introduced by the score into the language since its birth.

The root ।আছ আচ is used with the past participle to form a sort

10 ।as—*as-a-ti > ahaï of Prakrit > ṛhaï, ḍai of Hindi; ḍhē of Marathi, and of
Sindhi; ḍai of Magadi; and হা হায় (net হায় হা, হুচ hী = ḍhavati) of
Bengali. Magadi has kept হা < as and হু, ভূ < ভূ্য separate: e.g. past tense halai
from ।as, but হুী, ভূী from ।ভূী. Modern Bengali phonology would support the view
that ।hā is really ।*হঃ আঃ e.g. করেন কঃবে, কাত্বে, কারবে, কানবে, etc. drop the শ-ই in the
modern colloquial, and umlaut the ভ স to ও; কোবে, কোবে, kরেবা, kরোবী, kষ্ট্রী, etc. but where the
root ends in র- there is no umlaut: পরির রাহীরা > রাহীরা, not রাহীরা, from ।রাহী
; so গারিরাম গাহির > গাবে, গাবে, গাবে, গাবে, গাবে, গাবে, > গাবে, গাবে,
> গাবে, গাবে; from গাবে, তাহীর > similarly, *ধাইবে, যাইবে > *ধাইবে, *ধাইবে,
> *ধাইবে, *ধাইবে; but quite early the form ।হাইবে came to be employed in literature for
*ধাইবে, doubtless though the confusion with ।হাইবে হুহূঃ ভূূঃ ভূূঃ ভূূঃ ভূূঃ ভূূঃ ভূূ
. The ।ভূূঃ ভূূঃ ভূূঃ ভূূঃ ভূূঃ ভূূঃ ভূূঃ ভূূঃ ভূূঃ ভূূ
. The past base হইলা হাইলা represents ।*হাই. Early Bengali had the other past base ।হাই, ভার্জলাম ভায়িলা
from ।ভূূঃ.
of passive perfect, mostly in connection with nouns inanimate or nouns that are names of lower animals, which are subjects of the predicate, e.g. এ বই আমার পড়া আছে এই বই আমার পড়া আছে this book has been read by me, where আমার গভর্ন পড়া পড়া which predicates বই বই বই the subject of আছে আছে মাছ মাছ মাছ মাছ মাছ fish have been caught (i.e., fish that have been caught are); এ বই এ বই এ বই এ বই এ বই এ বই এ বই এ বই এ বই এ বই এ বই to পড়া পড়া পড়া পড়া পড়া পড়া পড়া পড়া পড়া পড়া পড়া পড়া পড়া this book indeed had been read before, etc., etc.

Two other idiomatic forms of the passive may be noted.  চল cāl go, to express the idea of possibility or continuance, occurs with the verbal noun in আ -া, which governs the personal object in the dative with কে -kē, and the inanimate object or object which is the name of a lower animal in the accusative. The construction is impersonal: e.g., ঝোলা চলে khāoā cālē can be eaten, কে দেখে ডেখাও cēllē the seeing went on.  কর khā eat in the sense of suffer takes the verbal noun মার mār a beating, and is conjugated actively, to denote to be beaten. This idiom occurs in other Indo-Aryan languages, as well as in Dravidian.

The impersonal and indefinite use of the passive is a noticeable feature in Modern Bengali. When one is not sure whether to use the honorific forms in speaking to an individual, recourse is taken to the passive impersonal to avoid any chance of giving offence by using the ordinary non-honorific: e.g., কি করা হয় ki kārā hāy what do you do? literally, what is done (by you)! instead of the honorific অপনি কি করেন āpni ki kārēn or the inferior তুমি কি কর tumi ki kārā. So কোথা থাকা হয় kōthā thākā hāy where do you live? etc. Cf. also the indefinite expressions থাকা থাকা থাকা থাকা dhōre nēōa jāk let it be granted; বাধা হয় or মাযাজার bālā hāy, jāy if it is said that; দেখা দেখা দেখা দেখা jōā jāy nā one cannot go by this way, where থাওয়া थार jāōa jāy is probably from *jāi;jāi, passive with -īj-; cf. দেখা দেখা দেখা দেখা ekhān diye jāy nā one does not, one should not go by this way, where থার jāy = *jāi, passive in -ia-.

The passive construction (karmāṇi prayōga) which is a notable feature for the past tense of transitive verbs in Hindi, Gujarati and other New Indo-Aryan languages, was also characteristic of Old Bengali. The past tense is a participial adjective, which qualifies the object when the verb is transitive, and takes up the gender and number of the object, the subject being put in the instrumental; and it is an adjective qualifying the subject, taking up its gender and number, when the verb
is intransitive. Old and Middle Bengali show occasional relics of this Prakritic construction, but the active use with the pronominal affixes attached to the past participle was fully established in Middle Bengali. Thus, e.g., we have in the Caryāpadas instances like—

खुट्टी उपाड़ि मेलिलि कान्छि (8. 2)  
khuṇṭi upāḍi mēlili kācchi  
Taking off the peg, the rope was loosened;  
ভোহোর অঁকরে মেও মেলিলি হাড়েরি মালী (10. 6)  
tōhōra antare mōe ghaliilī hádēeri mālī  
For thy sake the necklet of bones has been thrown away by me;  
ग्नणत नागेली जाली (28. 3)  
gaanata lāgeli dālī  
The branches touched the sky;  
সেসি ছাইলি; রাতি পেছাইলি (28. 4)  
sēji chāilī . . . rāti pōhālī  
The bed was made; the night was passed;  
ढरिली ... लेली (49. 2)  
gharinī lēli  
A wife was taken;  
फिटली सबराली (50, 7)  
phītilī sabarālī  
Was broken the Śabarā's nature or game;  

etc., where the feminine affix इ, इ -ि is added to the past base in इल -िl when the object (=subject with an intransitive verb) is feminine, showing the common early New Indo-Aryan affix -ि (-ia < -ika). In the Śrī-Kṛṣṇa-Kirttana, the passive construction for the transitive verb is absent, but the adjectival use of the participle for the intransitive past, in examples like चोलिल राही calīlī Rāhi Rādhikā went, is fairly common.

The Bengali future (in इब -ib-), now active in form and use, was similarly originally passive and neuter, being derived from Old Indo-Aryan future passive participle in -tavya. अमि बहव ami jāibā is really for मुই बहवo mui jāibō of Early Middle Bengali—I shall go; बहवo=jāib+१० jāiba+hō=I will go; the original construction was मुই बहव दिए mui ḍehā=Sk. mayā yātavyam (neuter construction), without the affixed pronoun, bāhīvo jāibō making it a finite verb. So अमि भাত बहव āmi bhāt khāibā I shall eat rice is for Old Bengali मुই, मई भात बहव mui, māī bhāta khāiba—mayā bhaktam khādityām (passive construction). As in the past tense, the transitive verb future is in form and origin a
verbal adjective qualifying the object. Traces of this original passive usage are found in Old Bengali: e.g.—

_Caryā 5—তুমি হোইব।_  
tumhē hōiba (=yuṣmābhir bhavitavyam)  
You will be;

_Caryā 7—কাহিও কাহিও করিব নিবাস।_  
Kānhu, kahi gai kariba nivāsa? (=nīvāsah kartyavyah)  
O Kānhu, where will thou go and dwell?

_Caryā 10—তোএ সন করিব (=করিব) ম  (=মহ, মে) সাঙ্গ।_  
tōe-sama kariba ma sānga (=kartavyō mayā sangah)  
With thee I shall have commerce;

_Caryā 29—মহ লিকৃতি পিরিছ।_  
mai dibi pircchā (dibi=*diabba+ia=*ditavya+ikā,  
fem.=Skt. mayā dātavyā prcchā)  
By me an enquiry is to be given (=I shall institute a discussion).

**The Causative Passive.**

The Causative Passive, or Potential Passive—’a causative that has assumed a reflexive or passive meaning’—has been fully discussed by Hörnle and Tessitori.\(^{11}\) It occurs in Bengali also. In modern Gujarati this causative passive is the only common form in use, the original -i-passive has passed over to the active voice, and in the present indicative first person plural only.

Examples from Middle Bengali—

_Śrī-Kṛṣṇa-Kṛithana_: p. 89, dēhi ṛgha gathē mahādānī bōlā, he is called the chief toll-collector in this highway;  
p. 186, ṭhe na ḍhāṛa ḍog jēnha nā chādāṅ ghōlā so that the butter-milk is not scattered.

Modern Bengali—

বেশ মনায়, bēṣ mānāy _fits nicely, looks well_;  
কথাটা ভাল শুনায় না  
kāṭhā-tā bhālā sunāy nā _the story does not hear nice, is not to be regarded as welcome_;  
কথাটা চারাীখাই, kāṭhā-tā cāraīyāchē _the news has been spread_;  
সে ভাল মাহুষ কহায় বটে, kīṣṭa loke śivīdār nāy _so bhālā-mānus kāhāy bātē,  
kintu lōk subidhār nāy he is spoken of as an honest man, but he is not of

\(^{11}\) _Gaudian Grammar, § 484; Grammar of Old Western Rajasthani, § 140_ (Indian Antiquary, 1914-16).
the good sort; and kisno dvo bhoten nā ē-tē kintu dōs khāndāy nā but the
evil is not averted by this; bhot pahāy adhā dōs bār āhā the more it is tested the larger the tale of faults that come out;
dul pārbār jānayā kān bēdhāy the ear is pierced to
bērāy dul pārbār jānayā kān bēdhāy the ear is pierced to
put on earrings; etā tātā khārāp dēkhābē nā this
will not show so bad, etc., etc.: the sense in most instances, as above,
is impersonal.

Cf. Oriya—Dhruva-caritra of Jagannātha-dāsa (Contai edition), p. 8:
sē bōlāi pāṭarāni she was called the chief queen; p. 48: dēbā-gānā-
mādhaye tu bōlāu sunāśira thou art called Sunāśira among the gods;
p. 26: dwādāsā āksārā māntrā-rājā ē bōlāi of twelve syllables this is
called the prince of charms.
THE PREHISTORIC SKULL OF BAYANA.

RAI BAHADUR B. A. GUPTE, F.Z.S., F.R.S.A., Curator, Victoria Memorial Collection; Lecturer in Anthropology and Ancient History, University of Calcutta; Member, Government Historical Records Commission.

(1) In 1903 Mr. Wolff found an old skull when excavations for a bridge on the Bayana-Agra Railway were being made on one bank of the Gambhir River near Bayana in the Bharatpur State, Rajputana. It lay 35 feet below the level of the bed of the river. It was sent to the Bombay Natural History Society, and the late Lt.-Col. K. R. Kirtikar of that Society forwarded it to the Anthropological Institute of Bombay, Dr. Modi, the Honorary Secretary of that Institute, sent it to Dr. Arthur Keith, M.D., F.R.S., Conservator of Museum, Royal College of Surgeons of England. The latter has given his expert opinion, comparing it with three other skulls and adding useful diagrams to illustrate it. I am obliged to Dr. Modi for allowing me to make use of a part of this valuable research.

In the Bayana skull the nasal bones are preserved. Its sagittal suture is almost closed and the coronal suture is closing. "A peculiar anomaly," says Dr. Keith, "is present; the mastoid region of the temporal bone has fused with the neighbouring part of the parietal on the left side. Its bones are stained a light brown; are dense and hard; the crevices and recesses are filled with a fine sandy loam. It is a cranium of small size. Its maximum length is 178 mm. and width 127 mm. The height of the vault above the ear passages is 108 mm. It is therefore narrow in comparison to its length and its width index is 71. It is also narrow in comparison to its height."

Thus it is shown by Dr. Keith to be the cranium of a man who had a small head which was narrow in comparison to its length and height. He compared it with about 500 skulls of people of various parts of the Indian Empire, now at the Royal College of Physicians, collected by Sir Havelock Charles and others. He found
it allied to that of a typical male Veddah. He also found that
the Bayana skull belongs to the racial type to which Risley applied
the term Aryo-Dravidian, and notes that the inter orbital width be-
tween the internal angular processes is 22 mm., between the inner
border of the right and left lachrymal grooves is only 16 mm.

He points out that the nasal bones are compressed and prominent
very different from the short flat depressed nasal bones of typical Veddah
and Dravidian skulls. It is also recorded that in the Bayana skull the
zygomatic arches and cheek bones projected well beyond the width of
the skull. He finally adds that of the close resemblance of skulls the
value lies in the fact that they may yet serve as evidence of the persis-
tency of type.

(2) On these skulls Mr. E. Vredenburg, Superintendent, Geological
Survey, favours me with the following interesting remarks at my re-
quest:—"In the absence of any precise information regarding the
constitution of the alluvium surrounding the Bayana skull and the
details of the superincumbent strata, we have but one fact to guide us,
the depth at which it occurred, alleged to be 35 feet. The rivers of the
region are, at the present day, not depositing, but eroding agents. The
impression, conveyed by the record of a specimen from so great a depth,
first is, therefore, that it must be of considerable antiquity. It should
be kept in mind that these rivers are liable to sudden floods which might
disturb and redistribute the alluvium without removing it. I doubt
whether the alluvium would be disturbed by these floods to a depth of
as much as 35 feet, but I have no information on the subject and I am
not aware of the publication of any precise observations. Moreover the
topographical circumstances of the actual locality would have to be taken
into account.

"Failing direct information, we have to fall back on the—charac-
ters of the actual specimen. As noticed by Mr. Keith, its colour implies
a lengthy sojourn in the alluvium. The skull was fractured across
when it reached me, and I notice that the colour extends right through
the substance of the bone. I know nothing of the condition of the
skull, regarding encrusting material, when it was found. The fossil
remains of animals which have been found in India in formations of un-
doubtedly pleistocene age, are generally encrusted with sand grains
adhering so firmly that it would be difficult, in cleaning them, to obtain
the perfectly smooth and beautifully preserved surface of the Bayana
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skull. Still, we must beware of attaching too much importance to this difference. If the Bayana skull was found in a fine-grained silt of the nature of "loess" so abundantly developed in the Bayana region, its condition, whatever its antiquity, would be very different from that of the bones found in the coarse-grained pleistocene formations of the Narabada and Godavari. These bones are generally more or less mineralised, which is not the case with the Bayana skull, but, again, I would not place too much reliance on this difference. Human remains have not been found in these formations, but they have yielded human relics in the shape of a palaeolithic implement discovered in the Narbada formation. The characters of this implement as also the general character of the fauna, indicate a rather early stage of the pleistocene. All the human remains of that period found in Europe belong to the very peculiar extinct type known as the Neanderthal race, while, according to Mr. Keith, the Bayana skull exhibits no particularly abnormal features when compared with modern races. In our total ignorance concerning the physical characters of the early inhabitants of India, this does not definitely establish a difference of age.

Taking everything into consideration, we may say that the Bayana skull is certainly not recent; but, whether it might be two thousand years old or twenty thousand, we have, at present no means of determining. Our knowledge of Indian post tertiary geology is scanty. It would be of the utmost importance, in the present instance, to entrust to a competent geologist, a thorough investigation of the post tertiary geology of the Bayana neighbourhood."

(3) I wish to add that Vedahas are natives of Ceylon. "Vedans of Madras and Mysore are supposed to be the remnants of the earliest inhabitants of the peninsula (of India) and identical with the Deddas of Ceylon." (Thurston). They are not found in tracts north of Mysore. It will thus be seen that the Vedahas are not the people whose remains are likely to be found in the north of the Vindya mountains.

Dr. Arthur Keith's measurements of the Bayana skull have been very accurately taken and most conveniently illustrated. He is right in assigning it to the Aryo-Dravidians. Local environments however lead me to believe that this Bayana skull belonged to a Bhar, an aboriginal tribe inhabiting the Bharatpur State. The cephalic length of the present somewhat civilized and mixed up representatives of the race
shows that out of 100 living specimens measured by Sir Herbert Risley, 17 range from 175 to 180, while the specimen before us is 178. Making allowance for the skin and hair covering the scalp in living subjects, we shall not be wide of the mark if we say that these are probably the people who were allied to the man whose skull we have been examining. Out of the measurements of the breadth of the skull of the 100 Bhars, that of 7 range from 120 to 131. That is a small proportion, but it is accounted for by the facts that they had great struggles with Aryan Guptas and the Mongals or Moslems of the west,—medium and broad-headed races. Intermixture must have taken place among them in several cases, and general evolution due to civilization must have added to some development of their crania. As a proof of what I thus guess, I lay stress on the fact that two of the bones of this skull have got fused on the left side. Fused bones are found rarely, but they show a disproportionate evolution of the brain which could not keep pace with the growth of the bones of the skull, and forced nature to overlap. The mastoid region of the temporal bone has therefore fused with the parietal bone. That marks a very primitive or early stage. The Bhars are still found in the locality of Bayana, and a little to the north. There are about 91,357 of them in Azamgad, 73,944 in Gorakhpur, 59,986 in Ghazipur, 58,860 in Balia, 42,631 in Benares, 26,869 in Faizabad, &c. As Bayana is situated in the Bharatpur State, its very name shows signs of its origin from the name of the tribe Bhar. There are many very old Indian temples in and about the town, which have been turned into mosques by the Moslem invaders. One of these temples bearing date A. D. 1043 mentions Jādon Raja (the Jādhavs of the present day). There is a red sand-stone pillar bearing an inscription of Vishnuyardhana, a tributary of Samudragupta dated A. D. 372. Jādon King, Bijapāl’s descendants rule Karauli this day. He was killed by a nephew of Mahmud Ghazni. Bayana is mentioned in Aīn-i-Akbāri as having in former times been the capital of the province of which even Agra was but a dependent village.1

Dr. Oppert thinks that they are the Bharatas, a mountain tribe mentioned in connection with the Shabarases and with the Berberas or Barbarians. One Surah, the chief of Surauli, wished to marry

1 Fleet, Gupta Inscription, p. 253.
a high caste Rajput girl and was murdered by her relations. He is still remembered as a ghost.

Sir C. Elliott tells us that in prehistoric days, Oudh was an uninhabited forest country, after the Surajbansis were literally banished, and was ruled over by aborigines called Bhars. This great revolution seems to be satisfactorily explained by the conjecture that the Bhars were the aborigines whom the Aryans had driven to the hills and who swarming down from thence not long after the beginning of the Christian era, overwhelmed the Aryan civilization even in Ayodhya itself, and drove the Surajbansis under Kanaksen to emigrate into distant Gujerat. They spread themselves over all the plains between the Himalayas and that spur of the Vindhya range, which passes through the south of Mirzapur. There, they are found even now. They are dark-complexioned, ill-favoured, and of mean stature with nomadic and predatory habits. In fact (says a Settlement report) throughout Oudh, and the eastern part of the N. W. Provinces, every town the name of which does not end in pur, abād, or mau is assigned to the Bhars. The universal tradition of southern Oudh proves, that these princes conquered by Nasir-ud-din Muhammad, King of Delhi, in 1246 A.D. were Bhars, and that the whole of the south of the province as far as Ghagra was included in their dominions. They are so very ancient a tribe, that they are supposed to be the Bhayas of the Mahābharat subdued by Bhimsen in his eastern expedition.

Mr. William Crooke says that the most probable supposition is, that the Bhars were a Dravidian race. This is borne out by their appearance and physique which closely resemble that of the undoubted non-Aryan aborigines of the Vindhyan Kaimur plateau. Married men among them are buried, or their corpses thrown into running water.

It has been stated that prehistoric people like the Veddhas originally lived all over India, and have been driven down to the south. If so, Dr. Keith has really done great service to the science of Anthropometry by identifying the old skull found at Bayana with a member of the prehistoric natives of India, like the Veddahas—locally known as Bhars, deposited when they were just coming in contact with the earliest immigrant Aryans.
DR. KEITH'S TABLE OF CRANIAL MEASUREMENTS OF
THE BAYANA SKULL.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measurement</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Max. Length</td>
<td>178 mm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Max. Width</td>
<td>127 mm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cephalic Index</td>
<td>71.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auricular Height</td>
<td>108 mm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basibregmatic</td>
<td>131 ''</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Min. Front Width</td>
<td>90 ''</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supraorbital Width</td>
<td>101 ''</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Max. Width at Coron Suture</td>
<td>107 ''</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bi-Asterionic Width</td>
<td>95 ''</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bi-Mastoid Width (max.)</td>
<td>120 ''</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bixygomatic Width</td>
<td>136 ''</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
DR. KEITH'S DIAGRAM OF THE BAYANA SKULL.
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ADDENDA ET CORRIGENDA

To the Paper on "The Ablative Termination in Gujarātī."

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>649</td>
<td>last</td>
<td>उपरि</td>
<td>उपरि</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>650</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>after चकु add—, on the other.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>654</td>
<td>11 from the bottom</td>
<td>चरं )</td>
<td>चरं (</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>657</td>
<td>before the last para add —</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

[Another little indication is furnished, I believe, by Si. He. VIII. iv. 416 wherein कमलि is given as an ādeśa of कुत: I conjecture that this is made up of क (a representative of कित्) + खोनाथ.]

658 note 6 | add: — also (10) | after "Grammar" fill up the blank thus:

660 note *  | after "Grammar" fill up the blank thus:

And for "Here" read — 'हित, here'
THE ABLATIVE TERMINATION IN GUJARĀṬĪ.

N. B. Divatia, B.A. (Bom.), Bombay Civil Service (retired); Wilson Philological Lecturer (1915–16), University of Bombay; Professor of Gujarāṭī Language and Literature, Elphinstone College, Bombay.

I. Modern Gujarāṭī has थो and थक्की as terminations of the ablative case. Of these two थक्की is generally confined to poetry and, in prose, to a few stray localities or classes of people. थो is the generally used termination. I propose to trace the history of these two terminations, i.e., their linguistic evolution.

II. It will facilitate our object if we place before our mind clearly the two distinct conditions in which थो and थक्की appear in the language:

(a) as an indeclinable suffix, as in जे मुंबायातीला वाणो; or या छावपरीका प्रायो; or पथांना माया सुधी मालं नदी; and the like, and उदर थक्की कंदा जावे नसे, जे तु प्रेत भाषणांची

(Kusuma-mālā, p. 91)

गिरिटोला ठक्की उंगरी सच्ची

(Ibid, p. 34)

and (b) as an adjectival affix, liable to changes of gender and number, i.e., as a भिकारी विष्णु; e.g.:

(1) चार राम लखिवे तिछां खाकां

(Sudāmākhyaṇ, by Gangādās, probably V.S.1 1716)

(2) उत्तांत सच्ची रस्खांकी चली प्रेते तरे गमांभले

(Bhramara Gitā by Brahadeva)

(3) जा खाश्च चक्कु

(Pancākhyāna, 641)

(4) उपरि दिहा जे हाणी घोड़ा (Kāndaḍa-De prabandha, I. 94.)

The following abbreviations have been used in this paper: Ap(abhrāṃśa); Notes on the Grammar of Old Western Rājasthāni with special reference to Apabhraṃśa and to Gujarāṭī and Mārgarē, by Dr. Tessitori in the Indian Antiquary. vol. xliii, Feb. 1914, ff; Pr(akriti); S(ans)k(ri)j; O(ld) W(estern) R(ājasthānī); Gu(jarāṭī); M(arāṭhī); V(ikrama S(aṃvat).
Note that in old literature खुँ is also found for खुँ; खाड़ is the precursor of खड़.

This distinction between the indeclinable थो and थड़ on the one hand, and the adjectival थो, थो, थु and थड़, थड़ must be borne in mind prominently because on that depends the discovery of the two lines of evolution which the originals of these have passed through.

III. Another feature, the significance of which will be perceived later on in the formation of the ablative, must be noticed specially. It is the fact that in a number of cases the termination थो is preceded by some indication of location, either latent or manifest in the shape of a change in the ending vowel of the base, thus—

(1) चोड़े यो पद्धो corresponds to Skt. यायत्वित्; but while थो takes the place of the ablative termination the base चोड़ो undergoes the change into चोड़े which signifies location, चोड़ो + ऋ (=locative termination) + थो; literally meaning, "from on the horse."

(2) आमदावादयो सुबाई खायो. Here the locative termination after आमदावाद is not manifest; it is latent, all the same, for it will be clear that आमदावादयो means आमदावाद + माओ + थो, if we compare the formation of the ablative in the case of a noun ending in थो or उँ, e.g., खा रक्षो खायो, or बड़ो यो खायो (रक्षो and बड़ो यो being the base words). The fact is that in forms like आमदावादयो (where the base word ends in थ) the locative suffix ऋ which used to be appended in older times, i.e., in the Gurjara Apabhramśa period (e.g., रावण लगाई कपालि = (Modern Gujarati) रावण लगाई कपाल), changes into simple ऋ.

(3) खायो मयो. Here the sense is not pure खाय and yet, being partly such, the position of खाय before थो is as if it was खाय + locative + थो, the locative ऋ or rather ऋ having disappeared in favour of a final ऋ.

(4) खावनो, खावि, खाए, खाओ. Here the words खावि, खाए, खाओ are all forms expressing location, forms which could be traced back to forms of the locative case;

* (See note at the end of the paper.)


(5) चर वाणो. Here चर, which is the locative of चर, clearly proves the pre-fixure of location before ची.

(6) माण्यती काँटी मांस्कु. Here there is a clear locative माण्यते before the ची; the only distinction being that माण्यते conveys a sense of व्याधिकरण in a modified form, a metaphorical व्याधिकरण being implied.

I admit that there are certain kinds of instances where the ची is attached without any locative expression before it, manifest or latent. Such are—

(7) पण ची माण्यते सुधीभाँ भांच चढो
(8) चारा परण सात्साङे चर एक माण्यते कुंडु के
(9) चरणी दुःसे ते दुर
(10) चा लोकाचायो पेळा ब्यांवा सुधीच माणरी चद के.

It would hardly be correct to import in these instances any idea of location before the ची, even by a stretched interpretation. This class of cases, however, belongs to a stage of grammatical evolution which was subsequent to the one wherein the ची always had a locative index before it, manifest or latent, and consequently these instances need not be regarded as exceptions to the general rule requiring a locative pre-fixure to ची, but only as a different class by itself wherein ची ceased to carry with it the reminiscence of its derivation, and assumed a 'purely च्यादान' aspect. This remark will be clearer when I come to discuss the derivation of ची which I accept.3

3 For instances, see infra, Section IX, p. 656.
3 There are other applications of ची which are not pertinent to our inquiry. These are:

(a) comparison—1. शणी पण मरम; चेसाली पण मरम; 2. व्यक्तिक व्यय चीणा (Bhālā, Kūdambari, p. 117, l. 12, K. H. Dhruva’s edition).
3. गायनी वकरी मरी; (also गायनाणी ...);
(b) agency—च्याराची च्यानातु नची;
(c) instrumentality—पणसी चिच्या कवरं च; पणसी तेंग भांरी; जोरचं वंचं.
A comparison of the following two instances will illucidate my point:—

(1) नारा खेंतरथी हेतुः खेंतर चार राथवा हे
(2) नारे खेंतरथी तु खाणो.

In (1) the change of उ to था in नारा shows the absence of a locative suffix, even latent, in its विशेष, खेंतरथी; whereas in (2) the र of नारे, distinctly a locative indication, reflects the latent locative in the विशेष, खेंतर रथी.

IV. We can now enter upon a search for the true derivation of घी-घकी (indecl.), as well as of घी-घी घुं and घकी-घकी-घकु (adjectival). Several derivations have been suggested by several scholars. I think the test to be applied in selecting as true or otherwise one or more of these must be:

(a) Whether the particular derivation fits in with the idea of location preceding the घी termination; in other words, whether the derivation supplies a psychological link between the locative sense and the sense of the termination;

and (b) Whether the derivation accounts for the apparent phonetic anomaly presented by the presence of र in घकी, etc., found in the earlier stages of the language. Under ordinary conditions the र of खरा would be elided in Prakrit, and hence the presence of र in घकी, etc., appears rather anomalous. Could it have been the result of semi-learned scribes desiring to give the word a learned appearance?

Let us then see what are the derivations hitherto suggested. They are these, so far as I have seen—

(a) तम (Skt.)—as in मुखः.
(b) तक्षि—locative singular of तक्ष in Prakrit and Apabhramśa.
(c) चितू—present part. < चितू < चित (Ap.) < महनकं (Skt.).
(d) खा = to stand (for घी; घी-घी-घु).
(e) घकु Pr. < घकुत् Skt. (?).

V. (a) तम. This derivation has several drawbacks:

(1) तम is an indeclinable, and consequently it cannot be the parent of the adjectival घी-घी-घु, with the inflections of gender. Śāstri Vrajalāl Kālidās, in his Utsarga-Mālā (p. 118, edition of 1870), overlooks this essential difficulty and tries to suggest the derivation from तम thus—
(I leave as irrelevant the bad Sanskrit in the sentence above, concocted by the Śāstrī himself). In his anxiety to show an exact reflection of forms he has given घो (G.) for ती (ती) (Skt.) forgetting that घो is adjectival and masculine, whereas ती is simply the sandhi-made accident from त्य an indeclinable.

(2) त् would leave the स in घो unaccounted for.

(3) Most important of all, there are the following two objections:—

(i) phonetic—in that the स in the old forms घो, etc., remains unexplained if त्य is accepted as the origin;

and (ii) psychological—in that the locative idea preceding घो in the ablative formation (e.g., घो र्मी पच्चि and the like) is incapable of fitting in with त्य.

