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Vivo autem jam non ego (Gal. 11.20)
Eyä diz solte du sële scheiden von allem dem, daz iht isl (Eckhart, Pfeiffer 525).
Her umbe sol der mensch gefliszen sin, dass er sich entbilde sin
selbes unt aller créâtüre noch keinen vater wizze denne got alleine….
Diz ist aller menschen fremde… Ich wolde, das irz befunden hëtet
mit lebende" (Eckhart, Pféiffer pp. 421, 464).
"When thou standest still from the thinking of self, and the willing of self" (Jacob
Böhme, Of the Supersensual Life).

An ego-mania occasioned the fall of Lucifer, who would be "like the
Most High" (1s. XIII. 14), thinking "Who is like me in Heaven or Earth?"
(Tabārī, Ch. XXIV), and desiring to deify himself (Augustine, De qu. vet.
Test. CXIII) not in the way discussed below by an abnegation of selfhood,
but as St. Thomas Aquinas says "by the virtue of his own nature" and "of
his own power (Sum. Theol. I. 63.3 c). We are all to a greater or less extent
ego-maniacs, and to the same extent followers of Satan. Act V. 36 refers to
a certain Theudas as "boasting himself to be somebody".

In the vernacular, when a man is presumptuous, we ask him "who do
you think you are", and when we refer to someone's insignificance we call
him a "nobody", or in earlier English a "nithing". In this worldly sense
it is a good thing to be "someone" and a misfortune to be "nobody", and
from this point of view we think well of "ambition" (iti-bhavabhava tónká).
To be "someone" is to have a name and lineage (náma-gotta), or at least
to have a place or rank in the world, some distinction that makes us recogn-
nizable and conspicuous. Our modern civilisation is essentially individualistic
and self-assertive, even our educational systems being more and more designed
to foster "self-expression" and "self-realisation": and if we are at all
concerned about what happens after death, it is in terms of the survival of
our treasured "personality"s with all its attachments and memories.

On the other hand, in the words of Eckhart, "Holy scripture cries aloud
for freedom from self". In this unanimous and universal teaching, which
affirms an absolute liberty and autonomy, spacial and temporal, attainable as
well here and now as anywhere else, this treasured "personality" of ours is at

1. Mainly based, as the title implies, on Christian and Buddhist sources.
2. We write "personality" because we are using the word here in its vulgar
sense and not in the stricter and technical sense in which the veritable "person" is
distinguished from the phenomenal "individual", e.g. in Aitareya Áranyaka II. 3.2
and Boethius, Contra Evulchen, II.
once a prison and a fallacy, from which only the Truth shall set you free: a prison, because all definition limits that which is defined, and a fallacy because in this ever changing composite and corruptible psycho-physical "personality" it is impossible to grasp a constant, and impossible therefore to recognize any authentic or "real" substance. In so far as man is merely a "reasoning and mortal animal" tradition is in agreement with the modern determinist in affirming that "this man", so-and-so, has neither free will nor any element of immortality. How little validity attaches to this man's conviction of free-will will appear if we reflect that while we speak of "doing what we like", we never speak of "being when we like" and that to conceive of a spatial liberty that is not also a temporal liberty involves a contradiction. Tradition, however, departs from science by replying to the man who confesses himself to be only the reasoning and mortal animal that he has

3. The doctrine is one of escape and the pursuit of happiness. It will not be confused with what has been called escapism. Escapism is an essentially selfish activity, failure to "face the music" (as when one "drowns one's sorrows in drink"), and the choice of easier paths; escapism is a symptom of disappointment, and cynical rather than mature. We need hardly say that to "wish one had never been born" is the antithesis of the perfect sorrow that may be occasioned by the sense of a continued existence: we are born in order to die, but this death is not one that can be attained by suicide or suffering death at the hands of others; it is not of ourselves or others, but only of God that it can be said in the words of St. John of the Cross, "and, slaying, dost from death to life translate."

At the same time, the true way of "escape" is by far more strenuous than the life that is escaped (hence the designation of the religious in India as a "Toiler", śramaṇa), and it is the degree of a man's maturity (in Skr. the extent to which he is pākva, "pukka", and no longer āma, "raw") that is the measure of the possibility of his escape, and consequent beatitude.

"The minds of some are set on Union (yoga), the minds of others on comfort (kṣema)" (TS. V. 2. 17, cf. KU. II. 1-4).

4. The denial of freewill in "this man", the individual, is explicit in Sn. 350. "It does not belong to the many-folk to do what they will (na kāmakāro ki pathuṣjjanānam, cf. 'Ye cannot do the things that ye would', Gal. V. 17): and this denial is made in a very striking manner in S. III. 66-67 where for the usual formula according to which the body and mentality are anattā, not I, nor mine, the proof is offered that this body, sensibility, etc., cannot be "mine", cannot be "I", for if these were myself, or mine, they would never be sick, since in this case one could say "Let my body, sensibility, etc. be thus, or not-thus"; nothing being really ours except to the extent that we have it altogether in our power, nor anything variable any part of an identity such as the notion of a "very person" (satpurusa) intends. A further consideration is this, that if the becoming (bhava) of the finite individual were not absolutely determined by "fate", "mediate causes", or "karma" (the terms are synonymous), the idea of an omniscient providence (praśādā, paśñā; knowledge of things not derived from the things themselves) would be unintelligible. In this connection we may remark that we are not, of course, concerned to prove any doctrine whatever dialectically, but only to exhibit its consistency, and therewith intelligibility. The consistency of the Philosophy Perennis is indeed good ground for "faith" (i.e. confidence, as distinguished from mere belief); but as this "Philosophy" is neither a "system" nor a "philosophy", it cannot be argued for or against.
"forgotten who he is" (Boethius, De Consol, prose vi), requires of him to "Know thyself", and warns him "If thou knowest not thyself, begone" (si ignoras te, egredere, Cant. I. 8). Tradition, in other words, affirms the validity of our consciousness of being but distinguishes it from the so-and-so that we think we are: the validity of our consciousness of being is not established in metaphysics (as it is in philosophy) by the fact of thought or knowledge; on the contrary, our veritable being is distinguished from the operations of discursive thought and empirical knowing, which are simply the casually determined workings of the "reasoning and mortal animal", which are to be regarded yathābhumam, not as affects but only as effects in which we (in our veritable being) are not really, but only supposedly involved. Tradition, then, differs from the "nothing-morist" (Skr. nāstika, Pali natthika) in affirming a spiritual nature that is not in any wise, but immeasurable, inconnumerable, infinite and inaccessible to observation, and of which, therefore, empirical science can neither affirm nor deny the reality. It is to this "spirit" (Gk. pneuma, Skr. ātman, Pali Atā, Arabi ruh, etc.) as distinguished from body and soul, i.e. whatever is phenomenal and formal (Gk. soma and psyche, Skr. and Pali nāma-rūpa, and saviṇṇāna-kāya, saviṇṇānakāya, "name and appearance", the "body with its consciousness") that tradition attributes with perfect consistency an absolute liberty, spatial and temporal. Our sense of free will is as valid in itself as our sense of being, and as invalid as our sense of being So-and-so. There is a free will, a will, that is, unconstrained by anything external to its own nature; but it is only "ours" to the extent that we have abandoned all that we mean in common sense by "ourselves" and our "own" willing; only His service is perfect freedom. "Fate lies in the created causes themselves" (St. Thomas, Sum. Theol. I. 116. 2): "Whatever departeth farthest from the First Mind is involved more deeply in the meshes of Fate (i.e., karma, the ineluctable operation of "mediate causes"); and everything is so much the freer from Fate, by how much it draweth nigh to the pivot of all things.

5. E.g., Avencebrol, Fons Vitae, I. 2, quid est ergo quod debet homo inquirere in hac vita? . . . . hoc est ut sciatis se ipsum. The reader will not confuse the "science of self" (ātmavidya) here intended the psychologist, whether ancient or modern; as remarked by Vansteenbergh, the gnōthi seautōn with which Nicholas of Cusa opens his De docta ignorantia "n'est plus le 'Connais toi-même' du psychologue Socrate, c'est le 'Sois maître de toi (=Dh. 160 attā hi attano nātho) des moralistes stoïciens" (Autour de la Docte Ignorance, 1915, p. 42). In the same way, the only raison d'être of "Buddhist psychology" is not "scientific", but to break down the illusion of self. Whereas the modern psychologist's only concern and curiosity are with the all-too-human self, that very self which even in its highest and least suspected extensions is still a prison. Traditional metaphysics has nothing in common with this psychology which restricts itself to "what can be psychically experienced" (Jung's own definition).

6. The phenomena of this "spirit" (the realisations of its possibilities of manifestation under given conditions) are all phenomena whatever (amongst which those which are called "spiritualistic" have no privileged rank,—on the contrary, "A mouse is miracle enough. . . .".).
And if it sticketh to the constancy of the Supernal Mind, that needs not move, it is superior to the necessity of Fate" (Boethius, De Consol. prose IX). This freedom of the Unmoved Mover ("That which, itself at rest, outgoeth them that run," Isā Up. 4) from any necessitas coactionis is that of the spirit that bloweth where and as it will (hòpou thèlei pnei, John III.8; carati yathā vaśam, RV. X.168.4); to possess it, one must have been "born again...of the Spirit" (John III.7-8), and thus "in the spirit" (St. Paul, passim), must have "found and awakened to the Spirit"s (yasyānvittāḥ pratibuddha ātmā, BU. IV.4.13), must be in excessus ("gone out of" oneself, one's senses), in samādhi (etymologically and semantically "synthesis"), unified (eko bhūtaḥ), or in other words "dead" in the sense that "the kingdom of God is for none but the thoroughly dead" (Eckhart) and that Rûmī speaks of a "dead man walking" (Mathnawi, VI. 742-755), or again that of initiatory death as the prelude to a regeneration. There is not, of course,

7. RV. X. 168. 3-4, John III. 7-8 and Gylfginginn 18 present remarkable parallels.

8. "He who sees, thinks and discriminates this Spirit, whose pleasure and play are with the Spirit, whose dalliance is with the Spirit (as in BU. IV. 3. 21. "All creation is male to God") and whose joy is in the Spirit, he becomes autonomous (svārāj), he becomes a Mover-at-will (kāmācārin) in every world; but his worlds whose knowledge is otherwise than this are corruptible, he does not become a Mover-at-will in any world" (CU. VII. 25. 2). The conception of Motion-at-will is developed in very many texts, from RV. IX. 113.9. "Make me undying there where motion is at will" (yatramukāma carālam...mām amṛtaṁ kṛdhi) onwards. The Christian equivalent can be found in John III. 8 and X. 9 ("shall go in and out and find pasture" like Taitt. Up. III. 10.5 "he goes up and down these worlds, eating what he will and assuming what aspect he will").

Motion-at-will is a necessary consequence of filiation or deification; the Spirit moving "as it will" in virtue of its omni-and total presence, and because "He that is joined unto the Lord is one spirit" (I Cor. VI.17); all possession of "powers" (yuddhi, iddhi, such as flying through the air or walking on the water) being gifts of the Spirit and depending upon a more or less ablatio omnis alteritatis et diversitatis (Nicolas of Cusa). In other words, our freedom and beatitude are the less the more we are still "ourselves", un tel. The "miracle" is never an "impossibility", but only so according to our way of thinking: performance is always the demonstration of a possibility. It is not opposites (as "possible" and "impossible", but contraries (for example rest and motion, both of which are "possibles") that are reconciled in divinis. "Primitive" languages retain the stamp of this polarity in words which may mean either of two contrary things (cf. FREUD on ABEL, "Gegensinn der Urworte" in Jahrb. für psychoanalytische und psychopathologische Forschungen, Bd. II, 1910, and BETTY HEIMANN, "The Polarity of the Infinite" in Journ. Indian Society of Oriental Art, V, 1998).

It may be added that because of the identity of the immanent and transcendent Spirit (I Cor. VI. 17: "That art thou" of the Upaniṣads, etc.) we make no real distinction in the present article between "my spirit" (the "ghost" that we "give up", at death) and "the spirit" (the Holy Ghost), although sometimes writing "spirit" with reference to the immanent essence (antarāṭman) and "Spirit" with reference to the transcendent essence (paramāṭman). So far as a distinction can be made, it is "logical but not real" (secondum rationem, non secundum rem).
any necessary connection between liberation and physical death: a man can as well be liberated “now in the time of this life” (śvām mukta) as at any other time, all depending only upon his remembering “who he is”, and this is the same as to forget oneself, to “hate one’s own life” (psyche, “soul” or “self”, Luke, XIV. 26), definere a se tota and a semetipsa liquecere (St Bernard), the “death of the soul” (Eckhart), “nothing else than that the spirit goeth out of itself, out of time, and entereth into a pure nothingness” (Tauler), becoming thus “free as the Godhead in its non-existence” (Eckhart); to have said “Thy will be done, not mine” or in other words, to have been perfected in “Islām”.

Man has thus two selves, lives or “souls”, one rational and mortal, the other spiritual and not in any way conditioned by time or space, but of which the life is a now “where every where and every when is focussed” (Paradiso, XXIX, 12), and “apart from what has been or shall be” (KU. II. 14), that “now that stands still” of which we as temporal beings knowing only a past and future can have no empirical experience. Liberation is not a matter only of shaking off the physical body—one self is not so easily evaded—but, as Indian texts express it, of shaking off all bodies, mental or psychic as well as physical. “The word of God is quick and powerful, and sharper than any two-edged sword, piercing even unto the dividing asunder of soul (psyche) and spirit (pneuma).” Heb. IV. 12. It is between these two that our choice

9. “Then shall the dust return to the earth as it was, and the spirit shall return unto God who gave it” (Eccl. XII. 7). Our sense of being may be “in the dust” or “in the spirit”, and so either “saved or lost”. It is well for him “who has been of strength to awaken before the body is unstrung” (KU. VI. 4).

10. For St. Bernard see Gilson, La Théologique Mystique de Saint Bernard, Paris 1934, Ch. V. How close to Indian formulation St. Bernard comes appears in his distinction of proprium from esse (mama from attā) and in Rousselet’s summary (ib. p. 150, note 2) “Cela revient à dire qu’on ne peut pleinement posséder dieu sans pleinement se posséder sol-même”, at the same time that (ib.—152, note 1) “Il n’y a plus de suum, l’être s’est vidé de lui-même”, as in SB. III. 8. 1. 2-3, where the initiated sacrificer is “as if emptied out of himself” (śīrīcāma ivātmā bhavati) in order to enter into possession of his “whole self” (sarrūtmānam), or as in A. 1. 249 where the man who “has brought into full being-body, will and foreknowing (bhāvita-kāyo, -citto, -pañño, i.e. whole self) is not emptied out (aparito aprarikta) but the Great Spiritual-Self of which the way is beyond all measure” (mahattā appamāṇa-vihāri).

11. As far as possible this clear distinction of “soul” (psyche, anima, nafs, vedanā, etc.) from “spirit” (pneuma, spiritus, rūh, ātman, etc.) is maintained in the present article; cf. Origen, cited by Eckhart, FfEIFFER p. 351 din geist ist dir niht genomen : die krefte diner sele sint dir genomen (“It is not thy spirit, but the powers of thy soul that art taken from thee”). It must also be recognized, however, that in the European tradition the word “soul” is used in many senses (for example, “animal” is literally “ensouled”, anima here as spiraculum vitae, cf. Skr. pṛṣaṇa-bhṛṭ) and that in one of these senses (which is strictly that of Philo’s “soul of the soul”, Heres. 55, cf. Augustine, De duabus animabib contra Manicheos “soul” means “spirit”. In what sense “soul” is or is not to be taken to mean “spirit” is discussed by William of Thierry in the Golden Epistle, 50 (p. 87 in SheWring’s English version, London, 1930). In the same way ātman may refer to
lies; between ourselves as we are in ourselves and to others, and ourselves as we are in God—not forgetting that, as Eckhart says, “Any flea as it is in God is higher than the highest of the angels as he is in himself”. Of these two “selves”, the psycho-physical and spiritual, one is the “life” (psyche) to be rejected, the other the “life” that is thereby saved of Luke XVII. 33 and Math. XVI. 25: and of these again the former is that “life” (psyche) which “he who hateth in this world shall keep it unto life eternal” (John XII. 25) and which a man must “hate, if he would be my disciple” (Luke XIV. 26). It is assuredly all that is meant by psyche in our word “psychology” that is in this way “le moi haïssable”; all of us, in fact, that is subject to affects or affections or wants of any sort, or entertains opinions “of its own”.12

The unknown author of the Cloud of Unknowing is therefore altogether in order when he says (Ch. 44) so poignantly that “All men have matter of sorrow: but most specially he feeleth matter of sorrow, that wotteth and feeleth that he is.... And whoso never felt this sorrow, he may make sorrow: for why, he never yet felt perfect sorrow.13 This sorrow, when it is had.... maketh a soul able to receive that joy, the which receveth from a man all witting and feeling of his being”. And so also Blake, when he says “I would go down unto annihilation and Eternal Death,”14 lest the last Judgment come and find me Unannihilate, and I be seiz’d and giv’n into the hands of my own Selfhood”. In the same way St. Paul, Vivo, autem jam

the psycho-physical “self” or to the spiritual self; from the latter point of view, the psycho-physical self is anattā, “not spiritual”! It is because both “soul” and “spirit” are selves, although of very different orders, that an equivocation is inevitable: the use of the words in their context has always to be very carefully considered; the proper sense can always be made out.

12. Cf. the citation from Jacob Böhme at the head of this article. It is comparatively easy for us to admit that a “self-willing” is egotistical; it is far more difficult, but equally indispensable to realise that a “self-thinking”, i.e. “thinking for oneself” or “having opinions of one’s own” is as much an error, or “sin”, defined as “any departure from the order to the end” as any wilfulness can be. A good case of “thinking for oneself” is what is called the “free examination of scripture; and here, as was lately remarked by Mr. David MacIver, “the number of possible objections to a point of doctrine is equal to the number of ways of misunderstanding it, and therefore indefinite”.

13. Vairāgya, ”dis-gust”, as distinguished from āśa bhaṅga, “disappointment”. nekkhamana-sīta as distinguished from geха-sīta in D. II. 279; or kata theon lūpē as distinguished from tou kosmou lūpe in II Cor. VII. 10.

14. As remarked by St. Thomas Aquinas (Sum. Theol. I. 63. 3), “no creature can attain a higher grade of nature without ceasing to exist”, which self-denial is a thing “against the natural desire”. It is not of its “own” will that the creature can desire its own “annihilation” or “death”. But our consciousness of being (as distinguished from any conceit of being So-and-so or such and such) is precisely not the “creature”; it is another will in me than “mine”, the lover of another (S. IV. 158) self than “mine” that “longs intensely for the Great Self” (mahattam abhiḥkhandatā, M. II. 21) i.e. for itself; this does not pertain to our self-love, but God’s, who is in all things self-intent and loves no one but himself,
non ego: vivit in me Christus (Gal. 11. 20).

We are sometimes shocked by the Buddhist disparagement of natural affections and family ties. But it is not the Christian who can thus recoil, for no man can be Christ's disciple "who hateth not father and mother, and wife and children, and brethren, and sisters", as well as himself (Luke XIV. 26). These uncompromising words, from one who endorsed the command to honour father and mother and who equated contempt with murder, show clearly enough that it is not an ethical doctrine of unselfishness or altruism that we are dealing with, but a purely metaphysical doctrine of the transcending of individuation. It is in the same sense that he exclaims "Who are my mother and my brethren?" (Mark III. 34 etc.), and accordingly that Eckhart warns "As long as thou still knowest who thy father and thy mother have been in time, thou art not dead with the real death" (Pfeiffer, p. 462).

There can be no return of the prodigal, no "turning in" (nivrtti) except of same to same. "Whoever serves a God, of whom he thinks that 'He is one and I another', is an ignoramus" (BU.I.4.10): "If you do not make yourself equal to God, you cannot apprehend God: for like is known by like" (Hermes, Lib. XI. ii. 20 b). The question is asked of the home-comer, "Who art thou?" and if he answers by his own or a family name, he is dragged away by the factors of time on the threshold of success (JUB. III. 14. 1-2): "that ill-fated soul is dragged back again, reverses its course, and having failed to know itself, lives in bondage to uncounted and miserable bodies. The fault of this soul is its ignorance" (Hermes, Lib. X. 8 a). He should answer "Who I am is the light Thou art. What heavenly light Thou art, as such I come to Thee", and answering thus is welcomed accordingly, "Who thou art, that am I; and who I am, art thou. Come in" (JUB. III. 14. 3-4) to the question "Who is at the door?" he answers "Thou art at the door" and

15. The traveller, at the end of life's journey, knocks at the Sundoor (as in JUB. etc.) which is the door of the house of Death (as in KU.), and that of Yama's paradise (as in RV.), and would be received as a guest; or as expressed in Pall, amalā-dvāram āhaccā tīfhati. Admission, however, depends upon anonymity, with all its implications of "being in the spirit" (āmasya etya mukha ādattē, "going in the spirit, the gate receives him", JUB. III. 33. 8). There can be no doubt that the same mythical and profound eschatology underlies the Homeric legend of Ulysses and Polyphemus. The latter is assuredly Death (his one eye corresponds to Siva's third; that is blinded and thus "closed" means that the world illumined by sun and moon, the two eyes of the Gods, is to persist for Ulysses and his companions; it must be an initiatory, not in final death that is overcome, as is also suggested by the "cave"); his land which yields crops untilled is a Paradise, like Yama's or Varun'a's; Ulysses would be his guest. The story as told by Homer (and Euripides) has become an adventure rather than a myth, but it remains that the hero who overcomes Death is the one man who when he is asked "who art thou" answers "No one"; and it is noteworthy that in the Euripides version when the blinded Cyclops cries out "Where is Nobody", the Chorus answers "Nowhere, O Cyclopes". It would be hard to say whether or not Homer still "understood his material": it may be taken for granted that Euripides did not.

16. Cf. Dh. 243 where after a list of "faults", we have "the supreme fault is ignorance" (avijñā paramam malam).
is welcomed with the words “Come in, O myself” (Rūmā, Mathnawi, I. 3062-3) ; it is not as un tel that he can be received,—“Whoever enters, saying ‘I am So-and-so’, I smite him in the face” (Shams-i-Tabriz) ; as in Cant. I. 7 si ignoras te, egredere.

“He that is joined unto the Lord, is one spirit” (I Cor. VI. 27). But this Spirit (ātman), Brahmā, God, the “What?” of JUB. III.14, “hath not come anywhence nor become anyone” (KU. II.18) ; the Imperishable has neither personal nor family name (BU. III. 8.8, Mādhyāṛidindra text), nor any caste (Mūḍh. Up. I. 1.6) ; “God himself does not know what he is, because he is not any what”17 (Ervigena) ; the Buddha is “neither priest nor prince nor husbandman nor any one at all (uda koci no’ṃhi)....I wander in the world a veritable naught (ākīncaṇa)....Useless to ask my kin (gottam Sn. 455-6).18

The outlines of the universal doctrine of self-naughting and of self-sacrifice or devotion in the most literal sense of the words having been drawn above, we propose to devote the remainder of our demonstration to its specifically Buddhist formulation in terms of ākīncaṇaṃvatana, “the station of no-what-ness”, or more freely “the Cell of Self-naughting”. “When it is realised that ‘There is no aught’ (n’atthi kiñci), that is Emancipation of the

---

17. The deformed soul in which an ablatio omnis alteritatis et diversitatis has been effected (Nicolas of Cusa) is therefore beyond our speechways (vādapattha, Sn. 1076), “unknown to herself or any creature, she knows well that she is, but does not know what she is” (Eckhart, PFEIFFER, p. 537).

18. In the same way the famous Ode of Shams-i-Tabriz (XXXI in NICOLSON), “....I know not myself....I am not of Adam nor of Eve....My place is the Placeless, my trace is the Traceless; nor body nor life, since I am of the life of the Beloved” (na tan nāsad na jān nāsad, ki man az jān jānān-am). NICOLSON comments : “I am nought” means ‘God is all’”. From the Indian point of view, the “Beloved” is, of course, “the Spirit which is also one’s own spiritual essence”,—“For one who has attained, there is none dearer than the Spirit”, or “than the Self” (na piyataram attaṇa, S.I. 75, cf. BU. I.4.8 tad etat preyaḥ putrāḥ....yad ayam ātmā.....āśāmāna eva priyam upāsita; II.4; IV. 5; CU. VII. 25 etc.). With “traceless” compare Dh. 179 tam buddham anvantacaram apadam, kena padena nessathā, “That Buddha, whose posture is without end, the footless (or trackless), by what track you find him out?” (complementary to the usual doctrine of the vestigium pedis, according to which the intelligible Buddha (or Agni) can be tracked by his spoor, pādā or padānī). “A Tathāgata, I say, is actually (dhamme) beyond our ken (anamucejo, M. J. 140) ; and in the same way of Arhats “there is no demonstration” (tesam naṭṭhi paññapanaṇyā, ib.) : “Him neither gods nor men can see” (tam ce hi nādakkham, S.I. 23). The last is spoken in the Buddha’s physical presence, and corresponds to the well known text of the Vajracchedikā Sūtra, “Those who see me in the body (rūpeṇa) or think of me in words, their way of thinking is mistaken, they do not see me at all ; the Blessed Ones are to be seen only in the Body of the Law, the Buddha can only be rightly understood as the Principle of the Law, assuredly not by any means” ; cf. St. Thomas “Therefore if anyone in seeing God conceives something in his mind, this is not God, but one of God’s effects” (Summa Theologica, III. 92. 1 ad 4)....“We have no means for considering what God is, but rather how He is not” (ib. I.3.1).
will”¹⁹ (ceto-vimutti) in the ‘Station of No what-ness’” (S. IV. 296, cf. D. II. 112). The exact meaning of “There is naught”, i.e. “naught of mine”²⁰ is brought out in A. II.177 “The Brāhman²¹ speaks the truth and no lie when he says ‘I am naught of anyone anywhere, and therein there is naught of mine anywhere soever’” (nāhan kuacani kassaci kincanañ, tasmin na ca mama kuacani kathaci kincanañ n'atthi, also in A.I.206),²² the text con-

19. Ceto-vimutti (often rendered “Heart’s release”) is contrasted with pañña-vimutti, “Intellectual emancipation” (ceto- and pañña- denoting both the means or way of liberation and the respect in which liberation is obtained); the texts often speak of a “being free in both departments” ubhato-bhāga-vimutti, as well as of other types of liberation; and it is evident that the two ways, which are those of the will and the intellect converge and ultimately coincide. A.II.36 ceto-visippato hoti vitakka-pathesu, “He is a past master of the will in matters of choice” or “matters of counsel”, brings out very clearly the conative connotations of ceto, which are evident also for cetas in AV. VI. 116. 3. S. III 60 defines sañcubhārā as sanceti nā, rendered by Mrs. Rhys Davids “seats of will”. It is clear, then, that the connection of ceto-vimutti with ākincanañ is intrinsic; since it is just to the extent that one ceases to feel that one is anyone and to the extent that one loses all sense of proprium (mama) that self-willing and self-thinking must cease. It is just because ceto implies both willing and thinking that it is difficult to represent it by a single English word; however, it is in just the same way that English “to have a mind to” is the same as “to wish to” or “to want to”, and so too that Skr. man to “think” and kām to “wish” or “want” are virtually synonymous in many contexts. Pañña is not, of course, “thought” in this sense, but much rather “speculation” in the strict sense of this word (āditye mahat...adare pratiripak Kauś Up. IV. 2, with very many Christian and other parallels, e.g. St. Thomas Aquinas, Sum. Theol. I. 12. 9 c “All things are seen in God as in an intelligible mirror”, i.e. the speculum aeternum). It is asked in M. I. 437, How is it that some are liberated in one way and some in the other, the Buddha replying that it depends upon “a difference in faculties” (indriyav-emattatam). The difference is, in fact, typically that of the royal from the sacerdotal, Kṣatriya from Brahman character; because of which difference it is that a bhakti-mārga and karma-mārga are stressed in the Bhagavad Gita and a jñāna-mārga in the Upaniṣads. The two ways, of ceto-vimutti (in thoubaka 19 identified with mettā, “charity”) and pañña-vimutti correspond to and are essentially the same as the bhakti-mārga and jñāna-mārga of Brahmanical texts.

20. It will be seen that the Arhat or Brahman who has attained to self-naughting and confesses accordingly “na’thi” or “na’thi kimci” might have been called a “nattika”, or nattikhavāda (“Denier”). If he is never in fact so called (but rather, śīvanvādā), it is because these were designations current in a very different sense, with reference viz. to the “materialist” or “sceptic” who denies that there is another world or hereafter (as in M. I. 402-3) or takes the extreme view (nattitā) that there is absolutely nothing in common between the individual that acts and the individual that experiences the results of the act (S.II.17). We propose to discuss this other “Denier” upon another occasion.

21. Pali Buddhism not only equates brahma-bhūta with buddha, brahma-cakkha with dhamma-cakkha, etc., but (where there is no polemic involved) maintains the old and familiar distinction of the Brāhman by birth (brahma-bandhu) from the Brāhman as Comprehensor (brahma-vit), in the latter sense equating Brāhman with Arhat, passim.

22. Netti 62 (cited in Gradual Sayings, p. 184) explains kincana here by tūga-moha-dosa, i.e. ethically, and this is true in the sense that when self is let go,
continuing "Therewith he has no conceit of being 'a Toiler' (samaya) or 'a Brahman', nor conceit that 'I am better than', or 'I am equal to', or 'inferior to' (anyone). Moreover, by a full-comprehension of this truth, he reaches the goal of veritable 'naughting'" (ākiṃcaṇṇam yeva paṭipadam). What is neither "I" nor "mine" is above all body, sensibility, volitional conformations, and empirical consciousness (i.e. the psycho-physical self), and to have rejected these is "for your best good and beatitude" (S. III. 33, chapter entitled Natumahāka, "What is not 'Yours'"). Accordingly, "Behold the Arhats' beatitude! No wanting can be found in them: excised the thought 'I am' (asmi);"² delusion's net is rent... Unmoving, unoriginated... Brahma-become... true 'Persons' (saṇṇaṇā), natural sons of the Wake... That heart-wood of the Brahma-life is their eternal-reason; unshaken in whatever plight, release from 'still-becoming' (punabhavā), on ground of 'dompted (-self) they stand, they in the world have won their battle... They roar the 'Lion's Roar'. Incomparable are the Wake" (Buddhā, S. III, 83-84). No question of a post-mortem "annihilation" here, then, but of "Persons" triumphant here and now; their unconditionality will not be changed by death, which is not an event for those who have "died before they die" (Rūmi), not an event for the jīvan-mukta, the veritable dīkṣita for whom the funeral rites have already been performed and for whom his relatives have already mourned (JUB. III. 7-9); of these it is only the mani-

there remains no ground for any "selfish" passion: kincana is the "somewhat" of the man who still feels that he is "somebody", and accordingly the ground in which interest, delusion and ill-will can flourish.

In all respects equivalent to nātthi (Skr. naśti) is Persian nēst in Shams-i-Tabrizi (T. 139.12 a, cited by NICHOLSON, p. 233), "Be thou naught (nēst shū), naughted of self, for there is no crime more heinous than thine existence".

23. This does not imply that the Arhat "is not", but excludes from an ineffable essence the process of thought. From this point of view, Cogito ergo sum is altogether without validity; what I call "my" thinking is by no means my Self. The Arhat does not wonder whether he is, or what he is, or how he is, or has been, or will be (S. II 26, Sn. 774). "He does not worry about what is unreal" (asati na parītassati, M. I.135) he is self-synthesised (ajjhataṁ susamāhito, passim), and in this state of synthesis (samādhi) though he is unaware of anything, yet there is awareness in him" (S. V. 7, cf. BU. IV. 3. 28. 30). The Buddha neither teaches that nibbāna is a "nothingness" nor that the Arhat "comes to naught": "there is (atthi) an unborn, unbecome, uncreated, uncompounded, and were there not, would be no way out of this here born, become, created and compound existence" (Uddāno, 80); a Tathāgata, whose "I am has been cast off" (asimmāṇo pañhino) is not "destroyed"—"It is in the very presence of such a Tathāgata that I call him 'past finding out' (anamujjho) and yet there are some who naughtily, vainly, falsely and contrary to what is the fact (asatā tucchā musā abhūtena) charge that the Tathāgata is a misleader (venayika, cf. dunnaya, heresy) who pounds the cutting off, destruction and ceasing to be of essences. That is just what I am not, and what I do not propound. The stoppage (niruddha) that I have preached, both of old and now, is nothing but the stoppage of Grief" (dakkha, i.e. of that which is anattā, not I nor mine), M. I. 139-140 (the coincidence of anattā with dakkha correspond exactly to the esa ta atmā sarvāntarāḥ ato'nyad attam of BU. III. 4.2).
festation in terms of "name and appearance" (nāma-rūpa) that comes to an end (as all things must that have had a beginning), so that after death they will be sought for in vain by Devas or men in this world or any other (S. I. 23, D. I. 46 etc.), just as one might seek in vain for God anywhere, of whom it is asked "Whence did he come to be?" (kuta ā babhūva, RV. X. 168.3), "In what quarter is He or in what?" (TS. V. 4. 3. 4), and "Who knows where He is?" (KU. II. 25), —"Thou canst not tell whence it cometh or whither it goeth: so is everyone that is born of the Spirit" (John III. 8) : in spite of all which it must be remarked that the attainment of infinite is not a destruction of finite possibility, for the deceased Comprehensor, being a Mover-at-will (kāmācārīn), can always therefore reappear if, when, where and as he will; of which "resurrection" examples may be cited in JUB. III. 29-30 (where the noli me tangere offers a notable parallel to the Christian resurrection), and in the Parosahassa Jātaka (No. 99) where a Bodhisattva is asked on his deathbed "What good he has gotten?" and answers "There is naught" (n'atthi kiñci) and this is misunderstood by his disciples to mean that he has gotten "no good" by his holy life. But when the conversation is reported to his chief disciple, who had not been present, he says "You have not understood the meaning of the Master's words. What the Master said was that he had attained to the 'Station of No-what-ness' (ākīncaṁāṇāyatana). And thereupon the deceased Master reappears from the Brahman-world to confirm the chief disciple's explanation.

The man self-naughted is a happy man, not so those still conscious of their human ties. "Look you, how they are blest, these 'Nobodies', yea these Comprehensors who are 'men of naught'; and see how hindered he for whom there is an 'aught', the man whose mind tied up with 'other men'" (Udāna 14). For "to have known the forthcoming of not being 'any-

24. It may be noted here that Alāra Kalāma's doctrine and realisation extended to the ākīncaṁāṇāyatana (m. 165).

25. Again a sufficient proof that even in "late" Hinayāna Buddhism, to have become "no one" was by no means the same as to have been "annihilated". The Buddhist position is in no way inconsistent with the "Never have I not been and never hast thou not been....nor ever shall not be" of BG. II. 12. It should be observed that the resurrections of JUB. III. 29-30 and J. as cited above are wholly "in order", and have nothing in common with the phenomena of spiritualism. An almost identical situation is described in J. I. 143. It is as much a Buddhist as is a Brahmanical commonplace that "the dead are not seen again amongst the living as asked in J.

26. The context is with reference to a man who steals for his wife. The contrasted terms are akiṁcana, "man of naught" and sākiṁcana, "man of aught" the man, that is, who "has" what he calls "his" individuality, which individuality in this case "expresses itself" in an act of partiality. This "man of aught" is hindered by the notions of "him-self" and of "his" wide, the "tie" being as between these two selves, subjective and objective; in so far as he does not "hate" both himself and his wife, he is not the Buddha's disciple, but is troubled and gets into trouble. In all these contexts it must be remembered that it is a question of the summum bonum and man's last end, and not of the "good of society", which is not a final end. The man's first duty is to work out his own salvation. Aban-
one' (ākīncañña-sambhavā nātva)...that is 'gnosis'" (etam, ānān Sam. 1115): this is Way, "Perceiving that there is 'No-what-ness' (ākīncanām) ...convinced that 'There is not' (n'atthi, i.e. 'naught mine', as above), so cross the flood" (Sn. 1070). And this is not an easy matter: "Hard to perceive what's false (anattam, here probably = ānītam),27 nor is it easy to perceive the truth (saccam = satyam); he knows, whose wanting has been smitten through, who sees that 'There is naught'" (n'atthi kīncañna, Udāna 80), "who hath overpast becoming or not becoming in any way" (iti-bhavābhavam, all relativity, Udāna 20).28

It will be seen that anonymity is an essential aspect of ākīncañña. All initiations (dikṣā), and likewise Buddhist ordination (pabbajana), which as in monasticism elsewhere is a kind of initiation,29 involves at the outset

donment of self and of all ties is not only literally "un-self-ish," but it is also both better and kinder to point out the way to happiness by following it than to be "sympathetic", i.e. to "suffer with" those who will not "seek peace, and ensue it."

27. The PTS. editor (Paul Steinitzal) reads anattam, but what is admittedly the best Ms. (A) has anatam, which is the form that would be assumed by ānītam in Pali (cf ānītam, anatam). A commentary has anatam, but apparently in the sense of the "not-bent", hence nibbāna, and it must be with this in view that Woodward translates by "infinite". But it is almost impossible to doubt that what we have is the familiar antithesis of anītam to satyam. The uncertainty of the reading nevertheless expresses a sort of double entendre; that which is anattā, "not what I really am" (na me so attā, passim) but "devoid of any spiritual-essence" (S. IV, 54), and "naught-y" (asat, M. I. 135) is equally from the Brahmanical point of view at the same time "false" and "human" as distinguished from what is "true" and "non-human", i.e. divine, as is explicit in VS. I. 5 and SB. I. 9. 3. 23. (Cf. AB. VII. 24), where the sacrificer (always in the last analysis the sacrificer of himself) when initiated and during the performance of the rite "has entered from the untruth (anītam) into the truth" (satyam), and when at the close of the operation he formally desecrates himself, but does not like to say plainly the converse of this, says instead "Now I am he that I actually (empirically) am", So-and-so.

28. "It is the Spirit in thee, O man, that knows which is the true and which the false (attā te purisa jānātī saccān vā yadi vā musā) the 'fair self' (kalyānam...attanām) or the 'foul' (pāpm attanām) (A. I. 149), in other words the "great self" (mahattā) or the "petty" (appattumo) of A. I. 249, the "Self that is Lord of self" or the "self whose Lord is the Self" of Dh. 380. The false view is to see "self in not-self" (anattani...atta, A. II. 52 etc.) i.e. in the empirical subject or its percepts (S. III. 130 etc.). It is "well for him that knows himself" (atta-saññato, S. I. 106; attānī D. III. 552), "whose light is the Spirit" (atta-dīpa, D. II. 100), the "Self-lover" (attakāmo, S. I. 75, etc.), "inwardly self-intent" (ajjhatañna suśamanīto, A. II. 31 etc.), "in whom the Spirit has been brought to birth" (bhūvitattā, passim), and so "Go seek your Self" attānī gaveseyyātha, Mahāvagga I. 23), "Quicken thy Self" (coday attānām, Dh. 379, for "Self is the Lord of self" (ib. 380).

29. The initiate is "nameless" in KB. VII. 2-3 and speaks of none by name; he is not himself, but Agni. In SB. III. 8. 1. 2 he is "emptied of self". Buddhist ordination (pabbajana from the point of view of the ordained, pabbajana from that of the ordainer, who during the Buddha's lifetime is the Buddha himself) has many of the characteristics of, and is sometimes called an initiation (S.I. 226
a self-denial; as is explicit in Udāna 55, where "Just as rivers lose their former name and lineage ( purimāna nāma-gotti) when they reach the sea, and are accounted just as 'the great sea', so men of the four castes ( khattiyā brāhmaṇo vessā suddā), when they as-wanderers-are-ordained ( pabbajītvā), discard their former names and lineage, and are reckoned only to be 'Toilers', 'Sons of the Sakyan'. It is thus that the "exile" ( pabbajāka) sets to work to "deform himself of himself" as Eckhart expresses it (daz er sin entbilde sin selbes), or in other words to "transform" himself.

The anonymity which we have described above as a doctrinally inculcated principle is by no means only a monastic ideal but has far-reaching repercussions in traditional societies, where our distinctions of sacred from profane (distinctions that are, in the last analysis the signature of an internal conflict too rarely resolved) can hardly be found. It reappears, for example, in the sphere of art. We have discussed elsewhere "The Traditional Conception of Ideal Portraiture" (citing, for example, the Pratimāṇāyaka, III. 5, where Bharata, though he exclaims at the artists' skill, is unable to recognize the effigies of his own parents): and may point out here that there is a corresponding anonymity of the artist himself, not only in the field of the so-called "folk arts" but equally in a more sophisticated environment. Thus, as H. Swazenski has recently remarked, "It is in the very nature of Mediæval Art that extremely few names of artists have been transmitted to us... the entire mania for connecting the few names preserved by tradition with well-known masterpieces,—all this is characteristic of the nineteenth century's cult of individualism, based upon ideals of the Renaissance." Dh. 74 exclaims,

Comm. explains cira-dikkhi, "long since initiated" by cira-pabbājita, "long since ordained"; in Jātakamālā X. 32 a Bodhisattva is dikkita.

The primary senses of pabbājati are to "wander", "travel" and "be in exile"; and so to become a fellow in the "Companionship" ( sangha) of Mendicant Travellers (bhikkhu, pabbājaka), a true Wayfarer; cf. my "Pilgrim's way in JBORS. XXIII and XXIV, 1938,—the Traveller is bound for a World's End that is within himself.

30. The ethical aspect of this self-denial is a dispositive means to the end of self-naughting and Self-realisation, not an end in itself. Tapas, whether Brahmanical or Buddhist, is never a "penance", but in its disciplinary aspect a part of that training by means of which the petty self is subjected to the Great Self, or in a familiar symbolism, by which the steeds are brought under the driver's control, apart from which the man is "at war with himself" (S. I. 71-72, like BG. VI. 5-6); and in its intrinsic character, a radiance, reflecting his "Who glows (tapati) yonder".

31. To appear in the third issue of "Twice a Year" (New York), 1939.
32. "History", rather than "tradition" in our stricter sense.
33. Journal of the Walters Art Gallery, I, 1938, p. 55. Cf. Strzygowski, "the artist in Viking times is not to be thought of as an individual, as would be the case today... It is a creative art" (Early Church Art in Northern Europe, 1928, pp. 159-160: and with respect to this distinction of "individual" from "creative" art, "I do nothing of myself" (John VIII. 28) and "I take note, and even as He dictates within me, I set it forth" (Dante, Purgatorio, XXIV. 52). Better to be an amenuensis of the Spirit than to "think for oneself"!"
"May it to religious and profane that 'This was my work'...that is an infantile thought." DhA I. 270 relates the story of thirty-three youths who are building a 'Rest Hall' at four cross roads, and it is explicit that "The names of the thirty-three comrades did not appear," but only that of Sudhammā, the donor of the roof plate (the keystone of the dome). One is irresistibly reminded of the "Millennial Law" of the Shakers, that "No one should write or print his name on any article of manufacture, that others may hereafter know the work of his hands." And all this has not only to do with the body of the work and its aesthetic surfaces, it has just as much to do with its "weight" (gravitas) or essence (ātman); the notion of a possible property in ideas is altogether alien to the Philosophia Perennis of which we are speaking. It is of ideas and the inventive power that we can properly say, if we are thinking in terms of the psycho-physical ego, that this is not "mine," or if self has been naughted so that, to use the Brähmaṇa phrase, we have "come into our own," that these gifts of the Spirit are truly "mine"; since it is the Synteresis, the Divine Eros, inwit, in-genium immanent spirit, daimon, and not the natural individual that is the ground of the inventive

34. The words of the original could mean either my "work" or my "doing," kamma covering both things made and done. The same ambiguity, or rather ambivalence, is present in the corresponding text of BG. III. 27, "One whose self is confounded by the concept of an 'I' imagines that 'I am the doer,'", and V. 8, where the Comprehensor does not think of himself as the doer of anything," the word for "doer," karyā, meaning equally "maker" or "creator"; cf. JUB. 1. 5. 2. "Thou (God) art the doer," and IV. 12. 2 "I (God) am the doer," or "maker." Like BG, as cited above is Udāna 70 "Those who give ear to the notion 'I am the doer' (āhamkāra), or are captivated by the notion 'Another is the doer' (paramāh) do not understand this matter, they have not seen the point."

We need hardly remind the reader that this is a metaphysical position, and must not be confused with the akiriyavāda heresy, that viz. of the man in Udāna 45 is represented as saying, even while acting, 'It is not I that am agent' (yo cāpi katvā na karomi 'ti cāhā). "I," "this man," "un tel," have no right to evade "my" responsibility in this way, by maintaining that it does not matter what I do, because it is not really I that am doing it. It is only when the non-entity of this "I" has been verified (sacchidāntvā) that in the sense of I John III. 9 being "born of God, cannot sin," or that of Gal. V. 18 "am not under the law."

35. In early Indian art, the names of donors are constantly met with, those of artists almost never. The donor's name is recorded, because he wishes to "acquire merit" for what has been done; the artist is not, as such, in this specifically moral sense, acquiring merit, but on the one hand earning his wages, and on the other working for the good of the work to be done, neither of these points of view implying any wish for fame.

36. E.D. and F. Andrews, Shaker Furniture, 1937, p. 44. In all these connections, however, it is the spirit rather than the letter that matters. In the same community, for example, furniture could not be owned "as private property, or individual interests," and yet might be marked with a person's initials "for purposes of distinction"; and it was in just the same way in order for a Buddhist monk to say "I" or "mine" when convenient. In the same way an artist's signature need not be an advertisement, but can be, like a hall-mark, a simple guarantee of quality and acceptance of responsibility.
power, and it is precisely of this invit, this intellectual light, and not our own "mentality" of which it is said that "That art thou."

In conclusion, the student must not be misled by such terms as self-naughting, non-being, or any other of the phrases of the negative theology. Non-being, for example, in such an expression as Eckhart's "non-existence of the Godhead" is that transcendant aspect of the Supreme Identity which is not, indeed, being but that to which all being, even God's, can be reduced, as to its principle; it is that of God's which is not susceptible of manifestation, of which therefore we cannot speak in terms that are applicable only to states of manifestation, yet without which God would be only a "pantheon," a "pantheistic" deity, rather than "all this" and "more than this", "within" and "without." In the same way it must be realised that of one assimilated to God by self-naughting, and therefore no longer anyone, we have no longer any human means or speechway (vādapatha) to say what he is, but only to say that he is not such or such; it would be even more untrue to say that he is not, than that he is; he is simply inaccessible to analysis. Even a theoretical grasp of metaphysics is impossible until we have learnt that there are "things which our intellect cannot behold...we cannot understand what they are except by denying things of them" (Dante, Convito, III. 15), and that these very things are the greater part of man's last end. If, for example, the Arhat no longer desires, it is not because he is in human language "apathetic," but because all desires are possessst, and pursuit has no longer any meaning; if the Arhat no longer moves, it is not as a stone lies still, but because he no longer needs any means of locomotion in order to be anywhere; if he is not curious about empirical truths, whether "this is so" or "not so," it is not because he does not know, but because he does not know as we know in these terms; for example he does not think in terms of past or future, but only is now. If he is "idle," from our point of view who still have "things to do," it is because he is "all in act" (kṛtakṛtyaḥ, katakarniyo), with an activity independent of time.

But if we cannot know him, it does not follow that he cannot know or manifest himself to us. Just as in this life whilst in samādhi he is inaccessible and for all practical purposes dead, but on emerging from this synthesis and "returning to his senses" can conveniently make use of such expressions as "I" or "mine" for practical and contingent purposes without attainer of his freedom (S. I. 14), so after death, by which he is not changed, a resurrection is always possible in any guise ("he shall go in and out, and find pasture," John X. 9, with many Indian parallels, e.g., Taitt. Up. III. 5 "he goes up and down these worlds, eating what he desires and assuming what aspect he will"), this possibility by no means excluding that of reappearance in that very (dis-)guise by which he had been known in the world as so-and-so. Examples of such resurrection can be cited not only in the case of Jesus, but in that of Ucchāśravā Kaupayeya (JUB. III. 29-30), in that of the Bodhisattva of the Paroahassa Jātaka, and in that of the former Buddha Prabhūtaratna. Such a resurrection, indeed, is only one of innumerable "powers" (iddhi),
such as those of walking in the water, flying through the air, or disappearing from sight, which are possessst by one who is no longer "in himself" but "in the spirit," and inevitably possessst precisely because they are the powers of the Spirit with which he is "one" (I Cor. VI. 27) 37 which powers (as listed for example in S. II. 212 f., A. I. 254 f., and S. V. 254 f.) are precisely the "greater works" of John XIV. 12, "the works that I do shall he do also : and greater works shall he do." There can, indeed, be no question for those who know the "facts," that in so far as the Yogin is what the designation implies, "joined unto the Lord," these "powers" are at his command : he is only too well aware, however, that to make of these powers an end in themselves would be to fail of the real end.

It will be seen that in speaking of those who have done what was to be done, we have been describing those who have become "perfect, even as your Father in heaven is perfect." There will be many to say that even if all this hold good for the all-abandoner, it can have no meaning for "me : and it is true that it cannot have its full meaning for "me" who, en etant un tel am insusceptible de deification and therefore incapable of reaching God. Few or none of "us" are yet qualified to abandon ourselves. But so far as there is a Way, it can be trodden step by step. There is an intellectual preparation, which not merely prepares the way to a verification (sacchakiriya) but is indispensable to it. So long as we love "our" selves, and conceive of a "self-denial" only in terms of "altruism," or cling to the idea of a "personal" immortality for our or other selves, we are standing still. But a long stride has been taken if at least we have learned to accept the idea of the naughting of self as a good, however contrary it may be to our "natural" desire, however aller menschen fremde. For if the spirit be thus willing, the time will come when the flesh, whether in this or in any other ensemble of possibilities forming a "world," will be no longer weak. The doctrine of self-naughting is therefore addressed to all, in the measure of their capacity, and by no means only to those who have already formally abandoned name and lineage. It is not the saint, but the sinner, that is called to repent of his existence.

37. This unification is to be understood in the same way that the "eternal reasons" are one with the intellect that entertains them, and yet distinguishable amongst themselves, so as to be in posse to project their images upon the walls of our cave. Filiation or theosis by an ablatio omnis alteritatis et diversitatis can be expressed in terms of "glorification" as a becoming consciously a ray of the Light of lights : the relation of a ray, although of light throughout its course, is that of identity with its source at one end, and separate recognizability at the other, where its effect is observed as colour. In no better way than by this adequate symbol, made use of in all traditions, can we express or suggest the meaning of Eckhart's "fused but not confused," or Indian bhedaḥbhedaḥa, "distinction without difference."
EXPANSION OF BUDDHISM IN INDIA AND ABROAD*
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VII. Korea

Korea has its importance in the history of Buddhist expansion from the fact that it was from Korea that Buddhism first entered Japan and the earliest extant edition of the Chinese Tripitaka known only by a single copy was preserved in Korea and thence taken to Japan. Buddhism entered Korea as early as the last half of the 4th century A.D. In the middle of the 6th century Korea fell out with Japan, and anxious to have an alliance with the Emperor of Japan, sent him presents which included Buddhist texts and images. Korea maintained friendly intercourse with the Tang Dynasty in China and became largely imbued with Chinese Buddhist culture. In the 7th century the capital of Silla came to be a centre of Buddhist culture and trade. Merchants and missionaries from India and Tibet visited Korea and Korean pilgrims made journeys to India. From the 10th to the 14th century under the patronage of the Wang and Yuan dynasties Buddhism had a flourishing existence but in the domain of scholarship and learning it was more or less sterile. Magnificent monasteries were founded and the religion received state patronage in many ways. Towards the end of the 14th century, however, the reigning dynasty was overthrown by a revolution which was mainly the work of a section of the nobility that came to be attached to confucianism. In the 15th century restrictive measures, sometimes amounting to persecution, were imposed against Buddhism. Buddhist statues were broken or melted down and Buddhist learning was forbidden. Towards the end of the 16th century, Korea successfully withstood a Japanese attack, but Buddhism does not seem to have enjoyed any very serious consideration in the succeeding centuries. Since the annexation by Japan in 1910, conditions have changed and the religion is being encouraged.

VIII. Japan

Japan received the doctrine of the Buddha from China through Korea in about the middle of the 6th century A.D. but there are many elements of

* Continued from p. 709 of Vol. II.
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difference between Chinese and Japanese Buddhism. Buddhism in Japan had always an intimate connection with social, political and even military matters of the country and from the 7th century until the Meiji era all Shinto shrines with a few exceptions were according to an agreement handed over to the custody of the Buddhist priests.

Among the undernoted twelve sects of Japanese Buddhists the first eight called by the Japanese Hasshū are all imported from China and represent the Buddhism of the Nara and Hei-an periods. The rest are later than 1170 a.d. and were “all remodelled, if not created, in Japan.”

The twelve sects are as follows:—

1. Kusha
2. Jo-jitsu
3. Ritsu-Shu or Risshu
4. Sanron
5. Hossō
6. Kegon
7. Tendai
8. Shingon
9. Jōdo
10. Zen
11. Shin

All Japanese sects of importance are Mahāyānists. The Hinayāna is represented only by the Kusha, Jo-jitsu and Risshu. The two former are both extinct: the third still numbers a few adherents, but is not anti-Mahāyānist. It merely insists on the importance of discipline.

Of the above twelve sects, the Tendai and Shingon, onwards for 700 years from the 9th century, played a very great part in the history of Japanese art and literature as well as in political and literary matters. The culture of the Fujiwara period was almost entirely their contribution. Of the four remodelled sects, the Jōdo and Shin-Shū are Amidists, i.e., those who have absolute faith in the mercy of Amida. The Nichiren sect is purely Japanese and is a protest against Amidism and an attempt to restore the historical Buddha to his proper position. Zen is the Japanese equivalent of Chinese Ch’an and is the name given to the sect founded in China by Bodhidharma. It is said to have been introduced into Japan in the 7th century, but died out till it was later revived under the patronage of the Hōjō-Regents and specially during the Ashikaga period. Zen monks profoundly influenced the art and literature of Japan.

IX. Ceylon

Ceylon along with Burma and Siam is one of the three countries which still adheres to Theravāda Buddhism. According to tradition, Ceylon was colonised from India from a region known as Lāla by a Kshatriya prince named Vijayasingha but the introduction of Buddhism did not take place.

28. For a general study of Buddhist expansion in Ceylon, See Dipavamsa, ed. by GEIGER; Mahāvamsa ed. by GEIGER; Mahāvamsa Commentary, 2 Vols. (PTS) ed. by MALALASEKERA; DE SILVA—“History of Buddhism in Ceylon” (in Buddhistic Studies ed. by B. C. LAW); ELIOT—Hinduism and Buddhism, Vol. III; GEIGER—“A Short History of Ceylon” (in Buddhistic Studies ed. by B. C. LAW).
earlier than the reign of Asoka, when the king of Ceylon sought the friendship of the great emperor and sent an embassy to him with presents. King Asoka sent two representatives of his own family, Thera Mahinda and Theri Saṅghamittā to Ceylon to propagate the religion there. The reigning king of Ceylon, Devānampiya Tissa accorded them a cordial reception and became a patron of the religion and thus the religion gained a foothold in the island-country, according to tradition. Even within the life-time of the two vanguardshundreds of men and women sought refuge in the religion and the religion was well-established. Monasteries, Stūpas and other Buddhist establishments came to be founded, hundreds became Bhikshus and Bhikshumis receiving support from the laity, and studies in the three pītakas commenced in full earnest. After the death of Mahinda and Saṅghamittā the hierarchy of the disciples was continued in pupillary succession. In the 2nd century B.C. King Dutṭhadāmani gave a good fillip to the religion and during the two centuries that followed Buddhism became almost the sole channel through which the social and cultural development of the island followed. The religion of the Ceylonese people during this period came to be purely and entirely Buddhist and traditions as recorded in the chronicles of the island indicate much practical activity in religious affairs, both in endowment and maintenance of religious institutions and the practice of religious principles. Towards the beginning of the 1st century B.C., during the reign of King Vattagāmani, two important events that concerned the Buddhist religion took place; the first was the committing of the Buddhist teachings into writing and secondly the introduction for the first time of a schism in the Buddhist church of the island. The order of monks at Mahāvihāra at Anurādhapura held a convocation and under the patronage of the king appointed scribes to commit into writing the teachings of the religion.

The schism that occurred in the church of Ceylon in about the 1st century A.D. was due to the infringement of certain rules of monastic discipline. Outside the precincts of the established church there was another Vihāra known as Abhayagiri where the dissentient Bhikshus had taken up their abode. They were later on joined by disciples of Dhammaruci Āchāryya. They adopted the Vaitulya pītaka and proclaimed it to be the teaching of the Buddha. For centuries the Mahāvihāra monks carried on successfully under the patronage of the reigning kings a long struggle against the Vaitulya fraternities of the Abhayagiri vihāra. But intercourse with India during all these centuries was so frequent that from time to time non-orthodox doctrines and their followers occasionally found their way to Ceylon and were favoured by certain classes of monks. But these had no marked effect on the general progress or the stability of the orthodox church.

In about the first quarter of the 9th century A.D. an ascetic of the Vajraparvata Nikāya clad in the robes of a Buddhist monk came to Ceylon obviously from the mainland of India and converted the reigning king into his secret doctrine. To-day it is difficult to find any books of either the Vaitulya pītaka or any other heterodox teachings. But the ruins of Anu-
radhapura and archæological explorations on other sites in Ceylon have yielded not only inscriptions but also images that are definitely not only Mahāyānistic but also frankly tantric.

To resume the story of the orthodox church one must refer to the activities of the great Thera Buddhaghosa in about the first half of the 5th century A.D. Buddhaghosa came from South India to Ceylon where under the patronage of the reigning king, Mahānāma, he engaged himself in the work of compilation of the celebrated aṭṭhakathās or commentaries of the Buddhist pīṭakas. His well-known works, the Visuddhimagga, the Samantapāsādikā, the Sumaṅgalavilāsini, the Papanicasudani, the Manorathapuranī, the Sāratkapakāsini and a host of other works were all written down in Ceylon. Buddhaghosa thus raised the position and prestige of the Theravāda Church of Ceylon to a great extent.

Towards the end of the 8th century Ceylon suffered severe political unrest and the Ceylonese Church felt the consequences for more than two centuries, so much so that towards the middle of the 11th century, it was once found difficult to get a chapter of ordained monks to continue valid ordinations. This was, however, restored by the help of a number of learned Theras who were brought out from Arakan by king Vijayavāhu. In the middle of the 12th century, under the patronage of the king Parākramavāhu, the religion received infusion of new life. Parākramavāhu restored vihāras and monasteries, built new religious edifices and brought about the unification of the three contending sects, namely, the Mahāvihāra Nikāya, the Abhayagiri Nikāya, and the Vaitulya Nikāya, and also brought about the restoration of the power and influence of the orthodox church, the Mahāvihāra Nikāya. He also brought into existence, probably for the first time, a code of regulations for the guidance of the Bhikshus. From the time of Buddhaghosa upto the time of king Parākramavāhu, numerous Buddhist works by celebrated scholars were composed in Pali and Sinhalese. During the reign of Parākramavāhu the Great, a systematic compilation of sub-commentaries took place under the guidance of Kassapa Thera. After his death unfortunately there were again political unrests in the island. Within a hundred years, the Bhikshus were again disorganised, but the sāsana was again restored (1266 A.D.) with the help of monks brought from the Coja country in South India. Monasteries were again established and there was again activity in the cause of religion.

The reputation of the Saṅgha in Ceylon became so well established that towards the middle of the 15th century when Burma was faced with a crisis of the cessation of valid ordination, the reigning king of the country sought the help of the Mahāvihāra in Ceylon for restoration of the Sāsana. From Burma at a later period the ordination of this Nikāya was carried to Siam. “The connection of Burma at this period has an important bearing on the fortunes of the Saṅgha fraternity and of Buddhism in Ceylon. For through these embassies the books that existed in Ceylon were taken to Burma, Siam and Cambodia and the Mahānikāya was established in these countries, which
helped Ceylon to get back the books and the ordination at a subsequent period when ordination had disappeared in the island and books were lost.29

In about this time the Portuguese arrived at the island and established a fort in Colombo, besides introducing Christianity into the island. The then reigning king Bhuvanekavāhu III (1552 A.D.) allied himself with the Portugese and brought ruin not only upon himself but also upon the religion. But a still more severe blow came from king Rājasingha I. He did havoc with the monks and monastic establishments. The king of Kotte with whom the Potuguese gained influence also pursued more or less the same policy. The king of other provinces also turned against Buddhism. But with the arrival of the Dutch in the 17th century conditions took a better turn. Their attitude was more conciliatory towards the religion and the subsequent kings were able to devote their times and energy to restore the status of Buddhism. During this time a great man arose in Saranaṅkara who was a Sāmaṇera as ordination had disappeared in the land. He made known to king Śri Vijaya Rājasingha (1734 A.D.) that the religion of the Buddha had deceased in the island because the order of the Bhikshus had become extinct. He prevailed upon the king to bring out a mission of Bhikshus from Siam for the restoration of the order. The Siamese mission started for Ceylon but the voyage was eventually abandoned. Saranaṅkara persisted in his attempt and finally prevailed upon the succeeding king Kittisiri Rājasīha to send another mission to Siam. This mission was cordially received by King Dhammika of Siam who sent Upāli Thera with a chapter of Ten Bhikshus and the order was eventually restored in Ceylon and Saranaṅkara was appointed Saṅgharāja, the head of the Sangha. In 1815 the island came into the possession of the English who pledged for the protection and maintenance of the Buddhist religion.

X. Siam30

The Buddhism of Siam belongs to the Theravāda school. The Siamese belonged to Thai family of a South Chinese people. The history of Thai rule in Siam may roughly be described as a succession of three kingdoms with capitals at Sukhothai, Ayuthia and Bangkok respectively.

The Southern regions of Siam came into contact with Buddhism at a considerably early period. The eastern coasts in India had intercourse not only with Burma but also with the Malaya Peninsula. Epigraphic evidence proves that the reign of Ligor came into contact with Buddhism as early at least as the 4th and 5th centuries A.D. and it is only probable that Siam was also touched by this wave of Indian religious expansion. In fact, some of the ancient sites of Siam, e.g. Dvāravatī have yielded sculptures and other antiquities that are either frankly Buddhist or are affiliated to Buddhism. An
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inscription of about the 4th century found in Kekah and another of the 7th or 8th century from Pra Pratom, both contained the well known-Buddhist formula of causation. The latter inscription and also one from Margui seem to be in mixed Sanskrit and Pali.

In an important inscription found at Sukhothai and now preserved at Bangkok and probably datable in about 1300 A.D. it is stated that the Siamese kingdom of the time extended on the South to the sea as far as Ligor and on the west to Pegu. From the same inscription we derive the knowledge that the court and the inhabitants of Sukhothai were devout Buddhists regularly observing the *Vassa* and the festival of *Kathina* and also that there were several arch monasteries, many Buddha statues and Buddhist relics. The form of Buddhism described seems to have differed little from the Hinayanism found in Siam to-day. In any case, it seems that at least during this period the Siamese were acquainted with Pali Buddhism. Whatever may have been the earlier form of Buddhism and wherever we may trace the source of the religion of earlier times, there seems to be very little doubt that when the Thai poured into Siam the religion was a certain kind of Hinayanism which in all likelihood was imported from Burma. We all know that towards the middle of the 11th century Buddhism in Burma received a new infusion of life and spread over very quickly to the Shan estates and it is not altogether impossible that it found its way to the not very distant kingdom of Siam. In a subsequent period "the Siamese recognised the seniority and authority of the Sinhalese Church by inviting an instructor to come from Ceylon, but in earlier times they can hardly have had direct relation with the island. A Khmer inscription composed in 1361 or a little later shows that the reigning king learned both in Buddhist and Brahmanical lore was a cosmopolitan in religious practices. In 1361 he had a *Śaṅgharāja* learned in the Piṭakas brought from Ceylon. He was received with great honour and became eventually the head of the Buddhist Church. Two other inscriptions apparently datable in this period refer to the importation of a branch of the Bodhi tree from Ceylon and certain Buddhist relics, probably from India, which were all installed with great solemnity. To this date may also be referred series of engravings on stone illustrating about one hundred *Jātakas*.

Towards the middle of the 14th century the seat of power in Siam was transferred to Ayuthia where we have several gigantic images of the Buddha and the ruins of numerous Buddhist establishments. A curious inscription engraved on an image of Siva found at Sukhothai and dated 1510 A.D. asserts, however, the identity of Buddhism and Brahmanism. At Lophburi we have some ancient buildings which were originally constructed for the Brahmanic cult were later on adapted to Buddhist uses. Ayuthia continued to be the capital of Siam until 1767 when it was sacked and ruined by the Burmese who, though Buddhists, did not scruple to destroy and deface Buddhist temples, establishments and statues. Phaya Tāk Sin, a Chinese in origin, repulsed the Burmese attack, made Bangkok the seat of Government but was soon deposed in 1782 by Chao Phaya Chakkri who established a new
dynasty. This king convoked a council and had the whole Tripitaka revised by monk scholars and built a hall in which the texts were preserved. During the reign of one of his successors, Mongkut who spent 26 years as a monk and then became King, Buddhism in Siam received a new lease of life. During the reign of his successor, Chulalongkorn, an edition of the Buddhist Tripitaka was published and printed in Siamese type.

XI. Burma

Tradition ascribes the introduction of Buddhism into Burma to Asoka. Four centuries later, in the 3rd century A.D., Chinese evidence points to the existence of Buddhism in a place called Lin-Yang which may be tentatively identified with a place in Burma. With the 5th and subsequent centuries we are on surer grounds. Epigraphic records provide us henceforward with definite evidences of a flourishing state of Pali Buddhism in the metropolis of the kingdom of the Pyus, Hwawan and old Prome, indicating at the same time a very intimate intercourse of Lower Burma with the Kadamba-Coja countries of South India. Buddhist records, in Sanskrit have been found in old Prome pointing to a very close relation with the Magadhan countries of Eastern India. Epigraphic records are supplemented by quite a good number of Buddhist monuments and sculptures and terracotta tablets which have been unearthed in old Prome and are datable from the 6th to the 10th and 11th centuries. All these evidences point to a resurgence of the religion in the old kingdom of Prome in about the beginning of the 5th century.

In 1057 A.D. took place the fateful invasion of Thaton by Anawrata. The story of this invasion really indicates a very flourishing state of the religion in Lower Burma. The story of the religion now centres round Pagan where the royal dynasty and gradually the people found in the Theravada imported from Thaton, a purer and simpler faith, a religion with a more direct appeal and a fresh message of deliverance. The religion slowly but steadily secured a solid ground and spread far and near on all sides. Hundreds of Buddhist monuments and monastic establishments came to be erected and embellished with Buddhist sculptures and painting. Even during the reign of Ambadatta the fame of Pagan as a centre of the Theravada faith was so well established that she exchanged religious gifts with Ceylon, with which she came gradually to be linked up in all matters concerning the religion. The clergyman of Burma looked up to the brotherhood of Ceylon as the source of all inspiration. This attitude of the Burmese brotherhood was in reality responsible for the introduction of the Sihala Sangha in 1181-82 A.D.

The Sihala Sangha gradually established itself also in Lower Burma. The splitting up of these two sanghas into various factions naturally led to
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the degeneration of the religious order. A movement for reform was successfully initiated by king Dhammaceti of Pegu in 1472. The Ceylonese brotherhood again came to the aid of the Burmese church and Dhammaceti’s reformation practically led to the final triumph of the Sihala Sangha.

But Theravāda was not the only form of Buddhism in the country. Probably Sarvāstivāda, on the evidence of Sanskrit Buddhist epigraphs as well as on that of I-Tsung, was another form prevalent in about the 7th and 8th centuries A.D. Some sort of Mahāyānism and Mahāyānist Tantricism had also penetrated into upper Burma. Towards the end of the 17th century the church in Burma began to show signs of slackness of discipline and of transgression of rules by individuals and groups within the order. The order divided itself into two factions which came to engage themselves in a long struggle. The story of the religion in the 18th century is the story of this struggle but eventually the orthodox school won and again the word and spirit of the original teachings of the Buddha were strictly adhered to.

The dawn of the 19th century saw the introduction of the Amarapura school or Burma Sangha (Burmese order) in Ceylon. This event may be interpreted as the first return gift of Burma to Ceylon. About 60 years later two deputations from Ceylon came to Burma to receive valid ordination from the Burmese fraternity, and Burma was thus able to return the gift Ceylon had made in the 15th century. The last figure in the history of Buddhism in Burma is that of Mindon-Min who brought another triumph for the orthodox Buddhist church in Burma. Mindon-Min observed with regret that laxity in monastic discipline was much in evidence. He wanted to enforce the disciplinary code of the monks and thought it well to impose a vow enjoining strict conformity to Vinaya discipline and eventually acted up to his thought.

In 1885 the English occupied Mandalay and thus came in possession of the whole of Burma. It signalled the termination of the old order of things and the beginning of the new.

XII. Indo-China

(Champa and Kamboj)

The earliest trace of Buddhism in Indo-China is indicated in a Sanskrit inscription palaeographically datable in the 2nd or 3rd century of the Christian era and found not far from modern Nhatrang. One cannot say definitely that it is a Buddhistic inscription but from some phrases and ideas used in the inscription it can more or less definitely be ascribed to Buddhistic inspiration. But more definite information about Buddhism in Champa is traceable not earlier than the 9th century. In the second quarter of that century.

a Buddhist of Pāṇḍurāṅga, Samanta by name, dedicated the monasteries and temples to the Jina and Siva. This indicates a very close association of Buddhism with Saivism which remained up to the end as one of the salient features of Indian religious life in Champa, as in other places of Indo-China as well as in Java and Sumatra. The growing importance of Buddhism is affirmed by the foundation of the great monastery of Lokeśvara, a pious work of King Indravarman II. In 902 A.D., a Mahāyānist sthavīra set up another Lokeśvara monastery and in the foundation charter one finds a clear resumé of the Mahāyānist theogony. All these inscriptions prove definitely that Mahāyānism was the prevailing form of Buddhism in Champa. At the end of the 12th century a King of Pāṇḍurāṅga boasted of practising the Mahāyāna Dharma and erected in the district of Buddhakaloka an image of Buddha Lokeśvara. Even as late as the 2nd half of the 13th century a fragment of inscription begins with the invocation “Om Namo Buddhaya” proving that Buddhism was not extinct even at that time. The ruins of Champa have yielded a large number of bronze and stone statues of Buddha Lokeśvara and Prajñāpāramitā. A number of clay medallions bearing images of the Buddha and Lokeśvara were picked up in the caves of Northern Annam.

But it is only likely that Mahāyānism in Champa was preceded by Hinayāna period. According to him, the Buddhists of Champa in the 7th century A.D. belonged to the Ārya Sammiti School and there were also a few followers of the Sarvāstivāda School. But the evidence of I-Tseng is open to doubt, for the pilgrim never visited Champa and there has not been found any archaeological evidence to support his contention. Towards the end of the 15th century Champa was seized by the Anāmites who burnt down the capital and took possession of the whole kingdom where they introduced a debased mixture of Mahāyānism.

Funan, a great empire that had its centre of power in the modern territory of Cambodia, is known to us only through Chinese historians. The hey-day of its glory occupies the first five centuries of the Christian era. As in Champa so also in Funan Saivism and Buddhism peacefully existed side by side. I-Tseng testifies that the people of the country were mostly worshippers of Devas but later on Buddhism came to flourish there. By the time the pilgrim wrote his account a wicked king had expelled and exterminated all Buddhists and there were no members, of the Buddhist brotherhood at all. Sākyya Nāgasena, who went to the court of China as an ambassador in 484 A.D. saw a Buddhist monk. The Bhikshus of Funan went to China for the translation of the holy books of Buddhism, among them were Saṅghapāla and Mandrasena.

In the south of Funan the Malay Peninsula was essentially a Buddhist country. The inscriptions found in Ligor and in the province of the Wellesley prove that in the 4th century A.D., there were some important Buddhistic centres on the coast. Inscriptions discovered on the south of the Isthmus of Kra dating from the 8th and 9th centuries prove that the religion was con-
tinued in those countries. One of these inscriptions commemorates the construction of three Caityas in honour of Bodhisattva Avalokiteśvara, Vajrapāṇi, and Buddha in 775 A.D.

Towards the middle of the 6th century the Kambojas came into prominence and overthrew the kingdom of Funan. An inscription of 664 A.D., praises two eminent Bhikshus of the realm. Another inscription of the same period refers to the worship of Maitreya Avalokiteśvara and the Buddha. Lokesvarā who is often associated with Vajrapāṇi and Prajñāpāramitā was a very popular Buddhist divinity in the Mahāyānīst pantheon of Cambodia. Tantrism seems to have exercised very little influence upon the Khmer cults although several images of Hevajra have been found in the ruins of Angkor; cult of Bodhidruma was also a popular one. Sūrjavarman I who probably belonged to the Buddhist religion as is shown by his posthumous name Paramasūryavijaya was probably indirectly responsible for the first Khmer inscriptions found at Lophburi in Siam. One of these inscriptions makes a distinction between the Sthaviras and Mahāyāna Bhikshus. It is, however, probable that the regions round Lophburi were the meeting ground of Mahāyānism of Cambodia. The Khmer kings had to abandon their capital in the course of the 15th century and their disappearance marked also the disappearance of Hinduism and Mahāyānism.

XIII. Java-Sumatra-Bali

The trace of Buddhism in Java is available in the accounts of Fa-Hien who visited the island in about 413 A.D. The Chinese pilgrim states that in that country there were many Brāhmaṇas but that the Buddhist religion was not of sufficient importance. Prince Gunavarman of Kashmir who turned the Buddhist missionary, visited the island in 423 A.D., but we do not know how far he succeeded in preaching religion in the island. Towards the end of the 6th century Central Java rose into importance which lasted for about two centuries. Towards the middle of the 8th century Java, especially Central and Western Java, passed from the hands of the Śaiva rulers into the control of a Mahāyānīst dynasty from Sumatra, known to historians as the Sailendras of Śrīvijaya, who had a mighty empire extending over the Malay Peninsula and Central Java besides Sumatra. These Sailendras were fervent Buddhists professing the Mahāyāna faith. The temple of Kalasan in Central Java was erected by one of their kings in honour of the Mahāyāna divinity Tara in 1778 A.D. The magnificent monument of Barabudur in Central Java also was the the work of the Sailendras. Towards the end of the 7th century I-Tsing had visited Sumatra and described it as a great centre of Hinayāna learning; but evidently after I-Tsing it had become a great stronghold of Mahāyāna Buddhism under the patronage of the

Sailendras who had extended their supremacy over Central Java as well. In the 10th century a Buddhist temple was constructed at Negapatan near Madras at the expense of a king of the Sailendras with the permission of a Coja Prince Nalanda. A copper plate of Devapāla records the grant of some villages by the Pāla sovereign of Bengal for the upkeep of a monastery at Nālandā which was built at the instance of Balaputra-deva of the Sailendra dynasty out of devotion to Buddhism. Dharmapāla the famous Guru of Nālandā passed his last days in Sumatrā. Under the Pala kings the Mahāyāna doctrine flourished in Bengal and Magadha as they did nowhere else in India and it was Mahāyāna tinged with Tantrayāna. We find exactly the same blend of Buddhistic and Tantric doctrines in Sumatrā, Java, and to some extent in Cambodia. The earliest Mahāyāna inscriptions of the Śrī Vijaya kings in Java are also written in South Indian Grantha characters but in a Central Indian script almost exactly like that of the 9th century inscriptions discovered at Nālandā.

All sorts and varieties of Mahāyāna, Vajrayāna, Bodhisattvas and Śaktis, Adi-Buddhas, Dhyāni-Buddhas, etc., have come to our view and iconographically they follow the Eastern School of Indian art. The study of Buddhistic literature in Java is proved not only by the discovery of important Buddhist texts but also by the sculptures of Barabudur and other religious monuments which presuppose a wide range of knowledge in its various branches. The later phases of Mahāyāna Buddhism in India are also met with in Java especially in Eastern Java. We may note in particular the adoption of Hindu gods in Buddhist Pantheon, the introduction of minor and miscellaneous divinities, of Tantric mode of worship etc.

Towards the middle of the 10th century the Śaiva princes who had been ousted from Central Java and had settled in Eastern Java, won back their lost territories from the Sailendras and there was a Śaivite revival in Central Java which, however, was soon abandoned. The scene now shifts to modern Java where it took some time for Buddhism to establish itself. The famous image of Prajñāpāramitā now in the Leiden Museum is ascribed to the second quarter of the 13th century to the reign of Ken Arok. To the middle of the 14th century belong the curious inscriptions of Ādityavarman, a prince of Sumatrā, who was a relation of a vassal to the Queen of Madjapahit, the centre of royalty in eastern Java. The language of these inscriptions clearly shows the prevalence of Tantric doctrine in Sumatrā and Java. After his death Ādityavarman was supposed to be identified with Avalokiteśvara. In this connection may also be mentioned the Tantric practices ascribed to Kretanāgara by Prapañcha. The Nāgar-kretāgama also refers to the Tantric chakra rites diligently carried out by Kretanāgara.

In the reign of Hyam Wuruk, there was a set of royal officials called Bhūjaṅgas or learned priests. They were Brahmanical as well as Buddhistic. The Nāgar-kretāgama gives a detailed account of the capital city, namely, Madjapahit. In the southern part of the city lived the Buddhists, the head
of the Saṅgha was Sthavira Rengkarnedi. Contemporary sources seem to point out that Buddhism flourished mostly in aristocratic circles; this explains the large number of fine Buddhist shrines which arose during this period but the religion does not seem to have entered much into the life of the people. Javanese literature is Brahmanical. Buddhism could not make much headway in Bali, and though the religion still survives in the island, Hinduism is in the ascendant.
YASNA HĀ XI.—HŌM YAST *

By

ERVAD MANECK F. KANGA

(1) The three righteous (creatures), the ox, the horse and the haoma, openly utter imprecations. The ox curses the Zaotar: "mayest thou be childless and followed by disrepute, who dost not distribute me when cooked, but thou makest me fatten for the belly of the wife, or of the son or of thy own.'

(2) The horse curses the rider: "mayest thou not bridle race-horses, mayest thou not mount race-horses, mayest thou not drive race-horses, who dost not demand (any feat of) strength from me in the much-attended festival meeting of the country thronged-with-men.'

* Chapters IX-XI of Yasna Literature, which comprise the Hōm Yast are specially recited in preparing the Haoma as part of the sacrifice. The term Haoma which is the same as the Vedic word Soma, is used in a double sense in the Avesta. In the first place it is the name of a yazata occupying a definite place in the Avestan Pantheon. In the second place it is the name of a Plant of magical and healing properties used in the Yasna Ceremony. Now-a-days only a few dry twigs of the Plant are used by the Parsi priests for the purpose.

1. Afrivacah—adj. lit. 'speaking benedictions'; here used euphemistically in the sense of "pronouncing curses, maledictions" (BARThOLOMÆ ALTIRANISHES Worterbuch, 331). The Pahlavi rendering āfrin-gobishnir and Skr. version āśirvacāsā are both used here euphemistically and this is quite obvious from Pahlavi and Skr. glosses: "they pronounce curses". Cf. Pahl. "ku nafrin kunand" and Skr. "kila śapān kurvanti" resp'y. For Av. word āfrī—meaning 'curse' see Sitzungsberichte der philos. philol. und historischen klasse der k. Bayerischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, München. 1868. 2. 536.

2. The chief priest entrusted with the recitation of the Gāthās; he conducts the religious ceremonies usually with seven subordinate priests called 'ratav's'. This name is a relic of an Aryan Age, for it is also found in the Veda, where it appears as Hotar. (Air Wb. 1653). He is the representative of the priestly class.

3. Adj. meaning 'cooked'. The Pahlavi version curiously translates it by X'-āstak, Ir. hēr meaning "wealth, riches." This passage indicates that the custom of offering animal sacrifice to Hōm was prevalent in the period of the Later Avesta.

4. gen. sg. instead of dat. sg.

5. Av. pourumaiti. loc. sg. from pourumant—'having or containing many'; hence 'much-visited, attended' (BARTH. Air Wb. 901). The Pahlavi version curiously translates it by "vas mat ēstēnd" as though av. suffix maiti. is derived from √gam—to come.

6. Av. Karshū—subs. fem. 'cultivated land, agricultural borough from √karsh—to cultivate, to till (Air. Wb. 458). Pahlavi version incorrectly translates it by "kartīr" meaning "doer, performer" as though the word is derived from √kar—to perform. SPIEGEL reads karshyo and translates "family-circle." ERVAD KANGA translates "a meeting, a thick crowd" (Dictionary p. 129).
(3) Haoma curses the partaker: ‘mayest thou be childless and accompanied by infancy, who dost keep me, when I have been pressed, in custody, like a thief sentenced-to-death. I who (am) Haoma, the righteous, warding off death, am not one-sentenced-to-death.’

(4) The Holy Father Ahura Mazdā has assigned to me, the Haoma, as a portion the cheek with the tongue and the left eye.

(5-6) Whoso deprives me of that portion viz. the cheek with the tongue and the left eye, or steals it or takes it away, which the Holy Ahura Mazdā gave me, never in this house will be born a priest, neither the warrior nor even the prosperity-bringing agriculturist; but in this house will be born the Dahaka, mūraka as well as the varsha of various sorts.

(7) Quickly cut off the portion of the ox for the most powerful Haoma. May Haoma not bind thee just as he bound the wicked Turanian Frangarayan who was surrounded by iron in the middle third part of this earth.

(8) Thereupon Zarathushtra spoke: ‘Obeisance (be) unto Haoma, created by Mazdā! Good is Haoma created by Mazdā! Homage (be) unto Haoma!’

(9) When from us comes one, those which have come to us from your are two, three, four, five, six, seven, eight, nine and ten.

(10) I dedicate to thee, O Righteous. Asha-increasing, Haoma! this body which appears to me beautiful, for Haoma’s energetic intoxication, for good life and for the possession of the highest claim. Mayest thou grant me, O righteous Haoma, warding off-death! the heaven of the holy, bright and all-comfortable.

(11) At will and desire, Thou, O Ahura Mazdā, rulest over Thine own creations: at will, the waters, at will the trees and at will all the good

---

7. frērēnaot—Imperfect 3rd pers. sg. from V ar—with fra-prefix = he assigned, he bestowed. (Air Wb. 185.) The Pahlavi rendering is franūft, from caus. inf. franāftan, "to go forth, to take a course". Av. word ar—has various meanings: (1) to move (ii) to grant, to allot & (iii) to stick. Here the Pahlavi translator has derived the av. word from the stem ar—to move.

8. The names of Davaic Creatures; they are the antitheses of the Ahurian priests, warriors and agriculturists. The Pahlavi translator translates the av. word dakhakāca by "dakhshak-kāhenitār" meaning "the diminisher of sign" and explains in the gloss "ke dakhshak i Ohrmazd bē kāhenēt" i.e. "who diminishes the sign of Ohrmazd". I compare dakhaka, subs. mas. with av. dahāka and translate "men of the type of a-dahāka". The Pahlavi rendering of av. word mūrakacha is mūtak-kartār, meaning "making weak, destructive", This is further explained by the gloss thus: Chich tapāh bē kunēt i.e. he destroys everything. Of av. maodhano-kara in yas. IX. 32, where the Pahlavi translator translates "mūtak-kartār". Av maodhanōkara (Air. Wb. 1109) means voluptuous, lascivious, preparing lust. The word mūtak is the Pahl. rendering of av. mrūn "destructive" in Vend II. 22. Av word varsha—is curiously translated into Pahlavi by varzītār. See BARTH. AIR. Wb. 704, 1189 and 1380.

9. Reference to the subterranean iron fortress of Afrāisyāb, where he took shelter after being defeated by Kay Husraw. It is known in the Shāhnhāmeh as Hang-i Afrāsīāb. Cf. Ābān Yaṣṭ. 41.
(creation), the seed of Asha. Make you (O Ahura Mazda!) the righteous one powerful (but) the wicked without power.

(12) May the righteous (man) be ruling-at-will, but may the wicked be without-free-power, defeated, suppressed\textsuperscript{11} and thrown-out from the creations of the Holy Spirit. (May he who) turned away\textsuperscript{12} (from the Religion be) without-free-power.

(13) Even I who am Zarathushtra, shall incite the leaders of the houses, villages, countries and provinces to think in conformity with, to speak in conformity with and to act in conformity with this Religion, which is of Ahura, revealed by Zarathushtra.\textsuperscript{13}

(14) I pray for affluence and ease to the world of the righteous, and distress and difficulty to that of the wicked.

(15) I praise good thoughts, good works, and good deeds through thought, through word and through deed. I hold fast all good thoughts, good words and good deeds. I renounce all evil thoughts, evil words and evil deeds. I dedicate unto you, O Holy Immortals, worship and praise, with thought, with word, with deed, with the impulse of the soul, with the very life of my body. I praise righteousness.\textsuperscript{14}

10. Av. havanghva, sub. n. "good life, blessedness" which is translated into Pahlavi by hu-okh vih. This is further explained by the commentator in yas. Hā LXII. 6. 17. as nēvak-dīlih pa+chyān vitarg. Vendīdād Fargard XVIII. 6 adds a gloss to this word thus: tak-dīlih pa+chyān vitarg, meaning "courage on the Chinvat Bridge." Dr. DHALA reads vindagarirh "acquisition" which is wrong. From a comparison of these glosses it follows that the word nēvak-dīlih and tag-dīlih are one and the same.

11. Hamistō. BARTH. (AIR. Wb. 1778) takes it as perf. part. pass. of ham + √maēd and translates "thrown down" "defeated". In Pahlavi version of Hōshbām it is translated by "hamistārih" antagonism, opposition. (DILHAR khurtak Avistāk p. 13.)

12. Vare tō (var. varatō) nom. sg. of vare ta, adj. "captive, captured, taken, driven away as booty. BARTHOLOMÆ translates "surrounded, i.e. deprived of free movement", deriving it from the stem var—to surround. Pahlavi. pa vartāš.


14. This section is known as "Frasutυγ-prayer", which is written in the Gāthic style and dialect. Spiegel remarks that this section has nothing in common with this Hā, but that it forms a sort of prelude to the yasna Hā XII, which deals with the Confession of Faith of a Zoroastrian. Note that this Hā XII is also one of the pieces written in the Gāthic Dialect. We have the Pāzand version of this section with some additional glosses, which forms part of the first karda of the Patēt Pashēmāni.
PRATYABHIJṆĀ AND ADVAITA

ABHINAVA'S MAHOPADESA-VIŅṢATIKA AND ŚANKARA'S
NIRGUNA-MĀṆASA-PUJĀ

After a critical examination of the Paramārtha-sāra-saṅgraha of Abhinava-gupta in its relation to the Āryā of Seṣa in NIA, 1. 1. pp. 37-72, Prof. S. S. Suryanarayana SASTRI observes: "The conclusion reached here has a significance not confined to the Paramārtha-sāra. It is possible that more than one Pratyabhijñā work has derived from Advaita sources." One more Pratyabhijñā work of this nature, deriving, though in part, from an Advaitic minor work, is the minor poem of Abhinava called the Mahopadeśa Viṇṣatika edited by Dr. K. C. PANDEY at the end of his book on Abhinava, (pp. 407-408, Chowk. Series, Studies I). Of these twenty verses of Abhinava, the verses 13 to 18 forming the latter part of the poem are more or less completely taken from a minor poem ascribed to Śankara called variously Nirguna-māṇasa-pujā, Atma-pujā, Parā-pujā and so on.

This minor work of Śankara is printed as Nirguna-māṇasa-pujā in volume 18 of the Complete Works of Śankara of the Vanī Vilas Press, Srirangam, but in this text there are a few omissions. The two Stotra Collections of the Gujarati News Press of Bombay give this work as Nirguna-māṇasa-pujā and the texts here are full. (Bṛhat-stotra-ratna-hāra, part 2, pp. 801-3 and Bṛhat-stotra-muktāhāra, part 2, pp. 424-427). The text comprises two parts, the first being the pupil’s questions as to how one could do the ritual of worship in the case of the one, attributeless and all-comprehending Atman, and the second part being the teacher’s answers setting forth a scheme of ‘ideal’ worship. Abhinava takes the former question-part and incorporates it in his work with an introduction, a few elaborations and a brief finish, of his own. When we examine the ms of this work of Śankara we find that it is available in a shorter version also containing the former question-part only, but with a verse or two at the end containing a brief reply or explanation. We also see that the name of the work varies with each ms almost.

In the Tanjore Descriptive Catalogue, No. 7400 is the same work, but called Šrīatma-pujā and containing only the answer portion. This is the BURNELL Ms noted by AUFRECHT on p. 75ib. of his C.C., I. In the Descriptive Catalogues of the Madras Government Oriental Library, No. 8610 gives, like the Tanjore ms, only the latter answer-part but calls the work Atma-mānasika-pujā; No. 8611 in the same Catalogue represents a ms of the whole work with both the question-part and the answer-part, but the work is here named Atma-lingārcana; the next number, 8612, in the same Catalogue, contains only the former part of question and is described in the colophon as Daksīṇāmūrti-mānasā-pujā (vidhi), and this last is the same ms as noted by AUFRECHT in C.C., III. p. 52b, Sg. I. 112. In the Triennial Catalogues of the same Madras Library there are two more mss, Nos. R. 1419 (n) and 1419 (o). These two texts contain only the answer-part with a few lines at the end by way of answer. The former of these two mss is called Atma-pujā and the latter Nirgunaśtaka-pujā. The readings of these two mss agree with those known to Abhinava; and the concluding verse of the latter, R. 1419 (o), seems to be the germ out of which the first 12 verses of Abhinava’s Mahopadeśa-viṇṣatika have grown. We have the same work of Śankara in the Atma-lingā-pujā-paddhati in HALL, p. 132.

The 7th verse in the text in ms R. 1419 (n) describes this worship as ‘Parā
pūjā', and this expression is retained by Abhinava in the last verse. In the Bhāt-stotra-ratnakara of the N. S. Press and in the first part of one of the Stotra Collections of the Gujarati Press, this shorter version is printed with the title Parā-pūjā. Aufrecht notes also a ms. of this work with the name Parā-pūjā. (B. iv. 68. C. C. I, 327a).

I give below the correspondences between the latter part of Abhinava's Mahopadeśa-viṁśatika and the former part of the Nīrgūṇa-māṇasa-pūjā of Saṅkara, showing also the differences which are only slight.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MAHOPADEŚA-VIṂŚATIKA</th>
<th>NĪRGŪṆA-MĀṆASA-PŪJĀ</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>अक्षरस्य कुठो चायां 12c.</td>
<td>Additions of Abhinava.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>निरूपणस्य च नाम किम 12d.</td>
<td>same 2a.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>पुण्यस्यावाहनं कुठ 13a.</td>
<td>same 2b.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>सर्वोदयस्य चालनम् 13b.</td>
<td>same 2c.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>स्वच्छं घातकं च 13c.</td>
<td>same 2d.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>शाश्वस्य च 13d.</td>
<td>same 3a.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>निर्मलस्य कुमतस्सस्मात 14a.</td>
<td>तारो किं विषोदरस्य 3b.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>वर्धः विषोदरस्य च 14b.</td>
<td>same 4a.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>निन्दितयस्य कुठो गमय 14c.</td>
<td>same 4b in Madras ms. R. 1419 (o);</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>रम्यस्यामलं कुठ: 14d.</td>
<td>same in R. 1419(n) but 3d here. In</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>निरालम्बयोपवीतम् 15a.</td>
<td>the printed texts we read as 4c-d:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>पुष्करं निर्वाचनस्य च 15b.</td>
<td>निर्विवेकस्य का मूला कोज्जिकेऽनिराकृतिः ।</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>अभ्राणस्य कुठो धूपः 15c.</td>
<td>same 4c in R. 1419 (o) and same 3c in</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>चकुद्दीनस्य दीपकः 15d.</td>
<td>R. 1419 (n), but in the printed text we</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>निर्भवस्य मैत्रेयम् 16 a-b.</td>
<td>have 3c-d:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>तामः च कुठो बिभोः:</td>
<td>अमोरस्य त्वमात्येऽकुस्सस्य पवीतिकम् ।</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>प्रदक्षिपणनन्तस्य 16c.</td>
<td>same 4d in R. 1419 (o); 4b in R. 1419 (n).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4b in printed texts:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>अभ्राणस्य कुठो धूपः: 5a in R. 1419 (o).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>निर्भवस्य कुठो धूपः: 4c in R. 1419 (n).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>निरालम्बयोपवीतम् कि धूपः: 5a in printed texts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>चकुद्दीनस्य दीपकः: 5b in R. 1419 (o).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>अभ्राणस्य दीपकः: 4d in R. 1419 (n).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>दीपेषिन्द्रीसः सर्वसाधिकं: 5b in printed texts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>same 5c-d in R. 1419 (o).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>निर्भवस्य मैत्रेयनिधिकम् 7b कुठ: ।</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>तामः च किं विषोदरस्य: कुठ: 5a-b-c in R. 1419(n).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>निरालम्बयोपवीतम् कि भवेदिह ।</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>विधातन्त्रिविद्युतस्य कि तामः च प्रक्षिप्तते ॥</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5c-d and 6a-b in printed texts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>same 7a in R. 1419 (o).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>same 6c in R. 1419 (n).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
THE UTTARA KĀŚI PILLAR INSCRIPTION OF GUHA.

This inscription was discovered at Uttara Kāśi in Tehri-Gharwal, by Paṇḍit Chiddur Chidhure Maṭha Virabhadra Sarma of Secunderabad (Deccan), who took an impression of it and has published some preliminary notices. The inscription is engraved on the dhvaja stambha before the temple of Śiva at the Uttara Kāśi. The pillar is called a Sakti stambha in the inscription and was erected to commemorate the victories of the ruler Guha. The pillar is now called a triśūla and current legends assert that Śiva’s triśūla after the destruction of Tripurāśura, was established in this place.

The inscription is engraved in late Gupta characters of about the sixth century, but earlier than the Banskhera grants of Harṣa. The language of the inscription is Sanskrit and the florid Kāvyā style of the record is reminiscent of the Allahabad inscription of Hariśeṇa and the Mehrauli inscription of Candra. The metres used

---

1 Vibhūti, 1939; Journal of the Telugu Academy, 1999.
are Sārālā-vikrīḍita and Srāgdarā. The text begins with the symbol for Om. and ends with the letter tha (ॐ).

Text.

Om Aṣād ṣaḥ kṣitipuruṣa Gaṇeśvara iti prakhyāta kirtiṁnarāhaṁ
Cakra yena Dhavasya veśaṁ himavacchānāṁ ācchhyām diśām paramakṣaṁ
Kṣiraṁ Vanajākṣiṁ pavaṁpanaṁ sūryaṁ bhūgyaṁ śrīyam
Vāsū teśaṁ suhiṁtvam utsukamanā yātāḥ SuMarvālayam
Pratyaśyaṁ mahābhūjo vipuladāk śīnmatārasthākāṁ
śrīyāṁ tvāyaṁ nayanā anāṅga dhananda Vīśāntitōdgaṁ
nāṁnā Śrī Guha ityudāra caritaḥ saddharmo dvūyasā satōṁ
śaktim śatranimamāt māraṁ śāyamānadhuraḥ śarāṅgagataḥ
Prātaḥ prātaṁ mayākśaṁ uruhir aviralam śāvaram dhūmsā dhvaṁ
ntamoghnāṁ nāḥaṁ śārāṅgakāra parikarōdāra śārodaratvam
svambimbaṁ citraṁ bimbāmbara talaśilakam yuvadarkho vidhate
tāvat kirtis sukirtiś ciramariyathānasyāstva rājñāḥ sthūreyam.

Summary.

There was a ruler named Gaṇeśvara whose praises were sung by men and who erected the resplendent temple of Bhava, high as the peak of Himavat. This forest-ruler (vanajākṣa) considering all his wealth (including amāṭya etc.) as less than an atom and remembering the friendship of Indra, went to Sumeru with a cheerful mind. After him, his son, Guha by name, strong-armed, wide-eyed, broad-chested, who had surpassed Manmatha, Kubera and Vyāsa in good looks, charity and nāya respectively, leading a gracious life and engaged in righteous activities, made this śakti (pillar) in front of Sambhu, to frustrate the ambition of the enemies. As long as the sun exists destroying darkness, like an ornament in the heavens, so long will remain the good fame of this king, who was the destroyer of his enemies.

This Gaṇeśvara, who was the ruler of the forests (unless vanajākṣa is a mistake for manujākṣa) may have been an āṭāvika rāja as indicated in the inscription of Samudra Gupta. As is well known Samudra Gupta is said to have uprooted the kings of Aryavarta and to have been served by all the rulers of the forests.

Rudradēva Matila Nāgadatta Candravarna
Ganapatināga Nāgāśe-Acyutanandā Balavarma-
ādyanēka Arvāvarta rāja prasabhiddhāraṇarād-
vṛtta prabhāva mahatathāḥ; parīcārikītā sar-
vāṭavika rājasya.

Ganapatināga however cannot be identified with Gaṇeśvara of the present inscription, though the names appear to be similar. The Allahabad inscription is far earlier and moreover Ganapatināga is a ruler of Aryavarta and is distinguished from the āṭāvika rājas. The present inscription does not mention the servitude of either Gaṇeśvara or Guha to any other paramount ruler. Ganapatināga’s coins have been found at Narwar and Bhusnagar. K. P. JAYASWAL assigns him to c. 315-340 A.D. and says he is the author of the Bhāva Sataka. But WINTERNITZ has rejected the reading Gajavaktra Śri and says that JAYASWAL’s conjecture is baseless.

The āṭāvika rājas of the Allahabad inscription are usually taken to mean the forest-chiefs of the south. Dr. Roy CHAUDHURI points out that Āṭāvika may be the equivalent of Alavaka (Ghazipur?) and the forest territory near Dabhāla. Sandhyākara Nandin in his Rāma Carita mentions Kōṭṭāvī. Rao Bahadur K. N.
Dikshita with reference to Kota Kulaja of the Allahabad inscription mentions the find of Kota coins in north-east Rajputana and Delhi, while Rapson mentions coins with the legend "Kota" near the Sarvasti region. The connection with Kotas of Nilagiris in the south seems to be far fetched. But in the Allahabad inscription the atavika rajas are mentioned soon after the rulers of Uttarapatha and before the southern rulers, implying that they belonged to the Himalayan regions. Therefore it may be conjectured that the ancestors of Ganeshvara may have paid tribute to the Guptas, but in the sixth century Ganeshvara seems to have thrown off the allegiance after the decline of the Gupta power.

Ganeshvara is said to have been the friend of Sakra. Yuwan-Chwang mentions one Buddha Gupta (Fo-to-kio-to) who was the son of Sakraditya. Sakraditya is identified by some scholars with Mahendraditya i.e., Kumara Gupta I (413-456 A.C.). But the paleography of the present inscription seems to prove the impossibility of the contemporaneity of the Ganeshvara and Kumara Gupta I. Therefore the natural meaning of Sakra as Indra should be accepted.

Another point of interest is in the mention of Kubera and Vyasa as well known for renunciation (tyaga) and Naya. Kubera as far as is known is a hoarder and not a dispenser of wealth. Vyasa's proficiency in naya may refer to Vyasa Smriti, quoted by Aparartha and the Smriti Candrahika. But it is doubtful whether the Vyasa Smriti is so old and it is more probably a reference to the Rājaniti portions of the Mahabharata.

Mysore. S. Srikantha Sastri.

VAMADEVA-PAD-ANUDHYATA

Verse 66 of the Malkapuram inscription of Saka 1183 (A.D. 1262) runs:—

अष्ट दुपशेखरमालपदितपदोक्त वामशिवरूपः ।
अग्हापि कलकुशीशा वचरणाराक्ष: प्रशस्यन्ते ॥

The predecessor's predecessor of this Saiva pontiff Vamasaambhu was Sadbhava-śambhu who founded the Golaki-matha in Dāhala at the time of Kalacuri Yuvarāja (I or II). Vamasaambhu was therefore very probably a contemporary of Karṇa. Some early Cālukya grants, moreover, prove that a king was sometimes mentioned as padanudhyāta of (or, by) his religious teacher. Considering all these facts, we thought that the identification of Vamasaambhu with Vamadeva of the passage Vamadeva-padanudhyāta found in the inscriptions of Kalacuri Karṇa and his successors is now proved beyond doubt, in spite of the royal titles attributed to Vamadeva. I tried to explain the significance of these titles in my paper in IHQ, IV, p. 96 ff., in which a few suggestions of Prof. H. C. Raychaudhuri were also incorporated.

In A Volume of Eastern and Indian Studies in honour of F. W. Thomas, p. 152 ff., Prof. V. V. Mirashi has offered a new suggestion regarding the problem. He refers to an inscription at Saugor, which is placed about the middle of the eighth century on grounds of paleography. According to Prof. Mirashi's reading, this epigraph refers to King Shankaragapa who was padanudhyāta of (or, by) Vamaraśādeva (previously read by Hiralal as Vagharaśādeva). This Vamaraśādeva has been identified by the Professor with Vamadeva mentioned in the Benares grant (1042 A.D.) of Karṇa and several later Kalacuri inscriptions. It is however difficult

6. JRAS. 1898.
to believe that Vāmarājadeva of the Saugor record was remembered after full three
centuries by Kārṇa and his successors who called themselves Vāmadeva-pādamudhyātā
in their records. We know of no such thing from the epigraphical literature of ancient
India. This difficulty therefore has got to be explained. I am afraid, Prof. Mirashi’s
suggestion cannot be accepted without further evidence.

Calcutta.

DINES CHANDRA SIRCAR

KOVIDĀNANDA WITH KĀDAMBĪNI OF ĀŚĀDHARA

Day by day the Ujjain Oriental Mss. Library is becoming a store-house of pre-
cious jems. Starting as an infant institution with only 676 MSS. in 1931, it has secur-
ed over 600 MSS. of Sanskrit, Arabic, Persian and other modern Indian languages.
Recently it purchased a collection of MSS. from a local Pandit in which there are
several unpublished works on literature and other sections of the Sāstras. The
Kovidānanda is one of them. Notices of this work of Āśādhara are found in
Catalogus Catalogorum of Theodore AuFRechT and the published edition of the Sāhī-
tyaśarpaṇa by Kane but no reference to the existence of this work is found in any of
the Oriental Libraries in India. From the information given in the works noted
above, it appears that there were two authors of the same name. The first was a
Jain author, his father and grandfather being Sallakṣṇa and Cāhāna respectively. He
belonged to Vyāghreravāla varṇa and compiled अव्यक्तगहड्योग, कान्यालंकारटीका, प्रह-र्गवित etc. and his supposed time was about 1200 A.C. The author of the present work
prepared कृतस्यांस्तकारिका, दीका, ब्रम्हीकरण and अवैवर्गविपक्क besides कौविदानन्द, and
therefore appears to have flourished in the 17th century; for, Appayya Dikṣita’s sup-
posed time was between 1520 to 1592 A.D. (History of Dharmāsāstra, Vol. I, by
Kane, p. 680).

The MS. is dated Saka 1733, Kārtika, bright fortnight, Tuesday the 5th i.e.
1811 A.D., the 22nd, of October and is legibly written on Straw-paper in fine black
ink by one Rama Kṛṣṇa Kadambara—the ancestor of the present holder Hari Sāstri
Kalamaka of Ujjain for his own use and is therefore 128 years old. It is only in
16 leaves and is of the size in 10” × 4½”. Half an inch space is left for margin. The
text is written in the middle space of the page while the commentary is given on
either sides of the text. Red pigment is used for marking the number of ślokas,
colophons etc. There are no mistakes committed by the scribe. The Commentary
mentions the following works and authors: शूचिवाचिक, निरूक, विवेकोश, अमरकोश,
Pāṇini, शिशुपालव, प्रतिशास्त्र, कुमार संस्क, कृत्यकाल, बासपदीय, महामथ, शिवताविषेक, कान्यालंकारण, अभिधानविनतामणि, छांडोपयोपनिपत, सकोटवाद, व्यास, वामन.
Quotations from unknown Smṛtis are also recorded. The language of the author’s
Kādambini is easy to understand and is a good production of the text which
only defines three powers of a word, viz. अभिभा, क्षण and व्यज्ञा. ‘मग्यां घोष:’
used generally as an example for indicating and suggesting the different meanings of
powers by other authors, is altogether absent in this work and its place is taken up
by a new similar example रेख्या ओळकारिलम. The following is a table showing the
number of Ślokās of chapters:

|   | अभिभा परिचय | नम्बर ओळकाः 51 |
|   | क्षणा    | नम्बर ओळकाः 32 |
|   | व्यज्ञा    | नम्बर ओळकाः 42 |
In this way there are altogether 125 verses. The Kārikās are easier than those appearing in other works such as कामक्रियाकलाप or साहित्यदर्पण and the idea is expressed by the author commenting on the मंगलाचरण verse. The MS. begins thus:—

Com:—

श्रीमद्बुद्धदेवासृष्टिः गुहन्तः नमः || धी: ||

प्रणवम् शंकरे सार्वेन कोषिद्रानंदनांमकं ||

श्रंच्च व्यास्यामि संस्कृतपाठसहूऽन्तः कोषिद्रानंदे नमः || । ॥

अधानं श्रद्धायारसंहारस्वतितायामायेः: यत्री: प्रेषित आशामयस्यान्तः कविः संस्के तुषिणुऽपि

कोषिद्रानंदमयायमेव किर्त्त्वन्त विषयोपतेन पुनस्यनिःशास्त्रायं मंगलमाचारविवेचनो नमः || तिनयः॥

Text:—

तिनयमलसयाचारधारेऽ: भद्याननन्दनः

सतसतसतसयाचारधारेऽ: कुटस्तततितिरिनीतः

ज्ञाति जगति व्याकुलवेषोज्वाकृति नामनी

पुनरि दयाततेन्दरम: सकालनिरोधस्त: || ॥

प्राच्यो वाचो विशारे श्रद्धायारसंहारस्वतितायामायेः

करोमि कोषिद्रानंदं सक्षमावलिते || ॥

End of the text:—

श्रद्धायारसंहारस्वतीमायेः परंश्रद्धायाममेव

श्रद्धायारसंहारस्वतीमायेः कृतसतसतसयाचारधारेऽ: || ॥ ॥

श्रीवस्ती भक्तव्यास्यामि समवासिनिः

भौनीर्धृष्टि रामलिङ्गम् आसीतिः

तत्तूमनायारसंहारस्वतीमायेः

स्त्रं: कुटोऽपि सुधिः सुदेवस्तु || ॥

इति तुनीवयारसंहारेः: ||

End of the Com:—

श्रद्धायारसंहारेः || श्रीवस्ती: कंतायोग्यक: यथान्तर भगवानमभायकारः || एकः श्रद्ध: समपकृष्णः

क्षणें मर्यं ब कामसुभवति || ॥

अंते श्रीवस्तीः मंगलायः || ॥

Colophon:—

इति अमिताभयामायां रामलिङ्गः भवायारसंहारः भव विनितायां कांदनी असमाधायां

स्वकृतकोषिद्रानंदम् व्यासायां व्याज्ञानपरिवर्द्धितृतीयम् || ॥

इति पुस्तकं कर्तव्र रामचुन्योन शस्त्रे

१७१३ कार्ती [ लि ] क छुद पंचमम् भीमे जंसूरसिः लिखितं || उरामय नमः ||

There is a slight difference in the colophon for the word ‘पारावरीण’ is found added in the colophon given at the end of the MS कुवल्वान्तः कारिकायाक्ष्यम् by the same author (B. O. R. L, Poona, Cat. of Alankāra, p. 176). The MS. is in a fine condition and deserves publication. The author gives no clue as regards his residence but the following verses in the text attributed in describing the present river Narmadā and its adjacent sacred temple of Śrī Omkārēśvara clearly tell us that he
was a resident of that place which was somewhere near to it, i.e. in Nimar. These
verses are given below:—

\begin{quote}
\textcolor{red}{\text{\textit{वर्ण्यम्}}} रेवायो शोभरः दिने दिने।
\textcolor{blue}{\text{\textit{यत्}}} प्रभुः पदितः: तन्तत्त्वादि गयः करम्।
\textcolor{green}{\text{\textit{प्राणाम्}}} संति रेवायो यत्नः: प्रविष्टति यत्।
\textcolor{purple}{\text{\textit{प्रदोषे}} जनसद्वाचे शंभावं: किंचितं च।}
\textcolor{orange}{\text{\textit{रेवा}} बारीसा लेमाली नुष्मिता यया पाद्या।}
\textcolor{cyan}{\text{\textit{चन्द्रः}}} से देश ईयत्र पोहुतुस्तुकं प्रतीयते।}
\end{quote}

In the 15th verse of the last chapter the author definitely describes his inability
of proceeding to Benares as a lone person and says that his last wishes can be fulfilled
here at Omkārāsva. The verse reads thus:—

\begin{quote}
\textcolor{red}{\text{\textit{एकादिना}}} मया काशी गंतु शक्यः कथं द्विजः।
\textcolor{blue}{\text{\textit{तदर्शिवर्द्धारिंच्छा}}} सन्निधे रज गम्यते।}
\end{quote}

It can clearly be seen from the verse and others in Chapters I & II that he
was a staunch devotee and lover of Śrī Śiva and Goddess Bhavānī.

\textit{Ujjain.}

\textit{N. V. Athaley}

\begin{center}
\textbf{PURVĀCĀRYA SAMJNĀS FOR LAKĀRAS}
\end{center}

The ten Pāṇinean Lakāras are:

(i) द series—लट, लिट्ट, लट, नट, लट, लोट।
(ii) ध series—लट, लिट्ट, लट, लट, लट।

These names appear to be \textit{pāṇini-utpajña}, but they were preceded by \textit{samjñās}
which perhaps had a better claim to express the tenses and moods they indicated.
The earlier terms belonged to the category of \textit{anvartha-samjñās}. It is not a little
significant that some of these should have been employed by Kātyāyana himself
though the Pāṇinean terms were well-known to him. They were as follows:—

1. लट—अवनती
Kātyāyana, III. 2. 123. 1; III, 2. 102. 4; III. 3. 133. 5.
Kātyāyana, II. 3. 1. 11.
Kaiyāṭa explaining III. 2. 123 says—अवनतीति लटः पूर्वाष्वाभिन्द, and the same
is repeated on III. 3. 133. 5 and II. 3. 1. 11.

2. लिट्ट—परोज्जा
Patañjali on I. 2. 18 quotes a \textit{sloka-vārtika} in which the older \textit{samjñā}
is used.

3. लट—अस्तन्ती
Kātyāyana on III. 3 15, has a \textit{vārttika} in which the older term is
employed:
\textcolor{red}{\text{\textit{परिवर्तने}}} अस्तनी भविष्यन्त्य। \textit{Kielhorn, Vol. II. p. 140.}

4. लट—भविष्यन्ती
The \textit{vārttika} quoted above uses this \textit{samjñā} also.
5. I am unable to trace its earlier equivalent in the writings of Kātyāyana and Patañjali. The Atharva Prātiṣākhya edited by Pt. Visva Bandhu SASTRI, uses the term NAIGAMI (II. 3. 2) which is in all probability the name of Let.

6. This is also found in the Atharva Prātiṣākhya in sūtra II. I. 11 and II. 3. 21.

7. This samijñā is used in the Atharva Prātiṣākhya in III. 2. 5. The distinction between Svastani and Hyastani is brought out in the Pāñinean system by a single word anadyatana as applied to bhaviṣya and bhūta kālas. Patañjali in one place (ibid, Vol. II. p. 57) distinguishing the three tenses (kāla-viśeṣān) uses the terms adyatana, hyastana and śvastana.

8. I have not yet traced the older samijñās for the āśīṣ and vidhi links.

9. This samijñā is used both in Kātyāyana, II. 4. 3. 2, III. 2. 102. 6, VI. 4. 114. 3 and in the Atharva Prātiṣākhya, II. 2. 6. Adyatana is equivalent to sāmānya-bhūta. The Udyota remarks on II. 4. 3, 'प्राप्तनीति लृक्षः संज्ञा', and this is supported in clearer terms by Nyāsa, 'लृक्षः पुर्ववाचयणिता एवा संज्ञा।'

10. The pūrvacārya term for this mood is not yet available. The prevalence of these terms in Kātyāyana shows his adherence to a tradition other than that of Pāṇini and perhaps older than the great grammarian. The lengthy discussions by Kātyāyana on the pivot of Pāṇini’s sūtras frequently show that the Vārtikakāra did not confine himself strictly to the legitimate scope of the system with which he was primarily dealing.

Lucknow.

VāSUDeVA S. AGRawALa

TOCHARIAN AND THE INVALIDITY OF THE SATEM-CENTUM HYPOTHESIS FORMING A PARALLEL TO THE HITTITE AND THE RATHAS-PATĪS HYPOTHESIS

In my paper, "Postulation of two probable degrees of abstraction in the primitive Indo-European tongue in the light of compound accentuation",1 I have shown how unexpected and decisive confirmation for the theory of Holger PEDERSEN to explain the identity of the nominative and genitive singular forms of -a-stems of Hittite is furnished by my Ráthas-patīs-hypothesis. I have also drawn attention to the fact that what seems to be an actual demonstration of this has been given by H. PEDERSEN in his recent work2 which is in large part an argument against the Indo-Hittite hypothesis.3

One interesting feature about my hypothesis is, whether we accept the Indo-Hittite hypothesis or not, the proposal to interpret Răthas-pédī'g as containing the stem řātha- to which the genitive singular termination -s was added in prehistoric times most satisfactorily explains the curious phenomenon of -a-stems in the Hittite being identical both in the nominative and genitive singular. The -a-declension in the primitive Indo-European has been hitherto supposed by all scholars to have the genitive singular in -s(1)-o or (In Italic, Lingurian, and Celtic) in -p. Nevertheless Holger PEDERSEN, always distinguished for his original and challenging ideas, has made an attractive suggestion that the identity of the nominative and the genitive singular of the -a-stems may be an archaism in Hittite. Until quite recently, E. H. STURTEVANT was wavering between the theory of W. PETERSEN (already referred to) and that of H. PEDERSEN. The value of my hypothesis lies in the fact that it gives an external proof from the old Indian to H. PEDERSEN's theory.

Here is a parallel to the question of Tocharian and satem -centum hypothesis. It was shown by MEILLET that Tocharian cannot be assigned to the western group


7. See H. PETERSEN, Etudes Lituviennes, Copenhagen, 1933, p. 25.

8. For instance, Hittite atas at-at-as. In this connection, it is interesting to note that there is a Hindustani word attah whose spelling is ata but whose pronunciation is ah-tak. Cf. Amarnath JHA, some Indian words in the Oxford English Dictionary: The Khippuswami Sastri Commenoration Volume, p. 66.


10. MEILLET, Indo-Germanische Jahrbuch, Vol. I, pp. 14-17, 1914. OSTTIR joins to Thracian phrygian the language of the ancestors of Scythians (Prescythian), which Herodotus mentions in book IV, chapter XI. The "Crimean" or "Crimea" preserves still perhaps the remnants [see OSTIR, Illyro-Thraikisches Archiv za arbanasku starinu, jeziki etnologiju, i. (Beograd, 1923), p. 133]. VASMER, Die Iranier in Südrussland (Veröff des balt und slav. Instit, III, Leipzig), p. 4. FEIST, Kulturher Indo-Germanen, p. 404. This hypothesis appears necessary because of Tocharian and Hittite. Sometimes Phrygotharian is assigned to the satem group and sometimes to the centum group according to the exigency of materials. See OSTIR, Voridg, zahlte, p. 294, 290; E. HERMANN K. Z., 50, p. 307, 1922. J. POKorny, Die stellung des Tocharischen im kreise der idg. Sprachen in the Ber. d. Forschungst. f. Ost und Or. in Wien, III, p. 24 ff. But in Tocharian and Hittite the change of K, > k is certain, and the preservation of k, uncertain. In Tocharian, the change of K, > k in all cases is convincing; for example idg. g zew., A Kukmu "come, arrived," and A Kuml, can easily be considered as a weak form; idg. pek., A paku "cooked, done dishes" 2 a pāk "to cook" etc.; cf. also SCHRADER-NEHRING, Reallexion. "On ne se trompera saudadue pas beaucoup en attribuant au tokharian une place intermédiaire entre l'italo-celtique d'une part, le slave et l'armenien d'autre" [MEILLET,
of languages. Tocharian does not seem to differentiate between the primitive Indo-European palatals and labio-velars. We find I. E. -k (e) as -k in kante (‘hundred’), okt (‘eight’). In Miço (‘urine’) besides Gāthā-Avestan maēzaiti, (‘he urinates’)

Indo Germanisches Jahrbuch, 1, 1914, p. 17. Ostřík’s view nearly comes to this. Likewise in Hittite, the preservation of the labiovelar is at least uncertain and not ensured by the form Kuse— ‘who, which’ which is ambiguous. See Idg. Zahlw, p. 195.

**ISOGLOSSES.**

![Diagram of Isoglosses](image)

1 + 2 + 3: Central Indo-European (mere velars).
4 + 5 + 6 + 7: Satem languages (K, > K).
8 + 9 + 10 + 11: Centum language (K, > K).
1 + 2 + 3 + 9 + 10: languages with ending r.
9 + 10 + 11: languages with mixed preterite.
6 + 7 + 8: languages with augment.


11. For the theory postulating the existing of the quartet system in the primitive I. E. from the word for eight, cf. J. MCKENZIE, The quartel system in I.E. pp. 1-4. Leeds studies in English and Kindred languages, No. 6. 1937. J. MCKENZIE concludes the large number of elements both lexicological and morphological, common to I.E. and Uralian (i.e. Finno-Ugrian Plus Samoyede) forces us to conclude one of two things: either I.E. and Uralian are related or primitive Indo-European and primitive Uralian were in contact at an exceedingly early period. It is therefore highly significant that Samoyede presents an expression of ‘8’ as ‘2×4’ (thus identical with our postulated formation of I.E. oktō) [on account of analogy with this, even the original **séptm** has changed into *septm*. Cf. Hirt, Handbuch oles urgermanischen II. Feil. 1932, p. 107, which is quite anomalous from the Uralian point of view.” See J. MACKENZIE, Ibid. p. 4. Cf. B. COLLINDE, Indo-Uralisches sprachgut. A. S. C. ROSS, Bulletin of the School of Oriental Studies, London, Vol. VIII, pp. 227-34. With regard to the theory of the Dravidic origin of the octaval system, cf. Mark COLLINS, Dravidic Studies No. 4, 1926, Univ. of Madras: Depus longtemps on est convaincu que l’une des causes principales de l’altération de l’indo-européen primitif est le substrat, notamment en Europe qu’il s’est opéré fatalement un mélange de langue et de cultures. D’autre part, sans vouloir même parler de “œuvres sans doute géniale, mais renfermant trop de conclusions prématuros de M. Trombetti, des Savants, opérant d’après les méthodes les plus sévères voire même scrupuleuses, ont cru pouvoir rattacher à l’indo-européen les langues finno-ougriennes (avec le Samoyede) [Wiklund, Paasonen, Jokl], de même que le chami-to-semitique, peut-être avec plus de probabilité encore (Herm. MöLLER, Semitisch und Indo-Germanisch Konsonanten Teil I. Copenhagen, 1907. Die gemein-indo-germanisch-semitischen
palćalē ('a burning') besides Avestan brāzaiti ('it shines') and Greek phlégō ('I burn'), there is secondarily assimilation before original front vowels ĝ. Likewise in pîntē ('fifth') and in derivative of the relative-interrogative pronoun such as kupsre ('if') and kuri ('when'), the k is from the primitive Indo-European q* (k*).

In hakns is to be traced the perfect reduplication gʷ em (gʷ em) of the primitive Indo-European root gʷ (g*). There is secondary assimilation of I.E.qʷ (k*) in pîc pîs ('five'), cem ('he has come') etc. The I. E. labiovular and the original palatal came to be respectively represented by a sibilant and a stop sound in pčakā ('fifty') besides Sanskrit pañcāśat and Greek pentēkōn Tocharian being neither satem- nor the centum-language, Meillet's suggestion is that it probably lies between the two.12 "Like a very deep furrow there runs through the Indo-germanic Linguistic stock a dividing line, broken into capriciously by secondary shiftings, between the centum and satem languages. These shiftings have brought it about that we can no longer separate centum and satem from each other by a single line, as even centuries ago there were already centum languages in the satem area, and even further afield. ....... However much stress we lay upon the division into centum and satem languages, there are still other considerations which open for us still deeper perspectives, still wider vistas. Through the whole of the Indo-Germanic mother language, cutting across both centum and satem there runs another, older, much more sharply defined line of division, which proves that the Indo-Germanic mother language itself was already a mixed language."13


13. C. C. Uhlenbeck, The Indo-Germanic Mother language and mother tribes complex. American Anthropologist Vol. 39, 1937, pp. 388-386. C. C. Uhlenbeck thinks that the Indo-European Mother language was composed of two complexes of elements A and B. It is still an open question whether the correlation between
SOMMER\textsuperscript{14} has demonstrated that the intractable language Venitic retained the palatais as stop sounds and that in it there was no trace of a labialization of the velars. The Indo-European enclitic *\textit{qe} appears as Venetic *\textit{ke}.\textsuperscript{15} SOMMER suggests that it might have lost the labialization on account of its lack of accent (see SOMMER, \textit{Ibid.}, p. 122). But E. H. STURTEVANT has shown that it is probable that Venetic *\textit{Ke} represents the regular treatment of the Velars in that language. His arguments are as follows:—Both Messapian and Albanian are without trace of the labialization of the Velars. Messapian of southern Italy is an off-shoot of Illyrian, and Albanian possibly descended from Illyrian. Herodotus, 1, 196, included the Venetic among the Ilyrii, and their personal names correspond closely with those of Ilytii.\textsuperscript{16} How the Veneto-Illyrian and Hittite and Tocharian invalidate the Centum-satem hypothesis has been demonstrated conclusively by E. H. STURTEVANT.\textsuperscript{17} 

the A complex and Centum languages can be definitely established. But "The Uralian character of the A-complex and mesocephaly of the centum speakers stands unchallenged." Cf. C. C. UHLENBECK, \textit{Ibid.}, p. 393. Cf. also C. C. UHLENBECK, der-Indogermanesch der Indogermanen in Mededelingen der Koninklijke Akademie van Wetenschappen, Afdeeling Letterkunde, Amsterdan, 1935, Vol. 77, Series A No. 4. "As a matter of fact, it is possible to demonstrate that between A and centum there exists an anthropological affinity, which is lacking between A and satem or between B and centum" C. C. UHLENBECK, \textit{Ibid.}, p. 389. In this connection, it may be necessary if only in passing, to call attention to yet another problem. According to MEILLET [Essai De chronologie des Langues Indo-Européennes. La Théorie du féminin, pp. 1-28 (exp. p. 11). \textit{Bulletin de la Société de Linguistique de Paris}, Vol. 32, 1951. "En hittite, au l opposition de l animé et du neutre (inanimité) est nettement marquée, par les moyens qu'emploie l Indo-Européen commun, on n a pas, jusqu ici, trouvé trace d une castricité du féminin. Etant donné la conservation générale des anciennes formes nominales, il est difficile de croire que le hittite représente ici un état de langue où les caractéristiques du féminin auraient été déjà pleinement développées"], feminine gender is a relatively late development in the Indo-European. UHLENBECK does not subscribe to this view. As he says, NIEUWENHUIS' attempt to explain the origin of grammatical differentiation of the sexes on the basis of primeval sexual-totemic conceptions deserves serious considerations, if only in view of the possibilities which it opens up. UHLENBECK further thinks that the classification of nouns in the PIE should have been derived from the B language [C. C. UHLENBECK, \textit{Ibid.}, pp. 388-9.]. Holger PEDERSEN [\textit{Hittschisch und die anderen Indo-Europäischen Sprachen}, Copenhagen, 1938, pp. 13-18, 35 f. See E. H. STURTEVANT, \textit{Language}, Vol. 14, 1938, p. 290] also does not subscribe to MEILLET'S theory that the lack of the feminine gender is an archaistic feature in Hittite. He seeks with ample justification traces of the former presence of this gender in Hittite. So it is certain that in the PIE if not in the Proto-Indo-Hittite, the feminine gender should have existed.

17. See Language, 1926, Vol. II, p. 128. There is a considerable dispute over the question whether Messapic is a centum-language or a satem-language. Usually it is assumed that Albanian (a satem-language) is a modern representative of an ancient Illyric dialect and very often Messapic is compared with Albanian. But there is no doubt that the IE palatal stops were not represented by sibilants in Illyric. [See H. HIRZ, \textit{Indo-Germanen}, Vol. II, 1907, p. 609, and "Stellung des Illyrischen" in \textit{Festschrift für Kiepert}, 181 ff. 1894. Here Hirz criticizes Kretschmer's view]. In view of the fact that in Messapic, there is nothing corresponding to the labiovelars of the centum-languages, [Latin \textit{quique}, Greek \textit{pemptos}, Albanian \textit{pese}, representing the IE velar stops (\textit{penkue})] it is possible to surmise that the palatals in Messapic might have been accorded the same treatment as in the satem-languages. Suggestion has also been made that venetic belongs to a stratum of IE speech earlier than the cleavage into centum- and satem-dialects, on the high degree of probability of non-labialisation of the velars and non-sibilisation of the palatals in venetic [cf. CONWAY, \textit{Annual Brit. Sch. et Athens}, 8,152, 1901-2]. Accepting this view, Albanian may be taken as a descendant of an Illyric satem-dialect belonging perhaps to a later stratum of Indo-European speech. However, there are other explanations. [Cf. GILES in \textit{Camb. Anc. Hist.} 2,26] J. Whatnough, on the phonology of the Messapic dialect
Now the Centum-Satem hypothesis can be invalidated purely through the method of reconstruction of the primitive Aryan. Leonard Bloomfield has demonstrated that the Indo-European palatal sounds came to be represented by stop sounds in the earliest Sanskrit for instance I.E. $\tilde{g} (j)$ appears in Sanskrit as $j.$ H. Collitz advances the argument that the Indo-European $\tilde{g} (j)$ must have suffered some change before the Aryan change of $\tilde{g}^{\prime} (g^{\prime})$ to $g^{1} (j)$ before $e$ and $i.$

But this can be explained away by the assumption that the original $\tilde{g} (j)$ and $g^{\prime} (g^{\prime})$ before $e$ and $i$ were distinguished during the Aryan period by pronouncing the former further forward in the mouth than the latter. Thus the primitive Aryan seems to be a centum language as far as the treatment of the inherited palatals go. Since in regard to velars, it is a satem-language, therefore Brugmann’s argument that the classification of the I. E. languages according to the treatment of the palatal agrees with their classification according to the treatment of the labiovelars, falls to the ground. In other words, the reconstructed primitive Aryan itself invalidated the centum-satem hypothesis. Thus we have seen that even as the invalidity of the satem-centum hypothesis established purely through the method of reconstruction of the primitive Aryan alone gets confirmed by independent facts in Tocharian (in Veneto-Illyrian and Hittite as well), the râthas-pâtis-hypothesis is also verified by the unique phenomenon presented by the Hittite -a-stems where the nominative and genitive singular are identical, which is undoubtedly a feature of the oldest phase of the primitive Indo-European, if not of the proto-Indo-Hittite tongue.

Madras.

C. R. Sankaran.

ADDENDUM.

There can be no doubt that Hittite and Tocharian have retained old characteristics of the PIE. This is attested by the existence of the labiovelar in these two languages as against the loss of the labialization in adjoining territory. Evidence of the past existence of the labiovelars is thus undoubtedly furnished [cf. E. H. Sturtevant, Language, 6.224]. The palatal stops were developed from the older velars of the PIE, in the satem-languages which gave up also the labial element of the labiovelars of the PIE [cf. paper, NIA, Vol. I, 1939, p. 632]. H. Hirt came to the conclusion [H. Hirt, Zur lösung der gutturalfrage im Indo-Germanischen. Bezzzenberger’s Beiträge, 24, 218 ff. 1899, Idg. Gram. I. 233 ff.] that the palatal stops in the ie were secondary developments from the original velars. “We have only to assume that this change did not reach as far as the centum-languages of the West or as Hittite and Tocharian in the East. It was of central origin and failed to penetrate a large part of the ie territory in the one direction and comparatively small part in the other.” [Cf. Walter Petersen, Hittite and Tocharian, Language, Vol. IX, 1933, pp. 12-3]. As regards the Indo-European labiovelars and palatals, both Hittite and Tocharian reflect an older state of affairs. It must be here remembered that J. Kuryłowicz [Études indo-européennes I, 1905, Ch. I] advances cogent arguments for establishing definite conditions under which labialized velars must have occurred in the prehistory of the centum languages, but his thesis that the labialized velars arose quite independently in the centum languages very late does not seem to be tenable and
sound and it is a matter least susceptible of proof. [Cf. J. Whatmough, the development of Indo-European labiovelars with special reference to the dialects of ancient Italy. Mélanges Linguistiques offres à M. Holger Pedersen. Aarhus 1937, p. 47.] It is not easy to agree with Kurylowicz [op. cit. pp. 22-23] that the earliest phase of the primitive Indo-European had only palatals and pure velars and that it is even inadmissible to put on the same chronology the problem of labiovelar series with those of the palatal series. [See also E. H. Sturtevant, Language, 12, 1936, p. 141]. The identical treatment of IE explosives leaves us in no doubt as to the question of the early separation of Tocharian and Hittite from the parent language which must have taken place in common. [Cf. Walter Petersen, ibid. pp. 25-6].