The Mugdhabodha-Auktiśāta gives त्य as one of the ablative suffixes (p. 3, col. 2, H. H. Dhruva's edition ज्ञाति, घोति, घति, घक्ति). It also gives त्य as a word corresponding to त्य (त्य किसिच्छं, तत्य किम्; p. 17, col. 1). But this should not mislead us; for त्य cannot take the place of त्य, the former being a complete ablative-like form of त्य, while the latter is a mere suffix having an ablative sense; though it is possible to explain गामति as coming from यामति: गामति and so forth by a natural transition of thought,—the idea of यामति (“village thence”) sliding gradually into गामति (simply meaning “from”), “from the village,” just as, in the case of the English genitive suffix (-s), John his passing into John's.

VI. (b) तिस्ति—This derivation is suggested by Dr. Sir R. G. Bhandarkar (Wilson Philological Lectures, p. 254). The difficulties in the way of accepting this view are these:

(1) The sense of तिस्ति, viz., that of location, cannot very well fit in with the idea of अवधान which is the essence of the ablative case.

(2) तिस्ति is an indeclinable, and it cannot account for the adjectival suffixes, घो, घो, घु.

(3) Nor can it account for the presence of the स in घो, etc.
and (4) it will not harmonize with the idea of location contained in the form preceding the suffix ऊँ, as in चोट्यो घो ऊँ and the like.

Dr. Bhandarkar himself derives the Marathi ablative suffix ऊँ—हूँ from चोट्यो (having been), and this should have really given him a clue to the true derivation of the Gujarati termination, ऊँ, as we shall presently see.

VII. (c) न्द्र—Dr. Tessitori (Notes, § 72, 2, 3) traces the ablative suffixes, न्द्र and न्द्र (O.W.R.) from न्द्र < लुँद्र < लुँद्र < भवन्तक . Now, this may be accepted as far as it goes. But I cannot go with Dr. Tessitori in his rejection of the derivation of न्द्र (adjectival) from the past participle of यावट्र (=to be, or become), or that of ऊँ (indeclinable from घोँ (by contraction), the conjunctive participle of यावट्र. In fact he has, to my mind, discarded the right derivation in favour of one which is second best, or perhaps only a basis for analogy; I mean his derivation of ऊँ (indeclinable) from *लुँद्र < लुँद्र, locative absolute of the present part. न्द्र, and of ऊँ (indeclinable) from *यालक, locative absolute from *यालक (यालक). (Vide his Notes, § 72, 6 and 15). Besides, his view (§ 72, 6, para 2) that घोँ by its very participial form may easily take the significance of ablative without being identical with the ablative post-position ऊँ, can hardly be accepted as sound simply because he finds instances where in Old Braja ऊँ is used as a participle in a similar situation: भवन्तक पवन पदसपरि घोँ, the wind comes after having been in (=from) the lotus-lake. One can very well argue that such forms indicate an earlier stage which preceded the crystallization of the participle (घोँ) into the suffix (�ँ). In fact in the instance उपश्राणिर न्द्रियि घोँ) Rṣabhadevaṇḍavala Sambandha, 51) cited by Dr. Tessitori, the घोँ is a post-position of an analytical stage, while the ऊँ in Gujarati गामधोँ, etc., is a termination of synthetical evolution. I shall deal with this aspect presently.

VIII. (d) ऊँ, (e) ऊँ, ऊँ,—It will be convenient to take these two conjointly in one section, though to be discussed, of course, separately.

I have just above referred to Dr. Tessitori's mention of the derivation of ऊँ and ऊँ from the past participle and the conjunctive participle of यावट्र. I prefer to go further back to the Skt. ऊँ. Dr. Tessitori (Notes, § 72, 4 and 5) derives ऊँ (adjectival) and ऊँ (adverb-
ial) from चक्र < चक्रति Skt. (Pischel, 488); and I believe he is correct, except in the coining of the Sanskrit root, for there is no such root in Sanskrit, whereas Hemacandra (VIII, 4, 16) gives चक्र as a ready-made अदेशा of स्था, which may have come from some Dēśya dialect.

I am inclined to accept Dr. Tessitori's view so far, but shall have occasion to differ slightly from him in applying the test (a) noted at the outset (Section IV, above), and in the important point regarding the exact predecessor of घो and घक्रो. I may at once state my conclusion categorically thus:

1. घो and घक्रो (indeclinables) are to be traced to the क्षान्न forms, conjunctive participles as Dr. Tessitori calls them, of घवे, घावे (Old G. and Modern Kāṭhiāvāḍī G.), स्था (Skt.) and चक्र (Pr.) respectively.

2. घो, घो, घु; घक्रो, घक्रो, घुङ (all adjectival forms) are to be traced respectively to स्थान (Skt.) and चक्रव (Pr.), चक्रव (Ap.) past part. of चक्र.

I shall briefly give reasons:

To begin with, the test (a) is fully satisfied in accepting these conclusions: the idea of location, in instances like घोडेखळी घो, घादेखळी घाथो, गाहाथो घाथो, तिस्म घक्रो and the like, harmonises well in the thought-linking of the sentence; thus—घादेखळी = having been (घो) in Baroda; and so forth.

To apply the test of the comparative method, let us see the Marāṭhī usage: तो माराठी घाथा; here घण (the ablative suffix) is a contraction of घोजन (==having been), meaning literally—"he having been (in) to the village." Dr. Bhandarkar (Lectures, pp. 255-6) gives this same derivation but gives the sense differently—"the village having been, he came." I submit this is obviously not as fitting as "he having been to the village." The absence of a clear locative indication in घाय + घोजन would not justify taking घाय in the nominative; in Gujarātī, for instance, घामळावाघढळी and such instances keep the locative suffix or the sense latent; similar may be the case with Marāṭhī, or the घा in गावा may represent an old locative index. Marāṭhī तेघण, तेघण (==there) + घण < ऊण, clearly points to the locative particle attached to तेघण.

The Hindi termination, सां, for the ablative may be traced to a
possible ज्ञान form of बस (==to be) + जग (Pr.)—जन. [Cf. Marāṭhī असम (==being, having been); rural Marāṭhī has ablative expressions like तिकडकसन which distinctly indicate the locative तिकडे + असन (ज्ञान of बसैं==to be). I would not trace the suffix सन to पासन (==from; पार्श + सन = जन) by contraction. Marāṭhī चरालस (==घर + बाह (inside) + जन) may be compared with Gujarāṭi घर्मा (Marāṭhī खांग with Gujarāṭi खांग, and Marāṭhī खांग बाधिक to Gujarāṭi तेवी बाधिक. This जो should not be confounded with the instrumental स—से, traceable to Skt. सम.

यो, चल can be traced back to विषतक to विषत (Apabhrr.); and यो, चल to शिष्ट (Apabhrr.). Their adjectival nature is not incompatible with their linking up with the idea of location, which the sense of "to stand" perforce requires. The double ज �accounts for the presence of क in the Gujarāṭi, त्यो, etc., for if we traced the word from शिष्ट the simple क would either disappear or be turned to ग.

IX. To compare the sense of location implied in the Gujarāṭi expressions कापरेयो, वोदरेयो, कलाप्यो, etc., we may go back to the Apabhramśa forms given by Hemacandra.

In his Sūtra, VIII. iv. 355, he says:

स्वादिशस्यवर।

Gloss:—व्याख्या स्वादिशकारणाय स्मरणे। श्रेयस् इति। इति भवति।

Instances:—जां होनाउ अघादौ। तसां होनाउ अघादौ। कां होनाउ अघादौ।

In the instances here given, I should regard the forms जां, तसां, 
कां as forms of the locative gender, or adverbs of location, and होनाउ 
as the ablative suffix, derivable from the present participle of चो (Pr.), 
—भू (Skt.). But strangely enough, Hemacandra regards the चो as the 
ablative suffix and होनाउ a mere incidental word. I submit he is in 
error here. I know, in Kumāra-pūla-carita, VIII. 26, he gives जां होनाउ 
and तसां होनाउ, and renders the former by व्याख्या मन्वन् in the 
commentary. But this poem was designedly composed to illustrate his 
sūtras, and consequently these quotations cannot have the value of 
independent evidence from literature. In the instances under VIII. iv. 
355, it is noteworthy that no instance is given of चो without होनाउ. 
The natural inference is that होनाउ is the essence of the व्याख्या sense,
whereas छो is something else in significance, and I contend it must have had a locative sense, at any rate in expressions of this kind. The locative forms, ष्, तथा, कहा, may have lost their independent existence or recognition in those days. My inference gains further support from the fact that in sūtras, VIII. iv. 372, 373, 379 and 380, the instances of ablative forms invariably have छोन्त व as a constituent:

लूक, छोन्त बागडो;
तुक,  ";
तुक,  ";
तुक,  ";
कुक,  ";
कुक,  ";
कुक,  ";
कुक,  ";
कुक,  ";
कुक,  ";
बागड,  ";

True, the forms preceding छोन्त व are not in the locative; but neither are they in any apparent ablative form; nay, they are all forms of the genitive case ¹—त, तुक, एक, etc.—a fact which would go to show more strongly that the अपदान सignificance is vested in छोन्त व.

[Mārkaṇḍeya seems to have missed this significance when he gives तुक, तुक, तुक, तुक, एक, एक as instances of ablative (without the essential छोन्त व). Vide Prākṛta-sarvasva, XVII. 46, gloss.]

The view I take regarding the forms ष्, तथा, कहा, viz., that they must have been locative forms (either as case forms or as avyayas) gains support from the fact that during the post-Apabhramśa period we find ष्, ष्, ष् in undoubted locative sense. Thus we find:

(1) ष्—यज्ञ, यज्ञ स्थान वा—Mugdhāvabodha-Auktika (V.S. 1450), p. 16, col. 1, last para, 11. 2, 3.

¹ This may, with advantage, be compared with the Gujarāti idiom, where, in the case of the first and second personal pronouns, the ablative suffix छो is preceded by the genitive form:

(a) मारावी रामराम व राम दृढ़ बंधो;
(b) मारावी वर्नर नये;
(c) मारायणये (प्रामायणये) यार कपिया स्वाधो.

Here, (a) is an instance of अपदान, but needing the genitive as a prop, wherein some such word as तथा or the like is understood; (b) is an instance where छो expresses instrumentality or agency; (c) is an instance where को, परं or the like must be interposed to express the idea; (cf. Skt. सम पार्श्वस्त). ष्, ष्, ष् (ष्), ष् (ष्) —not ष्, ष्, ष्—are forms, more or less obsolete now.
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(2) निष्काल-निष्कल, freely interspersed in the same book, p. 5, col. 2, ll. 2, 3; p. 4, col. 2, l. 3, under क्रदंतास, etc., etc.

(3) Kāṇhada-Dē prabantha (V.S. 1512) has निष्कल (=काल, "where", interrogative) at I. 105; निष्कल (=काल, "where", relative) at I. 15 (twice), 16; III. 246; निष्कल (=काल, "there") at III. 94.

(4) Hari-Lilā (V.S. 1541) has निष्कल तात्त्वत्त्वामी प्रक्ष्णद.

(5) Bhālaṇa's Kādambarī (V.S. sixteenth cent.) has निष्कल, निष्कल at several places; e.g., p. 128, l. 5 (पारिश्लेष निष्कल सत्त्वी सम्ब्रह्माण्य करतं काङ्ग्र थापार;) also l. 13 (निष्कल काल करक्रममलतां लोकन;) p. 129, l. 22 (निष्कल कन्थकालकसमाण्य बौधी दौढी ने तत्ततिकल)

Instances could be multiplied without end. I am sure that these forms निष्कल, निष्कल, निष्कल, were the successors of the जल, तात्त्व, काल cited in Hemacandra, VIII. iv. 355, which he erroneously regarded as ablative cases.

Dr. Tessitori regards these forms in चाल as primarily ablatives, which, having lost their original ablative meaning, passed into the locative sense, and, he thinks, this misled scholars into considering them as real locatives. (See his Notes, § 61.) Nevertheless he admits that in the instances in Hemacandra, VIII. iv. 355, the चाल, though cited as ablative, may as well admit of the locative meaning. On the whole, however, he is inclined towards regarding these forms as ablative, and traces the O.W.R. चाल back to रत्त्व (Skt.), through चाल (Pr.), चाल (Ap.); though he admits that चाल is very rare in O.W.R., and that the ablative चाल of Māravāḍi and Jaipurī must be traced to चम्फ, ablative plural termination in Apabhraṃśa. Dr. Tessitori clearly recognises that the employment of the present participle hontālī to form the ablative was frequent enough in Apabhraṃśa, and he cites the very instances given in Hemacandra, VIII. 4. 355. It is difficult to understand how, at the same time, in § 61 he takes चाल as the ablative symbol, for चाल + चाल, double ablative, would be an absurdity. I am therefore in favour of regarding चाल as the ablative symbol appended after the locative symbol चाल to represent the complex idea conveyed in such an express-

* The Sindhi ablative termination चाल must be referred to this same source, चाल.
* Notes, § 72, (2).
ion as "being inside," i.e., "from inside"; तत्त्व होनाउ = "being inside that place," i.e., "from that place." Mr. Kesavalal H. Dhruva, in his "Notes to Bhālana's Kādambari, Purvabhāga," p. 206, notices the form ज्ञात्व and regards it as locative, but stops short there and is silent as regards होनाउ and its significance. Rāo Bahādur Kamalāśankar P. Trivedī, in his "Gujarāti Brīhad Vyākaraṇa," pp. 132–134, discusses the ablative suffixes, and incidentally regards होनाउ as the ablative postposition in Apabhṛṣṭa, thus going against the express words of Hemacandra (from whom he quotes ज्ञात्व होनाउ, etc.), but not spotting his (Hemacandra's) oversight.

X. We see thus a sort of similarity in the Apabhṛṣṭa ablative ज्ञात्व होनाउ and the Gujarāti ablative अद्व्रयी, the only difference being this, that होनाउ is a present participle, and therefore adjectival, whereas थी is from थर, the conjunctive participle, which is indeclinable; a nearer approach to the form with होनाउ being the Gujarāti idiom ज्ञात्व थरो अद्व्रयी, where थरो is a present participle and therefore adjectival. This last idiom remains different in sense from the ablative idea, no doubt, but the essential origin is common between थर and थरो in these instances.

The adjectival घो-घी-घु are traced to—

(a) सिद्धत्तक
(b) चृतउ < होनाउ < भवलत्तक: ।

The latter derivation is favoured by Dr. Tessitori. 7 I prefer the former. My reasons are: the change of तउ to चउ under the influence of the थ of चृतउ, although not quite impossible phonetically, requires a needless step, whereas थ of सिद्धत्तक supplies the च naturally and easily; secondly, the थ as being the root common to the घी (adjectival) and थो (indeclinable), we secure a sort of brevity of phonetic principles (सिद्ध लाभ) consistently with probabilities.

The ablative suffixes given in the Mugdhaāvabodha-Auktika (p. 3., col. 2) are तउ, चृतउ, चउ, and चकउ. One need not, simply on account of the sequence in which these are given, suppose a common origin for them all. I believe तउ can be traced to चृतउ (by the elision of the unaccented first syllable), or to तउ: (as stated above, see p. 652); चृतउ

7 Notes, § 72, (3).
is obviously from होनाउ (Ap.), भवतकः (Skt.); यह from स्मृतक, and यक्त from यक्त (Pr. and Ap.), past participle.

Hemacandra gives (VIII. iii. 9), amongst others, two अदेशास in Pr. for the Skt. ablative plural भस्म्, चिन्नो and सुन्नो. I may be permitted to guess that the होनाउ of the Apabhramśa, which I detach from the instances जलं होनाउ etc., must be allied to these चिन्नो and सुन्नो, and that चिन्नो (probably changed from डळो) must have come from the present participle of Skt. भस्म and सुन्नो from that of Skt. यस्म. I cannot go with the extremely ingenious but for that very reason quite unconvincing theory of Lassen referred to by Beames, wherein he (Lassen) states that चिन्नो was a composition of रिचि (instrumental plural termination) and तस्स (Skt.) ablative particle, and सुन्नो was made by a mixture of सू (locative plural termination) with तस्स (Skt.),—the former meaning “from by” and the latter “from in”; that the fusion of the components resulted in a loss of the distinction between the two, and also of the distinction of number; and, further, that सू and सून्नो, as in केतीक सूः चयमेः सूः (Canda’s Prthuराजा-Rāṣau, I, 178), and कालित मिजः फिन्नसूः पूर सूः (ibid. I, 184), Hindī ablatives, resulted from this fusion of चिन्नो and सुन्नो; and, finally, this सूः gave the Marāṭhī ablative suffix न्न. All this has to be discarded. As we have already seen, न्न is from होनाउ, corresponding to the Gujarāṭi यो (from यह); and I see no reason to reject this view established by the comparative method, and various other data and arguments. Old Hindī सूः and सून्नो are equally clearly from Ap. होनाउ.

* [See p. 650. Instances of यो-यो-य (adjectival) can also be given. I do not stop to mention them. The oldest instance I find is in the verse quoted by Hemacandra in his Prakrit Grammar.

Here is the old precursor of यह-यो.
THE PSYCHOLOGICAL BASIS OF ALAṆKĀRA
LITERATURE WITH SPECIAL REFERENCE TO RASA.

PANDIT SIVAPRASAD BHATTACHARYYA, SĀHITYAŚASTRI, KĀVYA-
tīrtha, M.A., B.T., Professor of Sanskrit, Presidency
College, Calcutta.

It is a truism that the cultural asset of a nation is determined
by its literature; and it is as much a truism to say that the critical
literature of a country gives us a no mean estimate of the constructive
capabilities and potentialities of its master-minds. India has a lit-
erature of hoary antiquity and of wide range such as no other country
in the world possesses; and it is not strange to notice that her con-
tribution to the critical literature of the world is of matchless purity
and real value. Not to say anything of works which fall more properly
under the domain of physical and metaphysical sciences, her con-
tributions in the narrower field of literature and "letters" have been
immense and far-reaching. Her Alaṅkāra literature—for it is under
this name that these works pass—professes to be called an important
adjunct (व्युत्कर) to the study of Veda, and has as much sanctity attached
to it from times immemorial. The tale of the descent of the सारसत्य
काव्यपुस्त, which, after all, is a fine idea, hints at the importance of
this literature. Speech was rude and crude in the primitive stages of
civilisation;—so was poetry, the "soul and acme" of speech. It
was in speech that the prospective greatness of the human species
lay latent. वाचविखविखदु देव मनो मार्यति । नाषते च, वाचविखविखह, says
the Rśi of the Chāndogya Upaniṣad. वाचविखविखदु | वाचविखविखह | वाचविखविखह |
वाचविखविखह; reiterates the author of the Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa,8 in his
usual strain. Nay, as early as in the ages of the Vedic hymns, the
sages sang thus of Speech and her manifold manifestations:

1 Vide the Kāvyamimāṁsā of Rājaśekhara (Gaekwad Oriental Series):

2 Ibid, Adhyāya 1.

3 i. 4. 11.
As was naturally to be expected, grammar went hand in hand with rhetoric and poetics for elaboration, elucidation and a scientific study of speech. The one has analysed (शाकरण), the other has graced and adorned the elements of speech (शब्दमण), —so much so that it was in and through them that speech has justified its existence and spread its triumphs over thoughts and things.

It was great a triumph for man to speak out his thoughts, and surely it was as great a triumph for him to utilise his resources in analysing the materials of speech. It was for the three sages, with whose names the Science of Grammar is ever associated, to do it—and do it in a manner never to be surpassed. The well-known riddle-hymn of the Rgveda (IV.58.3)—

चलामि शब्दः वचो भास्य प्रदा वे श्रोवः सम शक्तासो भास्यः
विधा बड़ो शब्दमै रोगवैति मदो देवो मद्यी श्लोकमेष ॥

has been so interpreted by the Bhāṣya-kāra as to form the foundation stone of his science. Well might an ingenious old rhetorician have made it the text of the greatness of his śāstra too! Bhāmaha, with whom the Alāṅkāra-śāstra in its set and systematic form is believed to begin,—and who, by the by, was born too early to admit the presence of अनि (suggestiveness in literature),—believes in the eternity of sounds and words.\(^4\) The discussion connected with the four-fold utterance of words as noticed by the Bhāṣya-kāra and as indicated in the commonly known verse—

वैरो शब्दविशिष्टत्तयमात्र वृद्धिगोचर
शौक्तितार्थः च पंक्षली श्रुत्त्वावमनपाशिनी ॥

indicates clearly in what manner the Indian mind interested itself in the investigation of शब्दः,\(^5\) and to what a stage it reached in unfolding the physiological, psychological and ontological principles—for the

\(^4\) न शब्दः शक्तिः. \(\text{Kāvyālāṅkāra, IV. 6}\)

\(^5\) We read in the Mahābhāṣya: कालितशब्दः। येनेनार्थायते। मात्रायामध्यस्वरूपाविभाविनी। भमप्रायो भवति श शब्दः। शब्दः प्रतीतपदार्थार्थो लोकेः अनि। शब्द दृष्टं यतः।
psychology and ontology of a thing follow closely in train of its physiology—underlying the very being of speech. It is interesting to note in this connection how later writers on *Alaṅkāra*, while explaining the origin of *अनियमण* and the importance of *अनि* from its psychological and literary bearings, do not fail to notice the physical and physiological connection between *अनि* and *खोटः*. The critic in literature has to look to the sentence or (वाक्य) as the unit of his investigation. While the linguist and the physiologist have dwelt on the sound (or the syllable) and the manifestation thereof, the critic, with the aid of the logician and the psychologist, has dived deep into the mysteries of thought and their coherence and concentrated his attention on the substance, leaving the outer surface to itself.

Thus, the two prominent aspects of literature have their logical and psychological trends. The art of criticism, as it is conceived and fully developed in the *Alaṅkāra* literature of India, took note of both. The logical aspect of *Alaṅkāra* has been, and quite rightly too, the theme of many dissertations, both old and modern;—nay, it has been so much discussed and written on, especially in the later orthodox literature of the subject that, in reading some works professed to be on *Alaṅkāra*, one is often tempted to doubt whether they are not works of

---

*Says Mammaṭa : नृणामयःः प्रथमसमस्मार्त्यंवहस्त्रःसः गच्छसी अनिमित्ति वन्यः र

---

Similarly, we read in Kavikarṇāpūra’s *Alaṅkāra-kautuḥba* (a work which the writer of this paper has been editing for the Varendra Research Society, Bengal, the first volume of which has been out in March, 1923):

मन्दिरावस्तुसमस्मार्त्यं वन्यः परमेश्वराः ||

---

The same extract from the Bhūgaratapuruṣya is utilised in the Brahmanical Tantra literature (e.g., in *Sūradā-tilaka*) to explain the philosophy of the framing of *mantras*. *Vide JAOS., Vol. XXIII.*
logic (न्याय) as well.¹ The psychological aspect, on the other hand, one is apt to lose sight of, and the treatment it has received at the hands of modern scholars in the form of discussion and exposition is no index of its importance. The physical and the linguistic aspects of criticism are related to its psychological aspect as body to mind.²

It may be said here, without any fear of contradiction, that the rhetoric literature of no other country has produced such a system and thoroughness as the Alāṅkāra literature of India has achieved,—and achieved through its analysis of the spirit or the sentiment. The code of criticism in ancient India may be said to have approximated to the state of an exact science; for the rules and principles therein are general and universal,—almost all of them apply not to ancient Indian literature alone, but to any literature of any age; nay, they apply not merely to literature, but to any fine art which can be expressed by symbols and signs. And the reasons for the importance of Alāṅkāra literature are not far to seek. In Greece and Rome rhetoric was regarded as a means to an end—it was useful mainly as a powerful instrument in the hands of the orator and statesman. Very seldom, indeed, was any attention paid to any other side of the art than the purely "physiological" one or the style (रूप),—to the अभिव्यक्ति, as the later Indian rhetoricians would term it. In Europe, in the Middle Ages, the art of criticism got a set shape and colouring, after the manner of the "school-men"; but it was more often a shadow and phantasm that they pursued—the soul of art was a sealed book to many of them. We hear, in modern Europe and Greater Europe, of a good many schools of literary criticism; but, suffice it to say, that no definite constructive and thorough lines of criticism have been systematically chalked out so as to place the art on a solid footing. The Alāṅkāra literature does not stand charged with any such grave defects or shortcomings,—and it has, like Aaron's rod, exterminated unworthy

¹ As apt instances one may cite the many commentaries on Kūryaprakāśa, which are more often feats of intellectual (logical) gymnastics than of any ulterior value. The Alāṅkāra-kaustubha, a late South Indian work by Viśveśvara Pāṇḍīta, is fully saturated with this preponderance of the Nyāya mode of thinking and argument.

² "Etymology, vestification, syntax are respectable sciences and have their proper place in the wide field of human knowledge. They are the anatomy or physiology of poetry. But they do not help us to understand the secret of poetic power for the simple reason that poetic power is independent of accidental and external resemblances"—Spengarn's Creative Criticism, p. 111.
compositions and has done real service to the cause of **belles lettres** in our land. From Bharata, the author of the *Nāṭyaśāstra*, to Rūpa Gosvāmin, the author of the *Ujjvalanīlāmaṇi*, is a long way indeed; but, here too, the good old adage "the beginning shows the end" is applicable in no small a measure. The cardinal principles—the attention to and appreciation of the feeling-side (*रसात्मकता* )—have been the same all through; the literature on the subject has merely "broadened down from precedent to precedent." Hence the historical scholar must not under-estimate the importance of this evolution of thought and must not lose sight of the main under-current which flows deep underneath at the bottom. This reference to feeling and emotion⁹—to love and light, and greater life and greater law—has served as the connecting link between life and literature; or, in a country ridden by ideas and ideals, one would have found few traces of the environment within and without.

Psychology is a positive science; and it is primarily on the feeling-function—one of the tripartite divisions of the mental functions—that the rhetorician has made the soul of literature to lie (वाक्यं *रसात्मकः काव्यम्*). ¹⁰ The pleasures of understanding and those of imagination are, no doubt, brought into prominence in an intensive study of literature; but it is to the fortunate few that the poet imparts the outpouring of his heart and the surging of his sentiments. "Fear is poetry, hope is poetry, love is poetry, hatred is poetry; contempt, jealousy, remorse, admiration, wonder, pity, despair, madness are all poetry."¹¹ The critic in India has consequently taken his stand on the Longinian doctrine of *transport*, for he wants his poet so to speak in his verses that he may teach, that he may delight, and last but not least, that he may move. The poet may be a teacher, a sage; but above all, he is a *man*, a "pendulm betwixt a smile and a

⁹ "The only raison d'être of esthetics is to analyse the sentiment of beauty, and this in the final analysis rests on the Einfühlung (innate feeling)." (Encyclopaedia of Religion and Ethics, Vol. II, p. 447.)

¹⁰ Cf. also *Nāṭyaśāstra*: न दि रसास्तेन कविदियं: प्रकटेन रति। (Chap. VI, under कृषिका 32.)

¹¹ Hazlitt, *On Poetry in General.*
tear." No work of literature is worth the name, unless it be of feeling and imagination all compact, unless it can agitate our higher sensibilities and make us oblivious of our material surroundings. रसः वै सः— and it is रस or sentiment, freely felt and readily realised, that can help us in the attainment of the Sublime. "Our souls are somehow naturally exalted by the true Sublime; and, as if rearing or prancing, are filled with joy and exultation, as if (they) themselves had produced what they hear." 12 If we analyse it clearly and directly, we can readily see that the pleasure or bliss 13 we derive from a critical study of a literary master-piece is the outcome of a psychological process; and as the proof of the pudding lies in the eating, so the criterion of the bliss lies in the tasting or realisation thereof. As Viśvanātha puts it: प्रमाणः चतुर्भूषाणि खामिषः विदुषम् सतम्. While it is often the psychologist in the man that contributes to making him a poet or prompts him to judge well works of others, it may be equally true that psychology is indifferent, in the long run, in matters of this sort. There is required the philosopher's stone or the magician's wand—genius or taste, as the case may be—the hypothetical sixth sense (artistic sense) of the Empiricists of Europe. The following lines of Alexander Pope bear repetition in this connection:

In poets as true genius is but rare,
True taste as seldom is the critic’s share;
Both must alight from Heav’n derive their light,
Those born to judge, as well as those to write.

It is not in the domain of logic, nor of psychology either, to propound that process or to exhibit that light. It is enough if it can help in analysing that light. 14 Nor is it to be overlooked that the psychological aspect in its emotional bearing is one side of the shield; for, knowing—imagination and inference—has its place in criticism.

Thus the psychological basis of Ālaṅkāra literature is more than substantiated when we take passion or sentiment (रस) to be the ruling principle. Almost the self-same argument applies in their case.