Poona,

C. R. Sankaran.
REVIEWS

The Silappadikāram or The Lay of the Anklet, translated with an Introduction and Notes by V. R. Ramachandra Dikshitar, with a Foreword by Jules Bloch. Humphrey Milford, Oxford University Press, Indian Branch, 1939, Royal 8-vo, XI + 392. Price Rs. 15/-.

As Prof. Jules Bloch mentions in his Foreword this translation of a Tamil classic serves two purposes: it brings to scholars not familiar with Tamil its literary excellences in a readable form; it lays before historians source material which would otherwise be inaccessible to non-Tamil scholars. It is based on the edition of Silappadikāram by Mm. Dr. V. Swaminatha Aiyar.

The Sangam period in Tamil Literature is its Augustan age and Prof. Dikshitar demonstrates beyond doubt that the Sil. takes its legitimate place among the extant Sangam works and his own researches have shown its importance to the historians of South India. It also represents in a way the earlier musical and dramatic pieces which have been lost beyond recovery. The approximate period of its composition is assigned as the second century A.D. by Prof. Dikshitar.

In his learned introduction the translator deals with such topics as the story in the work, the place of Sil. in Sangam works, the date of Ceraṇ Sengūṭụvam and his achievements, an estimate of his character, Karikāla in the Sil., political conditions in Northern India of the period, and of South India, some features of the administration, geographical and religious data, social conditions, superstitions, traces of Aryan culture, etc. It is worthy of the scholar whose contributions to South Indian History are of outstanding merit.

As a piece of literature, as a romance, as a source book for history and sociology, the Sil. ranks among the best works produced in early India, and all historians and sociologists should be thankful to Prof. Dikshitar for his successful translation of this Sangam masterpiece, presented in beautiful print. For a work printed in India it is remarkably free from misprints and very excellently produced.

S. M. K.

Calendar of Persian Correspondence, Vol. VI, 1781—1785, 1938, Price 15-2-0.

The Imperial Record Department of the Government of India have recently issued the 6th volume of a very useful series of historical Correspondence known as the Persian Calendars, which contain an English summary of the vast amount of Persian letters that passed between the Company's officials in India and the numerous Indian powers. This Persian Correspondence gives a graphic inside picture of Indian politics and very materially supplements the historical information in numerous English papers already published by Forrest and other writers. This series commences with the year 1739, of which five volumes were already out and which had brought the story up to the year 1780. The present volume comprises an account of the transactions of the next five years, the culminating period of Warren Hastings' regime. A short introduction to the volume reviews the important events of this period and will be found suggestive and helpful by the reader in following the contents with interest and ease.

These five years cover the second half of Warren Hastings' administration and possess an absorbing interest in Indian history as they practically ensured the
establishment of British rule in India. The volume contains more than sixteen hundred (1600) letters that passed between the Governor General or his subordinates on the one hand, and the various Indian potentates and chiefs, such as the Emperor of Delhi and his agents, the Nawabs of Oudh, Bengal, Karnatak and Hydarabad, the Rajas of Benares and Nagpur etc. on the other. There are also many news-letters that came to the Government of the Company from the various Indian Courts. The work, it is understood, is to be continued to the end of the 18th century. When completed, it will indeed render a phenomenal service to Indian history.

Books of this kind are not expected to interest the general reader; they will be required mostly by the student-class in the higher grades of Universities. Thus their sale is likely to be very limited, particularly as the prices are rather prohibitive. Will not Government offer these Calendars to genuine students at some concession rates? If they do so, they will indeed earn the lasting gratitude of the poor Indian student.

G. S. SARDESAI.
NON-RGVEDIC MANTRAS RUBRICATED IN THE
ĀŚVALĀYANA-GṚHYA-SŪTRA : THEIR SOURCES AND
INTERPRETATION

By
V. M. APTE, Poona.

Introductory.

This study is an investigation into the sources and interpretation of all the mantras other than those taken from the RgVeda, liturgically employed in the Āśvalāyana-Gṛhya-Sūtra which belongs to the RgVeda. The connotation of the term Mantra is here extended so as to comprise all kinds of liturgical formulas viz. mantras from Sarhītās other than the Rg-Veda, passages from the Brāhmaṇas, Yajus, Praśas, gāthās etc.

Only a very small number of such mantras have been traced to their sources in Professor STENZLER’s edition of the Āśvalāyana-Gṛhya-Sūtra in the Indische Hausregeln, Leipzig 1864’ (Abhandlungen der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft III Band No. 4) and the translation of the work by Professor OLDENBERG in the Sacred Books of the East, Vol. XXIX. In the other editions of the Āśvalāyana-Gṛhya-Sūtra viz. the one with the commentary of Gārgya Nārāyaṇa in the Bibliotheca Indica (Calcutta 1869), another with a translation in Marathi by LOKAHITAVADI, Bombay 1880, a third with the commentary of Gārgya Nārāyaṇa, the Gṛhyaparıśiṣṭam and Gṛhyakārikās (second edition by Bhavanishankar SUKHITANKAR, Bombay 1909), a fourth one with a Marathi translation by Nana Yadava TAKLE, (2nd edition by Mahadeo Gangadhar BAKRE, Bombay 1915) and the fifth with the commentary of Haradattācārya edited by T. Ganapati SASTRI, in the Trivandrum Sanskrit Series No. LXXVIII 1923, not even an attempt is made to trace such mantras to their sources.

The Āśvalāyana-grhya-mantra-Vyākhyā edited by K. Śāṃbasiva ŚASTRI in the Trivandrum Sanskrit Series No. CXXXVIII (Śrī Citrodgamanājari No. XXVII) 1938, is a Sanskrit commentary on the mantras employed in the Āśvalāyana-Gṛhya-Sūtra by Śrī Haradattamiśra and it was expected that it would throw some light on the sources of obscure and untraced mantras. But as regards ‘sources’ the commentator quotes Saunaka :

“Anukṛṣṭastu yaḥ kaścit kalpe’tha brāhmaṇe’pivā |
mantraḥ padyo’tavā gadyo Vāmadevyāraṁ nibodhata ||”

[Whenever a yajus is cited in Kalpa or a Brāhmaṇa text, Vāmadeva is to be taken as the Ṛṣi or author thereof]. A number of early Vedic texts have been published since (i.e. in the period of time following the editions of Professors
STENZLER and OLDENBERG, to date) and more aids in the form of concordances, indexes etc. are now available. I am, therefore, in a position to make the humble claim in the following pages that nearly every non-RgVedic Mantra cited in the Āsvalāyana-Grhya-Sūtra has been traced as a whole or in parts to some definite early source. This problem, I regret to say, has not received the attention it deserves from scholars because in the many excellent editions of Grhya Sūtras that have been published till now, the matter has but rarely been taken up with any zeal. This is all the more regrettable in view of the fact that after allowing for mantra variations in the different Vedic Schools we find a fair residuum of Grhya mantras common to nearly all the extant Grhya Sūtras and that therefore a very thorough-going attempt in connection with one Grhya Sutra would have helped similar attempts in connection with other Grhya Sūtras. To take but one instance, in the very scholarly edition of the Vārāha-Grhya-Sūtra by Dr. RAGHU VĪRA (published by the University of the Punjab, 1932), Appendix II gives a mantra index in which "Such of the mantras as are not to be found in the Vedic Concordance or as show some variations therefrom are marked with an asterisk" (p. 54), but the problem is taken up no further, probably because it was not part of the original scheme. A number of mantras marked thus in that edition whose variants are employed in AG.* I. 7. 3. 6 & 13; I. 17. 6 & 7; I. 21. 1; I. 24. 32 etc. have been traced to their sources in the following pages.

In view of this almost general neglect of the valuable mantra-material (non-RgVedic, I mean) in the Grhya Sūtras, a few exceptions being the edition of the 'Mantrapāṭha', by Dr. WINTERNITZ, the edition of the Jaiminiya Grhya-Sūtra by Dr. CALAND and that of the Vārāha Grhya-Sūtra by Dr. RAGHU VĪRA, a special study of such mantras in the Āsvalāyana Grhya-Sūtra is attempted in this paper, with respect to their interpretation and especially their sources in earlier Vedic literature.

The term 'sources' has been used here in a special sense. In the matter of the liturgical employment of Mantras, a Vedic school did not regard as inviolable or unalterable, the text of a mantra which was not taken from the Samhitā to which it belonged! A large number of such formulas, besides, belonged to the common stock of Grhya tradition and was drawn upon by the different Grhya texts and all possible variations of what virtually is the same mantra, are found in these texts. Compare for example the formula 'imam aśmānam āroha' etc. quoted in AG. I. 7. 7 and the different versions of this same formula in SG. I. 13. 12; PG. I. 7. 1; APMB. I. 5. 1 and HG. I. 4. 1.

AG. I. 7. 7:— वर्षीय वर्षीयायामानमारोहयति "इममासमायायामारोहयथे लं स्थिरा भव। सहस्र पूवनायलोकस्थितिस्मिति पूवनायतः" इति । ७।

SG. I. 13. 12:— "एकसमायायामारोहयथे लं स्थिरा भव। अभि तिर्थ गुरुनायतः सहस्र पूवनायतः" इति दक्षिणे प्रपद्यनादमायानातः । १२।

* For abbreviations see p. 60 seq.
PG. I. 7. 1:—अथैनामस्मानमारिधस्यवुत्तरस्यकेदद्विःकिल्यायत्।  “आरोहे्मस्मानस्मेव लं धिष्ठत्र भव। अभिभवत् प्रूत्त्वलेवकर्ष्यस्य प्रूत्तात्” हितिः। ॥ ॥

APMB. I. 5. 1:—आति हेम ममबनामामियेव लं धिष्ठत्र भव। अभिभवत् प्रूत्त्वलेवकर्ष्यस्य प्रूत्तात्। ॥ ॥

HG. I. 4. 1:—कुमारसात्यापयति। “आधिशमामस्मानस्मेव धिष्ठत्र भव। प्रमृणिः हि दुरस्त्रस्त्रहस्य प्रूत्तात्।” हितिः। ॥ ॥

It is impossible, therefore, in many cases to point to any particular early Vedic text as the source in the sense that the formula occurs there in an identical form. The only aim of a Grhya text was to see that the formula it cited was suitable to the particular context in which it was employed and to this end, the utmost liberty was taken with the text of a suitable mantra occurring in an early text. A formula could also be improvised by joining together parts or lines of mantras drawn from different sources! Compare, for example, the mantra cited in our text AG. II. 9. 2, which is made up of one pāda “Ṛtena sthūnāṃ adhīroha Varma,” taken from AV. III. 12. 6a and another from RV. X. 18. 3i.e. “Drāghīya āyuḥ pratararāh dadhānāḥ”! Words of course, could be altered easily (compare the formula quoted in AG. I. 7. 6 where the last clause ‘jieva śaraṇā śatam’ has the dual ‘Jiveva’ which is not found in any of the numerous parallel passages though all the remaining words are the same everywhere!).

I have therefore, adopted the following procedure in the paragraph on ‘sources’ under each sutra. In the first place, an attempt is made to trace a mantra in the AG. to an earlier text where it occurs in an identical form. As, however, this is not always possible, a mantra or formula in an early Vedic text or failing that, a parallel Grhya text with the nearest approach in words and sense to the formula in our text as a whole is pointed out, if available, first. The formula is next considered part by part (whether it be a pāda or a line or a clause) and the ‘sources’ of each of these parts (in the sense of ‘passages or lines most closely allied in words and sense’) are pointed out, wherever available.

A survey of these sources reveals the following list of chapters or passages in early Vedic texts (i.e. Saṁhitās, Brāhmaṇas Āraṇyakas and Śrautasūtras), which treat of the same Grhya topics as are treated in the different chapters of the Āśvalāyana-Grhya-sūtra and which may, therefore, have influenced the latter. In certain cases, the identity of not only formulas but also of the sūtras in our text quoting them, with corresponding passages in these early texts, turns this probability into a certainty; e.g. for I. 3. 3 (the purification of Ājya) compare TS. I. 2. 1. 2 and VS. I. 31. For I. 7-8 (Kaṇḍikās treating of the marriage ceremony), compare AV. XIV. 2 (borrowing from RV. X. 85). For I. 10. 12 and 15 (the pārvaṇa sthāli-pāka) compare AV. XIX. 64. 2 and SB. I. 6. 38 respectively. For Kaṇḍikās I. 13-15 (rites connected with pregnancy and the birth of a son) compare KBU.
II. 8-10. For I. 17. 6, 7 and 10 (‘Caulam’ or the tonsure of the child’s head) compare AV. VI. 68. 1-3; for I. 17. 8-9 (the same topic) compare TS. 1. 2. 1. 1 and for I. 17. 16 (Caulam) and I. 18. 5 (the parallel ‘Godāna’ rite) compare AV. VIII. 2. 17. For I. 20. 6-8, (the ceremony of Upanayana) compare SB. XI. 5. 4. 1 seqq. For I. 23 (choosing of the Ṛtvijā) compare ĀPS. X. 1. 4, 10-14. For I. 24 (guest-reception with the Madhuparka), compare SS. IV. 21. For II. 6. 1-4 (mounting a new chariot) compare LS. 2. 8. 2, 6-8 seqq. For II. 8. 16 (house-building), compare AV. III. 12. 2. 6-7. For III. 1-4 (the five daily sacrifices, especially Svādhyāya), compare TA. II. 10-15. For IV. 1-3 (funeral rites on the death of an āhitāgni), compare SS. IV. 14. 17-35 and for IV. 8 (the Śūlagava sacrifice), compare SS. IV. 17.

This rapid preview of the sources of non-RgVedic Mantras in the Āsva-lāyana Grhya-Sūtra discussed in the following investigation reveals that Grhya passages and not merely mantras crop up in the most unsuspected places in the earlier or pre-Grhya-sūtra literature! Already in my monograph entitled “RgVeda Mantras in their ritual setting in the Grhya-sūtras with special reference to the Āsva-lāyana-Grhya-Sūtra”, I have shown that genuine Grhya Mantras in the Rg-Veda are not confined to its Marriage and Funeral Hymns nor only to its late parts as was supposed by Professor Oldenberg (S. B. E. Vol. XXX, Introduction : p. X seq.) but are scattered all over the RgVeda. The above preview of the sources of non-RgVedic Mantras has a similar story to tell. We find that among Sarhītās other than the Rg-Veda Sarhītā genuine Grhya-Mantras and passages and sections of Grhya origin are found not only in the Atharva Veda which is well-known as a treasure of Grhya verses but also in the Taittirīya and Vājasaneyi Sarhītās. Again, notable texts from this point of view are the ‘Satapatha’ among the Brāhmaṇas, the Taittirīya Aranyaka among the Aranyakas, the Kauśitaki-Brāhmaṇopanishad among the Upaniṣads and even the Śrauta-Sūtras of Śāṅkhāyana, Latyāyana and Apastamba among the Śrauta-Sūtras. Thus every phase of Vedic literature takes its place in this Grhya-pageant!

Secondly, as regards the interpretation of these Non Rg-Vedic Mantras, quite a number of them remain obscure in spite of the help afforded by the two Sanskrit Commentaries of Gārgya Nārāyaṇa and Hardattādārya and the German, English and Marathi translations mentioned above. Professors Stenzler and Oldenberg propose emendations in the text of a number of these formulas. In the majority of these cases, I have attempted to show that the emendations are unnecessary and that the Mantras admit of a natural and satisfactory interpretation just as they stand and have adduced parallel passages in support of the original readings they propose to emend unnecessarily in my opinion. Finally in the case of some formulas, I have given interpretations which are new and which in my humble opinion are more natural.

The plan adopted in the following investigation is this:—In the first paragraph is given the text of the sūtra in the AG. and the formula cited therein. The different parts, clauses or pādās of the formula are marked as (a), (b), etc. not only to facilitate reference but also because, for reasons stated already, the formula very often can be traced only in parts scattered in different earlier texts. Then follows my own translation of the sūtra and the mantra (which in many cases differs from that of Professors STENZLER and OLDENBERG). Next comes the paragraph on ‘Sources’ and I invariably state at the very outset, whether any such are pointed out by Prof. STENZLER or OLDENBERG. This is followed by a discussion of the text and interpretation of the formula if these offer any difficulties and of the emendations, if any such are suggested by Prof. STENZLER or OLDENBERG.

This whole material, therefore, I may humbly claim, is original except where Prof. STENZLER or OLDENBERG have made suggestions regarding the sources, these being invariably acknowledged in the proper places.

Sūtras in the text citing non-Rg-Vedic Mantras.

AG. I. 1. 4; ‘Yo nāmasā svadhvarā’ iti (RV. VIII. 19. 5n), (a) ‘Namas-kārenā vai khalvapi, (b) na vai devā nāmaskāramati, (c) Yajño vai nāma- iti hi brāhmaṇam bha vai

Trans: ‘He who (as) a good sacrificer (sacrifices to Agni) with homage,’ so (the RV. verse quoted above in Sūtra 3 goes on to say) ‘even through homage, indeed, to be sure (a sacrifice may be said to have been offered); (b) not beyond (the reach of) homage, (are) the gods surely; (c) homage, surely, is (itself) a sacrifice’ thus (runs) a Brāhmaṇa.

The wording of the passage gives the impression that these three clauses form part of a single connected quotation from some Brāhmaṇa. As a matter of fact the three clauses are syntactically separate and represent bits of Brāhmaṇa sayings, picked up at random because of their general unity of sense.

Context: The sacrificial character of the last two divisions of Pāka-yajñas viz. (1) the ‘Prahuṭas’ or those offered over something not the fire and (2) the ‘Brāhmaṇi-hutas’ or those offered at the feeding of Brāhmaṇas is established by the citation of the RV. verse, VIII. 19. 5 which says that a sacrifice may be offered not only by pouring an oblation into the fire but also by placing a fuel-stick on the fire or by knowledge or homage. This (so-called) Brāhmaṇa is cited by way of comment on the last pāda of that verse.

Sources: (a) & (c). No dictionary, concordance or index gives a clue. The nearest Brāhmaṇa passage that I could find to (a) and (c) is SB. VII. 4. 1. 20 (also IX. 1. 1. 16) where, in connection with a salutation to serpents, it is said “Namo nāma iti Yajño vai nāma, Yajñenaivēnān eton-nāmaskāreṇa namasyati.” When it is said ‘A homage! A homage!’—a homage, indeed, is a sacrifice—he worships them with a sacrifice when he worships them with homage (nāmaskāreṇa).

(b). The nearest approach to the words and sense of this part is found in GB. 2. 2. 1. 18 (pp. 117 & 118, ;—Na hi nāmaskāram ati devāh
"The gods are not beyond (the influence of) homage." A salutation to Prajāpati is the context. Very nearly identical is also the passage: SĀ. I. 5.

AG. I.3.3: “(a) Savitusṭvā prasava utpṇāy (b) achidreṇa pavitrena vasoḥ sūryasyā raśmiḥbhir iti prāg utpunāti, sakṛṇ mantrena, devīśnūn |

Trans: (a) "At the inspiration of Savitṛ, I purify thee, (b) with (this) purifier without holes, with the rays of the Sun—the Vasu (the Beneficent one)". With this mantra he purifies (the Ājya), (in an) eastward (direction) once and twice silently.

The context is the purification of the Ājya with two Kuśa blades as strainers as a necessary preliminary of all Gṛhya sacrifices whose general outlines are described in this Kaṇḍikā.

Sources: Prof. STENZLER compares VS. I. 31, a mantra employed at the purification of the Ājya in KŚ. 2. 7. 7 (not in KŚ. 2. 3. 31 as STENZLER states). This mantra is identical with ours except for the word ‘Vasoḥ’ in (b), which it omits. Part (b) with ‘Vasoḥ sūryasya’ etc. i.e. in a form exactly identical with ours, is traced to TS. 1. 2. 1. 2. where we have it after “Devastvā savitā punāt”, the context being the purification of himself by the sacrificer. As pointed out in the Introduction, the tradition of these Gṛhya-mantras admitted of different parts from different sources being fitted together, to make a mantra suitable to a particular context.

AG. I. 3. 10:—Tad esābhīyajña-gāthā īyate:—

‘Pākayajñaṁ samāsāya-akāyinya ekabarhisaḥ |
ekaviṣṭākṛtya kuryaṁ nānāpi sati daivate ||’

Trans: In this connection, the following sacrificial gāthā is sung. “If one has (before one, the performance of different) pākayajñas (at the same time), one should perform them with the same common Ājya, barhis and the same common Sviṣṭakṛt (oblations), though the deities (of these pākayajñas) may not be the same.”

The context is the same as before:—general rules for the Gṛhya sacrifices.

Sources: Kauś. VI. 34 has “Athāpi Ślokau bhavataḥ |” followed by two Ślokas, of which the second is our verse. Both the commentators—Dārila and Keśava (p. 21 Bloomfield’s edition: JAOS vol. 14.) remark that the Ślokas are from the Gopatha Brāhmaṇa; but in the existing edition of the Gopatha Brāhmaṇa (Bibliotheca Indica), the Ślokas are not traced! One can only hope that some manuscript of the Brāhmaṇa contains the two Ślokas.

AG. I. 5. 4: Aṣṭau pīṇḍāṁ kṛtvā (a) “Rtam agre prathamaṁ jajne, (b) tte satyaṁ pratiṣṭhitam | (c) yadiyan kumāry abhijātā (d) tadiyan iha pratipadyatām | (e) yat satyaṁ tad dṛṣyaṁ” iti pīṇḍāṁ abhimaṇtrya kumarīṁ brūyāt ‘Eśāṁ ekah gṛhaṁ’ eti |

Trans: He makes eight lumps of earth (taken from different places) and consecrates these lumps with the Mantra “(a) Rtam (the world-order ordained beforehand) was born in the beginning, the primeval. (b) On Rta
is established Satya (Truth or conformity of events to this world-order); (c) What this girl is born to (d) that she may attain here. (e) What the Truth is, may that be seen!” He then should say to the girl ‘Pick up one of these’.

Context: Śūtra 3rd enumerates the characteristics which a girl to be married, must possess. As these, such as intelligence, character etc. are difficult to ascertain, the procedure described in this Śūtra is adopted, so that the character of the origin (field, pool etc.) of the lump of earth picked up by her, may reveal her characteristics.

Sources: Clauses (c), (d) and (e) constitute Mantra-parts evidently improvised to suit the particular occasion and cannot be traced in early literature.

As regards (a) and (b), there are numerous passages in early Vedic texts containing the words ‘Ṛtaṁ’ and ‘Satyaṁ’, describing their mutual relation and their relation to the ‘world-order’ but there is none that is identical with ours. Very similar to our (b) is “Ṛtaṁ satye’dhāyi, satyaṁ ṛte’dhām” in TS. 7. 1. 18. 2 and “Ṛtaṁ satye’dhāyi, satyaṁ ṛte’ dhāyi” in TB. 3. 7. 7. 4, the context in both passages being the ‘Seasonal consecrations’. The latter part (in italics) of TB. 3. 7. 7. 4 meaning ‘Satyaṁ (Truth) was placed on Ṛta’ comes very near to our (b) in words and is identical in sense.

Among Śūtra-texts, the nearest parallel to our (a) can only be traced in GG. II. 1. 7 which reads: “Ṛtameva prathamam ṛtaṁ nātyeti kaścana | ṛte bhūmir iyaṁ śriyā.” TB. 1. 5. 5. 1 has also a very similar passage to this with ‘paramesṭhī’ for ‘prathamam’ and ‘Kiṅcana’ for ‘Kaścana.’ So TB. 1. 5. 5. 1 and the source of GG. II. 1. 7 (i.e. some early Sāmaveda text, as GG. belongs to the Sāmaveda) may be said to be the chief influences. The consecration of lumps of earth with a mantra describing Ṛta and Satya in our text is explained by the fact that VS. 11. 47 “Ṛtaṁ satyaṁ, ṛtaṁ satyaṁ” is a mantra to be recited while the lump of clay for the construction of the fire-alter, is held above the goat (one of the victims at the ceremony).

āg. I. 6. 3: “Sahā dharmāṁ caratam” iti prājāpatyāḥ,...... | ......
Trans. ‘Fulfil (ye) the law together’—(when) this (is said, it) is the Prājāpatya (form of marriage).

Sources: All the available parallel passages, support the reading adopted above. Baudhāyana I. 20. 3 has ‘Dharmāṁ cara’; Gautama Dharma-Śūtra 4. 7. has ‘Sahā dharmaṁ caryatām’; we read in the Manusmṛti. III. 30:— “Śahobhau caratāṁ dharmam” and Nārada Dh. 12. 40 has ‘Sahā dharmaṁ cara’, which are all formulas addressed to the couple or the bridegroom.

The commentator Haradatta pertinently remarks that although ‘fulfilling the law together’ is an essential condition of all marriage-forms, this special

1. Profs. STENZLER and OLDENBERG read ‘carataḥ’ (Third person dual of the Present Indicative) and translate accordingly:—“They fulfil the law together; this is the Prājāpatya” but I prefer the reading ‘caratam’ (Imperative, 2nd. person dual), of the Trivandrum edition which makes the part (in italics) a mantra addressed as an exhortation to the couple.
mention of the exhortation implies that the bridegroom is not to take a second wife, nor leave the householder’s life for any other Āśrama (or mode of life)—which distinguishes the ‘Prājāpatya’ from other forms of marriage like the Brāhma and the Daiva.

AG. I. 6. 8: “Hatvā bhittvā ca śīrṣāṇi rudatāṁ rudadbhyo haret” sa Rākṣasah ||

Trans: Should he carry her off (while she is) crying from (her) crying relatives after a smashing and breaking of heads, that is (the form of marriage called) Rākṣasa. Prof. OLDENBERG says (p. 167 footnote) “The text of this Sūtra seems to be based on a hemistic ‘hatvā bhittvā ca śīrṣāṇi rudadbhyo rudatāṁ haret’; comp. Manu III, 33”. This is an ingenious suggestion but it may be pointed out that the words of a Sūtra in our text as well as other Sūtra-texts sometimes just happen to be arranged in such a way as to give them quite unintentionally the appearance of a pāda or hemistic e.g. AG. I. 5. 1: “Kulam agre pariṣṣeta” is a perfect anuṣṭubh pāda! Besides, if such an Anuṣṭubh hemistic had existed, it should have been traced in late works employing ślokas, as it conforms to the model of the later regular anuṣṭubh.

That this shocking recognition of the ‘Rākṣasa’ mode as a form of marriage, without any apology, is a survival of a very ancient custom, has been shown in my monograph entitled “ṚgVeda mantras in their ritual setting in the Gṛhya Sūtras, with special reference to the Āśvalāyana-Gṛhya-Sūtra” (reprinted from the Bulletin of the Deccan College Research Institute), under AG. I. 8. 4: ‘jīvam rudanti’ iti rudatāṁ ||

AG. I. 7. 6: Pradaksinām agnim udakumbhāṁ ca trik pāriṇayāṁ japa: “(a) Amo’ham asmi sā tvam (b) sā tvam asy amo’ham (c) Dyauraham pṛthivī tvam (d) Śāmāham ṛk tvam (e) tāvehi vivahāvahai (f) praṇām praṇayāvahai (g) Sampriyau rocisni sumanasyamānu (h) jīveva śaṇadāḥ śatam”.

Trans: While leading her (the bride), round the fire and the water-pot, three times with the right side turned towards them, he (the bridegroom) mutters (a) “This I am, that thou; (b) that art thou, this myself; (c) the heaven I, the earth thou; (d) the Śāman I, the Ṛk thou; (e) come then (tau), let us marry; (f) (and) beget offspring; (g) dear to each other, bright and amiably-minded, (h) may we two live a hundred autumns”!

Sources:—(a) to (f). AV. 14. 2. 71 reads:—“Amo’ham asmi sā tvam, sāmāham asmi sā tvam, dyauraham pṛthivī tvam, tāviha sambhavāva, praṇām ajanayāvahai” which is equivalent to our (a), (d), (c), (e) and (f) in order. Our (b) is nothing but (a) with a transposition of ‘sā tvam’ and ‘amo’ham’, so its omission in the AV. passage is immaterial. Our ‘vivahāvahai’ in (e), for the corresponding ‘Sambhavāva’ in AV. is just an adaptation suitimg the exact context in the text. So this AV. mantra appears to be the source of our mantra-parts from (a) to (f). SB. 14. 9. 4. 19 has clauses very similar to ours from (a) to (d) cited as formulas for intercourse at a kāmya
rite aiming at the birth of a meritorious son. In a similar context in JUB. 1.
54. 6 ; 57. 4 appear formulas similar to our (a) and (b), But of interest is the
passage VIII. 27. 4 in AB. (which as a Rgveda-Brāhmaṇa is closely related to
our text) containing clauses similar to our clauses (a) to (e), the context
being the ‘selection of a Purohita’. Now, as Prof. KEITH remarks (p. 341
HOS. vol. 25.), there is a parallelism between this ceremony and that of
marriage. Our text gives evidence of this parallelism when both in I. 5. 1
(examination of the family of the bride or the bridegroom) and in I. 23. 1
(qualifications of Rtvigs to be chosen), it refers in identical terms “Ye
mātṛtaḥ piṭṛtaśceti yathoktam purastāt” to ĀŚ. IX. 3. 20, where are laid
down the qualifications of a priest to be chosen for partaking of a camasa at
the Daśapeya sacrifice.

Clause (g). For this, may be compared VS. 12. 57th as also TS. 4. 2. 5.
1v where the identical three words occur, the context being the throwing of the
Ukhyā fire (or the fire in the pan) on to the Gārhapatya hearth; the words
describing the mutual relation of the two fires thus brought together, are very
similar to the phraseology in our text.

Clause (h). There are numerous passages with nearly identical words
E.g. “Jivati śaradaḥ śatam” is found in RV. X, 85, 39th and AV. 14. 2. 24
63th; “Adhā jīvema” etc. in AV. 18. 4. 70th; ‘Jivāni’ etc. TB. 3. 7. 4. 10th;
“Jivāmi” etc. in TA. 10. 1. 8th and “Sa jiva” etc. in SB. 14. 9. 4. 26th and
in our own text in I. 15.3d, 9d but the dual ‘Jiveva’ that we have here is
nowhere met with! This is a very clear illustration of the liberty taken in
the different Vedic schools in the adaptation of mantras or parts of mantras
by alterations in words etc. to suit the particular context in hand!

ĀG. I. 7. 7.—Parihāya pariṇāyōasmānamārohayati :
(a) ‘imam aśmānamāroha, (b) aśmeva tvam sthirā bhava[, (c) Sahasva
prāṇyayataḥ, (d) abhitīṣṭha ṭṛtanyatāḥ” iti.

Trans: Each time he conducts her round, he helps her step on the aśman
(the lower mill-stone which plays an important part in the Gṛhya ritual, being
the counterpart of the pressing-stone of the soma in the Śrauta ritual) with
the mantra (a) “Mount on this stone; (b) like the stone be firm; (c) over-
come the opposing (enemies); (d) tread down the enemies”.

Sources: (a) to (c): In a note to AV. 2.13.4 (WHITNEY’s Atharva-
veda HOS. Vol. 7, p. 57), it is said that the Paippalāda or Kaśmirian
text of the AV. reads for that verse, (a) Imam aśmānam ātiṣṭha, (b)
aśmeva tvam sthirō bhava, (c) pramṛṇhi durasyataḥ, (d) Sahasva prā-
ṇyayataḥ.

The (a), (b) and (d) here, are nearly identical with our (a) to (c) with
the following variations:—instead of ‘sthirā’ in our (b) (addressed as the
mantra is to the bride) we have here ‘sthirō’ masc. because the mantra is
addressed to the male child, prayers for whose long life and welfare are con-
tained in that AV. hymn; our ‘āroha’ in (a), is a mere paraphrase of
‘ātiṣṭha’ in AV.; our (c) is exactly identical with the AV. clause (d). The
AV. clause (c) is a paraphrase in different words of our (d).
Clause (d).—The last pāda or clause is traced to TS. 4. 1. 2. 3rd and VS. 11. 20, the context in both places being, that the verse is recited while the Adhvaryu holds his hand on the horse’s back during the agni-cayana ceremony.

It may be noted here, that the aśman verses (or those containing exhortations to be as firm as a stone) are found employed in our text as well as in parallel Sūtra-texts in two contexts viz. the ceremony of marriage and the ceremonies of birth-rites as ‘addresses to the bride or the newly-born child’ (compare our I, 15. 3 which has ‘aśma bhava’ etc.).

How very fluid the tradition of these Gṛhya-mantras was, can best be seen by a glance at the parallel passage in other Sūtra texts viz. SMB. 1. 2. 1; PG. I. 17. 1; ŚG. I. 13. 2; APMB. 1. 5. 1 and 2. 2. 2; HG. 1. 4. 1; 19. 8. cited already in the Introductory section. We find here all possible variations (of what essentially is the same mantra) that the words constituting it were capable of!

AG. I. 7. 13:

(a) "Aryaman nu devān kanyā agnimayakṣata
sa imāṁ devo Aryāmā preto muṇcātu nāmutaḥ, svāhā|

(b) Varuṇaḥ nu devān kanyā agnimayakṣata
sa imāṁ devo Varuṇaḥ preto muṇcātu nāmutaḥ svāhā|

(c) Pūṣanān nu devān kanyā agnim ayakṣata
Sa imāṁ devaḥ Pūṣa preto muṇcātu nāmutaḥ svāhā”
ityavichindayāṇjaliṁ sruceva juhuyāt|

Trans: (a) “To Aryanman the god, to Agni, have the girls sacrificed (i.e. to Agni as Aryanman;) may he—god Aryanman, release her from here (i.e. from her father’s family), not from yonder (i.e. from her husband’s home).

(b) To Varuṇa the god, to Agni etc. [as above with ‘Varuṇa’ in place of ‘Aryanman’;]

(c) To Pūṣan the god etc. as above with ‘Pūṣan’ instead of ‘Aryanman’;]

Context:—After the ‘leading round’ of the bride, fried grain is poured into her joined hands by her brother or his representative. The bride sacrifices this fried grain without opening (lit. breaking open) her joined hands, as if she was sacrificing them with the ‘Sruci’ ladle while the above mantra is being recited by the bridegroom.

Sources: Only Sūtra-texts like ŚG., SMB., GG., PG., APMB. and MG. have got parallel passages but the mantra cannot be traced to any early text—with the exception of ‘Preto muṇcātu nāmutaḥ’ the concluding part of (a) (b) and (c) which is traced to RV. X. 85. 25 and AV. XIV. 1. 18. Oldenberg (SBE vol. 29. p. 44) on ŚG. I. 18. 3, compares Pāraskara I. 6. 2 “preto

1. That this is the construction and sense is clear from RV. V. 3 2 “Tvam Aryanā bhavasi yat Kaninām” [Thou art Aryanman to the girls] as addressed to Agni and cited in our text elsewhere i.e. I. 4. 8.
mūnicātu mā pateḥ" which shows what 'itah' and 'amutaḥ' refer to. The RV. and the AV. verse-pādas also have the same implication. I think that the influence here is AV. XIV. 1. 17 which reads "(a) Aryamaṇāṁ yajāmahe (b) suhandhum pativedanam | (c) urvārakamiva bandhanāt (d) preto mūnicāmi nāmutaḥ | for the following reasons: (1) The last pāda of each of our (a) to (c) is the last pāda here; our first pāda is reminiscent of the first of the AV. because of 'Aryamaṇā'. (2) There is general unity of sense. (3) This mantra in our text is followed by the citation in I. 17, 17 and 18, of RV. X. 85. 24 and 25 which correspond to AV. XIV. 1. 19 and 18. Thus, AV. XIV. I. 17, 19 and 18 which would correspond to the citations in our Sūtras I. 7.13, 17 and 18, very likely influenced our text.

ĀG. I. 7. 19 : 'Athānāṁ aparājitāyāṁ diśi sapta padány abhyutkrāma-yati, (a) "īṣa ekapadi (b) Urij evipadi (c) rūyaspoṣāya tri-padi (d) māyobhavyāya catuśpadi (e) praĵābhyaḥ pañca-padi (f) ṛubhyaḥ ṣaṭpadi (g) sakhā saṣṭapaḍi bhava (h) sā mām anuvratā bhava | (i) putrāṁ vindvāvahai bahūn (j) te santu jaraḍastayāḥ" iti.

Trans : He then (i.e. after the sacrifice of fried grain and the loosening of the bride's two locks of hair) helps her take seven steps forward with the mantra :-

(a) For sap, (be thou) one who hast taken one step forward,
(b) For juice, " " " two steps " ,
(c) For the augmenting of riches, be thou one etc. three steps forward,
(d) For comfort " " four steps forward,
(e) For progeny " " five steps forward,
(f) For the seasons " " six steps forward,
(g) Be a friend, (thou) who hast taken seven steps,
(h) So be thou devoted to me, (i) let us attain many sons,
(j) let them reach old age.

Sources (a) to (g) : TB. 3. 7. 7. 11 reads as follows :-
(a) ekam ṯe Viṣṇustvā anvetu,
(b) dve Urije " "
(c) trāṇi vratāya " "
(d) catvāri māyobhavyāya "
(e) pañca paśubhyah " "
(f) śaḍ rūyaspoṣāya " "
(g) sapta saṣṭapahoḥ ṛṝābhyaḥ "; sakhāyaḥ saṣṭapadā abhūma | sakhyāṁ te gameyam |

The context is:—The Yajamāna follows in the steps of the Soma-krayaṇi cow while she is being led. The remarkable agreement of this passage with our mantra with the exception of a few unimportant differences suggests it as the influence on our text. As regards the differences, it is apparent that the TB. has the better version. Our text e.g. makes an abrupt syntactical change in (g).

The idea of friendship consummated by the walking of seven steps in company, can be traced to AV. V. 11. 10 "Sapta padāḥ sakhāsmi" (I am
thy comrade of seven steps). Perhaps the faint origin of 'seven' as the number of steps is in RV. VIII. 72. 16:—"Adhuksat pipysum ḍs̄m āuk̄m sapta padid m arih | sūryasya sapta raśmibhīh" || where we not only come across the words 'ṛṣam' and 'Urjām' of our Mantra but also the association of the seven rays of the sun with the 'seven-stepped Urjām'!

(h) (i) and (j) — This part is only traced to JUB. 1. 54. 6 where it occurs after 'Amo'hamasmi' etc. a mantra parallel to our I. 7. 6. This part has the same position (as in JUB) in SG. I. 14. 6 and PG. I. 8. 1. This part of our Mantra then (easily detachable from the rest in sense and syntax) appears to have been a separate Mantra which our text has tacked on to our mantra (a) to (g) and which other texts have joined to other mantras in other contexts.

AG. I. 7. 22 : Dhruvam arundhatim sapta ṛṣin iti drśṭvā vācaṁ visṛjeta "jivapatni praṇāṁ vindeya" iti |

Trans: After observing the polar star, the (star) Arudhatī and the Seven Rṣis (Ursa major), let her release her speech (i.e. break her silence with the words) "With my husband living, may I aatain progeny."

Context—This follows after the saptapadi rite.

Sources. The part 'praṇāṁ vindeya' can be traced only to SG. 1. 17. 4 (as compared by OLDENBERG) in exactly the same context as in our text. The Mantra is one of those unimportant short mantras of a general invocatory purport, the words of which could be improved upon in any vedic school and which need not supposed to have a traditionally fixed text.

The Vedic texts cited or referred to in the present investigation, with abbreviations of their titles.

Saṁhitās.

VSK.—The variants of the Kāṇvya recension of the Vājasaneyi-saṁhitā as given at the end of each section in the above edition.
MS.—The Maitrāyani-saṁhitā, edited by Dr. LEOPOLD VON SCHROEDER ; four volumes, Leipzig, 1881-1886.
KS.—Die Saṁhitā der Kaṭha Sākhā, edited by Dr. LEOPOLD VON SCHROEDER ; first volume 1900, second volume 1909, Leipzig.

Brāhmaṇas, Aranyakas and Upaniṣads.

KB.—Das Kausāṇī Brāhmaṇa : B. LINDOE, Jena 1887.


PB.—The Pañcaviniśa Brāhmaṇa or Tāṇḍya Mahā Brāhmaṇa : Bibliotheca Indica, Calcutta, 1870-1874.

SB.—The Śaṅcaviniśa Brāhmaṇa, edited by Herman Frederick EELSINGH ; Leiden 1908.

JB.—Das Jaiminiya Brāhmaṇa in Auswahl, W. CALNAD : Verhandelingen Der Koninklyke Akademie Van Wetenschappen Nieuwe Reeks Deel XIX No. 4.

TA.—The Taittiriya-Aranyaka ; Bibliotheca Indica, Calcutta, 1872.

KBU.—The Kausitaki-Brāhmaṇa-Upaniṣad, Bibliotheca Indica, Calcutta, 1861.


**Srauta-sūtras.**

AŚ.—The Śrauta-sūtra of Āśvalāyana : Bibliotheca Indica, Calcutta, 1874.

ŚŚ.—The Sāṅkhāyana Śrauta-sūtra, Bibliotheca Indica, Calcutta, 1888.

LŚ.—The Lātyāyana Śrauta-sūtra, Bibliotheca Indica, Calcutta, 1872.


MS.—Das Mānavya Śrauta-sūtra : Dr. Friedrich KNAUER ; Books i-v. St. Petersburg, 1900-1903.

**Gṛhya-Sūtras etc.**

AG.—The Āśvalāyana Gṛhya-sūtra : Prof. STENZLER’s edition, Indische Hausregeln : Āśvalāyana Erestes Heft. Pp. 1-45 : Leipzig 1864. The readings given in the ‘Kritische Anmerkungen’ (pp. 46-53) and the emendations proposed in the Vorrede (I to III) to the Zweites Heft (Übersetzung : Leipzig 1865) have been discussed where necessary. When I mention Prof. STENZLER’S views, I refer to this second part, where he gives a German translation of the work with notes.


PG.—The Pāraskara Gṛhya-sūtra, edited by Prof. STENZLER, Indische Hausregeln II, Pāraskara ; Leipzig, 1876.

GG.—Das Gobhila Gṛhya-sūtra, Dr. F. KNAUER, Dorpat and Leipzig, 1884.


HG.—The Hiranyakesiṇ Gṛhya-sūtra, edited by Dr. J. KIRSTE, Vienna, 1889.

ĀpG.—The Apastambiyā Gṛhya-sūtra edited by Dr. WINTERNITZ, Vienna 1887.

ĀpMB.—The (Mantra-Brāhmaṇa or) Mantra-piṭha of the Apastambins, edited by Dr. WINTERNITZ, Oxford, 1897.


SMB.—The Mantra-Brāhmaṇa of the Śāma-veda edited by Satyabrata SAMASRAMIN, Calcutta, 1873.


S.B.E.—Sacred Books of the East.
JNANAGHANA PUJYAPADA

By

E. P. RADHAKRISHNAN, Madras.

Appayya Diksita in his Siddhântaleśasâṅgraha,1 refers to an advaita manual by name Tattvaśuddhi. This2 is an authoritative work in 46 chapters,3 called prakaraṇas, by one Jnânaghanapâda,4 a disciple of Bodhagahanâcârya.5 Who Bodhaghana and Jnânaghana were are to be considered here.

In a work entitled Śrṅgagirīguruparaṁparâ (No. 302 of Seshagiri Sastri's II Report) is given a list of the various pointiffs of the Śrṅgeri Mutt. The list mentions 41 ācâryas on the whole beginning with Mahâdeva (Lord Śiva) and ending with Narasimha Bhârati. Though this list may not be quite accurate, it is also not wholly incorrect. That is to say, unless and until some positive evidence is set forth to prove the inaccuracy of the list, its tentative correctness holds good. The whole list may be reproduced here with advantage:

"Mahaśvēmō Mahāvīrya: tūtiyachaśurūna: ||
Vasīla: Śrṅkīyogīntra: pahāraśurūneeśa: ||
Vyaśa: Śrṅko gūḍapadē gōvindamabhāmāṇu: ||
Guru: Śrṅbhārāchārye: gṛnmaṭriśāpan: prāma: ||
Bhishmānācārye: nityānandānāmibh: ||
Lato: Śrṅnachārye: nārāyanaśāmu: ||

1. See pp. 141, 190, 266 and 363 of Siddhântaleśasâṅgraha, Kâśi Skt. Ser. 36.
2. Being serially issued by the present writer in the Annals of Oriental Research, University of Madras, in collaboration with Mr. S. S. Suryanarayana Sastri.
3. Das Gupta, History of Indian Philosophy II, p. 57 f. n. n: "Jnânaghana, who probably lived in the 13th century, wrote an elaborate dialectical work in 33 chapters (prakaraṇas) called Tattvaśuddhi." This is wrong. The evidence for placing Jnânaghana in the 13th century is not given. The enumeration of chapters as 33 is also not correct; probably he concluded that the work is complete in 33 chapters, on the basis of an incomplete copy in 33 chapters, found in the Govt. Or. Mss. Library, Madras (R. No. 2897), referred to as B. in my edition of the same.
4. See colophons to the chapters of Tattvaśuddhi:

In the light of the following evidences also the apparent and tentative accuracy of the above list can reasonably be assumed to hold good.

First, in a work entitled *Sāṅkarācāryacarita* by Govindaṇātha,⁶ (No. 301. of Sheshagiri SASTRĪ's II Report ; same as MD,⁷ 12171-2) the predecessors of Śaṅkara are mentioned as Nārāyaṇa, Brahmā, Vasiṣṭha, Śakti, Paṛāśara, Vyāsa, Śuka, Gaudāpāda and Govinda.⁸ Lord Śiva is left out. The rest of the ācāryas mentioned corresponds with the predecessors of Śaṅkara as found in the Śrīgagirigruruparamparā.

---

7. MD = Madras Des. Cat. of Mss.
8. See Sheshagiri SASTRĪ, II Report pp. 101-2. But in the printed edition this is missing. Only Śuka, Gaudāpāda and Govinda are referred to;
Secondly, in a work called Gadyavallari⁹ tantra, by Nijātmaprakāśa¹⁰ Ānandanātha Mallikārjuna Yogīndra Yati (Mitra Notices, VII, No. 2261), which opens with a list of the teachers of the Śaṅkara sect, the first 22 names beginning with Śiva and ending in Vidyāranya correspond with those in the Śrīgagirigruparamāṇparā. Gadyavallari mentions 28 acāryas before Mallikārjuna, its author.

Again in another work called Guruvāmānāhākāvyya,¹¹ by Lakṣmana Śāstrin,¹² son of Vīreśvara Śāstri, written under orders of Saccidānanda Bhārati, disciple of Narasimha Bhārati, a long list of the successive pontiffs of the Śrīgeri Mutt is given. This order of the acāryas corresponds to a greater length with the order found in the Śrīgagirigruparamāṇparā.

This concordance of the four lists is sufficient evidence to show that, the opening part and a great extent of the list in Śrīgagirigruparamāṇparā are reliable, if not the entire list. It is possible that the Guruvāmānāhākāvyya was based on the Śrīgagirigruparamāṇparā; still the accuracy of the Śrīgagirigruparamāṇparā is not disproved.

Now let us examine the list proper. The list mentions on the whole 41 acāryas from Lord Śiva to Narasimha Bhārati. Śaṅkara is the eleventh and Vidyāranya 22nd. According to Mr. Sheshagiri Sastri, Vidyāranya came to the pontifical seat in 1331 A.D.¹³ After him, according to the list there were 19 priests and the period of reign for each acārya, after Vidyāranya is 29 years, on an average. Previous to Vidyāranya and after Śaṅkara, there were 10 pontiffs. Accepting 820 A.D. as the date of Śaṅkarācārya's demise, we get 510 years of interval for 10 acāryas, i.e. on an average each acārya would have been in the pontificate for about 50 years. Granting that ascetics generally live longer than ordinary men and assuming that they are usually appointed as pontiffs at an early age, it may seem that a reign of 50 years for a single pontiff is not unreasonable. But 50 years of reign in succession for 10 pontiffs cannot be satisfactorily explained. The more so when we come to note that after Vidyāranya the average period for an ascetic is abruptly reduced from 50 to 29. Mr Sheshagiri Sastri on this point doubts the reli-

9. Dr. Aufrecht in his C. C. I., p. 377a, under Bodhaghana, says that he is mentioned as the successor of Viśvarūpācārya in the Śrīvidyāpaddhati. Bik. Cat. 613. This Śrīvidyāpaddhati is only a portion of the Gadyavallari. See colophon to Śrīvidyāpaddhati:

10. Aufrecht identifies him with Prakāśānanda, author of the vedānta work, Vedāntasiddhāntamukta va.


12. Lakṣmana Śāstrin was contemporary of Somāsekharī II (1714-1739 A.D.) of Keladi, when Saccidānanda Bhārati (1708-1741 A.D.), disciple of Narasimha Bhārati adorned the pontifical seat at Śrīgeri, ibid.

13. Recent researches have shown that Vidyātirtha, a guru of Śrīgerī lived to the end of 1375 A.D. and was immediately succeeded by Vidyāranya. See J. A. H. R. S. IX. pt. 4. p. 40; also O.L.D. 1938 No. 6. 118.
ability of the list and says that the manuscript of Śrīgagiriguruparamparā is defective.

But we have evidence to believe that some ascetics lived longer than others. Viśvarūpa, according to tradition, lived very long. Again take the case of Jñānottama (author of Iṣṭasiddhiyāvanā) who is said to have adorned the pontificate for 63 years:

\[\text{Jñānottama}\]

\[\text{Śrīgagiriguruparamparā}\]

Granting even this, we cannot satisfactorily reconcile the fact that 10 ascetics before Vidyāranya were long-lived and his followers abruptly came to be short-lived. Thus arises the doubt regarding the accuracy of the list in Śrīgagiriguruparamparā. To explain this discrepancy away the possible course is to assume some break in the continuity of the pontiffs. And until and unless there is some positive evidence for proving this discontinuity, it is unsafe to assume it. Thus apparently the list in the Śrīgagiriguruparamparā has to be taken as correct.

Coming to the list itself, the order of succession of the ācāryas is as follows: Śiva, Viṣṇu, Brahmā, Vasistha, Śakti, Parāśara, Vyāsa, Śuka, Gaudāpāda, Govinda, Saṅkara, Viśvarūpa, Nitya-Bodhagana, Jñānaghana, Jñānottama etc. Saṅkarācārya is mentioned as the eleventh in the order of succession. Next to Saṅkara comes Viśvarūpa, who has been proved by authorities to be none else than Suresvaraśrīrāja. Saṅkara's disciple. Viśvarūpa is mentioned invariably as the successor of Saṅkara in all the four lists referred to. Govindanātha in his Saṅkarācāryacarita, clearly mentions Suresvara as the second disciple of Saṅkara. He also says that Viśvarūpa was his former name as a house-holder, and Suresvara was his name after sannyāsa.

\[\text{Śaṅkarācāryacarita}, \text{Govindanātha. V. 61.}\]

---

15. See Anandkānubhava's Nyāyaratnadipāvali p. 154, Ms. R. 5505 of Madras Library. Viśvarūpa and Suresvara are clearly identified.

\[\text{Viśālaśvaraśrīrāja}\]

\[\text{Śrīgagiriguruparamparā}\]
It is surprising to note that Mr. J. C. Ghosh\(^\text{16}\) omits Viśvarūpa’s name, probably copying the mistake of Rajendralal Mitra,\(^\text{17}\) while giving the list of ācāryas in the Gadyavallari. The text in the Gadyavallari is very clear:

\begin{itemize}
\item \textit{ततः धीरांवरायां विभवस्य एव न।}
\item \textit{ततो बोधनावायां: ततो ज्ञानपन्नः।}
\end{itemize}

Jñānaghana is the third in the order of succession after Śaṅkara. Since all the lists agree with respect to this fact, this position of Jñānaghana seems to be fairly acceptable, until the above fact is disproved. Thus we are in a position to fix Jñānaghana’s date roughly. The date of Śaṅkara’s death has been accepted by scholars as 820 A.D. This date is also supported by a striking epigraphical evidence. In Inscriptions du Cambodge, Vol. I, one Śivasoma, predecessor of King Indravarman (877-889 A.D.) is said to have studied the Śāstras from Śaṅkara:

\begin{itemize}
\item \textit{पैठानाथाय शास्त्राणि महवर्धाराहृतयः।}
\item \textit{निःश्रेष्ठखलमुच्छितमालावलिहठ्ठाप्तः। Verse 39.}
\end{itemize}

Prof. Coedes remarks on this: ‘It is not impossible that this is a reference to the celebrated Śaṅkarācārya, whose activity in India falls at the beginning of the 9th century.’\(^\text{18}\) King Indravarman flourished about 877 A.D. So that it is not impossible for his preceptor, Śivasoma, to have been a student of Śaṅkara in Śaṅkara’s closing years. The latter half of the above verse clearly favours this view.

Now Suresvarā (i.e. Viśvarūpa) was Śaṅkara’s disciple and immediate successor. He was followed by Bodhaghana. Bodhaghana was also very famous like his illustrious predecessors. This is borne out when Jñānaghana, his disciple, says of his teacher,

\begin{itemize}
\item \textit{स्वयंमविदनिमित्तो जडक्षिमः कर्मदेवशाहस्या।}
\item \textit{तत्तात्मनिवेद्यवाप्सिद्विषिः नि:प्रवस्ताः संस्कृतः।}
\item \textit{विद्याविदमुयुंपृक्षिप्यवत्तिसतस्तः: क्षयम शोभते।}
\item \textit{शाखद: बोधनस्य वस्तु मुरुगे तस्मै नमः: पैठ्यसे।}
\end{itemize}

Tattvaśuddhi Ch. I. v. 4.

Bodhaghana was followed by Jñānaghana. Thus approximately some 80 years can be reasonably assumed to have elapsed after Śaṅkara, and before Jñānaghana came to the pontificate, assuming of course, that Suresvara and Bodhaghana together adorned the seat at Śrīneri for 80 years. This assumption is not altogether impossible, when we take into consideration the fact

that according to tradition, Suresvara had a very long life. Thus Jñānaghana can be placed at 900 A.D.

This date is supported by other evidences too. Taking the internal evidence: Jñānaghana rarely quotes from others. In one place in his Tattva-

śuddhi he quotes a stanza from Maṇḍana’s Brahmasiddhi:

तत्त्ववण्डे किन्तू कित्तौताहिैः निघित्यते ।

विवाचानन्तरं न निशेचन्व संभव: ॥ १७०

In chapter 39 of the Tattvaśuddhi, in connection with the discussion of the substrate of avidyā, Jñānaghana refers respectfully to the view held by Suresvara. The actual reference is: atmaiva svāvidyāya sarisarati svāvidyayaiva vimucyate iti hi tattvavidām sthitī. Though he does not explicitly mention Suresvara by name, from Appayya Dīkṣita’s Siddhāntaleśasasangraha (p. 122 of the Kasi Skt. Series. See also Acyutakṛṣṇānda’s commentary thereon) we know that this view was held by Suresvara. 

This favours Jñānaghana being about 900 A.D.

Again in chapter 44 of the Tattvaśuddhi, on avidyāniṁvṛtti, Jñānaghana says:

सर्वत्र नाभानिस्त्रि: सदस्वभविष्यिैः अस्तानिैथुपम्यते: । निैथुपम्यते । सदस्वभविष्यि: किदलिङ्कि: अस्तानिैथुपम्यते: । अस्तानिैथुपम्यते: । अस्तानिैथुपम्यते: । अस्तानिैथुपम्यते: ।

In the above pratiśka, there seems to be reference, without mention of name, to the views of Vimuktaṭman. For in the advaitic tradition, the fifth mode of avidyāniṁvṛtti is associated with the name of Vimuktaṭman, though in the Siddhāntaleśasasangraha, this view is attributed to Anandabodha. This would show that Vimuktaṭman was a predecessor of Jñānaghana.

Again in the above pratiśka it does not seem altogether impossible to suppose that there is a veiled reference to Jayanta Bhaṭṭa, when Jñānaghana says: yaksānurūpo baliḥ iti hi nyāyah. Jayanta Bhaṭṭa, the great grandson of Śaktisvāmin, the minister of King Mukṭāpiḍa Lalitāditya of Kashmir, could not have been very far removed from the famous Vācaspati Miśra (841 A.D.). Probably both of them were contemporaries. This also is in favour of placing Jñānaghana about 900 A.D.

19. Prakarana 1, p. 6 of the Madras Univ. edn.
21. Citsukha attributes this view to Vimuktaṭman. See Citsukhi, p. 363 and also the commentary thereon by Pratyagṛūpabhagavān.
23. Chapter IV.
In another place\(^{26}\) he refers to Umveka, not directly, but refers to his views as Umveka-pakṣa. This is clear evidence to prove that Ṣaṅnāghana lived at a period, when Umveka’s views were authoritatively recognised. Umveka has been proved by scholars to be the same as Bhavabhūti, the dramatist-philosopher, on the evidence of Citṣukha.\(^{27}\) Umveka now, is also accepted to be a disciple of Kumārila.\(^{28}\) Bhavabhūti lived about 750 A.D.\(^{29}\) The fact that Umveka was very proficient in mīmāṃsā, especially in the ślokavārtika of Kumārila is testified by the commonly quoted stanza:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{ओशेक: कृति कारिका श्रवणं वैत्तिक प्रमाणम:} & \\
\text{वामसहस्त्रं वैत्तिक न किविद्विप्र रवेन:} & \\
\text{Ṣaḍdārśanasamuccayāṅkā:} & \text{Guptaratna, p. 20 Bib. Ind. edn.}
\end{align*}
\]

The frequent references to the doctrines of mīmāṃsā and vedaic exegesis in the dramas of Bhavabhūti also point to this fact. Umveka’s commentary of the Ślokavārtika\(^{30}\) has been recently discovered. Umveka also wrote a commentary\(^{31}\) on Maṇḍana’s Bhāvanāviveka.\(^{32}\) He noted different readings in the text of Maṇḍana and in some places also gave alternative interpretations.\(^{33}\) All these prove that Umveka was a great mīmāṃsaka. Reasonably some 100 years can be fairly assumed for the spread of Umveka’s views in mīmāṃsā and for him to become as an authoritative exponent of this system and to have followers to justify the phrase—umvekapakṣa. Thus umvekamata in mīmāṃsā would have been prevalent only at about 850 A.D.\(^{34}\) And the fact that Ṣaṅnāghana refers to Umveka’s views with a certain amount of contempt shows that Ṣaṅnāghana could not have flourished earlier than 850 A.D. Thus Ṣaṅnā-

---

28. See Intro. to Gauḍāvahā p. ccvi. by S. P. PANDIT:
29. Bhavabhūti must be referred to the last quarter of the 7th century and the first of the eighth, i.e. 675-725 A.D. See R. G. BHANDARKAR. Intro. to the Report on Search of Mss. in the Bom. Pres. during 1883-4, p. 15.
30. To be published shortly by the Madras University.
31. Printed in the Sarasvati Bhavana Texts Series.
32. There is some doubt regarding the identity of this Umveka with the commentator on Slokevārtika. For Maṇḍana seems to have known of Saṅkara’s views about samuccayavyāda and he disagreed with him. This shows that Saṅkara and Maṇḍana were contemporaries. Thus Umveka, who commented on Maṇḍana’s Bhāvanāviveka, and noted different readings also in Maṇḍana’s text, should necessarily be later than Maṇḍana and thus later than Saṅkara too. Umveka, who is identical with Bhavabhūti and who wrote a commentary on Slokevārtika, thus cannot be the same as the commentator on Bhāvanāviveka.
34. Another plausible objection is this: Is it necessary that Umvekapakṣa should signify a school or a following of Umveka? Why not it be taken to mean Umveka’s individual views? But the clear comparison of Umvekapakṣa with Kṣapaṇakapakṣa in the reference given serves to answer this objection.
ghana can safely be placed about 900 A.D. which makes him a contemporary of Sarvajñātman, author of Saṅkṣeṣaṅaśārīraka, who lived about 900 A.D.,35 and not a contemporary of Prakāśātman,36 as supposed by Mr. S. Srikanta Sastri.

Another important point not to be lost sight of in this connection is this. The date of Jñānaghana is arrived at 900 A.D. taking that of Saṅkara's death as 820 A.D. There is a difference of opinion regarding this date of Saṅkara. If the date of Saṅkara's death is taken as 664 A.D.,37 a deduction of 156 years becomes necessary and thus Jñānaghana will have to be placed at 744 A.D. This is too early for him as proved by the internal evidence, where Jñānaghana refers to the Umvekapakṣa, which as has been said above would have been prevalent only at about 850 A.D. Nor can the date for Saṅkara (655-687 A.D.) given by Dr. Chintamanī38 be accepted, for the same reason. Again for the very same reason, the date ascribed recently by Bhagavaddatta to Saṅkara's disciple, Viṣvarūpa (600 A.D.) also cannot be accepted. Bhagavaddatta attributes this date to Viṣvarūpa after identifying Pratāpaśīla occurring in a verse at the end of the Ācārādhyāya of Viṣvarūpa's Bālakṛṣṇā,39 a commentary on Yājñavalkya smṛti, with King Prabhākaravardhana (who died in 605 A.D.) and was probably Viṣvarūpa's patron on the authority of Bāṇa Bhaṭṭa, who in his Harṣacarita, beginning of the 4th Ucchvāsa says:

तेषु शौचमुष्यमानेयु...प्रतापशीले इति प्रक्षिपतपनामा प्रभाकरवर्धनो नाम राजाधिराजः।

This is not sufficient evidence to establish the identity. For the word 'pratāpaśīla' occurs in many inscriptions and need not necessarily imply a proper name. It, after all, signifies only valour. And Prabhākaravardhana was not the only King noted for his valour. Bāṇa simply wanted to give expression to Prabhākaravardhana's prowess and he poetically expressed pratāpaśīla as another well-known name of Prabhākaravardhana. Thus the identification of Pratāpaśīla with Prabhākaravardhana is not sufficiently supported by evidence.

Hence until further decisive evidences are put forth to contradict the date of Saṅkara's death as 820 A.D., it tentatively holds good.

Mr. J. C. Ghosh,40 on the authority of the Śrīṅgeri list, assigns Jñānag-

35. Das Gupta : History of Indian Philosophy, II, p. 111.
36. See later.
39. इति संस्कृतमः हुः समापुर्वके सर्वं : प्रतापशीले : 
विवेक नृपति : सम : प्राणो जगदकारिं व्यवहारतो बिमाति।

See also:
प्रवचनोदयानुसारे निमित्तमलं मण्डत्व निं खुला।
पाठ्यति सतातुसस्व अविष्करितो नृसवित।
End of Vyāvahārādhyāya of Bālakṛṣṇā.

40. IHQ. Dec. 1937.
ghan to the period 848-910 A.D. This is approximately correct. But he goes on to identify Sirhagiri found in the list with Gaudêśvara, Citsukha’s preceptor and says that Sirhagiri is identical with Jñânottama. This point is still doubtful.