12 Longinus, On the Sublime (as translated and quoted in Saintsbury's Locis Critici).
13 चानन्दचेतसी रसः—सन्तारसायन (२।२१).
14 Sāhityadarpana, (Jīvānanda’s edn.), III. 57.
15 Similarly, Anatole France describes the critic not as a judge imposing sentence, but as a sensitive soul detailing his “adventures among masterpieces.”
who choose to take चाचि (theoretically, suggestiveness of any sort whatsoever) as the essential characteristic of literature (काव्यa). The minor modifications in the mode of argument, which have to be called into being, are, however, rendered superfluous when we remember that Anandavardhana and Abhinavagupta (the learned commentator on his Dhvanyāloka), the two commonly acknowledged champions of the Dhvani school, speak every now and then in a strain which makes one doubt whether they do not sail practically in the very same boat with the adherents of the rasa school. In the dhvanikārikā, for example, we read:

काव्यस्थाना सं रसार्थ्यतासा चालिकृतेः पुरा
श्रीसन्धिविश्वेश्वरेऽश्रीकृतस्मातः (I. 5.)
दुधूचूर्ध्व श्रवत्र श्वरणं काले रसपरिर्यात्
सामे नवा इतराभासित सधुमाम इव शुमा (IV. 4.)

The Locanakāra quotes, apparently with approval and reverence, the views of his teacher (Bhāṭṭatota?): प्रीवास्था च रसस्तदेव नात्य गाथा: गाव च वैद इवमेदायाय।

16 Says he in his Abhinavabhāratī (under Chap. VI, verse 33): नात्य गाव च रसा: काल्याय गाथा यथा वर रस कायाशः। Anandavardhana himself refers to the following well-known verses in his Dhvanyāloka:

व्यापरे कायासङ्गारे कविरेकः प्राप्तति: 
यथास्मै रोकते विशुचित्यं परिवृत्ते।
प्रस्फुरी चेतुः कविः काशे जातं रसमं जगत्:
स गाव वैतग्रामसहोरसं सहस्मेव ततः।

The Locanakāra comments—इवालपद रसोपलमागहमृ. The school that takes its stand on sublimity of sense (रसोपलाहृयायूर्वश्चः: प्रतियादेकला) and counts amongst its followers the renowned Paṇḍita-raja Jagannātha has but to choose either of the alternatives afforded by the Dhvani or the Rasa school in matters relating to suggestiveness (व्यञ्जना). But what shall we say when we find the Riti (or Guṇa)

16 Dhvanyālokālokacana, under III. 10-14.
17 Dhvanyāloka, III. 43.
18 More properly, the presence of "expression conveying charming sense," according to the rendering of Dr. F. W. Thomas. That Jagannātha was not the pioneer of this school is evident from the reference to and acceptance of its main principle by the Kashmirian critic Kuntaka, the celebrated author of the Vakroktī-jīvita.
school taking its stand on something different from either of those alternatives? Vāmana, the staunchest champion of this school, following his great master Daṇḍin, rules: रॉनिगिला काव्य 19, as if structure is all-in-all! 20. But it is he again who opines that सन्देश्यु दशशृष्टकं वैय: । 21 These two statements appear irreconcilable unless we take it to be his intention that रसवल्ल, which figures so prominently in dramatic literature (रूपक), is par excellence a primary requisite of Kāvyas. Similarly awkward is the position of those Ālaṅkārikas who, taking the Kashmirian critics Bhaṭṭodbhaṭa and Rudraṭa as their leaders, like some of their confrères in the West, opine that it is figures of speech (Ālaṅkāra in the narrow sense of the word) which make literature what it is worth, and that rasas and, for the matter of that, Dhvani in general, are species of Ālaṅkāras and are of secondary importance; 22 for, it will be enough to state that even the Kavyālaṅkārasamgraha (4th kāṇḍa) of Bhaṭṭodbhaṭa refers to the पञ्चशृष्टि of rasa and is not bold enough to discard it outright. 23

Thus, judged with the apparatus of criticism with which the various writers of different ages and belonging to different schools are equipped, and from the manner in which they interpret themselves in practice, it becomes evident that poetry, to be poetry, must appeal to readers through sentiment, and that the pleasure in the perusal of Kāvyas lies in the savouring of sentiments (रसाखात), a point to which we have already referred. The sentiment may be any one

19 Kavyālaṅkārasaṅkara, I. 2.
20 Anaandavardhana makes a rather ganty remark, while referring to the achievements of the Riti school (Dhanvyāloka, Kāvyamāla Edn., p. 231): रॉनिगिलविभाषिनां वि कायतकसंवेदनां (अभिष्रुष) चढातनय: सनात्क्य विदितसंपर्कारवृत्तिः।
22 रसा: रूपक काव्यासंग्रहः, Kavyālaṅkārasamgraha. Says Pratiharendra in his Laghuverti (Kāvyamāla edn., p. 79) in this connection: नग वर्त किं भद्यदयवादिनो व्यासाश्च वर्णास्तसंग्रहो वि नादसंग्रहो
of the rasas mentioned in Alankara treatises; for, every rasa has its function in the realm of poetry. Bhaṭṭanāyaka, one of the leading exponents of the Rasa school, while approving of the free admission of all rasas in poetry, formulates, in his own way, the three stages of realisation of the sentiment (र्साधार) and opines that the third stage (चर्चण or भोगौप्रौत) is the most important. The critic is to see that the चर्चण (tasting) is there, in the proper place, to make people understand that it is "a thing of beauty" and is hence "a joy for ever." As Victor Hugo has it: "Art has nothing to do with leading strings, with handcuffs, with gags; it says 'Go your ways' and lets you loose in the great garden of poetry, where there is no forbidden fruit. Space and time are the domain of the poet. Let him go where he will and do what he pleases: this is the Law." So much for the positive side of criticism, which relates to our appreciation of literature and regulates our commerce with things and thoughts, as they occur in the pages of writers.

This does not mean, however, that the critic wants the poet to give free rein to his powers of impression and expression, to give his thoughts in a plain, bold, cut-and-dried fashion, to present facts just as they are and are to be presented to the psychologist or the natural historian. Far from that. What is life-like narration to the natural historian may be and often is a lifeless mass of words to the poet.

Literature is not science and the poet is but an artist. It is for him to instil life into the whole thing—to season it properly and profusely. As Mahima Bhaṭṭa says: प्रवचनोपिक्षाः सामान्यतः संविद्यसानं सचेतसं न तथा चमल्लामात्मावति यथा स शब्द सत्वविना ववमोचरतां गमित्. Here comes in the discipline under the regimen of which the poet is put. This discipline is really a salutary influence. Much is being, and has been, said in the past against rules,—but there are rules and rules.

---

24 Vide a reference to his views made in Jayaratha's commentary on the Alankara-saraasa.
25 Prof. Saintsbury calls this "the Magna Charta of Poetry", loci Critici, pp. 418-419.
26 "Science is the response to the demand for information, and in it we ask for the whole truth and nothing but the truth. Art is the response to the demand for entertainment for the stimulation of our senses and imagination, and truth enters into it only as it subserves those ends."—George Santayana, The Sense of Beauty. The italics are ours.
28 Was it not an English critic (the earliest English critic worth the name), who was
this matter the eastern rhetorician, who exacts विचित्रति or वैचित्र्य as a safe principle to start with, is at one with the western critic, who has recorded his vigorous protest against the decriers of rules in criticism in the following passage 23: “To assert that rules and criticism can oppress genius is to assert that practice and example are oppressive—it is to limit genius not merely to itself, but to its own first attempts.” It may not be deemed irrelevant if we state in this connection that two of the eighteen adhikaranaś of the comprehensive Alaṅkāra-śāstra—as was schemed by old writers on the subject and has been followed, for example, by Rājaśekhara in his Kāvyamīmāṁsā, (of course no sweeping generalisation can be made, since the work published in the Gāekwād Oriental Series is a fragment only)—the वैचित्र्यक and the वास्तव, treat more properly of facts and sentiments, as they are and as they occur. The former treats of the genesis and practice of pleasant amusements in the form of Anyokti, and the latter of figures of speech like राजति (known otherwise as कृत्वस्विति). Here, too, as is quite evident, the principles of the art regulate the attempts of the poet—he is not free to write as he pleases but is to abide by the golden rules of propriety (विचित्रति and वैचित्र्य); otherwise poetry, which is the consummation of ecstatic and aesthetic intuition, deteriorates itself into something base and nauseating.

Thus, though literary criticism has got a psychological basis, the functions of the mental scientist and of the critic are not the same. While it is in the province of the psychologist to give, amongst other things, an account of the genesis and working of the several types of

23 Lessing, Hamburg Dramaturgy, translated into English in Loci Critici, p. 261. It augurs well for the future of the literature of criticism in the west that we have amongst the present-day critics a few who would rather choose to be called “classic,” “rule-ridden” and “artificial” than damn rules and restraints, and be hailed as “romantic,” “catholic” and “natural.” Criticism in the west, like many other things, indeed, is turning back to the ideal of the east, and it would be a splendid gain for literature if this rapprochement of the eastern and the western ideals happens to stay in and exercise its sway (especially in India) over her rapidly growing vernacular literatures.

20 Dhanuyāloka, under III. 10-14, quotes the following dictum:

| अनौग्यवालहि समयसम्भवः कारणम् |
| प्रत्यौपत्तवशाय समयसविवेकः परः |

Cf. the basis of differentiation between rasa and rasa-bhasa (śuddha rasa and maśīna rasa) in Indian poetics and later Vaishnava rasasūtra.
feeling within the compass of the human mind, it is the privilege of
the poet to construct out of these feelings and sentiments a fairy land
of verdure and grandeur, serenity and sublimity. Then again, as we
have already hinted, the poet is nothing if he is not a teacher. And
hence the poet has to be realistic in his work as far as possible,—his
literary efforts must have an unambiguous reference the co-ordinates
of the life and environment of his species. The positive, psychological
or concrete side of criticism—as distinguished from its normative,
metaphysical or abstract side—takes its stand here, directly and
decidedly. While works in Alâmkâra literature in general touch on both
fringes, there are some (e.g., Daśarûpaka, Bhâvaprakâsa, Šrînâratulaka,
Rasamañjari, Rasârañnavasudhâkara) that have directed themselves
mainly to the positive side. There are other treatises (e.g. Rasasudhâ-
karâ, Ujñavalanilâmani, Bhaktirasâmrtasindhu), again, which have, more
or less, a spiritual bearing and in which the 'hungering for the eternity'
finds a lasting expression. Kâmasûstra has a family likeness to the
former type of works, Bhaktisûstra to the latter. The technical Dharmá-
sûstra and Artha sûstra treatises fall, in a way, under the provinces
of both, though in each of them the normative side has cast into shade
the positive one. The critic, however, is ever on the alert to re-
mind him that his work is to be चतुर्वेण्यमप्ररत, if it is to be classed as
something of abiding value. Here it is that idealism inevitably creeps
in and prevents literature from being degraded into a jargon of
common-place thoughts and spurious ideas. In the hands of the
clever Indian poet, the real and the ideal merge their being and blend
into a homogeneous whole. Western literature is replete with instances
of works deriving their value for the time being, from the whims and
oddities of the writer, or the fashions and fancies of the time; but
we will seldom find a work in Sanskrit literature dealing purely with
the follies and foibles of its times which has survived and has come down

31 Bhâma (I. 2): र्गर्गांशकाममीवेशृष्ठिं सीववयन कलासु च।
करोति कौशिक प्रीतिम मायुक्तिविनिष्ठवमस।

We read also in Kâtyâsûtram: कविवशिव्य च कलापुरुषघनाः। शाच च नि-वेष्यपु-तस्मिनि
मधये। The terms śreyas and preyas of upaniradic fame hit at almost exactly the
same demarcation between the poet's business in its supersensuous subjective aspect and
that in its sensuous realistic plane as a teacher.

32 Thus, according to a well-known platitude of Hegel: "Art and the Beautiful in
which it is realised are the perfect identity of the ideal and the real."
to us. The critic in India was abroad and assailed with force and fury anything that went against the time-honoured canons of his śāstra and tried to loosen the bonds of society and service. He was no respecter of persons and consequently wielded an enormous influence in the empire of belles lettres. In no other country do we find the study of literature and literary criticism so indissolubly linked as in India. And this practice has helped in its own way to make the study of Kāvyā itself a sort of literary discipline and to awaken in its readers an amount of literary sense which otherwise would have lain dormant.

There have been many who opine that the study of Alaṅkāra in our country has been worse than useless. The first ground for this assertion of theirs—the inadequacy of results achieved nowadays by students taught in the orthodox fashion—may be met by saying that the older methods of study have died away as a result of the superficial acquaintance with literature, which has followed in the train of little learning (which has been in vogue simply because learning and earning are measuring their strength against each other), and that these studies have not been reinforced by a comparative study of the critical literatures of other climes. The other charge brought against the utility of an intensive study of Alaṅkāra literature by scholars is that it is over-ridden by mere mechanical analysis, dry classifications, divisions and subdivisions carried on ad infinitum,—things which are sufficient to perplex any one and drive him mad. This charge, too, is the outcome of insufficient equipment, and not infrequently, of narrow prejudices.

33 It is to these that the ruling काबालकपंच नामार्थम् applied.
34 Even a commentary to a Kāvyā is regarded as incomplete unless it enters satisfactorily into the deep and abstruse questions underlying the passages comprised in it and it is a significant fact that not a few of the scholiasts on Kāvyas, whose commentaries are still extant (e.g. Rāghabhaṭṭa, Vallabhadeva, Nātha, Mallinātha, Bhagiratha), were no unworthy Alaṅkāra scholars.
35 Even a cursory look at the Dvanyālokālocana, the Daśarūpaka (with its Avālōka), and at Chap. VI of the Sāhitya-darpāna would suffice to make one arrive at this conclusion. All, intelligent spectators (प्रेक्षक) before whom was represented a drama (कथा)—the best species of literature according to the concensus of expert opinion in all climes—were required to be well-informed critics, to have a fair estimate of the poet's powers and intentions. They had to move and feel with the poet; for, as the Saṅgītaratnākara puts it:
as well, and it is to be traced to a wrong mode of approaching the subject and to expecting from it what it cannot bestow. We have classifications, divisions and subdivisions—we have enough of them, especially in many of the later works on the subject. Where, indeed, is a science that has been in a position to do away with these mechanical aids? We submit that in Alaṅkāra literature we have no irrelevant division or classification. In the midst of analysis we have synthesis, in the midst of apparent diversity we have real unity indicated along lines as clear and bold as possible. And this is avowedly the motive which many of the Ālaṅkārikas profess for themselves and their works.

A close study of the themes commonly treated in Alaṅkāra treatises would convince one of the truth of this assertion. The kernel of the contents of such treatises relates to Dvani, rather, as we have above indicated, to its essential adjunct Rasa. And these have been touched upon in their psychological, ethical and aesthetic bearings in quite a novel and illuminating way. It was the life-work of Bharata, Anandavardhana, Abhinavagupta, Mamāta and others to demonstrate satisfactorily the scientific basis of criticism and to give an analytic and thorough study of dvani or rasa. The great dictum of the sage—

विमानानुभावन्विभाविरसंवेदनावस्मिनियन्ति—

—has been construed to form a right basis of the psychological study of Alaṅkāra. Rasa (feeling) has Bhāva (sentiment) as its counterpart or crux. As has been ably put—

न भावोऽभेदतः रसोऽभावो रसवर्णितः ।

परस्परःपरस्यादेशः रसभावायंः॥

The inseparable concomitants of passion—the dominant sentiments (स्थायिभावस्), along with their occasional and accidental varieties, the accessory sentiments (वर्षायिभावस् and सास्त्राभावायस्)—have been

58 This is what Panditarāja Jagannātha ingenuously remarks on the position of the Pre-Dhvani schools of rhetoricians:

अनिकारानु अचार्यामभावासद्वत्सिस्तवथा यथास्थायिभावोऽभावो यथाविषयः भावमच्छिन्नाधिकारः न प्रबुधार्णे तत्त्वानाम सत्यज्ञात्वर्योऽर्थोऽसः सत्यमेव भावायुभाव्यं तत्त्वात्त्वात्त्वात्त्।

Rasagāṅgūdhara, pp. 658-659 (Benares Sanskrit Series).

59 Bharata's Nātyasāstra (Chap. VI, under verse 32). Adds the sage: हर्षति वि

भावोऽभावार्चामभावासाशस्मिनि रसभावो भावायुभाव्यं।...

वस्त्रो वीजाद्वद्वद्वव स्वाभावः पुष्य पुष्य वस्त्रः।

तथा गूढः रुक्षः धम्म रसिं भावायु भविष्यतः। इत्यतः ॥ २८

60 Cf. Nātyasāstra (Nirñaya Sāgara Press Edn.), p. 72:

वर्षायिभाविरसंवेदनावस्मिनियन्ति विमानानुभावन्विभाविरसंवेदनावस्मिनियन्ति।

A 43
studied, elaborated and exposed. Though rasa is खङ्काठ (self-luminous) and छल्ल (undivided), yet it is through these and through its exciting (विभाव) and indicating (सार्वनिक्षमाव) and ensuant (ब्रह्मव) factors that the psychological process of realisation is rendered complete. The different ways and views about the interpretation of Bharata's dictum and about the nature, function and appreciation of Rasa do not concern us here. Sufficient it will be for our purpose to state that in none of these ways and views the psychological basis of Alankaśa literature with especial reference to rasa is obscured and blotted out. As to the explanation of the processes of appreciation and realization (साधारण्रूप) underlying the whole theory of rasa, in which operation विभाव, etc., actively participate and are blended into one homogeneous whole, as in the formation of a chemical compound, the following analogy of Bhāvaprakāśakāra will be found to be of fairly good help:

मत्नन्दा भिमज्ञानः कालोपाल्ये यथापने |
तत्स्थायीत्व वितत्वान्निं यथान्निं तथृतत्ततामि ॥
तथा खामिविनिमित्ता खंभाय खङ्काठयारिषाः ।
प्राप्तत्व खामिविन खापथ तत्व यथान्निं रसाक्तिनां ॥

The processes of inception and realisation have also been very tersely unfolded in his usual masterly manner in the Kāvyapratīṣa by Mammaṣa in the following lines after Abhinavagupta:

लोके प्रमदाद्विन्द्रि खुमश्रुमाणि भाषाधामपार्काल्ये काव्य गाथः ॥
तैः राजादिविशिष्टानि खिताभावाधारसायां तदात्त्री तदात्त्रीते, न सम्राङे न प्रवरं न तदात्त्रीते इति समव्यासविशिष्टानि
परिशार्यनिष्ठानानि भवसायां साधारणानि प्रावतीः ।
सामान्यता भाषातानि द्वितीय तत्ततात ।
खामिविन खामिविन नित्यमाणवेच्चारामा साधारणोपायोद्वात् तत्ततात
विविधमनिर्दिष्टप्रमदाद्विन्द्रित्वात्सत्तात द्वितीयानि ॥

19 Sāhityadarpana, III. 60 (Jivānanda's Edn.). Also ... "प्रमदाद्विन्द्रित्वात् यथाय बंदानप्रभुवात् सत्तात रतिः च ॥"

40 "The object of representation is intended to please 'me'—subjective finality; but at the moment of enjoying it, I am unconscious of this finality; to be conscious would be to break the charm."—Encyclopaedia of Religion and Ethics, Vol. II, p. 447.
Not only have the Indian rhetoricians analysed and explained the nature and all-pervasiveness of *rasas*—these have been variously numbered at four, six, eight, nine (the commonly accepted number), ten and even twelve—and showed them in the proper light, but also the process of evolution of these *rasas* has been tentatively explained, and, by the reverse process of synthesis, critics have arrived at one *rasa* as the cardinal and guiding principle in life and literature. Kumārasvāmin in his *Ratnāpana* (commentary on the *Pratāparudra-yaśodbhūṣana* of the South Indian critic Vidyānātha) has the following valuable note:

"..."

---


43. The *Nāṭyaśāstra* takes the primary *rasas* to be four and derives four more secondary *rasas* therefrom. We read (Chap. VI, under Kārikā 38):

"...

---

The genesis of the derivative or secondary *rasas* is thus referred to (Chap. VI, Mārikā 39):

"..."
The serial order given above may not appear unobjectionable: it is cited only to show that this attempt at getting into the order in the evolution of the sentiments was not an unthought-of thing in the range of Alankāra literature. This order will, mutatis mutandis, do also for those Vaiṣṇava critics who, with the great author of the Śrīmadbhāgavata at their head, choose to number the rasas as twelve, and include स्खः, बाल्यः and दास्य as primary rasas. The author of the Mandāramaranda summarises the views of the great rasa writers and points to the final word said on the point thus:

अथ भोजष्ठ्यादेशां मतस्थ प्रकाश्यते।
रसो वै स ईति अवा रस एकः प्रकृतिसति॥
अतो रसः स्याश्चूहार एक वै तरे तु न ॥

...
...
...

One pitch higher and we rise to the level of the great रसमात्र, the fountain-head of all rasas and bhāvas depicted so nicely in that semi-theological work, the Brahma-Saṁhitā. This is analysis and synthesis brought to their proper places,—out of One to come to many, and from many to arrive at the One. This phase of critical thought in literature rises above its normal plane, yet it is in no way dissociated therefrom in India. We have had here a devoted race of critics, whose mission was to link the mystic or metaphysical element in their

44 रौद्रदृष्टं प्रृविचित्रं श्रवण्यद्वाशा वैरौध्य नतात्युसः कयमो भवाहुः (=भवाहुः) बोभवमयम् उद्धरोत नैव शासनं प्रमाणभद्रिति ते द्विधिक। दश ग्रंथं॥—Given in the Kriṣṇanandini (commentary on Sāhitya-Kaumudi of Baladeva Vidyābhūṣāṇa).

45 Mandāramaranda, Bindu 9. Cf. also Agnipurāṇa, 339. 2-5 (Anandārama Edn.):

क्षणमन्द: मद्वसन्य ( वस्माः ) अत्यते च कदाचन।
वृक्कि: धा तम स्वितन्यसमाख्यरसङ्कथा॥
...
...
...

रति: धा च परिपूर्णपुष्पः।
विभिव्यादिदिनभासमच्छुरार ईति गीते॥

45 Cf. statements like ‘पिछल भक्तमय सरसं’। It was to explain this recondite and mystic side of rasa that works like Rasasudhakara and Bhaktirasūmyāṅhvidindhrīṇa were designed. Sr. Rūpa Gosvāmin says rather apologetically of this in his Rasāmṛta-sindhu:

विभिन्नस्यवृत्तिनवसन्दर्भाद्यं रसः।
रससङ्कथा भविष्यति स्वितंसाधीपि निःश्च।
art with its psychological or physical side. It was with them that the ब्रज (suggested sentiment) and the ब्रजक (suggerter) are unified—criticism-literature assumes almost the rôle of non-dualistic philosophy. 47 Rūpa Goswāmin of sacred memory in his Ujjvalanīlāmāyi, an epoch-making work which treats fully of the psychological or positive side of Alāṅkāra and of its transition to and culmination in the Infinite, 48 has given us at full length his views on the point. In one instance he quotes with reverence the following verse from an authoritative work of Līlāśuka:

प्रसन्नरघसयं श्रीबन्धिष्येवविभूषणम्
ब्रजीतकराकारमाधवेः सुनासयम् ॥ ४९॥

Thus did the Rasāśāstra and the Alāṅkāraśāstra merge their being into one in the hands of the religious-minded school of critics. Or, will it be too hazardous a conjecture to make that it was out of this synthetic study of rasa that in later ages the modern Bhaktiśāstra was evolved and developed, especially in Bengal, at the hands of the writers of the Gauḍīya Vaiṣṇava Bhakti School, with whom literary and religious worship went hand in hand? The psychological element in the literature of criticism awakened the sense of greatness in beauty, and out of beauty and grace came the refined form of worship taught in the Bhaktiśāstra, which is more aesthetical in its origin than religious. As Sir G. Grierson puts it: "No one who reads the Indian religious literature of the fifteenth and following centuries can fail to notice the gulf

47 Thus in the very beginning of Jīva Goswāmin's Locana-rocini—ब्रजक्रजयोरभेद ब्रजयन्——the two in one, the one in two (भेदभेद). The following well-known verse gives a nice expression to this feeling:

ब्रजक्रज स्मृतियोत्पत्ति कष्ट्यितम्
पशुभास्मान न च समाधादितम्।
ब्रजक्रज स्मृतियुद्धस्मांतः
कुष्ट्यितं कोश्चापति न धर्मि देवम्॥

48 Cardinal Newman (in his "Poetry with reference to Aristotle's Poetics") says "With Christians a poetical view of things is a duty." With the literary critics of our land, a poetical view of things and a religious trend of thinking have gone together.

49 Ujjvalanīlāmāyi, Nāyakabhedāy, Sloka 19. The following verse, attributed to Bhaṭṭanāyaka, the author of the Ḥṣayadārpana in the Dhanvyālokaśāstra (p. 29, Nirnaya Sāgara Press Edn.) is to the same effect:

ब्रजभागुरूपमसः च द्रव्यमस्य ग्रीहमभिधि यः।
तेन नामस्मसः स्मृतद्वारवे ग्रीहमभिधि यः॥
that lies between the old and the new. .... Religion is no longer a question of knowledge. It is one of emotion."  

This was one side of the development. The realm of literature (or Kāvya) is the happy confluence of mellifluous streams of thought;  
and an analytic and systematic study of Kāvya cannot but fructify in more directions than one. The realistic or positive side in the art of criticism led the rhetoricians in their study of, and mastery over, facts concerning the different shades of human character, of all possible types and ranks. The division and characterisation of members of both sexes, more especially of the heroes (Nāyaka) and the heroines (Nāyikā),  
the description, in detail, of their several qualities of the head and the heart, according to differences of age and sex, etc., show to what extent the Indian critic tried to make his art scientific and regular by a close and comprehensive study of all phases of human character that came under his minute observation.  
The reading of one’s intentions from his looks and gait—the interpretation of ‘speechless messages’ and ‘measured tread,’ and such other things, which fall properly within the domain of the empiric art of physiognomy—have been treated of in Alaukāra literature with a nicety which would go to prove the thoroughness of the analytic apparatus with which the critic in ancient and mediæval India was furnished. This, however, is a point which lies on the border-land between Alaukāraśāstra and Kamaśāstra—a science, if science it may be called, intensely realistic. In the latter, we treat of things purely for their own sake (or rather from the standpoint of the ethical ideals of the society); in the former, such considerations are of secondary importance, and the subjects

---

30 Bhūkīmārga in Encyclopaedia of Religion and Ethics, Vol. II. Thus, these writers almost always employ the terminology of the Indian poetics—e.g., in Rasāmrtasindhu, Bhāgavatāmṛta.
31 चक्षुविद्यामानिकायनं काव्यम्—Rajasekhara in the Kavyamimamsā.
32 Sāhityadārpaṇa, III., 96-122 (Jivānanda’s Edn.). The rhetoricians do not all agree in this division. Viśvanātha gives the number of Nāyaka as 48 and that of Nāyikā as 381; while Kavikarṇapūra mentions 144 classes of Nāyaka and 1908 classes of Nāyikā.
33 When this is clearly realised, the charges brought against the Hindu mind about its ‘speculative temper’ by critics of the type of Walter Pater, who think the Indian to be ‘lost to sense, understanding, individuality,’ lose much of their cogency and value. It is a pity that much capital has been made—and that not very properly—out of India’s lack of a practical and practicable turn of mind.
introduced are to be judged by the interest and charm they produce when depicted in works of art. Not improbably these two kāstras were closely allied in the early part of their evolution and had parallel courses to run. Nothing more can be said, as regards the earlier phases of the evolution of Rasa-cum-Alaṅkāra literature (the period from Bharata to Bhāmaha is, to all purposes, a blank to us)—and the history of the Kāmasūstra literature immediately after Vatsyayana is quite obscure.

So much by the way. The other entities of Alaṅkārasūstra (other than भौति and रस which we have touched on)—रूप, गृह or रूपित, for these are interconnected—and कल्प in proper (figures of speech) are there as secondary, or as tertiary elements; in other words, they have no separate existence apart from the primary or guiding principle as judged from the psychological standpoint. The element of प्रक, which has to do with the executive side of the poet—which is something different from rīti or style, and a clear exposition of which is found in many Alankāra works bearing the stamp of the South Indian school—is not a separate entity by itself and does not require more than passing mention. Hence it follows that the psychological bias pervades the very being of Alankāra literature, ancient and modern, and no amount of ingenuity is able to obliterate the stamp which it has left on it—the stamp which, like the veritable Śrīvatsa mark on the breast of Śrī-Hari, it took from the much revered and old sage.

Thus it is that the literature of pure literary criticism in India has had a glorious history and an equally glorious goal in view. If poetry in India, as it has to be everywhere, is the high-wrought enthusiasm of fancy and feeling, criticism in India has been the standard of common-sense and reason,—not of mere ravishment and ecstasy. If poetry leads us to high Heaven and to the bliss of Elysium, criticism brings us to the kindred points of Heaven and home.