Recently again, Mr. S. Srikanta SASTRI,41 thinks that Tattvaśuddhi was based on a work named Atmatattva! probably by Ananyānubhava. The basis for this assumption is this. First of all he wrongly quotes the text of Tattvaśuddhi thus42:

\[\text{Iddhā bhūtā śāṃkuśāṇānākṣhālānārājānānānāmāśvānānānāntānānāmāśvānānāntānānāmāśvān}
\[\text{tātātātāttvāt tattvāt tattvāt vāśuddhi vībhīṣaya}
\]

The correct version of the text is:43

\[\text{Iddhā bābhūtā tattvāt tattvāt vāśuddhi vībhīṣaya}
\]

He seems to read in the words ‘ätmatattvānti adhikṛtya’ some undue emphasis and interprets them as based on Atmatattva, a work! Who is the author of this so-called Atmatattva? Srikanta SASTRI proceeds to interpret the compound/ananyānubhavāṉandadvīyātmatattvam as referring to Ananyānubhava, the author of Atmatattva, on which is based Jñānaghana’s Tattvaśuddhi. In support of this wrong reading and undue emphasis on certain words, he sets forth the evidence of Prakāśitman, who in his Vīvaranā44 says that one Ananyānubhava was his guru. Thus Srikanta SASTRI makes Jñānaghana a contemporary and probably a disciple of Ananyānubhava.

This sort of surmises seems to come out of the interpreter’s enthusiasm to find out new and hitherto unknown works and authors in advaita. For the explanation of the commentary45 on Tattvaśuddhi for the word ‘adhikṛtya’ is not in his favour. There, adhikṛtya is given as equivalent to ‘prastutya’, which means only ‘about which’. Further the words अनन्यानुभवानदद्वियत्वात्तत्त्तत्तंतरात्तत्त्त्रत्वात्तत्तमोऽस्मात्तशात्तत्तमोऽस्मात्तत्तम0

42. *IHQ.* XIV. ii. p. 402.
43. See edition of *Tattvaśuddhi* in the *Annals of Or. Institute*, Madras University.
44. See Vivaranā Introductory verse 6:

\[\text{वन्दे तमास्मस्यद्विवरुध्दशब्दां बहुवेदः}
\[\text{अयंतोष्टि न नाना योगोऽन्यस्यतमस्य गुरुः}}\]

45. The commentary is by one Uttamajīna, disciple of Jñānottama. See the introductory verses in the commentary as also the colophon. A copy of this commentary is available in the Madras Mss. Library. No. 15730.

Colophon:

\[\text{िति परात्मद़्ीर्हत्वोर्वतिकाक्षरवा ज्ञानोत्तममभावं मूर्त्यादिश्ये-}
\[\text{नोत्तमब्रह्मविशेषः मयं सत्त्वं देवोऽस्मात्तत्त्तमोऽस्मात्तत्तमोऽस्मात्तत्तमोऽस्मात्तत्तमोऽस्मात्तत्तमोऽस्मात्तत्तमोऽस्मात्तत्तम0}


cannot satisfactorily and without prejudice to the principles of Sanskrit grammar give rise to the assumption that Ananyānubhava was the author of one Ātmatatva, a work! If this is so, the words ānanda and advitiyā go without any connection or sāmartya and could not be tagged together in the above compound. The words at best yield only the sense—that some points about (adhikṛtya) the nature of Ātman (ātmatatvā) which is secondless and of the nature of bliss to be realised only by personal experience (ananya-anubhava-ānanda-advitiyā) are to be considered in the following 46 chapters of the Tattvasuddhi.

If Mr. Srikanta SASTRI thinks that he can have some liberty in interpreting the above compound, another person cannot be denied the same. And a third man can as well suppose one Anubhavānanda as the author of some work, probably Ātmatatva. If against this Mr. SASTRI says that his position is supported by Prakāśatman’s evidence, it is also possible to say that Anubhavānanda was the guru of Amalānanda46 (Kalpataru). Or one can again suppose that Anubhavānanda, pupil of Kṛṣṇānanda (author of Siddhāntasiddhidhānja) and author of a commentary called Advaitaratnakosa-prakāśa47 on Nṛsiṁhāśramīn’s Advaitaratnakosa, was the author of Ātmatatva, an independent advaita work, on which was based Jñānaghana’s Tattvasuddhi. In this case, instead of Jñānaghana being the contemporary of Prakāśatman, as supposed by Mr. Srikanta SASTRI, he can be shown to have flourished in the 18th century. For, Anubhavānanda, the commentator on Nṛsiṁhāśramīn’s Advaitaratnakosa, should have flourished in the latter half of the 17th century. And Jñānaghana to base his Tattvasuddhi on this Anubhavānanda’s work, the so-called Ātmatatvā, can be easily ascribed to the beginning of the 18th century. All this to show that there is or can be no limit to this kind of surmises.

Let us now see what other information can be had of Jñānaghana. All that we know of him is that he was the disciple of one Bodhagahañcārya, and that he was the fourth from Saṅkarācārya in the pontificate at Śrīgeri. AUFRECHT48 notices a commentary on Caturvedatātparyasāngraha of Haradatta, attributed to one Jñānaghana and identifies him with the author of Tattvasuddhi. A copy of Jñānaghana’s gloss on Caturvedatātparyasāngraha is available in the library of the Asiatic Society of Bengal.49 It begins:

46. See colophon to Amalānanda’s Kalpataru. Also introductory stanza 8 to the same:

स्वयमसुमुखं ब्रह्म दयारङ्गितविमघम्।
यथार्थायवज्ववान्तपदगीतं गुरुं सुमः॥

47. See Des. Cat. of Mss. in the Tanjore Sarasvati Mahal Library, Noa. 7502-04. This Anubhavānanda is also the author of a commentary called Prabhāmāṇḍala on Sāstrādiṣṭikā. ibid. No. 6932. This work is different from the Prabhāmāṇḍala of Yajñānārāyaṇa Dīkṣita on the Sāstrādiṣṭikā.


49. Des. Cat of Mss. in ASB. VII, No. 5621.
This Jñānaghana seems to me to be different and later than the author of Tattvaśuddhi. Haradatta Sivācārya probably flourished at the end of the 11th century. For Kureśavijaya is a point to point refutation of Haradatta’s Pañcaratnamālīkā. Haradatta, thus was a contemporary of Ramānuja and an elder contemporary of Kureśa. Again from the introductory verses of the chapters of Tattvaśuddhi it is clear that Jñānaghana, author of Tattvaśuddhi worshipped Viṣṇu. And for the devotee of Viṣṇu, to write a commentary of a purely Śaiva work, though not impossible, does not seem to be probable. Further the Dipikā on Caturvedatātparyasāngraha is very brief, and does not exhibit the thorough and comprehensive style of Jñānaghana, author of Tattvaśuddhi. Thus with the available facts, at present, it is not safe to say that the author of the Caturvedatātparyadīpikā is identical with Jñānaghana, author of Tattvaśuddhi.

---

51. See also the last stanza in Tattvaśuddhi where the author himself says that he was a devotee of Viṣṇu:

श्रीमहामायाप्रमुखस्वयंभरामाय विष्णुभत
सदर्थोपयोगनो विवेचनात्मात्सरसोल्ङे वर्षति ।
तद्वियाहलिवदुसंयुतमालिकेके सदाभोक्षते
भक्तो ज्ञानपामिथानगित: तत्त्वाध्यायं मुनिः ।

52. Dipikā-samkhya śata-dvādaśa (112). Refer to above.
CORRESPONDENCE

A COMPREHENSIVE INDEX TO THE QUR'AN

To

THE EDITORS,

New Indian Antiquary.

Dear Sirs,

The Committee of the Islamic Research Association has for some time past been considering the advisability of preparing a comprehensive Index to the Qur'an in English. The inadequacy and incompleteness of the existing indexes is well known to all those who are interested in Islamic studies. It is felt that a full and adequate index, free from the prevalent inaccuracies, would be a useful addition to the reference books concerning Islam.

It is therefore a matter of gratification to the Committee to announce that the President of our Association has offered a prize of Rs. 500 for the preparation of such an index. The index when ready will be published by the Association at its own cost. The particulars, terms and conditions are as follows:

(1) The Index to the Qur'an should be in English.

(2) The references will be to the Egyptian Royal ed. (A. H. 1342, Bulaq) and also, to Flügel's ed. of the Arabic Text.

(3) The Index should be arranged like a dictionary and should be on the model of Wensinck's Handbook of Early Muhammadan Tradition (Brill, Leiden, 1927). It should be arranged alphabetically, for facility of reference, and not in separate sections. It must be full and comprehensive, containing (a) Geographical Names, (b) Names of Persons and Tribes, (c) Technical Terms and (d) a complete subject-index, and full cross-references.

(4) In the preparation of the index, particular attention should be paid to the needs of the layman (accustomed to read the Qur'an in an English translation).

(5) The MS. (typewritten, or written with equal legibility) should be submitted on or before 31st December 1942, to the Hon. Secretary, Islamic Research Association. It should be copy for the press, that is, absolutely ready for being sent to the printer, typewritten (or written) on one side of the paper only, and provided with a margin.

(6) The Committee reserves to itself the right to give extra time to an author, on sufficient reason being given.

(7) The Committee shall be the sole judge of the merits of the MSS. submitted and it reserves to itself the right to reject any or all MSS. offered without assigning any reasons, and its decision shall be final.

(8) The rejected MSS. will in due course be returned to the respective authors, but whilst it is intended to take every care to ensure the safe return of the MSS. to the author, the Association or its officers will not be responsible for the loss of, or damage to, the MSS.

(9) The selected MS. will be published in the series of the Islamic Research Association.
(10) Every person regardless of religion, nationality, race or sex is eligible to compete,

Provided that the Members of the Executive Committee of the Islamic Research Association shall not be so eligible.

(11) The accepted MS. and its copyright will belong to the Association.

Every student of Islam is earnestly invited to compete for the prize. Scholars who are contemplating to prepare such an index are invited to write to the Hon. Secretary.

I shall be grateful if you will kindly give to the above announcement the widest publicity possible, by publishing it in the journals in which you are interested, or by exhibiting it on the Notice Board, or by any other means.

Yours faithfully,

Bombay, 10 April 1940

A. A. A. Fyzee

Replies may kindly be sent to Asaf A. A. Fyzee Esq., Hon. Secretary Islamic Research Association, Government Law College, Bombay, 1, India.

OUTLINE OF A SCHEME FOR AN INDIAN ACADEMY OF ARTS AND LETTERS

Objects:

1. To represent to the World of Letters, the intellectual achievement in the Indian vernacular literatures and to stand out as a representative institution of India by means of which the influence of India might be greater.

2. To make known the vernacular literatures outside their linguistic area and to encourage good writers by means of annual awards.

3. To influence the Cultural unification of India and to co-ordinate the various activities of several branches of study and creative genius.

4. To encourage individual genius by awarding annual prizes to the best of literary, scientific and artistic productions in India.

5. To foster unity and friendship among poets and artists all over India by holding conferences in which mutual expression of views and experiences should be rendered possible; and to do all that is necessary to encourage, spread and develop by all possible means the literary and artistic genius in India. The Academy should be run absolutely on non-communal and non-provincial lines. The membership of the Academy should be kept on a basis of pure merit and should be free from all personal considerations. It shall be a distinction comparable to membership in the Academies of leading Western Countries.

The Constitution and The Organization of the Academy:

1. Branches of the Academy should be established in each province (having a recognised vernacular) and these should be co-ordinated by a Central Office of the Academy at Delhi, Calcutta or Bombay.

2. Each Provincial branch should maintain its own language and collect specimens of excellent literary and artistic productions of the year. They should be sent to the Central Office from all parts of India.
3. The Board of Award at the Centre should be run in English or Hindi; and it should assign the hallmark of recognition to certain really meritorious works, after appraising their value and apportioning their merit. They should arrange for their translation into a common language. The awards should be made for the best work in all fields of Cultural activity, Literature, Art, and Research in Science and History.

4. The Academy should run a bi-monthly journal in English or Hindi in which contributions from writers all over India and reports of activities from all provinces should be published. The Journal should be conducted by an Editorial Board representing all provincial units and aspects of culture.

5. The Academy should undertake the publication of a Bibliography of Indian Publications, for which the Co-operation of all the Academies, Research Societies and Art-Galleries in India should be sought. This should be an annual feature, for which a handsome subsidy from the Government should be applied for.

6. The Management of the Academy should vest in an annually elected President, Vice-President and three General Secretaries assisted by an Executive Committee of a representative character. The Board of Award and The Editorial Board should be affiliated to the Central Executive Body.

7. An All-India Conference should meet every year, to which delegates from all provinces should attend. The Conference should be utilized for exchange of views, discussion of important topics and problems facing the Academy and the body should arrive at resolutions which should be binding on the Body. The President of the Conference should be duly elected by all delegates.

8. The Indian Academy should be represented in all International Conferences, by a batch of delegates, specially elected by the body.

In the initial stages, the Academy should apply to the Government and Public Bodies for funds. Liberal donations from patriotic philanthropists should also be sought.

Vizianagaram City.

D. Visvesvara Rau.
REVIEW


This Report of the Archæological Survey of Mysore for the year ending 30th June 1937 is as replete with information and illustrations as its predecessors. Among the ancient sites studied during the period of this report were Channagiri, Chitaldurk, Kittur and Hale-Alur. Of the monuments studied two deserve special mention viz. (1) The Arkeśvara temple at Hale-Alur with its numerous sculptures of the Chōla period and (2) the Rāmesvara temple at Narasamangala, a unique monument with very fine sculptures. Some valuable epigraphic work was also done by the Department during this period. About 75 inscriptions were collected, some of which have been edited by Mr. R. Rama Rao, the Assistant of the Department with the help of Pandits under the instructions of Dr. M. H. KRISHNA, M. A., D. Litt. the Director of Archæology. Among the new finds, two are important: (1) an epigraph on the Dhvaja-stambha of the Keśava temple at Bēlūr stating that the golden Khaga-dhavja-stambha was set up by Jakkara, son of Timmarasa, subordinate of the famous king Krishnarāya of Vijayanagar, and (2) an inscription of the same temple recording a grant made to some Śiva temple near Bēlūr by Ballāla I, the Hoysala king in 1106 A.D. The Department also purchased the Basavanpur copper-plates of the Punnād king Skandavarman which were published as No. 53 of 1936. An interesting MS (of the "Memoirs of Hyder Ally from the year 1758 to 1770") by Eloy Joze Correa Peixoto, a Portuguese in Hyder's service) which was acquired previously was completely copied in spite of its faintly visible hand-writing and studied for review. The Department also acquired some 50 interesting coins and prepared 141 electro-type casts for the coin show-case of the Government Museum, Bangalore. The Director and his assistants, took an active part in the sexcentenary celebrations of the Vijayanagar Empire at Hampi. These are some of the details of Part I of the Report.

Part II of the Report is devoted to the Study of Ancient Monuments and Sites (pp. 3-73). It contains much useful matter for the benefit of students of Indian Sculpture and Iconography as a mere glance at the plates will show.—Part III deals with Numismatics (pp. 74-81) and describes some Pāṇḍya coins of date prior to A.D. 1200 and also those of later Pāṇḍyas (after A.D. 1210) viz. Mārarman Sundara Pāṇḍya I, Sundara Pāṇḍya II, Jātavarman Sundara Pāṇḍya and Mārarman Kulaśekhara I. Part IV (Manuscripts) pp. 82-119 describes the MS of Memoirs of Hyder Ally referred to above and takes a detailed review of its contents. The MS was purchased in London. Another copy of this MS in English exists in the British Museum and consists of 176 pages. The present MS contains 166 pages in three books. It is possible to suggest that this MS is a translation of an original Portuguese MS written in A.D. 1770. These Memoirs of Hyder (1758-1770) record chronologically many anecdotes about his rise in the army and eventually in the administration of the country. It refers to many facts touching on Hyder's ability and character e.g. his unscrupulousness in killing his mother with his own hands. This story of matricide requires corroboration though it is a contemporary statement from one who had great admiration for his hero.—Part V (New Inscriptions for the year 1937) pp. 120-189 contains the texts, Notes and translations of many lithic records, some of which bear dates A.D. 1455, 1340, 1259, 1282, 1311, 1280, 1294, 1303, 1196, 1337, 1514, 1276, 1181, 1109, 1148, 1162, 1140, 1097, 1142, 1240, 1207, 1551, 1122, 1303, 1300, 1334, 1337, etc. One of the inscriptions, though not dated belongs to the Gaṅga ruler Satyavākya Rāchamalla II
The sculpture of a bull (Plate II, 2) depicting a young bull of the "Baroda breed" would be found interesting to the historians of Indian agriculture and Cattle-breeding. Another important sculpture is the image of Paraśurāma (Plate XI, 3) with his paraśu or mace-axe resting on the right knee. As in the sculptures in Ellora and Elephanta his lower lip is thick while the upper one is thin. This reminds us of the celebrated "Austrian lip." Other sculptures though important cannot be indicated in this notice for want of space.

Dr. Krishna and his Department deserve our best thanks for publishing such Reports under the direct patronage of the Government of H. H. the Maharaja of Mysore, one of the most progressive and enlightened rulers of modern India.

P. K. G.

Vijayanagara Sexcentenary Commemoration Volume (Published under the auspices of the Vijayanagara Empire Sexcentenary Association and Karnataka Historical Research Society, Dharwar) 1936; Pp. iv+380; Size: 71/2" × 10".

The present volume, sumptuous in matter and form, is a visible indication of that national consciousness among Indian Scholars, which has shown itself as a potent factor dominating all their activities in varied spheres, social, intellectual and political, during the last two decades. This healthy attitude of mind has brought forth a national revival in all spheres of intellectual life and has given us a new vision and a new aim in our studies pertaining to our past glories as also our pitfalls.

It is really an irony of fate that a Hindu Empire which stood in tact against foreign inroads for no less than two hundred years should be shattered to pieces by one decisive battle and should require a Sexcentenary volume to commemorate its glories and cultural achievements! Be that as it may, we heartily thank the organizers of the present volume for putting together much valuable historical matter about this "forgotten empire" in the form of 32 papers (with numerous illustrations) from young and veteran scholars, who have been actuated by the sole desire of representing every aspect of this empire on the basis of historical records.

In 1931 Mr. P. N. Bengeri of Hubli suggested a celebration at Hampi in commemoration of the Sexcentenary of the foundation the Vijayanagara Empire. An association for this purpose was formed in 1933 and public opinion in favour of the celebration was created among the people of Karṇāṭaka by holding conferences at Hubli (1933), Raichur (1934) and Bombay (1934). It was decided to publish a (1) History of Vijayanagara in Kannada, (2) a Vijayanagara Commemoration volume first in English and in vernaculars later on as also (3) a picture-album of the monumental relics of Vijayanagara. Of these three items the monumental English volume is an accomplished fact and we await an early execution of the other two items with eagerness.

The present volume has been brought out under the guidance of the veteran historian Dewan Bahadur Dr. S. Krishnaswamy Aiyangar, M.A., Ph.D. who, in spite of his advanced age of 66 years devoted his energies to the work of the volume and but for whose guidance "the volume would not have had the finish in the matter and form which it now has" as we are informed gratefully by Mr. D. P. Kammarkar, the Secretary of the "Vijayanagara Commemoration Volume."

Before closing our short notice of this volume we shall only indicate in brief the names of contributors together with their contributions: (1) S. K. Aiyangar—Character and Significance of the Empire of Vijayanagar in Indian History, (2) H. Heras—Vijayanagara Empire a Synthesis of South Indian Culture, (3) R. Ramrao—Hinduism under Vijayanagara Kings, (4) K. Ishwarra Dutt—Telugu Literature under Vijayanagara Empire, (5) S. R. Sharma—Vijayanagara and Jainism, (6) C.

P. K. G.


The volume before us is an illustrious addition to the celebrated Saraswati Bhavan Texts Series of Benares. The Ishvara-Pratyabhijñāvimaśiṇi of Abhinavagupta is the most important work on the Saiva Philosophy of Kashmir, as it is a mature product of Abhinavagupta’s brilliant genius. It gives the fundamentals of Saivism in a brief but lucid manner of exposition. Abhinavagupta is known to us also as the author of the Abhinawadhārati commentary on Bharata’s Nātyasāstra. He was influenced in his exposition of the theory of Rasa by the Kashmir Saiva Philosophy of which he was an acknowledged master. The need for a traditional interpretation of this philosophy so long felt by scholars has been at last fulfilled by the present commentary of Bhāskara, published for the first time by two able scholars Prof. Aiyar and Dr. Pandey of the Lucknow University.

Bhāskara’s commentary or Bhāskari is represented by a rare MS used for the present edition. It was discovered by Dr. Pandey (the indefatigable author of the monumental work on Abhinavagupta) in Srinagar in 1931. Its owner is a descendant of Bhāskara still living in Kashmir. A copy of this original MS is now in the possession of Pandit Maheshwar Razdan of Srinagar. This copy has been used for the pre-
sent edition. The difficulty of editing a Sanskrit text on the basis of a single MS is very great but the editors have tried their best to be faithful to the MS used by them facilitating the work of subsequent editors. In the critical introduction the Editors have explained in detail the value of this commentary. They are of opinion that "Bhāskara's interpretation of the Vimarśini is in strict accordance with tradition, because the Saiva tradition was unbroken, as he himself says, upto his time (Bhaskari, I. p. 7)." Giving an estimate of Bhāskara as a commentator we are told that "Hardly any word of the original is left unexplained. But it is not merely a word for word commentary. He tries to bring out the philosophical import of the original and, where necessary, he enlarges upon the real meaning of Abhinava." As regards Bhāskara's date and antecedents Dr. PandeY has already dealt with the subject on p. 151 ff. of his "Abhinavagupta" and hence the subject is not dealt with in the present Introduction.

If Bhāskara strictly follows tradition and if his exposition of Abhinava's text is very scholarly and rooted in this tradition the fact that Bhāskara is a late commentator of the 18th century need not detract the value of his commentary as emphasized by the learned editors. It is high time that many of the texts on the Saiva Philosophy of Kashmir now in MS form are published by scholars in Kashmir and outside and thus made available for further critical study in the manner adopted by Prof. Aiyar and Dr. Pandey.

P. K. G.

---


It is a pity that Malwa, which played an important part during the Hindu and early Muslim periods of Indian History has had upto now no history worthy of its past except Sir John Malcolm's Memoir of Central India (1820), which, being a pioneer work, was necessarily imperfect and became obsolete in course of time. This deficiency in the history of Malwa has been now happily made good by our learned friend Dr. Raghbir Singh, who combines in himself in a unique degree all the benefits accruing from a rare co-operation of Sri and Saraswati. To add to this blessed circumstance the Maharaj Kumar possesses intimate knowledge of Malwa with its topography and genealogy—a factor which makes his present study of Malwa, "intensive, accurate and exhaustive" as Sir Jadunath SARKAR calls it in his brief but forceful foreword to the Volume. The Raj Kumar has also utilized all the available materials, bearing on the period chosen by him, in printed and manuscript records from Persian, Marathi, Hindi, English and French sources, thus making his history comprehensive, rich and factual, but perspicuous and readable, divested of hyperbole and undue patriotism. It would be difficult to replace such a history of Malwa easily by a better one for at least half a century to come.

The volume is divided into seven chapters:—(1) Malwa at the close of the 17th century (pp. 1-23); (2) Malwa during the last decade Aurangzeb's reign (pp. 24-87); (3) The increasing importance of Malwa (1707-1719) pp. 88-126; (4) The Mughal-Maratha struggle (first stage 1719-1730) pp. 127-207; (5) The Mughal-Maratha stage (second stage—1730-1741) pp. 208-287; (6) The consolidation of the Maratha Hold on Malwa and the End of the Epoch (1741-1765) pp. 288-321; (7) Condition of Malwa during the Period (1698-1765) pp. 322-339.

The author's conclusion about the First Phase of Malwa's history dealt with in the present volume is that "the whole period (1698-1765) was naturally one of transi-
tion and that the province saw great changes which revolutionized its society, culture and ideals, introduced new factors and above all gave entirely new colour to its political map.” During the period of upheaval and disorder any great creative effort was naturally wanting. A general degradation of intellectual life of the province was inevitable during the period. Whether the impact of the Marathas would help Mâlwa to rise once again to its former greatness could be answered by a study of the second phase. We await with eagerness this study of the Second phase of the history of Mâlwa promised by the learned author in the present volume. The Bibliography, Index and the Maps which accompany the volume make it very useful to the students of Indian History. The volume has been carefully edited and neatly printed,—features which reflect credit on the author and the publisher alike. A few photographs of some of the historic sites in Malwa would have enhanced the value of the historical narrative of this Mâlwa in Transition.

P. K. G.

The Successors of the Sîtavâhanas (in lower Deccan) by Dinesh Chandra Sircar, M.A., Ph.D., University of Calcutta, 1939, Pp. xv+417. Size:—6\(\frac{1}{4}\)" \(\times\) 9\(\frac{1}{4}\)".

The early history of India has ever remained a subject of exceptional interest to historians perhaps on account of the paucity of material which makes historical reconstruction difficult, if not impossible. Eminent scholars, Indian and foreign, have exerted themselves continuously to give us a reasonable and readable account of the early dynastic and cultural history on the strength of epigraphic and literary evidence so far available. Much churning of the available inscriptions has already been effected and as a result of this incessant labour the bare outlines of history have been made visible. The pioneer work done by scholars like Bhandarkar, Fleet, Rice, Derbreuil and others in the field of the early history of Peninsular India has been inspiring younger scholars like Dr. D. C. Sircar to further efforts in the field and as a result thereof we have before us the present volume in which the author tries to develop in a strictly scientific manner the views exposed by him in his monographs and papers bearing on that “Blank in history” between the last great Sîtavâhana (Andhra ruler and the first Pulakesin). The Volume is divided into two Parts, Part I dealing with the Eastern Districts (the Andhra region) and Part II with the Western Districts, (the Kârpañita region). To reconstruct a back-bone from the dry lines of epigraphs is not an easy job, especially in a field where many of these bones are likely to remain “bones of contention” between one expert and another. The author has given in this volume not merely a survey of research but has added to it some new points (vide p. 5 Intro.) for the consideration of responsible scholars. We have, therefore, no doubt that his work would be useful to every student of Indian history who cares to interest himself in the exploration and investigation of the dark recesses of the history of the Deccan in the widest sense of the term. We await with eagerness the Second Volume of this work (in the course of preparation), dealing with the dynasties that succeeded the Sîtavâhanas in the Upper Deccan.

Poona.

P. K. Gode.
HARI KAVI'S CONTRIBUTION TO THE PROBLEM OF THE BHAVĀNI SWORD OF SHIVAJI THE GREAT

By

P. K. GODE, Poona.

In 1924 Mr. S. M. Edwards contributed a note on Shivaji's Sword "Bhavāni" to the Indian Antiquary which he concluded with the following appeal to scholars:

"The question still remains 'where is now the original Sword Bhavāni?' In view of what is written above and of the fact that the Sword now worshipped at Satara is the Sword of Shahu, can any reader suggest a solution of the problem? Could the Sword have been taken to Benares when the Raja retired thither after his deposition? Has it been hidden to reappear at some future date as the symbol of a united Maratha people? Perhaps

I. Vol. LIII, 1924, pp. 18-20—References to the Bhavāni Sword recorded by Mr. Edwards are as follows:

1. Svadigvijaya Bakhar (reference translated by Dr. Surendranath Sen on p. 181 of his translation of Sabhāsad Bakhar).

2. Grant Duff's History of the Marathas Vol. I, Oxf. Univ. Press, 1921, p. 230—Grant Duff states that the Bhavāni Sword "is still preserved by the Raja of Satara". On p. 244 (Vol. I) he mentions that Sambhaji carried the sword during the Maratha attack on Goa in 1683 and that he did great execution with it. On p. 313 (Vol. I) he states that two swords viz. (1) the Bhavāni Sword and (2) the sword of Afzalkhan of Bijapur had been taken by the Mughals at Raigarh. These were given as presents to Shahu by Aurangzeb when Shahu's nuptials were celebrated by the Emperor. Both these swords as well as the third sword personally presented to Shahu by Aurangzeb were in the possession of the Raja of Satara at the time Grant Duff published his history in 1826.

3. Mr. D. B. Parasnis informed Mr. Edwards that the sword preserved at Satara is 3'-9" in length in the blade and 8" long in the handle and bears a Marathi inscription "Śrīmān Śarkār Rajmandal Raja Shahu Kadim Avval," which shows that it is the weapon of Shahu. Parasnis further informed Mr. Edwards that there is a belief at Satara that the original Bhavāni Sword was taken by Tarabal, wife of Rajaram to Kolhapur and that in 1875 this sword was presented by the Diwan of Kolhapur to H. M. the late King Edward. It was exhibited in 1878 at the Paris exhibition (vide p. 68 of Handbook of the British Indian Section of this exhibition by Sir George Birdwood). Mr. Edwards made inquiries in England about the above sword the result of which rendered it certain that the Bhavāni was never taken to England.

4. Pratap Singh the Raja of Satara presented General Lionel Smith with a sword in A.D. 1820 with the approval of the then Governor of Bombay. Mr. Edwards rejects Parasnis' suggestion that this sword may have been the Bhavāni sword.
some one of the leading students of Maratha history may be able to answer the question."

In view of this appeal made 14 years ago by the then editor of the *Indian Antiquary* and finding that no effort had been made by scholars to examine the whole problem of the genesis and historicity of the Bhavâni sword I was tempted to make some notes about this problem and make my own contribution to it, howsoever slight, though I don't claim to be a 'leading' student of Maratha History. In these notes I tried to gather what has been said about the Bhavânî sword by some of the previous writers on the subject with a view to indicate the stage at which the problem stands at present. Thinking that these notes may be of use to other workers in this field I am publishing them after waiting for full two years (since this paper was first drafted) with a view to get the benefit of exchange of views with senior workers in the field.

In the *Shivaji Souvenir* published on the occasion of the Ter-centenary of the Maratha King, Shivaji the Great, we find photographs of four panels of Shivaji Memorial prepared by the celebrated sculptor, V. P. KARMARKAR (facing p. 98 of English Section of the *Souvenir*). One of these panels contains the picture of Goddess Bhavâni with eight arms presenting a sword to Shivaji Maharaj, who is shewn at her feet with face towards the goddess and receiving the sword with both his hands. Mr. H. George FRANKS interprets this panel by putting the following words on record as coming from the mouth of the Great Shivaji:

"I received that famous sword very early in my career as a token of a compact with the Chief Gowardar Sawant. It has been suggested to me on my way to the place where it was being kept that I should take it by force, but remembering what tremendous storms are sometimes raised by unnecessary trifles, I thought it better to leave it to its owner, especially as its possession was not a matter of life and death to me. In the end the wise chief brought the sword to me as a sign of amity even when he knew that its purchase-price was not to be measured in blood. From that day onward

2. Edited by G. S. SAREDESAI contains an *English section* which includes (1) the Jedhe chronology (2) the Jedhe karena (3) Are the Bhonsales Kshatriyas? (4) Shivaji and the Portuguese (5) Original documents:—Shahaji's letter to Ali Adil Shah, A Persian Firman, Shivaji's letter to his father, Shivaji to Maloji Ghorpade, Shivaji to his officers, etc. (6) Shivaji's letter to Jayasinha, etc., and a *Marathi-Hindi Section* including (1) Kavi Bhushan (2) Shivabaliwani (3) Maratha Forts (description) (4) Maratha Forts (alphabetical list) (5) The birth-date of Shivaji (6) Historical documents and letters:—Shivaji's letter to Baji Prabhu, Jijabai's letter, Treaty between Shivaji and Portuguese, etc., (7) Commercial policy of Shivaji, (8) Some old arms and their history (9) Meeting of Shivaji and Chhatrasal (10) Life sketches of Shivaji's contemporaries, etc.—This volume was published on 3rd May, 1927. It contains the following illustrations:—(1) Shivaji on horseback (2) Aurangzeb in old age (3) Ambarkhana at Panhalgad (4) Shri Ramdas (5) Kalyan gate of Sinhagad (6) Swords and arms (7) Chhatrasal (8) Four panels of Shivaji Memorial (9) Shahaji and Shah Jahan (10) Bust of Shivaji (11) Some Marathi letters reproduced.
the sword, which I reverently named after my tutelary deity Bhavānī always accompanied me, its resting place when not in use generally being the altar of the goddess, to be received back from her as a visible favour from heaven, always on the Dasara day when setting forth on my campaigns. I am told that the sword is now at Satara, but I am afraid that I cannot verify it until I can see it to identify it. The fine Genoa blade 3 feet and 9 inches in length, might, in fact, be my other favourite sword which I called Tulja presented to me by my father."

I am not aware of the authorities on which the above journalistic description is based but it may be taken to be an upto date summary of the history and tradition associated with the swords of Shivaji the Great. I am concerned in this paper with the sword known as the Bhavānī sword and hence shall try to put on record references to this sword from contemporary and subsequent records which may reveal the high value attached to it on account of the successive and successful feats of bravery and personal adventure which mark the entire career of this great hero.

In the Maratha Chronicle composed by Malhar Ramrao Chitnis in A.D. 1811 we find the following passage referring to the Bhavānī sword:—

Page 134—“महाराजाणी सफाईः कहन ‘तुम तो बड़े और पठाण, आव दृंकारी महानी शिवाजीकी देखो’ महान तरवारीचा वार शांतावर केला”.

In the above extract which describes the Afzalkhan incident in Shivaji’s life we are told that Shivaji retaliated to Afzalkhan’s attack by giving a

3. Mr. Y. R. Gupte has reproduced an original letter of Shivaji addressed by him to his step-brother Vyankoji which begins with “श्रीमान्देव श्रीसुल्तान महानी”. It appears from line 49 of this letter that Shivaji was conscious of the favour of his deity in all his operations against the Muslims. This line reads as follows:—

“इसरा विचार कर्तव्य होता हो, श्रीदेवताची व श्रीची रूपा स्वारी पूजन जाती आहे. दुस्तुऽनुन्माने ते मारितात etc” (Vide इतिहाससंग्रह (October, 1915) Vol. VII, Nos. 1, 2, 3 (४८. दुले. देख. २). Cf. Jayarama Kavi (A.D. 1653-58) Radhāmādhavavilāsa Campū (VI Ullāsa) p. 227—“तुलजामानी श्रीमानांगुर्जन च……तुला”

4. Life of Shivaji the Great in seven chapters by Malhar Ramrao Chitnis, edited with copious notes, critical and explanatory, by K. N. SANE, 1924 (A. B. Press, Poona). Some other chronicles pertaining to the Maratha History are:—

(1) शिवाजीपतीच चरित—by Krishnaji Anant Sabhasad written in 1694 at Jinni, by order of Rajaram; ed. by K. N. SANE, 3rd ed. 1912. Trans. into English by J. L. MANKAR as Life and Exploits of Shivaji (Bombay 1st Ed. 1884, 2nd Ed. 1886).

(2) रायसुमाबनर् composed about 1760.

(3) शिवाजिनिबंध Ed. by P. R. NANDURBARKAR and L. K. DANDEKAR. (Baroda, 1895).

stroke of his sword with the words: “you are a big person besides being a Pathan; just have a taste of this Bhavānī (sword) of Shivaji.” The accounts of this Afzalkhan incident state that Shivaji carried with him the tiger’s claws (vāgh nakha) and a bichvā (a small dagger). If these details are true to history it may not be true that Shivaji had with him on this occasion the Bhavānī sword referred to in the Chitnis Bakhar. It may also be difficult to presume the identity of the bichvā with the Bhavānī sword. Leaving it to specialists to settle these questions we may feel satisfied by only noting the reference to the name Bhavānī (sword) in the Chitnis Chronicle of A.D. 1811.

Another chronicle which gives exhaustive information, about the Bhavānī sword is the “Sri Sivadigvijaya” published at Baroda in 1895. Dr. Surendranath Sen in his Siva Chhatrapati translates the account of the Bhavānī sword appearing on pp. 354 ff of the above edition of the Sivadigvijaya as follows:

The Bhavānī sword “S.D. [154] the Sāvants had an excellent dhop tarwar (a long and straight sword) worth two hundred Hons. Shivaji wished that such a famous sword should be with him. But it is not proper to wish for a good thing that belongs to one’s Sardars [155] or a neighbour of rank.

***The Mahārājā wished to have the sword but it would bring him disrepute as the precedent showed,—and so the Mahārājā observed that the matter should not be even spoken of;—as in another age such a cause had resulted in the slaughter of many.* * *But the sword that had divine properties addressed the Mahārājā in a dream.―“If thou goest to fight with me in thy hand even at the head of a small force against a mighty army the enemies will be routed and victory shall attend thee. Do not give the sword back, keep it always near thee and duly worship it.” That very night the Sāvant heard the following behest in a dream—“Give the sword to the Mahārājā and secure his friendship thereby. Otherwise thou shalt lose thy kingdom. I shall no longer stay with thee and I am going away.” The Sāvant assembled his officers and related all about the dream. With the counsel of all, it was decided to secure the friendship of the Mahārājā by

5. Vide Siva Chhatrapati, Vol. I, Calcutta 1929 by Dr. Surendranath Sen. Sivadigvijaya is the most voluminous of the three bakhars viz, (1) the Sabhasad bakhār (2) the Chitnis bakhār and (3) the Sivadigvijaya. Its authorship is shrouded in mystery. Its author was a Prabhu Kāyastha according to Dr. Sen, but not Kharqpa Bāllāl as the editors suppose. RAJAWADE thinks that the author was some scion of the Baroda branch of the Chitnis family. Its language is at times very modern. RAJAWADE thinks that the bakhār is a revised edition of an old bakhār. Sir Jadunath SARKAR, thinks that it is the revised edition of a new lost bakhār of which Tārikh-i-Shivāji is the Persian rendering. Its date is uncertain. RAJAWADE supports the date 1818 suggested by Mr. Shankar Balakrishna. (pp. 258-259).

An English translation of Tārikh-i-Shivāji is published by Sir Jadunath SARKAR in Modern Review—March 1907.
presenting the sword. Accordingly the Sāvant came to see the Rājā and presented the sword to him. It was named Tuljā Bhavānī."

In the picture of Shivaji reproduced by James Douglas we find Shivaji seated on horse-back in full attire holding the reigns of the horse in the left hand and a straight sword blade extending from its handle firmly grasped in the right hand. This sword blade appears to be the earliest pictorial representation of Shivaji's sword. Can it by any stretch of historical imagination be identified with the famous Bhavāni sword the subject of so much description in the Sivadigvijaya quoted (in translation) above?

In the Shivaji Souvenir volume (1927) we find a very exhaustive article on Historical Weapons by Prof. Manikrao of Baroda (pp. 138-153) in which he states that the Bhavāni sword of Shivaji was sent to King Edward by the Maharaja of Kolhapur and that it is preserved at the Buckingham Palace in a golden cupboard. He also expects its return to the Indian soil and exhorts the historical research scholars to collect all possible information about this sword (p. 150). He then gives us a description of this sword in detail such as—two deep lines or grooves on both the sides; golden decoration on the steel parts of the handle; its handle made of steel and provided with cover; its blade broadened at the joint of the blade and the handle; the end of the handle studded with rubbies and diamonds. This sword, Prof. Manikrao states, was preserved at Kolhapur and was an object of worship but the descendants of Shivaji parted with it out of a sense of loyalty to King Edward. (p. 151.)

I am unable to verify the statements made by Prof. Manikrao regarding the Bhavānī sword in the above article. If the sword is preserved in the Buckingham Palace its identification may not be a difficult matter. But as matters stand the Bhavānī sword has become the object of much historical speculation and patriotic wonder and the people of Maharashtra will be prepared to pay any price for it provided its existence is traced and its identity proved on historical evidence.


7. Bombay and Western India by James Douglas, London, 1893. Vol. II, p. 174—Mr. Douglas remarks: "No portrait of him has come down to us in an English work except the one in Orme's history, evidently from an oval on glass by some Delhi painter [Given ante Vol. I, p. 331. The accompanying cut is from De JanCigny and X. Raymond's Inde (Firmin Didot fr. 1845).—B] and most probably picked up by Orme or his father (landed an adventurer in Western India, 1706) in their wanderings along the coast of Western India in the early part of the 18th Century. Their proximity to Shivaji's own time, is a partial guarantee of its faithfulness". Douglas gives a bust of Shivaji on p. 331 of Vol. II from Orme.

In the Travels in the Mogul Empire (A.D. 1665-1668) by Bernier reprinted in 1891 (London: Constable & Co.) a bust of Shivaji is reproduced on p. 187 from Valentyn's Beschryving in which is published an engraving of this bust from an Indian drawing. Mr. V. S. Bendre has published in 1933 this bust of Shivaji with the following endorsement:—"Copied from the painting secured by Von Valentyn just after the Surat Sack of 1664 A.D.". For other pictures of Shivaji see Pictorial Shivaji published by Y. N. Kelkar, Poona, 1935.
There was once a belief current in Maharashtra that the sword was preserved in the British Museum. The late Mr. V. L. Bhave has tried to dispel this belief by publishing a letter from the authorities of the British Museum stating that no such sword as the Bhavani sword has been preserved in that Museum. This belief runs counter to the statement of Prof. Manikrao that the Bhavani sword is preserved at the Buckingham Palace.

Mr. Parasnath in his article on the Afsalkhan incident quotes the following passage from Justice M. G. Ranade's *Rise of the Maratha Power* (pp. 97-99) :-

"The Mahomedan historians, whom Grant Duff follows, charge Shiva-jí with treachery in the first attack he made with the fatal vāgh-nakh (tiger claws) and the Bhavānī sword, etc."

The above remarks give rise to an impression that the works of the Mahomedan historians contain a reference to the Bhavani sword. I am unable to verify the above statement at present. In the present paper I am confining myself to the references to the Bhavani sword in the Maratha records with a view to point out the earliest reference to this sword in the contemporary records.

Prof. R. P. Patwardhan in his article on the Afsalkhan incident remarks that the chief sources for the Afsalkhan incident are *Śivabharata, Jedhe Sakavali, Pavada, Sabhāsadi bakhar* and 91 *Kolami Bakhar* and then states that no reference to the use of vāgh-nakh occurs in *Śivabharata*.

8. *Itihāsa Samgraha* (Dec. 1914-Jan. 1915) Vol. VI, Nos. 4 to 6 गळा वेदक — No. 19 (p. 62) — In the description of the combat as given by Parasnath on the authority of a bakhar discovered by him at Satara the only offensive weapons on Shivaji's person when he set out for the combat are (1) vāgh nakha and (2) Bichvā (p. 69). In this article Parasnath has published a photograph of Afsalkhan's tomb at Pratagpad (facing p. 73). There is also an article in this issue of the *Itihāsa Samgraha* on the family diary of Shivaji containing a photograph of the image of the goddess (facing p. 74) and another photograph of the temple of the goddess (facing p. 76).

James Douglas gives a picture of vāgh nakha in Vol. II of his *Bombay and Western India* (p. 181). His chapters on Shivaji's Forts in this volume (pp. 157-197) will be found interesting. They contain some good illustrations such as (1) Ganga Sāgar Tank at Rayaghar (p. 157); (2) Rajah (p. 66) (3) Prataggarh and Afsalkhan's tomb (p. 167); (4) Shivaji on horseback (p. 171); (5) Plan and elevation of Shivaji's Cenotaph (p. 180).

Jayarama Kavi's description of Shivaji's visit to the temple of Bhavānī at Pratagpad and of the image of the goddess will be found in the *Parnālappersvata-grahānākhyāna*, chapt. IV, verses 21-54. The temple was thronged with people gathered for the mahā pūja

"चंद्रमुन्देशकालाय्यलिंगनिनासिद्धम्।
कलोन्नितमहापूर्णसंतहस्यजयोऽश्चिद्धम्॥ २६॥"


10. Ibid., p. 164.

11. Edited by S. M. Divekar (B.I.S. Mandal, Poona, 1927) with numerous
Jadhe Sakavali and 91 Kalamay bakhari. The Sivabhārata refers to "Kupālikā" while the 91 Kalamay bakhari refers to only bichvā and pattā. The Jedhe Sakavali does not refer to any weapon at all. Later Prof. Patwardhan describing how Shivaji got ready to meet Afgah Khan states (p. 176)—"He held the Bhavani sword in the right hand and the bichvā in the left and tied the shield to his back" ("उजवे इतांत मावणी संसरण व उजवे इतांत चिवच चितता पाळका हाय बंधली"). I am not aware if Prof. Patwardhan identifies the "Kupālikā" referred to in the Sivabhārata with the Bhavani sword. Possibly the term Kupālikā may refer to the bichvā more than to the Bhavani sword. This reference is however inconclusive so far as my present inquiry is concerned because we don’t get in the Sivabhārata any mention of the name Mavane as applied to Shivaji’s sword.

In the Sivakavya composed by Purushottama in Sanskrit the meeting of Shivaji and Afzalkhan is described at some length. This poem was composed in A.D. 1821 and hence, though its historical value may not be very

---

12. An English rendering of this chronology appears in Shivaji Souvenir (1927) pp. 1 to 45—by Sir Jadanath Sarker. Pages 47-99 contain an English rendering of the Jedhe Kareena by Sir J. Sarkar. The original texts of the Jedhe Sakavali and the J. Kareena in Marathi were published by Lokamanya B. G. Tilak in Siva Carita-Pradipa (pp. 14-65) ed. by D. V. Apte and S. M. Diyekar (B. I. S. Mandal, Poona, 1925). These texts are based on a MS in the possession of Dayajirao Sarjerao Jedhe Deshmukh of the village Kari in Bhor State. This MS is on Portuguese paper (22 folios). Rajawade published fragments of this Sakavali in his Sources of Maratha History (Kandha XVIII, No. 5).


14. Amarakośa Kanya II, verse 89 mentions the word Kupālikā ("कुपालिका) as sword ("निःविषविचारदहसवचिरिन्: । कौशिको मण्डलप्रम: करवालः कुपालिकेऽऽ नारायणवत् ॥ ८९ ॥") (see B.S.S. edition of Amarakośa, 1907, p. 202). For the text of this work the editor has used a MS copied in A.D. 1297. (Vide his Sīcānā at the commencement). Mr. Apte in his dictionary explains Kupālikā = a sword while he explains Kupālikā a knife or a dagger. The lexicon Abhidhāna Cintāmani of Hemacandra records the word: Kupālikā (३ मल्लकुपालिका) — "हुरी हुरी Kupālikā"

In the Parnālaparvata grahamākhyāna (or the story in verse of the capture of the Panhal fort near Kolhapur) composed by Jayarama Kavi in Saka 1595 (preface p. 1) = A.D. 1673 the following verse shows that the vāghnakha was used by Shivaji’s soldiers as a matter of routine:— (chapter III, verse 25 of the Bh. I. S. Mandal Edn., 1923, Poona)

"शाहरूखनाबाहिनीनिर्माणकरिकृतसूर्यसुतान" ""सा काव्यजनकोपरिवर्तितनिर्माणकरिकृतसूर्यसुतान"

15. Published in the Kavyetthasa Samgraha (1884, 1887, by K. N. Sane and J. B. Modak.) This Kavya is almost an epic of the Maratha History (from A.D. 1627 to 1818). Purushottama’s surname was Bandeṣṭi and his family was resident of Pedgaun in Ahmadnagar District. Purushottama was born in A.D. 1766 and died as a sanyāśī in A.D. 1856.
great it has some merits as a poem. It describes the fatal embrace of Afzalkhan as follows:

"आलिमन्द्रण इमो मुगराहिबेंगं
भूला नूपस्य सबिरः प्रविधाय बाहोः।
तत्स्थि गुप्तौ वल्यानं नक्तोंस्य कुर्क्षी
शाक्याः (क्रया) विभेद विशेषो हयनं पपात || ५९ || "

The MS from which the above verse is quoted contains illustrations in colour of the Afzalkhan incident. One of these illustrations represents Shivaji dressed for the combat or rather his meeting with Afzalkhan. He holds on his right hand the vāgh-nakha and a small dagger in the left hand, which is obviously the bichvā referred to in the several accounts of this incident and mentioned as शाह्री by our poet. The following three verses tell us how Shivaji meditated on his family deity Durgā and obtained her favour before starting on his perilous task:

"शाह्री ल्वदीयोर्ष्म सरायकोशः कालो बलीयानां कृतत्रो समायमः।
श्रवणेवभ भीमवलोहमालो हुँ भें देवी शरणं न चायनं: || ४८ ||
तत्स्य: प्रसादाद्वियोमथ्य निःलिम विभता न षि काकिणः।
तद्विन्नो लेभाभाण्या वीर वीरवन्मोः: पातिंवीरस्वस्वः: || ४९ ||
द्वस्य स सेनापिमति प्रवेषात्र हस्तायुः व्याधनस्य निबध्यः।
वधे करे सुधमतरः शाक्याः निधाय देवीं प्रणमः प्राय: || ५० || "

The poet explains the word शाक्य as follows in his commentary:

"शाक्ये ह्यरिको व्याध्यर्ष्म चालित पुत्री च ह्यरिका चारि वेदुः क्रमः: ||

16. I have copied this verse from a MS of the work in the Govt. MSS Library at the B. O. R. Institute, Poona,—No. 81 of 1907-15. Purusottama composed a commentary on his poem in which he explains the above verse as follows:—

"आलिमन्द्रण इति षि: यवनः मुगरासः सिहः: इशमिभ आलिमन्द्रणश्य क्रोणे समवे एन्वो राजाना
भूला नूपस्य शिर: बाहोः मने प्रविधाय हं भूला तत्स्य:।
वल्यानं गुप्तौ अस्य गवलस्य कुर्क्षी
कुक्कुशिक्षेदारी नछेनेति हलतः: साप्तिविकिरहति: व्याधनशेषेनेत्यथः: शाक्याः (क्रया) न विभेद विच्छेद
हि यस्यां मेलनालुः बिगता बिलास्यमात्र सुविदः: यक्नोपि अवनी पपात परिष्वानः || ५९ || "

17. Vide folio 45a of B. O. R. Institute MS No. 81 of 1907-15. The verse describing the person of Shivaji reads as follows:—

"नान्तुची नाहिनीचः कमलदलिन्द्रप्रजाहार्ष्मपोषो
सौरायो मूडजुजुम्बन्धः न जननयोपिता कामादेवः।
निमित्त: सिन्हावानोपराशरकर्मः केंद्रमुपाभिमूर्ती
मुद्रवनारक्षणादिजितिहिताल्पमानास्योः प्रतिवे: || ५२ ||

This verse of course does not mention the vāghnak and the dagger shown in the picture (2½ inches × 1½ inches in size) referred to as व्याधन and शाह्री in verse 50 on folio 44a.
It appears to me that the "सुभृत्तराष्ट्रीय" mentioned by Purusottama is the same as the क्रुणाशिका of the Sivabhārata. It is, however, difficult to identify क्रुणाशिका with the Bhavāni sword.

James Douglas in his chapter on Shivaji in his Bombay and Western India published in 1893 makes a reference to the Bhavāni sword and states in a footnote:—"The Genoa blade presented to the Prince of Wales in 1875 during his visit to India by the Raja of Kolhapur" and reproduces a picture of the sword from Grant Duff's History (p. 346). This picture gives us a long blade of sword with a decorated handle with the scabbard pictured near it. The blade of the sword as represented in this picture is curved at the end but the breadth of the blade is almost uniform and not broadened as in the case of the sword claimed to be Shivaji's sword by Mr. Bomontee D. Pudumji of Poona, who has published a small pamphlet called "Notes on the subject of Shivaji's sword". This sword is a "tegh" sword with a broad curved blade, slightly concave in the middle and made of flexible steel. It is single-edged and higher up double-edged up to a length of 9 inches from its point. The length of the blade measured along the middle of its curve from the point to the hilt is 2 ft. 4½ inches. The tang of the sword is 2½ inches wide. The blade is broader higher up, the maximum width being nearly 3 inches. The hilt of the sword is beautifully

---

18. Bombay and Western India, Vol. I, pp. 331-346, deal with Shivaji, his country, his birth, his person and character, his accomplishments, his motto, his good and bad traits, etc. These pages contain the following illustrations:—

(1) Picture of Shivaji (bust) from Orme's Fragments (p. 331).
(2) View of Sinhgadh (from a photograph by Dr. T. Crooke (p. 339).
(3) Shivaji's sword "Bhavāni" (from Grant Duff's History) (p. 346).

19. Ibid, p. 342—This footnote explains the statement of Prof. Manikrao of Baroda referred to earlier in this paper to the effect that the Maharaja of Kolhapur presented the sword to King Edward. The Prince of Wales referred to by James Douglas is of course identical with King Edward VII. Students interested in the history and identification of the Bhavāni sword may hunt up this clue from official sources.

20. Mr. Pudumji in his pamphlet (August, 1928,) gives us a picture of a sword in his possession which he claims as Shivaji's sword. He also observes (p. 2 of pamphlet) "At any rate one thing is certain that the sword called 'Bhowāni' has not yet been irrefutably identified. There is a belief in Satara that a sight of the sword causes safe delivery of a woman in labour". He refers to the information published by Mr. P. M. Chandorkar in the Journal of the Bharata Itihasa Mandal, Poona, 1918 A.D., to the effect that on either side of the throne of Shivaji at Satara there are two swords. One of them is an ordinary sword. The other is the Bhavāni sword on the right hand side of the throne. There is an engraving on the blade of this sword viz. "सरकार राजा साहबनाथपति काद" from which we find that King Shahu appears to have engraved his own name on it. On the blade of the sword in the possession of Mr. Pudumji the words "छापति महाराज शीवाजी" are inlaid in gold in Devanagari characters. Dr. S. K. Belvalkar thinks that a letter in the word छापति is written in the style in which we find it in MSS 150 or 200 years old (p. 15 of pamphlet).
enchased with tiny gold flowers. On the other side of the blade are marks of the crescent moon (6 small marks of the crescent moon, 4 small marks of the full moon possibly and 2 big marks of the crescent moon). Mr. Bomanji Pudumji prints on p. 3 of his pamphlet a copy of a letter dated 24th March, 1925, from the authorities of the British Museum stating that the British Museum does not possess the original “Tiger-claw” or sword of Shivaji.

21. In a letter dated 12th February, 1912, from Mr. D. P. Moos to Khan Bahadur B. D. Pudumji, the writer considers the sword in question to be a genuine old sword of Shivaji. This opinion is based on the following points:—(1) the quality of the steel (2) its “Taga” shape, a characteristic of the Maratha swords (3) its old-type lettering and (4) the “Tahanshah” work of inlaying the letters, the art of which is now extinct. (Mr. Moos represented the firm of “The Indian and Oriental Armour”, Medow Street, Fort, Bombay). Mr. Pudumji quotes an extract from the illustrated Hand-book on Indian Arms (by Wilbraham Egerton now Lord E.) which refers to a sword presented by the King of Kabul to the Governor-General. This sword once belonged to Tamurlane. Swords are estimated by their age, watering or temper. Pudumji reproduces a coloured view of “Jevaveer Khana” once the residence and stronghold of Shivaji (Fort Singur, Dt. Poona) and now in his possession. He also gives an extract from Satara Gazetteer (1884) by Sir James Campbell which reads:—(p. 238)—"The sword of Azalkhan and Shivaji’s favourite sword Bhavani passed to the Moguls on the capture of Shambhaji in 1690. They were restored by Aurangzeb to Shahu in 1707 and till 1827 remained a valued trophy in the armoury of Shivaji’s descendants.” In the revised edition of his pamphlet, Mr. Pudumji (1929) gives a photograph of a brass tray (p. 36) about 2 ft. in diameter with him on which is embossed the celebrated episode in Shivaji’s life viz. the release of a beautiful Moghul lady (daughter-in-law of the Subedar of Kalyan) brought as a captive after the sack of Kalyan in 1664 A.D.

22. Mr. Pudumji in a revised edition of his pamphlet (21st March, 1929,) on p. 11 draws our attention to the last para 91 of Shivaji’s letter to Jaysinha, who invaded the Deccan at the head of the Moghul army. This para reads as follows:—"91. Tomorrow, the moment the sun shall conceal his face behind the evening cloud, the Crescent moon of my sword shall flash forth. That is all. God be with thee." Mr. Pudumji is of opinion that the expression "Crescent moon of my sword" in the above para represents "Shivaji’s own description of his sword" as to its shape, i.e., it had a curved blade. The letter of Shivaji from which the above para has been quoted is in Persian and has been published by the Nāgari Pracharini Sabha of Benares in their Patrikā (Bhāgā 3, No. 1—Saṁvat 1979). This has been reprinted in the Shivaji Souvenir (1927) Marathi Section (pp. 161-170) and English trans. of it in the English Section (pp. 170-178). Though this letter in the form of a poem may have a high poetic value its testimony on the question of the shape of Shivaji’s sword has no value, especially as the document bears no date and is also of anonymous authorship. Hari Kavi (A.D. 1685) describes the Bhavani Sword by the terms "वचन्रहस्यः" बज्रचन्धी, असित्वता, in his Sambhusadja Carita.

23. This reply was received by Mr. V. L. Bhave, author of the History of the Marathi Literature (Mahārāṣṭra Sārasvat) and is printed in the Journal of the Bharata Itihasa Samshedhak Mandal, Poona, of Saka 1837 (=A.D. 1915) p. 91. It is signed by C. Hercules, Record-keeper of the Department of British and Mediaeval Antiquities and Ethnology, British Museum, London, W. C.)
The Sabhāsad Bakhar\textsuperscript{25a} composed in A.D. 1694 refers in many places to the tutelary deity of Shivaji viz. Sri Bhavānī\textsuperscript{25a} but no references to the Bhavānī sword can be found in it. The references to the family deity Bhavānī in this bakhar are generally associated with the major incidents of Shivaji's intrepid career but I have failed to trace in this source any mention of Bhavānī as the name of Shivaji's sword. I await more light on this problem from scholars who have done intensive research in the history of the period.

The next important contemporary source of information on the problem of the Bhavānī sword is the Sivabhārata\textsuperscript{25a} composed by Kavindra Paramā-

24. Life of Siva Chhatrpati (by Krishnaji Anant Sabhasad) Ed. by K. N. Sane, 1923, (Fourth Edition). Mr. Sane has based his text on five MSS: (1) MS produced from the pujārī at Pratapgadh (2) MS copied in A.D. 1852 and deposited in the Native General Library of Poona (3) and (4) MSS procured by Krishnajipant Acharya Kalgaunkar of Satara. (Mr. Sane has relied on the Pratapgadh copy as it is very old and especially on account of its being found at Pratapgadh. The date of composition recorded in this MS is Saka 1616 (=A.D. 1694) but the Sāhravataśāstra mentioned is "Īśvara" which is equivalent to Saka 1619 (=A.D. 1697); (5) MS procured at Mahad, in which some changes appear to have been made from Duff's History.

25. Ibid. p. 9 "(शी भवानी कुलदेवता महाराजांची)"); p. 11 and 23 ("शी भवानी तुल्यपारूची") p. 37 ("शी भवानी") p. 42 ("शी शंभूस व भवानीस मस्तकर केला") p. 46 ("शी शंभूसाहीदे, irthday महाराजी") p. 49 ("शी भवानी") p. 53 ("शी-भवानीने") p. 83 ("शी महादेव व शी भवानी कुलस्तामी") p. 89 ("शीभवानी") (cf. Jede Sakavali (under Saka 1581)—"कशीहि श्री अंबेश्वय वर्दे अफजलकात् मूल्य पावल तरी इङ्कातीचे अवाज महावरी हौतोल") (and under Saka 1600) भवानीशास्त्र लेख संभाजी राजे यासी जाळी (at Sringarpur).

25a. Edited by S. M. Divekar, Pub. by the Bharata Itihasa Mandal, Poona, Saka 1849 (=A.D. 1927.) contains a fine frontispiece of a picture of Shivaji in colour from a painting in the Prince of Wales Museum, Bombay. It is a fascimile reproduction from the original in which the height of Shivaji's figure is about 34 inches. Other good features of the edition are (1) Upoddhāta pp. 1-28 by S. M. Divekar; (2) a useful bibliography; and, (3) a masterly introduction by D. V. Arte (pp. 1 to 200.) The text and the Marathi translation of the 31 chapters of this epic ("विनाशक भरतस्य भरती").—Chap. I, 22) of the Life of Shivaji has been critically edited. This is followed by an exhaustive index of places and persons mentioned in the text. The illustrations besides the frontispiece are (1) a contemporary horoscope of Shivaji by Sivaram Jyotisā (page 56) (2) photo of folio 39 of MS recording verses about the birth-date of Shivaji (p. 56); (3) photo of the extract from Jedhe Sakavali containing the birth-date of Shivaji (p. 56); (4) Bangalore Fort (p. 64); (5) Images of the Goddess Bhavānī at Fort Sivaneri (Sivānī) and at Fort Pratapgadh (Bhavānī) (p. 65); (6) Map illustrating the Muslim dominions in Shahaji's time (p. 80); (7) Map of Karnata in Shahaji's time (p. 80); (8) Map of Southern India in Shahaji's time (p. 80); (9) Map illustrating Shivaji's invasion of Konk in Saka 1583 (=A.D. 1661) (p. 81); (10) Photos of the forts, Purandhar, Rajagad and Sinhagad (p. 208); (11) Photos of Pratapgadh, Panhalgad and of a picture of Afzalkhan (p. 209); (12) Map illustrating Shivaji's invasion of Saka 1589 (=A.D.
nanda by order of Śrī Chhatrapati Shivaji Maharaja. This poet hailed from Nidhinivas (=Nevase on the bank of Pravara river) and was a contemporary of the celebrated Gāgābhāṭṭa who officiated at the Coronation of Shivaji in A.D. 1674. He composed the *Sivabhārata* after Saka 1583 (=A.D. 1661) and before *Saka* 1596 (=A.D. 1674) the year of Shivaji’s coronation at Raigad. 26 Mr. D. V. APTE 27 has already pointed that Shivaji made use of the sword in his fight with Aفزکhan and this sword is none other than the Bhavāṇi sword referred to by Paramānanda in the *Sivabhārata* in verses 16 and 22 of Chapter XX. These verses are as follows as translated by me in English:—

"Prostrate him (Afzalkhan) to the ground by the great stroke of your sword (अभिम) as that person (demon in the form of yavana) is constantly rising on this earth for the obstruction of *dharmā*" (verse 16). 28

"It has been ordained by the Creator that he (Afzalkhan) should be killed by this hand of yours and hence, O King, I (goddess Tulaja) have identified myself with your sword (कुपाणी)" (verse 22). 29

"With these words Sarvāṇi, i.e., the goddess Bhavāṇi or Tuljā entered his sword (कुपालिम) and he (Shivājī) though in a waking state regarded it (the whole occurrence) as a dream." (verse 23). 30

In the above verse we get a genesis of the Bhavāṇi sword which is perhaps the earliest on record from contemporary sources: Evidently the goddess Bhavāṇi enters the usual sword of Shivājī and makes it unusual. This association of the goddess Bhavāṇi with Shivājī’ s sword given in a contemporary record (between 1661 and 1674 A.D.) is extremely valuable as it explains how

1667) after the Afzalkhan incident (p. 248); (13) Map illustrating Shivaji’s battle of Umbarkhind (p. 248); (14) Map illustrating Shaista Khana’s invasion of Saka 1582 (=A.D. 1660); (15) Map illustrating the siege of Panhalgad Saka 1582 (=A.D. 1660) (p. 249); (16) Pictures of Shah Jahan, Muhammad Adil Shah, Shaista Khan, Jasavant Sinha, Aurangzeb, Fazalkhan, Raja Jayasinha and Dilerkhan (pp. 252-253.)

26. These Chronological limits are given by Mr. DIVEKAR (vide p. 20 of his Upoddāta to the *Sivabhārata*). The poem refers to the death of Siddi Johar (A.D. 1661).

27. *Sivabhārata* (Prastāvanā, p. 168). In the Index (p. 12) under Bhavāṇi Tarvār reference is made to verses 22 and 23 of Chap. XX of the text.

28. Page 193 *Sivabhārata*—

"उद्वांतवर्षो विनीतवर्षो दृष्टितोऽ बुद्धिः।
तमेनमसिरपतेन महता भुवि पातय ॥ १६ ॥

29. Ibid—

"विना विनीतवर्षो दृष्टितोऽ बुद्धिः।
अतित्रिष्टां भूकां दृष्टितोऽ बुद्धिः तव ॥ २२ ॥

30. Ibid, p. 194—

"व्याहत्रविनां तत्त्वाणिमविवशस्त्रा।
अति भाष्यवशोपि तत्त्वाणिमस्मिन्तः ॥ २३ ॥"
the term Bhavānī tarvār came into being. The verses quoted above do not, however, refer to any sword of Shivāji as Bhavānī tarvār, an expression which became an established usage during the course of centuries that have elapsed since the tragedy of Afzal Khan. The human sword of Shivāji having once become divine by its association with the goddess Bhavānī and this having been linked up in popular imagination with all the heroic exploits of Shivāji, whom the people believed to be an incarnation of Śiva,—this human sword has now become an object of much wonder and speculation for the historian and the patriot alike. It would be certainly a red-letter day on which its existence and identification are proved beyond challenge by any scholar or institution interested in historical research. Our duty for the time being is to collect all possible information which might help scholars and patriots in keeping the memory of the Bhavānī sword fresh in their minds so that this quest of the holy grail may continue unabated by all lovers of the Maratha history in particular and of history in general.

The foregoing discussion and record of references to the Bhavānī sword appears to me like Shakespeare's drama Hamlet without the King of Denmark. The account of this sword as recorded in the Sivadigvijaya being a late one cannot be taken as historical truth especially in the absence of contemporary evidence to support it in material particulars. The account of the Śivabhārata is quite valuable so far as the genesis of the expression Bhavānī tarvār is concerned. The reference to this sword in the Chitnis bakhār of A.D. 1811 is also not very helpful. It is, therefore, necessary to search for more contemporary references to the Bhavānī sword like that of the Śivabhārata. Such references alone can give that factual touch to the history of this question which is necessary to fill up the historical void that separates us from the time of the author of the Śivabhārata. I shall, therefore, conclude this paper by putting on record at least one contemporary reference to the Bhavānī sword in which we find a poetic description of the exploits of the Bhavānī sword in the hands of King Sambhājī, to whom this sword must have passed on as a heroic legacy after Shivaji's death in A.D. 1680. This reference is also very important as it is the only one so far discovered in which the name "Bhavānī's Sword" is mentioned five years after the death of Shivaji, i.e. in A.D. 1685 and in which no less than 3 verses or 12 lines are devoted to the praise of this sword. The bearing of these verses on the history of the Bhavānī sword was not quite apparent to me when I

31. Vide Śīva Caritra—Pradīpa (B. I. S. Mandal, Poona, 1925) p. 75 where the date of composition of the Śivadigvijaya is given as Saka 1740 = A.D. 1818. The extracts from several Bakhars relating to the birth date of Shivaji (pp. 71-78) will be found interesting. These bakhars are (1) Sabāsad B. (A.D. 1697), (2) Chitrāgupta B. (about A.D. 1759), (3) Kālamī B. (A.D. 1780), (4) Bakhār composed for Savai Madhav Rao Peshwa (Rajawade Kumāra 4) (A.D. 1783), (5) Chīnīs B. (A.D. 1810), (6) Chotī B. (A.D. 1817), (7) Śivadigvijaya (A.D. 1818), (8) Panta Pratimīḍhi B. (A.D. 1844), (9) Pandit Rao B. (A.D. 1848), (10) Shri Shivaji Pratap (A.D. 1829), (11) Shędgumkar B. (A.D. 1854).
noticed them first three years ago in my paper,\textsuperscript{23} on "Hari Kavi alias Bhānu-
braṭṭa, a court-poet of King Sambhāji and his Works." I was then under
the impression that in the documents of the period many authentic references
to the Bhavāni sword must have been traced and scientifically recorded by
the indefatigable researchers\textsuperscript{23} in the field. When, however, I began to look
for them in the published records I was thoroughly disappointed to find a
woeful lack of reliable information on the question of the history of the Bhavāni
csword based on contemporary and subsequent evidence. Evidently
the problem has not been examined by any scholar competent to search for,
scrutinize and arrange in a chronological order all the available data bear-
ing on the question. I have gathered in this paper a few facts regarding
the Bhavāni sword solely with a view to provide a historical background to
Hari Kavi’s description of this sword in his Sambhurāja-Carita, composed in
A.D. 1685. This description shows that to a resident of Surat like Hari Kavi
the glory of the Bhavāni sword had some poetic appeal as will be clear from
the following verses:—

Folio 82\textsuperscript{a} of MS No. 191 of 1875-76—

"राजाजी योगबालमध्य विजयमधी ते वसं मंद वाणो
बीरभोमाण्डः करतविलम्बचंद्रहासो भवाण्यं ( च्या ) "

32. This paper was submitted to the Modern History Congress, Poona in June,
1935 and was published in the Annals of the Bhandarkar Institute, Vol. XVI, pp.
262-291. Hari Kavi was a resident of Surat. His family hailed from the Mahā-
rāṣṭra. He composed (1) Sambhurāja-Carita by order Kṛṣṇaparājita, the guru
of Sambhaji, (2) Haihayendra-Carita and its commentary Sambhuvilasikā by order
of Sambhaji and an anthology called the Subhāṣitaḥāravali. The Sambhurāja Carita
was completed at Surat on 12th January, 1685. It is a mahākāvya in 12 sargas
of which only some fragments are available in the Govt. MSS. Library at the B. O.
R. Institute, Poona.

33. Rao Bahadur G. S. Sardesai, the Maharashtrā Historian has directed my
attention in a private communication dated 16th April, 1938 to his views on the
problem of Bhavāni Sword as recorded by him on p. 53 of his volume on Shivaji
(Marathi Riyasat—2 Saka Kartā, Shivaji, Bombay, 1935) :—Shivaji during his
Konkan expedition (A.D. 1657-58) came into contact with Lakham Savant of Goa
(1651-1675 A.D.) whom he made a vassal. This Savant had in his possession a
famous sword manufactured in Europe, which Shivaji acquired by presenting
the Savant 300 hors and a dress of honour. This sword was named Bhavani. As its
possesion brought much success to Shivaji he used to worship it daily. This
sword is still at Satara in the temple of the goddess and is included among
articles for worship. (Footnote:—King Shahaji (father of Shivaji) sent by sea
some valuable articles from Karnatak such as a bedstead, a belt and an armour
and a Phiranga talvar according to the statement of the Chhoti Bakhar of the Mara-
thā Empire. It is possible to conclude that the sword included among the above
articles is the Bhavāni Sword. The story about the transfer of this sword to London
is not true.)

34. Vide Annals, XVI, p. 266, where these verses have been quoted by me.

35. चण्ड्रहास := a glittering sword (Apte); “खङ् तु निकृतिचन्द्रहासांस्तिस्वद्." Amarakośa (I1, 8, 89) Bhānuji Dikṣita explains:— चशं वर्ण हास: प्रभा अर्थः। चन्द्र
इसति वा। युतिमलाव.
SAMBHURĀJA-CARITA OF HARI KAVI (A.D. 1685)

(Folio 82 of MS. No. 191 of 1875-76 containing three verses about the Bhavāni Sword).
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HARIKAVI'S SAMBHURĀJA-CARITA : LAST FOLIO

Containing the date of its composition viz. Samvat 1741 = A.D. 1685
In the foregoing three verses Hari Kavi gives us a fine poetic description of the "Bhavāni's Sword" and its doings on the battle-field. This description is inserted in the battle-scene of the Sambhurājā-Charita in which Sambhāji is shown as surrounded by the army of his enemy intending to attack him. With him we find Campā, the terror-struck heroine of the poem on her journey to her husband's home after her marriage with Sambhāji.

36. खंडवाली = the sword-creeper = sword resembling a creeper possibly by its length and elasticity.
37. कांदविनी = a long line of clouds.
38. ब्याल = darkness; आली = a row or continuous line.
39. समातय = having over-spread in an intense manner.
40. The infathomable waters in the form of weapons (used by the army) = water.
41. प्रथम = Battle and बुधपति = earth; प्रथमबुधपति = the battle-field.
42. जयवत = flooding.
43. इमकुम: = the foreheads of elephants which were full grown (रीढ). The elephants had their temples shattered to pieces (खुण).
44. मणिकरकाण = Hail stones in the form of pearls in the temples of elephants (the temples of elephants are supposed to contain pearls). Verses 126 and 127 contain a metaphor of a violent storm attended with lightning and dark clouds and followed by a heavy rain shower with hail stones.
45. The MS has the reading "चन्द्रहरो मधवाय।" The correct reading ought to be चन्द्रहरो मधवाय: = Bhavāni's sword.
46. The Sambhurājā-Charita (A.D. 1685) gives a detailed description of Sambhāji's marriage with Campā. In this connection compare a picture of a marriage scene in colours painted on folio 61 of Skandha IX of the Bhāgavatapurāṇa (B. O. R. Institute MS No. 61 of 1907-1915). This MS was prepared in A.D. 1648 at Udayapura. The picture in question shows the bride and bridgroom in matrimonial attire seated facing each other with two priests shown seated near the bride and the bridgroom with the nuptial fire between the priests. Another picture on the same folio shows the bride and bridgroom seated on a chariot possibly on a journey to the bridgroom's home. The chariot is dragged by two white horses.
at Surat as also *Krṣṇapandita*⁴⁷ the guru of the Maratha King, who is described as a very important personage throughout the poem and at whose instance Hari Kavi informs us he wrote the *Sambhurāja-Carita*. This description of the Bhavānī's sword has an earlier parallel in the description of the sword of Shahāji⁴⁸ by Jayarāma Kavi, who composed his *Rādhāmādhava-vilāsa Campū* or a Life of Shahāji between Śaka 1575 (= A.D. 1653) and Śaka

47. I shall prove in a separate paper the identity of this *Krṣṇapandita* with Kavi Kalasha or Kabji, the celebrated minister of king Sambhājī.

48. Vide p. 236 of *Rādhāmādhava-vilāsa campū* by Jayarāma Pindye, edited by V. K. RAJAWADE (Śaka 1844 = 1922 A.D.) Poona. This poem is a Life of Shahājī, the father of Shivājī and grandfather of Sambhājī. The description of a sword or *kṣaraṇ* occurs in the 8th Ullāsa (verses 227-235) as follows:—

"पुनरस्थितिभमि दिवसे यथार्थमे स्मरिति सहि राजानि शन्माधवकोशस्वति रतनंकितम्

\[\text{पांडवलिङ्गप्राणेन स्नानं प्रत्येकं श्रावणम} \]

यथास्मित्वा विगो तव क्रुष्णाक्रियाय: स्तुति

विवाह्य विनिगम्ये सदति सत्कवीना पूरे:।

परिक्लासनात्क्षणस्वतिः स्वतंसहस्रं—

क्षण नति तत्स्वांक्षणं स्वर चतुरंति॥ २२७॥

राजा सार्देर तच्छल्लान। यथा ।

\[\text{गुरु तव क्रुष्णाक्रिये गुरुतकर्पीपीयं संभ्रंता।} \]

अर्जुनकोशा सर्वनिन्यः परिःश्रय वैरिणां केठे ॥ २२८॥

\[\text{गुरु तव क्रुष्णाक्रिया: प्रायः सार्देरनी छाया!} \]

अन्या निक्षय श्रुतुयुक्तः सापि तत्र पञ्चमान,॥ २२९॥

हस्तोतितो विगो: शाहमहाणाल खजनेपते।

\[\text{वसंतः द्वारं हि दासों कुरलं तैवी जीवजीवनाभं} \] ॥ २३०॥

आर्क्षे तव शाहक्ष्मतीश रत्नं क्रुष्णाज्ञस्य ।

\[\text{श्रुतं मुखेऽ कुरलं यस्तुरुधिः पतियर्दशु} \] ॥ २३१॥

अर्जुनकोशं छुते वा वैरिणिन सन्नवन वस्यपुः:।

\[\text{गुरु तव क्रुष्णानीरादि: मच्छति गीरे परस्य वदनन्यं} \] ॥ २३२॥

क्रुष्णाको श्रवणीरादि: विलक्षणाज्ञा जयति।

\[\text{हरि परस्यार्किन्स्य श्रीक्षेत्रस्वीकरणं} \] काले ॥ २३३॥

\[\text{श्रीभाद्रं महाप्रयाग: गुप्तमकालिता कालद्रा गरीम्नं} \]

\[\text{भुवनमिलितह कलंत्रा सुले क्षिं सत्स्वां गंगां} \] ॥ २३४॥

\[\text{अलमदक्ष्युन्य शाहक्ष्मतीश रत्नं क्रुष्णासेविभयेत्} \]

\[\text{तुष्माकमलितवर्तनं विलोक्य नित्यायार्कमस्त} \] ॥ २३५॥

एवमादीन्यैवेशपि महाकवींन शक्तिवर्णनायाकमस्त किंमति विविधं जीवनप्रत्युत्साहाः स्वत:।

\[\text{etc.}’’\]


1580 (A.D. 1658). Evidently Jayarāma Kavi was a senior contemporary of Hari Kavi (A.D. 1685) and his description of Shahāji’s sword is not merely poetic but factual as well. It is described as “रलकिचितमुड्यमूलूं” or “lovely on account of its having a handle bedecked with jewels.” It is compared to a cloud (कुआणजूलद) and is called कुण्या or of darkish luster due to its being rubbed clean by the application of some polishing oil (शल्मारंजकतैलावित). Will it be possible to prove on documentary evidence that this very sword of Shahāji actually seen and described by Jayarāma Kavi before A.D. 1658 was transferred to Shivāji sometime thereafter and was actually in his possession at Pratapgar at the time of the Afzalkhān incident of A.D. 1659? If this sword of Shahāji is proved to be identical with the sword of his son Shivāji with which the goddess Bhavāni identified herself at the time of the Afzalkhan incident as stated by Kavindra Paramānanda between A.D. 1661-1674 it would be easy for us to imagine that this same sword passed on to Sambhāji after his father’s death in A.D. 1680 and was later described by Hari Kavi in A.D. 1685. Even if this identity of the two swords remains doubtful it would be worth while representing the results of our discussion about the contemporary references to the swords of Shahāji, Shivāji and Sambhāji in a tabular form as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Serial No.</th>
<th>Owner</th>
<th>Source of Description</th>
<th>Date of Description</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Shahāji</td>
<td>Jayarāma Kavi in VIII Ullāsā of Rādhāmādhavāvilāsa Campu.</td>
<td>Between 1653-1658 A. D.</td>
<td>“रलकिचितमुड्यमूलूं” and “कुण्या”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Shivāji</td>
<td>Kavindra Paramānanda in Śivabhārata XX, 16, 22, 23.</td>
<td>Bet. A. D. 1661-1674</td>
<td>कुआणी or अशि</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Sambhāji</td>
<td>Hari Kavi in Śambhurāja Carita</td>
<td>12th January 1685</td>
<td>नंद्वालो भवान्या: - असिस्त्ता or खज-बाही</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The foregoing table shows three different swords associated with the grandfather, the father and the son in one and the same line of kings and

49. According to RAJAWADE: vide p. 4 of his Intro. to Rādhāmādhavāvilāsa.
50. Cf. Bar. M. K. Sett’s remarks in his article on “Sri Vatsayana” in the Jubile Volume (1938) of the Anthropological Society, Bombay, p. 197—“A young man is asked to go out into the world and carve a career for himself. The carving was done by his trusty sword, often the parting gift of his family.”
described by three different poets all of whom were contemporaries of their patrons. The difference of about 30 years between the first contemporary reference to a sword and the last reference and the chronological sequence of references tend to suggest a hypothesis for further verification that the objects referred to by three contemporary poets are not several but identical.

The foregoing discussion about the Bhavani sword associated with the hair-raising exploits of Shri Shivaji Maharaja raises the question of the existence or otherwise of any earlier historical parallel to the story of the Bhavani sword as now finds currency in the Maharastra and the veracity of which has to a certain extent been confirmed by Hari Kavi’s description of the Bhavani’s sword (भवाणी चंद्रहस्तः) in the hands of King Sambhaji. Luckily for us such a historical parallel is found in the divine sword given by a strange woman to Kumara Kampaana the eldest son of King Bukka of Vijayanagara and which had been the heirloom in the royal Pandyyan family.

The account of this Pandyyan sword has been fortunately preserved for us in a magnificent poem composed by Kumara Kampaana’s talented queen Gaṅgādevi and hence possesses much historical value. Kumara Kampaana also called Kamparāya was the son of Bukka I (A.D. 1376—Death, V. Smith Oxf. His. 1923, p. 302) by his wife Depāyi. When the prince Kampaana grew to manhood his father advised him on the duties of royal princes and asked him to proceed against the king of the Turushkas with his headquarters at Madura. Kampaana accordingly undertook this expedition and pitched his camp in the town of Marakata. A goddess appeared before him and after describing to him the disastrous consequences of the Muzalman invasions of the South and the sad plight of the southern country and its temples exhorted him to extirpate the invaders and restore the country to its ancient glory, presenting him at the same time with a divine sword. Kamparāya then proceeded against Madura and in a battle, killed the Sultan ruling at the place. He then made grants to several temples.

The closeness of the above historical parallel to the story of the Bhavani sword is remarkable. Though the Pandyyan sword mentioned by Gaṅgādevi as presented to her husband Kamparāya is removed historically by about 350 years the points of similarity of the circumstances connected with each sword may now be tabulated as follows:

51. I am thankful to my friend Dr. B. A. Saletores, for pointing out to me this parallel.
52. Vide Sources of Vijayanagar History by S. K. Aidangar, Madras, 1919, pp. 23-24 where Dr. Aidangar has given us a brief analysis of each of the eight cantoes of Gaṅgādevi’s historical poem called कर्नाश्वरविवर्तितम् from a MS in the Govt. Ori. MSS Library, Madras. Vide printed edition of this poem also called महरुविवर्तितम् by Pt. Shrinivas Shastri of Travancore, Archaeological Department (Trivandrum).
53. Kamparāya Caritam, Canto V.
54. Ibid., VIII.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The Pandyan Sword</th>
<th>The Bhavani Sword</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1) This sword is given by a goddess to the hero.</td>
<td>(1) This sword is also given by the goddess Bhavani to the hero.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2) The hero here is Kumara Kampaya or Kamparaya, son of Bukka I.</td>
<td>(2) The hero here is Shivaji, son of Shahaji.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3) This sword is given to the hero on the eve of the performance of a heroic deed viz. the destruction of the Sultan of Madura by Kamparaya.</td>
<td>(3) This sword is also supposed to be given on the eve of Shivaji's meeting with and destruction of Afzalkhan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4) The object of the exploit of the hero was to deliver the Hindus from the tyranny of the Muhammadans, not to say their religious oppression and desecration of Hindu temples.</td>
<td>(4) The object of Shivaji's exploit was also to deliver the Hindus of the Maharashtra from the Moghul and Muhammadan tyranny indicated by the breaking of Hindu idols and destruction of Hindu temples.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(5) Kamparaya, the hero kills the Sultan of Madura and becomes victorious.</td>
<td>(5) Shivaji kills Afzalkhan and effectively checks the Muhammadan tyranny.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(6) Kamparaya makes grants to several temples after the conquest of Madura.</td>
<td>(6) Shivaji also made some grants to some men of his court according to the Sivadivyajaya.55</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I believe the above parallelism between the incidents associated with the Pandyan sword and those connected with the Bhavani sword will be found sufficiently interesting by the students of the Maratha history.

In concluding my survey of the problem of the Bhavani sword I have to point out that so far no contemporary reference to this sword has yet been traced by scholars working in the field of the Maratha history. In view of this fact vouched by close students of the Maratha history Hari Kavi's re-

55. Ed. by P. R. NANDURBARKAR and L. K. DANDEKAR, Baroda, 1895, p. 171—"Pantajipant was the recipient of the inam of the village Hivaresi. He was also given the robes of honour. Visvissrao Nanaji and others who had served (at the time of the Afzalkhan incident) were also the recipients of some inams, etc. A new tower was built at the place where Afzalkhan was killed, etc."
ference to the Bhavāni sword in a.d. 1685 must be treated as "practically contemporary" and hence should retain its evidential value in any discussion about the genesis and historicity of the Bhavāni sword. In view of the decaying condition of the MS in which Hari Kavi's verses about the Bhavāni sword are found I have thought it advisable to publish along with this paper photograph of the folio of the MS on which these verses are recorded as also that of the last folio on which the date of composition of the Sambhurāja Carita is found.

56. This paper was read before the Bharat Iti. Sams. Mandal, Poona in June 1938. Mr. V. S. Bendre who was then in London, had sent a note on the subject of this paper for the annual gathering of the Mandal where this paper was read. On reading this note I wrote to Mr. Bendre pointing out that there is no contemporary evidence regarding the Bhavāni sword except the three verses of Hari Kavi. Subsequently Mr. Bendre sent me a copy of his paper on the Bhavāni sword which he had contributed to a London Journal and in which he has admitted the force of my evidence as will be seen from the following extract:—"Where is the Bhavāni sword of the great Maharatta hero Shivāji? Much has been told in the later chronicles about this sword which was a gift to him by his goddess Shri Bhavāni. These narratives are not, however, quite unanimous in their description. The only practically contemporary reference is that by Hari Kavi in his Sambhurāja Carita (1685 a.d.)—Folio 82 verses 126-8 of this work—photo-copy supplied by my friend Mr. P. K. Gode."
NON-RGVEDIC MANTRAS RUBRICATED IN THE
ĀŚVALĀYANA-GRHYA-SŪTRA: THEIR SOURCES AND
INTERPRETATION*

By
V. M. APTE, Poona.

ĀG. I. 10. 12:—'Śrāṁi havṁinyabhighāryodagudvāsyas parhiṣyā-
sādyedhmanabhīghārya (a) "Ayaṁ ta ākma ātmā ātawedas (b) tenedkya-
sva vardhasv ceddha (c) vardhaya āsmān prajāyā paśubhir (d) bhram-
varcasenāṃdāyena samedhaya svāhā” iti.

Trans: After sprinkling (with Ājya) the cooked portions of sacrificial
food, taking them from the fire to the north placing them on the Barhis, he
sprinkles the fuel (with Ājya) with the Mantra “ (a) This fuel is thyself
O Jātavedas; (b) with it blaze and increase, O Blazing One, (c) and increase
us with progeny, (and) cattle; (d) with holy lustre and nutrition advance
us”.

Context: The Pārvaṇa-sthālipāka—the norm of Pākayajñas (see ĀG.
I. 10. 26) is described in this Kāṇḍikā I. 10.

Sources: The nearest approach to our Mantra in words and sense is
AV. XIX. 64. 2 (a) Idhmena tvā jātavedaḥ (b) samidhā vardhayāmasi |
(c) tathā tvam āsmān vardhaya (d) prajāyā ca dhanena ca” || (With fire-
wood, O jātavedas, with fuel, we increase thee; so do thou increase us with
progeny and wealth). The subject of the AV. hymn XIX. 64 is service of
the fire with fuel.

ĀG. I. 10. 15: Vijñāyate ‘cakṣuṣi vā ete yajñasya, yadājaḥbhāgaun’.

Trans: It is known (from the śruti): “These two are, indeed, the
eyes of the sacrifice, namely the two Ājyaḥbhāgas”. The context: In the
Pārvaṇa-sthālipāka, (Sūtra 14 tells us) the two Ājyaḥbhāgas are offered, the
northern one to Agni, the southern one to Soma. The above quotation from
the śruti in Sūtra 15 explains this special assignment of the Ājyaḥbhāgas to
Agni and Soma.

Sources: Prof. Stenzler aptly compares ŚB. I. 6. 3. 38 which is identi-
cal with our quotation except for the word ‘ha’ inserted before our ‘vā.’
That this is the source is made very probable by the fact that ‘Vijñāyate’
genearly introduces a quotation or the gist of a passage from the śruti (that
is some Brāhmaṇa work).

* Continued from p. 61 of May 1940 issue.
1. This translation which follows the pāda division of the mantra and connects
prajāyā paśubhiḥ with Vardhaya and takes pāda (d) as a separate clause, is different
from Oldenberg’s where vardhaya stands awkwardly by itself.
AG. I. 10. 23: (a) "Yadasya karmano" tyariccam, (b) yadvā nyūnam ihākaram | (c) Agniṣṭat sviṣṭakṛd vidvān (d) tsarvam sviṣṭam suhutam korotu me | (e) Agnaye sviṣṭakṛte suhutahute sarvaprayāṣcitā hutināṁ kāmānāṁ samardhayitre sarvān naḥ Kāṁṣamsardhayā svāhā" iti |

Trans: (He sacrifices the sviṣṭakṛt oblation with the following mantra i.e. the one in this Sūtra according to Nārāyana and Haradatta but the wording of the mantra shows that it accompanies both the Sviṣṭakṛt as well as the Sarvaprayāṣcitta oblations) "Whatever I have exceeded in this rite, or whatever I have fallen short of therein, all that may Agni Sviṣṭakṛt, the knowing one, make well-sacrificed and well-offered for me. To Agni Sviṣṭakṛt, who offers the oblations for general expiation so that they are well-offered, (and) who furthers (the fulfilment of) our desires! Fulfil all our desires! Svāhā!"

Sources. (a) to (d). Prof. Oldenberg compares ŚB. XIV. 9. 4. 24. The passage is identical with ours except that 'Sarvam' and 'me' at the beginning and end respectively, of our (d) clause are omitted and 'svāhā' added. But I think that our text is influenced by the passage ĀP. III. 12. 1 which is identical with ours except for the omission of 'me' at the end, because the context 'Dārśapūmamāsā' sacrifice, is the exact Śrāuta counterpart of the Pārvaṇa-sthālpāka which is the context in our text and because the following clause (e) is traced only to ĀPMB:, another text of the same Apastamba school. (e):—Clause (e), is only traced to ĀPMB. 2. 18. 31 and HG. 1. 3. 7 where the same mantra occurs with a few changes. Both the texts omit 'Sarvānnaḥ kāmān samardhayā, svāhā'. ĀPMB. adds instead 'suhutahuta āhutināṁ' while HG. adds 'sarvahute sarvahutāhutināṁ'.

AG. I. 13. 1: Upaniṣadī garbhalambhanam puṁsavanam anavalobhanaṁ ca |

Trans: In the 'Upaniṣad' (are treated), the rites of garbhalambhana (to secure conception), the puṁsavana (to ensure the birth of a male child) and the anavalobhana (the rite to ensure absence of miscarriage etc.)

The problem is:—What is the Upaniṣad referred to here? Nārāyana says that it belongs to another Śākhā and treats of topics beginning with the garbhaḥāna rite and ending with Ātmajñāna (knowledge of the Self). The same is the explanation of the commentator Haradatta. Prof. Stenzler (p. 33) reproduces the above view of Nārāyana. Prof. Oldenberg (p. 179) after referring to Nārāyana's view compares Prof. Max Müller's note on Brhad-Aranyaka VI. 4. 24, the suggestion being that the Brhadāraṇyakopaniṣad, which incidentally treats of these ceremonies may be the 'Upaniṣad' referred to in our text. I, however, think that the 'Upaniṣad' meant is the 'Kauṣṭikā-bṛāhmaṇa- upaniṣad' for the following reasons:—(1) The non-Rgvedic and Rgvedic citations in this and the following two kaṇḍikās, which treat of Puṁsavana and allied rites are all found in a similar context in that Upaniṣad which contains the very mantras cited in our text and none others. (2) The KBU. belongs to the RV. and stands along with the Kauṣṭikā Brāhmaṇa, in a specially intimate relation to the SG. with which our text is closely allied. (3)
Our text treats of only two rites^1 (the ‘Purînsavana’ in I. 13. 2-4 ‘Anavalobhana’ in I. 13. 5-7) out of the three mentioned in this Sûtra, ignoring the ‘garbhhalambhana’ probably because it is treated in the KBU. (4) ‘Yadi nādhīyāt’ (‘if he does not study the text’) in the next sûtra implies that the Upaniṣad referred to, was one, the knowledge of which was presumed but not definitely presupposed on the part of an adherent of the Āśvalāyana sākhā. In other words, it was just a text like the KBU, which did not belong to that sākhā but was at the same time closely associated with the literature of the sākhā as it belonged to the same veda.

ĀG. I. 13. 3: (a) ‘Kim pibasi, kim pibasîti’ pṛṣṭvā (b) ‘Purînsavanam purînsavanam’ iti triḥ pratijñānīyāt |

Trans. When he (the husband) has asked ‘What dost thou drink? What dost thou drink? ’ she should thrice reply ‘Purînsavanam (the begetting of a male child) ! purînsavanam !’

Context: These questions and answers are with reference to three handfuls of curds (each handful being mixed with two beans and one barley grain) which the wife is given to eat in the Purînsavana ceremony.

Sources: Only (b) and that too in the form ‘purînsuvanam’ is found in ĀPMB. 2. 11. 4 in very much the same context.

ĀG. I. 13. 6: ‘Prajāvajñavaputrābhāyān’ haike |

Trans: According to some (authorities), with the ‘Prajāvat’ and ‘Jivaputra’ hymns.

[Context: In the anavalobhana ceremony (the description of which commences with Sûtra 5, immediately after that of the Purînsavana), the husband inserts into the wife’s right nostril (the juice of) a herb that has not faded, while she is seated in the shadow of a circular apartment]. Sûtra 6 now states that this ritual act is accompanied by the recitation of the ‘Prajāvat’ and ‘Jivaputra’ (hymns) according to some authorities. [I do not agree with Prof. OLDENBERG’s view (p. 180) that the text here describes one continuous ceremony (that of the Purînsavana) in this Kaṇḍika. Nārāyaṇa, in my opinion, is right in his view that Sûtras 2-4 refer to the Purînsavana and in sūtra 5 begins the Anavalobhana. I give the following reasons: (1) ‘Atha’ in sūtra 5 signifies the introduction of a new topic and ‘maṇḍalāgarachāyāyām’ indicates a change of scene for the new rite. (2) The ignoring of the garbhhalambhana cannot, as Prof. OLDENBERG takes it, serve as a parallel to the ignoring of the ‘anavalobhana’ because the proper place for a description of the ‘garbhhalambhana’ was after sūtra I. 8. 14 (where the rite has been passed over), at any rate long before a description of the Purînsavana rite; a reason for ignoring it may have been, as already suggested a treatment of it in the ‘upaniṣad’ of sūtra 1 a knowledge of which is presumed; there is no such justification for passing over the ‘anavalobhana’, the proper place for it being after that of the ‘Purînsavana.’]

---

1. OLDENBERG thinks that only one continuous ceremony is described. I have discussed the point under ĀG. I. 13. 6.
Sources: Prof. Stenzler gives the following information: "The two verses:—as given in the Kritische Anmerkungen (p. 48) are: (1) Ā te garbhoh yonimaitu puṁśan bāṇa ivesudhim | ā viro jāyatāṃ putaras te daśamāsyaḥ || and (2) Agniraitu pratham o devatānāṃ sosayai prajām muṇcatu mrtyu- pāśāt | tadayāṃ rājā varūpo numanyātāṃ yatheyāṃ stri pautramahāṃ na rodāt || These two verses are the first verses of two sūktas, which according to Nārāyaṇa are named after their seers 'Prajāvat' and 'Jivaputra'. According to the Sāṃskāra-kaustubha, Hiranyagarbha is the Rṣi of both these Sūktas and according to both the Sāṃskāra-kaustubha and the Prayoga-ratna each of these two sūktas consists of five verses. The first of these sūktas agrees in part with AV. III. 23; there is no trace of the second sūkta in any of the samhitās before us; its first two verses are found in PG. I. 5. 4." (italics mine). [Incidentally, it may be noted that these two verses are given in the Bibliotheca Indica Edition, p. 61].

Definite information is now available on this point, in the light of which some of these statements (given in italics above) of Prof. Stenzler will have to be corrected. 'Jivaputra' is mentioned as an ācārya in PG. II. 4. 3 and a Prajāvat (Prajaḍāpatya) is the Rṣi of RV. X. 183. So Nārāyaṇa's view that these are the names of two Rṣis, whose hymns go by their names is quite plausible. In fact a precise statement to that effect is found in the Bhaddevatā V. 92" "Prajāvai-jivaputrau vā garbha-karmanī saṁstutau" (="Or the two hymns of 'Prajāvat' and 'Jivaputra' may be used together as 'praise' in the ceremony of pregnancy). Our Sūtra 6 seems to be an echo of this view, our 'Eke' corresponding to the 'vā' of the Brh-D verse. Prof. Macdonell in his notes to the translation of this verse (on p. 189-90 HOS. vol. 6) says "This (i.e. the Prajāvat) khila called by the name of its author has seven stanzas in the Kashmir MS. and is there described in the Anukramaṇi as garbhaṃhāśāṣṭasūtraḥ. In his note to the word 'Jivaputra' he adds that the Jivaputra khila also called after its author, comes immediately after that of Prajāvat in the Kashmir MS. and has five stanzas.

Were it not for this decisive statement of the Bhaddevatā that 'Prajāvat' and 'Jivaputra' stand for the two RV. khilas named after their seers, it would have been a tempting theory to look upon RV. X. 183 (a hymn whose Rṣi is 'Prajāvān' and whose subject-matter admirably suits our context) as the 'Prajāvat' hymn referred to.

In 'Die Apokryphen des Ṛgveda' by Schefeleowitz are given (pp. 81 to 84) the two khila-hymns the opening verses of which are the two verses given above with some minor variations. The note there on p. 82 gives the same information that is stated above:—'Dieses Lied, nach der Anukramaṇi von Prajāvān verfasst, wird ebenso wie der folgende Jivaputra-Hymnus beim Garbhakarman vorgetragen, vgl. Brh.D. 5. 92, etc.

AG. I. 13. 7: Prajāpattyasya sthālipākasya huvā, ṣrdaya-deṣam asyā

1. This is a free rendering of the relevant parts of Stenzler's note 6 in German on p. 34 of Indische Hausergebn: Aśvalāyana, Zweits Heft: Übersetzung.
ālabheta " (a) yatte susīme hṛdaye (b) hitam antah praṇāpatau | (c) Manye' ham māṁ tadvidvānāsan (d) māhām paurtramakham niyām" iti |

Trans: After the sacrificing of a sthānipāka sacred to Prajāpati, he (the husband) should touch the region of her heart with the Mantra ‘What is placed, O fair-proportioned one’, in thy heart, in Prajāpati, I think myself the knower of that. May I not suffer harm that comes through sons’.

The context is a continuation of the same ‘anavalobhana’ ceremony mentioned above.

Sources: Prof. Stenzler points out (p. 35) ‘Der verse steht auch Kauśitaki Upaniṣad 2, 8. u. 10’, The explanation is that our first two pādās (a) and (b) are the same as the first two pādās of KBU. II. 10 except for ‘sritam’ in the latter for our ‘hitam’ and our (c) and (d) are the same as pādās: (c) and (d), of KBU. II. 8 except that the latter has ‘putryam’ for our ‘Paurtra and ‘rudam’ for our ‘niyām’. This is one more illustration of the fluid tradition of Gṛhya-maṇtras! A mantra was improvised or made up so that it might suit a particular context by joining parts drawn from more than one source!

Similar verses are found in a number of Sūtra-texts. Our first two pādās are found without variation in SMB. 1.5.10—where the last pāda is also the same except for ‘nigām’ instead of our ‘niyām’.

AG. I. 14. 3: Athāgnim upasamādhiyā pasçādasyānaduḥah carmāstīrya prāgriviṣumuttaraloma tasminnupaviśṭayāṁ samanvārabdhāyāṁ “Dhātā dādātu dāśusa” iti dvābhyaṁ ....... iti ca |

Trans. Then having put fuel1 on the (domestic) fire, and having spread to the west of it, a bull’s hide with the neck to the east and the hair upwards, (he makes oblations) while his wife who is seated upon that (hide) takes hold of him with the two (verses) beginning with ‘May Dhātā give to his worshiper’ ...... etc.

The context is the ceremony of Sīmantonnayana (or parting of the hair) which takes place in the fourth month of pregnancy.

Sources: Prof. Stenzler gives the two verses (p. 36) as they are given in the Sāṅskāra-kaustubha and Prayogaratna and Prof. Oldenberg refers to SG. I. 22. 7, but no explanation is given of the remarkable fact that our text cites the two verses by quoting the opening pāda of the first as a pratiṣṭha although the verses do not occur in the Rgveda. Our text evidently presupposed a knowledge of the text from which the verses are extracted on the part of an adherent of the Āsvalāyana Śākha, as in the case of the Rgveda. Now an investigation of the source of the two verses reveals that

1. Prof. Oldenberg’s translation of ‘Susīme’ as “O thou, whose hair is well-parted” seems to be due to a confusion of the word ‘Simā’ (in the epithet: Susīme) with the word Simanta’ (≡ the parting of hair). Besides, the parting of hair took place in the ‘simantonnayana’ ceremony which follows this ceremony in point of time!

1. Oldenberg’s translation of ‘Upasamādhiyā’ as ‘gives its place to the fire’ ignores the technical sense of the term.
they are taken from Ās. VI. 14. 16, which explains why our text has not cited them in full. Evidently the Sanskāra-Kaustubha and Prayogaratna (very late ritual texts) have extracted them from the Ās., as their version of the two verses (as given by Prof. STENZLER) is exactly the same as that of ĀS. ! It has been shown by me elsewhere 2 in a discussion of 'Rākāmaham' (RV. II. 32. 4-5) cited in this very sūtra along with these 'Dhātr' verses that TS. III. 3. 11. 3 is a section that has influenced the citation and sequence of Mantras in this sūtra. TS. III. 3. 11. 3 and 2 are two 'Dhātr' verses reminiscent of the Ās. verses in a general way, though only TS. III. 3. II. 3 agrees with the first pāda of the first 'Dhātr' verse quoted in Ās. VI. 14. 16.

It is a curious fact that the last two pādas of our second verse are an adaptation of the last two pādas of RV. III. 59. 1 'Mitraḥ krṣṭir anīmśa-bhīcaṣte, mitrāya havyaḥ gṛtavajjihota ||' with 'Dhātā' substituted for 'Mitraḥ', as 'Dhātr' is the appropriate deity here. This is not an isolated example of adaptation of verses or verse-pādas from the RV; compare for example the mantra cited in AG. II. 9. 2 which incorporates RV. I. 53. II 3 into a larger mantra and the one cited in AG. I. 7. 6, which adapts RV. X. 85. 39a = "Jivāti śaraṇaḥ śatam", by changing 'Jivāti' into 'Jiveva'.


Trans : He issues instructions to the two lute-players: 'may they sing to King Soma'!

Context: This order is given by the husband in the sīmantonnayana ceremony after parting his wife's hair three or four times.

Sources: ĀPS. 20. 6. 5 reads 'Atra brāhmaṇo vināgāthī gāyati". ĀPS. 20. 6. 14 has 'ŚaYaṁ dhṛtisu hūyaṁānāsu rājanyo vināgāthi, and ĀPS. 20. 7. 1 has "ŚaYaṁ prāṭar vināgāthinau gāyātām". It appears from these passages that of the two lute-players one was a Brāhmaṇa, the other a Rājanya (or Kṣatriya) an important fact showing that the art of lute-playing was looked upon as worthy of practice by the two highest castes.

The parallel passage in SG. I. 22. 11-12 shows that there were sometimes more than two lute-players. This passage as well as PG. I. 15. 7 (where 'King Soma' is implied though only the word 'Rājānam' is used) show that the kingship of Soma was symbolic of earthly kingship.

AG. I. 14. 7. "Soma no rājāvatu mānuśiḥ prajā niśīṭaκaκrāsāv" -iti yāṁ naḥim upovasiṁ bhavanti |

Trans: Prof. STENZLER construes the gāthā thus:—

(1) 'May Soma, our King, protect the human species, who have settled down within thine jurisdiction O thou (referring to the river)' i.e. he separates 'niśīṭaκaκrāsāv' (a case of irregular double sandhi in his view) as 'niśīṭaκaκrāh asau' and construes 'niśīṭaκaκrāh' with 'prajāh'. This construction is supported by the parallel passages in APMS. II. 11. 12 and 13 where

2. See my monograph: 'Ṛgveda Mantras in their ritual setting in the Gṛhya-Sūtras' reprinted from the Bulletin of the Deccan College Research Institute Vol. I.
'vivyttacakraḥ' a variant of 'niviṣṭacakraḥ' qualifies 'Sālvih' (prajāḥ) and 'Brāhmaṇīḥ prajāḥ' respectively.

(2) Prof. OLDENBERG (p. 181) suggests that the words should be separated according to regular sandhi rules as 'niviṣṭacakraś asau' the two words going with 'Nādi' (who is to be named next as 'asau' implies) and translates 'May Soma, our King, bless the human race. Settled is the wheel of N. N.' Prof. OLDENBERG does not seem to have noticed that this is the construction of Nārāyaṇa also (Haradatta, the other commentator also gives the same construction), when he says 'Niviṣṭacakraś gānge'. Prof. STENZLER who generally follows Nārāyaṇa and who has quoted his comment on this part of the Mantra, has either not noticed or has disapproved of Nārāyaṇa's construction, when he remarks that 'Niviṣṭacakraśau' is a case of irregular sandhi. None of these two constructions explain the propriety of the mention of the 'particular river' in connection with 'prajāḥ', or, the introduction of the river-name in connection with Soma and finally the propriety of the mention of the river and Soma in the Śimantonnayana ceremony. I therefore split up and construe the gāthā thus:—The lute-players sing: 'Somo no rājā (Soma is our king)' [My reasons for taking this as an independent clause are that the parallel clause in APMB. II. 11. 13 ; HG. 2. 1. 3 and PG. 1. 15. 8 is an independent sentence like 'Soma eva no rājā' ; compare also RV. X. 109. 2a : 'Somo rājā prathamo brahmajāyām']. The next sentence would be 'āvatu mānuṣīḥ prajā niviṣṭacakraś asau'. May this (river) whose wheels (i.e. banks or course) are well-settled, protect the human race (i.e. keep them safe from the danger of floods and supply them with water). This meaning of 'niviṣṭacakraś' is supported by 'āvinuktacakre tirē' in PG. 1. 15. 8. The mention of the name of the local river thus becomes quite natural. The association of 'Soma—the King' with the waters and, therefore, with a river is well-known. Compare KS. XIV. 2 'Somo rājā oṣadhīṣu apsu'. The mention of the river in the Śimantonnayana ceremony is (I suggest) appropriate because the clear (and at times slightly deviating) parting of the hair brings to our minds the spectacle of a river whose winding course runs through trees and reeds. For the figurative association of 'hair' with 'reeds or plants', compare AV. VI. 137. 2a and 3e keśā nadā iva vardhantām let the hair grow like reeds and APS. 6. 20. 2 : Keśā barhiḥ = the hair are (like) Kuśa grass!

AG. I. 15. 1. Kumāraṁ jatam, purāṇyairālambhāt, sarpir madhunī hiranyanikāsam hiranyena prāśayet (a) 'Pra te datāmi madhuno ghṛtasya (b) Vedāṁ savitrā prasūlam mahāhonām | (c) Āyuṣmān gupto devatābhīḥ (d) śatāṁ jīva śarado loke asminīti |

Trans: A son (newly) born, (the father) should, before others touch him, give to eat, of butter and honey, from (a piece of) gold after rubbing them (together) with (that) gold with the mantra: (a) 'I give to thee of honey (and) ghee, (b) (a mixture symbolising) holy knowledge inspired by Savitṛ for the bountiful (institutors of sacrifices); (c) full of life, protected
by the deities, (d) live a hundred autumns in this world'. [The sūtra and the mantra require some explanation].

A small quantity of butter and honey (mixed up) is poured on a stone and rubbed with a piece of gold vigorously enough to allow some gold dust to be assimilated into the mixture and then one end of that piece of gold is put into the mouth of the child to be licked up by it. So 'hiranyena' does not mean 'from a golden vessel or spoon' as Prof. OLDENBERG takes it.

Sources : Prof. STENZLER (followed by OLDENBERG) corrects the reading 'maghnām' (genitive plural) of the manuscripts into 'Maghnā' (instrumental singular, qualifying 'savitṛā') on the analogy of SG. I. 24. 4 which has a mantra very nearly identical with ours. The variations are : Pāda (a) reads there as 'pra te yacchāmi madhuman makhāya'; (b) has 'maghnā' for our 'maghnām'; (c) has 'gupito' for our 'gupto'—an improvement from the point of view of the metre; (d) is the same as our (d).

The correction of 'maghnām' into 'maghnā' on the analogy of SG is quite plausible but not at all necessary because as has been seen, each individual school-text often exercised the right to alter the readings of a Mantra which belonged to the common Grhya tradition. Besides, in my translation given above, 'Maghnām' yields quite a good sense, the genitive case often doing duty for the dative.

AG. I. 15. 2. Karnayor upanidhāya 'medhājananam' japatī : (a) "Medhām te devaḥ savitā, (b) Medhām devī sarasvatī | (c) medhām te aśvinau devau (d) ādhattām puṣkarasrajavati."

Trans. Holding (his mouth) near (the child’s) ears, he (the father) mutters the (following) 'medhājanana' text [lit: producing 'medhā' or intelligence] 'Intelligence may God Savitṛ, intelligence may goddess Sarasvati, intelligence may the Aśvins, the lotus-wreathed gods put in thee'.

The context of 'Jātakarma' or birth-rite is continued.

Sources : Our mantra is an adaptation the RV. Khila : X. 151. 2 which reads : (a) "Medhām mahyām āṅgirasaḥ (b) medhām devī sarasvatī | (c) medhām me aśvinau devau (d) ādhattām puṣkarasrajavā".

The variations are : our mantra substitutes in (a) 'savita' for 'āṅgirasaḥ' (savitṛ is a very popular deity of the Grhya-ritual; compare the ceremony of Upanayana); and 'te' for 'me' throughout as the father addresses the mantra to the child. TA. 10. 40. 1 also has a very similar mantra to ours, only (a) being different and reading 'Medhām me indro dadātu'.

TA. 10. 40. is an anuvāka that constitutes the 'Yājñikī Upaniṣad' and TA. 10. 40. 1 is a prayer for intelligence. It is curious that this TA. mantra is an adapatanon of RV. X. 184. 2 where 'garbham' occurs for the 'medhām of TA. and 'sināvāli' (a deity very appropriately invoked in birth-rites) is mentioned in the first pāda—an interesting process which illustrates the genesis of the Grhya tradition of mantras!

AG. I. 15. 3 : Aṃśāv abhimṛṣati : (a) "aṃśā bhava paraśur bhava, (b)
hīranyām astraṭam bhava | (c) Vedo vai putra-nāmāsi, (d) sa jīva śaradaḥ śatam' iti.

Trans:—The father then touches the two shoulders of the child with the mantra "Be a stone, be an axe, be gold insuperable [I prefer the reading 'asrutam' (=unmelted or solid) of PG. I. 16. 18 and SB. 14. 9. 4. 26 to our astraṭam' (=insuperable)] Thou art, indeed, the Veda named 'son'; so live a hundred autumns."

Sources:—The SB. 14. 9. 4. is a section (Brāhmaṇa) treating of the rite called 'Putra-Manthra' ensuring the birth of a son endowed with certain desirable characteristics. After the birth of a son (SB. 14. 9. 4. 23), rites similar to those described in our text follow and 14. 9. 26 reads 'athainam abhimpāti' (he then touches him with the mantra) 'Āśmā bhava' etc. a mantra very nearly the same as in our text. The only variations are 'asrutam' (the reading I prefer and found in PG. also) for our 'astraṭam' in pāda (b) and 'ātmā' for our 'putro' in (c).

The word 'Vedah' is puzzle! Prof. Oldenberg suggests (p. 182) that it might be the nominative either of 'veda' or of 'vedas', (property). SB. 14. 9. 4. 25, however throws light on its meaning; it reads 'Vedośīti guhyam nāma karoti'. He gives him a secret name, namely 'Veda'. KBU. 2. 11 also has the same verse in a similar context, only with 'ātmā' for 'putro' in (c). All possible varying versions of the mantra are also found in SMB. 1. 5. 18; HG. 2. 3. 2; MG. 1. 17. 5 etc.

I think the idea of 'āśmā bhava' (be a stone) as an address is developed from RV. VI. 75. 12b (= VS. 29. 49b, and TS. 4. 6. 4) = 'Āśmā bhavatu nas tanūḥ' (may our body be like a stone) addressed to 'arrows' as a prayer for bodily strength.

ĀG. I. 15. 9. Prawāśād etya putrasya śirah parigṛhya japati: (a) "Āṅgak anāgat sambhavasi, (b) hṛdayādadhikāyase | (c) Ātmā vai putra- nāmāsi, (d) sa jīva śaradaḥ śatam' iti mūrdhāni trir avaghṛṣyā |

Trans: Having come back from a journey, (the father) clasps his son's head and having smelta (him) on the head mutters three times: 'From every limb, art thou born; from out of the heart hast thou been produced. Thou art indeed the Ātmā (Self) named son; so live a hundred autumns'.

The context:—From the position of the sūtra, I think, the rite is here prescribed primarily for a very young child (under one year of age), this being the norm for a similar ritual in the case of a grown-up boy.

Sources: The first two pādas are found in SB. 14. 9. 4. 8 where the Mantra is employed at 'cohabitation' to ensure the birth of a specially qualified son in the course of the Putramantha rite. Prof. Stenzler compares KBU. 2. 11 (where the whole verse occurs in the same context) and KS. 4. 12. 22.

The whole verse also occurs in a similar context in PG. I. 18. 2; HG. 2. 3. 2; APMB. 2. 11. 33; and MG. 1. 18. 6 with slight variations.

1. Prof. Oldenberg's rendering of 'avaghṛṣyā' (he kisses him) is not literal.
AG. I. 16. 5: Dadhimadhuhgəntamisram annam prəsəyet: (a) 'Annapate'nnasya no deky (b) anamivasya śuṣmiṇaḥ | (c) prapradərəm təriṣa (d) ৰুজন no dhehi dvipade catuspade' iti.

Trans: (Such) food mixed with curds, honey and ghee, he should make (the child) eat, with the mantra 'Lord of food, give us food that causes no disease and possesses (full) strength. Advance (pra təriṣaḥ), the great giver (prapradərəm); confer power on us—on (our) bipeds and quadrupeds.

The context is the ceremony of annaprāśana that takes place when the child is in its sixth month. 'Such food' (in the translation above) means any one of the three kinds of food mentioned in Sūtras 2 to 4.

Sources: Prof. STENZLER compares VS. XI. 83 and when he suggests the correction of 'pra pradərəm' as printed in his text into 'pra pra dərəm' in the Kritische Anmerkungen (p. 49), he has probably in his mind the VS. reading. But the Mantra is found in earlier Sāṁhitās like TS., MS. and KS, and the reading of TS. 4. 2. 3. 1 (and TS. 5. 2. 2. 1 which is the Brāhmaṇa of the former passage) where the mantra occurs without a variant, is 'pra pradərəm' and I have translated accordingly. TS. 4. 2. 3 is a section containing mantras for taking the Ukhya fire (i.e. fire in the pan) to the place of the Agnicayana and with 4. 2. 3. 1 (i.e. our mantra), the adhvaryu puts on the fire, a piece of Udumbara wood dipped in Vrata milk. In VS. 11. 83 the context is identical. SB. 6. 6. 4. 7 just quotes this same mantra from VS. and gives the Brāhmaṇa thereon. It is however, in TB. and PB. that we meet with a context suggestive of our context. In TB. 3. 11. 4. 1 the mantra accompanies a home with rice for the placing of bricks in the 'Naciketa-cayana' and in PB. 1. 8. 7, the mantra accompanies the acceptance of food as Dakṣiṇā in a Soma sacrifice, which is suggestive of our context of 'annaprāśana' or first 'tasting of food'.
INSCRIPTIONS OF KATHIAWAD*

By
D. B. DIKSALKER.

SHIMARA

This fragmentary inscription at present consisting of two pieces was discovered in the village Shimar near Ajär in the Únā Mahal of the Junagadh State. From the characters the inscription can be assigned to the 15th century of the v.s.

The inscription seems to record the digging of a well. A portion of the date viz. Thursday the fifth of the bright half of [Mā]gha is only visible.

Text.

1  

2  

3  

[=kya:]  

[=kya:]  

[vict]:  

[palubhajana]:  

[vichet:]  

[maldehi]:  

[=amunam]:  

[=kapi]:  

[=shiva]:  

[=shud]:

MAHUVA

No. 75]  

v. s. 1500  

[23-4-1444 A.D.

The subjoined inscription is engraved on a black stone slab built up in the pedestal of the god Lakṣmī-Nārāyaṇa, whose temple is situated near the Darbargadh of the sea-port town Mahuvā on the southern coast of Kathiawad in the Bhavnagar State. But as the inscription mentions the digging of a well and makes no mention of the temple it seems that the inscribed stone was brought from elsewhere and built up in the temple. The inscribed portion, which is beautifully engraved and is well preserved measures 1’8” in length and 11” in breadth. The record is both in Sanskrit poetry and prose. As regards orthography it may be noted that a consonant is sometimes doubled after ฬ.

It was formerly published in the Prakrit and Sanskrit Inscriptions of Kathiawad p. 162 ff.

The inscription opens with the date, expressed in words, Thursday, the full moon day of Vaisākha of v. s. 1500, the sарhvatsara being Prajāpati. In the concluding portion of the inscription, in line 17, where the date is again given, the day is expressed as paścami, which seems to be a mistake for paūrnimā. The inscription then states that in the town named Madhumatī, situated in Vālāka, there lived a merchant named Narapāla, of the Moḍha community, which derived its origin from the hoof of Kāmadhenu. He was a great devotee of Kṛṣṇa and was a minister of a king named Rāma.* His son was Pālha, and his grandson was Rāma, who is said in the record to be conversant with the Vedas. The latter had by his devoted wife named Jānu a son named Mokala. For the final beatitude of his parents Mokala caused a well to be dug in Madhumatī in the region where water was scarce, during the reign of the Gohel King Sārangji.

The inscription then describes in the eleventh and twelfth verse the antiquity of the town thus—It is said in the Dharmārāṇya Purāṇa that this beautiful town was founded by Brahmā, when he created the universe. It was called Dharmārāṇya in Kṛta Yuga, Satya Mandira in Treta Yuga, Veda bhuvana in Dvāpara Yuga and Moheraka in Kali Yuga.

The inscription then states in prose all that was mentioned above in poetry viz.—Mokala caused a well to be dug to the west of (the town) Madhumatī for the final beatitude of his father Rāma and mother Jānu and brother Rāghava on Thursday, the fifteenth (wrongly put as fifth) the bright half of Vaisākha in v. s. 1500 when Prajāpati was the Sarhvatsara.

The Gohel King Sārangji mentioned in the record was Sārangji, son of Kānoji, and an ancestor of the Mahārāja of Bhavnagar. Sārangji's gādi was usurped for some time by his uncle Rāmji, but it was afterwards, recovered by him. Nothing is known of the king Rāma, who was the patron of Narapāla. He cannot be identified with Rāmji, the uncle of Sārangji, but might be the Vājā king Rāmadeva mentioned in No. 72 above.

Vālāka mentioned in the third line was the name given in old times to the southern coast belt of Kathiawad from a point north of Valā to as far as Jāfrābad on the south-west, where Valās were ruling.

Text.

1 ओऽ नमः श्रीसर्वेश्वर: ॥ सत्सति व्यतितमति प्रसिद्धिनुसारीविकुमातिकमात्र संविधिपुत्रपदवियः ॥
2 [पु] जनती संस्खे प्रजातिः पति। भिने वाली प्रजानीपरं धने महाभाषे शुक्ले
3 पुराणिनी गुरुः च गुरुः
4 संहोपोगुणवेशः ॥ १ ॥ वालाकायातरं पुरे मधुमतीस्वं मिनि सातिरते श्रीमल्लासवीषी
5 रुद्रस्वरवर्ष्णभूते वंशे

* I think this is the purport of the expression श्रीमल्लासवीषी-प्रियतान्तः: in l. 4.
1. Expressed by a symbol. 2. Read कामगवी
JUNAGADH (Uparkot)

No. 76] v. s. 1507 [21-1-1451.

This inscription is fixed in a wall of the fort Uparkot in Junagadh. As it was considerably disfigured most probably by the victorious Muhammadans, it cannot be completely read. Fortunately no important portion is lost. The engraver no doubt did his work excellently. The inscribed portion measures

3. Read मोकळः: 4. Read जानु

5. Below the words शेषिट मोकळ in the line some letters are indistinctly seen. They are perhaps of the name of the engraver. For the letter मू i.e., सूत्खार can be read.
2'8" in length and 1'6" in breadth. It is both in prose and poetry. The language of the record is mostly Sanskrit but sometimes Prākrit forms are freely used in it, which are rather difficult to be understood.

The record opens with the date, Thursday the fifth of the dark half of Māgha of v. s. 1507, which is once more given in the 24th line both in figures and words. It then records that at the request of a merchant named Ḥāsa son of Deva, a resident of Stambha Tirthā (i.e. modern Cambay) and of others the King Maṇḍalika, son of Mahīpāla and grandson of Rāṇa Mela-gadeva of the Yādava dynasty ruling at Junagadh (Jirnodurga) in the Sau-rāṣṭra country, issued orders at the time of his coronation prohibiting the slaughter of animals on the 5th, 8th and the 14th day (of the month) in addition to the 11th day and the Amāvasā day, when prevention of slaughter was already in observance. This is the object of the inscription. But repeated praises of Maṇḍalika in prose and again in poetry for this kind action of his have made the inscription very long.

The inscription is interesting as it contains a few forms in old Gujarati. Besides this two more inscriptions of the King Maṇḍalika are found, which are published below. Two dates of v. s. 1512 and 1525 are found of this king from MSS. (See p. 305 of Vol. I of Purāntattva).

Text.


2 ...ताप्युग्मा सर्वजीविक्षणकरणतत्परेण [श्री]दार्यंगा[भीष्मचतुर्य]शौर्यविद्यायनेरत-रतलकरण वर्षास्यपदातिने काले स्तम्भतीथियास्त्वत् सारं देवालयं हंसा... गदी मथ्यं? सर्ववरसुतुली...।

3 ...समस्तजीवविधियदानकरण[प्रसा]दकरकरण पंचमीश्रीवातुस्तोद्देशीदिनेनु सर्वजीव अमारी कारिता। राजा मिशेक [['ना]नंतर सहस्रनाथने श्रीमंडलिकराजाभिने श्रीअमालय

4 ...य शिकित् श्वस्तिक्षितातिकारासहं समापितं। पुराण एकादशी आमालये पालन-माने हं: संक्षेप एवं खिस एलेनु पंचमी अमाली एकादशी चन्द्रीदी अमालयादिनेनु राजाधीराजीश्रीमंडलिक[प्रसा]

5 जा सर्वेेये: कल्याणकारकी सह्यदिरतुगोपवर्गनिवारणी सर्वजीव अमारी[वि] कर्तवयोग्य निरंतयात्। प्रथम श्री-उग्नि जीवकल्याणकारकी लोकसमस्तजीवन-मा श... कीमार

6 -सदीमं निंद्रियका... वि आहेंद्रकाल कौरी मारे या। बाबर खंट तुरक एलेनु-हेतू... कोहें ने विषय न-वि केशी-ई-मोहाने क्षेत्र[रु]विचित्रित नींगोत्तें-ई। जिंको

7 ...इतिहास गणे मंडलकारक्या... श्रीमंडलिककालुणा आ [आ] बक्त धिंबा। तेहेंहदे गुणा-सिक। विषय-वो मुंकः। ए दोपते... अमा [वि] प्रवत्ता वण्हार श्री मंडलिककुणां नाही
8 ...शों दु + द [व] बमेनोत्सुबिषिता चारोस्मिन्दु: वियृति
भीम: शरु...ढुबभ...अ...वियृति गी।पति: । सीमायत् सु[तु]ण्ड: शमिक विसृतों राजहु:
प्रति...लेखता केला: कीति...
9 [सु]भूष + क हर्जों तो श्रीमंडलके: प्रभृती ॥ श्रीभुवतो ॥ अथ प्रश्नारत्सावानी ॥
श्री [मान] श्रीयुद्धभूस्तित्वयुगमेः: व्यति: प्रभृती [स्वातु] सर्वविषयोपकरणे हत: कृतय
[शो] लंकारता सं...18...1 तपस्म.
10 ...रा श्रीजातिकापारा । ज्धपुयाय स्वतीसंधे गुलारो श्रीमंडलकरम्मुः: [ ]] 1
देवनां...विशिष्या [विनुमणे है] धारिता नामततो । केशे येन यथा:प्रताप-रथा
महाकस्म...18...3यंहुपयेः...18...15 स्वान
11 ...हर्जति । जलवा मंडलकाकम्पथिनिहताः जीवेतु गुणो दशां ॥ 9 यस्मादक्रियातातो
नयविनययुतो मंडलीको नरेश:। सम्या म्व [-] द...जो...स्थान: [18] सर्वांगी
शु - 18...11 सुह...
12 बन्धुते भूमिशर्यैः [**:०] । जूठ: स्वा...चनो भवतिपुर्विशेषभूतिरस्तीयसंहीः: 11 । श्रीने-
मिलामिलनाय: संकल...वचः—य...ह...कृष्णनुजु...समुहस्तित्वाय स...पि हैतो...
5 पि प्रा?
13 हुतोवं हुदुकृतनिलक: श्रीदुपन्यन: [आ]चकारिणम्भाजा किटितवज्ञाये मंडलीक
...1 9...मालूह...18...11 श्रीनमि: । 7...वादिमथुमुः...पि वाचः:
14 र: प्रताप हुदृ: श्रीपीतुनित्वागमिवः । स...तेवरप्रमणकुः श्रीमंडलकेन तत् ॥ 9
नैौके सम्पूर्ण्य-दान...त्य्य...रा...दु...प्रत्य-य...यथ: स...1 9 के—
15 18...प...स...संस्कार:। वि...निवचिति निम्नन्युः: श्रीमंडलके २० पो ॥ 6
भुस्नुः...निवित्स्ये...स्वत्तः
16 सावः विष्कर्कमिति श्रीमंडलको नूपे । यदुस्सत्त्वत्सरसति केते हुणा: संयाति: ॥
7 18...वादिक: प्रभुप्राप्तसानोऽत्यथाब्यस्माद...सु: । शा...डुपते...माँ च...
17 ...हुदृ वर्ण प्राश्राण:। श्रीति: केदुयुको निसर्गपूर्वा श्रीमंडलके व्युहः: ॥ 8 या
वेदु गुणस्मृतिपीतपिताबिनिकारः प्रेक्षा जीवम...सृ...करी मा...18
18 ...अविकल्पीप्रसृतिए श्रीमंडलको सा ॥ 9...सत्य प्रभवमुदयुष्याशास्मुच्ये
5निमाः...सांविष्य...कारयुः...नामा...विष्कर्वे...18...
19 ...सुश्रवामारिमः उजजते नरपरमेधेनिमयाऒः ॥ १० श्रीति: स्मृतिस्पीति सहजातित्वत
व्यवहारनिहताः सावः विशā: [शा]:...18...11वि भवनि...क...स...18...शरीतिति: । तो श्रीजातिकाय
विचारचुः: श्रीमंडलिकः
20 [श]वाणा: स विशेषेये सक्ते पूर्वपेन्मेतलसमं ॥ 11 श्राव्यः: श्रीमेश्वराच: पुरारि
नितराः श्रीमंडलिपालः यदुर्व...त...तो...मूर्तिनादिति...जनयति: ॥ दान
पदार्थम् म—
21 श्रीमंडलको गुलारमहिमाभृत्तिहि निदानः ॥ १२ येन न्यास्मिनवितब्युः बहुरता
श्रीमानात्ति: । 18...सिं...क...समी। । निमायेत् स्मृतिगोचरः उदकितो...वा
विधा | ॥ श्रीमंडलिकः
22 [श] भृगुहितसुधु: राजयिरे नंदनाम् ॥ १२ सर्वाणे य: पश्चात् भयक्ष्यति भुवनां
प्रदत्ते । दुष्यावे मे...नानात्व:...सुत्वा स्वत्त राजामिषेपे। च चावृद्धस्वाय परमि...
This inscription is engraved on a very large slab of stone built in the wall of the Neminātha temple or as is popularly called of the ‘Rā Khengār Mahāl,’ on the left of the entrance of the Devakoṭa on the famous Girnar hill. This slab does not contain the whole of the inscription but it seems that a second slab was used on which the remaining portion was engraved. But as the other slab is not discovered as yet we have to remain satisfied with this incomplete inscription. The upper left corner of the stone is broken away, otherwise the inscription is in an excellent state of preservation. The inscribed portion measures 3½’ in length and 2’ in breadth. The poet who composed this prāṣasti was no doubt a learned man, but his ideas are many times far-fetched and are difficult to be understood. Though the engraving is done in a very clear way the inscription is full of grammatical mistakes of every kind.

This important inscription was first published in the Journal of the Bombay Branch Royal Asiatic Society, Vol. I, p. 64, and again in the Antiquities of Kathiawad and Kachh, p. 159, and in the Revised List of Antiquarian Remains in the Bombay Presidency, p. 347.