44 प्रक is depth of sense (चर्चगोचरिष) . Bhoja admits it in his कल्पमंजि under the name of प्रकि; Vidyādharma, the author of the Ekaśāli, smooths the way when he says: चक्षु रत्नविनिगद्यनयिनिगवमय

45 Hazlitt, On Poetry in General.

45 Hazlitt refers to Aristotle’s description of poetry as ‘the representation of the ideal.’ The criticism-literature of medieval India has tried to make that ideal intelligible in terms of the real in and around us, and, withal, like many other branches of learning here, has aspired to the highest flights of thought possible.
and to the pleasures in the pleasure-land. Criticism has all along been regarded as one of the finest flowerings of the human intellect, as closely related to the mental and moral sciences and to the requirements of life as possible. The critic's function is to interpret life in an unbiased manner, and the Indian Ālaṅkārika has done it magnificently. For the matter of that, literary criticism in India has been impersonal in the past; for, criticism of an author by an analysis of his works piecemeal and by a reference to his code and creed is a thing unknown to the Ālaṅkārikas. This has done good,—at least in one respect it has done away with the 'personal equation,' the question of personal likes and dislikes. Literature here is sacred; and there have appeared but rarely critics who are 'cool, sober murderers of their neighbour's fame,' or false parasites, paying their court and homage to honour and rank. A wisely fashioned and closely followed code of rules of long standing—not empirically got but based on the stable truths of the mental sciences, especially of psychology, ethics and aesthetics—served as a powerful preventive against petulant vituperation or flimsy cheap praise.

"Another race has been and other palms are won." Yet, in these days of advanced ideas, when we notice daily codes and creeds of criticism changing chameleon-like, 67 we Indians cannot but be proud of our achievements in this direction,—based as they have been, not on the shifting sands of empiricism, but on the firm rock of intuitional truths, clearly grasped and forcibly expressed. Criticism is philosophy in its essence,—and philosophy in India is the philosophy of the spirit. The appreciation of the psychological basis of Ālaṅkāra—the realisation of rasa—has but one inevitable sequel, viz., spiritual betterment, a point to which we have already referred. It is Anandavardhana, the great literary critic, who is credited with the authorship of the

67 A certain European critic (Leibnitz) describes beauty—with many the sine qua non of art—to be "the confused, therefore indefinite perception of all that constitutes order," whereupon another (Lotze) opines that "German aesthetics is brought into being for belittling its object"—Encyclopadia of Religion and Ethics under 'Beauty.' It is, however, refreshing to turn to the views of the school of modern trans-Atlantic critics. Says one of them (in his Introduction, p. 10, to his work The Sense of Beauty): "There is... a real propriety in calling beauty a manifestation of God to the senses, since in the region of sense, the perception of beauty exemplifies that adequacy and perfection which in general we objectify in an idea of God."
following verse, wherein are very finely depicted the inspiration and the aim of the Indian critical mind:

या आपारवती रसमृत रससिद्धम् कार्यत् कनोनां नवा
दृष्टिर्वाच परिविष्ठाश्चिन्तनस्य संवेदिते ।
ते देव चायझ्वलना परिविष्ठाश्चिन्तनस्य संवेदितानहो वर्य
अहान्ता, नेत्र च ज्ञातसमविष्यन लल्लितुं शुद्धं ॥ ५५ ॥

The psychological bearing of rasa (which alone, properly guided, results in a metaphysical or spiritual understanding of it) has had to fight a strenuous fight with its linguistic and physiological aspects; for, while the latter deal with words and things evanescent, it is the former that has directed the human soul and has inspired it to rise higher and higher, through ethereal regions, to the Absolute and the Sublime (रसाः तैः सः)। ५६ Thus considered, the Nātyaśāstra of Bharata, the Dhvanyāloka of Anandavardhana and the Ujjvalanilamani of Śrī Rūpa Goswāmin are three epoch-making works—not of Indian critical literature alone, but of the critical literature of the world, inasmuch as it was in them and through them that the synthetico-analytic faculty of the human mind has reached its highest point, from a realisation of rasa in the concrete—rasa in literature in general (as in the Drama), rasa in its individual objective aspect—to rasa in its universal subjective phase, to rasa in the abstract, both within and without. These are works which, along with their commentaries and sub-commentaries, deserve to be read and re-read, digested and re-digested, for a full appreciation of literature and of life. And the inquisitive student who pores over these works and ponders over them shall be amazed and shall bow down in reverence, and admit in the words of the great and reverent critic:

अत्तलवादपार्वत्तासोसै दृष्टिविद्याशतामः ।
सुधाः परं लल्लितं रससिद्धमेधागुरो मया ॥ ५६॥

५५ Dhvanyāloka, Uddyota III, under verse 44.
५६ It was here in India that in Middle Ages the idea stuck root in literature, in legend and in life that the Great Lord comes down unto His people to enjoy to the fullest extent the pleasures of ānand (रसिद्धार्थार्थांचिन्तनस्य). The following lines of Dr. Rabindranath, perhaps the greatest poet-critic of the present age, expresses felicitously the same idea in the usual semi mystic style of that master-mind:

अनौम से चाय सोमार निरक्ष सस
सोमा इते चाय अनौमेस मधे हारा ।

५६ Ujjvalanilamani, Sambhogabhidhā, verse 69.
THE INTELLECTUAL LAWS OF LANGUAGE AND BENGALI SEMANTICS.

Hemanta Kumar Sarkar, M.A., M.L.C. (Bengal).

INTRODUCTION.

Scholars have so far been mostly busy with the formal aspects of language like phonetics, the order of words, accentuation, etc. But that side of language which deals with meaning, which again really is the soul of language, has received but scant attention. Not that the subject is unimportant, nor that it is unable to supply food for the best brains, but it has failed to attract scholars and perhaps for good reasons.

It was only in the year 1897, that the Science of Meaning-Change was formally introduced and expounded by the great French Scholar Michel Bréal, Professor of Comparative Grammar at the College de France, in his Essai de Sémantique (the English translation of which was published in 1900 by Mrs. Henry Cust). Bréal had been working on the subject for the previous thirty years (1867–97) and the result of his research during this period was published in the form of essays in the Annuaire de l'association des études grecques, the Mémoires de la société de linguistique, in the Journal des savants, etc. The difficult nature of the subject may be realised from the following words of Bréal himself. "Again and again, repelled by the difficulty of the subject" he says, "I have vowed never to return to the book itself. I have at last decided to publish this book, which I have hitherto abandoned as often as I have begun." The laws which he indicates are chiefly of the psychological order and so hold good outside the languages dealt with in his book. His object has been, as he says in the preface, to sketch a provisional plan in a domain which has not yet been exploited, and demands the combined labour of several generations of philologists.

"The study of Semantics had its beginning in lexicography. In his lectures on the Latin Language (delivered 1826-27, published 1839) K. Reisig had called attention to the importance of a scientific and
systematic study of the meanings of words. His premature death, perhaps, prevented Reisig from penetrating farther into the subject which he had thus opened. It was reserved for his pupil, Agathon Benary (1834) to leave the purely lexicographical aspect of the semantic question and to give to it a much wider and at the same time profounder meaning. He was the first to distinguish clearly between the formal and semantic side of a word, and this not only with reference to the word as a whole, but he applied this same distinction to the grammatical elements of which the word is made up, such as inflectional and formative affixes. These also, he pointed out, deserve a separate treatment from the point of view of their meaning."

During the period mentioned, other scholars also were working in the field. Next to Bréal we should mention the excellent contribution of the great German scholar, Paul, who devoted to this subject a few chapters of his Prinzipien der Sprachgeschichte (published in 1880). In their Introduction to the History of Language (which is an English adaptation of Paul's great book) the authors, Strong, Logeman and Wheeler, have shown how far Paul's observations hold good in English and other languages.

Professor Postgate of the University College, London, also took up the subject about the year 1877 for a "Fellowship Dissertation" at Trinity College, but was compelled to give it up for dearth of suitable materials. He again took up the subject later on and drew the attention of scholars to it in an inaugural address at University College, London, in 1896.

The contribution to Semantics by Brügmann, Bechtel, Heerdegen and Sweet should also be noted.

In India, however, the name of the subject is still unheard of even amongst scholars. Of course, the Hindus, who produced the most wonderful grammar in the world, must not be thought of as having paid no attention to such a subject. We find Yāska (circa. 500 B.C.) at the beginning of his Nirākta discussing thus: "If the grass is called फळ from its quality of pricking (कठ), why does not this name supply to everything that pricks, as for instance a needle or a lance? And on the other hand, if a column is called मधुर because it stands upright (मधुर), why is it not also called that which supports, or that which fits in?" We have here and at other places in his works a glimpse of the effort at discovering laws of meaning-change.
It cannot be possible that the semantic aspect of language did not strike Panini (cir. 350 B.C.), the greatest of grammarians the world has yet produced. It is quite evident from the aphorism प्राचीनानुष्ठानानि विद्वानाय शास्त्राणि प्रमाणादाना (I. 2. 56), that he also thought of the semantic side of language. But he excluded all semantic considerations from his grammar which should confine itself to pure formal analysis. And it is rightly pointed out that the meaning of a word is not fixed by grammatical rules but by usage and idiom.

The Mimamsa and Nyaya Philosophies and occasionally the Vedanta and Vaiśeṣika deal with the nature and force of words.1 The commentators on these, and Vedic literature and various grammars have discussed this question of meaning here and there. The books on Sanskrit poetics deal with the different forces of words such as अभिधा, लण्डका, अप्ल्या, etc.

But excepting these stray references no systematic attempt has as yet been made in India. Professor Gune of Poona in his Introduction to Comparative Philology (1918) and Professor Taraporewala of Calcutta in his class-lectures (1917-18) have supplied examples from Sanskrit and Indian Vernaculars while discussing laws of meaning-change.

In Bengali no work of the kind has been done as yet. The scientific study of Comparative Philology of which the Science of Meaning is an integral part, has only recently been introduced in India. A text-book of Comparative Philology with reference to the Indian languages is being written by Professor Taraporewala. Mr. Bijaychandra Majumdar has treated the historical side of the race and language in his History of Bengali Language. Moulti Sahidullah has undertaken the laborious task of writing a historical Grammar of the Bengali Language. As elsewhere, here in Bengal the phonetic side of the Language has received a good treatment in the hands of such capable scholars as Dr. Sunitikumar Chatterjee, Pandit Vidhuśekhara Śastrī, Mr. Jogeshchandra Ray and others. The Science of Meaning as applied to Bengali still remains to be taken up.

It is hoped that the work will go on apace henceforth. There is no
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dearth of material. From the writings of Dr. Rabindranath Tagore, Messers Dwijendranath Tagore, Lalitkumar Banerji, Jogeshchandra Ray, Jnanendramohan Das, Ramendrasundar Trivedi, Dineshchandra Sen, Bijaychandra Majumdar, Rajendrachandra Sastri, Haraprasad Sastri and others a good harvest may be reaped. But as in other languages, so in Bengali the number of workers is hopelessly small, *apparent rara nantes in gurgite vasto,* "a gulf immense, a swimmer here and there." The subject is almost of limitless extent, but workers not more than a score throughout the whole world may be found.

"The Science," says Prof. Postgate, "is as yet in its beginnings. Its prime need is the collection of facts. The student of this subject must begin with what he knows (i.e. his mother-tongue). The science is in no position to disdain the humblest effort of the most insignificant contributor." Hence my humble attempt.

The first need of the science is a good terminology. Professor Grote, the brother of the famous historian, tried to provide it with one in some posthumous articles which appeared in the earlier volumes of the Journal of Philology. His nomenclature, however, is too cumbersome and repellent to be generally accepted.

Even the very name of the science is proposed differently by different scholars. Professor Postgate proposes the name Rhematology, from ῥῆμα, a thing said. Bréal gives the name Šemantique, Semantics (from σημαίνω "to signify");—Σημαντικῆ τέχνη, the science of significations, in opposition to Phoneticks, the science of sounds. I shall follow Bréal both in his method and terminology.

In the *Dictionary of Philosophy and Psychology* of Baldwin, Semantics is defined as "the doctrine of historical word meanings, the systematic discussion of the history and development of changes in the meanings of words." Lady Welby in her article on "Signifies" in the *Encyclopaedia Britannica* distinguishes "semantics" from "signifies" thus: "Semantics may be, for present purposes, described as the application of signifies within strictly philological limits".

The main problems of semantics, according to Oertel, are the following: "By what means has a given language in each individual case expressed its thought? How many meanings is the same form capable of expressing? In how many different forms can the same thought be expressed?" 1

1 Lectures on the Study of Language, p. 280.
A question may be raised as to the Bengali equivalent of the name Semantics. অর্থতত্ত্ব would have been convenient but that word is already being used in Bengali in connection with the science of Politics. শব্দ-তত্ত্ব is the next word exactly suited, but I am afraid we cannot get it accepted now for the vehement opposition of the purists. So শব্দার্থতত্ত্ব would perhaps be the best, taking শব্দ (=অর্থরূপক-হৃদন্ত) to denote a word or phrase or even a sentence. We shall here especially deal with that side of semantics which affects the meaning of a word or a phrase, leaving aside for the present the syntactical portion.

Mr. T. G. Tucker, Professor of Classical Philology in the University of Melbourne, says: “Laws of meaning-change are not yet discovered and are probably undiscoverable. Interesting observation can be made of certain tendencies and phenomena, but beyond this we can hardly go. In changes of meaning the mind is the one factor. So we cannot hope to reduce to rules the complex psychological operations which transform one meaning into other. We can say that some words widen their meaning, that some narrow it, and that some shift it, and we may often be able to trace the association of ideas which brought these occurrences to pass. But we cannot get to fundamental principles which determine that a certain class of words shall necessarily widen rather than narrow their meaning and vice versa.”

So the word “law” here should be understood in the philosophic sense, as the constant relation discoverable in a series of phenomena. As Prof. Sayce points out: “It must be remembered that the ideas suggested by most words are what Locke calls ‘mixed modes.’ A word like ‘just’ or ‘beauty’ is but a shorthand note suggesting a number of ideas more or less associated with one another. But the ideas associated with it in one mind cannot be exactly those associated with it in another; to one man it suggests what it does not in another.”

Here lies the fundamental cause of meaning-change.

The chief motives of meaning-change may be thus classed after Tucker (pp. 380-81):

(1) Indefinite width of meaning in a word as originally applied, causing diversity of use.

(2) Predominance of one element in a thing named, causing a more special application of the name to that element.

*Introduction to the Natural History of Language*, p. 373.
(3) Unconscious inclusion of a secondary meaning, due to a natural association of ideas, and thence a gradual transference to that secondary meaning or else a widening to comprise it.

(4) Effort at force or at liveliness, causing a figurative application of words and hence a broadening of these words.

(5) Emotional emphasis, leading to a misuse of the term in a wider or weaker sense than the true one.

(6) Euphemism and irony, or a desire to avoid the unpleasant or less courteous term, and thence a new sense acquired by the euphemistic substitute.

(7) Other laxity in the use of words, through ignorance or misapprehension.

It will be seen that all these changes are reducible to:

1. Specialising or narrowing.
2. Generalising or widening.
3. Shifting or transference.

I shall deal with the Bengali Semantics with reference to these aspects. It will be found from what follows that specialising is the tendency of the language, because men want to be exact and like to have as many special expressions as there are ideas.

It may be mentioned here that Whitney in his *Study of Language* (p.106) has classified all sorts of meaning-change under two heads—Generalisation of special meanings and Specialisation of general meanings. Pot thus gone deeper and has tried to show in a masterly way how these laws arise and operate.4

In cases of phonetic change the rise of a new sound goes on side by side with the disappearance of the old one. The employment of the word কাগজ to denote a newspaper implies a narrowing of the extent of the signification of the ordinary meaning of কাগজ, which is "paper." So we may take a word টিকিট, properly and originally applied to railway tickets, and apply it to a whole class, which we regard in some way as resembling it, as when we speak of টাকা-টিকিট (postage stamp,) রেসিপির টিকিট (receipt stamp), পাণ্ডুর টিকিট (the pass of a carriage), etc. In this case we widen the application of the word by narrowing its contents but even when thus widened the meaning still includes its original denotation. Frequently such a widened application becomes once more narrowed.

4 *Etymologische Forschungen*, (2nd ed.) Introduction.
by the widening of the contents. An instance of this double process we have, e.g., in the word "fan" (fan) originally only meaning 'wings,' it was, by a metaphor applied to a class of objects similar in some respects to it. A process of narrowing these applications leads to the use of the word as a specific name for certain moving things like wings. The word, in this sense, no longer includes its original meaning, and is transferred. It is only by such a succession of widening and narrowing that a word can assume a signification absolutely different from its original meaning.

I shall now illustrate the various phenomena arising from these laws. First, I shall take up what are called the Intellectual Laws of Language by Bréal. These laws, as we have already noted, are not "blind laws" without exceptions. They have their limits. They only denote "the constant relation discoverable in a series of phenomena." The first part of our thesis will be devoted to the discussion and illustration of those intellectual laws, though strictly speaking they do not fall within the exact scope of Semantics. Semantics proper will be treated in the second part.

PART I.

THE INTELLECTUAL LAWS OF LANGUAGE.

The Law of Specialisation.

"If certain modifications of thought expressed primarily by all words, are little by little restricted to a small number of words, or even to a single word, which takes upon itself alone, the whole function, we say that specialisation is the law that has presided over these changes."

The general aim of language is to express ideas with the least of effort. When we have a number of grammatical instruments to express the same kind of idea, we may restrict ourselves to only one kind for the sake of invariability.

As for example a number of suffixes may be used to denote a grammatical relation. Gradually the function may be taken over by one or two suffixes or by a single suffix. It might be that having lost the subtle shade of difference the variety was not needed as in earlier times.

The suffixes for comparative and superlative furnish us with an illustration. In ancient languages the adjective expresses degree by
means of suffixes. These suffixes were originally numerous and diverse.

In Sanskrit-न, -त, -म, -र, -छ were the suffixes for comparative and superlative. The latter set seem to have triumphed over the former so far as frequency of use is concerned; —मात्र, महत्र, सारत्र, महोत्र, वर्त्र, अवर्त्र, पेश; सर्व, लाव, सारव, मधुर, वर्ष, अभ. The suffix of enumeration म, a shortened form of -तम, has frequent use;—प्रम, पत्र, सत्त, अत्त, नव्त, द्वाद;द्वित, द्वौतः are the only two forms in द्वौत; while चत्त्र and छछ show च, short for छछ.

The modern Sanskritic vernaculars of India have given up this way of forming comparative and superlative and use only the equivalent of them, e.g. Ben. फुर, Gujrati थी. Marathi uses the word अधिक to denote comparison. Bengali sometimes uses अধिक and often colloquially अধर in the same sense.

There are a good many words in Bengali with the Sanskrit suffixes of comparison. But they are mostly the outcome of pedantry. Of course a number of forms exist intact which are not considered as combinations of a word and a comparative suffix, but regarded as one whole for their relative brevity and frequency of use, e.g. उत्तर, उत्तर, गरौनी, दमि, श्रेष्ठ. This is supported by the fact that all these words are again compared in Bengali, एই आरुक उत्तर, आरुक उत्तरে यাও; अधिक गरौनी, etc. अछछ has already in Sanskrit taken comparative and superlative suffixes, e.g. अछछतर, अछछतम.

"Among all words of a certain kind distinguished by a certain grammatical imprint, there is always one which is little by little drawn apart from its fellows. It becomes the pre-eminent exponent of the grammatical conception of which it bears the stamp. But at the same time it loses its individual value, and is no more than a grammatical instrument, one of the wheels of the phrase."

When we use the word अधिक or आरुक or चेढः, etc., they have no more existence from a semantic point of view than the inflection -तर. After long use in various connections the word loses its individual significance and becomes a grammatical instrument. Then it may even be used in

* Latin, out of a variety of comparative and superlative suffixes, retains for each degree one suffix alone (-ior, -issimus). The Romance languages have gone a step further. One single word has absorbed the function of both the degrees: French, plus; Italian, più; Spanish, mas; Portuguese, mas; it must be noted that this word which has survived is itself a comparative. So also English, more; German, mehr.
altogether an opposite sense, e.g. বড়োবাড়ী করা বড়ু নয়, (the house is not a little large); বেশী চোট কিন্তু বেশী বড়ু, (too small or too large). Here, the words কর and বেশী which denote "small" and "large" are used as auxiliaries only to denote degree. In বেশী খাওয়া, (to take much), the original sense is retained.

The substitution of prepositions for the ancient declensions is another example of specialisation.

In ancient languages like Sanskrit, Greek, and Latin substantives added a modifying final syllable (or প্রারম্ভ) to denote the relations of dependence, interiority, instrumentality, etc. The cases of declensions being insufficient to express all the relations the mind could conceive, adverbs were placed by the side of these cases to define them. "Between the inflection and the particle of place or time they supposed the existence of some special connection, some relation of cause to effect." In Sanskrit the উপবার্তী ব্যবহার এই সকল ব্যবহারই মূর্ত হয়, (the adverb is attached to the verb in exactly the same way as the preposition was attached to the nouns in English or French. "Adverbs of place and time from having been the accompaniment of the genitive, dative, or accusative, become the cause of these cases; from having been adverbs, they become prepositions."

In the Vedic texts, we find words which have since become well-known prepositions, still in the condition of adverbs and have become inseparably attached to verbs in Classical Sanskrit, e.g. প্রতি যে চারামধ্যে ... প্রায় প্রায়; অন্তর্ভুক্ত উদরেক্ষণ আ; প্রায়নিন; প্রায়নী, etc.

In Bengali small words like বিশ্ব, ঘা, কর্কুক, for the third case, and হাঁ, থেকে for the fifth case, are post-posed to denote case relations.

"Thus the most important step in the transition from synthesis to analysis comes under the heading of specialisation." But one fact must be noted. The prepositions afforded no help to distinguish subject and object which remained distinct the longest, e.g. মাত্রে গোরু চরে, (in the field cattle graze), ভার গোরু ধরে, (they take beef). Here the forms are the same. Of course generally an accusative suffix -এ or -র is used in Bengali but no help is afforded by prepositions. In the present examples the various positions of the words indicate the cases.

The principle of specialisation is also illustrated in the case of English genitive. The sign 's is as if it were an independent word. The 's may even be put after two or more substantives, e.g. the King of England's tour, Asquith and Lloyd George's ministry. In Bengali
also the sign of the genitive -র, accusative -কে and locative -তে are used in the same way, e.g. কলিকা, বর্ধমান, পাটনা and এলাহাবাদের লোক, (Calcutta-Burdwan- Patna- and Allahabad's people; i.e., the people of Calcutta, Burdwan, Patna and Allahabad); রাম, শ্যাম and ফুলকে দাও (give to Ram, Shyam and Jadu); কুকুরকর and কুকুরকাতে দেবিবিহ (see at Krishnagar and Calcutta).

Here only the last words have taken the case suffixes. These are really speaking compounds and as such take the inflection at the end. The Bengali future and past are formed by participial suffixes. Of all the suffixes in Sanskrit denoting past and future, ন and নথা have been selected. Thus করিল is originally derived from the past participle with র (কৃত্রিম > ন > নাই ন) and করির from the future participle with -নথা (হথা > হাত > হব > হইব).

The use of some auxiliary verbs in Eng. to denote tense and person is another example of specialisation, e.g. I do go, I did go, etc.

Thus arose the periphrastic constructions in the vernaculars of India, e.g. পিতাড়ি, বাইরেছি, আসিয়াছিলি, আসিয়াছি, সামান্য। These forms are very frequent in Bengali. The present perfect আসিয়াছি, past আসিয়াছিল, present continuative আসিয়েছি are all found with the auxiliary root আছ, (Sans. আছ, to be). The forms are even now separately used in East Bengal, e.g. আছে অথবা আছি, and so on. In Bankura in West Bengal আছি বা আছি আছি, আছি, where had you been? is used. আছি is even used as an auxiliary to the root আছ, which comes from Sanskrit আছ (to be) meaning the same thing as আছ, e.g. আছি = আছি + আছি. আছি has not lost its independent use however, e.g. ওখানে আমার বই আছে or আমার বই ছিল, (my book is or was there).

The incorporation of the root আছ shows the influence of synthesis.

"It is rare for the principle of specialisation to triumph at once. The history of languages is sown with abortive attempts and half-successes."

The Sanskrit past forms in আস, ব্যার and বসুর, e.g. চৌরায়, "ব্যার" and "সুর" may be compared. "In this case verbs signifying 'to be' (in Sanskrit bhu and as, in Latin fuo and esse) join themselves on to the principal verb. But cast into the middle of a synthetic conjugation, these auxiliaries are at once absorbed."

"Finally we discover a first attempt as early as the Indo-European period. The future (in Gk. δαισ, in Sans. দায়িম) composed with the auxiliary as, together with the other tenses composed with the same

1 Professor Brajendranath Seal and Mr. Bijaychandra Majumdar, however, doubt the derivation of আছ from আছ।
auxiliary are attempts which show us how often language has had recourse to the same means, before realising at last the progress that it had in view." The periphrastic future in Sans. देवानन्दित्वः was a later attempt and seems to have survived in the Vernaculars to some extent.

The root कर in Bengali gives another example. In Bengali verbs are often resolved into the noun and the root कर e.g. देखा=दर्शन करा, खाओ=होम करा. Some of these forms have not got the corresponding single verbs, e.g. इज़ा करा, पान करा. The single forms may be preserved in poetry or in some phrases, e.g. इज़ा, पिया etc., e.g. 

(1) इज़ा मरिबारे।

(2) खाओ भारुः खार्स-शोलित पियाब मा अतिरिक्तै।

(3) गोकु पियात्त्यो केल।

The Law of Differentiation.

"Differentiation is defined as the intentional, ordered process by which words, apparently synonymous, and once synonyms, have nevertheless taken different meanings and can no longer be used indiscriminately."

"It is by Differentiation that the child applies little by little to distinct objects the syllables which he at first scatters impartially upon everything that he meets.

To the popular mind there exist in languages no absolutely identical terms. Either they are differentiated or else one of the two terms ceases to exist."

"The question of the Science of language is at bottom a social or national question. When two languages or even two dialects find themselves face to face, a process of classification takes place, which consists in attributing degrees to synonymous expressions. According as an idiom is considered superior or inferior, these terms are seen to increase or diminish in dignity."

M. J. Gillieron describes the effects through the invasion of Swiss dialect by French. In proportion as a French word is adopted, the Patois vocabular, degraded and driven back, becomes vulgar and trivial. Formerly a room was called paître: since the word chambre has come into the village paître means a garret. In Brittany, says the Abbe Rousselet, gardens were formerly called curtils: now that the word jardín is known a shade of contempt adheres to the rustic word. It matters little that the two terms had the same origin. The Savoyard uses the name of père and mère for his parents, while he keeps for his cattle the old words pdrė and mdrė. Among the Romans, coquina signified "kitchen," the Ocean popina, which is the same word, meant a common tavern.
So in India Sanskrit, Persian and later on English words have displaced the indigenous (ঞমুণ্ত) word. Sanskrit ছাদ্য is reserved for "heart" in abstract sense, in Bengali, while দৃষ্ট is used in the concrete sense. লাভ means "ceremony," কষ "work." ভাগ্নি is used in connection with woman, ভাগ্নি is used to denote a female animal. পুল্লুক means "book," পুট্ঠুক means "manuscript book," ঠুর্না is "god," and নেয়া "cloud."

When Persian words were adopted in the Bengali language, the indigenous words were cast into shade and denoted things of inferior nature. পাষাণ, ভাঙার were used for buildings, while কুটীর was driven back to mean the cottage. কুড়া which comes from কুটীর implies a sense of contemptible littleness, meaning 'hut.' বাজার means market, while বাজার is associated with the village market which does not sit everyday. বাজার, চাবা denote the same thing but the latter is chiefly used for taxes levied by the English Government from whose language the word has come. বাজার is used for Zemindar's rent, and is a Persian word.

So also is the case with English words. খুল generally means educational institutions of a higher order. পাঠশালা has been associated with primary schools. মাটির is the English-knowing teacher, while পাঠিত means the orthodox vernacular or Sanskrit teacher. অস্মৃত and মলিলাস are both physicians, but the former is educated according to Western methods, while the latter practises the indigenous art of healing. পুষ্করঃ denotes paintings framed and glazed while the word পুষ্ট is used for those produced by the village artists according to the old fashion. কুল পুষ্করঃ which is the English word is used for a kind of a light fed with kerosene oil, while পুষ্করঃ which is the older word denotes a kind of light having an earthen vessel. In asking one's father's name, it is considered more polite to use আপনার ঠাকুরের নাম কি ? The ordinary word বাবা would sound harsh, while "father" (ফাদার) is getting current in this connection and is supposed to denote greater politeness.

Some words which were synonyms gradually get differentiated and by virtue of association some of the terms undergo a downfall. পার্ব্য (<বার্তিয়া) and পেরাতি both mean "pregnant," but the former is used only for animals, while the latter is reserved for women. বিভানো and প্রমব করা denote the same thing, the former is rather vulgar and is generally used for animals, the latter for women.

The young ones of different animals are denoted by different words, e.g. মাছের স্ত্রী, গোরক বাছুর, ছাগলের চানা, মাছের পোনা, বাদার বাছা and so on, like child, calf, kid, colt, etc. Collections of different kinds are denoted
by different words which cannot be used indiscriminately, e.g. গোকর পাল, মাতালের বল, মাজের ঢাক, etc., like Eng. herd, shoal, sheaf, etc. The particular portion of bodies of men and animals may be denoted by different words, e.g. মান্ধেরের মাই, গোকর বাট, etc., as in Eng. breast, dugs. Adjectives denoting the same quality may vary according to the nature of things qualified, e.g. খোজা মাহুস, আকৃতা বোড়া, হাড়া গোল, খাদি চাপল, etc., as also Eng. eunuch, gelding, castrated.