It opens with an invocation to the goddess of learning (Sāradā). The meaning of the second and third verses is not clear, but the second verse seems to praise the sun god. In the fourth verse the goddess Ambikā is praised. Then in three more verses the Girnar mountain called both Ujjayanta and Raivata in the record is described. From the eighth verse an account is given of a family born of Harr, in which Siva, Angaja (i.e. Madana), Aycuta (i.e. Kṛṣṇa), Bala [rāma] and others were born. In that famous family called Yādava, was born a great king named Māndalika, who built with many gold plates a temple of Nemi[nātha]. His son was Navaghana, whose son Mahipāladeva built a temple of Somānātha at Prabhāsa. His son was Śaṅgāra (Khangara), whose son was Jayasinhadeva. The latter had a son named Mokalasirīma, whose son was Melagadeva. The latter’s son was Mahipāladeva, who had a son named Māṇḍalika. From the seventeenth verse to the twenty-first this king is extravagantly praised. As the description of the royal family ends with this king it can be supposed that
the inscription belongs to his time. As we know that the last Maṇḍalika ruled from v.s. 1506-1527 this inscription belongs to that period probably to v.s. 1510 or (1454 A.D.). On the twenty-fourth line, which is the last one in this slab, description is begun of Śāna a famous merchant, but there being no sufficient space on the slab for further engraving the record is left incomplete.

This inscription gives the longest genealogy of the Cudāsamā kings, beginning with Maṇḍalika who is supposed to have begun his rule in v. s. 1316 to the king Maṇḍalika the third of the name and who was destined to be the last ruler of the family, his kingdom being seized permanently by the Muhammadans in v. s. 1527. After Navaghana Mahīpāla I is said in the inscription to have come to the throne. He was in fact the younger brother of Navaghana and not the son as is wrongly stated in the inscription. It may be noted that after Jayasimha I, the names of only direct descendants in the line are given. For Jayasimha was succeeded by his elder son Mahīpāla and the latter by his younger brother Mokalasimha. Similarly Mokalasimha was succeeded by Maṇḍalika and the latter by Meliga. Thirdly Meliga was succeeded by Jayasimha and the latter was succeeded by Mahīpāla. But our inscription which is bent upon giving the names of only direct descendants has dropped in the genealogy the names of Mahīpāla, Maṇḍalika and Jayasimha, each of whom was succeeded not by his son but by his younger brother. Now on the same grounds the name of Navaghana the elder son of Maṇḍalika I, ought not to have been given. But the composer of our prasasti wrongly thought that his successor Mahīpāla was his son and not younger brother. For the full genealogy of the family from the first Maṇḍalika in the inscription to the third Maṇḍalika see the Introduction.

Text.

1. ...मते:¹ श्रेण: सुधोमाती संखोंच नवति-वा भुवपरिश्रावानलुतागावः। दूषयाप्य-तबोवलणाप्रिजगति
2. ...[तो]तेवा सारदा। खं करते:² पुरत: सम[ता]महाविरहो(यो)तनया अभी खोठा त्व ऐ रेखिरे विजगति जामततापा अि। दाराति स्त्र सवदीय सांसम्
3. ...वयच्छः(तुलनीयत् (?)। २ कि भूमिया: प्रकटसु कुटानीरं तप्रभृतितातरतः जितपितामहं (?) निर्मिते धार्यविदं मोण्डिट्यवर्गः मस्तरामिस्सि भूरोपनरकतिष्ठताय गतिः भवे
4. ...तीव्रबिन्दुस्थिरो हंदुः तथा प्राचीनासावक्त्यव भिमति। या हंलति माकंदरां भरम्याणं। घटके सुतसुल्टुष्ट जतातितचष्ठूषयेऽहैं कि नृणं। ४ तो दिएकहि
5. तत्तः धीरजखः संखोंचे। ५ हर उज्जवलं निर्मितमुखचित्रतीति सद्धमं कमङ्करणोयमिनां जनानां। सानिध्यमाहित्तमें मुखमेधनादेशाशाविष्णुप्रतीति।³

1. This line as well as some phrases in other lines are unintelligible.
2. यकाते: 3. शुकुटा। 4. रतेऽ? 5. This and the following phrases are unintelligible.
7. Such unnecessary strokes are common in this record.
8. शिवेकहिता। 9. मेघदावेशा?
6 [बिंदू] छ्रज्ञदु || ५ || अय्य च || नामातीयोऽपवत्तोऽपवत्तीकाविन्यामः || पौररेखें १० 
मेघदुर्योऽपवत्तां तुतीयोऽपवत्तेवसहः || दमीश्वरपरस्मयः ११ विश्वाम राजौक्षेप: छु 

7 राज्यं १२ राज्यं पुष्पशु। निर्गिर्नाय सर्गदीर्घत्वः ॥ ६ ॥ नागा गर्भभवतिपरंतिपरं होत्वा 
भुजास्तस्या ॥ आवल्ले राजरघं धृतनाथ: केवल नुम्भवाः: ॥ १७ ॥ एको रैवतबुध 
नरे विजयां यद्गृहान्नामण्याचः ॥ यात् १३ अत्विद्वत्ता: किंतु महानंदे चूक्ष्युप: 
॥ ७ ॥ तत् च च || गिरि १४ शुशुङ्खधिं चिर्विनात्तामुरुषाचार्यः ॥ सुपर्व महिमापदे 
जनता व 

9 शा आस्ते हुरे: ॥ यदुवन्यशिवांगजन्तुवर्त्तमाद्युवा अन्त्यन्ति ददति निषेचभिनितसः सुज्ञा आपि व ॥ ८ ॥ वर्देशमिन्दुनाम कावरपतेषुधुमोर्योऽन्त्यिरामकु 

10 || लं मुणिच्विगुरु सौयाधिबालितम् ॥ ॥ आनामुण्डमहलिनन्दपरम; श्रीमदधीक: कमँदा ॥ 
प्राप्तां गृह्यशिवात्विनित्वार्याचर्यः ॥ ९ ॥ नवघननुशंसत्तदीयसु 

11 नवरदहवितमेससमादानम: ॥ नवघनकृष्ट: प्रजाविनाय: ॥ नवप्रनासार्थस्योरिमाय: 
॥ १० ॥ महिमाकोः महिमापदेवोः पुत्रसदियोजनी यथेषु: ॥ यहांनदेयः 

12 शुद्धेरस्वलङ्गसम्बन्धनामामत्वे १७ वीमाल्के सोमनायप्रासादद्वार: ॥ ॥ बंगारनामा 
मितुरायश्चक्षुशुकुमार एवार्जना भुमिभाविता: ॥ गंगारुक्कुलकर्त्ता जालामन्यमा बंगार [भा] 

13 || रा जगतीलिखः ॥ ॥ रा आत्मो श्रीर्ज्ञासिद्धेषुनृपत्तितामव्यमानी भावोऽधृतमसालिनयनी न्यायार्चितेऽर्थ ॥ 
शुद्धारुक्कुलस्यंतो १८ वहिमा सम्बन्धम् १९ 

14 || स्त्रेष्ठानितमणीयमूपमृत्तिक्रियातिविधिः ॥ ॥ १२ || दिषुते तदुपः मोकलसिद्ध 
शुद्धभूमिजम्भेदनसिद्ध: ॥ यदुवन्यशिवांगदिवं हस्त: सन्नय: सन्निध: 

15 कलहः ॥ ॥ १४ ॥ तदुपः मेलावदेवसर्वे: ॥ मुक्तात्मुखवर्थक: ॥ ॥ मामावः 
[नाथ २२] प्रविधु: ॥ भस्मता कलात्मनागवत् ॥ ॥ १५ ॥ तत्तादिदेवसाधनम् 

16 लुढ़काचैऽपायापानुभूतो ॥ विन्ध्यक्षरस्तरकर्ममितभृत्षेखरे भासः ॥ आस्ते, श्री 
महिमापदेवप्रश्नते: निमित्तिनितितस्वामापालोहम? (१५) 

17 कालम्: कृष्णीतितिमर्मचतुंचन्तुपुलम्: ॥ ॥ १६ तस्मुनुज्यति दिपतक्रिडिन्त्रित (५) 
कर्मचारिन: ॥ श्रीममभंित: किंवित्वश्रित्व: कोल्हेदृश्यः: ॥ श्री [२४] 

18 शुद्धुपृष्टितस्वातित्वान्तरस्यापने वद भौतिसत्तसमवेत्तितितित्वाधीनस्य बर्धिशुचार 
लयः (३) ॥ ॥ १७ ॥ नायण (२) प्रयः कृत उत्तरो नर्तमः: करण: कृतो किंवितः: 

19 सते २५ पाते कुते: क्वमन तृतीयी किं दिष्टक्ष: लक्षिता: ॥ वैराज्युधित्वात: दु: 
साधृष्टिविनिधिकेषः किं प्राप्त: ॥ कीर्तिः मेंडिक: किंवित्वश्री भिवर इह श्रीराजितित्व: ॥ १८ 

20 आलीनस्तलमोहो ज्योक्तकल्मामामधा भोमोचितेषु: ॥ केतेऽः कृष्णीयोऽपे २५ रामविभमन: 
सयोऽह (श्री) अभिभो: पूर्वांतः: ॥ ॥ श्रवणविश्वसि चक्षरः वैराजङ्गानानाना 

INScriptions of Kathiawād

No. 78]  

This slab of stone containing a bilingual (Persian and Sanskrit) inscription was found fixed in the southern wall of the Darbargadh of Pasnāvād; a very old town in Junagadh State, at a distance of 5½ miles to the east of Sutrā-Pāḍā. The Sanskrit portion measures 1' 3½" by 3". The language of the record is very incorrect, but the mistakes can easily be detected.

The inscription opens with the date, Sunday, the second of the dark half of Śrāvaṇa of v.s. 1514 (7-8-1457 A.D.) and states that SULTAN MALIK ASAD, son of Malik Muhammad, and grandson of Malik Mubārk, was then governing Devapātaṇa (i.e. Somanātha Pātaṇa) on behalf of SULTAN KUT-BUDDIN (of Gujarat). He caused very strong iron gates to be made to the fort at PāSNAVĀD. This work was completed on Sunday, the sixth of the dark half of v. s. 1514 (Māha).

Text

1  || संवात् १५१४ कष्ण भाषण वदि २ रवी मुल्लान श्रीकृष्टबदरीन विजिराये श्रीदेव-पतन

2  || त: मुल्लानान्द[ः]मलिस्क भी: मसारक सत मलिकीमायादसत मलिक श्रीकृष्णाद:  

3  || फरीदाति वजे पस्तायाद: कोटेन हम्नयान। भामरति साधारि। सर्ववृद्धा पारता किया  

4  || सुत्र पीमास सुत्र शुरा। सुत्र पला। सुत्र धीरा। १ सुत्र सुत्रमिह सुत्र सल। कायस्य।  

5  || संवात १५१४ कष्ण महाब वदि [१] रिवै सत्ययं ॥

JEGADVA

No. 79]  

This inscription is found in one of the deris near the Mātri Vāv in the village Jegadvā at a distance of six miles to the south-east of Dhrangadhra. It measures 27" × 13".
The inscription records that Ramābhai, born in the Guhila family and married to Rāṇa Raṇavīra of the Zālā family caused a well to be built on the 10th day of the bright half of Vaiśākha in v.s. 1518. Ramā’s sons were Rāmādāsa, Arjuna and Gajabhrama.

Four more inscriptions, recording the same object are found in four other deris in the same place. Two of them are of the same date, but the remaining two do not give any date.

The expression ‘chief queen’ पह्पराघी used with Ramābhai, wife of Rāṇa Raṇavīra seems to be a formal one, since the Halvad inscription of v.s. 1538 published below gives the name of Lilāde of the queen of Raṇavīra whose son Bhīma succeeded his father to the gādi. Ramābhai built the well after the death of her husband in v.s. 1516.

Text.

(1)

1 वेश्यत्1918 वषे वेश्या
2 ष शृदि 10 हिने ओऽश्रुङ्
3 बंशे रणभी रणवीरः राज्या गृहि
4 लंशे बाई ओरमादे
5 इ बावि करारी पुत्र रण
6 श्रीभास रणभी
7 अजस्न्दे रणभी [गज्]
8 [अम्]³.
9 .
10 .

(2)

1 बाई ओरमया
2 वामिका का
3 ष कार्मया जीवजीव
4 नजीवमां [1*] दसिता रामिता देयमा
5 रामया समयालया [1.11*] रणवीरस्य
6 राज्ये [**:]* पहराघी रमाभिधा वतिते निःके
7 लंकया धर्मस्य करणा वथा [11*] २

GIRNAR

No. 80] v.s. 1519 [13-5-1463.

This inscription is engraved on the pedestal of a black marble image in the nijamandira of the Sampratirāja temple. It consists of two lines and

1. This word was left to be engraved in its proper place and was therefore engraved on the top of the first line.
2. The further portion is worn out.
3. Read. निःके.
measures 2'10½" in length and only 3" in breadth. It is in a good state of preservation.

It records that during the time of the king MANDALIKA an image of Nemi-
nátha was caused to be made by two brothers Sahasakaraṇa and Pomasīha,
sons of Síkha and that it was consecrated by Udayavallabhasúri of the
Vṛddhatapā pakṣa (i.e. Gacha), on Friday, the 11th of the dark fortnight
of Vaiśākha in v. s. 1519.

Text.

1 ॥ सं १५१९ वर्ष वैशाखवदि ११ शुक्रे रायराय श्रीमंडलिकविज्ञाराज्ये शोऽकि
मुऽत शोऽ
2 सहसाकरणपीमसीहम्या (ो) श्रीनेम्याचबिंब कारिते प्रति २० लंपपाये श्रीउदयवल्लभ-
सुरिमः

JEGADVĀ

No. 81]

v. s. 1524 [26-1-1468 A.D.

This inscription is engraved on a pālīo standing on the eastern bank
of the Kāḷāsara tank to the east of the village Jegaḍvā in Dhrangdhrā State.
A camel driver is engraved between the second and the third line of
the inscribed portion, which measures 1'4" in height and 1'1" in breadth.
The concluding three lines cannot be clearly read.

The record opens with the date, viz. Tuesday, the second of the bright
half of Māgha of v. s. 1524, and refers to the reign of a king named MAHĀ-
RĀṆĀ VARASIMHADEVĀ. It seems to record the death of a person in a fight on
the above mentioned date.

It must be noted that the king who held sway over Jegadvā at that
time must be no other than a Zālā king of Kuvā. We do not however find
a king in that family who was ruling in v.s. 1524 and who was called Var-
asimhadeva. A king of that name did rule in the Zālā family but he lived
in an earlier period from circa 1441 to 1448 of the Vikrama era. The
date, again, can definitely be read as 1524. I am, therefore, inclined to
propose that Varasimhadeva was some Bhāyāda of the ruling family but was
given the honorific title ‘Mahārāṇā’ only in the inscription. He may be
the eleventh son of Rāṇū Satrasālji of the main ruling of Kuvā.

Text.

1 संवत् १५२४ वर्ष माध
2 मासे शुक्रपक्षेः हितीया ति
3 नी भीमसिन्हे पारतिमान
4 हसने विविधापिंग योगे विविधापि
5 एवं शुष्णविहिद्राया पुष्पतिमिनी
6 महाराण नीयाकराज्यविज्ञाराज्ये
7 बाई कामेलास बाई काकाला?

8-10

1. Read. वरसंगदे i.e. वरसिंहदे
KHĀMBHAD

No. 82] v. s. 1531 [25-7-1474.

This inscription is engraved at the door of a small temple near the deri of Khāmbhadia Nāg in the village Khāmbhad. The inscribed portion is round an image of Gaṇapati and measures 1' 7" in length and 6" in breadth.

It records that the temple was built on Monday the 12th of the first half of Śrāvaṇa in v. s. 1531 in the village Khāmbhad by Meheta Harapal in the time of a Zālā king, whose name is illegible, but is probably Bhima.

Text.

1 संवत १५३१ वर्ष सरलेन छैन
2 १२ सोम माघपारमे
3 शाय श्री [भीमराये] महं हरपाल
4 ......... देरी करावीः

KUTIYĀNA

No. 83] v. s. 1531 [5-10-1574.

This inscription was found in Kutiyāna under Junagadh State, but it is now kept in the Junagadh Museum. It is broken in its lower portion. The record is full of mistakes.

It opens with the date, Wednesday, the tenth of the dark half of Aśvina in v. s. 1531, and makes a mention of the Mahājanas of KUNTIPOUR (i.e. modern Kutiyānā). The names of certain articles of commodity, viz., ja-wari, cotton, etc., are given. It seems that the Mahājanas trading in the Māndvi were asked to contribute to some public purpose certain amount of grain, cotton, etc.

Text.

1 संवत १५३१ वर्ष आबनं पदि १० कुष्येः: गङगा-पुरुषालाव्यम् मांवीन्तकालिसम् (?)
2 महाजन तपसद् त्रि मित्रं विप्रं: तथा विद्या
3 जीरी कुलशं १ प्र. ९ ६ [जो] री क १ प्र. २० १ वंडीकः विद्वान्
4 कुलक १ प्र. ९ ६ [क] गाम भा १ प्र. ६ कुलक १ प्र. २० नामगृहव वंडीकः
5 ....... पश्चिमकु कपास भा १ प्र. २० आपद ॥ पट
6 ...... घनसा भा १ प्र. ६७ को १ प्रेट-
7 ...... मा १ प्र. ११ जेहन पा॒ड़ि
8 ....... ते पट
9 ......... नही

1. Read Aabhan 2. Read कुष्ये 3. Read कुलशं Kuntipur कपास भा
4. and 6 and 1? 5. Read कलशी?
CANDRASAR

No. 84] v.s. 1534. [9-2-1478

This inscription is found engraved on a stone fixed in the southern dam of the big lake to the south of the village Candrasara in the Rājasitāpur mahal of the Dhrangdhra State. Its length is 5'9" but the breadth is only 4". The average size of the letters is 2" by 1½".

It records that a farmer or a kṣatriya (क्षत्री) named Dipacandra of Darbha gotra caused to be dug a beautiful tank for the comfort of beings on Monday the 7th of the bright half of Phālguna of v.s. 1534.

On p. 241 of the revised list of Antiquarian Remains in the Bombay Presidency this inscription is read thus—

चंद्र हारे तद्भाग न कारितं दर्भ गोत्रिणा।
बुधाणं शास्तयेनुमे चंद्रशापन क्षत्रिणा॥

and the making of the tank is attributed to the king Candrasimhajī of Halvad, But there is no doubt that the correct reading of the text is as given below. The date 1534 is quite clear. In another inscription of v.s. 1911 at the same place published below this work is attributed to Candrasimhajī and the date for that occasion is given as v.s. 1640 simply to suit the reign of Candrasimhajī the Zālā ruler of Halvad. The present inscription tells us that the author of the tank was Dipacandra and that his gotra was Darbha, whereas the gotra of the Zālā family in which Candrasimhajī was born is known to be Mārkaṇḍeya.* It is thus clear that the building of the tank is wrongly attributed to Candrasimhajī by tradition, that the writer of the inscription of v.s. 1911 simply bowed down to that tradition and stated the wrong year for that purpose, and that BURGESS wrongly read the inscription in the light of the tradition, if at all the Zālā ruler might have repaired and enlarged the tank.

Text

1 संवत् १५३४ वर्ष फाल्गुन मुदि ७(७) [सोमे म]नोहरे तद्भाग न कारितं दर्भगोत्रिणा।
2 सत्यानं शास्तयेन नूर्ने। दीपज्ञेयः क्षत्रिणा॥

GOSĀ

No. 85] v.s. 1536. [6-2-1480

This inscription is found in the southern part of the village Gosā. It measures 12"×11".

It refers to the rule of Patshaha Mahmamad and the Jethvā chief Vikamāitji and states that on Sunday, the 11th of the dark half of Māgha in v.s. 1536 one Munjāl, son of Surā, belonging to the Nāgar Vānia community caused a well to be dug up in Gosā.

Patshaha Mahmamad mentioned in the record was the powerful Gujrāt Sultan Mahmud Begada who conquered Kathiawad in v.s. 1527, ended the Cūḍāsamā rule at Junagadh and enforced his claims as overlord over

*See Limbdi Inscription of v.s. 1830 published below.
the small states in Kathiawad, Rana Vikamaitji of Porbandar being one of them.

Text.

1 संवत 1536 माष वि
2 दि 11 दिवस पातसाह श्रीम
3 हमेंद्रजे जेट्या श्रीबिकमा
4 इता गोमतारामांत नागरन्या
5 ति वाणी सुरसागृह सुजातिले
6 वाणी करावू लिपिहं शु
7 जालमुल भोजा

RAMPURA

No. 86] v.s. 1538. [1-2-1482.

Between the villages Rāmpurā and Rāṭbā in the Wadhwan State there is a well where the following four inscriptions of the same date are found. The letters of all are well engraved and well preserved. The first inscription measures 18" in length and 14" in breadth, the second 17¾" by 14", the third 17" by 13½" and the fourth 17½" by 14½".

All the four inscriptions bear the same date, viz., Friday, the 13th of the bright half of Māgha of v.s. 1538 or Śaka 1403. Though they are differently worded, as may be seen below, their object is the same. It is as follows: — In the time of Pādāshāhā MAHAMUD and during the regime of Rāṇā VāGHJɪ and when Paramāra Lakhadhir and Hādā and Alukhān were governing the locality two wives, Rāṇibai and Velhāde of Setha Vīnā of Srīmāl community residing in JHĀNJHANAGAR (i.e. Jhinjhuvaḍā) caused a well to be made in Sūryapura for public use. The account of the family to which Vīnā belonged is given thus—Setha Kelhāna had a wife named Pomī. They had a son named Āso. His wife was Vānu, from whom he had a son named Mānḍaṇa. The latter had two wives—Manī and Mānu. By Manī he got four sons—Vīnā, Dhano, Suro and Vīsō. Vino had two wives—Rāṇibai and Velhādebai, who caused the well to be made as mentioned above. Surā had two wives—Sāmpu and Sōbhagani; while Visā had a wife named Haḍī. The names of the officers of Rāṇā Vāghjī in whose time the well was dug are also given.

Padshahā Mahamud mentioned in the record is the Gujarat Sultan Mahamud Begada and Rāṇā Vāghjī is the Zala ruler of Kuvā. Paramaras Lakhdhirji and Hada were governors of the part and Khan Alu Khan was the thānādar of Jhinjhuvaḍā.

Below is given the text of only two inscriptions, the remaining two being almost similar to these.

Text

(1)

1 ॥ ॥ संवत 1538 वर्ष आफे 1403 प्रवत्तेमाने माषमासे शु
2 कलापे 12 दिवस पातसाह श्रीमहिसुद राणधी वधविवरणे
KHODU

No. 87
v.s. 1544. [17-7-1488.]

Khōdu is a very old village in Wadhwan State at a distance of 15 miles to the north-west of Wadhwan. Near the temple of Phulesvara Mahādeva a stone slab containing the following inscription is lying. The inscribed portion is in an excellent condition but being so full of mistakes cannot be well read. It measures 5½ feet in length and only ½ foot in breadth.

The purport of the record is this: Vāja, son of Rāṇā Suradāsa who was son of Devā died in Jhālāvād on Thursday, the eighth of the bright half of Śrāvaṇa in v.s. 1544. To commemorate his memory his mother named ‘Purāde’ caused a deli to be made.

Vāja was evidently a bhāya of the main Zālā family of Kuvā.

Text

1 संवत १५४४ अग्नि अणक तर ८ राण भर सुरदस्स देवाहत वाज शालावाहमाग
2 त्ता जानणपि राण भर सुरदस्सी देवहरी माता भोधुरादे देवहरी करावी सुत्र भोटा नीपा
3 ई करावि जोिसि प-ब्र सारिपि: (१) शुत जसा (१)
BĀDI

No. 88] v.s. 1572. [1516.

This inscription is engraved on a stone lying near the temple of Khodiyār Mātā in the village Bādi in the Gogha district. The letters are very carelessly engraved.

It opens with the date, Thursday, the eleventh of the dark half of Māgasara of v.s. 1572 and seems to record that by order of the MAHĀMALIK PĪR MUHAMMAD and other officers Miyā Alādiyā, Dosi Shivarāja, Meheta Mankā, Patel Varajang, Brahman Nāga made a grant of a piece of land in the village BĀHADĪ in the possession of the VAZIR. Imprecatory lines are given at the end so that no Hindus and Muhammedans should violate the grant.

Text

1 संवत 1572 वच्च मागसर
2 वदि 11 शृङ्ग महामलेक
3 पीरमोहमदु तथा समसल बजे
4 दार (?) वजनाल वजीरनिन बाहदीप्रा
5 मे मीया थे अजादीया, दीसी
6 तिभराज, मही ५ माहा, पटो ५ बर
7 जांग, नाहमण नामा, मुदी
8 आनो फ़ूसरी ते हलनी
9 भुमी मुक्की ही कोलो (?) पि हींडु
10 मसलमान इस्निन तेहनि
11 प्रसीत दोषे जाको काळि
12 कालि बेह लोपे तेहनी प्र प्रि ठुं
13 पाप पि हरवास कणबौ

KUVA

No. 89] v. s. 1572 [20-7·1515.

Kuvā is the chief town of a Mahal of the same name in Dhrangdhra State. It is also called Kankāvaṭi. In its north-west quarter there is a well called Khārīvāva. The present inscription is found fixed there. Its length is 3'-2" and breadth 1'-2". Being very incorrectly engraved it is doubtful if the reading of certain names is correct. The mistakes can easily be understood, so they are not given in the footnotes.

The inscription records that on Thursday the ninth day of the bright half of Śrāvaṇa in v.s. 1572 (śaka 1437) Patel Abu repaired the well. At that time Bādasnahā Muzfar was ruling (over Gujarat) and Rāṇē Rāṇakade, evidently the Zālā ruler of Halvad was ruling as his subordinate and Tājakhān and Aman were governing as Subas. The village Patel was a Muhammedan named Muso.

*The date does not agree.
The Bādashaha Muzfar mentioned in the record was the Gujarat Sultan Muzfar II who reigned from A.D. 1513 to 1526 at Ahmedabad.

**Text**

1 संवत १५३२ वर्ष शाह के १४३३ प्रमाणे दशरथापने वधारती महामार्गप्रद भाव
2 प्रमाणे शालक्षियां नवदिवारं तरां भूमिवारे रोकिणी नयां पातसाहा श्रीमद्वर व
3 जिराजे महाराणाथिराणावेधेजिराजे पानछेतां (?) पान
4 मी॰ श्रीअमन व्यावहारे पतल्लीवाहाम (?) ग्रहे मार्गे बाई जलेया छु
5 त पटल शाखामध्ये मार्गे बाई पाई प्रथा खुल पटल हाजी प्रहे मार्गे बाई
6 जबा खुल पटल मूतो प्रहे मार्गे बाई ओमणां बारी अयरण सुता पटलई
7 सर मात्र अदु पटल मूते बारी उचरण" मात्र वहाम मात्र शालमान मात्र भा
8 इश्वर मात्र बीहा मात्र होना मात्र फरीद शुरुं भवतु आरोपकल्पणान्वयस्तु ।

SARĀ

No. 90] v.s. 1579. [20-11-1522

Sarā is a small but very old village in the Sāyalā taluka. It is 18 miles to the north of Thān. In the Darbargadh there is a masjid called Gebal Shah Pir. There the subjoined inscription was found. It measures 1'-10" in length and 12" in breadth.

The inscription records that Moḍhera Hājādi, resident of Sarā caused a masjid to be made on Thursday, the second of the bright half of Māgasar in v.s. 1579 during the rule of Pāṭsāhā Muzzfarshah and his queen Bibi Rāṇi.

Muzfar Shah was the Gujarat Sultan who ruled from A.D. 1513 to 1526.

**Text.**

1 || संवत १५३९ वर्षः मौग्यार शाह द्विती गह
2 || पातसाह कीसुमुदाफरशाह बीवीवंद्वरणी
3 || जिराजे शराबाश्च इंदू मलक्षी के
4 || तब मोदेर बाला भारज्ञा बीबी सत मोदेर
5 || दाउद भारज्ञा पाती मात्र कासम मोदेर
6 || भारजा बाली मसीत मोदेर हाजी करा
7 || बी सत मोदेर हीजी मोदेर बोसी मोदेर सतम्

*This word उचरण i.e. उदरण shows that the old well was probably repaired.
NOTES OF THE MONTH

The Aryan Path, the premier monthly journal of Bombay, "stands for all that is noble in the East and the West alike." After a meritorious service of no less than a decade it has just entered its eleventh year as evinced by its issue for January 1940 (Vol. XI, No. 1). The entire credit for running this illustrious monthly with increasing popularity and international reputation must go to Mrs. Sophia WADIA, who by her learning and ability has succeeded remarkably well in establishing a firm contact with thinking minds and busy pens of the foremost countries in the world. The need for such an organ maintaining a dignified but philosophic outlook on all matters of moment affecting the conflicting creeds and warring nations is greater at present than in bygone days in view of the infinite capacity for mischief generated by our so called civilization. The message of the Mahabharata "A man should practise dharma as if he is held by the hair by Death" appears to have been lost on us. The need for self-purification and self-discipline, not to say the curbing of the desire for "self-help" is also to be emphasized by all whose voices are heard by the "maddening crowd" who control the machinery of the state and direct it for "ignoble strife." We feel confident that the Aryan Path with its eclectic message deeply rooted in spiritual development and strengthened by the hard work of a decade will continue to spread this beneficent message to the innermost recesses of the civilized world in the years to come. It requires no prophet to tell man that he is a brute but it certainly requires a prophet or a philosopher to point out the divine capabilities of this brute. The Aryan Path points the finger to this God in Man and we must stand by it in its uphill task of spreading this important message unmindful of all sacrifices.

* * * * *

The Karnataka Historical Research Society of Dharwar inaugurated its Silver Jubilee celebrations on 29th May 1940 under the distinguished presidency of Rao Bahadur K. N. DIKSHT, M.A., the Director-General of Archeology of India. On this occasion two Silver Jubilee publications of the Society were announced and the portrait of the founder Mr. Venkatrao ALUR, B.A., LL.B., was unveiled. During the last 25 years the Society had "to rouse the political consciousness of the Kannadigas" and to recall to them their glorious past. The Society conducts an English Journal called the Karnataka Historical Review of which five volumes have been so far published. Publications of the Society in Kannarese language, though they may possess a local appeal to the Kannarese knowing public are not likely to rouse much interest in the Society's work in other parts of India. We trust, therefore, that the Society would develop their Research Journal into a first class medium for making widely known all important results of research conducted by the members of the Society. The Museum of the Society contains 457 coins, 8 stone images, 37 palm leaf manuscripts and 50 choice photographs of temple architecture in Mysore. This collection of exhibits in the Museum needs also to be increased and we have no doubt that with the sound advice of Rao Bahadur DIKSHT and the ardour for research displayed by the organizers of the Society the Museum can be developed into a Model Museum of Karnataka antiquities and culture. The Karnataka territory is not lacking in well-to-do and highly educated persons and given the will to develop the Karnataka Historical Research Society into a research centre with a dynamic drive it will not fail to attract scholars from other parts of India. We congratulate the present and past organizers of this Society for the groundwork of research done by them during the last quarter of a century and wish the Society ever-increasing prosperity and success in all their endeavours to put the Karnataka Historical Research in its proper academic perspective.
A-I. ÜRNÄVÄBHII- "SPINNE".¹

By

ALBERT DEBRUNNER, Bern.


Von dem das Vorderglied ūṇā- "Wolle" enthaltenden Wort für "Spinne" sind durch die Petersburger Wörterbücher (einschliesslich der Nachträge im 4. Band des grossen) folgende Bildungen bekannt geworden:

Kāṭh. 8, 1 (83, 8) (Prosa) ūṇa-vābḥi-, SB. 14, 5, 1, 23 ūṇa-vābḥi- ist die Grundlage des Dāmonennamens RV. 2, 11, 18 b; 8, 32, 26 b; 8, 66 (77), 2 b aurnāvābhā- (eigentlich "Spinnensohn"), ist demnach die älteste bezeugte Form des Wortes; aurnāvābhā- und aurnāvābha- kennt als Patronymikon das SB. 14, 7, 3, 26 (="BAU. 4, 1), als Eigennamen Nir. und Bhadd.

Etwas jünger bezeugt ist ūṇa-nābhi-: T.B. 1, 1, 2, 5; BAU. 2, 1, 20; Mund. U., Kauš., BhP. (ūṇa-nābhi- Kṣurikop. 9), noch jünger ūṇa-nābhā-: Svet. U. 6, 10, Lex, als Name ep. und im Gaja śiva zu P. 4, 1, 112 (als Grundlage des Patron. aurnanābhaus-) und im Gaja rājanya zu P. 4, 2, 53 (als Grundlage von aurnanābhaka- "vom Stamm der U. bewohnt").

Aus dem Pāli bringt Günther a. a. O. einige Stellen für unnaṇābhi- und eine für unnaṇābhī- bei.

Zu diesen verbuchten Belegen kommen aus den Paralleltexten zur Kāthakastelle hinzu: MS. 1, 6, 9 (101, 5) ūṇa-vābhi-. und KapiśṭhSaṃh. 6, 6 (64, 11 Raghv Vīra) ūṇa-vābhi-. Damit ist das Altersvorrecht des -v- über das -n- bestätigt.

Etymologisiert wurde ūṇa-nābhī-, wie Günther zeigt, schon von indischen Kommentatoren von Pālitexten aus v. nābhī- "Nabel", und Paul a. a. O. erklärt es als "(Wesen) dessen Nabe (Nabel) Wolle hat"; die v-Variante trennt Paul in ūṇa-vābhi-, wobei er begreiflicherweise für das -bhi- keine Entsprechung findet. Beiden ist entgangen, dass schon Aufrecht (KZ. 4, 1855, 282) ūṇa-vābha- einleuchtend zu ṣp-aṇvā und deutsch weben usw. gestellt und als "Wolleweber" "gedeutet hatte; diese Etymologie war bequem bei Böhtlingk-Roth unter ūṇa-vābhi-, bei Wackernagel Ai. Gr. II 1, 11 § 3 ca (wo

ebenso einleuchtend ūṇa-nābh- als volkstümliche Umdeutung von ūṇa-vābh- erklärt ist) und bei WALDE-POKORNY I 257 zu finden.

Die Bildung von ūṇa-vābh- ist klar: es ist ein Kompositum mit Nomen agentis auf -i im Hinterglied und abhängigem Nomen im Vorderglied (vgl. WHITNEY Sanskr. Gr. 2. § 1276 a, 1287 c, WACKERNAGEL a. a. O. 224 § 92 d), wie z. B. v. saho-bhāri- "Kraft nährend", AV. pathi-sādi- "am Weg sitzend", v. pāḍ-grbhī- "am Fuss ergreifend" (Name), SB. mano-mūśi- "den Sinn raubend". Allerdings hat in diesen Bildungen das Hinterglied gewöhnlich Tiefstufe oder Vollstufe. Die Dehnstufe ist ausserst selten: ich kenne nur hamsa-sāci- als Namen eines Vogels ("Gänse begleitend") in einem Mantra TS. 5, 5, 20, 1 = KāṭhAsv. 7, 10 (181, 4); der Name puṣkarasādi ĀpSS. ist wohl nur Verschreibung für pauskarasādi- BÖHTLINGK Wb. s. v.). Wir werden es also begrüssen, wenn uns neuerdings die Kürze in vābhri- bezeuggt ist: In dem Band Kṛṣṇa-Jayurveda (New edition), Part I (containing, Ādhāna and Punarādhāna sections), ed. by Paṇḍit Vāmanāśāstri KINJAVADE-KAR and Brahmasri Rāmadīśi HANGAL (Poona 1938) ist auch die oben angeführte Stelle des TB. abgedruckt (S. 3 Z 1. 3); aber unser Wort lautet dort nicht ūṇa-vābhahayah, wie in der Ausgabe der Bibliotheca Indica, sondern ūṇa-vābhahayah, und KATRE bemerkt in der Uebersetzung, die er zu dem genannten Buch beigesteuert hat, mit Recht: "The word has not so far been recorded either in PW or pv." (S. 4 f. Anm. 6). Ich zweifle nicht, dass dieses ūṇa-vābhri- die ursprüngliche Form des Wortes ist; die Vollstufe -vābhri- entspricht der Norm weit besser als die Dehnstufe vābhri-. Da die Wurzel vabh- sonst verschwunden war, suchte man "volkstümlich" Anknüpfung und fand sie zuerst wohl in dem Synonymen vā- "weben" (daher die Umgestaltung zu vābhri-), dann an nābhī, und schliesslich wurde -nābhī- nach der Regel angūri-: dasāṅgulā- (WACKERN. a. a. O. 118 f. § 51 a) zu-nābha-.


Der Doppelakzent der neuen Bezeichnung des Wortes ist ebenfalls eine Altertümlichkeit. KATRE a. a. O. erinnert mit Recht an v. brāhmaṇas-pāti-, śīnaḥ-sēpa- u. dgl (WACKERN. a. a. O. 262 f. § 103 a); zu bemerken ist jedoch, dass diese und alle andern Fälle von Doppelakzent (ebenda 41 § 17 b) andern Kompositionstypen angehören: ūṇa-vābhri- ist meines Wissens das einzige Beispiel für Doppelakzent in einem Kompositum mit regierendem

2. Uber P. 6, 2, 40, 41 -sādi(n).- -vāmi- a. WACKERN. a. a. O. 220 § 91f. α A.
verbalem Hinterglied! Das gibt uns aber nicht etwa ein Recht, dieses Beispiel anzuzweifeln; denn die von Katre angeführten Bemerkungen der Kommentatoren zeigen deutlich, dass auch ihnen der Doppelakzent vorlag.


Zum Schluss ein Wort über das Geschlecht dieser Wörter für die Spinne. Es wäre nicht nötig wenn nicht Paul a. a. O. 57 urṇanâbhi- als Femininum von urṇanâbha- bezeichnete weil er gegens die geschichtliche Folge der Wörter im Ai., aber seiner Etymologie urṇanâbha- = aw." varnâvâva- >varnavâva- zuliebe, urṇanâbha- für die älteste Form hält (in den Zitaten aus dem PW. setzt er S, 56 richtig das Maskulinum an!). Die Lexika geben aber für alle diese Wörter männliches Geschlecht an, und mit vollem Recht; schon der Kompositionstypus urṇâ-vâbhi- beweist das Mask., natürlich auch für die Umgestaltungen des Wortes; auch spricht in den Belegen rein nichts für Femininum, wohl aber manches für ein Maskulinum, z. B. Kâth. so ‘yam urṇavâbhî, MS. yé ’dhare tá urṇavâbhâyâ, SB. 14, 5, 1, 23 só yâtho urṇavâbhîs tántuño ‘ccâret “wie diese Spinne vermittelst des Fadens aus sich herauskommt”.

Der Stammbaum der Bildungen ist also so herzustellen:

TB, urṇâ-vâbhi-

MS. urṇa-vâbhi-

Kâth. SB. urṇa-vâbhi-
(v. arṇa-vâbha-)

pâli urṇa-nâbhi-

TB. BAU. urṇa-nâbhi-, pâli urṇa-nâbhi.
Svet U. urṇa-nâbha- + kl. tantu-vâya-

Svet U. tantu-nâbha- kl. tantu-vâpa-
ANCIENT INDIAN HISTORY AND RESEARCH WORK *

By

P. C. DIVANJI, Bombay.
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I. Genesis of the Study of Ancient Indian History.

Although the East India Company had ceased to be a purely trading company and had begun to take an active interest in the political condition of India since about the beginning of the second half of the 18th Century, it was not until the then predominant power of the Peshwas was gradually broken by making separate subsidiary alliances with the members of the Maratha Confederacy, and was finally crushed out of existence in 1818 during the Governor-Generalship of the Marquis of Hastings that the said Company can be deemed to have laid the foundation of the British Indian Empire. Shortly after that foundation was laid the work of its consolidation and reconstruction was commenced with a view to its roots being planted as deep as possible in order to make it as permanent as human institutions could be and as human ingenuity and foresight could make it. Amongst the various steps that were taken towards that end on getting the constitution amended by an Act of Parliament in 1833 was the ascertainment of the history of India prior to the commencement of the struggles for supremacy between the British and the other European powers, the Portuguese and the French, who had some possessions in India, in order that the mistakes of the past rulers of India may not be repeated by the British.

II. Available Sources for that Study.

2. There were ample materials for the study of that history up to the date of the first Mahomedan incursion in India headed by Mahomed of

* This paper was read before the Archaeology Section of the Tenth Session of the All-India Oriental Conference held at Tirupati in March 1940.
Gazni\(^1\), namely the first quarter of the 11th century, because the Mahomedans had all along kept sufficient records in the Persian language of the most important events that had taken place since then. The task of ascertaining the vicissitudes through which the different provinces of India had passed prior to that date was however by no means easy for the European administrators and historians, who had undertaken the study of Indian history, because, whereas, on the one hand it could not be denied that the Indian civilization was at its zenith from a date long long prior to the commencement of what is called the mediaeval period, there was, on the other, a total absence of purely historical records thereof kept in Sanskrit or in any other language and such Sanskrit works as contained materials from which the necessary dates could be ascertained were so voluminous and so mixed up with mythology that a very labourious research was required to be made for that purpose even after one acquired a workable knowledge of the language. Before Mount Stuart ELPHINSTONE undertook to write the first History of India in 1833 such research work, so far as the Sanskrit works on law and general literature were concerned, had already been commenced by Oriental scholars like Sir William Jones and others, who founded the Bengal and Bombay Branches of the Royal Asiatic Society. But the vast mass of the Vedic, Paurânic and Prakrit literatures, from which historical materials could be garnered, had remained practically unexplored and much of it had also remained unknown to the European scholars. Some Christian missionaries had dived into a portion of it but they had been led to form some fantastic and unsavoury notions about the character of the Indian civilization. ELPHINSTONE therefore stigmatized that source as unreliable and set down 326 B.C., the date of the incursion of Alexander the Great of Macedonia according to the Greek writers, as the earliest date from which the past history of India could be re-constructed.

III. Commencement of Research Work and Its Reaction on History.

3. Such evaluation of the known indigenous sources rendered it necessary to make scientific researches for more reliable ones. Towards that end, the authorities turned their attention to the collection of such other historical evidence as it was possible to procure on searching for epigraphs, coins, plates, tablets, relics of artistic works, grants and literary records. In order to carry out that plan, they created the posts of the Director of Archaeology in India and of the Superintendents of Circles for the Search of Sanskrit Mss., all over India. Thus, while on the one hand CUNNINGHAM, BURGESS, COUSENS, FERGUSSON, PRINCEP and others carried out archaeological researches, POTTERSON, BHANDARKAR, Rajendralal MITRA, STEIN and others carried on the

---

1. Technically speaking the first Mahomedan invading army that had entered India from the north-west was that of Mahomed Kasim and it had done that in the last quarter of the 8th century but it had touched only the border-province of Sind, and the principal Hindu States then in existence in the interior and along the other borders had remained unaffected by it,
search for Sanskrit Mss., all over India. The former brought to light many hidden inscriptions, coins and relics and led to the development of the sciences of palaeography, epigraphy, numismatics and archaeology on which Cunningham, Princep, Peterson, Bhandarkar, Bhau Daji, Bhagwanlal Indrajit and others worked very hard and the latter aided further by the researches of the representatives of learned societies here and in Europe like Bhau Daji, Bühler and others led to the establishment of Mss. libraries at important centres in India like Poona, Calcutta, Benares, Jammu, Bikaner and Madras and in Europe like London, Paris, St. Petersburg, Rome &c., and to the application of the method of historical research to the interpretation of the Indian religious works.

4. While this spade-work was in progress for nearly four decades Henry Beveridge published his Comprehensive History of India in 1862, Sir H. M. Elliot brought out his History of India in 8 volumes commencing from 1867 and Cowell revised Elphinstone's History of India. The two former had not indeed sufficient materials before them because research work had been commenced shortly before they composed their works. But even Cowell, who had some pre-historic materials before him did not think it worth his while to collect and sift them with a view to arrange them chronologically and give them a place in a chapter on the history of a period prior to the date of Alexander's incursion.

5. The British Indian Government, however, made use of the results of the researches so far made by getting the volumes of the Imperial and Provincial Gazetteers composed and published for the benefit of its administrative officers. The Oxford University too decided to start independently literary research work and inaugurated the Sacred Books of the East Series, in which were published English translations of important works in Sanskrit and other ancient eastern languages with critical notes, introductions &c. The Indian Universities too had by that time begun to turn out able Indian scholars. Dr. Max Müller, the general editor of the said series, therefore availed himself of the co-operation of some of those scholars like K. T. Telang in addition to the European oriental scholars like Bühler, Jolly, and others. A historical study of the Vedic literature was pursued also at other centres of learning in Europe and notably thereout in Germany by Roth, Schlegel, Goldstucker, Weber and others. As the result of all this literary activity of the European linguists, who already knew Greek and Latin, the Science of Comparative Philology was founded, the theory was established that the Indo-Aryan civilization was a sub-branch of the Indo-Iranian civilization, which itself was a branch of the Indo-European civilization and it was placed beyond the possibility of a doubt that the Jain and Buddhist works in Prakrit contained unmistakable data for the re-construction of the political history of India from the foundation of the Śaivānga dynasty at Girivraja in Magadha by King Śiśunāga in about 602 B.C. to the accession of Candragupta Maurya on the throne of Magadha, on extinguating the line of the

Nandas between 323 and 321 B.C. with the assistance of the well-known statesman Čaṇākya alias Viśṇugupta. Moreover the Histories of Sanskrit Literature by Weber, Max Müller, and Macdonell, Buddhist India by Rhys Davids, Bhandarkar's Early History of the Dekkan, and Pargiter's Dynasties of the Kali Age had also shown the way to re-construct Indian history from the indigenous sources.

6. These were results so definite and based on such solid foundations that even the strictest votary of truth, sitting solemnly to weigh facts like a jury-man, which was the ideal of a historian set up by Goethe and adopted by Vincent Smith,\(^3\) could not shut his eyes against them. Accordingly when the latter published the third edition of his Early History of India, which is the earliest edition which seems to have come down to India, he recognised "literary tradition" as a source of history buttressed by as much corroboration as could be drawn from the works of the Greek travellers and ambassadors\(^4\) and devoted the first about 50 pages of the book containing 475 pages to a discussion as to the nature and reliability of the sources of information with regard thereto and the reliable facts which could be gathered therefrom. So far as political history was concerned, he pushed back its commencement to 602 B.C., relying for that purpose on the conclusions drawn from the Buddhist and Jain Prakrit works and as regards the condition prior to that date he made the following remarks, namely "Modern research has brought to light innumerable facts of the highest scientific value concerning pre-historic India but the impossibility of assigning dates to the phenomena discovered excludes them from the domain of the historian whose vision cannot pass the line which separates the dated from the undated,"\(^5\) although the latter may be invaluable for the purposes of ethnology, philology and other sciences. The great Sanskrit epics, he looked upon as "of value as traditional pictures of social life in the heroic age" but as not containing "matter illustrating the political relations of states during the historical period."\(^6\)

IV. Progress in Research Work and in History.

7. A decade before that standard work on history appeared Lord Curzon had begun to take an unusual interest in the archaeological department. He had got a special Act passed by the Indian legislature in order to empower it to take the necessary step towards the preservation of the ancient

---

3. SMITH quotes in support of his view the following definition of the duty of a historian from the Maxims and Reflections of Goethe namely:—"The historian's duty is to separate the true from the false, the certain from the uncertain and the doubtful from that which cannot be accepted. Every investigator must, before all things, look upon himself as one who is summoned to serve on a jury. He has only to consider how far the statement of the case is complete and clearly set forth in the evidence. Then he draws his conclusion and gives his vote, whether it be that his opinion coincides with that of the foreman or not." (Early History of India, Third edition, Introduction pp. 3-4.)


monuments throughout the Indian Empire. He also re-organised the department and expanded it by appointing Superintendents of Circles under its Director-General and provided for a handsome recurring grant being placed at his disposal for enabling him to carry out the necessary repairs to the existing monuments, to make arrangements for their preservation and also so far as may be possible to excavate new sites selected on the strength of reliable evidence. This gave an unusual impetus to the officers of the department to strive to assist the historians in their attempt to place the ancient history of India on a more solid basis than that of mere literary tradition. The discovery of the fort-wall of Rājagrha and Jarāsandha's Akhāḍā in Bihar was the outcome of this impetus. But for one reason or another it was not followed up by excavations in the surroundings of those sites which might most probably have brought to light unmistakeable positive evidence of the statements of facts contained in the literary works. The consequence was that archaeology remained what it had hitherto been, a hand-maid of history and could not become its guide along an untrodden path. And since the sciences of epigraphy and numismatics depend for the supply of the necessary materials for their advancement on archaeology, and since the votaries of that science limited their activity to the discovery of facts tending to confirm, correct or contradict the conclusions arrived at by historians from the literary sources or at best to fill in the gaps left by them, they too even in their highest flights could not pierce the layer of clouds at the 4th century B.C. which obstructed from the vision of the denizens of earth, the bright celestial region above it peopled by the Aryans of the Vedic and Epic ages.

8. Therefore although literary research continued to progress, history remained static between the years 1914-19, as can be seen from the second impression of the *Early History of India* by Vincent Smith published in 1919 and the second chapter of the *Ancient History of India* by D. R. Bhandarkar published by the Calcutta University in the same year. From the fact that the second edition of The Hindu History of A. K. Mazumdar of Dacca was published in 1920 it appears that its first edition must have been published before that but as at any rate the position of the history for the period 3000 B.C. to 600 B.C. as re-constructed by him did not receive recognition at the hands of any university authorities the above observation remains unaffected by that fact.

V. *Indus Valley Civilization and Its Reaction on Historical Studies.*

9. The three or four years that followed 1919, which marked the conclusion of the Great War by the Treaty of Versailles, were the years of some of the greatest upheavals not only in the contemporary political history but also in the ideas of scholars as to the ancient history of India. The great event which caused that upheaval was the accidental discovery in 1921 by the late Mr. R. D. Bannerji of certain seals at Mohenjo-daro in the Larkhana district of Sindh while digging up certain mounds there for the purpose of locating an old Buddhist monastery. His chief, Sir J. Marshall, agreed
with him that those seals, though not capable of being deciphered, pointed to
the spread of a pre-historic civilization in the region of the Indus Valley since
similar seals had been found also at Harappa in the Punjab and encouraged
him to make a determined effort to get the relics of that civilization from the
deeper layers of the earth there. His effort was crowned with success beyond
anybody's expectation for it led to the discovery of three cities built one over
the other, by a fairly civilized race of people, according to fixed plans, and
of statues, images, implements, pottery, toys and ornaments besides seals of
the above nature, from the buried houses, prayer and assembly-halls, gutters,
roads, by-roads, wells &c. comprised in those cities. On their being subjected
to a most careful scrutiny they led to the unmistakeable conclusion that those
cities must have been built between 3000 and 4500 B.C. by an Anaryan race
of people. A comparison of those relics with those found at the sites of old
Sumeria and Elma in Asia Minor led to the further conclusion that there
must have been a close commercial intercourse and a cultural affinity between
the Indus Valley people and the Sumerians. A patient study of the seals
made by scholars like Rev. Father HERAS has further made it possible to
infer that the said people must have belonged to the Dravidian stock whose
early home was in Baluchistan and that their principal deities were Siva with
or without his consort and the Mother Goddess and that even in that distant
age Siva was being worshipped in the form of a Līnga.⁷ All these conclusions
stirred the historians to the very depths of their souls and set them thinking
seriously whether in view of them it was right to adhere to the view that the
political history of India really commenced from 600 to 650 B.C. As the
result of this convulsion in the minds of the historians many works on revised
history had been published since 1921, the notable ones amongst which were
the following namely:—Ancient Indian Historical Tradition, by F. E.
PARGITER, 1922; Cambridge History of India, Vol. I, by E. J. RAPSON, 1922,
Early History of India, by V. A. SMITH, 1924; A Sketch of the History of
India by DODWELL, 1925, Ancient and Medieval Hindu India, and Downfall
of Hindu India, by C. V. VAIĐYA, between 1924-26, Hindu India, Parts 1 & 2,
by S. K. AYYANGAR, 1927, Outlines of Ancient Indian History and Civiliza-
tion, by R. C. MAZUMDAR, 1927, A History of India, by SRIŅIWAS and AYYAN-
GAR, 1927, Chronology of Ancient India, by S. N. PRADHAN, 1927, Mohenjo-
daro and the Indus Valley Civilization, Vols I to III, by Sir J. MARSHALL,
1931, Dynastic History of Northern India. Vols. I & II, by Hema Chandra
ROYCHAUDHARI, 1931, Political History of India, by the same author, 1932,
Imperial History of India, by K. P. JAYASWAL, 1934, Pre-historic Ancient and
Hindu India by R. D. BANNERJI, 1934, and Cambridge Shorter History of
India, by ALLAN, HAIG and DODWELL, 1934. Thereout JAYASWAL's work is
an English translation of a Chinese version of a Sanskrit work on history com-
encing from 700 B.C. The writers of the rest of the works can be divided
into two classes, the radical historians and the conservative historians. In the

⁷ Pre-historic Ancient and Hindu India, by R. D. BANNERJI, 1934, Foreword
by D. A. MACKENZIE, p. vii.
first class fall PARGITER, RAPSON, VAIYDA, S. K. AYYANGAR, R. C. MIZUM-
DAR, SRINIVASA and AYYANGAR, PRADHAN, and BANNERJI and in the second
V. A. SMITH represented by S. M. EDWARDS, DODWELL, H. M. RAYCHAU-
DHIRI and ALLAN, HAIG and DODWELL. These two classes are distinguish-
able by the amount of enthusiasm and frankness with which they availed
themselves of the results of the literary researches made during the period
preceding the composition of the work of each although owing to the changed
outlook almost all of them were compelled to devote a first few pages of their
works to an account of the ancient geographical situation of the Indian Penin-
sula and the changes it had undergone during nearly the last 5000 years, the
early and later Vedic civilization and the civilization of the epic period and the
post-epic period down to about 650 B.C., when according to the Buddhist
works in Pali and Jain works in Ardhamāgadhī there were 16 states in North-
ern India.8

VI. Problem Left Unsolved By Them.

10. In spite of this changed outlook which is no doubt due to the archæ-
ological discovery above referred to, and in spite of so many histories having
been composed in the meanwhile, it cannot be denied that the only original
attempts to push back the beginning of political history to a distant past were
those of PARGITER and PRADHAN, the others having merely summarised the con-
clusion arrived at by the research scholars in the meanwhile. Of these two
again, PRADHAN seems to have attempted to re-construct history from the
later Vedic age downwards, the most outstanding personality wherein was
Divodāsa, son of Vadhryaśva of Kāśi and the most notable event in whose
life recorded in the Ṛgveda is a battle with Śambara and Varcī in which
he had the help of one Daśaratha, who is identified with the father of Rāma-
candra. The learned doctor has arrived at the conclusion that this event
must have occurred about 1514 B.C.9 and taking that as the starting point
he has attempted to make out connected lines of contemporaneous kings of
several dynasties continued up to the time of Buddha and Mahāvīra. For
establishing their contemporaneity he has made use of data obtainable from
the Vedas, the Brāhmaṇas, the Upaniṣads, the Śutras, the Epics and also some
Buddhist and Jaina canonical books. The above conclusion, though arrived
at after so much extensive and intensive research, deserves to be examined
seriously and carefully because the author seems to have overlooked certain
data not consistent with his conclusion. And even he has not pursued the
subject further and tried to give a connected history of the period between
1514 B.C. and 583 B.C. as it could be gathered from the sources which he had
tapped. As for PARGITER, he seems to have relied almost exclusively on the
Paurāṇic tradition and the result which he arrived at was such as to compel

8. E.g., see History of India, by SRINIVAS and AYYANGAR, Part I. Hindu
India, pp. 1 to 36. Pre-historic Ancient and Hindu India, Bk. I, pp. 1-58. The Cam-
bridge Shorter History of India by ALLAN, HAIG, and DODWELL, pp. 1 to 15.
9. Chronology of Ancient India, Ch. XV, pp. 168-76.
Dr. Raychaudhari to criticise it in the following words:—"But the scheme of chronology proposed by them (i.e. Pargiter and other scholars of his class) on the basis of this (i.e. the Paurânic tradition) has not yet been thoroughly discussed and tested so that it can be safely adopted in any survey of Indian history. The earliest land-marks known for certain in Indian history are still "the approximate dates of the Achaemenian invasion of India (Cir. 520-18 B.C.), and of Alexander's irruption (Cir. 326-25 B.C.). By calculating backward from these dates and with the assistance of the chronicles of the Brahmins, Jains and Buddhists a rough chronological frame-work has been established from about 600 B.C. downwards."12 Allan, Haig and Dodwell writing in 1934 also deplore the lack of reliable materials for the re-construction of Ancient Indian history in the following telling phraseology namely:—"The most striking feature of the literature of Ancient India when compared with the European is the absence of historical works. It has no Herodotus or Thucydides, no Livy or Tectius. The early literature is entirely religious and exegetic in origin and while the important data regarding the social life of the people can be deduced from it, it contains little reference to historical events and still less matter of chronological value."11 They have illustrated this remark by a specific reference to the Epics while as regards the Pûrânas they say:—"The Pûrânas, whose authors might in some ways be compared to our medieval chroniclers, are mainly legendary and mythological collections; they contain a certain amount of genealogical matter, the historical significance of which it is difficult to estimate."13 Having thus dismissed the Epic and Paurânic sources they came to the Sanskrit and Pali works of the Buddhist period and remark:—"The historical data that can be gathered from the Sanskrit and Pâli literature cannot be despised but interpretation is often difficult and there is an entire lack of chronological data. It is with the help of synchronisms given by foreign, mainly Greek and Chinese, writers that the chronology of Indian history has been built up."13 Such being their opinion, although they had some good things to say about the Indus Valley culture, they commenced Indian history proper from the date of the incursion of Alexander preceded by a short account of the Kingdom of Magadha, which existed at that time, occupying a few pages (16 to 20).

11. This undoubtedly means that the historians of India whose opinions carry weight with the authorities and are imbibed ad hoc by the university students here and abroad, are not prepared to extend the scope of ancient Indian history beyond the seventh century B.C., whatever the quantity and quality of the facts deduced solely from the indigenous literary records, unless they can lay their hands on some sure data enabling them to fix up definite chronological periods in which such facts can be deemed to have occurred. We

cannot afford to ignore their opinions. Can we then bear to look unconcerned at the present unfortunate estrangement that has taken place between the peevish son, history and his two living parents, archaeology and oriental research? Our patriotism, our love for truth and our ambition to secure for our country an honoured place in the coming new world-order by making an admirable contribution to the stock of the world’s knowledge of the first appearance of human life on earth, of the different currents into which it has flown, of the forces which have impeded and those which have invigorated their flow during their long journey in the plains of time and of the occasional conflicts between the mutually irreconcilable ones amongst them such as the one we are witnessing to-day and to the foresight and resourcefulness required in determining the future course or courses of those currents, would not allow us to do that. What then shall we do to bring about an amicable settlement of that family dispute?

VII. Ways and Means To Solve It.

12. The easiest way that readily suggests itself to anyone interested in this affair is that individual scholars should in right earnest sit down to work on the available materials in order to supply the want of history. That it is not however the surest way is already proved by the experience we have had during the last quarter of a century. There has been no dearth of enthusiastic individual scholars in India. We have seen that some such have already worked hard on the materials brought to light up to the time that they conceived the idea of making a substantial contribution to the re-construction of ancient Indian history and produced historical works commencing from the Vedic period. But we have also seen that they have failed to impress the cool thinkers who are at the helm of affairs at the leading universities. They would apparently nod their heads only if something tangible is discovered in support of what the Indian literary works lead us to believe. The officers of the Archaeological Department now fortunately headed by the Indian scholar of the calibre and established reputation of R. B. K. N. Dikshit and the leading lights of certain private institutions here and in the West have not been slow to realize their duty in the matter. The latest reports to hand show that certain sites situated in the Ranchi and Singhbhum districts of Bihar have been dug up departmentally and relics of the palaeolithic or at least the neolithic age were discovered therein, that excavations carried on by Dr. K. A. A. Ansari at Bijnor, Dehra Dun and other places outside the Indus Valley have confirmed the belief held by some scholars that the kind of civilization which was prevalent in the parts of Sindh, and Punjab watered by the Indus in pre-historic times was not confined to that region but had extended to the Ganges delta as well and that the department had also sought the guidance of a British archaeologist named Sir Leonard Wooley on getting its activities

15. Annual Bibliography of Indian Archaeology, (1936), published by the Kern Institute, Leyden; Poona Orientalist, IV, 1 & 2, p. 91.
during the last few years critically examined by him. We also learn that an American school of Iranian and Indic Studies has been taking an active interest in the re-construction of the cultural history of India on scientific lines and had in 1935 sent to India a deputation headed by Dr. Earnest Mackay charged with the duty of gauging by experimental field-work the extent of the Mohenjo-daro civilization and that its labour and outlay were amply rewarded by the recovery of such an unusually large number of such antiquities from a site near Chanu-daro in the Nawabshah district in Sindh, as throw "a new light on the problem of the successive cultures that flourished in the Indus Valley in the third millennium B.C. These discoveries striking as they are, have, instead of solving the riddle of the Mohenjo-daro civilization, added yet another to it, namely that of the chronological sequence or the co-existence of different types of civilizations, Aryan and Anāryan, in the same area. In view of that can we hope that the formation of Field Clubs for conducting excavations at several places in the United Provinces, Bihar, Gujarat, Kathiawad, Karnatak and other provinces which the learned Director-General has advised in order that the efforts of the Government department may be supplemented by non-official ones backed up by financial support from philanthropic resourceful gentlemen would tend to an early solution of the riddle? I believe, not, so long as the stray inferences suggested by the relics that have been and may hereafter be discovered remain unsupplemented by other corroborative evidence which would enable the historians to make out a connected and dated account of the period or periods to which the relics relate. Where shall we search for such evidence?

13. The answer to that question is that archaeological research is only one of the wheels of the slowly-moving cart of our political history. It has another wheel, namely that of literary research. An impatient listener is likely to murmur at once that it has already been tried and found wanting. To him I appeal to bear with me for a while. I agree that there are no such contemporary foreign records as the historians are accustomed to rely on for the period commencing from the incursion of Alexander of Macedon. They do not, however, exhaust all the available materials. It cannot be denied by any honest and open-hearted thinker that such of the Indian literature as has been preserved for our generation by the much-maligned Brahman community and the conservative Sannyasis and Sadhus is still considerably extensive and valuable even from the purely secular stand-point. It is true that our country had produced no Herodotus or Thucydides, no Livy or Tacitus, but that is due to the predominantly religious character of the civilization which has survived in a modified form through several thousands of years and it is due to that very character that this country can boast of having admirably preserved at considerable risk and sacrifice and with infinite and unparralled reverence the records not only of events which occurred ever since the development of human

life on earth but also of those which some of the seers had in their ecstatic visions witnessed just as they had occurred ever since the idea of "being manifold" arose in the mind of "The One." Thus in India history becomes a branch of anthropology, anthropology that of cosmology and cosmology that of metaphysics generally and of its two branches epistemology and ontology in particular. The names of those great seers and sages who contributed to the development of these records from con to con are so numerous that a mere mention thereof instead of occupying a line or a page would occupy several pages. I can anticipate being confronted with the fact that the great European and Indian savants of the 19th and the first three decades of the 20th century had explored all the available Vedic literature and brought to light all the best points therein. But let me remind this audience that in recent years even European scholars have begun to realize that the way in which the said literature has been interpreted by the Oriental scholars so far, is not the only possible way of interpreting it and that one of the alternate ways is the one in which the great Smṛtkāras, amongst whom I include the authors of the epics also, understood it and interpreted it in their works in the age succeeding the Vedic after some upheaval, whose effect must have been so extensive and deep-rooted as to make re-organization of the social fabric, on keeping in view the changed circumstances, necessary and to embody its scheme in a language which the majority of those for whose benefit it was meant could easily understand, as distinguished from the old Vedic. But considerable progress will have to be made before the necessity to interpret the Vedic literature would arise. Our immediate purpose can be served by the Itihāsas and Purāṇas and to some extent the Brāhmaṇas including the Aryanyakas and the Upaniṣads. I agree that in the mixed and somewhat exaggerated forms in which the accounts of the races which inhabited this country according to tradition, appear in the Itihāsas and Purāṇas they can be of no use to a secular historian. But that is exactly where the oriental scholars can help the historians. As made out by me in my paper on the Historical Value of Purānic Works the facts that can be gathered from them can be scientifically tested by comparison with similar facts relating to the same period gathered from another independent source, e.g. the Jain Purāṇas in the case of the Mahābhārata period and

18. "It willed:—I am one; let me be manifold": Chāndogya Upanishat, VI, 2-3.