Let us now turn to some effects of differentiation in an ancient epoch of our languages.¹⁰ Though অহুভাব and অহুভব come from the same root, they are used to denote altogether different ideas. The former denotes "majesty," the latter "feeling." রাগ meant both "anger" and "love" in old Bengali. In Sanskrit রাগ is never used in the sense of anger. In modern Bengali however the preposition অহু is prefixed to রাগ to differentiate it from রাগ (anger).

The nearer words approximate in form, the more do they invite differentiation. বুঝি, বোধ; চাপা, চাপী; প্রাণ, প্রাণী; বেদ, বিদ্যা,—though etymologically synonymous, mean altogether different things. মোমর রাগ করবে and তোমাকে রাগ করি are wholly opposed to each other.

The needs of thought are the first agent of differentiation, cf. Ger. Mann and Mensch (also der Mensch and das Mensch). In Bengali মানুষ, মুনিয় and মেরে মানুষ, the word মানুষ is differentiated and used in different senses.

"When the popular mind has once devised a certain kind of differentiation, it is naturally tempted to complete the series. It is well known that there are languages in which the various acts of life are not designated in the same way if an exalted personage be concerned, as when the ordinary man is in question."¹⁰

¹⁰ The root মনু seems to have served in the beginning to designate vaguely all the operations of the soul; মনুক, মনুষ, মনে, মনন, মন্ত্র—all belong to the root মনু to think. A less rudimentary psychology introduced some order into this confusion. In the last the feeling aspect was emphasised, the first three relate to thought. "Even amongst them there is differentiation as মনস (mind), মনস্ত (thought), মনন্ত (constant thought, deep concentration).

¹⁰ "The Cambodgians do not designate the members of the body nor the daily operations of life by the same terms, when speaking of the king, as when speaking of a mere individual."

"There is something of the same kind in English, but only in a rudimentary state. To mark the difference between men and animals there are mouth and muzzle, nose and snout etc. It is obvious that etymology has had nothing to do with this." Cf. German Mund (mouth), and Maul used for animals.
The act of eating is denoted by the word ভোগ and প্রসাদ when used in connection with the gods and exalted personages, e.g. ঠাকুরের ভোগ, রাজভোগ, সুকুমার প্রসাদ. But খাওয়া is ordinarily used. ঠাকুরদের সম্বন্ধে স্থানীয় প্রসাদ ও রাজদের সম্বন্ধে are also similarly used. Generally learned Sanskrit words are used to give an appearance of awe and reverence. We have already noted the use of such words as গাথিন, বিষ্ণু, etc. and বোতভি, প্রশ্ন করা, etc. according as the objects denoted are animals or women. The dust of the holy places like স্নানোন্নতি etc. is denoted by the more learned word রস.

Corresponding to words used for ordinary or good people, i.e. the creation of the Good Spirit, the ahura-words, there is a whole series of daeva-words in Zoroastrian literature.¹

To express humility different words are used according as the speaker refers to himself or to others, e.g. আমার কুইরে পথিকৃশা দিয়া বাহিত করিবেন ; আমার সামাজাই এই কুইরের কথা গ্রামে করিবেন কি ? Cf. Hindustani আমাকে দীক্ষানন্দা বিধি মাহিবিখানা.

There are a few words in Bengali which are used differently according as they denote Hindus and Mahomedans, e.g. ভঁটু is the Hindu oilman, ভুটু is the Mahomedan of the same profession, ভাঁটু is the Hindu weaver, ভোটা is the Mahomedan weaver.

Sometimes a strange psychology is discovered by synonymous words. Sanskrit বন্ধু and Persian ঈহারকী meant the same thing, but in Bengali the Persian word has acquired a degraded sense implying vulgarity. আগামন and বে-ইয়ং, পশ্চাতান and বে-হৃষা, অন্দলতা and বে-অন্দলতা are pairs originally having the same meanings. But now the Persian words give a stronger sense. Some English words in Bengali also are acquiring similar force. If you call a Bengali বোকা he will not be so wroth as when you use নন-সম্ভব (non-sense) instead.

"When terms distinguished by common usage are examined, it is seen that etymology rarely justifies the differences that we attribute to them, e.g. species, kind, branch, class, division, brigade, regiment, battaMon."

ঈশ্বর and ঈশ্বরী meant the same thing originally, but now a differentiation is made in their use. The former is used in Bengali before the

¹ uši in Avesta, when used literally to mean "ear," is in the ahura-sense, the daeva word is karm (তুষা); gara (hands) is daeva, zasta (বা তা) is the corresponding ahura-word. tvārā (make or create) is an ahura-word, kṣānt is the daeva-word.

This custom continues even to-day among the Parsis, e.g. ধুতু (to sleep) but the daeva-word is ধোতু, ধোতু (to eat) and ধোতু, and so on through a whole series.
names of elders while the latter is reserved for younger people. নমস্তার
and প্রণাম both meaning "bowing down" have got a shade of distinction. 
প্রণাম implies greater respect. চাঁদ and কুর্স are originally the same thing; 
now চাঁদ means "milk" and কুর্স "milk thickened by boiling."

In passing from material to moral ideas, we shall see still better the
effects of differentiation. Between মেহ, অন্তরাগ, প্রিয়ত, ভক্তি—no gradation
imposed by etymology can be perceived. মেহ is used in connection
with affection for younger people, অন্তরাগ and প্রিয়তি for persons of equal
status, and ভক্তি for superiors.

The limits of the law of differentiation have been put by Bréal
thus:—

(1) The terms to be differentiated must already exist in the lan-
guage. Differentiation must first find a material in which to work, as
it does not create, but only attaches itself to the terms existing in order
to use and perfect them.

(2) The mind does not always manage to fertilise all the riches
proffered to it by language. Grammatical mechanism by the combina-
tion of existing elements, can produce such a wealth of forms as to
embarass the intelligence. The over-production of tenses of Greek and
Sanskrit verbs may be taken as example. Verbs denoting the same
thing, e.g. খান, মত, অন, অধ্যুপ all meaning "to eat" are found. Origi-
nally they might have had different meanings now lost. The supple-
menting of one root by another might have in the beginning a semantic
cause. The extinction of useless forms fortunately diminishes the
weight of this dead capital.

(3) Another limit to the principle of differentiation is set by the
greater or less progress of civilisation. There are shades of meaning
which arise only among cultivated peoples.

The Sontals cannot distinguish all kinds of colour, so they have
got only two names for all sorts of colour, heude (dark), and punđi
(light).

Irradiation.

Irradiation is the name given by Bréal to a process by which good,
bad, or any other particular sense becomes associated with particular
forms—the idea being slowly introduced into the forms appears after-
wards to be inherent (as in suffixes, etc.).

There is in Latin a form of participle (corresponding to Sanskrit
नय, to express the idea of obligation. In fact it originally expressed
nothing more than the idea of action, whether passive or active. The conception of obligation made its entry afterwards. These are the participles in -dus, -da, -dum. Take for instance the Sanskrit verbs in -त्स called inchoatives, because they denote the beginning of an action that comes about gradually, e.g. रच्छति. Here the termination is used in its proper function. But in verbs like रच्छति, रच्छति, रच्छति it has not got that sense at all.\footnote{There exists in Greek a group of verbs ending in -σαω, that express a disease of the body or the soul. From some verbs with this inflection denoting disease, the idea of disease has been transferred to the inflection gradually, though originally it had no such signification.}

There is in Bengali a suffix -বি which gives a deprecative sense to a word, e.g. পাকামি, নডামি, বুডামি, জেডামি, ছেলেমি.

The suffix -ই gives both the senses. It is peculiar that this suffix is often added to words of foreign particularly of Persian origin, and implies generally a pejorative sense, e.g. গোরামি, চালাকি, হালিমি, সাহেবি. Another pejorative suffix is -রান used in a similar way, e.g. মুসলিমান, সাহেবিযান, মানবিযান.

The suffix -আী is used to denote larger things and -ই to denote smaller ones, e.g. গোলা, পোড্ডা, but গুলি, পুটলি and so on. It may be noted the distinction of gender in the primitive stage of languages depended upon this difference, which is still to be found in the languages of Africa. This -ই denoted the feminine gender. টি, থাবি, etc., are used to denote smallness or affection ছেলটি, মুসলমান; cf. সক্রেডে কোহী বুল নামিনিরাবি (শ্রীলংকা, p. 11). টা gives a sense of largeness and sometimes of contempt. As Pandit Jagannath Tarkapancharana asserted: কৃষি রাজা না হ, রাণাটা; আমি পাটিত নই, পাটিত্তা (you are no petty king—you are a big Raja; I am no ordinary Pandit, but a big one). The sense of contempt is found in words like বুড়াটা, কেটা, etc., e.g. বুড়াটা কি বলে? আমি কেউ কেটা নই.

We may happen to consider as belonging to the “formal element” letters or syllables taken from the “material element” of a word. This is a phenomenon of Irradiation.
The letter or syllable being neighbour to the inflection becomes transformed into an inflection itself. Such words as despotism, patriotism gave the idea that -tism was the suffix, hence we get egotism where t is out of place. So also the n in tobacconist is from analogy with pianist or machinist; and the l in could after should and would.  

In Bengali words like লজ্জাবদ্ধ, হাসাবদ্ধ, etc. are often heard. The ন comes in by analogy with words like বশাবদ্ধ, তেজাবদ্ধ etc. It might be that in course of time -বদ্ধ will be considered the proper suffix.

The genitive plural sign in Bengali বিবর is formerly not an independent suffix, e.g. রামবিবর=রামবিবরের=রাম+আবার+বিবর. The word is pluralised by আবার added to it. The original sign for genitive is -বিবর—the whole is fused together and বিবর becomes the suffix for plural.  

*Survival of Inflections.*

When an inflection disappears whether through the action of phonetic laws, or for any other reason, it does not follow that it will cease to exist for the mind. There it may still live a long time, thanks partly: (1) to tradition, partly (2) to the position occupied by the word in the phrase, partly also (3) to the comparisons which our memory instinctively makes with analogous constructions.

The words with Sanskrit inflections in Bengali may be taken as examples of the first case—কেন, অন্তর্বার, অন্তর্বান, সেবাব, চড়াব, etc. The phrases পেল কাল (yesterday) and আসুচ্ছ কাল (to-morrow) may be cited as illustrations of the second case. পেল, etc. were participles originally ending in Sanskrit প্ল.

```
নাদ ন বিনী ন রবি ন শুশা শ্রী, চিকিরাম সহাবে মুকল। (চিকিরাম সহাবে মুকল)। মুকল=
মুক্ত—মুক্ত (বোভাগাণ ও হোহা, p. 49) আইহন চিকি। কুকুরীথাই গাইদ, গাইহ (গাইল) (ibid.
p. 5).
```

This shows the transition stage. In old Bengali, the participles are declined according as the gender varied, e.g. বালা গোল্ড.

13 Mr. Wheeler tells us that the American "find means to provide a singular for words taken rightly or wrongly for plurals". Such are, from Chinese and Portuguese, the singulars Chinese and Portuguese. In this way the inflection -se passes to the condition of formal element. For Fr. chaises a singular shay has been found in America. Orange has lost the initial n (Hin বাংলা).

14 According to Mr. B. C. Mazumdar বিবর comes from বিব + ম + genitive sign-এর. *History of Bengali Language.*
Modern Bengali has lost its past tense and uses this participle form instead. The old use as participle is preserved in the phrase owing to the particular position of the word. In আসে কাল, the participle is present progressive. Modern Bengali uses it as present tense.

The participial adjectives ending in -শ্চ in Bengali are examples of the third case. বাজার, গড়াল, চলাস, যুক্ত—are formed after the analogy of the plural Sanskrit forms of the participles. 15

We even see that feminine substantives have lost their gender and turned into neuters. Sanskrit কলাবর্ণ German Mädchen (maiden) is neuter.

The opposite process is illustrated in Sanskrit. মিথ, অপতা, are neuters though they denote masculine substantives.

Limits:—

(1) When an inflection is no longer represented save by a small number of specimens and when these specimens have themselves become unrecognisable they are abandoned or transformed.

We find a transformation of the genitive construction in expressions like Regent Street, Queen Anne's Gate, etc. Here is no longer a genitive that we perceive. We imagine ourselves to be pronouncing the very name of these public thoroughfares. The same holds good for the use in Bengali, e.g. অধিষ্ঠ রোড, দয়ানন্দ ঢাকার স্ট্রিট, রাজী মুবার গার্লি, etc.

It may happen that these survivals are preserved in the language

15 "By means of a few precious fragments containing survivals, the declension of pronouns survives a most complete in the French language."

Another Latin form that still survives, although seemingly extinct in French as the neuter, e.g. l'absolu (the absolute), le divin (the divine). The Eng. abstracts which are in essence neuter are similar; the true, the good, the beautiful. Cf. স্বর্গ, সামর্থ, সুস্থির
of literature or in the dialects, e.g. ডলকে ডাহ এবং in poetry and in the Bankura dialect.

কাথে কলসী পানীকে বায়—ডলকে চল
গুরুকে দেবী দিয়া ধরকে গমন।—রূপিবাস
ছিলাম অনমন, একবার গৃহকোপে, কে থেন ডকিল রে “জলকে চল”।
—রবীন্দ্রনাথ
(চন্দনকা, 3rd ed., p. 54).

"So long as these do not detract from lucidity, these relics of a former age are precious: they endow the language with dignity grace, and power."

False Perception.

We often imagine that we perceive an inflection where none exists. People have a feeling for utility, but do not trouble at all about history. They use whatever they possess.

In English oxen, the syllable -en is recognised as the distinguishing mark of number. Yet this is merely the Anglo-Saxon stem oxen, Sanskrit uksan. The real mark of the plural has been dropped. Cf. German, der Ochs, die Ochsen; der Mensch, die Menschen etc.

More was felt to be a comparative, whereas it is not really a comparative. This led to the supposition of a positive mo which gave most. Cherries (Fr. cerise) was originally singular but later on came to be considered as plural and a new singular cherry was formed. So also the word pease Lat. pisum was a singular, but a new singular pea was formed and another kind of plural peas as well.

Another kind of false perception is a belief in the presence of grammatical forms which might have never existed. In Sanskrit the instrumental, dative and ablative possess a single dual inflection. So little is the deficiency felt that philologists are not yet agreed as to which of the cases are missing. 18

It would seem as if the variety of vowels in verbs like sing, sang, sung, had been invented expressly to mark the variety of

18 The loss of an inflection may add to the significative value of that which survives. The difference of vowel between man and men, Vater and Väter is due to the influence of a final syllable originally present but later on abolished by the wear and tear of ages.
tenses.17 The diversity of vowels is produced by accentuation or contraction. Though not significative in its origin, this change of vowels has ended by becoming significative.

The opposite phenomenon of False Perception should also be noted. We sometimes perceive no inflection where there is one. অলঙ্গাবার contains the genitive sign ি, but we use অলঙ্গাবারের দোকান. The people of Magura in Jessore, I have heard, rightly use খাবার দোকান and not খাবারের দোকান. The double inflections and suffixes come under this head, e.g. শৃঙ্খল, এলাপ্পকার, কাব্তীওয়ালাবার, সাবান, উৎকবর্তা, গোয়াগুলি সব, মনেতে, and so on.

According to Moulavi Sahidullah the Bengali first personal pronoun in singular আমি is really a plural form, the genuine singular form being হী; আমি is even now used for the plural in Assamese, so also the Marathi 1st pers. pronoun. আমरা is actually a double plural. When আমরা is formed with the general plural sign -রা, আমি has been relegated to take the place of singular. We do not now perceive it to be a plural.

In the combination কারী, the latter word is popularly believed to be the feminine of the former, which it is not. সারী is not কারী. The two are altogether different kinds of birds.

Again as Prof. Bhandarkar cites Bengali আঁকের, কালকের, etc., as examples containing the Prakrit genitive sign -কের. This is also a case of false perception. The ক is really a pleonastic one which may be seen in the forms আঁকে, কালকে, etc. The forms আঁকের, কালকের are just as ordinary as any Bengali genitive.

The formation of Bengali genitive plural sign বিগ্রে or accusative বিগ্রে has already been explained. It was so perceived as a separate word that in mediaeval Bengali it stood independently, e.g. আমি আগন চাকরের বিগ্রে আঁকে কালকে বিগ্রে (From the translation of a letter by Rajiblochan, which was written by Nawab Sirajuddoulia to Drake).

The perception of the negative particle in অমৃত, অমৃত, etc., also furnishes cases in point.

**Analogy.**

"Man is by nature imitative: if he has to invent an expression, he does it more quickly by modelling it on some existing type, than by

17 The tenses of verbs in Esperanto are marked by the change of vowels, e.g.:

Infinitive esti; Pres. estas; Past estis; Fut. estos.

" iri; " iras; " iris; " iras.

" ami; " amas; " amis; " amas.
limiting himself to original creation. But it is a mistake to represent Analogy as a cause. Analogy is nothing more than a means."

In the following cases, as pointed out by Bréal, Language allows itself to be guided by Analogy:

(1) To avoid some difficulty of expression.
(2) To secure greater clearness.
(3) To emphasise either an antithesis or a similarity.
(4) To conform to some ancient or recent rule.

We shall illustrate it one by one:

(1) To avoid some difficulty of expression:

"A more convenient formation having been found, the ancient formation is in a manner, arrested in its power of expression, reduced to that which it actually possesses, and deprived of all opportunity of further enriching itself. But from the moment it ceases to be enriched, it becomes impoverished."

We find that in Sanskrit -मि is the termination of the 1st person, singular, present, throughout all the conjugation whether they have a thematic vowel or not. But originally there was a distinction. The thematic verbs had ओ, while it was only the non-thematic verbs that had ( -मि ) -*मि. Thus we have in Greek ἔφω, Lat. ferō, Goth. bairā, which should be in Sanskrit bharā (भरा) instead of the actually existing bharāmi (भरामि); it is to be noted that this form in ओ is probably preserved in the Vedic subjunctive forms like ब्रवा (bravā) and the old Avestic spasyā corresponding to Latin speciō; while we have elī Sans. ब्रस्मि, Avesta ahmi.

In Sanskrit, however, this distinction was lost and -मि was applied throughout, under the influence of some such analogy as देश्यं : देस्यिः : भरामि : भरामि ; or दिब्रि : देश्यिः : भरिः : भरामि. In the Vedas the 1st and 2nd personal pronouns in the nominative dual are ब्रवम् and युवम् ब्रवव्यम् and युवव्यम् being used for the accusative. Gradually only the accusative survived, because in the noun declension there is no difference

13 The case is exactly opposite in Greek. In the two conjugations in -οί and -ο in Greek, we find since the earliest ages, the one in -οι constantly retiring, the other in -ο as constantly progressing. The conjugation in -οι being the more ancient, presents the spectacle of a formation that has beenstormed and sacked. Each of the losses that it has undergone has been a gain for the conjugation in -ο.

In Latin the struggle is already at an end. But even at the present day there remains in every Romance Language a witness to the conjugation in -ο.
between the nominative and the accusative in the dual. An exactly parallel case is the English ‘you’ and ‘ye’; ‘ye’ was the nominative and ‘you’ accusative plural. Now both have combined in one ‘you’. It seems, however, that the ‘you’ (accusative) first absorbed the dative and then it encroached upon the nominative. In colloquial Bengali আমাদের, which is genitive, is being used in the accusative, e.g. আমাদের মারা গেছা নয় and আমাদের মে🍀টি. So the accusative and the genitive are going to have the same form.

A declension that is easier and clearer gains ground from other declensions, e.g. the consonantal declension of Sanskrit passes into vowel declension in Prakrit and vernaculars, e.g. ব্রাহ্ম, পীড়, কর্মন, সন্ন এবং জলম are all a-declensions in Bengali and so forth.

(2) To secure greater clearness:

“So far as it can be avoided, grammatical forms must not give rise to ambiguity. If they are too short, too blunt, they threaten to become unintelligible.”

In Avesta the termination āt is added to the ablative singular to all nouns to avoid confusion with genitive. This was originally purely pronominal.

The original instrumental singular termination in Sans. was -ā with consonant and vowel stems; e.g. Ved. बन्ध and मशिला. But even in the Veda and regularly in Classical Sanskrit the stems have as a rule the termination -na with the change of the final a of the stem to e. This is nothing but a case of pronoun where the -na is original, as we see from forms in the related languages. तेन (Ved. तन), O. Persian tya-nā, Goth. an. This suffix -n is probably the same as in चन, विना, Ved. कुशन and Latin plus.

The original genitive plural termination is -आम् with consonantal and vowel stems. Cf. ἵππος, Lat. deum, Ved. चर्ताम्, ब्राह्म. The आम् was, according to Thumb transferred to ṛ-stems, from the feminine ṛ-stems, which acquired it in the first instance from the n-stems.

आমिन : आमस : आमानामː
बालामिन : बालास : बालानाम.

Note also आम and बाला are exactly alike in form, also accusative बालास which becomes identical with the genitive form बाला : बालानामː.

In the conjugation of verbs which are irregularly declined, children
are often found to use what should have been the regular form. Instead of 'I came', 'I caught', children are often heard to say 'I comed', 'I catched'. Foreigners also make similar uses when first learning a language.

My little niece aged three uses আসে in the second person singular present instead of এসে which is the standard form. This is due to the third and first personal forms আসে and আসি. The people of Eastern Bengal, however, use আসে regularly.

(3) To emphasise either an antithesis or a similarity.

"The mind which naturally associates ideas in couples, likes to solder together contraries by giving them the exterior." While this helps the memory, it gives greater relief to speech, e.g. Latin dius (day), noctu (night) from nocte. English 'before' and 'after' অধ: (from অধ: and নিষ:), অহোরাণ: (from অধ: and রাণ:), অপরাণ: and নিষরাণ: (which should strictly be নিষরাণ:); অক্সম and নক্সম (ইক্সম). The original form is স্ত্রুম in Sanskrit; Oriya still uses this form.

The compound অষ্টমতলী is formed in analogy with ইক্সলমস্যো or ইক্সলনী or ইক্সলমিছী. Marathi পাকমাস in contrast with পাপাশ: is due to দার্জিলিং; বিশাখা in contrast with প্রলদ: and প্রলমান: ; বাঙাল: (from চেমি: and কালিগ:).

We may find in every language some words which from being similar in meaning have approximated in form. Cf. আয়ুন (thumb), জ্যো (lip), কোর (belly), উপাধ (lap); রুডঃ, পুলভ (bull), পুলর (bull), রাসায়ন একাঙ্ক: and গোলাঙ্ক:.

It is in syntax that this kind of symmetry is observed. In English because we say "to agree with some one" we say, too, "to differ with some one," also in Sanskrit তথ্য বিয়োগ: from তথ্য সংযোগ: Similarly in Bengali তাহার সংহিত বিয়োগ: তাহার সংহ: হাতাহাড়ি and so on.

(4) To conform to some ancient or recent rule.

"We are now speaking of a rule not yet formulated; a rule at which mankind strives to guess and which we see children trying to discover. By presupposing its existence, the people actually creates it."

Greek verbs take the syllabic or temporal augment in the imperfect or aorist. But we are not prepared to find the augment modifying an adverb or a pronoun. This is however what happens.

In Sanskrit, too, the suffixes for the degrees of comparison of adjectives have been extended in use even with verbs and nouns to denote a greater degree e.g. অধঃতর, অধোমু, প্রতিরামু, etc.
The cases of double endings may also be considered here. Noun-forming suffixes are again added to nouns in analogy with the regular forms, e.g. Ved. मक्त्वता, Mod. Marathi दाम्मल, Beng. দোহাঙ্গা, উংকরতা, etc.

Forms which bear an unusual aspect, are regarded as faulty, and brought back to the so-called regular type. In this way exceptions become less and less and finally disappear, e.g. নন্দুক (not নিভুক). Cf. ভাডুক, etc.

"শ্রেণী শিবশোভা কেষের ছেদেন" 
"ষ্ঠা চাতকিনী কুষণিনি দন বর্ষিতেন"

Now a word about false analogy. The phrase is a convenient term for designating such cases where analogy has been applied, but the word itself or the word with which it has been compared has been misunderstood. The falsity therefore comes in the understanding of the words compared and not in the analogy itself. If we bear this point in mind, we shall not be liable to be misled into the belief that analogy itself can be false or falsely applied. নেই দেবের চেয়ে কানা মামা ভাল—'a blind maternal-uncle is better than no uncle.' Here the word কানা is really the Hindi word কানা which means 'who may be called.'

But the application of analogy has to be kept within strict limits. Motives of clearness or of harmony suffice to hold analogy in check. If unduly pressed, analogy would make languages too uniform and in consequence monotonous and poor.

New Acquisitions.

"We more often hear of the losses undergone by language than of the reinforcements which come to its aid, because the evolution of the latter is very slow and hence escapes observation."

"There can be no question here of creations ex nihilo. The form which progress assumes is the appropriation to new usage of material transmitted by the past."

Bréal cites the development of the Infinitive, the Passive, and the Adverb as illustrations.

The Infinitive is the product of a slow selection; it is the fruit of a tardily accomplished union between the substantive and the verb. Infinitive is not a mood, it is the most general form of a verb, disburdened of all accessory elements, viz. person, number, tense, voice. The infinitive is the most recent of verbal forms.
The passive form of expression is also a new development. It was by taking possession of the reflexive form (so also in Sanskrit the Atmanepada form) that the greater part of the I.-E. languages, especially Latin and Greek contrived to create a passive voice.

The adverb is another new development. It is an ancient adjectival or substantive which has abandoned the regular plan of declension, e.g. once, twice, needs, etc., तिरं, अगमा, etc.

The tenses in Bengali are instances of "new acquisitions." None of these is formed regularly. The simple past and the future are formed by participles, e.g. करिग (from Sanskrit ना) and करिब (from Sanskrit नञ्चा). The other tenses are formed by adding different conjugations of root आच to the infinitive of the main verb, e.g. करितहिलम = करित + आचिलाम, करितहिचि = करित + आचि. The past perfect and the present perfect are also similarly formed, e.g.

करिय़ाहिलाम = करिय़ा + आचिलाम,
करिय़ाहिचि = करिय़ा + आचि.

The development of post-positions is another case in point. In the development of the Indian dialects we find the case terminations themselves tending to disappear and post-positions taking their place, e.g. आमार बारा, आमा हहित, etc.

The upasargas in Sanskrit have also been turned into prepositions, e.g. उदरेष्य ब्रह्म, अधिह सारि; तथा सच्छ, मृत्तासारू वाँचि; अयं विना.

Extinction of Useless Forms.

"The extinction of useless forms is not to be understood only of those which, after having existed for a longer or shorter period, have dropped out of usage, but also of those forms which virtually possessing the right to live, have yet never attained realisation."

If some verbs having the same meaning be conjugated through all tenses and all moods in Greek and Sanskrit, there would be such an abundance of forms that the mind would be overwhelmed. But fortunately what is of no use is suppressed. Hence also the composite conjugations. In proportion as languages grow old they rid themselves of their superfluity. The extinction of useless forms goes the length of uniting different verbs in one and the same conjugation, e.g. I go, I went; I am, I was; I have been; and so on. Beng. आचि, आचिब्रह्म; Sans. पद्धति, दर्शि; गच्छि, जगाम, बृजमन्त्र; etc.
The pronominal declensions consisting of various stems may be taken as illustrations. The first personal pronoun in Sanskrit gives the forms वष्णु, वायवा, वस्म्, मास्, न्, अस्मान्, which come from different stems. Similar is the case with the second personal pronoun. The third personal pronouns also show the same thing, स् ते, तस्मान्, etc., are of different origin. Sometimes the original uniformity is shown by forms which have grown obsolete, e.g. संस्कृत for टस्मान्, समान् for तस्मान् in the Vedas.

The Bengali third personal pronoun also discloses the same fact. সে, তাহারা come from different sources. Only the nominative singular has retained the স-stem. In East Bengal however সের is used in the Vikrampur side instead of the standard তার (তাহার) in the genitive singular. The ত-stem is also found in older Bengali where we now use স-stem e.g.

সত্যায়ণে বেদ অর্থ জানি মুনিগণ।
সেই মত চালাইল সংসারের জন।॥
জেতায়ণে বেদ অর্থ জানিতে নারিগ।
তে কারণে মুনিগণ পুরাণ রচিল।॥

(সে কারণে)—Prithvīchandra  গৌরীমঙ্গল (1806),
(S.P. Patrika, 1303, Vaisākha).

A comparison between the verbal systems in the Vedic and Classical Sanskrit will reveal how much of extinction has taken place in the latter. In fact the chief difference between Vedic and Classical Sanskrit lies in the very elaborate tense-system which are found in the Veda, but are completely broken down in the classical. In the Vedas we have four well-developed systems of tenses each of which possesses a primary tense and an augmented tense (preterite), and has the three modal variations and the two participles, active and middle. In Classical Sanskrit only a fraction of these survive in the ten স্ত্রীমাস given by Pāṇini.

The suppression of certain words ensures clearer oppositions. The feminine of a word survives in composition, but as a simple word it may disappear giving place to another. পা meant ‘son’, শি ‘daughter’ in Bengali; now they survive as such only in composition, e.g. থাকিবো, থাকির-শি. But ordinarily শি has taken the signification ‘maid-servant’ and the corresponding masculine is থাক্র ‘man servant’.

In this sense পা is never used and has been suppressed. Some-
times suppression comes about in another way. The regular masculine or feminine having been suppressed, another word of altogether different origin is supplied, e.g. Eng. bull, cow; stag, hind; cock, hen; gentleman, lady; etc. Beng. বাবা, বালী; মামী, মিনল; মামী, শী; কাশি, পূর্বিক; and so on.

When a language has at its disposal two correlative terms the suppression of the one must have the effect of changing the meaning of the survivor. This has been illustrated by পো, ভি given above.

When the same idea is represented by two synonymous terms, Language gets rid of one of the two, though not so completely as to leave no traces. The word গবর্ড, কোম্পানী in Bengali are used to denote the ruling power. But the latter word has fallen into disuse, only surviving in a few phrases like কোম্পানীর কাগজ, কোম্পানীর মুল্লক, etc. ভি and মেহে are another pair.

In the sense of daughter ভি is almost extinct and only to be found in compounds like ভাকুড়িবি, etc. মেহে has usurped its dominion almost completely.

The extinction of dual number in all the modern I.-E. Languages furnishes us with another illustration. The dual being a special case of plural was considered a grammatical luxury and got rid of gradually.

Coming to noun-declensions we find several case-forms are identical, e.g. instrumental, dative, and ablative plural, ablative and genitive singular, genitive and locative dual. The original case forms must have been distinct but disuse or similarity of function or some other cause must have led to the extinction of different forms and helped towards identity.

**PART II.**

**BENGALI SEMANTICS.**

*The Deterioration of Meaning.*

Words originally possessed of good meaning gradually come to acquire a bad sense and are used in that special sense only. ছোট (small), অর্ণ (non-existent), etc., have now come to mean, 'small-minded,' 'dishonest,' respectively, e.g. ছোটলাক (small-minded man), অর্ণ বারি (dishonest man). The word ইচ্ছার (lit. others) is now used in the sense of 'low.' In the Bengali phrase ইচ্ছার-বিশেষ the original meaning is retained, e.g. Sanskrit যদ্যপ: অসার্থঃ অসার্থসাধেতম। স যতু প্রমাণী উচ্ছিন্থ স্থাক্তাদলাজয়তি।—(Bhagavad-Gītā, iii, 21.) 'As do the great, so do the
rest of mankind.' Perhaps this use as contrasted with "the great," furnishes the clue to the transition.

There are certain words however, which are still in the midway, i.e. they are used both in good and bad senses. In course of time the bad sense only may survive. Examples are আড়া (stand) and গুলির আড়া (rendezvous); খেলোয়াড় as in ঘাল খেলোয়াড় (a good player) and খেলোয়াড় লোক (a designing man), etc.

Exaggeration often leads to deterioration. The word সর্বনাশ as in হেলটার সর্বনাশ করবে রেখিয়ে (lit. I. see he will destroy everything of the boy) is generally used to mean simple ‘injury,’ 'harm.' হেট মরাম (lit. I am done to death by walking) really means 'I am utterly exhausted with walking.' নিঃশব্দ জীবন (lit. lifeless life) denoted 'life not so full of vitality. Thus words possessed of a very strong meaning become less forcible in expression by being constantly used.

When a word is used in all kinds of associations, deterioration is often accompanied by a kind of discoloration. This is found often in colloquial language, e.g. টিন ভরসার ভাল মাহু ছাড়া (he is an awfully good man), অপের সাঙ্গালিতিক জান (his knowledge of mathematics is striking); cf. also German schrecklich warm.

The words which refer to the relations of sexes are specially exposed to semantic changes of this kind, e.g. সহবাস (lit. living together) means sexual intercourse, সংম (originally 'assembly') is also used in the same sense.

The word পীরিতি (commonly পীরিত in colloquial language) was used in its original good sense 'love' in old Bengali, e.g. কাহার পীরিতি চন্দনের রীতি বসিতে সৌরভময় (চণ্ডীর পাথর, p. 156); or

এতেক বলিয়া চরণ পদ্ধিরান।
বত পূৱি নারীগণ।
কহ মাঙ্গী করিয়া পীরিতি
আশাকীর্ত্তি কর মনে।

চতুর্ণগোল (A.B. Patrika ed., p. 16).

In the time of Bharatchandra we find the word being used in both the senses দেহেতে চন্দ্র জল অঙ্কে মূর্ত্তি, কহিয়ে প্রজাগতি পীরিতি করিয়া (affection), (চতুর্ণগোল, Basumati edition, p. 52) but in বুড়ি পীরিতি বালির রন্ধ, ক্ষে হাতে বড়ী কণ্ঠে ঢাল (বিন্ধ্যচন্দ্র, p. 74) the word is used in a somewhat bad sense. In modern Bengali however the word signifies only 'illicit
love.' Dr. Dineshchandra Sen remarks that it was the promiscuous mixing of men and women in the lower orders of Vaishnava Society, which by leading to immorality, caused the degeneration in the meaning of this word. (History of Beng. Lang. and Lit., pp. 826 ff.)

There are certain words which by their association acquire a degraded sense. রক্তিকা (paramour), মহাজন (money-lender) originally meant 'protected' and 'great man' respectively. It is an irony of fate that cooks in Hindu families, who are mostly Brahmainas should be given highly honoured names all over Northern India. Bengalis call them দুর্গু (God), Oriyas call them পুরাণ (worshipper); Biharis use বন্ধু (father), and U.P. people মহারাজ (great king) for them. A maid-servant is ordinarily called মা (lit. daughter). The original meaning is still to be found in phrases like দুর্গু-মা (father-in-law's daughter), দৌড়ি-মা (sister's daughter), গোলাড়ি-মা (Ghose's daughter) মারেন-মা (mother and daughter) and in some proverbs (which may be said to be the repository of old usage), such as মা দেব দেও মুঠ শান্ত (lit. to chastise the daughter-in-law by beating the daughter), etc. The word মা originally meant 'cultivator,' now it means 'unmannerly' because of the rude manners of the cultivator. It is curious to note that this word having acquired a bad sense, a man especially if he belongs to a high caste but lives on agriculture is called মাপী to distinguish him from a মারা, e.g. মাপী গৃহস্ত (a family living on agriculture).

Certain words acquire a degraded sense when they pass from one language to another. দর্দ-মা a well-wisher, from Persian khaîr-khvâh, means 'sycophant' in Bengali, চলাক from Persian câlak means 'clever,' but চলাকি means 'wiliness, cunning' in Bengali. Other examples are বাহাদুরি (bravado), পাদাসি (meddlesomeness), ইহার-কি (vulgar friendship), originally from 'brave,' 'expert,' 'friend.' Perhaps here is reflected through language the attitude of the conquered people towards their conquerors.

Another phenomenon is the tendency to level the meaning by constant use মহারাজ, বাবু, মহাশয় etc., are cases in point; cf. also Marathi माजा. Their original use has been preserved in phrases like उल्लास बाबू (the great Zamindar Babus of Ula), etc. At present the word is used as an ordinary title like English Mr. and Fr. Monsieur, Ger. Herr has also shared the same fate. The following peculiar use of the words মহাশয় (lit. great-minded) and হৃদমোহক (gentleman) may be noted হৃদমোহক মহাশয়ের মত নিচনা (low-minded) হৃদমোহক আদী দেথি নাই; তার মত জ্যাচোর (dishonest)
The original sense of the word is preserved in the following: চিঠি পড়া শেষ হইলে রাসমণি বলিয়া উঠিলেন, বেরাই অতি মহাশয় লোক (চাক বন্ধু), পশ্চিমান, p. 118). The word বাবু has even come to acquire a bad sense, meaning 'a foppish lazy fellow,' as in বাবুজিরি.

The degradation has extended even to pronouns. The use of the pronoun তুই furnishes an illustration. It is often used in a deteriorated sense. The phrase তুই-মূই-করা means 'slighting one by calling one তুই.'

The word, however, is used in a good sense in addressing mother-land, God, mother, etc. in a sense of affection and familiarity, e.g. মা আমায় ছুটিয়া (তুই) কত (রামগ্রাম); সবাদে তোর ধানের মোট কিং দেখেছি মনুর হাসি 'What beautiful smile have I seen on thy fields of paddy in the month of Agrahayana' (রবীন্দ্রনাথ). The use of the word 'thy' in English is an exact parallel.

The word পাথর has an interesting history. It was formerly used in quite a good sense. But now it has come to mean the very opposite. A sect of ascetics, who were non-Buddhists, were called, পাথর (পাংড়া) by Emperor Asoka and were awarded royal gifts by him. Manu uses the word in the sense of non-Hindu. Later on the Vaishnavas began to apply the term to sects other than theirs. It then came to acquire the general meaning 'unbeliever' whence 'sinner,' 'rogue.' In Hindustâni the word পাথর (বাঁধ অখ) is still used in the sense of 'unbeliever.' In Gujarâti, however, পাথর means a rogue.

রিরুক means উদাসীন (indifferent, not attached to the world) in চৈত্রভাগবত and other old Vaishnava books. It is now used in the sense of 'disgusted,' though the original use is still retained by the Vaishnavas, e.g. রিরুক রূপক. So also is the word আহব্যাস, cf. ভক্তি দিয়া জীবে প্রোক্ত কর আহব্যাস 'Make the people thy own by giving them the spirit of reverence.' Now the word denotes 'to make one's own by dishonesty.' প্রিত্য is another word used in a good sense in চৈত্রভাগবত, e.g. প্রেচ্ছ অহ্মাবাব্ব. It is now generally used with words denoting something bad, as প্রেচ্ছ কোথা, etc.

Effects of party warfare, of the strife of interests and of opinions often give rise to bad senses of words. German Kultur has acquired a bad sense since the outbreak of the world-war. The term Bolshevik, which has become associated with such tragedy and horror, was in the beginning an innocent word enough, the original Russian meaning being "men of the majority." In India such a bad odour has been attached to the word 'native' used by Anglo-Indians, that a Govern-
ment circular has been necessary for the use of the word ‘Indian’ instead. The name of the ‘moderate’ party in India is মধ্যপায়, lit. ‘the party addicted to pride.’ The word সিকম্ফিক (lit. lizard) is used to denote ‘detectives.’ These words are gradually gaining currency. Here the laws of meaning change and phonetic ‘decay’ may be found to work side by side.

Sometimes the word may be used in a particular dialect of a language in bad sense, e.g. শারীর in East Bengal dialect is used to mean ‘a woman of ill repute.’ In West Bengal, however, the word denotes ‘a woman’ though a sense of contempt is implied.

**Indirect Expression of Meaning.**

Closely allied in some respects to the previous phenomenon is the peculiar process by which things are meant by terms other than the usual ones. The outward expressions may not correspond to the inner meaning. Sometimes the meaning may be the very opposite. Again in other cases it is expressed only in an indirect manner.

The word শৌচ which only means purity or cleanliness, is used to veil the disagreeable but all the same every day bodily necessity. Wine is sometimes referred to colloquially by the terms পানীষ নদ (a kind of ale made from paddy, lit. the goddess of the paddy), or লাল-পানি (lit. red water). All this illustrates the humour of the people. In Gujarati also লাল-মানি is used in the same sense. To speak of a man as a মাতাল (drunkard) is rather harsh, so we say তার পান দোষ আছে, in its literal sense ‘he has the bad habit of drinking.’ When a woman goes astray we say তিনি বঞ্জামন করেছেন, lit. ‘she has gone out (of her family).’ When a man dies we prefer to say তিনি দেহস্থ হয়েছেন (he has gone to heaven), তিনি পঞ্চাক্ষর করেছেন (he has undergone dissolution into the five elements), তিনি ঈশ্বরের হাত ছেড়েছেন (he has left this world). Cf. কুঞ্জপ্রাণি (to get Krishna, i.e. to die).

On a close examination of the causes it will be noticed that this is the result of a very human disposition, as Bréal says, which prompts men to veil, to attenuate, to disguise ideas which are disagreeable, wounding or repulsive. There is nothing in it all save a feeling of consideration, a precaution against unnecessary shocks,—a precaution which whether sincere or feigned is not long efficient, since the hearer seeks out the thing behind the words, and at once identifies them.

Sometimes the very opposite term is used to express the sense.
The Bengal Hindu wife has to take recourse a good deal to this indirect manner of expression. The husband is never referred to by his name, হেমা or রামু or the pronoun উনি is used instead. If a gentleman happens to be of the same name as any of the names of the superiors of her husband's family, it is considered a serious breach of decorum on her part to pronounce that name. If the name of her husband's elder brother and that of the servant be identical, say নৌবরন সhe will call the servant by some such name as লুজু (for নৌবরন) or change the name of the servant. The custom is in vogue all over India and even outside, e.g. the rural districts of England. (Giles, Manual of Comparative Philology, p. 238.)

The Kafir women, as we are told by the Rev. J. W. Appleyard, in his excellent work on the Kafir language have many words peculiar to themselves. This arises from a national custom, called Ukuhlonipa, which forbids their pronouncing any word which may happen to contain a sound similar to one in the names of their nearest male relations, from hlonipa—to be respectful, to avoid mentioning one's name. (Max Müller, Science of Language, Vol. II, p. 43.)

Another cause of this indirect process of reference is personal or sectarian hatred or prejudice. A Vaishnava, whose hatred against Śaktas is well known, is said to have spoken in the following manner while reporting that the kid has been cut into two, and weltering in a pool of blood on a field near Durgapur under a bel tree:—হাতেইড়ার মা র নগরের মাটে পেকজাদার গাছের তলে বাছাকে আমার কে দুখনা করে বিদ্যুম্ভে কেন পারে শব গা ভেসে গিয়েছে (i.e. হৃদি—গলের না)-নগরের মাটে বেগাদের তলে ছাগলজুনাতলেকে কে দুখনা করে কেটেছে, রাক্ষস শব গা ভেসে গিয়েছে। The very names of Durga, and the fruit of the bel which is used for her worship by the Saktas, and the very idea of cutting into two a living animal, are repellent to the Vaishnava, the chief doctrine of his religion being বসিয়া পার্শা গাছী।
In this connection we may notice the various figures of speech. Irony, Euphemism, Periphrasis, ব্যাকরণভট্টি, etc. When discussing the character of a dishonest man, if we say সে বড় সাহে! we really assert that he is not honest. In ব্যাকরণভট্টি censure and praise are expressed in the same language, the words having double meanings.

"বিবাহ করিয়া লীলার লাগে,
আসিলেন রাম নিজ আলোয়া,
চুমো যতেক বালক সবে,
আসিয়া হাসিয়া কহে রাখবে,
সন হে কুমার তোমারি আজ;
কুলের উচিত হলে কাজ।
তব হে জনন অতি বিপুলে,
কুলে বিদিত অজের কুলে;
জনক হৃষিতা বিবাহ করি
ভগবান ভাঙেতে যশের তরি।"

(From a quotation in পদাঘাট, ওঝা ভাগ, Introduction.)

Here Rama is praised for marrying the daughter of King Janaka and this is quite worthy of one who is born in the line of অজ the world renowned ancestor of Rama. The other meaning is that Rama has married the daughter of his father (জনক) as befits one who belongs to the race of goats (অজ)!

Sometimes humility on the part of the speaker expresses the meaning in rather an indirect way. When a gentleman requests his guest একটু জল খেয়ে যান (lit. please drink a little water), what is really meant is not water alone, but it may be a good dish along with it. Houses are given names which do not at all represent the nature of the building. মদনমোহন কুটীর may be a many storied big building though the word কুটীর means only a cottage. Sometimes this humility causes reference to persons in the third person. In expressions like গোষ্ঠী দাসের ভাগা কি হবে? "O Lord, what is ordained for the humble servant? (referring to the speaker himself)." অথবা হৃষে: a modest phrase to designate the speaker himself is used in Sanskrit. In Vikramoreśi, II, the King when taking leave from Urvāsī says তোমার ব্যবহার অথবা: ; cf. সৌভাগ্য তোমার.

In sentences like হংস কি বলেন, 'What does your Honour (lit. presence) say?' the same cause operates. In Sanskrit forms like ভাষ্যপুচ্ছ, ভব, ভগবান্ etc. are instances of the kind. Sanskrit ভবান্ত and
Bengali অখণ্ড (from Skt. অক্ষণন; Prak. অখণ্ড) may have the same cause for their being used for the second person, though they themselves are originally third persons.

The colloquial হে (from হই) —East Bengal হে—is used in Bengali for all sorts of things, when the idea to be expressed does not at once come forth before the mind of the speaker. Bhojpuri Hindi मङ्गिः is a similar instance.

Some uses of the negative in Bengali, while implying emphasis, also give the opposite sense which is positive, e.g. ताहि ना दोश thou eat.

In Hindi also ना is used in the same way. Gujrati has ने and नि used in the same sense. But Bhojpuri uses नू instead. Babu Bijoy Chandra Mazumdar, however, is of opinion that this ना is only another form of Sanskrit नू. Then of course the negative sense does not at all come in.

In the interrogative sentence जिनिस्ता कि अमन? the अमन implies that the thing is not bad, the real form should be जिनिस्ता कि मन? "Is the thing bad?" In Eastern Hindi we find a similar use in अधमल् 'restless' for Sanskrit अधम (Hoernle, Comparative Grammar of the Gaudian Languages, p. 95). But in Bengali the original negative sense is preserved as is illustrated in the following lines:

परशुनिली प्रकाश तोमार अचूपक तार जोयति,
लोना क‘रे निक परशु अमार सव कलाक कालो।। (रवीन्द्रनाथ)

Sometimes nervousness and superstition cause indirect expression. Small-pox is referred to as शीतलार कूप (cf. दारवेर अंध्रां ‘the favour of the goddess, Śitalā, the cooler’), a snake at night as लता (lit. creeper), a ghost as देवता (lit. God) and so forth. Cf. the common Greek name for the Furies, Eumenides or the well-disposed ones.

**Elevation of Meaning.**

The contrary of the process of deterioration is what may be called *Elevation* of meaning. Just as rising in the physical, moral and social world is more difficult than falling, so also is the case here. Instances of the degradation are very numerous but those of elevation are comparatively rare.

Some words from Sanskrit have assumed an elevated sense in Bengali. The word साह्म is an example. It is defined in Sanskrit as,
THE INTELLECTUAL LAWS OF LANGUAGE.

मनुष्यमार्गां चेर् परदारामिबिमव्याम्।
पार्श्वामन्तवर्गौं साहसं पङ्खिया सङ्क्षा्।

(Cf. साहस = बलन < साहस used in the R.V. in the sense of strength.)
This practically implies साहस is the term for all sorts of heinous crimes imaginable, murder, theft, rape, haughtiness and falsehood. But strangely enough it has come in Bengali to exclusively mean 'noble courage.'

चाइ बल चाइ बाया आनंद उज्जल परमाणु
साहसबिस्त्रू वक्ष्यत्—(रवीन्द्रनाथ)

We rather add the prefix श्र (viz. श्राहस) to denote rashness, etc. श्राहस is also occasionally found. In Gujrāti साहस is used in both the senses.

कापड़ originally meant 'old rag' (cf. पटभरों चीलेवश्च समीनल्लक-कपड़े). Pali कम्पट = विश्ववक्र, Oriya कुटी = दोंच विश्ववक्र. Now it means an entire piece of good cloth. Here the law of restriction also works.

श्रब्द has a similar history. In Sanskrit it means 'fear' (cf. सम्मानल्लक राम: रामायणम्, आरायणम्, In old Bengali books like Kavindra and Shrikaran Nandi's Mahabhārata the word is used in its original sense of 'fear,' e.g. श्रम न गँगरे भाय शाते शहसर. In modern Bengali it has the meaning 'respect.' The respect inspires fear perhaps.

श्र was used to denote 'beautiful' or 'foolish,' cf. सुमधुर सुन्दरे श्रृः; इत्यादिसम् प्रियंति: अनुब्धय सुमधुरम्—Uttararāmacarita, Act III. भाषात दुःस्व (foolish) राजा ना पातिल काने (चतुराष, श्रीकृष्ण, p. 27). In old Bengali we find the word used also in its original literal sense: देश राजा श्रुः ह' (swooned) पड़ोन धरो। In modern Bengali the word is exclusively used in the good sense—

शुभ्राणि बिपुला एই धरा पाने
चेष्टे गार्कि आति मुहुः (charmed) नयनेन—रवीन्द्रनाथ
सात कोटी सहानेबे, हे मुहुः (fond) जनौनी
रेघच साहसी कहे' माहूः करनी—चन्दनक, p. 245.

Words like सांघातिक as in सांघातिक ज्ञान (striking knowledge), etc. which have been given elsewhere may be taken as illustrations of this law, only in that particular context.

Some words while being used as equivalents for English words
have come to acquire an elevated sense through misapplication, e.g. 
বাধিত ‘obliged’ (lit. pained), cf. ন তথা বাধিতে ক্ষত্র: যথা বাধিত বাধিতে।

Concretion and Abstraction of Meaning.

These are two allied processes. The process of concretion takes 
place when an abstract word, instead of keeping its abstract sense, 
instead of remaining the exponent of an action, a quality or a state, 
becomes the name of a material object.

Sometimes the modified word preserves both the meanings, e.g. 
নিম্নলিখিত as in নিম্নলিখিত ভোজনা to partake of the food offered by the inviter, but 
in নিম্নলিখিত রক্ষা the abstract sense ‘invitation’ is retained.

The abstract idea is sometimes forgotten, the material signification 
alone surviving, e.g. জনন (formerly also denoted মহান্যাধ) now means 
crowd—ভোজন জনন উপলব্ধ। সন্তান সন্তান সন্তান ‘lines of descendants,’ 
অবস্থা, হারেম (lit. confinement), অনরাজ অনরাজ ‘enemy.’

“অনরাজ বিক্রমে পরাজিত হ’লে
চিতানলে ধারা তুষ দিত চেলে।

(হেমচন্দ্র, ভারতকালিনী, Basumati ed., p. 346.)

জনন (জন + তি) seems to have meant originally ‘birth.’ Now it 
means genus, species, caste, race, etc., e.g. মানবজাতি, বাঙালীজাতি, কাশ্মীরজাতি, 
etc.

The opposite phenomenon abstraction takes place when words 
denoting concrete things gradually come to be used in an abstract 
sense. কপাল (forehead) now means ‘fate.’ The word হৃদয় ‘heart’ is 
own used in its figurative sense হৃদয়ন্তৰী, আমি তোমার জন্য সিদ্ধান্ত পরিভাষা করে এসেছি, তুমি আমায় তাছ ক’রে না। (cf. ‘to take heart’).

In old Bengali we find the word used in its concrete sense—

হৃদয়(হ) মুক্তি হোরি গোর কোঁর।

খনে আর দই খনে হোর কোঁর ||—বিদ্যাপতি, p. 6.

প্রথম ঘোড় মনে মুখিত ভাঙগর।

হৃদয় কান্তীল গজমুক্তার হার ||—শ্রীকৃষ্ণকীর্তন, p. 58.

জাতি পড়িয়াছে তার জন্য ছাড়িয়া।—গোবিন্দদাসের কৌতুক।

The word কপাল retains both its concrete and abstract sense but in 
the case of the word হৃদয় the concrete sense is altogether gone.

সমস্ত ই is used in its concrete sense only, e.g. সে অনেক দাম ক’রেছে।

Here it means ‘landed property’. In old Bengali however it is seen to
be used in an abstract sense. নবধীর সম্পন্নি কে বর্ধিতের পারে—'Who can describe the prosperity of Navadvipa?' Cf. বিষয়—country (in Sanskrit).

The phrase বুকরের পাটা (lit. the broadness of chest) now means 'courage': কৃত্তিলে আনিয়ে মাগে কলি আমায় লোহাপটা।
আমি তুমি মা ব’লে ডাকি এমনি আমার বুকের পাটা।—মায়ণারা.

দেবষা probably originally meant the collection of gods, now it means an individual god. The quality of a god is now denoted by the word দেবষা in Bengali.

The abstract noun forming suffix অন্ত্র gives us the words ভবন (habitation), কলস (clothes), etc. which are examples of concretion.

Instances may be multiplied in this way. We shall now close the chapter with the remark that abstraction becomes rather frequent along with the progress of language and the advancement of civilization.

Restriction of Meaning.

"Our languages are condemned to a perpetual lack of proportion between the word and the thing. Expression is sometimes too wide, sometimes too narrow. We do not notice this want of accuracy because, for the speaker, expression adapts itself to the thing through the circumstances, the place, the moment and the obvious intention of the discourse. At the same time the attention of the hearer, who counts for half in all languages, goes straight to the thought behind the word, without dwelling on its literal bearing, and so restricts or extends it according to the intention of the speaker."

The real cause of disproportion between the name and the thing is the nature of the verbs. The roots which are properly called ঘাত্তু in Sanskrit are the "essential and capital" part of our languages. Nouns and adjectives are mostly derived from them. The subjects, object or instruments of an action may be formed from the same verb, which of course has its own general signification. So the special forms derived from it must become restricted in meaning by usage. The verb denotes something like an abstract idea—the name of the action. The absence of roots of general ideas in some primitive and savage speeches is to be noted. Thus several words are formed out of the same verb as one by one they become limited in meaning; the same source is drawn upon and other new words are formed which again in their course be-
come restricted in meaning and thus the process goes on. भावना, भावा, भाव, all belong to the root भू ‘to be’, भावना means ‘anxiety’, भाव ‘to think’ and भाव ‘feeling’.

This phenomenon of restriction is perhaps the most interesting and at the same time instructive side of semantics, there is hardly any profession or any state of life which does not use the general words of the language to its own advantage and gives them a peculiar impress of their own, making them restricted in meaning.

"The more advanced the civilisation of a nation" as Bréal points out, "the more varied are these Restrictions of meaning." The word ঝি to a soldier means ‘a bullet’, to a tailor ‘a ball of thread’, to a boy ‘a marble’ and so on.

Words which formerly denoted a whole class may gradually come to mean merely a particular portion of that class. হং denoted all sorts of animals (cf. श्रोधन्यं मन्दग; Amara.) but it now means deer only. The restriction is found even in Sanskrit. The history of the English word ‘deer’ is also similar. In Persian मुर्ग (मोर्ग) means ‘bird,’ a winged creature, but in Bengali we use the word in a restricted sense, namely ‘cock’ (cf. O.E. fugol—bird > fowl). অবলা is used to denote the weaker sex, its literal meaning is ‘one who has no strength,’ and to man the woman was pre-eminently weak, whom they were to protect, e.g. অবলা, অবলী, সূর্য অবলা সম্র (নবীনচর, উপসভা), similarly অঙ্গনা, শুটিয়া, etc. The Bengali dialectal word মুনিস now means a labourer. It is same as মন্দ (cf. colloquial, মনিস); the very form মুনিস is found in its general sense of ‘man’ in some of Ashoka’s Edicts; স্বে মুনিসা সে পশ্চ (Jaugad, 2nd Edict).

The most universal necessaries of life had often very general names at the beginning. This is found in other languages also.

अष्ट—(√अष्ट + क्ष) (cf. अष्ट + काढ) which is our staple food, lit. means ‘that which is eaten.’ कष्ट was originally the same as घन ‘wealth’ (घन + खाम = घন). Grass is called by the most general name ‘that which is eaten’ (√घन मोलो + घ, क्षों).

Sometimes it is found that the various meanings of a word grow obsolete excepting one and it goes down to future ages with the meaning which alone has survived. The word কলাকৃষ্ণ is a case in point. It was originally used to mean any relation: এথ বঃ জ্ঞাথযজ্ঞনো জনকান্ত কায়োঃ (Uttararāmacarita, Act IV). "Here is your esteemed relation, the chief of the race of the Janakas." Here the word is used literally in
the sense of 'connection.' But now in Bengali শপথী is used only in the sense of wife's brother. In Gujarati as in Sanskrit समथायং denotes 'any relation' but in Hindi it has been restricted to one 'by marriage,' विवाहित, and is used in the restricted sense of brother-in-law may be noted in this connection. (Cf. German Schwager and Schwagerschaft, relationship by marriage.) धूर्त and দাড়া are now restricted to mean the cloth worn respectively by male and female persons. But formerly they used to denote cloths worn by either a man or a woman.