20. The reason which makes these Purāṇas available for the collection of historical facts of the above-mentioned period is that the history of the Indian religion contains to my mind clear evidence of the Jain and Bhāgavat sects being the offshoots of a single sect started by way of protest against the doctrine that the highest goal of man was to secure happiness in this world and in the Swarga ruled over by Indra by the performance of animal sacrifices and of their having held in reverence several important personages of the pre-Mahābhārata period and preserved their memories in literary compositions made in a Prākrit dialect and traditionally handed down till committed to writing. It is therefore desirable for the Hindu writers to shake off their prejudice that the Jain accounts are only perverted versions of stories borrowed from the Hindu literature.
those which pass that test can be safely pressed into the service of secular history. It is no doubt true of them too that the facts of history are at times mixed with legends or twisted for the purpose of exalting the dogma of their own sect in the eyes of their readers. Great and minute circumspection would therefore be required in selecting facts from them also as in selecting them from the orthodox Purāṇas. It would be necessary in some cases to remove the sectarian varnish which may be found applied to them in order to suit the particular purpose their writers had in view. Once this is done in the case of both the sets of facts they become ready for comparison and out of them that can be taken to answer the purpose of the historian which in view of his knowledge of the other relevant circumstances appears to him more rational. In forming that judgment, however, it must be borne in mind that mutability is the inherent characteristic of all the products of nature, that the heart and head of man are susceptible of development in several other directions than those known to us in this age, that human thoughts are capable of being expressed in other ways besides that in which we are habituated to express them and that nature could have revealed her secrets to the human beings of a far distant age as the result of a method of approach different from that with which we have become familiar for the last 3½ centuries. If these truths are borne in mind while working on the above materials I feel sure that we would be able to get several important facts which would serve as landmarks on the road which we have to traverse and supply many of the missing links which the research workers are striving to get.

(To be Continued.)
NON-ṚGVEDIC MANTRAS RUBRICATED IN THE ĀŚVALĀYANA-GRHYA-SŪTRA: THEIR SOURCES AND INTERPRETATION*

By
V. M. APTE, Poona.

AG. I. 17. 6: Paścāt kārayiṣyamāṇasyāvasthāya śīloṣṇā apaḥ samāṇiya "Uśṇena Vāya udakenekhi" iti.

Trans: (The father) taking his position to the west of (the boy) for whom the ceremony is being performed, pours cold and hot water together with the mantra 'With hot water, O Vāyu, come hither'.

The context is the ceremony of Caula [or forming the (hair-) crest] performed in the boy's third year.

Sources: AV. VI, 68. 1ab = (a) Āyamagan savitā ksurenā (b) Uśṇena vāya udakenekhi (=Savitṛ has come here with the razor): clause (b) as will be seen, is identical with our formula. The hymn AV. 68 in its liturgical employment accompanies the act of shaving.

PG. 2. 1. 6 has the identical formula and variants of it are found in other Sūtra texts such as SMB., ĀPMB., MG., GG., etc.

AG. I. 17. 7: Tāsāṁ ghrītvā navanītam dadhidṛpaṇō vā, pradaksīṇam śiras trīr undati (a) 'Aditiḥ keśān vapatu,' (b) 'Āpa undantu varcasā' iti.

Trans: Taking (some water) out of those (i.e., the mixture of hot and cold water referred to in the preceding sūtra) and fresh butter or globules of dadhi (curds), (the father) moistens (the boy's) head three times from the left to the right, with the mantra "May Aditi cut (thy) hair; may the waters moisten (thee) for glory."

Sources: The first two pādas of the verse: AV. VI. 68. 2 [immediately following the one (AV. VI. 68. 1ab) quoted under the preceding sūtra] are:—
(a) "Aditiḥ śmaśru vapatu (b) Āpa undantu varcasā." This part is identical with our mantra except for the word śmaśru instead of our keśān but this does not make it a different mantra for the following reason: Our text while describing the Godāna ceremony later prescribes in AG. I. 18. 3. the employment of the same mantras that are employed here for the Caula ceremony with the modification that the word 'Śmaśru' is to be substituted for the word 'keśa'. So the AV. Mantra above (AV. VI. 68. 2) is exactly the mantra prescribed in our texts for the 'godāna' ceremony as the Ūha (modified form) of the mantra cited under this sūtra. The AV. verse, then, is definitely the source of our mantra.

It is interesting to find out in what sacrificial context, such mantras

* Continued from p. 110 of Vol. III.
(treating of hair-dressing) were possibly employed in other Sanshitās! TS. 1. 2. 1. 1. reads 'Apa undantu (jivase dirghāyutvāya) vareasa'. The part outside the brackets is identical with our (b). The two formulas immediately following TS. 1. 2. 1. 1. are identical with those that follow in our text! Evidently even these TS. formulas stand in a close relation to the formulas cited in this Kaṇḍikā. The TS. context is the shaving of the whiskers of the sacrificer, which is part of his bath etc. as a preparation for his initiation into the Soma-sacrifice.

AG. I. 17. 8 and 9. Daksīne keśapakṣe trīṇī trīṇī kuśa pinjūlānā abhy-ātmārūni nidadhāti (a) 'Oṣadhe trāyasvainam' iti || 8 || (b) 'Svadhitē mainam hīṃsāhi' iti nispīḍya lauhena kṣureña || 9 ||

Trans: (8). Into the right part of the hair, he inserts three (and again) three Kuśa bunches with the ends pointing towards (the boy) himself (i.e., three each time before cutting the hair) with the formula 'O Herb! protect him' (9) “With the mantra ‘O Axe! do not injure him,” he presses a copper razor (on the kuśa bunches).

Sources: As pointed out under the preceding Sūtra, TS. 1. 2. 1. 1. has both the formulas (a) and (b) in an identical form. VS. 4. 1. also has them in exactly the same context as in the TS. (which has been described already). But these two formulas occur also in these two Sanshitās elsewhere and in other Sanshitās and Brāhmaṇas, so frequently that the contexts in which they are employed may be classified as follows: (1) Shaving of the whiskers of the Soma-sacrificer, as in TS. 1. 2. 1. 1 (mentioned already). (2) The cutting of the ‘Yūpa’ by the adhvaryu with the aid of a carpenter. The address ‘Oṣadhe’ in this case is appropriate because darbha grass is placed on the Yūpa (just as Kuśa grass is inserted into the hair) before cutting it; compare TS. 1.3.5.1 and VS. 5.42 (pointed out by STENZLER on p. 43). (3) Cutting of the Omentum in an animal sacrifice, ‘Oṣadhe’ in this case being addressed to a grass-blade placed on the navel of the victim; Compare TS. 1.3.9.2; and VS. 6.15 mentioned by STENZLER p. 431.

The two formulas are also met with in the ŚB. and the Śrauta Sūtras of Kātyāyana, Āpastamba and Mānaṇa, in one or the other of these three contexts, the first one (the shaving of the whiskers of the Soma-sacrificer) being almost an exact Śrauta counterpart of our Grhya ceremony!

AG. I. 17. 10: Pracchinatti: (a) 'Yenāvapat savitā kṣureṇa (b) Somasya rājīno Varuṇasya vidvān | (c) tena brahmāṇo vapatejāmasya (d) āyuṣmān jaradāstir yathāsat' iti.

Trans: He then cuts [(the hair) and the Kuśa bunches laid thereon] with the mantra:—

"That razor by which Savitṛ, the knowing one, shaved (the hair) of Soma the King and of Varuṇa, with that, ye Brāhmaṇas, shave now his (hair), so that he may be long-lived and reach old age.

Sources: For Clauses (a), (b) and (c), Prof. STENZLER refers to AV. VI. 68.3. The first three pādas of this verse are identical with our (a) to
(c) and appear to be their sources, particularly as AV. VI. 68. 1 and 2 are responsible for the formulas cited in the preceding śūtras ĀG. I. 17. 6 and 7 as shown above. The first three pādas are also traced to TB. 2.7.17.2 which is interesting as revealing another sacrificial context for formulas of this type viz. the shaving of the king before mounting the chariot in the 'Coronation' ceremony. The three pādas are also traced to APS. 22. 28. 6 and parallel Sūtra-texts with slight variations. (d) The fourth pāda is traced in an identical form to AV. VIII. 214 occurring in a hymn directed against witchcraft. It is also found in RV. Khila X. 128. 91 and VS 34. 524 with 'yathāsam' for our 'yathāsad'. This pāda is a general prayer for long life, easily detachable from the first three pādas, to which it seems to have been tacked on here, by our text.

ĀG. I. 17. 12: (a) 'Yena dhātā bṛhaspater (b) agner indrasya cāyuṣe vapat | (c) tena ta āyuṣe vapāmi (d) suślokyāya svastaye iti dvitiyam |

Trans: (He cuts the hair) a second time with the mantra 'That with which Dhātṛ has shaven (the head) of Bṛhaspati, Agni and Indra, (to ensure) long life, with that I shave (thy head), (to secure) for you, long life, fame and welfare.

Sources: The mantra is traced to VSK. III. 9. 5. (a) Yena dhātā bṛhaspater (b) indrasya cāyuṣe vapat, (c) tena te vapāmi brahmaṇā (d) jīvatave jīvanāya || The first two pādas are identical, save for the omission of the superfluous 'agneḥ' at the beginning of our (b) ; the general sense of the verse is the same and the variations in the last two pādas are such as occur in the different versions of the same Grhya-mantra in the different śākhās.

Prof. STENZLER (p. 44) thinks that in the first line āyuṣe is probably a later addition but I think that āyuṣe is wanted in both the hemistichs for the parallelism of the acts; human and divine. Probably, STENZLER thought so, because the second pāda is metrically faulty, being too long and would be improved by the omission of some superfluous word which according to him was āyuṣe. But VSK. III. 9. 5b the source of our mantra suggests that it is the word 'agneḥ' that is superfluous in our mantra and the VSK-pāda which omits it is metrically faultless. Nor does the sense of the verse suffer by the omission of 'agneḥ'.

ĀG. I. 17. 13: (a) 'Yena bhūyaśca rātryāṁ (b) jyok ca paśyāti sūryam (c) tena ta āyuṣe vapāmi (d) suślokyāya 'iti triyam |

Trans: (That) whereby, further, during the night and for long, he may see the sun,—with that I shave thy (head) for thine long life, fame and welfare.

Pāda (a): The literal translation above, which closely follows the order of the words shows that the first two pādas as they stand hardly make any good sense, 'he may see the sun at night' being the puzzle!

Prof. STENZLER whose work was published in 1865, remarks (p. 44) that he reads the pāda (a), as given above, because all the MSS and the Prayoga-ratna agree in giving that version although it is on the face of it,
corrupt and that Pāraskara II. 1. 16 gives it in a better form. Prof. OLDENBERG also follows the above version and draws attention to Pāraskara’s variant in a footnote (p. 185).

It is surprising that the reading of the Bibliotheca Indica edition, (published in 1866-69) ‘Yena bhūyaṣ carātyayam’ of the first pāda which gives an excellent sense has not been noticed by Prof. OLDENBERG whose translation appeared in 1886. The Trivandrum edition (since published) has the same reading. The parallel passage APMB 2. 1. 5a has the same pāda. MG. 1. 21. 6a is also the same pāda with only the variation, ‘caratayayam’ for ‘carātyayam’. So the reading of STENZLER’s MSS should be corrected into ‘yena bhūyaṣ caratayayam’ which could easily be corrupted into ‘bhūyaṣ ca nātryām’. The reading of PG. II. 1. 16a ‘yena bhūriṣ ca divam’ cannot be adopted as STENZLER’s reading is too remote from it to be supposed to have been a possible corruption of it.

Pāda (b) :—This pāda is found in APMB 2. 15b, in PG. II. 1. 16a with ‘paśyāsi’ for ‘paśyāti’ and in MG. 1. 21. 6 with ‘paśyati’ for paśyāti, which are unimportant variations and has not suffered corruption like Pāda (a). Compare—RV. IX. 4 6b = ‘Jyok paśyema sūryam’.

Pādas (c) and (d) :—These are the same as the last two pādas of the mantra cited in the preceding sūtra, which shows that the mantra is a perfectly legitimate makeshift composition of the sūtra period as, besides, it is traced to no early vedic text.

The translation of the first two pādas (adopting the reading of the Bibliotheca Indica edition for the first pāda) would be ‘That whereby he may further live and see the sun long’ etc.

AG :—I. 17. 16. Kṣuratejo nimrjet : (a) “Yat kṣureṇa marcayatā supeśasā (b) Vaptā vapasi keśān (c) śunddhī śiro (d) māsyāyuḥ pramośir” iti.

Trans. He wipes off the edge of the razor (with the Mantra) :—‘In that with a harmful (though) well-sharpened razor, (thou) a shaver, shavest (his) hair, clean his head but do not steal away his life.

Sources: Profs. STENZLER and OLDENBERG compare AV. VIII. 2. 17. (APMB., PG., HG. and MG. also have parallel verses). This AV. verse is the same as our verse with the following variations :

In (a) AV. reads ‘sutejasā’ (which is also the reading of MG. 1. 21. 7a) for our ‘supeśasā’ (found in PG. 2. 1. 19a; HG. 1. 9. 16a and APMB. 2. 1 7a). In (b) AV. has ‘Keśāmaśru’ (found in APMB. and HG.) for our ‘Keśān’ (found in PG. and MG.). That this latter is no variation really, as our text prescribes this same mantra in AG. I. 18. 3 with the AV. variant in the Godāna ceremony has been already noted. The reading ‘Vaptar’ (O Shaver!) in HG. and MG. is better (as agreeing well with ‘vapasi’ the verb in the 2nd. person singular) than our ‘Vaptā’ though it is also found in AV. and PG. In pāda (c) our ‘Śunddhī’ (also found in APMB., PG. MG.) is a much better reading than the puzzling AV. reading ‘Sumbhan’ or ‘Sumbham’. The reading ‘Mukham’ in AV. and HG. for our ‘Śiro’ does
not constitute a variation as it makes the pāda parallel to our ĀG. I. 18. 5.
which is a modification of this pāda to suit the Godāna ceremony.

It may be noted that ‘shaving’ as the business of a professional barber
is mentioned through a simile in RV. X. 142. 4—‘Vapteva śmaśra vapasi
prabhūma’ addressed to Agni.

ĀG. I. 17. 17. Nõpitān śisyāt: “Śitoṣyābhīr ardhit arbharh kuvāno
kṣaṇīkam kuṣālikuru” iti.

Trans: He instructs the barber: ‘Doing whatever is done with water,
with (this mixture of) hot and cold waters, arrange in order (‘Kuṣālikuru’
is a euphemism for ‘vapa’ = shave) the hair.

Sources: The mantra (technically a praiṣa), has parallels in PG. II. 1.
21 = ‘Aksanān parivapa’ (pointed out by STENZLER) and in Kauś. 54.
1—‘aksanān vapa kesaśmaśruroma parivapa, nakhāni ca kuru’ which explains
and amplifies our ‘kuṣālikuru’.

ĀG I. 18. 5: ‘Sundhi śirovākham māsāyuyuḥ pramośir’ iti.

Trans. (The mantra cited in I. 17. 16 for the ‘Caula’ ceremony re-
appears in a modified form here in the Godāna—ceremony) ‘Clean his head
and face; do not steal away his life’.

Context. I. 18. 1 lays down that the rules for the Godāna ceremony
are the same as for the ‘Caula’ ceremony described in the Section I. 17. Now
I. 18. 3 says that the mantras employed in both the rites are also the same
with the modification that for the ‘Godāna’ ceremony the word ‘Śmaśra’ is
to be substituted for the word ‘Keśa’ wherever it occurs in the Mantras of
the ‘Caula’ rite. In this Sūtra, our text actually gives an illustration of
this rule for the modification of mantras. The mantra cited here is, for
example the modification (technically called ‘Uha’) of the latter part of the
mantra cited in I. 17. 16. in connection with an exactly parallel ritual act
in the ‘Caula’ ceremony.

The significance of the use of ‘Śiraḥ’ as well as ‘mukham’ in the man-
tra is as follows: ‘Clean the face (mukham)’ is appropriate in the cere-
mony of ‘Godāna’ (shaving the beard) but the addition of ‘śiraḥ’ (Clean
the head and the face) is explained by the practice prevalent among ortho-
dox persons in India of shaving the head along with the beard and never
shaving the beard only, leaving the hair on the head untouched.

Sources: These have been pointed out under ĀG. I. 17. 16 where it has
been shown that AV. VIII, 2. 17c with its reading ‘Mukham’ is parallel
to this mantra.

ĀG. I. 18. 6: “Kesaśmaśrulomanakhāny udaksaṁsthānī kuru” iti sam-
preṣyati.

Trans: (In this ceremony) he instructs (the barber) ‘Cut (‘kuru’ = do,
is a euphemism for ‘vapa’ like ‘kuṣālikuru’) the hair on his head (keśa),
face (śmaśra) and body (loma) finishing (them) in the north’.

Prof. Oldenberg states (p. 186) what according to Nārāyaṇa, is the
full formula. The fact is that our text implies that the formula given in I.17.17.
for the 'Caula' ceremony is to be employed in the Godāna ceremony also with the necessary modifications which only are given in this sūtra, the rest being taken over from I. 17. 17.

Sources : Kauś. 54. 1 quoted above under I. 17. 17 is a formula parallel to this one. Kauś. 53. 19 = 'Yat ksūrenety' udakpatrena ksūrena iti [= the razor is held so that its blade points towards the north] furnishes an explanation of 'Udaksarṇaṃsthāni kuru' in our formula. When the razor blade points towards the north, the hair on the north side only of the youth's head and face can be cut. As the youth must face the east, the hair are cut so that they end i.e. the hair cut last are those on the north or his left side.

AG. I. 18. 7 : Aplyuta vāgyataḥ sthīvāhaḥśeṣam ācāryasakāse vācaṃ visṛjeta 'Varaṇ dādāmi' iti.

Trans. After bathing and remaining silent (lit. controlled in speech) for the rest of the day, he should release speech (i.e. break the silence) with the formula 'I give a vara (i.e. a free gift)'

Context. This marks the end of the godāna ceremony.

Sources: Not only the formula but the words ('vācaṃ visṛjeta') of this sūtra also, seem to be based on the passage (8.9.5.7.) of the AB. which runs "Atha yad 'varaṇ dādāmi jītyā abhiṣijyai, viṣjyai, saṁsiṣjyai' iti vācaṃ visṛjeta etad vai vāco jitaṃ yad dāmītyāha" (when he breaks his silence with the words 'I give a free gift for victory etc.' that indeed is the victory of speech that he says 'I give'). The context is the placing of a kindling-stick on the Āhavanīya fire in the Pumarabhiseka ceremony. In ŚB. 13. 4. 1. 10 also, we have : Vareṇa vācaḥ visṛjate "varaṇ dādāmi brahmaṇe". = He releases speech with (the announcement of) a 'Vara' or free gift etc. With these words uttered at the time of the morning oblation to the fire, the sacrificer and his wives break the silence observed during the previous night which they have spent in the sacrificial hall. This ŚB. context is very suggestive of the context in our text.

AG. I. 20. 4 :—.... (Devasya tvā savitūḥ prasauve śvinor bāhubhyām pūṣno hastābhyāṁ) hastāṇi grhyāmyasaśu iti. tasya pāṇinā pāṇām saṅguṣṭham grhyāyitaḥ |

Trans : with the mantra " (At the inspiration of god Savitṛ, with the arms of the two Aśvins, with the hands of Pūsan) I grasp thy hand, O, so and so !" the ācārya should grasp with his (own) hand, the (pupil's) hand along with the thumb.

Context. This is done in the Upanayana ceremony after the ācārya has emptied his joined hands full of water over the pupil's joined hands (which) also (are) full of water.

That the bracketed part above constitutes the mantra proper and the part outside, the improvised additions suiting the 'Upanayana' context is clear from the fact that the same part occurs again in AG. I 24. 15 with the addition 'pratigrhyāmi' [=I accept (thee)] i.e. the Madhuparka, as the context there is the acceptance by the guest with his joined hands, of the Madhuparka offered
to him]. A survey of the sources of this mantra reveals (as shown below) that the Madhuparka context is the more original context of the mantra in early texts, and it is intimately related to and follows the mantra cited in I. 24. 15: 'Mitrasya tvā caksusā pratikṣe' [= I observe thee (i.e. the Madhuparka while it is being brought to him by the host) with the eye of Mitrā]. I therefore discuss these mantras together here in the following order: I shall take up the mantra in ĀG. I. 24. 14: (a) 'Mitrasya tvā' etc. first; then the Mantra in I. 24. 15 (b) "Devasya tvā" etc. which is the same as the bracketed part in our present Śūtra I. 20. 4 with 'pratigṛham' added as the mantra is addressed to the 'Madhuparka' and the Mantra in our present Śūtra I. 20. 4 last: 'Devasya tvā' etc. (i.e. the bracketed part) with 'hastaṁ grhyāmi' added, the Mantra being addressed to the boy who is being initiated.

Sources : (a) and (b) are found in VSK. 2. 3. and 4 respectively; (a) is employed in VSK. 2. 3 when the Prāśītra (the Brahman's portion consisting of yava or pippala) is being gazed at and (b) in VSK. 2. 4 while it is being eaten. Our text seems however to have derived these mantras from the Kauśitaki Brāhmaṇa which is closely related to our text as belonging to the Rgveda. KB. 6. 14 has both the mantras in a context similar to that in VSK. as described above. TS. 2. 6. 8. 6 has mantras almost identical with our (a) and (b) [only 'prekṣe' occurs for 'pratikṣe' in (a) in a similar (i.e. Prāśītra) context].

This shows that these mantras employed in early Vedic texts in connection with the eating of the 'Prāśītra,' were transferred to the madhuparka context in the Śūtra texts. SS. IV. 21. 6 actually makes a statement to this effect. SS. IV. 21. is a section dealing with the madhuparka offering (the Kaṇḍikā I. 24 in our text is modelled on this section). SS. IV. 21. 6 says, 'Madhuparka' ityukto yathā prāśītram tathā pratikṣya [i.e. when the madhuparka is announced to the guest, he looks at it in the same manner (i.e. repeating the same mantras) as when he looks at the Prāśītra].

The next transfer of the mantra from the madhuparka to the hasta-grahaṇa context in the Initiation ceremony as in I. 20. 4 was an easy step for the following reasons:—(1) The words 'hastābhyām' and 'bāhubhyām' in the mantra are suggestive of 'hasta-grahaṇa' (hand-clasping); (2) God Sāvitrī whose inspiration is referred to in the mantra is the predominant deity of the Upanayana rite and its mantras as seen from the important part played by the Sāvitrī verse (sacred to Sāvitrī) in that ceremony.

ĀG. I. 20. 5: 'Savitā te hastam agrahād asau iti dvītyām.
Trans. With the mantra 'Savitā has grasped thy hand, O so and so!'
(he grasps the pupil's hand) a second time.

Sources : AV. XIV. 1. 51b reads 'Savitā te hastam agrahīt' which is identical with our formula save for the more modern form 'agrahit' instead of our 'agrabhit' above. AV. XIV. 1 is a marriage-hymn and the 'Pānti-grahaṇa' context in the marriage-ceremony is exactly parallel to the 'hasta-grahaṇa' context in the Upanayana ceremony!
AG. I. 20. 6: 'Agnirācāryastavaśāv' iti triyam |

Trans: With the formula 'Agni is thine acārya O, so and so!' (he grasps the boy's hand) a third time.

Sources. SB. 11. 5. 4. 2 reads 'athāsya hastam grhrāti | Indrasya brahmaçāryasya | agnir acārāystava | aham acārīystavāvasau iti | [He (i.e. the Acārya) takes his (right) hand with (the formula) 'Indra's disciple art thou, Agni is thy teacher, I am thy teacher so and so]. The context is the same as in our text, namely, 'entry into Brahmacarya' (which is the description of the Upanayana ceremony in the early texts).

AG. I. 20. 7 Adityam ikṣayet: (a) 'deva Savitar esa te brahmacari taṁ gopāya, (b) sa maṁrta ityācāryah |

Trans. He should make him look at the sun while the acārya says: 'God Savitṛ! this is thy Brahmacārin; protect him; (b) let him not die'.

Sources: The formulas cannot be traced to any early vedic text. (a) appears to be an echo of SB. 11. 5. 4. 3 'Devāya Savitre paridadāmi' (I hand thee over to god Savitṛ) said by the acārya with reference to the pupil.

Clause (b) which looks a bit abrupt, becomes intelligible in the light of SB. 11.5.4.5 where the acārya while instructing the pupil in the various vows of brahmacarya says "Mā susūptha iti 'Mā mṛtha' ityevaināṁ tadāhā" [When he says "Do not sleep (during the day)", 'do not die' is what he virtually says to him.]

AG. I. 20. 8: (a) 'Kasya brahmacāryasi (b) prānasya brahmacāryasi (c) Kastvā kaµuµpanayate (d) Kāya tvā paridadāmi' iti |

Trans: (The teacher further says): Whose (or of ka—i.e. Prajāpati)1, brahmacārin art thou? Thou art the brahmacārin of Prāṇa. Who initiates thee to whom? (or 'Ka' initiates thee to 'Ka'). To whom do I give thee over? (or 'I give thee over to Ka').

Sources: This same quibble on the word 'Ka' is found in SB. 11.5.4.1 (Upanayana context) 'Athaṁnamāha, ko nāmāsīti, praţjāpati vai kaḥ | praĵāpatyaṁvaiṁaitat kṛtvopanayate'. [He i.e. the Acārya says 'Ka' (or what) is thy name? Now 'Ka' is Prajāpati. He thus initiates him after making him one belonging to Prajāpati]. SB. 11. 5. 4. 3: 'athaṁnam bhūtebhyaḥ paridadāti | praţjāpataye tvā paridadāmi | ' etc. will be a parallel to our (d), if 'Ka' is definitely understood (as I think it should be) in the sense of Prajāpati. The part 'Kāya tvā' only of (d) is also traded to VS. 20. 4 with the same play on the word 'Ka' the formula being addressed to the Asandī (seat) by the sacrificer before sitting on it in the Sautrāmaṇī sacrifice.

1. I think that the alternative translation given in brackets is the correct one as the quibble on 'Ka' in the double sense of 'who' and 'Prajāpati', starting as early as or very soon after the days of the RV.X. 121 had, by the time of the Sūtras, become definitely established.

2. I understand 'Kam' (accusative) as referring to the person or deity to whom the boy is initiated or introduced and not as referring to the boy who is so introduced as OLDENBERG takes it, because that unnecessarily splits up (c) into two incomplete halves.
AG. I. 20. 11: aignim parisamuhya brahamacari tuoim samidham adadhyut; (a) tuoim vai prajapatyam, (b) prajapatyo brahamacari bhavaiti vijnayate.

Trans: The Brahmacarin, after wiping around the ground fire, should put on fuel silently, (because) it is known (from the Shruti): ' (What is done) silently belongs to Prajapati; the Brahmacarin belongs to Prajapati.'

The argument here is that since the Brahmacarin belongs to Prajapati and 'Silence' also belongs to Prajapati, therefore the Brahmacarin should observe silence while putting on the fuel.

OLDENBERG's translation (p. 189) 'the student becomes belonging to Prajapati' represents a different argument viz. since the Brahmacarin observes silence (and silence belongs to Prajapati) therefore, by virtue of his observance of silence he becomes one belonging to Prajapati. This, I think, is not correct as the quotation is brought in to show why silence is observed.

Sources: (a) 'Iti vijnayate' generally introduces a quotation (or the gist of a quotation) from a Brahmana text but (a) is not traced anywhere. SB. 7. 3. 2. 2. praises silence in the words: 'aniruktam vai tad, yat tuosim; sarvanam va aniruktam' (what is done silently is undefined and Undefined is All).

For (b), may be compared SB. 11. 5. 4. 1 already quoted under I. 20. 8 above 'Prajapatyam evainam krtvopanayate. (He initiates him after making him one belonging to Prajapati).

AG. I. 21. 1: Mantrena haike (a) 'agnaye samidham aharsam, (b) bryhate jatavedase | (c) tay tvam agne vardhasva (d) samidha brahmanah vayah; svaheti |

Trans: Some (however) do so (i.e. put fuel on the fire, the reference being to I. 20. 11 the immediately preceding sutra) with the mantra 'To Agni have I brought fuel, to the mighty Jatavedas. Through that fuel do thou increase O Agni! and through (this) prayer (Brahman), (may) we (increase).

Sources: (a) and (b): AV. 19. 64. 1ab are the same as our first two padas except for 'agne' instead of our 'agnaye' in the first pada. All the sutra-texts that have parallel passages (PG. 114. 3; HG. 1. 7. 2; APMB. 1. 6. 32) read as in our text 'agnaye which seems to be a deliberate modification of the AV. 'agne' in order that the word might agree with 'Jatavedase' and Agni may not be distinguished from 'Jatavedas'. Kauś. 57. 26 employs the AV. verse exactly as in our text.

Padas (c) and (d): There is a general resemblance to the words and sense of these two padas in AV. 19. 64. 2 'Idhmena tvā jatavedah samidhā vardhayamasi | tathā tvam asmān vardhaya prajaya ca dhanena ca' || (With wood, O Jatavedas, with fuel, do we increase thee; so do thou increase us, with progeny and riches). The Padas can also be compared to VS. II. 14a

1. OLDENBERG's rendering of 'tusnim' (an adverb), as 'silence' (a noun) is inexplicable to me!

AG. I. 21. 5: Tasya vāsasā pāṇībhyaṃ ca pāṇi saṅghṛhya “sāvitrīm anvāha paccho rāharcaśaḥ sarvām.”

Trans: The Aćārya grasping the (student’s) hands with the (student’s) garment and his own hands, recites the sāvitrī, pāda by pāda, hemistich by hemistich (and finally) the whole verse.

Sources: The part within inverted commas is not a mantra but is so closely allied to SB. 11. 5. 4. 6 that it is quite clear that the sections in our text dealing with the Upanayana are modelled on these corresponding sections in SB. Our text like other Gyhayātras in fact is a compilation rather than a composition, which draws not only its mantras from the RV. and other earlier texts but also a number of its rules from earlier sources. SB. 11. 5. 4. 6 reads ‘Athāsmai sāvitrīṃ anvāha ||6|| ... tam vai paccho’ nāha | trayo vai Prānā .... | athārdharcaśo, dvau vā i māṇu prāṇaṃ ... | atha krṣnāṃ ’ where the same rule regarding the three modes of recitation of the sāvitrī verse is found interwoven with fanciful explanation in the familiar Brāhmaṇa style.

AG. I. 21. 7: Hydayadeśe’syordhvaṅgulim pāṇim upadadhāti : (a) “Mama vratे hrdayaṃ te dadhāmi, (b) mama cittam anu cittam te astu | (c) Mama vācam ekavrato juśasaṃ (d) bhṛhopatiśtvā niyuntu makhyaṃ” iti.

Trans: The Aćārya places his hand with the fingers upwards on the region of his (i.e. the student’s) heart with the mantra: (a) ‘ Into my vow (or service) I hold thy heart ; (b) after thy mind, let thy mind be ; (c) my words thou shalt welcome single-minded (lit. single-vowed). (d) May Bṛhaspati ordain thee for me.

Context: This follows the teaching of the Sāvitrī verse.

Sources: The mantra is traced to a Khila-hymn of the RV. mentioned in the Brhad-devatā and given by SCHRTELLOWITZ but not found in the editions of AUFRECHT or MÜLLER.

BṛhD. VIII. 117ed read :—

(b) paraṇī yattu ‘mama vrate’ | (c) tadāśirvādabahulari (d) Stauti viśvān divaukasah ||

Prof. MACDONELL’s note to his translation of the verse (H. O. S. vol. 6 p. 281) is as follows : ‘this (i.e. the Khila-sūkta beginning with the words ‘Mama vrate’) is the first of the two Khilas which, in the Kashmir collection, come between RV. X. 84 and 85. It consists of thirty-two stanzas chiefly in the Anuṣṭubh metre’. The Anukramaṇī accompanying the hymn quoted in the same note describes it as made up of marriage-formulas. This context of our mantra in the RV. Khila as well as its occurrence in SMB, 1. 2. 15 among marriage-formulas are further evidence of a parallelism between marriage and Upanayana ceremonies in the intimate relationship newly established between husband and wife in the one case and between preceptor and pupil in the other. In SCHRTELLOWITZ, the first verse of the Khila hymn agrees almost entirely with our Mantra, the only variation being ‘Ekavrata’

1. Die Apokryphen des Rg-Veda (Breslau, 1906) p. 100.
for our 'Ekavarto' in Pāda c—a variation explained by the marriage context in the former place—'Ekavratā' being addressed to a bride, our 'Ekavarto' to the pupil.

AG. I. 22. 2 : (a) Brahmacāryasi, (b) apōśāna; (c) Karma kuru; (d) divā mā svāpsīb; (e) ācāryādhīno vedamadhīṣveti |

Trans: With the words : (a) 'Thou art a Brahmacārin; (b) sip (lit. eat) water; (c) do the service; (d) do not sleep by day; (e) dependent on the teacher, study the Veda.

Context: These are the vows inculcated on the pupil as part of his Brahmacarya by the teacher after having tied a girdle round him and given him a staff (I. 22. 1).

Sources: ŚB. 11. 5. 4 (a section dealing with Initiation) has exactly these rules! ŚB. 11. 5. 4. 5 reads :—'Brahmacāryasyaśāha [parallel to our (a)]. A fanciful explanation of why this is said, then follows in the Brāhmaṇa manner and then comes 'apōśāna' [identical with our (b)] 'Karma kuru' [identical with our (c)] and 'Mā suṣuptā' iti [do not sleep (during the day)—which is similar, if not identical with our (d)]. The rule in our clause (e) is found in different words in ŚB. 11. 3. 3. 6 = "Atha yad ācārya-vacasarā karoti | yad ācāryāya karma karoti."

AG. I. 22. 4-8 : Sāyam prātar bhikṣeta | 4 | Sāyam prātal samidham ādādhyañ | 5 | Apratyākhyāyinam agré bhikṣeta | 6 | Apratyākhyāyinām vā | 7 | "Bhavān bhikṣāṁ datātv" iti | 8 |

Trans: 4. In the evening and in the morning let him beg (food) 5. In the evening and in the morning, let him put fuel-sticks (on the fire). 6. First, he should beg of a man who will not turn him away. 7. Or of a woman who will not turn him away. 8. (Let him beg with the words), "Your honour may (please) give food."

Sources: For these rules regarding 'bhikṣā-caraṇa' or the daily begging of food by the student more as a spiritual discipline in 'plain living and high thinking' than as a material necessity may be compared ŚB. 11. 3. 3. 4 to 7 :—Sa yadagnaye samidham āharati | 4 | Atha yad ātmānaṁ daridriktityeva ahrīr bhūtvā bhikṣate | 5 | yasyā eva bhūyisṭhāṁ śāṅghe tāṁ bhikṣeta | 6 | yadyanyāṁ bhikṣitavyāṁ na vinedapy svām eva ācāryajāyām | 7 |

The purport of the passage is : Let him beg unashamed imagining himself to be poverty-stricken as it were. He should beg food of a woman whom he holds in the highest esteem. If he finds none such, let him beg of the wife of his Ācārya and even of his own mother.

The passage reads like an extract from a Grhya text!
A NOTE ON TWO HOARDS OF PUNCH-MARKED COINS FOUND AT TAXILA

By

D. D. KOSAMBI, Poona

Memoir no. 59 of the Memoirs of The Archaeological Survey of India, by Mr. E. H. C. WALSH, C.S.I., M.A. [Retd. I.C.S.], [1939, pp. iv + 164, with XLVIII Plates] deals with punch-marked coins found at Taxila. I approached this work with a view to seeing what systems of coinage-weights existed in ancient India, and of determining them by statistical analysis in case no such determination had been given in the memoir cited. In fact, I had made a certain amount of progress in the statistical work when it became evident that the report written by Mr. WALSH contained an astounding number of oversights and mis-statements which might completely invalidate the work I had undertaken. I publish this criticism (by no means comprehensive) of the Archaeological Survey Memoir No. 59 because others might take all its statements—backed as they are by official sanction and by Mr. WALSH’s reputation as a numismatist—as consistent and authoritative.

The frontispiece reads “An Examination of a Hoard of 1171 Silver Punch-marked Coins of the Older Class, Long-Bar Coins and Minute Coins found in the Bhir-Mound at Taxila in 1924 and a Hoard of 167 Debased Silver Punch-marked Coins of the Later Class found in the Bhir-Mound at Taxila in 1912.” The description is repeated on p. i of the preface, but on p. ii, the second and smaller hoard becomes 176. On the first page of the text proper, the first hoard is reduced to 1167, and the second continues as 176. Turning to the tables themselves, we find Appendix XI headed on every page [pp. 100-153] as “List of 1,167 Coins...”. But on p. 153, the final number actually tabulated is, after all, 1171. This is the same number that appears in the plates. App. XII, the list of the later coins, has a sub-heading “The Hoard of 176 Silver Punch-Marked Coins...”, but the actual number tabulated as well as represented in the plates is 167.

This sovereign contempt for mere arithmetic characterises the entire work. We read on p. 15: “Class C, ‘Bull-Hill Area contains 101 coins...”, but the table on p. 46 gives a total of 102 in that class. On p. 32, we again find 167 coins in the later hoard, of which, omitting five of a separate coinage, weights of 162 are given for various ranges. But the coins so given add up to 163; and on my own tabulation from App. XII, the 52-53 grain range contains one coin less, 53-54 two coins less, 54-55 two coins more than given by the memoir.

Either the proof-reading has been faulty, or there is an unexplained notation. P. 141, the weight of coin 935 is entered in Clarendon type;
weights of 936, 944-5, 948, 956 are entered in italics. Serial number 1098 [p. 146] is itself entered in italics; weights of 1110, 1114 [p. 147] have just one of the three figures for the weights in Clarendon. Coin 1167, which seems a Double Obverse coin from the plates and is labelled as such in Table A [p. 39] is boldly labelled Double Reverse in App. XI, [p. 153]. Now for my purpose, the typography of the description of the coins is quite insignificant, if only the weights have been accurately found and entered. But I have grave doubts even about this. Coin 839 weighs 52.2 gr. in Table A [p. 37]. But it has lost a grain to become 51.2 gr. in App. XI, [p. 127]. The weights of most of the coins have been given to 1/10 gr. only; which is not at all objectionable, were it not for the fact that the weights of some have been given to 1/100 gr. Of the 33 Long-bar coins [p. 100], just one, i.e. no. 12, has a weight in the hundredths; it would seem unlikely that all the remaining 32 came out exactly to 1/10 gr. Of the 1059 coins tabulated on pp. 102-153 only 268 have weights given to 1/100 gr. Of these again, as many as 229 have the last figure 6; 32 have weights that end in 3; three have weights ending in 9; one each has a weight ending in 1, 5, 8, 2. No coin that has the hundredth grain given in the column of weights has the figure 4 or 7 there. I obtain these on a quick count, and a coin or two might have been miscounted, but the classification is substantially correct, and the overwhelming preponderance of the figure 6 in the last place inexplicable. One would like to know the system of weights used, the approximate errors of the experiment, and the methods used for checking. At least, this is the procedure demanded from the average science student in the laboratory, and there seems to be no reason why the Archaeological Survey should not adopt that standard.

There are some other discrepancies in the tables that add to the reasonable doubt that—I hope—has been cast upon the reliability of the memoir. I fail to see that Appendix VII, Table G [p. 90] is a table at all in any sense of the word; perhaps, a similar remark might be made, with less force, of Appendix VIII, Table H [p. 91]. App. X, Table J, coin 302 has not been mentioned at all [p. 99]. But it is shown on Plates X, XI, and Table J is supposed to contain only reference to Plates. In Table C [p. 47], we find two classes E, F, with the extraordinary statement, "There is no Class E. or F. The coins at first entered under those classes, were found to belong to other classes, under which they have been entered." To one who does not claim to be a numismatist, it would have seemed obvious that these classes, having no existence, should have been omitted altogether, and the later classes re-lettered accordingly. Coin 320 [p. 108] is described as having a blank reverse, with 1 indistinct mark, which seems a contradiction in terms. Coin 1149 [p. 150] shows an extra, unmatched entry in the column headed "Number of Marks". The descriptions of reverse marks on coin 831 [p. 126] and 675 [p. 120] seem highly questionable to me. I should, however, again like to remind the reader that I am not a numismatist, and that this is just a cursory examination.
Apart from the fact that one does not expect such discrepancies in a work so sumptuously printed, priced at Rs. 24-10 [or 38 s.], it is curious that the amount of time spent on the work should not have sufficed for a thorough checking. The preface, dated 10th February 1938 says [p. 1] that the work was begun in 1928.

I have a few remarks to offer about the theoretical conclusions of the paper. We find [p. 32] about the later coins:

"The coins are an alloy of silver and copper. The metallic composition of two of the coins, taken as example have been determined by the Archaeological Chemist in India, who 'is of the opinion that they are composed of an alloy of silver and copper and contain 40.3 and 75.3 per cent of silver and copper respectively. It is obvious that their composition is very irregular'. It may be due to this fact that the weights of some of these coins vary so much from the usual weight of the Punch-Marked coins". It is difficult to understand how the extreme variability of 162 coins was determined by assaying just two of them; in addition, the quotation about percentages of silver and copper is very difficult to interpret, showing that whatever the composition of the coins, the English composition of the source of the quotation has been even more irregular.

On p. 16, Mr. Walsh comes to the conclusion that inasmuch as the heaviest seeds of the Abrus precatorius [rati or guñjā] average 1.86 grains the kārṣāṇa [he calls it karshāṇa p. 15] of 32 raktikā's would have been much heavier than the coins actually found. This statement has an air of verisimilitude, as the weights of coins 113-1171 average about 52.4 grains on my calculation. But the average of the guñjā seeds of 1.86 grains comes from Cunningham's experimental determination, checked by the current Indian goldsmiths' guñjā's, as well as by picking out the largest seeds of the sample obtained by our author [p. 16]. But we find on the same page that the author obtained an average weight of 1.68 gr. for the rati "after excluding all small seeds". On the basis of his own experiments, he would have obtained the weight of the coin of 32 rati's as 53.76 grains, and had the small seeds not been excluded, it is a safe guess that 32 times that average rati would have tallied very closely with the average weight of the Taxila coins, allowing for loss of weight by circulation; in fact, even now, the two are quite close. Nevertheless, we find at the end of the third paragraph on p. 16. "It is, therefore, clear, that at the present time only the largest seeds are used as weights, and Cunningham's 'full weight' is correct, and, on present practice the theoretical and actual weights of these coins cannot be reconciled". The statement is quite true, but hardly to the point. It is well-known [cf. Report of the Weights and Measures Committee 1913-14, Simla, 1914] that at present, the weight most commonly used for the tolā is the current British-Indian rupee of 180 grains. But inasmuch as the tolā is to be 96 guñjā in weight, the largest seeds would have to be used by a goldsmith or jeweller to give anything like a 180 [or 183.75] grain tolā.
I take it that the weight of the *Abrus precatorius* seeds, as well as the weight of any group of coins struck at any one place under the same system, would tend to vary according to the normal [Gaussian] law, about a given mean value. The average is the only quantity we ever find in general reports, but what is of the utmost importance is the variance, though no numismatist seems to have heard of the term. It was my intention to test the variance of the *Abrus precatorius* seeds by experiment, calculate the variances for the groups of coins given in this and other memoirs and to see whether any evidence exists for non-homogeneity. This can be done by modern methods developed by statisticians, particularly R. A. FISHER, in connection with the theory of small samples. The *t* test and the *z* test would be immediately applicable; and I hope to publish, in another paper, my results on the system of weights used in our ancient coinage. Inasmuch as the work would be highly technical I publish as a separate note this criticism of one of my main sources. The errors pointed out here need not affect the statistical work provided the weights as entered are substantially correct. But the classification is sure to cause difficulties, if I have to rely on the authority of such numismatists for the actual classes, without any confidence in their data.
NOTES OF THE MONTH

The Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute, Poona, celebrated its 23rd Foundation day on 6th July 1940. On this occasion Dewan Bahadur K. M. Jhaevri M.A., LL.B., ex-Judge, High Court of Judicature, Bombay, presided and addressed the gathering, consisting of distinguished scholars from Poona, on "The Ethic Discourses of Bhishma." The chief item in the programme of this function was the announcement by the Institute of its publication of the Udyogaparvan of the Critical Edition of the Mahâbhârata and its presentation to Shrimant Balasaheb Pant Pratinidhi, B.A., the Raja of Aundh and the patron of the Mahâbhârata project, work on which is being carried on by the B. O. R. Institute since 1919. Before the volume of the Udyogaparvan was presented to the Rajasaheb, Dr. V. S. Sukthankar, M.A., Ph.D. the General Editor of the Mahâbhârata Edition acquainted the audience with the progress of the Edition in a brief but lucid statement which dealt with such points as (1) the special features of the Edition, (2) the history of the project, (3) the methods followed in the preparation of the several volumes, (4) appreciation of the work by competent scholars and learned bodies of status and standing like the British Academy, London and others and (5) the stimulus given by the Edition to the study of Epic linguistics by scholars like by Dr. Jose Canedo, a Spanish professor and by some students at the Dacca University and by professors and students of the Linguistics Department of the Deccan College Research Institute, Poona. Towards the conclusion of his statement Dr. Sukthankar briefly outlined the financial side of the whole project with special reference to the present difficulties but expressed the hope that when the war clouds have passed away better days will dawn for this monumental work of international cultural value. The appeal made by Dr. Sukthankar for more financial help to complete this gigantic project had a good augury in view of the announcement made on this occasion by Dr. R. N. Danekar, M.A., Ph.D. the secretary of the Institute to the effect that the Trustees of Sir Dorabji Tata Charities have sanctioned a grant of Rs. 5,000 for the Mahâbhârata and that the chief Saheb of Ichalkaranji and the Rajasaheb of Phaltan have been pleased to continue their patronage to the work. We feel confident that the Indian public, the Government of India, the Provincial Governments and the Rulers of Indian States will readily come forward to render liberal help to this important undertaking and thus save it from a financial crisis consequent upon the present international situation.
ANCIENT INDIAN HISTORY AND RESEARCH WORK*

By

P. C. DIVANJII, Bombay.

VIII. Immediate Objective Requiring Concentration.

14. A word of caution is also necessary against pitching our aim too high at once. Our starting-point at present is the commencement of the 7th century B.C., when a few years before the births of Buddha and Mahāvīra the adventurer Śisunāga coming from Kāśi founded a small kingdom at Girivraja in Magadha, which in the times of his successors Bimbisāra and Ajātasatru grew into an empire. The materials for a progress upwards from that stage, which are easily available and afford ample scope for the application of the above comparative method, are those relating to the Age of the Mahābhārata War and some years before it. Our immediate objective must, therefore, be to trace the history of Magadha as far back as we can. We can do that easily because the Mahābhārata has recorded that 13 to 15 years prior to the Kuru-Pāṇḍu war Yuddhiṣṭhira had commenced to perform a Rājasūya sacrifice, that he desired that all the known contemporary ruling sovereigns should come to his capital Indraprastha and take part in it, that whereas all the others could be persuaded to do that, Jarāśandha of Girivraja, who had commenced to perform a Rudra Yajña, in which he intended to sacrifice 100 crowned human heads and had towards that end already kept in confinement 86 sovereigns, could not be persuaded by the Pāṇḍavas to give up that intention, that Yuddhiṣṭhira, therefore sent a message to Śri Kṛṣṇa at Dwārakā in Saurāśṭra, where he had settled down with other Yādava families to come to his succour, that the latter thereupon went to Indraprastha, held a consultation with those whose counsel be valued and went to Girivraja with Bhīma and Arjuna in the garb of a mendicant to beg for a duel with Jarāśandha, that a duel took place near that city between Bhīma and that sovereign and the latter was ultimately killed, that thereafter his son Sahadeva surrendered himself to Kṛṣṇa and agreed to take part in that sacrifice and that thereupon Kṛṣṇa took him under his protection and installed him on his father’s throne.21 The Jaina account agrees with this in the main particulars.22 The Mahābhārata further records

* Continued from p. 143 of Vol. III.
22. The Jaina Purāṇas in which both Kṛṣṇa and Jarāśandha figure as Ardha-cakravartins and as therefore 2 of 63 Salālāpurūśas give a different version of the way in which Jarāśandha had met his death. According to them a pitched battle had taken place between his force and those of the Yādavas and the Vidyādharas (mountain chiefs) on a plain in Saurāśṭra near the village Sinapalli where later on a new city named Anandapura was founded and Kṛṣṇa himself had killed Jarāśandha with the latter’s own Cakra. The two sources, however, agree so far that Jarāśandha
that this Sahadeva had joined the Pāṇḍavas in fighting against the Kurus on
the field of Kurukṣetra. Our first step towards the desired goal should, there-
fore, be to fill up the gaps between the two terminii, one the age in which Giri-
vraja was the capital of Jaṅgandha and Sahadeva and the other in which Śiṅuṅaṅga settled and founded a small kingdom there. The works of PAR-
giter and PRADHAN above referred to would be very helpful in doing so,
though for filling up the details of the events between those dates patient work
has to be undertaken.

IX. Necessity of Active Co-operation between the Oriental Scholars and the
Archæologists.

15. This can be done satisfactorily if the workers in the literary and
archæological fields put their heads together and draw out a scheme of mutual
co-operation towards the end in view.23 There are enough materials in the
orthodox Itihāsas and Purāṇas and even in the Brāhmaṇas and in the Jain
and Buddhist story—literature from which the necessary facts for bridging the
gulf between the two outposts can be gathered and they can therefore be chro-
nologically arranged. R. B. DIKSHIT, the present Director-General of Archæ-
ology in India had, while lecturing at the annual meeting of the Bhandarkar
Oriental Research Institute, Poona, in August 1939, already suggested a more
extensive and intensive study of the Paurāṇic literature. In order that the
results of this kind of study on the part of individual scholars may not be the
subject of controversy but may become co-ordinated with a view to yield re-
results acceptable to the majority of scholars and the educational authorities
here and abroad, I venture to suggest that the Oriental Conference should
appoint a Committee of both research scholars and archaeologists, select schol-
ars for such study, allot them definite works for study and after they have

was a contemporary and an inveterate foe of Kṛṣṇa, that the enmity between them
was due to Kṛṣṇa having killed Karsha, son-in-law of Jaṅgandha, that the latter had
attacked Mathurā 17 times without success but that when he attacked it for the 18th
time with the help of Kālayavana and his non-Aryan followers Kṛṣṇa and the other
Yādavas consisting of 18 families had migrated to Saurāṣṭra and settled there, that
on the expiry of some years after they had done so, the enmity was again revived, that
Jaṅgandha was killed and his son Sahadeva was placed by Kṛṣṇa on the throne of
Magadhā but his powers were considerably curtailed (Trīṣaṣṭhisalākāpurusācarita, by
Hemacandra, VIII, 8, Bhavnagar edition, p. 126, Harivamśa Purāṇa by Jinasena-

23. I happened to read in the “Times of India” of October 9th, that the All-
habad Session of the Indian Historical Congress had already taken a step in that
direction and that its session at Calcutta was likely to consider a scheme submitted
by Dr. S. K. AYANGAR of Madras and to appoint an editorial board for the re-con-
struction and publication of a History of India on scientific lines. That is gratifying
news indeed. But I am of opinion that the work of the historians as such will begin
after useful results have been arrived at by the co-operation of the archaeologists and
the research scholars. The above attempt must therefore be held to be premature.
The said Congress can get an authoritative history written from the existing materials
only but that would not mean any progress.
collected valuable historical facts, discuss them and fix upon those which in their view should find a place in the history of our country. These works would also supply definite information for the selection of ancient sites suitable for excavation by the archaeologists. If excavations are made at depths more than at least 25 feet below the surface of the adjoining grounds, I feel sure that sufficient evidence tending to confirm most of the facts gathered from the literary records would be forthcoming. The formation of field clubs suggested by R. B. Diṣhīt is no doubt necessary as the Government of India cannot be expected to allot from year to year such large grants as would be required to carry out the necessary programme. But I fear that the efforts to be made by such clubs would not be productive of satisfactory results unless they are backed up by the Archaeological Departments of the Government of India and the Indian States in whose territories the sites may have been situated and unless they are made under the guidance of the Director-General of Archaeological Survey of the Government of India.

X. Suggestions for their Lines of Action.

16. It is not necessary however for either the scholars or the archaeologists to wait till concerted action has been decided upon and planned by an authoritative body. The Purāṇas, distinctly so named, have as yet been explored by scholars like Pargiter only with a view to make out the dynasties of kings. No attempt has yet been made to ascertain the principal events in the reigns of any particular line of kings of a particular dynasty and to arrange them chronologically. Nor has any been made systematically to study the different stages in the cultural history of India. This inactivity is due not to the total absence of any evidence of historical value concerning such events and stages but to the dreaded difficulty of separating the secular from the religious elements in the sources of our information. The Mahābhārata is again a mine of information as to the political, economic, social and religious conditions of India in the age in which the principal characters of the epic lived and in a few years before and after it. Those who like Allen, Haig and Dodwell see in it nothing of value for a political history must be held to be ignorant of its contents or not to possess that open mind which is required for the evaluation of a past record. There is also evidence in that work of the conditions of things in the age in which the work was expanded and transformed into a fifth Veda, a treatise on Dharma for the benefit of the masses who had no access to the old Vedic literature. It may be that between that event and the recitation of the work by Sauti before Sunaka and others some accretions may have been made therein. We might also concede that even after the work received its present form i.e. its division into 18 Parvas with the Harivānisā as a Khila Parva, which could not have been later than the 4th century A.D.²⁴ some interpolations had been made therein. Still

I believe that with some patient effort it is possible to gather sufficient materials for the purpose of history of the Age of Kṛṣṇa. For doing that we need not and cannot afford to wait till the Bhandarkar Research Institute has critically edited all its Parvas as suggested by Dr. Winternitz. Moreover we can check the information so collected by references to other works speaking of the personages and events of the same period such as the Brāhmaṇas, Sūtras, &c. The Jain Purāṇas too might prove to be of considerable assistance in this attempt because many of their Tīrthaṅkaras, Cakravartins, Ardhacakravartins, Pratyadhacakravartins and Baladevas were men whom the orthodox sects also held in reverence and who were contemporaneous with the principal characters in the Mahābhārata. It would therefore be a right application of energy for the research scholars to study those Purāṇas from a historian's point of view and gather materials for comparison with those found in the orthodox Paurāṇic works in which I include the Mahābhārata. Such spade-work done by individual scholars would much facilitate the work of the authoritative committee above suggested. The archaeologist too need not wait till such a committee is set up. From the investigations made by the previous generations of scholars and archaeologists they can very easily select several sites for making similar spade-work by digging trial-pits at the necessary depths. Such for instance are those of Rājagṛha,²⁵ where an old fort-wall has already been partly opened out, Jarāsandha's akhāḍā, where a duel between him and Bhūma is believed to have taken place, Taxila²⁶ which was a flourishing city at the time of Alexander's invasion and which had a big university where even men like Pāṇini and Cāṇākya are believed to have been educated, Mathurā of the Yayāvā period, which must be very near the northern bank of Yamunā on the road from modern Mathurā to Gokul, Old Gokul on the opposite bank of the said river, old Vṛndāvan which must be very near the old ghats and temples to the south or to the west where there are several mounds and growths of wild plants, Saurāpur, which according to the Jain traditions was within a short distance of Mathurā and was the capital of Samudravijaya, uncle of Kṛṣṇa and father of Ariṣṭanemi, the 22nd Tīrthaṅkarā and a feudatory of Jarāsandha, Prāgyotisa, most probably in Assam²⁷ where Bhauma or Narakāsura, whom Kṛṣṇa is believed to have killed some years before the Mahābhārata war and after whom Bhagadatta, a powerful warrior who had fought in that war on the side of the Kurus, had been ruling, Śoṇitapur in the Gadhwāl district, where Bāṅsāra, father of Uṣā, whom Aniruddha had secretly married and whose superfluous hands (i.e. I believe, powers in excess of those of a feudatory) where curtained by Kṛṣṇa after

²⁵ It is gratifying to note that the site of Maniyar Math has been excavated at Rājgir (Poona Orientalist, IV, 1 & 2, p. 91), but what I suggest is the digging of pits below the Buddhistic level.

²⁶ This site though excavated extensively has not been excavated at sufficient depths to yield results useful for a re-constitution of the history of the pre-Buddhistic age.

defeating him in a pitched battle, Dwārāvali28 the pleasure-resort (Vihāra-bhūmi) of King Revata, who subsequently became the father-in-law of Balarāma, elder brother of Kṛṣṇa, a place in the littoral along the sea-coast at a short distance from Mount Raivatāka (modern Girnar) where Kṛṣṇa with 18 Yādava families had, according to the Harivanaśa encamped before Dwārakā was built on an island, Kuṇḍinapura, the capital of Bhāṣmaka, father of Rukminī, the pet queen of Kṛṣṇa, that of Bhōjakata in the Berars which Rukmi had built after he was defeated and dishonoured by Kṛṣṇa when he was pursued while eloping with his sister Rukminī,29 the capital of the Cedi province where Śīśupāla, an ally of Jarāsandha, who was killed by Kṛṣṇa at the Rājasūya sacrifice of the Pāṇḍavas, Karaviraṇapura in the Southern Maharashtra country where Kṛṣṇa and Baladeva had, according to the Harivanaśa, an encounter with Śrīgāla Vāsudeva and Krauṇicapura, which must be at a short distance from the last town and somewhere near Bādami in the Bijapur district. If trial-pits at the necessary depths, determined in each case according to scientific calculations are made, I feel confident that relics leading to a definite conclusion as to a particular outstanding event of the Age of Kṛṣṇa will be found at some of those places. And once that terminus ad quem is fixed it would not be difficult to fill up the gap between it and the terminus a quo, the probable date of the foundation of the Śaiva Śāmāga dynasty in Magadha, for the Mahābhārata itself, some of the old Purāṇas such as the Bhavisya, Matsya and Vāyu and the Jain Purāṇas contain ample materials for that purpose. It is true that in the matter of chronology we cannot rely much on the Purāṇas but the Mahābhārata is quite free from the fault of making such hyperbolic statements with regard thereto as the Purāṇas.30 After these details are collected it will be the task of the proposed committee of the Oriental Conference to examine them critically and sanction such of them as satisfy an agreed test for incorporation in the political history of the period between the above two termini. It would be then only that the necessity to revise the whole history of our country would arise. The cry for doing so raised on the discovery of the Mohenjo-daro relics was premature.

30. For instance it is not open to suspicion that 12 years had elapsed during the peregrinations of the Pāṇḍavas after the second dice-game at Hastināpur, that one year had elapsed between the termination of that period and that of the reclamation of the herds of cows of Virāṭnagar by Arjuna on defeating the Kauravas, that Dhṛtarāṣṭra had lived with the Pāṇḍavas peacefully for 15 years after the war and the performance of the obsequial ceremonies of the dead relatives (Mbh. XV. I . 6), that the cataclysm at Dwārakā and the fratricidal conflict at Prabhāsa between the young Yādavas and the death of Kṛṣṇa had taken place after the lapse of 36 years from the date of accession by Yudhiṣṭhira on the throne of Hastināpur (Mbh. XVI. 2. 20-21). Even some of the Purāṇas are likely to furnish some reliable clues such as that according to the Bhāgavata XI. 25 Kṛṣṇa was 125 years old at the time of the fratricidal conflict.
XI. Their Effect on the History of Indian Culture.

17. This kind of re-construction work, if assiduously carried out, can also be hoped to provide a satisfactory solution of the riddle of the Indus and Gangetic Valley civilizations for various reasons. Thus some of the relics found at Mohenjo-daro point to the buried cities there having been inhabited by a non-Aryan race most probably of the Dravidian stock whose principal tribal deity was Rudra. During the Mahâbhârata period, Jayadratha, a Ksatriya son-in-law of Dhrtarastra, was ruling over some portion of Sindh.31 One of the notable feats of Krsna for which he was identified with Viśuṣu was the freeing of Bhûratavasra from the pest of several impious and tyrannical kings like Karhsa, Jarâsandha, Siśupâla, Bhauma, Bâpâsura, Kâlayavana, Sâlva and Śrîgàla-Vâsudeva, some of whom were Kṣatriyas and others non-Aryans and most of whom were the worshippers of Rudra. This does not however mean that there was no social intercourse between the Aryans and the Anâryans. On the contrary there are numerous instances of inter-marriages between them, in each of which the male was an Aryan and the female Anâryan. Thus Arjuna, Bhûma and Krsna himself had married the daughters of several Anâryan chiefs, called Nâgas, Râksasas, &c. Some of the well-known sages like Dvaipâyana owed their birth to a sexual intercourse between Brahmins and low-caste girls, Santanu, grand-father of the Kauravas and Pâṇḍavas had married the very girl Satyavaî or Matsyagandhâ, who had given birth to Dvaipâyana during her maidenhood. The Droṇa Parva of the Mbh. contains a very detailed account of a fierce battle that had taken place after mid-night between the Râksasas headed by Ghatotkaca, son of Bhûma and Hedaribî, and Alambuṣa and Alâyudha, other Râksasas, who had come to assist the Kauravas with contingents of several Anâryan tribes such as the Kâmbojas, Kiṟâtas, Daradas, Barbaras, Yavanas, Šabaras, Bîlas and others. This account also makes it crystal clear that whereas Aryan warriors depended upon weapons made of iron, and bows and arrows, the use whereof presupposed a knowledge of some science, some of the Anâryan warriors fought with stone-weapons (śilâyuddha) while others made use of their knowledge of some sciences stigmatised by the Aryans as Râksasâ and Asurî Mâyâs, which enabled them to rise up in the air, become invisible and fight unseen by the adversary, to put the latter on a wrong track and weakening the morale of his army by spreading false rumours and creating false evidence in support of them &c.32 The Aryans had their own code of honour to be observed even in war-times just as the European nations now have their international law relating to war-times. Thus for instance, we find it discussed in the Mahâbhârata at several places whether a particular act of the one party or other was or was not in accordance

31. It has been discovered that the descendants of this Jayadratha had migrated to Kâthiawâd at the time of the invasion of Sindh by Mahomed Kasim and were ruling over parts of it in the 9th, 10th and 11th centuries (Râjasthâna for July 1939, pp. 2-9).

32. Mbh. VII. 108 to 192.
with Dharma, which both being Aryans were bound to observe. The Rākṣasas and Asuras did not feel themselves bound by any such code and "everything is fair in love and war" was their motto. All this goes to establish that the Aryans, who had made considerable progress on the spiritual side of life and the Anāryans, who had made such on its material side, had been living side by side in the age in which Śri Kṛṣṇa, his relatives like Vasudeva, Balarāma, Arisṭanemi, Akṛūra, and Ugrasena, and adversaries like Jarāsandha of Magadhā, Śiśupāla of Cedi, Karha of Śūrasena and Bhuama of Prāgyotisa and the sons of Dhrṛtarāṣtra and Pāṇḍu and others lived and had been mixing socially with each other and influencing each other’s thoughts and actions to a considerable extent.