Marathi घोळ < घोळ means 'washed garment,' घोळी in Hindi denotes both the kinds. बाह in Bengali means a Hindustani nautch girl only (cf. বাহিনী). The word বাহ originally means any respectable lady, coming most likely from মাহ 'mother' as Pandit Vidhushekhar Sastri suggests; cf. Marathi बाह्रāऽ—wife and is used in that sense even now in Rajputana, Maharashtra and Gujarat, e.g. महाभारत बाह्र, परिा रामायाने etc. বাহ also means a mistress in these languages, but that is not the general acceptation of the term. In Bengali the word has only one meaning, viz: 'nautch-girl.' ভামাসা is often used in the sense of 'joke' in Bengali—

The restriction of meaning in synonymous words is sometimes very peculiar. সূরুষ and শ্রেণ (lit. endowed with শ্রেণ or fortune) were originally used without distinction before names of persons, e.g. পুর্বেপাস্পদ শ্রীমন্ত রামায়ানো শ্রেণ্যন্ত্রে মহাসাগর: (Rāmāyana). Now in Bengali শ্রেণ is used only before the names of younger people. শ্রুণ্ণ and শ্রীর meant the same thing. শ্রীর means now only a special preparation of milk. In some
cases the synonym extends and contracts itself by just so much the
domain of its companion. জাতি and কুটুষ্ঠ were originally synonyms.
Now জাতি is reserved for ‘kinsmen’ and কুটুষ্ঠ means ‘relations by
marriage’.

A word may receive a particular impress from a particular class of
people and emerge with a restricted meaning, e.g. গরম মশলা means
দাক্তা, হোটেল and লব্ধ only; and পালতানি denotes not any five kinds
of spices but only কাদাহিলা, মৌলি, মেরিল, রাধানী and মন্ন. The words মহারাজ
(commonly মহার) and সক্র্িহ্রন being used in connection with Vaishnavism
have acquired a peculiar significance. The particular festivity of the
Vaishnavas in which cooked food is indiscriminately distributed amongst
the people assembled is called মহাযোগ. The word literally means a
‘great festivity’ and in Sanskrit it is always used in that sense. সক্র্িহ্রন,
the Sanskrit meaning of which is ‘reciting’ or ‘singing,’ is used to
denote a particular kind of singing of God’s name by a procession of
Vaishnavas.

At other times it is found that a word changes its meaning and
becomes restricted in sense on account of the influence of some historical
event. ভেঁক which used to denote Sanskrit ভেঁ (or ভেঁ dress; cf.
Marathi ভেঁ or ভেঁ, Apabhramśa Hindi, ভেঁ or ভেঁ, ভ = খ) took with
Vaishnavism the special meaning, ‘dress of a Vaishnava.’ “Once impressed
with the seal of religion, all other usages came to an end.” ভেঁক
লাগা now means ‘to become a Vaishnava.’ In old Bengali the meaning
‘dress’ is found:—

তাফিয়া আপন ভেঁক, নারদ হইল রেক
পুনরবর্ত হইল মলাণা।

—শুন্ত পুরাণ, Parisat Ed., p. 141.

The use of the word in the same sense in modern Bengali is only accidental,
the speaker trying to transfer the association in another similar field.

তার এই মুসলমানী বেশ দেবিয়া কলাগা হারিয়ার জিজ্ঞাসা করিলেন—৫ কি রে! গোবিন্দ
হারিয়া বলিল—তুমি কি বলিতে পারবে চাই ভেক ভেক এই দ্বিতীয় কি রকম ভক্তিরক্ষামান
ভেক নইলে পরিবর্ত পাবেন কেননা কতে ভেক বন্দ্যো, পঙ্কতোলক, p. 199.

Sometimes the vulgar form of a word is used in a restricted sense
while the learned form retains the general signification, e.g. দেশ in the
sense of cloud is used by the ordinary folk, while the original দেবতা
means ‘god’. In poetry দেশ is even now used in the sense of cloud.
In our every day language we use a large number of words in their restricted sense, which use varies according to time and place and leaves no durable traces. The word শহর means to all country folk the nearest town. We had a maid servant who came from a village near Berhampur, which to her was the town par excellence. But even when she was in our house at Krishnagar, which was as good a town as Berhampur, she always meant Berhampur by using the word শহর. London is the town in England. In Krishnagar College the word সহেব is used to denote the Principal, who is the only European on the staff at present (1920), (cf. the use of the word সহেব itself, when it means an Englishman or European). বাবা (father) রাজবাড়ী (kitchen) etc. are used in the sense of proper nouns in individual families.

Expansion of Meaning.

"Expansion of meaning is the counterpart of what we have just been observing. It may be thought surprising to find two movements in opposite directions existing simultaneously. But we must note that the cause is not the same in both cases: while restriction depends, as has been seen, on the fundamental conditions of language, expansion has an exterior cause: it results from the events of history."

A thing is given a particular name after some of its prominent characteristics. This characteristic may retire into the background and even be wholly forgotten. Then the name may come to denote the whole class instead of designating a particular kind, e.g. কালি is a black liquid for writing (from কাল, black). Now the word means all sorts of fluids for writing; even the combination লাল কালি is found to denote ‘red ink.’ নিয়াড়া in Hindi has a similar history, Pers. siyāh is black, লাল নিয়াড়া is red ink (or more commonly মুক্ত নিয়াড়া); Av. suxra, Pers. surkh, red: cf. রঙ্গ.

An action or thing may be given a name first on account of its association with a particular circumstance which may be only casual.
But afterwards the particular association which occasioned the giving
of the name may be quite forgotten and the word comes to acquire a
general meaning. **সৌরভর্ক্রি** originally meant "a prologue or prelimi-
mary verses in praise of Gour (Shri Chaitanya) in the collection of Vais-
nava verses." The word means "anything said or even done at the
beginning." It is used almost as an equivalent of 'introduction' but
generally in a deriding tone.

Sometimes proper names are used by people in the sense of the
genus to which the thing belonged. The word গঙ্গা from গঙ্গা, the Ganges,
is an example. It is used for any river (even in Ceylon), e.g. বঙ্গ
ধূলে বান এসেছে, জয় না বলে ভাঙাও তরি. The word is similarly used in
Marathi to designate big and probably holy rivers like Godavari,
Krishna, Kaveri, etc. A woman in Sangli, as Gune points out, will
always say महानगर मेली छोली when she only means—काँग्रे etc Here the
idea is to ascribe to the Krishna equal holiness with the Ganges. A
village woman, asked the name of the little stream near the village,
will always say গঙ্গা. The word লঙ্ক (লঙ্ক) is used to denote a distant
country in বোঝা ও পোঝা, p. 49 perhaps on account of the distance of
Lanka from here.

উপরে উপর ছাড়ি না লেছরে বক্ষ |
নিকটে বসবি না জাছরে লগ * * |
( কবর কান্দি হাই না লও রে বক্ষ |
নিকটে সমুদ্র না বাবে রে লঙ্ক * * )

In the Bengali phrase সাতলঙ্কা in 'সাতলঙ্কা ঘুরে বিছুই হ’ল না,' the same
sense seems to have entered.

The word ফার্জধ, discloses a very interesting history. The origin of
the word has differently been traced by different scholars. Mr.
Jogesh Chandra Roy derives it from English 'Frank', while Moulavi
Sahidullah from Persian *Firangi*. Principal Ramendra Sundar Trivedi
says: "the European word 'Frank' in the sense of inhabitant of
Western Europe was used in Turkish and Arabic as ফার্জধ, ফারাঙ্গু, ফারাঙ্গু
Faranj (in Arabic) ফারাঙ্গু, etc. whence comes Persian ফার্জধ whence
Hindi ফিছালী from which comes Bengali ফিছালী."

"(Sāhitya Parisat Patrikā, Vol. XXV, I.) Whatever might be the origin of the word its original
meaning in Bengali was 'Portuguese pirates,' then 'their children by
Indian women,' and now 'Eurasians' generally. Even it is sometimes
used to denote 'Europeans' also; cf. ফারাঙ্গু ফিরিঙ্গী সব বাঙ্গালাতে হ’ল.
The familiar word मेसे shows another case of expansion. It originally denoted 'mother' and we have it on the authority of Mr. Dinesh Chandra Sen (बंगाली और साहित्य, p. 257) that it is even now used in the same sense in the form माई by the people of Ujanpur, Tippera. In old Bengali and Hindi the more original form माई signifies 'mother'; cf. Bejoy Gupta's Padmapurāṇa. माई and माई gives us मेसे which now means 'daughter,' whence 'woman' in general. Peculiarly enough मेसे in Raniganj means 'wife.' Compare the forms मेयेलाक and मेये, used to denote 'woman.'

बंगाली, the first weekly in Bengali of considerable circulation, and बरिसेन (hurricane lantern)—perhaps the first of its kind to be introduced—are still used by the people in remote villages, in the sense respectively of 'newspaper' and 'lantern' in general; cf. Marathi कादमबरी—novel, Hindi रामकथानां= a romance, a wondrous tale; cf. ओग्रे=Uigur tribe of Turks, turn Türk= 'become Mahomedan,' Saracen= Mahomedan, etc.

We call a measure by the name of some object which in some way resembles it in dimensions एकड़ (one cubit), एकचाल (one chain) etc. are examples. So also a 'pen' originally of feather (the Latin word for 'pen' is penna connected with the Latin pinna, feather) is now used for any writing instrument and may be even a ‘steel-pen’. Cf. German Stahl-feder, French plume.

Words expressive of conceptions of time are transferred to conceptions of space and vice versa, as—

आगे चल आगे चल भाइ—रबीहला।

ढाँडा ओ आमर आर्थर आगे—Ib.

and

आगे भागेही जिजिये दिली बांशी—Ib., बलका, p. 63.

Here आगे means 'fore' in the first two, and 'early,' in the last sentence.

Words which in their proper sense denote sensual and corporeal ideas only, are transferred to the denotation of ideas spiritual and intellectual, e.g. आत्मा 'soul' originally meant 'breath' whence body, etc. Cf. आत्माइहिः चतुष्कोषि खमाइ अर्मानि: also German atmen 'to breathe,' Grk. ἀποθέω 'vapour.'

Words which properly denote one species only are fallaciously
given a wider extension in meaning, e.g. as in তিনি মাছ (whale), চিংড়ি মাছ (lobster), etc.

We make proper names pass into class names as when we speak এখন দেশে হাজার গাঢ়ির আবিষ্কার, 'a thousand Gandhis are now required in the country.'

Sometimes the word denoting the male sex is used for the whole class—male and female. ঘোড়া signifies both male and female horses. But when any special distinction is meant we say মাদী ঘোড়া (a female horse). In Gujarati ঘোড়া has its feminine in ঘোড়াই which is also sometimes found in the vocabulary of our village people in the form of ঘোড়া। কুকুর, গাথা etc. are used for both the sexes. All this is due generally to familiarity.

The opposite process is also met with, the name for the female sex may denote the whole class, e.g. কাঠবিড়ি (squirrel, fem.), মুখী (hen), etc. In Gujarati the feminine ঵িহালী (বিহালী) is used to denote 'cat' while in Bengali the masculine form is used. বেটা is used in Gujarati for boys and girls alike, there being no degraded sense; the word is used also as a term of abuse in Bengali. We see the word বালা lit. 'girl' used to signify a boy in Old Bengali, e.g. নানোজাত বালা বাড়া ভোমা বনিয়ার (শ্রীরামকৃষ্ণাদ, p. 5); চারি-ষুজ্জর হল বানিয়ার বালা। (কবিকুঠ)। Even now the word is used in this sense in Hindi. The form is a decayed one from বালক>বালন্থ>বালা।

A number of words in feminine gender are used in connection with males, probably originally by females themselves. যাঙ্গা চেল (a boy as gentle as Lakshmi) is as right as যাঙ্গা মেহে (a girl as gentle as Lakshmi). Even সত্তা (good, fem.) is used in a similar way; cf. সত্তা চেলে, নিজে বড় সত্তা, etc.; also মাথিকাচ রাজা বদে বড় সত্তা (মাথিকাচ রাজার গীত, J.A.S.B., 1878, p. 14).

বাঙ্গালী (brother) is used as a form of address amongst themselves by the women of West Bengal especially. In Eastern Bengal বোন (sister) is rightly used.

Compound words often acquire an expanded sense. The reason is that when the words are linked together, the mind perceives the combination as a whole and does not pay attention to the meanings of the component parts; e.g. রাখপুত, রাইং (lit. the son of a king) now means a whole tribe.

The word গোয়াল (গো+শালা) originally signified 'a shed for cows'. It is now used for any similar shed, e.g. ভোজা গোয়াল 'a shed for sheep'.
"Sanskrit बाह्यगोष्ठ means a stable for horses, although गोष्ठ is a compound containing the word गो cow" (Bréal).

Sometimes the use of a word is extended from one profession to another. गोष्ठ is literally cultivation of the soil, but the use of the term in connection with fishery as मछेऽद चाँ (pisciculture) is perfectly current now.

Another kind of allied extension is found in the use of words in metaphorical sense. दोज (straight) may be used in दोजा पथ (straight way), दोजा कथा (straight word), दोजा मन (straight mind) and मा in गाड़ेर माथा (the top of a tree), गाड़ेर माथा (the head of a village), कलमेर माथा (the end of a pen), etc. Idiomatic uses of verb roots would come under this, e.g. माथा खाऊँ (to ruin), भज़ खाऊँ (to fear), भूं खाऊँ (to take bribe) etc.

Words are also frequently transferred from one department of sensation to another. मन्दूर धृति (sweet memory) does not remind us of the original use of the word मन्दूर ‘sweet (to the taste)’ in connection with material substances. Words like मिर्गी etc. are used in the various domains of our senses as मिर्गी कथा (sweet word), मिर्गी पन (sweet smell), मिर्गी प्यास (sweet taste), मिर्गी प्यास (sweet touch) and so on.

Expansion takes place when we call a part of one object after the part of another object which corresponds to it in appearance, etc. We talk of बोलने का गला (the neck of a bottle), जूठेर लेख (the tail of a kite), जोरेर गर्भ (the bed of a river), जानुर चोक (the eye of a potato).

As pointed out by Gune, Yaska in his Nirukta notices a similar process and derives कश्चा as कश्च सेवते, आयमपोतरो मनुष्ककल एतमादेव वाजस्यलसामायाबार्खस्. Here is some expansion due to association by similarity. माह is ‘foot,’ then ‘part,’ as part of a book, etc. cf. Nirukta माह: प्रमाण: आयमपोतरोऽ मनुष्ककल: प्राहापाद: प्राहाप्रक्ष्यति। (०. ७.१.)

This brings us to the close of this chapter. As Prof. Strong points out the great number of phenomena occurring under this head renders it hard to classify them: so only a few of marked peculiarity are mentioned here.

**Transference of Meaning.**

As Prof. Whitney points out, all sorts of meaning change can be summed up under two heads: Generalisation and Specialisation. Transference of meaning takes place under both the circumstances. Illustrations of this have already been met with in previous chapters. Here we
want to deal with cases which for their peculiarity and importance deserve special notice.

This kind of change in meaning, as may be already noticed, is caused by the transference of the idea to what is connected with the fundamental conception of the word by some relation of place, or time, or cause.

The phenomenon takes place when a part is substituted for the whole or the effect for cause. When we say গ্রামের সর পাকা মাথা এক হয়ে পরামর্শ করতে হ'বে, 'all the grey heads of the village must hold consultation jointly'; here মাথা is substituted for the whole man. Again ঘাম in Bengali means 'sweat,' it is derived from (চম্ম) 'heat' of which 'sweat' is the effect. Gujarāṭī and Hindi use the word घाम in its original sense also. It may be noticed here that the word গ্রহ which comes' through Persian (cf. Avestan garōma which is again the same as (চম্ম) means 'heat' in Bengali.

Names are given to objects from some prominent features with which they are commonly connected, e.g. গাল পাগড়ি 'police.' সংবেদ পাগড়ি is used by Parsis for 'priests', poilu, lit. 'bearded,' is used for French soldiers.

Name of the country is used to denote the people, e.g.

রক জামী হারায় বিলা হাসিবেক গোড়,
দেখি আগে বিলার বিলার কর দেওড়।—বিলাশন্ত্র, p. 73.

here গোড় denotes 'the people of Gauḍ (Bengal),' cf. বিয়মমরােকান্তা লৌহিত পার্শুকা রক্ষায়নে প্রাথমিক—Mrchakatika.

Writings are denoted by the name of their authors e.g. বেশখ, বলীম, etc.

The different kinds of change may follow each other and unite. A বাঁশী is a wind instrument which may be, but is not commonly, made of bamboo (বাঁশ < বংশ). The name may equally apply to an instrument made of other materials. We may compare the semantic history of 'pen,' which has been already noticed.

It frequently happens that some idea foreign to the essence of a word and connected with it merely by accident, becomes absorbed into its signification as a mere accessory; and this is then thought of as the proper meaning, the primary meaning being forgotten. বালাম is a kind of boat used in Noakhali and other places in East Bengal, in which rice is carried. Hence the word came to mean the particular kind of rice imported from East Bengal. Even now the word ডোঁড়া বালাম, i.e. a kind
of rice produced in Rādh in West Bengal, resembling bālām is gaining currency. The name is supposed to be the name of a mountain in Southern India. The name is transferred to the wind blowing from the south, e.g. মলা হচ্ছে মুরাভি লুটিয়া বে—রবীন্দ্রনাথ and মলা আসিয়া করে গোছে কানে, প্রিয়ভদ্র তুমি আসিয়া—বিরক্তিকাল—গান, 3rd ed., p. 28. Urdu (cf. Eng. horde) in Turkish means 'camp', whence 'the language of the Turkish camp', whence again comes the meaning 'the Persianised Hindi'. The word উরুদু in the sense of military camp is used in Bharat Chandra's work Mānasṛṣṇa (Basumati ed., p. 114), in which the poet describes a flood that destroyed a considerable portion of Mansingh's army—

গারি বে মেরে লেলাম জাহাজের হাজার
তল গেল মালামাত্র উরুদু বাজার

"Thousands of men were drowned and the urudu bazar (i.e. the bazar attached to the military camp) with all its goods lay under water.".

আমাশ্য which literally means "mucus-bag" (corresponding to the globe-cells in the gastro-intestinal tract) is now used in the sense of 'dysentery'. নাম্বালী, lit. the lines of names printed on a piece of cloth, means the cloth itself. লেডিকেনি, which is a kind of sweet-meat much liked by Bengali children, received its name from Lady Canning whose husband is still held in revered memory for his 'clemency.' To take ডি: গুপ্ত means to take an anti-malarial mixture prepared by D. Gupta. The inventor of Batliwala's Ague Mixture was himself given the name of 'Ague-mixture'.

The name of the material of which a thing is composed is used to denote the thing itself, e.g. তার (wire, telegraph), কোপালিয়ার কাগজ (Government Promissory Notes).

আঠামী মেরে the 'stone of a fruit': it is transferred from Prakrit বাটা, Sanskrit বাঁশ which means 'bone'.

There are a good many words in Bengali which come from Sanskrit but with their meanings sometimes completely changed. A list of such words has been given in a separate place. আমোদ in Sanskrit means দুর্গামী সুগ্ধ but in Bengali it means 'enjoyment'. In the Taître Up. it means a special kind of 'religious ecstacy'. We find in the Brāhmaṇas and Kātyāyana Śrauta Sūtra the use of the word in the Bengali sense: আমোদেরোম। 19 "Read the শ্রদঃ and pleasure will come.'

19 Aitareya Brāhmaṇa (33. 21).
This is a rejoinder of the Adhvaryu-priest in answer to the Hotṛ-priest’s request for permission while reading Śāstras.

Even within the same language this phenomenon is seen. The following examples will show how আকুল and করণা have changed their meanings.

আকুল (scattered) কহিলে কুস্তুলভ—শ্রীকৃষ্ণকীর্তন, p. 142: now আকুল means ‘overwhelming’.

ঘামের বরে রাধিকার নয়নের পানী।

আদিক করণা (weep) করে চন্দ্রাবলী রাণি —শ্রীকৃষ্ণকীর্তন, p. 157:

but now করণা means ‘mercy’.

Metaphor.

‘Unlike the preceding causes, which work slowly and imperceptibly, Metaphor changes the meaning of words and creates new expressions on the spur of the moment. It is born from the instantaneous glimpse of a similarity between two objects or two acts. If it be accurate or picturesque, or even if it merely fill a gap in the vocabulary, its adoption is assured. But the metaphor remains such at its outset only; soon the mind becomes accustomed to the image; its very success causes it to pale; it fades into a representation of the idea scarcely more coloured than the proper word.’

We use comparisons metaphorically which are at once suggested to our mind—e.g. when we say দোস্ত লোক, দৌড়ান্তি জর্জর, মেঝে, we mean ‘the man is straight (in his ways as it were like a stick),’ ‘his intelligence is sharp (as an arrow) which can at once penetrate a thing,’ ‘the superior whose wisdom is weighty,’ and so forth.

When a man does not speak more than what is necessary and that, too, thoughtfully we say সে গোল্প করে কথা বলে, when a man does a thing in a calculating spirit we say সে মেঝে মেঝে চলে, lit. ‘he walks measuringly.’

There is a kind of metaphorical use, which, as we have already seen, is a prolific source of expansion of meaning. Words which are used in connection with a particular organ of sense are often transferred from one department of sensation to another, e.g. the sensations of sight into the domain of hearing, the ideas of taste into the domain of touch and so on. Illustrations are শব্দার শব্দ (deep sound), মিষ্ট কথা (sweet word), মনুর দৃষ্টি (sweet memory), উচ্চর শব্দ (high sound), etc.

Adjectives which are used chiefly in connection with persons are
transferred to inanimate objects also and are thus used in a metaphorical sense, e.g. অড়ট্টগণ (a blind well), কানাগুগ (a blind pond), etc.

Phrases are sometimes used in a metaphorical sense, a touch of irony being implied therein. A person may be বক্ষালিক (from a crane who assumed piousness to kill frogs), or ভিক্ষ বিড়ল (a wet cat full of wrath but seemingly quiet), বেশাকর (handwriting like that of gods, the implied meaning being 'bad handwriting'), কৌতুকলীন (pretending wisdom and authority like the uncle, father's elder brother), বলতর বড় (jail, lit. father-in-law’s house) are used in an ironical meaning with reference to persons and things.

Terms of endearment such as: গোলা, পাণি, ধন, চাদ (lit. gold, jewel, wealth, moon) are examples of metaphorical use. Sometimes words with a bad sense used as terms of endearment lose their opprobriousness, e.g. ছুক্তু (lit. ছুক্তু 'corrupted,') usually merely 'naughty,' পাগলা (lit. mad).

Terms of abuse such as the names of animals like বাড়ি (monkey), উশুর (baboon), গাঘর (ass), শুষ্ক (hog), চূঁচো (mole), etc. are used in a metaphorical sense. Only animals marked by some peculiar opprobriousness are selected for this purpose. This is the case in all languages.

No one uses the words গোলা, পাণি, ধন and the like in this way. But in Skt. we get শুষ্কপুত্র, etc. Sometimes even good words acquire bad meanings by being constantly used as terms of abuse e.g., শালা (lit. wife's brother), পাতা (lit. son), ইত্তর (lit. other), চোটকো (lit. small man).

Sometimes a whole historical perspective is discovered in a metaphor as in গায়ের বাস (to live in perfect peace and safety as in the kingdom of Rāma), হস্ততপন (to tell the truth half-heartedly just as Yudhishtir did), লায়কাও হওয়া (the happening of a destructive event like that of the burning of Lāṅkā by Hanumān).

The special characteristics of different nations are shown in some of their metaphors. Bengali মাদ্রীমি and German Vaterland perhaps show the feminine tenderness of our imagination and the masculine nature of the German way of thinking.

Polysemy.

"The new meaning of a word, whatever it may be, does not make an end of the old. They exist alongside of one another. The same term can be employed alternately in the strict or in the metaphorical sense, in the restricted or in the expanded sense, in the abstract or in the concrete sense. In proportion as a new signification is given to a word, it appears to multiply and produce fresh examples, similar in
form, but differing in value.” Bréal calls this phenomenon of multiplication Polysemy, from πολλός, 'numerous' and σημείον, 'signification.' "All the languages of civilised nations," Bréal further remarks, "have their part in it. The more meanings a term has accumulated, the more it may be supposed to represent the various sides of intellectual and social activity. The manifold meanings of a word show the proportionate advancement of culture."

The word মূল which comes from agriculture is equally connected with philosophy, mathematics, astronomy, economics, philology, etc. It means First Cause, capital, original text, root, price etc., e.g. মিন পিণ্ট কার্য (First Cause) ট্রাইয়ে প্রথম কার্য; পাদ আশে নাই; কেহ মূল (capital) নায়ি ব্যাধয়—ব্যাধয়; মূলের (original text) ব্যাধ (root); মালানী সাইয়া নির্দৃষ্টত ব্যাধ, মালা মূল করে (settles the price) ইত্যাদি—সাধারণ.

The word শাত হas similarly a lot of meanings. It signifies God, the five elements, ingredient, vitality, semen, nature, root, metal and so forth. In music it denotes what is called পাগ্নাস as স, সি, প, ম, etc., and with the Buddhists it means 'relic' as the tooth-relic শ্রী-সাত্তা of the Buddha and so forth.

The surroundings and context of a word pre-determine its meaning. If we see the word সমাপতক written on a door, say in the বাঁটিয়া সাহিত্য পারিষ, we will think only of the 'secretary' of the Parish. But if the same word be seen on a signboard in the Bengalee office, we will think only of the 'editor' of the paper. If we hear the word বুঝ (Head Assistant) in a business firm we would never think of the barrister's clerk, who is also called by the same name.

It may be asked why a confusion of ideas does not arise in our minds when we use a word, which is possessed of several meanings. The answer is that when we use such a word, we do have before our mind only the idea which is required in the context, the other meanings not at all appearing in our consciousness for the time being. The little Bengali word তা as a result of 'phonetic decay' has come to acquire a large number of meanings coming from various sources. Yet in the following sentences it does not at all give us any trouble to make out the meaning. In তা কার (from Prakrit স্ত, Sanskrit স্ত), গেঠে তা নেওয়া (from Sanskrit স্ত) ; cf. গেঠে দেহ তার—কবিরক্ষণ, p. 57), নির্দৃষ্ট তা নেওয়া (from Sanskrit নাম), এক তা কাগজ (from Arabic তা)—the meanings are easily understood from the very context.
The different meanings of the word ব্যঞ্জন are apparent in the following:

সত্রাশিয় ব্যঞ্জন (Yoga-austerities) করেন;
আজ সকালে ব্যঞ্জন (auspicious moment) আছে;
and অষ্টাধ্য ব্যঞ্জন (addition) দাও.

One sound may denote several ideas. "A new acceptation is equivalent to a new word." Each time the word is used in a different sense, it serves practically as an altogether new word, though the outward form is the same. So a word is required to be repeated when it is used successively in two different meanings.

কীর্তিবাস কীর্তিবাস কবি এ বন্দ্রে অলাহার—মাহেকেল, মেহনাদবাধ, canto IV.

In poetry the same word is sometimes used in different meanings and is even allowed to rhyme with itself.

লূপণ লূপণ জিনি মৃণ কুমলাঙ্গ (lotus)
কিরূপ ! কিরূপ কবি কৈল কুমলাঙ্গ (Brahma, the Creator)

The proper meaning of a word may have been long forgotten and the word may still be in use with an indirect meaning. মশান in its strict sense which is 'place of slaughter' exists no longer, but it continues to be used as শবদান-স্থান or গ্রেফ-হৃদি. Its old meaning is somewhat preserved in the form মশান (=শমশান) > Prakrit মশুমা যাস as in শ্রীমন্তের মশান, the slaughter of শ্রিমান্তা in কাব্যকল্প. মশান is used in Gujarātī as also in Bihāri dialects as a sort of equivalent for 'cremation ground (where spirits dwell).'

The same word may have different meanings in the different dialects of a language, e.g. জামাই in East Bengal is used to mean husband, while in West Bengal it denotes 'son-in-law'; মেহে in Ranigunj signifies 'wife,' elsewhere it means 'daughter.'

A word may mean the same thing in two different but cognate languages, while it may be used in another sense in a third allied tongue, e.g. বরাবর 'straight' in Bengali and Gujrātī generally. In Hindi it means 'equal.'—Persian 'breast to breast.'

Sometimes a word possessed of two meanings becomes restricted in one sense, the other meaning being expressed by a new device—

রাগ দেখু মেহ লাইজ চার (রাগ দেখে মেহ) পরম মেহ লবল মূল্যকার !—বৌন্ধানা ও লোহা, p. 21.

Here রাগ means both love and anger as given by MM. H. P. Sastri in his notes on the book, রাগে, ভেজ ভয় নান রাগে (ক্রোধ)—কৃষ্ণকীর্তন, p. 39.
রাগ (love) ভগমগ প্রকৃ দেয় সত্যতম।
পাড়ে গাড়াইয়া দত ভক্তনণ্—গোবিন্দবাস, কড়চা।

রাগ is now only used in the sense of ক্রেগ (anger), in the sense of 'love' it has শ্ব prefixed to it. But in Oriya, অনুরাগ means anger.

In tracing the semantic history of a word we are sometimes surprised to see that the word has come to mean almost the very opposite to that which it first signified. The word বাহ �originally implied great respectability, then through many intermediate stages, it has come to mean 'a foppish dandy.'

Sometimes the same word acquires a different meaning, having assumed a second form in the mouth of the people, e.g. পুঁচ, বড়; মুখ, মুড়া; বাহুল, বাউল। বাউল now means a class of Vaishnava mendicants, the old meaning which is the same as that of বাণুল is seen in old Bengali and even in modern poetry: বাহ পদার্থ বাউল (বাউল=বাণুল=mad) হইয়া তখন এড়িকে ধায়—জনবাস। In কে চায় প্রেমিতে বল বাঁটলের গান—অনেকগুলু, the word may be taken in both the senses. বাউলের চেয়ে কফি বড় (strong), thus runs the proverb; মাহারের মুখ but মাহারের মুড়া; but মুঢ় in Bihari is the head of man.

Sometimes a vowel change gives the new meaning in a similar manner, e.g. সিড়-পুঁক্ষ but সেদ চাল (boiled rice); মুঢ় root, but মুঢ় রাদিশ, just as in Gujarati also. প্রধার, আঘার, etc. are different words, made by the addition of different prefixes to the same root.

In some cases the change of accent gives a new meaning to a word. This is to be met with in all languages. In the Vedic language kripāna means 'misery' but kripānā with accent on the last syllable means 'miserable' (Whitney, Sanskrit Grammar, §1150 g., p. 427); so also kár-āna means 'deed,' but kar-ānā is 'active.' (Macdonell, Vedic Grammar for Students, p. 255). Cf. Índra-sātru and Indra-sātru. In Bengali চিনি means 'sugar,' but it is used to mean 'know' as a verb with a change of accent. Of course, it should be noted here that though the form is the same, the sources of the word are different. পড় denotes both 'fall' and 'read' but with a variation of accent. আপনি একটা গান গান—here the two words গান and গান have different accents, the first is a noun, the second a verb.⁴⁹

Similarly the pronominal particle কি gets different values according as it is accented or unaccented. Mr. Dvijendra Nath Tagore has

---
⁴⁹ These observations refer to the pronunciation of the Nadia District where the standard dialect is spoken.
pointed this out very clearly (প্রবালী, অগ্রহায়ণ, ১৯২৬, পৃঃ ১৪২). He makes out the distinction thus. কি is not accented in connection with questions relating to verbs or adjectives, e.g. তুমি কি খাইয়াছে ? (have you taken your food ?), তুমি কি ব্রাহ্মণ ? (are you a Brahmana ?). But it is accented কী in connection with questions relating to objects, e.g. তুমি কী খাইয়াছে (কি খাবা )? (what have you eaten ?).

A Special Cause of Polysemy.

"A very frequent cause of Polysemy, which evades foresight and classification, is abridgment. It happens for example, that of two words primitively associated, the one is suppressed. At this sudden removal the remaining term seems to change its meaning abruptly. In this case it would not be accurate to say that there was either expansion or restriction. The event which has come to pass is of a different nature; like an heir who becomes the sole owner of a property which had previously been a joint possession, the last survivor succeeds to an entire idiom and absorbs its signification. When once the meaning of the two are combined, they thenceforward constitute a single sign. Now a sign can be cut, clipped, reduced by half, provided it is recognisable, it still fulfils its original function."

The object or the complement of a verb may be left out owing to constant use and the verb acquires a new signification, the meaning of the object or complement being present therein, e.g. বাওয়া-পরা, পড়া-ওনা.

The adjectives are also enriched by the value of an implied substantive সারু (সারু বাক্যঃ), and whole phrases may be compressed into single words, e.g. পরিসং used for বন্ধু সাহিত্য পরিসং—by the people familiar with it. It is in this way, as Bréal aptly remarks, that from age to age words assume the meaning of lost companions. "Without this kind of intussusception language would soon take undue developments." The particular situation in which a word is used gives us an association of ideas which requires hardly anything more to make the meaning explicit.

The epithet which serves to specify the idea is alone expressed—

দৈনিক (দৈনিক লক্ষণ), সাংস্কৃতিক দিয়ে কাজ করা, ভাঙ্গা (ভাঙ্গা) পেঁচা দিয়ে খাওয়া।

Hence we see a large number of adjectives turn into substantives in course of time.

The word frequently acquires a characteristic signification in a particular profession or department, by absorbing into it the meaning
implied by its companion. आठम in the legal vocabulary means Act VIII of 1819; so also पाप आठम is Act V of 1861; डेपुटी means a Deputy Magistrate and Deputy Collector, in the post office it denotes the Deputy Post Master and so on. मशहूर महाशय in a school means a teacher, in a railway station the station master, and in a post office, the postmaster.

When the hearer is conversant with the subject matter talked of, it is quite natural to suppress what is self-evident from the very nature of the topic. कोण in Indian politics means the Indian national political organisation of the name and so on. To a student of European history it would mean the Vienna Congress of 1815 and it may be used by an American for the American legislative body called Congress.

Articulated Groups.

Language contains words which have been so long united by usage, that, for our intelligence, they no longer exist separately. These are called Articulated Groups by Bréal. Their importance in syntax is very great. There is no language without a certain number of these.

"The most of men make use of them without having ever given them a thought. Everybody knows that the word, in its isolated state, has no very clear existence in the popular consciousness, and that it is apt to join on to that which precedes or follows it."

The Articulated Groups taken as a whole have a special meaning which their component parts do not give, या जहाँ-जहाँ (=या जहाँ जहाँ) in Bengali means 'bad,' e.g. या जहाँ तभी धरान. But when the literal meaning is emphasised the words are juxtaposed otherwise से या इंके तभी धाम नेबे (he will take whatever price he wishes), बोकौ है, या-आज्ञ, कि ना, ता’ नेल (या है ना आज्ञ) are other examples. In Gujarāṭī मज्जें (मे कल्ले जे) is used in a similar manner meaning 'I say that."

These Groups sometimes contain forms which are not otherwise used in the ordinary languages, e.g. त्यस्त, तांबिकिं, हंगरोनांस्ति, etc.

These groups also pass from one language to another for their aptness, e.g. सब्जास्त्रा, शाब्जके-शाब्जे, कूडसपुरास्ता-नेहाइ have gained currency in Bengali from Hindi through Anglo-Indian English where also they are used.

Examples of the Articulated Groups are not many. Those current in Bengali are given above.

Compound Nouns.

"The formal aspect of the question of composition of nouns have been considered all important up till now. The semantic aspect of the
question has long been neglected. It must be borne in mind that it is the meaning and nothing else, which makes the compound, and which finally determines its form.”

There are some combinations of terms which are scarcely thought of as compounds, e.g., ভালবাসা, লোকদিগের, কার্য, স্বল্প, পক্ষ, etc. The mind takes cognition only of the whole without paying attention to the meaning of the individual parts of which these are composed, e.g., আমি আপন চাকরেরবিগকে আঁজা করিয়া বিলাম (Translation of a letter from Nawab Sirajuddowla to Drake by Rajiblochan). The combination লোকদিগের is equal to লোকেরবিগের, বিলাম being supposed to be a separate word. This is also to be found in Rammohan Ray’s works and also in the তহবিলিনি পত্রিকা. My professor of Sanskrit, Pandit Janaki Nath Bhattacherjee, lately of Krishnagar College, a man of 60, coming from 24 Pargannas, still (1920) uses the words uncompounded.

Sometimes the first term bears the mark of an inflection yet the whole thing may be a compound, e.g., কলের-গান, গায়ে-হলুদ, অবশাস্বাবী. It is quite correct to say আঁজ কল কলের-গানের দাম বেড়েছে; কল তার গায়ে-হলুদের দিন।

As soon as the two ideas are taken as a whole, it becomes possible for the first term to get reduced or clipped, e.g., রাজবাড়ী—রাজার বাড়ী.

The question of the order of terms is only of minor importance, the usual order is that the principal word comes last and assumes the case inflections, the whole compound being taken as a single word. The order of words is generally determined by usage, e.g., লেখাপড়ার, পড়ারুনায়.

Sometimes individual attempts may be seen to work in the subversion of the ordinary order. This is found especially in the case of proper nouns compounded of words which have independent values. Cf. proper names like চুক্তির চুক্তি and চুক্তির চুক্তি; মোহনলাল and লালমোহন.

In Bengali there are a few compounds the second member of which contains an inflection, e.g., হল-খাবার. The whole idea is so united and the meaning is so specialised that we decline the already inflected word just as it had no inflection and even the sign of the genitive is added to খাবার as in হল-খাবারের, though খাবার already contains the genitive inflection —খাবার জিনিস. খাবার is already a noun before it is compounded with হল.

In Magura, Sub-division of Jessore, খাবার দেকান is rightly used.

There are some combinations of words in Bengali the members of which, if compounded, would coincide with stereotyped forms which mean quite a different thing; e.g., পত্রপাঠ, ‘as soon as the letter is read,’ i.e. ‘immediately,’ but পত্রের পাঠ ‘the superscription of a letter.’ Cf.
also নামাইন and নামাই নাম। The latter cannot be compounded into নামাইন, which, however, would mean 'the maternal uncle of one's wife (or husband).'

The Bengali double compounds like চীরপত, জনমানব, বাসনকোর বাল্ল are of great interest from the semantic point of view. They cannot be done justice to here, so we leave the subject for the present simply mentioning it.

In Sanskrit a whole phrase may be expressed in the form of a compound. Thus composition is a sort of alternative course in Sanskrit which permits it to evade syntax almost entirely. Of course this is a gross abuse of the faculty, which brings in starving of all other means of expression. প্রায়ীবিসঃ in Sanskrit means 'one who has the necessaries of life.' In Bengali we have a few examples, e.g. হাত (he who has the word হা (alas)) and ভাত (rice) in the mouth) i.e., he who is extremely needy.

One wonders, as Bréal points out, if there is not hidden behind the so-called compounds which are nothing but small phrases with fairly loose construction, a less strictly regulated condition of language. Bengali, which is a growing language, shows the forms সব-পেঁচিয় দেশ, প্রায়-ভুঁতানো ধন, পাগল-করা হাওয়া, মুখ-পাড়া বারব, etc., which may be taken as illustrations in point.

Says Bréal: Whatever the length of a compound it never comprises more than two terms. This rule is not an arbitrary one: it arises from the nature of the human mind, which associates ideas in couples. It may chance that each of these two terms is in itself a compound. But it is clear that each of the two parts counts for one element only. The important question in such a case is to make the division at the right place.

"Aristotle, taking the side of Democritus, who has held that the meaning of words is put into them by the speaker, and that there is no necessary connection between sound and sense, laid down that words 'symbolise' objects according to the will of those who use them." (Sayce in Encyclopaedia Britannica.)

In the time of Pāṇini there were some grammarians who held that the meaning of a compound is determined by the principal word contained in it. But Pāṇini (1. 2. 56) is against this opinion and rightly says that the meaning of a word is not fixed by grammatical rules but by usage and idiom.
How names are given to things.

We shall now proceed to deal with this intricate subject from the semantic point of view.

"It is an undoubted fact that language designates things in an incomplete and inaccurate manner. 'Incomplete'—since we have not exhausted all that can be said of the horse when we have declared it to be the swift animal. 'Inaccurate'—since we cannot say of the sun that it shines when it has set, or of the horse that it trots when it is at rest, or when wounded or dead."

When one uses the words অমরতা, সরলতা, etc., in their abstract sense all that is to be found in the idea is to be found also in the word. But if some real object, existing in nature, be taken, it will be impossible for language to introduce into the word all the ideas which the object brings before the mind. Language is therefore compelled to make a selection out of all the ideas and thus gives a name which is not long in becoming a mere sign, e.g. সূর্য (sun, lit. that which moves in the sky), পৃথিবী (earth, lit. that which is widely extensive), সর্প (snake, lit. that which moves in a zig-zig manner), পর্঵ত (mountain, lit. that which has wings), etc.; the literal meanings of these do not now arise in our mind.

Names are at first given to things after some prominent characteristics. But as soon as the mind is satisfied that such and such names could be given for such and such characteristics the names represent mere signs, the mind no longer giving heed to the connection between. Many objects are thus inaccurately named through the ignorance of their original authors, e.g. হাওয়াগাড়ি (motor-car, lit. a car driven by wind) বাজুর (museum, lit. a magic house), or by some intervening change which disturbs the harmony between the sign and the thing signified, e.g. তৃণ, (book, lit. that which is knotted), ভাঙ্গি (flute, lit. that which is made of bamboo), চীনা (cement, lit. China-clay).

This name may sometimes reveal a lot of interesting facts. It may reveal to us the ignorance of the people who gave the name, or of their prejudices, or it may furnish us with valuable pieces of historical information of which it is the voluntary depository. Examples are: বাজুর (lit. 'magic-house') is used to denote 'museum'; হাওয়াগাড়ি (lit. car driven by wind) for 'motor-car'; হাওয়াগাড়ি (lit. eaters of barley or oatmeal) is used as a name for the upcountry people in India in a sense of contempt; একচাকার গাড়ী (lit. one-wheeled carriage) is used by the vil-
lage folk for a bicycle; and केरोसिन काठ is a kind of wood of which boxes for kerosene are made but it looks as if it meant 'kerosene wood.'

The word सिगोर (from Port. senhor) in Bombay means the head of a firm, perhaps from its association with the Portuguese in olden days. The following set of words reminds us of Mahomedan supremacy and luxury: हूट (hut) is a 'Hindu' word, if I am permitted to use it in the sense of 'derived from Sanskritic languages'; माला, एमारत names of huge buildings are taken from the Mahomedan vocabulary; ग्राम (village) is a Hindu word, शहर the name for town is a Mahomedan word. The words of respectable address, ह्वृद्व, साहेब, etc., are all taken from the Mahomedans.

Proper names are also not beyond the pale of language. The word श्रीराज्य has now become a common adjective to the religious heads of the sect founded by श्रीराज्य. Similar is the word Caesar from which the German Kaiser is derived. Proper names from foreign languages when imported into other languages sometimes repeat the word giving the particular class to which a thing belongs. Thus the words meaning the same thing are repeated over again; e.g. पाउर from Portuguese, pão (bread), ब्रेड = bread; म्लायिगिर, malai in Dravidian means 'mountain', yet we add the word गिरि which also means the same thing, and म्लायिगिरि is now a proper noun, 'the Malaya Mountain.' The English people similarly use 'Nilgiri Hills' (गिरि=hill); 'Hoang-ho-river' (हो in Chinese is 'river'); 'Tian-shan mountain' (Chinese शंतन=mountain); etc.

The real cause of this is that the foreigner perceives the whole combination as one and adds his own word to help his memory.

The names of places and persons furnish a very interesting field for semantic investigation. But that remains to be dealt with independently as an entire subject. We shall here only notice by passing some of the interesting points.

Names of persons.—There might be no correspondence between the object named and the meaning of the name. A man with the name पलालोचन (lotus-eyed) may be blind, cf. काना छेलर नाम पलालोचन (lit. a blind boy with the name lotus-eyed). A person may be called कालीरा मा even after काली, her child, has long been dead. Some of the names, especially nicknames, are often meaningless; e.g. नित्यहु, तुल, etc. In West Bengal a name like देबेन is ordinarily reduced to देबेन which gives no meaning; the East Bengal people always use देबेन, the preser-
vation is due to accenting on the last syllable. Other names like इन्द्र, कुमुदीन, कृष्ण सन्त, are shortened to इन्द्र, कुमुदीन, etc. which give quite different meanings; thus, इन्द्र is Siva, but इन्द्र is Moon. From Mr. Jogesh Chandra Roy we learn a Marathi gentleman took श्रेष्ठ (श्रेष्ठ) to be the name of a lady! Sometimes whole phrases are used as names. When daughter after daughter is born to a dowry-ridden Bengali father, he wishes not to have any more and gives the name आर-ना-काली to his last child, which means 'Kali, no more.' So when children die young, the names धाको-मणि (stay my jewel), or राजा-हरि (keep him, O, God) are given; so also the आवार-धारा संदेश. Cf. Puritan names like Praise-God Barebone.

The names of individuals of various Indian nationalities are interesting to observe. The Bengali method gives us only the name of the person and the surname. Sometimes even that is not given; e.g. रामकृष्ण सरकार where the last word indicates a title denoting the profession of the ancestors of रामकृष्ण. But रामकृष्ण बसु is all right, बसु gives the caste and the surname of the family to which रामकृष्ण belongs.

The Beharis and U.P. people have names which sound incomplete to our ears. Only रामप्रसाद or मनोहरलाल may constitute a name which furnishes no information as to the caste or surname of the family. The names of the people of the Southern and Western Presidencies are perhaps the most complete in this respect; a lot of information is contained in them. In गोपाल कुमार गोबिंदे the first name denotes the name of the person, the second that of the father, the third the surname. The names of Parsis sometimes go even a step further. The name of the person, that of his father, then that of his grandfather, and lastly the name of his village may all be given. The Slav names also give the name of the father. In Madras the name of the place is put before the name of the person; e.g. ताज्जोर माधव राजार, बिचूर शेखरन सावर.

The study of Bengali surnames is an interesting problem by itself. These surnames have come from non-Aryan, Mahomedan, Christian sources, besides the Aryan which furnish the majority. Some are due to occupations in life, others have been taken from the names of vegetables, fruits, animals, musical instruments and so on.

Names of places.—Places may be named according to some prominent characteristics of their own. नगरी, it is said, formerly consisted of nine islands. গোসাড়া (গোপ + বাড়ি) is the name of my own place, for it had numerous milkmen. But the reason for which the name is given
may in course of time disappear, yet the name continues. The village ভালপুর may still be so-called, though there may not be a single tank with a palm tree within its limits.

There are several names of places in Bengal which mostly come from non-Aryan origin, have become unintelligible to us, so far as their meanings are concerned. Examples are:

ঢাবড়া, রিবড়া, চাপড়া, টুচুড়া, বাঙড়া;
ঘাটাইল, টাঙাইল, মড়াইল, মেড়াইল, সাহাইল, রাগাইল;
সরিয়াকান্নি, তুলাকান্নি, হাইলাকান্নি;
শিলিগুড়ি, জলপাইগুড়ি, ময়নগুড়ি, কুপগুড়ি।

The endings show that there must have been some meaning common to these names, which may be discovered after careful and laborious investigations.

Popular etymology plays a considerable part in giving names to things. A word or phrase borrowed from a foreign language or for any reason unfamiliar, a word which has no intrinsic or derivative meaning to the speaker, is altered by him to a word that has such a meaning. Mr. Gilchrist’s name was transformed into গিরিপিটি (a kind of lizard) by the chaprasis, and Mr. Mackenzie becomes মাঘনজ। Hospital, motor, etc., have turned into হাসপাতাল, মটর, etc., in our vernaculars. And thus the list can be swelled.

Folk-etymology is a very interesting subject for investigation. In all languages nations revelled in giving new meanings to words. The Brāhmaṇas of the Vedas are replete with such examples.

Luxity in the use of words.

Under this we shall deal with words used in a wrong way owing to ignorance or misapprehension. Here the transfer of meaning is not actually meant, but the word wrongly used gives a different meaning. The word is used owing to its similarity with the word actually meant. This may either be due to form or to meaning. Illiterate or half-educated people and sometimes children are found using words in this way. Malapropism falls under this head. আপনি কবে এসেছেন?—here এসেছেন is used for the more correct and more polite এসেছেন. আপনি কি আমায় ইতিহাস করেছেন?—here what is really meant is উপহাস করেছেন (joke). Sometimes learned forms being used cause confusion—আপনাকে আমি যে দিন অবিদি প্রদান করেছি, সেই দিন অবিদি আপনার প্রতি মন আড়ি হয়েছে, আপনি অতি সন্ত্রাসের
THE INTELLECTUAL LAWS OF LANGUAGE.

...the correct words should be দর্শন, হাতকালীনি, বিজ্ঞান, গাণিতিক, লালদিত, খিলি. Old Gobbo in Shakespeare’s Merchant of Venice is guilty of such speech. As these people try to imitate the higher class in their manner of speaking, so also gentlemen try to avoid vulgarisms by shunning certain pronunciations and thus sometimes commit mistakes. The uneducated classes of people put in র in words where there is not any র at all, to give their speech a gentlemanly form; so the upper classes do at times think it beneath their dignity to pronounce certain words without র where there are none; e.g. কাউই, বৃহস্পতি, শ্রীম, শ্বেত, শ্রীমতা, which are frequently used for উই, বৃহস্পতি, শ্রীমতি এবং শ্রীমান respectively.

Half-educated Bengalis with a smattering of English often commit mistakes of this kind when speaking. One of my friends used to recite a sentence, though a bit artificial, yet finely illustrative of the point: “পাউরকরে গিয়ে দেখি, কেহনি মেশের আর মেশের (passenger আর passenger), আমরা একএকের enterprised (surprised) হ’য়ে গেলাম, তার পর কোনো গতিকে একটা apartment (compartment) preserve (reserve) ক’য়ে বেশ privilege -এ (comfort -এ) দাওয়া গেল।”

Some of the following words have acquired the right of full citizenship in what is called chaste diction, though originally through laxity of use. Their claim is now firmly established.

A good many of these forms which are grammatically incorrect are used even by the best writers, e.g. নিষ্কং মেল (abortive cloud), নিষ্কং মৃদু (waterless milk). Here there is no reason why the adjectives should be in the feminine gender. In many places the adjectives do not follow the grammatical gender. This is a special tendency of the Bengali language, which may be compared to Dravidian in this respect. The declension of adjectives is a learned importation from Sanskrit. Nowadays the idea denoted by the word seems to be the guiding factor in determining the gender; e.g. হে আবির্জনী সিংহ, বহুদূরা সম্মান ভোমার।—বরীণমান, চালিকা, p. 111; সে ভাবে পাতিত ধরি, পার হ’য়ে লিঙ্কট, আমিতে বি পাতিত হবে? 21

In this connection the following use of গহিমা সাহিত্যের স্বর্গারণী may be noted, perhaps this is due to the oft-quoted sentence সাহিত্যের স্বর্গারণী সাহিত্যের গহিমা; e.g. পরাশীর্ষ বর্চরাস হতে গহিমা সাহিত্যের স্বর্গারণী।—বরীণমান, পলেশ্বর যুদ্ধ, canto IV.

Sometimes words have their feminine forms which are unwarranted.

21 দাও has also something to do with নির্দেশিত here.
by grammar: জন বজরকান্ত বামী, ৫-টি চরণের নীলতল বলিয়া অর্থের দিয়া আরম্ভ।—চণ্ডীদাস, p. 332); ধরা চতুর্কিনী তৌতুকিনী ধন দর্শনে।—মদনমোহন তরকালিকায়। স্বেতকিনী বিনিশ্চিত কেশের ছেদন (পদাশ্ব); and so on.

The rules of composition in compound words are sometimes violated, yet the forms are regarded as correct; e.g. নিরপরাদী, মহাপাপী, মহারথী, বিবাহিনিশ্চিত, and so on.

Nouns are used for adjectives and vice versa though wrongly; ইন্দুর বন্ধ আছে; the Eastern Bengal people use the correct form বন্ধ আছে; সে সাক্ষা (সাক্ষা=evidence) দিবে৷ তার মাহ মাহ পন্তে গিয়েছে; সে আরেক (নীরোগ) হয়েছে; আমি নিরাশ নিরাশ হ'লাম।

There are some words in Bengali which look like pure and correct Sanskrit words which they never are; e.g. অপরাপ, উপরাপ, ভরাচ, ভারবৃক্ষ, পুষ্পামুক্ত, পুনরারুক্ত, পৌরোক্তিক, প্রথুল, বর্জি, বিদ্রুপ, সারুণ, etc.

Forms which show redundancy have become current through use—শৈলেম্বর, বিষ্ণুপ্রকাশ, কেবলমাত্র, etc.

Thus examples can be multiplied. Many of the above examples are incorrect only when judged by the Sanskritic-Bengali grammar. Otherwise the forms are all right.

Such forms were first admitted into chaste language through laxity of use by their original author; analogy also played a very important part in this connection.

**APPENDIX.**

Some Vedie and Sanskrit words that have changed their meaning in Bengali:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Word</th>
<th>Sanskrit meaning.</th>
<th>Bengali meaning.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>অগ্নি</td>
<td>A priest who has to worship fire and Soma.</td>
<td>invalid, old.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>অগ্নিত</td>
<td>Then + and</td>
<td>Even then, on the other hand.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>অভিকার</td>
<td>occasion, room</td>
<td>leisure.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>আমোদ</td>
<td>diffusive fragrance, joy.</td>
<td>pleasure.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

২২ সাক্ষা is used for সাক্ষা which should be the phonetically corrupted form of সাক্ষা; cf. সাক্ষা এবং সক্ষা.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Word</th>
<th>Sanskrit meaning</th>
<th>Bengali meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>অক্ষেপ</td>
<td>chiding</td>
<td>repent.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ইতঃ</td>
<td>others</td>
<td>low.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>উদয়ীন</td>
<td>neutral</td>
<td>indifferent.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>উপরাগ</td>
<td>introduction</td>
<td>novel.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>এবং</td>
<td>thus</td>
<td>and.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>কাতর</td>
<td>discouraged, afraid, perplexed.</td>
<td>overwhelmed, ill.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ুণ্ড</td>
<td>dependants, family</td>
<td>relation by marriage.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>কষায়</td>
<td>fragrant, red, astringent</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>কীর</td>
<td>milk</td>
<td>milk boiled to hardness.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>কুপণ</td>
<td>miserable</td>
<td>miser.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ঘৃষ</td>
<td>heat</td>
<td>sweat.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>তথ</td>
<td>truth, message</td>
<td>sweets sent with a messenger to get news (in West Bengal).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>তটস্থ</td>
<td>standing aloof</td>
<td>afraid.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>মিসেখ</td>
<td>wink</td>
<td>moment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>মির্থর</td>
<td>sound (adj.)</td>
<td>depend.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>মিরাকরণ</td>
<td>prevent</td>
<td>ascertain.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>প্রথচ</td>
<td>trick (<del>কোশল</del>)</td>
<td>essay.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>প্রচু</td>
<td>very hot</td>
<td>awful.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>পরামর্শ</td>
<td>seizing, pulling, consideration, etc.</td>
<td>consultation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>প্রসাদ</td>
<td>grace</td>
<td>food left.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>প্রশঃ</td>
<td>praised</td>
<td>large.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>প্রস্তুত</td>
<td>proposed, praised</td>
<td>ready.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>পরিস্তর</td>
<td>clearness</td>
<td>clear.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ফলাহর</td>
<td>eating fruits</td>
<td>dinner.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>বিষক</td>
<td>unattached</td>
<td>disgusted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>বিজ্ঞান</td>
<td>the knowledge of mokṣa.</td>
<td>science.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>বিবেক</td>
<td>true knowledge</td>
<td>conscience.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
THE INTELLECTUAL LAWS OF LANGUAGE.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Word</th>
<th>Sanskrit meaning</th>
<th>Bengali meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>বিদায়</td>
<td>gift</td>
<td>farewell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>বিষম</td>
<td>a thing of enjoyment</td>
<td>subject, property</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>বিশ্বর</td>
<td>a stretch of words,</td>
<td>many. (Cf. সবিশ্বরে বলিতেছি.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ব্যাবসায়</td>
<td>effort</td>
<td>trade</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ব্যাপার</td>
<td>business</td>
<td>event. (Cf. আধার ব্যাপারী.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ব্রাহ্ম</td>
<td>relating to Brahma</td>
<td>a member of the Brahmo Samaj. (Cf. ব্রাহ্মসূচ্য.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>বাজা</td>
<td>divided</td>
<td>busy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ব্রত</td>
<td>course, protection</td>
<td>vow.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ভাক্তি</td>
<td>division (Ved.)</td>
<td>reverence.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ভাসা</td>
<td>light</td>
<td>sun.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ভাবনা</td>
<td>feeling, thought</td>
<td>anxiety.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ভূত</td>
<td>being</td>
<td>ghost.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ভাস্তর</td>
<td>room</td>
<td>temple.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ভূষা</td>
<td>beautiful, simple</td>
<td>charmed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ভাজান</td>
<td>great man</td>
<td>money-lender.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ভবতা</td>
<td>selfishness</td>
<td>attachment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ভাগ</td>
<td>love</td>
<td>anger.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ভয়ানা</td>
<td>secret</td>
<td>joke.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>লৌকিকতা</td>
<td>social custom</td>
<td>presents sent.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>লোহ</td>
<td>org. any metal</td>
<td>iron.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>হংস</td>
<td>swan</td>
<td>duck.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>শান্ত</td>
<td>a hymn of praise</td>
<td>weapon.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>শুভ্রা</td>
<td>willingness to hear</td>
<td>nursing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>শ্রুতাংগ</td>
<td>all the more</td>
<td>necessarily.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>সচরাচর</td>
<td>the world with its</td>
<td>generally.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>animate and inanimate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>beings (সহ + চর + আচর).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>সংবাদ</td>
<td>discussion</td>
<td>news.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>সমাজ</td>
<td>assembly, meeting</td>
<td>society.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>সরদার</td>
<td>any relation by marriage</td>
<td>brother-in-law.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Word</td>
<td>Sanskrit meaning</td>
<td>Bengali meaning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>साहस</td>
<td>rash courage</td>
<td>noble courage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>सपन</td>
<td>sleepy (Ved.)</td>
<td>dream</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>सर्वज्ञ</td>
<td>reciting</td>
<td>singing God’s names</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>सहस्र</td>
<td>native (adj.)</td>
<td>easy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>समूह</td>
<td>compounded</td>
<td>all</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>समाज</td>
<td>bewildered</td>
<td>respectable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>सहन</td>
<td>joining, uniting</td>
<td>search</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>