18. It further seems to me highly probable that if we get a success in solving the above tangle we shall also be able to ascertain the exact relations between the Vedic and the Bhāgavata or Pāñcarātra religions, the Vedic and the Pāśupata religions, the Vedic and the Śaṅkta religions, the Vedic and the Buddhist and Jain religion and also those between the non-Vedic religions inter se because all those religions whether orthodox or heterodox, have some beliefs and mythologies in common and some of them e.g. the Bhāgavatas and the Jains share some common traditions also.83

XII. The Line of Further Progress and Appeal to the Research Scholars.

19. The above are only the immediate results of the proposed line of research. It has its remote results as well. Once we are on stable ground as to the history of about a century before the Mahābhārata war we can make further progress also along this purely Indian line because our literatures also have the potentiality of affording clues to the re-construction of our history, in the age next prior to the above namely, the age in which Rāmacandra, son of Daśaratha was the predominant personality and the most notable event wherein was a war between Rāmacandra and Laxmaṇa sons of Daśaratha on the one hand and Rāvan and Kumbhakarṇa, grandsons of the sage Pulastya on the other at Lāṅkā, a city on an island in the midst of the southern ocean whose northern shore appears to have been situated far to the north of Dhanuṣkodi and Kanyā Kumārī. The sons of Daśaratha were assisted in their invasion of Lāṅkā by the chiefs of Anāryan tribes, which though described as Vānaras (apes) and Rkṣas (bears) and though living in subterranean or mountain caves and fighting with stones and trees had some sort of social and political organizations of their own, which by the time of Kṛṣṇa had become almost extinct. The grandsons of Pulastya had also their own army of mighty warriors who were experts in the science of archery and had amassed immense wealth collected from all the quarters and particularly from the region north of the Himālayas. Since however they were epicureans in their outlook on life and as such knew no Dharma and were cannibalistic in habit they were stigmatised as Rākṣasas. The Rāmāyana of Vālmīki, the

---

33. WINTERNITZ, HIL. I. pp. 320, 407 et III. seq. pp. 113-14, 484 et seq.
Rāmopākhyāna in the Mahābhārata, the Paśūmacariya of Vimala Suri and some of the Buddhist tales now obtainable only in Chinese and Tibetan translations, can serve as the sources from which the history of this age can be re-constructed. Vālmiki's Rāmāyaṇa also contains in the subsequently added 1st and 7th Kāṇḍas a description of the dynasties of the kings of the Solar race prior to Daśaratha and some important events in the lives of some of them and references to the foundation of several cities, whose sites can, after some research, be located with some amount of certainty. If excavations are made at those sites at appropriate depths, archaeology can be helpful to purely literary research with regard to this period also.

20. The Rāmāyaṇa and the Mahābhārata contain evidence of an age earlier even than that of Rāmacandra, in which the predominant personality was Paraśurāma, son of Jamadagni and the most outstanding event wherein was a long-continued bitter struggle for supremacy between the Brahmans headed by him and the Kṣatriyas headed by Sahasrārjunas of Māhiṣmati. The Purāṇas too, if critically examined, might be helpful in ascertaining the dates of some of the important events of that age.

21. The age of the Vedic Rṣis was still earlier than that. The most outstanding event in that age was the struggle for supremacy between the Brahmans headed by Vasiṣṭha and the Kṣatriyas headed by Viśvāmitra, which is described in details in both the said Epics. Although in this respect this age resembles the previous one it differs from it also in that Vasiṣṭha did not fight with weapons but with his spiritual powers and Viśvāmitra was the Rṣi to whom is ascribed the origin of the first-known work on Dhanurveda. We read also of his having taken the assistance of several Anāryan tribes while trying to suppress the power of Vasiṣṭha.

22. The history of the human races in India having two different kinds of ideals of life and therefore two different kinds of civilization, one spiritual, and the other material, struggling for supremacy over each other, thus seems to go back to very remote times. The early beginning of that struggle is found recorded in the Indra-Virocana story in the Chāndogya Upanishat wherein Indra is the king of the gods and Virocana that of the demons and according to which whereas the latter was satisfied with the knowledge that the self was identical with the physical body and spread the materialistic doctrine amongst his followers that happiness in this world and the next could be attained by adoring that body with clothes, ornaments, food, etc., which was very similar to that of the ancient Egyptians, Indra persisted in his inquiry assiduously and learnt the doctrine, that the real self was neither identical with the body nor with the mind, was not affected by pleasures and pains and was not subject to changes of states but was identical with the one immutable essence which pervaded the whole universe and became re-joined to it and merged in it

35. Vide Madhusūdana's remarks on 'Dhanurveda' in the Prasthānabheda.
36. Chā. Upa. VIII. 1 et seq.
when divested of the body. If thus the Indian records are approached and studied in the right spirit they will lead to the solution of many other riddles which the European anthropologists have been striving to solve without their assistance. Their potentiality lies deeper still and extends to the solution of even the riddle of the evolution of the universe in different cycles, i.e. to say, the gradual formation of the planets, the constellations, the signs of the zodiac, etc. In fact they would acquaint man with everything which he wants to know and strives to know.

23. That is, however, a far far distant cry. It would not be a small achievement even if the history of the Indian races, their civilizations and their action and re-action on each other are investigated and placed on a stable footing. The first step towards that objective, as I have said, is to trace the history of India up to the Age of Krishna, for doing which there are, as stated above, very ample materials on the surface of this land and very probably below it also. If it is to be taken seriously, we can no longer afford to wait till some western institution leads the way to it. It is high time we learnt to stand on our own legs and go our own way. It cannot be denied that there is the danger of our faltering and even losing our way at times. That danger should not, however, deter us from taking courage in both hands and making a beginning. It is well-known that those only succeed in all walks of life who are enterprising, self-reliant, frank-hearted enough to acknowledge mistakes, sincere enough to correct them whenever pointed out by others and resolute enough to overcome all the difficulties as they arise during the pursuit of their high ideals and to rest only after the settled objective is reached. This land which has produced a poet like Dr. Rabindranath Tagore, a plant-physiologist like the late Sir J. C. Bose, Chemists like Dr. P. C. Ray and Sir C. V. Raman, a philosopher like Sir S. Radhakrishnan and a historian of the Moghul and Maratha periods like Sir Jadunath Sarkar, is not wanting in research scholars with the above qualifications. Already some individual scholars have put forth their best efforts in the field of ancient history. But in that subject there is too much room for differences of opinion. What is, therefore, wanted is a joint action commenced under the auspices of an authoritative body like the All-India Oriental Conference in collaboration with the authorities of the archaeological department of the Government of India. R. B. Dikshit, who at present leads them, is not only highly sympathetic towards the movement for a substantial progress in the ancient Indian history of our country and has not only been doing all that he can do from his high position to push on that movement but has also as above-stated taken several opportunities to throw out suggestions for the line of future work on the part of societies of research scholars and archaeological investigators, which in his view is likely to lead to the attainment of the desired goal. The Indian Historical Congress too has been taking steps towards the same end. But historians as such are in the position of judges whose proper function is to weigh the evidence placed before them and

pass a judgment as to whether that evidence does or does not satisfy a recognized test. Those whose views cannot be ignored have already weighed the evidence till now collected and passed their judgment which points out several lacuna in the evidence. It therefore now behoves the advocates first to bestir themselves to search for materials which would enable them to fill in those lacuna and if any satisfactory ones are found out to apply for a review of that judgment on the ground of the discovery of new and important matter or evidence. Out of the advocates the archaeologists have already been doing their bit. Will the group of research scholars, organised as the All-India Oriental Conference realize their responsibility in the matter, settle their differences, take concerted action for doing their part and place before the judges such fresh evidence as they would consider satisfactory for justifying them in reviewing their previous judgment and passing a re-considered one allowing their claim on behalf of the Indian civilization? Let us hope and pray that they will. 38

38. The Council of the Oriental Conference at its meeting held at the same place after the sectional meeting was over, passed, at the instance of the President of the Archaeology section, a resolution drawing the attention of the Executive Committee to the scheme set forth in this paper and recommending the consideration thereof with a view to determine whether it was possible to give effect to the said or any other modified scheme for the attainment of the object the writer of the paper had in view and if so, what steps should be taken towards that end. It also brought to the notice of the said Committee that Mr. Divanji had offered to subscribe Rs. 1,000 to any fund that may be started in order to meet the expenses that may be incurred in taking such steps.
NON-RGVEDIC MANTRAS RUBRICATED IN THE ĀŚVALĀYANA-GRHYA-SŪTRA: THEIR SOURCES AND INTERPRETATION*

By
V. M. APTE, Poona.

AG. I. 22. 21; Anindītāyāṁ diśyekamūlam palāsāṁ kuśastambham vā palāśopacāre pradakṣiṇam udakumbhena trik pariṣīcantam vācayati: (a) Suśravaḥ suśravā āsi; (b) Yathā tvaṁ suśravah suśravā āsyevā māṁ suśravah suśravasaṁ kuru; (c) Yathā tvaṁ devānāṁ yajyasya nīhipośy, (d) evamahām manusyāyaṁ vedasya nīhipo bhūyāsam* iti |

Trans: While the student is sprinkling\(^1\) a Palāśa tree with a single root (or a Kuśa bunch in the absence of a Palāśa) in an unobjectionable direction (i.e., neither south nor south-east nor south-west) from the left to the right, with a water-pot, the ācārya makes him repeat the following mantra: (a) Suśravas (good listener)\(^2\) thou art famous (a play on the word 'suśravas' meaning 'hearing well' as well as 'well heard of' is intended). (b) As thou, O Suśravas, art famous, so do thou, O Suśravas, make me endowed with fame. (c) As thou art the guardian of the treasures of sacrifices for the gods, (d) so may I become the guardian of Vedic learning for men.

Context: This is the medhājanana ceremony (for the production of 'Intelligence') which is performed for the student when he has completed his vows.

Sources: The mantra is an address to the Palāśa tree and though it cannot be traced as a whole, the story alluded to in it (which explains the epithet 'Suśravas' as applied to the Palāśa) is found in TS. 3. 5. 7. 2—'Devā vāi brahmān avadanta | tat paṁca upāśraṇat | suśravā vai nāma, yasya pāramāyāi juhur bhavati, na sa pāpaṁ ślokaṁ śrṇoti | [The gods discussed regarding holy power (brahman) and the Pāṇa (a name of the Palāśa tree) overheard it; he whose ladle is made of Pāṇa (wood) is called Suśravas (famous); he hears no scandal]. TBR. I. 2. 1. 6 is even more explicit "Brahmavādaṁ vadaṁyaḥ yad upāśṛṇoḥ suśravā vai śrūtaṁ, [Since thou didst over hear the (gods) discussing Brahma, thou art known as Suśravas] tato māmāviśaṁ brahma-varcasam" (May holy lustre therefore enter into me). This last clause is very suggestive of our Medhājanana rite.

* Continued from p. 155 of Vol. III.
1. Prof. OLDENBERG’s translation suggests (p. 192) that water is being sprinkled round the tree. It is, however the tree that is being sprinkled.
2. This address to the Palāśa tree implies an allusion to the story of the part played by the Palāśa tree in over-hearing the conversation of the gods, mentioned in the next paragraph. The epithet 'Suśravas' which I have translated above in the light of this allusion, is translated by OLDENBERG as "O glorious one."
Among Sūtra texts only APMB. 2. 5. 1 has all the clauses (a) to (d) with unimportant variations. MG. 1. 22. 17 has (a) and (b) without variations; PG. 2. 4. 2 has the same two with some variations.

AG. I. 23. 5: 'Sadasyan saṣṭadaśaṁ kauṣītakinaḥ samāmananti, sa karmanāṁ upadraṣṭā bhavati.'

Trans: The Kauṣītakins prescribe the 'sadasya' as the seventeenth so that he may play the part of the overseer of (all) rites.

Context: This view is mentioned in connection with the rule that either the four chief priests or all the sixteen (who officiate at Ahāna and Ekāha sacrifices) may be chosen to officiate at a sacrifice.

Sources: Our sūtra occurs word for word in ĀPS. X. I. 10. 10-11 and this whole Kaṇḍikā (I. 23) has been modelled on ĀPS. X. I. 10 where are found many of its sūtras and quotations. Our text correctly represents this view as the peculiar view of the Kauṣītakins, because ŚB. X. 4. 1. 19 denounces the employment of the 'Sadasya' priest whereas KB. 17.7 and 26.4 and 5 mention along with other priests the 'Sadasya' priest, whose duty it was to supervise the whole offering and call attention to any lapse, never leaving his post (the 'Sadas' enclosure)—which explains 'Sa karmanāṁ upadraṣṭā bhavati' in our Sūtra.


Trans. (8) "Agni is my Hotṛ; he is my Hotṛ, I choose thee So and So! as my Hotṛ;" (with this formula he chooses) the Hotṛ. (9) 'Candramas is my Brahman' etc. as above. (With this formula he chooses) the Brahman. (10) 'Aditya is my adhāvya' etc.; (thus) the adhāvya (11) 'Parjanya is my Udgāṭṛ etc.'; thus the Udgāṭṛ (12) 'The waters are our reciters of what belongs to the Hotrakas etc.'—(thus) the Hotrakas. (13) 'The rays are my Camasaśadhvayus etc.'—(thus) the Camasaśadhvayus (14). "The Ākāsa is my Sadasya etc." (thus) the Sadasya.

Sources: Each Mantra consists of two parts:—in the first deity Agni (Candramas etc. is) declared to be the Divine 'hotā' ('Brahmā' etc. respectively) and then in the second part, the priest is declared to have been chosen as the Human hota etc. This double address is explained by ŚB. II. 10 (a section dealing with the same topic) where we find mantras identical with or similar to those in our sūtras above.

ŚB. II. 10. 1-3: Daiva anye tvivo, mānuṣā anye | sa etān daivān tvivo vṛṇata "agnir me hota" etc. | sa etān daivān tvivo vṛṇa athātaṁ mānuṣān vṛṇata | (Here the commentator gives the required formulas "etamādakena yañenāhoṁ yaksye tatra me tvāṁ hota etc."). "The divine priests are different and the human priests are different. He chooses the divine priests with the
formulas ‘Agnir me hotā’ etc. (these formulas are identical with the first parts of our mantras in order). Having chosen the divine priests, he should then proceed to choose (the corresponding) human priests” [with formulas given by the commentator (meaning: I propose to offer such and such sacrifice; be thou my ‘hotā’ there etc.) the last parts of which are similar to the second parts of our mantras] ĀPS. X. 1. 14 also, has similar mantras with the same double address.

AG. I. 23. 15 : Sa vrto japen “mahan me’voco, bhargo me’voco, bhargo me’voco, yaśo me’vocah, stomam me’vocah klptam me’voco, bhuktim me’vocas, īptim me’vocah, sarvam me’voca” iti |

Trans : The priest chosen (as above) should mutter “A great thing hast thou told me; lustre hast thou told me, ‘fortune’, ‘fame’, ‘praise’, ‘success’, ‘enjoyment’, ‘satisfaction’, hast thou told me (this last clause being repeated with each of these words); ‘all’ hast thou told me.”

Sources : PB. I. 1. 1 gives a formula similar to ours as the formula to be muttered by the Udgātṛ when chosen (‘Vṛṣasya udgātur japa-mantrāḥ’) because as a Brāhmaṇa of the Sāmaveda, it was only concerned with the functions of the Udgātr. PB. I. 1. 1. omits some words like ‘bhagah, klptim’ etc. but is substantially the same mantra as ours. ĀPS. X. 1. 4. gives a formula identical with ours except for the omission of ‘bhagah’. Somewhat similar formulas are also found in MŚ. 5. 2. 15. 2 ; LŚ. 1. 1. 10-14 and ŚŚ. 5. 1. 10.

AG. I. 23. 16-18 : Japitvā “agniṣṭe Hotā, sa te hotā hotāham te mānuṣa” iti hotā pratijānīte | 16 | Candramāste brahmā sa te brahmā brahmā | 17 | Evam itare yathādeśam | 18 |

Trans : (16) Having muttered (the formula given above) the hotṛ (loudly) declares his acceptance with the formula “Agni is thy Hotṛ; he is the Hotṛ; thy human Hotṛ am I.”

(17) “Candramas is thy Brahman; he is thy Brahman”—(with this formula) the Brahman. (18) In the same way, the other priests according to the (individual) specifications (given above such as ‘Āditya’ for the ‘adhavya’ etc).

Sources : These mantras are of the nature of responses by the priests to the mantras cited in sūtras 8 to 14, with just the necessary modifications e.g., ‘te’ for ‘me’ and ‘hotāham te’ for ‘hotāram tvā.’ They are hardly independent mantras therefore and are not traced to any other text in this particular form.

AG. I. 23. 19 : ‘Tan māmavatu, tanmāviśatu, tena bhūkṣiyeti’ ca yā-jayisyān |

Trans : When he (the invitee) intends to perform the sacrifice (for the inviter), he should repeat the following formula (in addition to the one given in the preceding sūtras :) “May that protect me; may it enter into me; may I thereby enjoy (bliss)! ”

The alternative (to ‘yājayisyān’, even after accepting the invitation) implied in this sūtra according to Nārāyaṇa is that the priests may simply be
performing the Agnyādheya for him, in which case they do not recite this formula.

Sources: PB. I. 1. 1. gives an identical formula in the same context, with only ‘mām’ for ‘mā’. ĀPS. X. 1. 4 also gives an identical formula in an identical context.

ĀG. I. 23. 21: Somapraṇavākam pari-pṛcchet (a) "Ko yajñāḥ, (b) Ka ṛtvijāḥ, (c) Kā daksīṇāḥ" iti.

Trans: (The Ṛtvij chosen) should ask the Somapraṇavāka (the representative of the Soma-sacrificer who gives the invitations on his behalf) "What sacrifice is it? Who are the (other) officiating priests? What is the fee?"

Sources: ĀPS X. 1. 3 in exactly the same context, has "Tam (the commentator supplies 'Soma-pravākam' as in our text) pṛcchanti rtvijāḥ "Ke yājyayanti, kaccinnāḥnaḥ, kaccit kalyāṇyo daksīṇāḥ"—itī āhāna prabhāna-ṇam bhavati | Trans: The priests ask him ‘Who are going to perform the sacrifice? [This is parallel to our (b)] Is it an Ahāna sacrifice? [This is parallel to our (a)]. Are the fees decent?’ [This is parallel to our (c)]—So runs a Brāhmaṇa of the Chandogas.

I do not understand why Prof. Oldenberg refers us to the commentary on the Paṇca-viiniṣṭa Brāhmaṇa for this passage when it is found in the ĀPS. itself, as shown above.

ĀG. I. 24. 8: (a) ‘Ahaṁ varṣma sajātānām (b) vidyutām iva sūryaḥ, (c) idāṁ tam adhitisthāmi (d) yo mā kaścābhidāsatī ityudagre viśtara upaviśet |

Trans: He (the guest) should sit down on the seat (of darbha grass) so that the (grass-)ends point to the north (the superstition that the fringes or loose ends of a carpet or mat should not point to the south prevails even to-day in India) with the mantra "I am the summit (varṣman) of my kinsmen, as the Sun is of Lightning (flashes). Here I sit on him who harasses me."

Context: The guest does so when the seat, madhuparka etc. have each been announced to him thrice, by the host.

Sources: This same verse is found in §§ IV. 21. 2 in an identical context (our kaṇḍikā in fact is indebted to the section §§ IV. 21 dealing with the guest-reception with the madhuparka for some of the mantras quoted as well as the wording of some of its Sūtras such as ĀG. I. 24. 1 to 7).

The variations are 'sāḍṛṣṭānām' a synonym of our 'sajātānām' in (a), and 'asmaṁ abhidāsatī' for our 'mā kaścābhidāsati' in (d). The mantra occurs with slight variations in PG. 1. 3. 8 and MG. 1. 9. 8.

ĀG. I. 24. 13: Praksālitopadoṛghyam aṇājalinā pratigṛkyāthācama-nīyenācāmati: (a) 'Amṛtopastaraṇam asi' iti.

Trans: His feet having been washed, he takes the Arghya water in the hollow of his joined hands (and after thus signifying its acceptance, pours it
out) and then sips the ācamaṇīya water (intended for sipping) with the mantra. "Thou art the 'underspread' (or foundation-layer) of Amṛta."

It would be convenient to consider another formula of the same type in sūtra 28, along with this.

AG. I. 24. 28 : (b) Athācamaṇīyanāvācāmāti ‘Amṛtiṣṭidhānam asi’ iti |

Trans : He then (i.e. after eating the Madhuparka) follows it (i.e. the eating) up by sipping the ācamaṇīya water with the formula. "Thou art the 'covering-lid' of Amṛta.

Sources of (a) i.e. the formula in I. 24. 13 and (b) the one in I. 24. 28: The two formulas are traced to TA. 10. 32. 1 and 10. 35. 1 respectively where the commentator explains that they are to be employed before and after a meal respectively.

The practice of sipping water before and after a meal, with exactly these two formulas which stand, as it were, for the prologue and epilogue of the ritual drama of a dinner is in force even to this day in India!

AG. I. 24. 14-15. The mantras 'mitrasya tvā etc.' in I. 24. 14 and 'Devasya tvā etc.' the first mantra quoted in I. 24. 15 have already been discussed under I. 20. 4.

AG. I. 24. 15-18 : (a) 'Vasavastvā gāyatrena chandāsa bhakṣayantu' iti purastān nimārṣṭi | 15 |

(b) 'Rudrāstvā traṅgubhena chandāsa bhakṣayantu' iti daksinātah | 16 |

(c) 'Adityāstvā jāgatena chandāsa bhakṣayantu' iti paścāt | 17 |

(d) Viśve tvā devā anuṣṭubhena chandāsa bhakṣayantu' ity-uttaratah | 18 |

Trans : [(Sūtra 14) : After having looked at the Madhuparka; (sūtra 15) : accepted it with his joined hands, transferred it to his left hand, looked at it again with appropriate mantras for every stage, he stirs the madhuparka thrice from left to right and then] wipes (what sticks to his fingers of the madhuparka) on the eastern (side) with the mantra (a) 'May the Vasus eat thee with the Gāyatrī metre'; Sūtra 16 : (b) 'May the Rudras eat thee with the Tristubh metre'—with this formula, on the south; Sūtra 17 : (c) 'May the Adityas eat thee with the Jagati metre'—with this formula on the west; sūtra 18 : (d) 'May the Viśvedevas eat thee with the Anuṣṭubh metre'—with this formula on the north.

Sources : The first three mantras (a), (b) and (c) cited in sūtras 15 to 17 are found in a number of texts with various verbs (other than our 'bhakṣayaantu') ending the sentences: e.g. (1) the three mantras with the variation 'parighṛhantu' for 'bhakṣayantu' are found in TS. 1. 1. 9. 3, the context being the tracing of the 'Vedi' by means of the 'sphya' (= the wooden sword). (2) They are found with the variation 'pravṛhantu' for 'bhakṣa-

1. This must be done before he takes up the water for sipping in his hands—a small detail not noticed either by Stenzler or by Oldenberg and ignored in the two commentaries of Nāṇiyaṇa and Haradatta, as too well-known probably!

2. SS. IV. 21. 8 makes it clear that this wiping is done on the eastern, southern, western and northern sides of the Madhuparka vessel.
yantu’ in TS. 3.3.3.1, the context being the offerings of ‘Aṃśu’ and ‘Adībhya’ cups in a Soma sacrifice. (3) They are found with the change ‘Krṣṇvantu āṅgirasvat’ for ‘Bhaksyaṇantu’ in TS. 4.1.5.3. VS. 11.58 and SB. 6.5.2.3 the context being the making of the fire-pan while the adhvaryu or the sacrificer repeats the mantras. (4) They are found with ‘dhūpayantu’ for our ‘bhaksyaṇantu’ in TS. 4.1.6.1 and VS. 11.60 the context being the fumigating of the fire-pan. (5) ‘Samaṇjantu’ appears instead of ‘bhaksyaṇantu’ in TS. 4.1.6.3 and VS. 11.60, the context being the filling of the fire-pan with goat’s milk and (6) Aṃjantu is the variant for ‘bhaksyaṇantu’ in TS. 7.4.20.1., the context being the anointing of the aṣya medha horse.

Our text, then, has derived (1) the ending ‘bhaksyaṇantu’ (2) a suggestion of the context and (3) the addition of the fourth category in (d) of the ‘Viṣvedevas’ from ŚŚ. IV. 21. 8-12 where the Vasus, Piṭṛs, Adityas, Rudras and Viṣvedevas are associated with the wipings on the eastern, southern, western, northern and central sides (respectively) of the vessel. LS. 1.10.17 also has four similar mantras for wiping the four sides of the ‘dronakalasa’. There is a certain propriety in the association of the metres with the deities e.g. the Gāyatrī metre with 8 syllables in a pāda goes with the eight Vasus, the Trisūtbh metre with eleven syllables in a pāda goes with eleven Rudras and the jagatī metre with 12 syllables, with the 12 Adityas. Perhaps the Anuṣṭubh metre as the common śloka metre was associated with Viṣvedevas.

AG. I. 24.19: ‘Bhūtebhyaśastva’ iti madhyāt trirudghya |

Trans: With the formula ‘To the beings (I offer) thee’, he three times takes some (of the madhuparka) out of the middle of it.

Sources: In TS. 1.2.12.3, the Sruc (ladle) is picked up with this formula in the marking out of the high altar (Uttara-vedi) and in VS. 5.12. the centre of the altar is anointed with butter with this formula after the four corners have been anointed with suitable mantras. In both these (TS. and VS) passages, the guest offering to Soma (the early model for the ‘Madhuparka offering’) precedes the formulas. The idea of ‘taking up a little of the madhuparka from the middle’ may have been suggested by ŚŚ. IV. 21. 12—where we read: ‘Viṣe tuvā devā bhaksyaṇantu iti madhyādūrdhvan.’

AG. I. 24.20-22: (a) ‘Virājo dohoṣi’ iti praghamam prāśniyāt | 20 |
(b) ‘Virājo doham aṣīya’ iti dvitiyam | 2 |
(c) ‘Mayi dohaḥ padyāyai virājaḥ’ iti tritiyam | 22 |

Trans: (20)=(a): ‘Thou art the milking of the Shining One (Virājo’ —with this formula, he eats of it, for the first time. (21)=(b) : ‘The milking of the Shining One, may I attain’ with this formula (he eats) a second time (22)=(c) : ‘In me, may the milking of the Shining One (the Earth-Cow) endowed with feet’, dwell’—with this formula a third time.

Sources: The formulas are found without variation in ŚŚ. IV. 21. 3, the context being that the guest accepts the water for washing the feet, with these

1. Reasons for this translation of ‘padyā Virāj’ which according to OLDENBERG (p. 97 on SG.III.7.5) is the Virāj metre, are given below.
formulas—a context which brings out more clearly the play on 'padyāyai' (endowed with feet). But an explanation of the puzzling phrase 'Vīrajo dohaḥ' is found in śB. 1. 5. 2. 20 "Iyām vai vīra ṣ | asyai va ēṣa doha, evaṁ ha va ēṣā iyāṁ vīraṁ sarvān kāmān duhe | ya evam etāṁ vīrajo dohaṁ veda" (Trans) :—This (i.e. the earth represented by the altar) is verily the 'Shining One' and of her, is this milking; in this way does this Shining one (the earth-cow) milk forth all his desires for him who knows this milking of the Shining One.' My translation of 'Vīrajo dohaḥ' as 'the Milking of the Shining One' (the earth-cow) is based on this śB.-passage and the appropriateness of this phrase as applied to the madhuparka of which dadhi (curds)—a product of cow's milk—was an important ingredient is evident. The epithet 'padyāyai' also becomes significant as referring to the feet of the earth-cow. Prof. Oldenberg's view (p. 97) that 'padyā vīraj' is the vīraj metre in so far as it consists of feet does not explain the association of 'doha ' (or milking) with 'vīraj' in the formulas; besides, that meaning also may be just suggested here as part of a play on the various meanings of the words 'padyā vīraj' (which is not uncommon) but it cannot be the principal or primary meaning of the phrase.

AG. I. 24. 29. (a) 'Satyaṁ yaśaḥ śrīr, (b) mayi śrih śrayatām ' iti dvitiyayam |

Trans : With the formula: "Truth! Fame! Fortune! May Fortune rest on me!" (he sips water) a second time (It has been sipped first with the formula in the preceding sūtra discussed already under AG. I. 24. 13, after the eating of the Madhuparka is finished).

Sources : RV.Kh. V. 87.10 reads "Manasaḥ kāmām ākūtiṁ vācaḥ satyam aśīmahi | paśūnāṁ rūpam annasya, mayi śriḥ śrayatāṁ yaśaḥ ||

The last pāda along with the word 'satyam' in the second pāda, seems to have suggested our formulas. VS. 39. 4 is just this (RVKh.) verse with the last pāda reading as 'Yaśaḥ śriḥ śrayatāṁ mayi' and employed as a formula to atone for defects in the Pravargya ceremony. Our text seems to have rearranged some of the words in these verses, to make up the prose formula that we have above!

AG. I. 24. 31-32 : (a) 'Hato me pāṃmā, pāṃmā me hata' iti japitvā (b) 'Om kuruta' iti kārasyaṇ | 31 | 'Mātā' etc. (= RV. VIII, 101.15) iti japitvā, (c) 'Om utṣṛjata' ityutṣraksyaṇ | 32 |

Trans : (31) (a) 'Destroyed is my sin; my sin is destroyed'—having muttered (this formula), he adds (b)='Om; make (her i.e. kill her and dress her flesh as food for me)', if he desires (the host) to make her for himself (32): If he desires to set her free, he should add (c) 'Om! release her!' after muttering the (RV.) verse 'Mātā' etc.

Context : The guest gives these instructions when the cow has been announced to him after he has sipped water.

Sources : (a) The formula identical in part with (a), is VS. 6. 35 'Pāṃmā hato, na somas', where the formula is supposed to exculpate the sin of beating (and pressing) the soma (into juice) just as our formula exculpates the sin of killing the cow.
Formulas (b) and (c) : §§ IV. 21. 23. 24 contains both these formulas along with the same RV. verse (VIII. 101. 15) that is quoted in our sūtra I. 24. 32 in exactly the same context with only the addition 'tṛṇānyattu iti vā' (Let her eat grass) which is recommended as an optional formula for 'Om Uṣṭjata'.

Similar formulas, in exactly the same context, are found in Lś. 1.2.12 seqq. TA. 6. 12. 1 uses (c), along with the same RV. verse, for letting loose the cow that accompanies a funeral procession, if it is decided not to kill her for being laid limb by limb on the corpse.

AG. II. 1. 9 : Kalaśāt saktūnāṁ, darvīṁ ārāvyitvā prāgupaniśkramyā śucau deśe'povaniyā : "(a) sarpa-deva-janebhyaḥ svāhā" iti hūtā nāmaskaroti ; (b) 'ye sarpaḥ pārthivā, ye antarikṣyā, ye divyarā, ye diṣyās, te bhya imaṃ balim āhārṣaṁ, te bhya imaṃ balim upākaromi' iti |

Trans : He fills a ladle with (barley-)flour out of the jug (set apart at the beginning of the ceremony) ; goes out (of the house) eastward ; pours water on a clean spot and sacrifices (i.e. deposits the barely-flour on it as a bali offering) with the formula : (a) 'To the divine host of Serpents ! Svāhā!' and makes a (reverential) bow with the formula : 'The serpents who are terrestrial, who belong to the antarikṣa, who belong to heaven and who dwell in the quarters—to them, do I bring this Bali'.

Context : This takes place in the Śravaṇāṅkarma (a rite to the serpents) after the sacrifice of the sthālipāka, puroḍāsa and besmeared fried grains.

Sources. (a) This same formula is employed 'again in our text in II. 1.14 at the daily (morning and evening) offerings of Balis till the ceremony of 'pratyavarohana' (or 'redescent'). VS. 30 : 8 has 'Sarpadeva-janebhyo' pratipadam | [To the divine hosts of serpents, an untrustworthy man (is offered as a victim at the Puruṣamedha sacrifice)]. The same expression (as in VS.) is found in TB. 3.4.1.5. (b) The formulas nearest to (though not identical with) those in (b), are TS. 4.2.8.3 and VS. 13.6. 'Namostu sarpebhyo, ye ke ca prthivīm anu | ye'ntarikṣe, ye divi, tebhyaḥ sarpebhyo namaḥ |

The context is as follows :-In the Aśvamedha, the ground for the fire is being prepared. The horse advances to the Darbha-bunch spread on the ground ; then a lotus-leaf is put on the horse's foot-print, and the golden image of a man put on top of the lotus-leaf, is addressed with this mantra. In the VS., the employment is similar ; only it is in connection with the construction of the Āhavaniya fire-altar. These VS.-Mantras are commented on in the SB. 7.4.1.28 and are quoted by pratikas, in PG. II. 14. 18, in exactly the same context as in our text, as both these works belong to the VS. A comparison of our formulas with those in TS. VS. etc. shows that our 'Pṛthivā' etc. is a mere paraphrase of 'ye ke ca Pṛthivīm anu' etc. Our version is also found in APMB. 2. 17.8°.

AG. II. 1. 10 : Pradaṅksīnam poritya paścād balear upaviśya : (a) 'Sarpo'si, (b) sarpatām sarpaṇām adhipatir asi, (c) amena manusyaṁs trāyase' pūpeṇa
sarpān, yajñena devāṁ, (d) tvayi mā santam, tvayi santah sarpā mā hirn-
śīsūr, (e) dhruvāṁ 1 te paridadāmi’ iti.

Trans: Having gone round (the Bali), keeping his right side towards
it, he sits down to the west of the Bali (and recites the mantra) : (a) ‘Thou
art the Sarpā; (b) the lord of creeping serpents art thou; (c) thou nourish-
est men with food, serpents with cake and the gods by sacrifice. (d) May
not the serpents living in thee, harm me who am also living in thee. (e) I
give thee the ladle (dhruvā:—the same as the ‘Darvā’ mentioned in sūtra
9).

The meaning of (a) to (d):—The passage in the ŚB. 7.4.1.25 in which
Agni is invoked by ‘sarpā’-names and in which the epithet ‘sarpā’ is applied
to the fire-god as well as to all the worlds of which he is the lord (with an
implied reference to the etymology of the word ‘Sarpā’ from √Srप = to
creep) throws considerable light on the meaning of this mantra. I think that
there is a play here on the word ‘Sarpā’ meaning ‘serpent’ as well as ‘fire’
(the Gṛhya-fire was always near at hand in all Gṛhya rites) and only then
can (c) be properly understood as it is the fire that supports the gods by
carrying oblations and human beings and serpents by means of food and cake
which it helps to cook (as is mentioned in the Mantra).

The meaning of (e). Prof. STENZLER’s emendation is unnecessary as
‘Dhruvāṁ te’ yields excellent sense. The ‘Darvā’ (ladle) of sūtras 2 and 9
is deliberately referred to here by the synonym ‘Dhruvā’ because of its near-
ness in sound to ‘Dhruva’ the lord of serpents, referred to in the following
sūtras; besides it is a pointed reference to the ladleful of barley-flour offered
as Bali on the clean spot (sūtra 9th) to the west of which the performer
who repeats this mantra is sitting.

Sources. The formulas—(a) to (d), are only found in sūtra-texts and
are not traced to earlier literature. MG. 2. 126. 3 has them with the follow-
ing variations; it omits ‘Sarpātām’ in (b), ‘yajñena devāṁ’ in (c), and for
(d) has ‘tvayi santam mayi santam mākśīsūr, mā rīśīsūr, mā hirnśīsūr, mā
dānksulḥ sarpaḥ’ which is an expansion of our (d); APMB. II. 17. 3 has (c)
with the addition ‘ṭrāṇaḥ paśūn ... svadhayā pitṛn, svāhā’ and to our (d) cor-
responds APMB. II. 17. 4d “tvayi naḥ santah, tvayi sadbhya varśābhya naḥ
paridehi” which as a prayer for protection from the rains, indicates the danger
of snakes in the rainy season.

ĀG. II. 1. 11-12:—‘Dhruvāmūn te dhruvāmūn te’ ityamātyān anupūrvam
11 | “ dhruva mān te paridadāmityām antatah | 12 |

Trans: “Dhruva! I give so and so, over to thee! Dhruva! I give so
and so over to thee!” With these words (repeated for each member) he
gives over his family members in charge to the Serpent-god, one by one and
finally himself (saying) “Dhruva! Me I give over to thee!”

Meaning of ‘Dhruva’. TA. 10. 67. 1 mentions a deity called ‘Dhruva’

1. I adopt the reading of Prof. STENZLER’s MSS (see his note on p. 66); his
emendation ‘dhruvāmum’ for ‘dhruvām’ is quite unnecessary as shown hereafter.
along with Agni "Agnaye svāhā!—dhruvāya bhūmāya svāhā!" The character of this deity is made clear by the comment of Haradatta on the above Sūtras in our text: 'Dhruvo nāma sarpaṇām adhipatiḥ'—Dhruva is the Lord of the Serpents.

Sources: These formulas are mere improvisations dictated by the particular context and are not traced to any other text.

AG. II. 2. 3. Pṛṣātakam aṅjalinā juhuyād: (a) 'Onam me pūryalām, (b) pūrṇam me mopasadat, (c) pṛṣātakāya svāhā' iti.

Trans. With his joined hands, he should sacrifice the 'Pṛṣātaka', (repeating the mantra) 'May whatever is deficient in me be made good; may what is full, not fall off from me. To Pṛṣātaka svāhā!' [There is a difference of opinion as to the exact ingredients of this Pṛṣātaka which is admitted to be a mixture. Prof. Stenzler quotes the Gṛhya-samgraha (p. 70) according to which it is a mixture of 'dadhi' (curds) and 'sarpīḥ' (butter), but Nārāyaṇa says that it is a mixture of milk and Ājya and Haradatta in support of the same view, quotes the Chandogas as saying 'payasyavanayedāyam tat pṛṣātakam iti Chandogāḥ'.]

Context: This follows the sacrifice of a Sthālīpāka to Paśupati in the 'Āśvayuji' ceremony (in celebration of the Āśvina full-moon).

Sources. Only in one Sūtra-text viz. PG. 2.16.3 are formulas (a) and (b) traced: (a) without variation and (b) with 'mā vigāt' (which means the same thing) for our 'mopasadat'. (c) is not traced anywhere; in fact 'Pṛṣātaka' as a deity appears only here and in II. 2. 2. above!

AG. II. 2. 4: (a) "Sajūr ṛtubhiḥ, sajūr vidhābhiḥ, sajūr indrāṇiḥbhīyāṁ svāhā | (b) sajūrtubhiḥ, sajūr vidhābhiḥ, sajūr viśvebhīyo deśvībhīyaḥ svāhā | (c) sajūr ṛtubhiḥ, sajūr vidhābhiḥ, sajūr dyāvā-ṛṇaptaḥbhīyaṁ svāhā" ityāh-hitāṅgaṁ āgrayañasthālīpākaḥ |

Trans: The Āhitāṅga (one who has set up the three Śrauta fires) offers a sthālīpāka (a mess of cooked food) at the Āgrayaṅa sacrifice [in the Āhavaniya fire—this follows from the next Sūtra which prescribes that the 'ānāhitāṅga' offers it in the domestic fire] with the mantra: (a) 'Harmonious with the seasons, harmonious with the Modes, harmonious with Indra and Agni! Svāhā! (b) Harmonious...... (etc. as above up to 'modes', and then) harmonious with the Viśvedevas! svāhā! (c) Harmonious etc. (as above, and then) harmonious with Heaven and Earth! svāhā!

Context: This is the ceremony of Āgrayaṅa in which the first fruits of the harvest are consecrated before being partaken of. This is a Śrauta, rite also and is described as such in the ĀS. II. 9. I agree with Nārāyaṇa's view (p. 203, Oldenberg) that it is described here i.e. in a Gṛhya Sūtra for an Āhitāṅga who is unable to perform it in its fuller form in the ĀS., where it is prescribed at the time of the new harvest of every season.

Sources: The formulas are found in TS. 4.3.4.3 where they accompany the depositing of the 'ṛtavyā' bricks (a name derived from the formulas themselves beginning as they do with 'Sajūr ṛtubhiḥ') in the Agnicayana cere-
mony. VS. 14. 7 seqq. has the same formulas in the same context; only the bricks here are called the 'Vaiśvadevi' bricks [a name derived from 'Vaiśvēbhyaḥ' the words of the mantra part (b)]. SB. 8.2.2.8 comments on this VS.-passage. They are also found in ĀPS. 17.1.3 and KŚ. 17.8.18 etc.

ĀG. II. 3.3 : Nivēṣānam puṇar navikṛyā lepanā-staraṇopastaraṇāīr, astamite pāyasasya juhuyur : (a) "Apa śveta padā jahi (b) pūrveṇa cāpāreṇa ca | (c) sapta ca vārṇīr imāḥ, (d) sarvāśca rājañāhāvī śvāhā || (e) na va śvetaścābhyaśāre 'sir jaghāna kiśaca | (f) śvetāya vaidārvāya namah śvāhā" iti |

Trans : (In the ceremony of Pratyavaraṇaḥ) having again renovated the house by coating (the walls), spreading (the roof) and levelling (the floor), they should after sunset, sacrifice oblations of milk-rice with the mantras:— (a) “Strike off, O White One! (b) with thy fore-foot and hind-foot, (c) these seven (prajās i.e. sevenfold progeny) of Varuṇa and (d) the entire kingly fraternity. (e) In the vicinity of the White One (I read ‘śvetasyābhyaśācāre’—an emendation discussed below), the Serpent has killed none. (f) To the White One, the Vaidārva, adoration! Śvāhā!"

Sources : Prof. STENZLER (p. 69) draws attention to AV. 10. 4. 3. which has (a) and (b) with ‘ava’ for our ‘apa’. He and Prof. OLDENBERG (p. 204) compare PG. II. 14. 5 and ŚG. IV. 18. 1. Similar verses, it may be added, occur in MG. 2. 7. 1; ĀPMB. 2. 17. 26 and HG. 2.16.18.

Meaning of the Mantras :

‘Śveta’? As regards the meaning of ‘Śveta’, Prof. STENZLER on PG. II. 14. 4 and 5 (p. 70) says that Dr. HILLEBRANDT drew his attention to the ‘White Horse’ in the RV., dealing death to the serpents, which the Aśvins gave to Pedu and that this meaning suits the second pāda well. This may be accepted but why the metaphor of the ‘White Horse’? The explanation, in my opinion, is found in RV. V. 1. 44: ‘Śveto vājī jāyate agrahānām’ | = The white Horse (evidently the sun) is born at the beginning of the days. The Aśvamedha-context of ‘Śvetāya Śvāhā’ in TS. 7.3.18 and TB. 3.8.17.4 makes it certain that ‘śveta’ is ‘the White Horse’ and the Dictionary (MONIER WILLIAMS) explains ‘śveta vaidārea’ occurring in our clause (f) as a deity connected with the sun’. This double implication of ‘Śveta’ meaning ‘White Horse’ and also ‘a solar deity’ gives excellent sense to our clause (b) as the fore-foot and hind-foot of the ‘White Horse’ would then represent the eastern and western strides of the Sun.

The corrupt reading in (e) : The reading ‘Śvetaścābhyaśācāre’ in (e) does not make good sense; so Prof. OLDENBERG proposes (p. 204) that it should be ‘śvetasyādbhyaśācāre’ in conformity with PG. II. 4. 5a but this is too great a change to admit of the possibility of the emendation being the original of which the existing reading may have been a corruption. I propose that it should be read as ‘Śvetasyādbhyaśācāre’ which is the reading of MG. 2. 7. 1a. Besides it is not improbable that the letter ‘svā’ should have been corrupted into the present ‘scā’. HG. 2.16.8a also has ‘Śvetasyādbhyaśācāreṇa’.
Sapta Varuṇih? I cannot understand why Prof. Oldenberg translates this phrase as "the Seven daughters of Varuṇa"! The parallel passages in H.G.P.G. and ÆPMB. make it almost certain that 'Prajā' is to be understood after the phrase giving the meaning: 'the seven-fold progeny of Varuṇa'. The serpents are so-called because, in my opinion, Varuṇa is the lord of the waters and the waters of the rainy season bring out the serpents. That 'Rāja-bāndhavī' denotes the fraternity of King Varuṇa is clear from ÆG. II. 9.5: 'aitu Rājā varuṇo revatibhiḥ'.

ÆG. II. 3. 5: "Abhayara naḥ prajāpatyebhyo bhūyat" ityagnimikṣamāno japati |

Trans. While looking at the fire, he mutters "May there be safety to us from the progeny of Prajāpati".

Sources: A sūtra text, MG. 2. 7. 1 alone has this mantra with 'svāhā' at the end.

ÆG. II. 3. 6: 'Śivo naḥ sumanā bhava' iti hemantam manasā dhyāyat |

Trans. He should meditate in his mind on the Hemanta (the winter-season beginning with the month of Mārgaśīrṣa, in which this ceremony is performed) repeating the mantra "Gracious to us, well-disposed be thou".

Sources: The formula is found in TS. 4. 5. 1. 4ª and VS. 16. 51ª as one of the prayers addressed to Rudra in the Šatarudrīya hymn. In our text: IV. 8. 27-28, the serpents are associated with 'Rudra' and naturally therefore a prayer to Rudra has been employed in a ceremony which signifies the end of the period of danger from snakes.

(To be continued.)
THE LATE MR. JOGENDRA CHANDRA GHOSE

By

N. C. GHOSE, Calcutta.

BABU JOGENDRA CHANDRA GHOSE, second son of late Babu Ananda Chandra Ghose, was born at Baisari, a village in Bakhargunge in the year 1872. His education began at his own house in vernacular and having completed it he joined Brojamohan Institution at Barisal, where his youthful mind came to be licked into shape by the benign influence of renowned educationists like Babu Aswini Kumar Dutt and Jagadish Ch. Mukerjee who always took care to lay the real foundation of true character amongst the pupils by their own example of saintliness, love of duty and orderly habits. From this institution later he came to Calcutta and joined the B.A. class of the St. Xavier's College; he had however to give up studies and seek employment. During his college days he displayed an extraordinary bent for mathematics and without graduating himself, he successfully coached many students appearing for B.A. and M.A. in higher mathematics.

After leaving the college he married, and secured a clerkship in the office of I. G. P. in Bengal. The death of his father and his elder brother who were both in the Government employ, at this stage, threw the burden of maintaining a joint family upon him. With his small pay, he found it very hard, but took courage and improved his income by taking up insurance agencies and such other sundry works. His fellow clerks liked him very much for his honesty, integrity and independence of character.

His married life was very short. Two years after his marriage a son was born to him and when the child was only two years old, his wife died. He never married again though repeatedly requested to do so by relations, friends and well-wishers.

After some years of intense struggle he got some relief when his youngest brother joined the Bar and ultimately got employed in the Bengal judicial service.

His spirit of justice and independence was very high, and it may be mentioned that he twice tendered his resignation when his just claims to higher grades were overlooked, although he knew full well what this resignation meant for himself and for those whom he dearly loved.

* His many valuable contributions towards historical research were published from time to time in many important journals of history both in India and abroad, such as The Journal of the Bihar & Orissa Research Society, Indian Culture, The Indian Historical Quarterly, The Indian Antiquary, The Journal of the Asiatic Society of Bengal, etc.
In connection with his service he had to go to many places of Bengal and Bihar and wherever he went he utilised his off-time by gathering useful historical information about those places. His bent for antiquarian researches thus peeped through his days of bondage.

When he was transferred to Barisal, his intense desire for doing something for public utility showed itself in the establishment of a Co-operative Bank for the good of the ministerial officers in the district who often found themselves handicapped in securing loans when they were most needed. He devised the scheme, started the Bank and was himself its founder-Secretary. He had to put forth a tremendous amount of labour for securing deposits, to constitute the capital of the Bank, and be it said to his credit that the Bank is now established on a sound financial basis and can be said to be the premier Bank of the district. When this venture came to a success, he turned his attention to the welfare of the general public and laid the foundation of another Bank to accommodate the public with loans to be repaid by easy instalments. He even sunk some of his slender private resources for its capital and begged from door to door for deposits and raised the working capital to Rs. 40,000/- in three months. This was a labour of love but the success it attained was its reward.

During his stay at Barisal he also directed his energy to find out the genealogical tree of his family and picked up the genealogical trees of almost all the well-known Kayastha families of the district from the Ghataks and other sources.

He ransacked Government records and procured all possible information for the compilation of a complete history of the pargona of Selimabad (not yet published) of which, he had the satisfaction to discover, one of his renowned ancestors was the one time overlord.

The idea of writing out a general genealogical table of all the renowned Kayastha families of Bengal was finally given up as he found his friend Babu Bisheswar Roy Chowdhury of Idilpur engaged in the same work.

After his premature retirement—due mainly to his sense of injustice done to him, he became master of his own time and was able to devote his whole time, energy and devotion towards his favourite pastime, viz. the historical researches. His first excursion into this realm was at the controversial point of the origin and places of the Kayasthas of Bengal and he traced the original source to the Nagar Brahmins of Gujarat. In this connection he came in contact with Dr. D. R. Bhandarkar, the renowned scholar and like the great connoisseur that he is, the doctor found out the genius that lay hidden in an ex-clerk of the Bengal Secretariat. The two worked together in collaboration as friends in various researches the result of which has filled the pages of the historical records. They remained friends to the last and Dr. Bhandarkar still sincerely mourns the loss of his friend's extraordinary capacity for research. During this period of useful work he came to be intimately known to many other workers in this line such as Prachyavidya-
maharnava Nagendra Nath Bose, Dr. N. L. Law, Pandit Amulya Bidyanathusan, Khan Bahadur Abdul Ali Khan and other learned professors of Calcutta and other Universities throughout India in the department of history. This intimacy ripened in many instances into mutual regard and genuine friendship.

Besides the origin of the Bengal Kayasthas the spirit of research led him to other discoveries which not only found appreciable recognition from learned circles but also secured for him the title of Puratattva Vicaksana.

Some of his famous articles of later days are:—

(i) His learned discourse on the theory of (Devi Ekan gashi) recognized and rewarded by the Government of Bengal, (ii). He ably controverted the theory of Aśvamedha Yajña (iii) Antiquity of Gaya (Journal of the Bihar & Orissa Research Society Vol. XXIV Part iii, Sept. 1938) (iv) His last article written in Bengali created a sensation amongst the learned scholars of Bengal. He brought into his researches an analytical mind, a deeply critical and persevering brain and a complete mastery of details and strange to say an infirm body and sickly health were no hindrance to the spirit that always roved about for things anew. These qualities and above all his affable personality illuminated by lustrous erudition made him loved and respected by those whom he came across.

He left behind him two brothers Babus Dinesh Ch. Ghose and Woopendra Chandra Ghose (Rai Bahadur) and one son—(Dr. Narendra Ghose) to mourn his loss and a host of admiring friends and relatives to revere his memory.
MISCELLANEA

DR. SALETORE AND THE AUTHENTICITY OF MUDHOL FARMANS

In a previous issue of the New Indian Antiquary (vol. II. No. I; pp. 6-24), Dr. B. A. SALETORE has published an article concerning the Mudhol farmans, in which, after criticizing those farmans published by Dr. BALKRISHNA in his Shivaji the Great (vol. I, part I) and Mr. D. V. APTE in his मुढोळ संस्थानच्या धोरणदी धरा-णाचा इतिहास (Appendix A), and after quoting the remarks passed by Sir Jadunath SARKAR on the spurious nature of Marathi documents and farmans, found in Maha-rastra, he has questioned the authenticity of the farmans; nay, he has even tried to impress upon the minds of readers that the farmans are mere forgeries.

The other side of the issues raised by Dr. SALETORE ought to be put forth by Dr. BALKRISHNA and Mr. D. V. APTE. It is better if they do so and I hope they will do it in the near future. But as the editing of the farmans in question, published in Mr. APTE’s book, has been done by me, I think I am entitled to examine Dr. SALETORE’s criticism. Without waiting, therefore, for the reply by the two distinguished scholars, I place before the readers the result of my examination of Dr. SALETORE’s views concerning the Mudhol farmans.

Before considering, however, the farmans individually, I wish to bring to the notice of readers some facts of a general nature regarding the farmans and the material for the history of the Bahmani and ‘Adilshahi dynasties to which the farmans pertain. (1) Only photographic copies of the farmans were handed over to me from which I edited them. I did not get the advantage of examining the originals. Both the internal and external examinations of a document are equally necessary for the determination of its authenticity. (2) I am not responsible for the English translations printed in the book as they were handed over to me with the instruction that the same might be inserted in the book without any material changes. (3) I found some discrepancies in the farmans which I have noticed in the notes. (4) Dr. SALETORE in his article has dealt with the farmans No. 1-9, from Mr. APTE’s book; all, but the last, of which pertain to the Bahmani period. Dr. SALETORE after comparing the contents of these farmans with the narrative of Firishta (F.) and after finding that they cannot be reconciled to F.’s account, arrives at the conclusion that the farmans are not reliable. But here, I think, Dr. SALETORE is mistaken. Firstly, he has relied, for the meaning of the farmans, on the summaries or versions given by Dr. BALKRISHNA and Mr. APTE. But it is possible that both may have been in the wrong. A research scholar ought not to rely on translations and versions of a document, especially when he has to raise grave objections against it. He must study the document in the original. Then alone there is the possibility of his arriving at the truth. I am very sorry to note that Dr. SALETORE has not followed this method and consequently has committed very palpable mistakes. Secondly, Firishta is not the only Persian source for the period of the farmans as Dr. SALETORE seems to assume. There are the Burhan-i-ma’athir (BM.) of Tabataba, Tajikratul-muluk of Shihazi, Sirajul-kalub etc. The narrative given in BM. is found in many places to be superior to and more faithful than that of F. That F. could not even give a faithful pedigree of the Bahmani sultans has been proved by the contemporary coins and the narrative in BM. Is Dr. SALETORE ready and willing to rely, as the only source for the Bahmani dynasty, on F.’s narrative and denounce all others? That he is not, as far as contemporary
inscriptions are concerned, can be easily gathered from this very article of his. Then
is it logical to suppose that the Mudhol farnans which bear seals and Tughras i.e.
farnans, the contemporaneity and authenticity of which cannot be questioned as
far as the external evidence is concerned, are forgeries, because they are not con-
sistent with the account of F.? Especially when we know that F. is full of
inaccuracies and inconsistencies? Moreover as the critical examination of individual
farnans, which follows, will show, the information supplied by the farnans is
not so much inconsistent with the narrative of F. as the Dr. supposes. If the con-
temporary documents are to be condemned as unauthentic they ought to be com-
pared with contemporary documents, the genuineness of which is beyond doubt.
Is it logical to compare them with a narrative composed some two hundred
years after the events had actually happened? (5) Dr. Saletoe seems to
think that the event serving as the cause of some inam, when referred to in a
farnan, ought to take place in the same year in which the farnan is issued. But
this is quite an untenable supposition. Even under the well-organised British
regime, inams for bravery shown in the last great war were granted years after the
treaty was signed. Why should we then be astonished if the issue of farnans
of grants was delayed for a year or two in old Muhammadan courts? The above
statement can be easily substantiated from Bijapur farnans and Marathi sanads.
Why should we expect a different situation under the Bahmani rule?
With these general remarks on some of the very queer assumptions of Dr.
Saletoe, I now propose to examine his criticism of the farnans individually.

(1) Farnan Dated 1352 A.D.

Both Dr. Balkrishna and Mr. Apte have given their versions of this farnan.
But as the information in the farnan, presumes Dr. Saletoe, is in contradiction
with F. and Vijayanagar inscriptions, it cannot be reliable. But Dr. Saletoe seems
not to have studied the farnan in the original. It clearly states that Dilipasinh]{
was given an inam in consideration of his self-sacrifice. The details of the sacrifice,
however, have unfortunately disappeared owing to the lacunae in the document.
Mr. Apte has assumed on the evidence of the Bakhar which he has incorporated in
his volume, that Dilipasinh] was sent to Karnatka about 752 H.3 and was re-
warded for some act of his bravery there. Dr. Balkrishna further took Karnatka
to mean Vijayanagara and conjectured that Dilipasinh showed his bravery in a
battle with a Vijayanagara king.2 But as remarked above, the text of the farnan
mentions neither Karnatka nor Vijayanagara. All the same be it noted here
that both F. and BM. refer to the Karnatka expedition of Alau'd-din Hasan Gangi
Bahmani and Dr. Saletoe does not seem to question the date of this expedition
which F. puts in either 752/1351 or 753/1352. Then where lies the propriety of
Dr. Saletoe's criticism, especially when we know that the farnan is dated in
753 H.?

(2) Farnan Dated 1398 A.D.

Before examining Dr. Saletoe's views on this document it is convenient to
give the gist of the farnan here. It is dated in 800 H. Rabi II 25/15-1-1938 A.D.
and was issued by Firuzshah Bahmani. Firuz finding that there was misgovernment
due to the short-sightedness of some Amirs and the tender age of the reigning sultan
[conceived of getting the throne for himself and with that object in mind] went to
Sagar. Siddhaji, the thanadar of that place received him warmly. Firuz, with
the help of Siddhaji and other adherents, fought a battle with the army of the
reigning sultan at some place in which the latter with his son showed much bravery,
but was unfortunately killed. Some time after this battle Firūz succeeded to the throne.

F. gives nearly the same account but with a slight variation. For instance, according to Briggs, F. calls the thanadar of Sāgar Suddoo, a slave of the royal family and does not mention of his death in the battle of Merkole fought before Firūz gained the throne.

Now Dr. Saletore raises the following points in connection with this farman.

(1) If Siddhaji died, according to Dr. Balkrishna, in 798/1388, how could he have helped Firūz in 1397 in his struggle for the throne?

(2) Siddhaji cannot be identified with Suddoo who may have been one of the many Abyssinian slaves at the court of the Bahmani ruler.

(3) Had he helped Firūz, F would have certainly mentioned him along with Mir Faizullah Anjū, Mullā Issac Surhindī, Mir Shamsu’d-din Muhammad Anjū and Ahmadkhān Amīru’l-umārī who helped Firūz on his accession to the throne.

(4) In 1397, the date of the farman there was no misgovernment due to the short-sightedness of the Amir but only the rebellion of Firūzkhaṇ.

I regret to note, in connection with these points, that Dr. Saletore has committed blunders and had there been any layman in Dr. Saletore’s place, I would not have cared to answer these points. But in the present case I feel I must show the mistakes and I do it here very reluctantly.

(1) Had Dr. S. instead of believing in Dr. Balkrishna’s conversion of the Hijra year, referred to some ephemeries, he would have found that 798 H. corresponds to 1395/1396 A.D. Moreover neither the farman nor the bakhar nor F mentions this date of Siddhaji’s death. On the other hand both the farman and F. explicitly narrate that Siddhaji or Suddoo was alive till at least the battle of Merkole. Siddhaji or Suddoo must have, therefore, died only a short time before Firūz’s accession to the throne which took place by the end of 1397 A.D.

(2) I do not understand how Dr. S. calls Suddoo an Abyssinian slave. In Persian mass. diacritical marks are generally omitted and the name Suddoo (Saddū) can easily be read as Siddū. The Nawal Kishore edition of F. gives the reading Siddū instead of Siddū and Siddū is quite a common corruption of names beginning with Siddha among Marāṭhī speaking people. Thus there is no difficulty in identifying Suddoo of Briggs’ F. with Siddhaji of the farman. The Nawal Kishore edition of F. describes Siddū as ‘Az ghulāmān-i-ān khāndān’ which has been, it seems, translated by Briggs by the phrase ‘a slave of the royal family.’ But “slave” is not the only meaning of ‘ghulām.’ Any Persian dictionary will give the word ‘servant’ as a synonym of ‘ghulām’ and there are a number of Persian and Marāṭhī documents and seals in which the word is actually used in that sense. It is not, therefore, so easy to make Suddoo of Briggs’ F. an Abyssinian slave as Dr. S. has done.

(3) The farman clearly states that Siddhaji died before Firūz could succeed in his object of getting the throne. F’s statements are not inconsistent with those of the farman. How can we, then, expect F. to mention the services rendered by Siddhaji to Firūz after the latter’s accession to the throne, and to refer to him along with others.

(4) Had Dr. Saletore borne well in mind the date of the farman, he would not have dared to make the bold statement in 4. The farman was issued on 15/1/1398 A.D. i.e. some two months after Firūz ascended the throne. Could Firūz have named his own doings a rebellion and his antagonist’s rule good govern-

ment in a farman issued by himself? I must plainly assert that what has been said by Dr. Saelore about this farman is all illogical.

(3) FARMAN DATED 1424 A.D.

The farman bears the Tughra of Ahmadshah bin Ahmad Bahmani and after referring to the service rendered by Siddhaji and Bhairavasingh and bravery shown by Ugrasena in the war with Vijayanagar, reaffirms the hereditary grant of inam to Ugrasena. Dr. Balkrishna attributes the issue of this farman to Ugrasena’s saving the life of Ali-ud-din Ahmadshah Bahmani when the latter was surprised by a detachment of the Vijayanagar king in a hunting expedition.

Now Dr. S. quotes the contents of this very farman in his article and states that there is no mention of a hunting expedition in the farman. But ignoring this as well as the fact that the farman bears the tughra of Ahmadshah bin Ahmad Bahmani and its date falls in Ahmadshah’s reign, goes on criticizing Dr. Balkrishna’s attribution of the issue of this farman. He brings in the evidence of F. to prove that the date of the farman falls in the reign of Ahmadshah Walji Bahmani and not in that of Ali-ud-dinshah Bahmani, that no hunting expedition worthy of special note was undertaken by Ali-ud-dinshah Bahmani, and that there was a war between this sultan and the Vijayanagar king Devaraya II in 1443 A.D.; and finally questions as to how the Mudhol farman can be relied upon for the details relating to the war with Vijayanagar in 1424 A.D. But where is the room for all these baseless and contradictory speculations? As the farman is dated in 1424 A.D. and as it, instead of mentioning a hunting expedition, refers to a war with Vijayanagar you are only to see whether there was a war going on between the two powers in 1424 A.D. or a short time before 1424 A.D. By referring to F. one can easily assure oneself that there was such a war which ought to be assigned the date 1423 A.D.

(4) FARMAN DATED 1454 A.D.

Here again Dr. S. has confounded the interpretation with the contents of the farman. The farman makes no mention of either the Sirke chief or the chief of Khelna. It only refers to a battle fought in the Konkan in which Ugrasena, an ancestor of the Ghorpade chief of Mudhol was taken a captive. Dr. S. admits that the version given by Mr. Apte is different from that given by Dr. Balkrishna; but then asks ‘which of these scholars shall we believe?’ Why should he ask such a question? If he had found the versions given by the two scholars in contradiction to each other, it was his duty to verify the statements in both the versions from the original and find out the truth. But instead of doing that, he has unnecessarily believed in the version of some one and brought in the evidence of F. and Grant Duff to prove that Sirke chief was different from the chief Khelna as against Dr. B.’s identity of the two chiefs. But where was the necessity of either identifying or differentiating between the two chiefs? As they are not mentioned in the farman, neither their identity, nor their differentiation would affect the genuineness of the farman. He ought to have proved that there was no battle fought in the Konkan about the date of the farman. But that is an impossible task. By the by let me tell the readers that Dr. S. seems to be quite ignorant of the fact that Sirke is a Maratha family name and not a place name. Otherwise he would not have used the phrases ‘the chief of Sirka (Sirke),’ ‘the Raja of Sirke,’ and ‘the ruler of Sirke’ which betray his perfect ignorance about the above fact.

(5) FARMAN DATED 1471 A.D.

Dr. S.’s main contention about this farman seems to be that as F. does not record the information supplied by the farman, one fails to see how the statements
in the farman can ever be accepted as historically valid. But let me bring to the notice of readers that BM, records about the campaign, referred to in the farman, such details as are not to be found in F. and letters of Mahmúd Gáwán, the gists of which have been published recently, supply still more details which are to be traced neither in F. nor in BM. Does Dr. S. know this? Whom will he then discard as untrue, either F. or BM. or the letters of Mahmúd Gáwán? If he cannot reject any of the three sources why should he reject this farman which supplies still some more information?

(6) FARMAN DATED 1522 A.D.

This farman which is dated in 1522 A.D. refers along with others to an episode in the life of Ismáíl 'Adílsháh in which he, while leading an expedition against Tim-ráj, the ruler of Vijayanagar had to fight a pitched battle on the bank of the Kri-shna. In it Ismáíl was hemmed in and could not cross the river. At this juncture Máloji Ghórpáde, the son of Kheloji, came forward and at the risk of his own life, brought him out of the danger safely. In recognition of this service Máloji was exempted from Kurnisat.

Now Dr. S.'s main objections against this farman are (1) that the other events mentioned in the farman do not fit in with the accounts already known, (2) that Kheloji and Máloji of this farman should be identified with their name-sakes from the Bhusale family who lived only a century later (3) and that Máloji Ghórpáde does not figure in the account given by Firírshta about the calamity which befell Ismáíl 'Adílsháh.

About the first point let me note that the other events mentioned in the farman are indeed referred to by F. and in the same order as the farman does. The only difference between the two is of some details and personal names. But unless we prove the farman to be spurious by some independent evidence, how can we accept the one source and discard the other?

On the second point I may be permitted to state that Dr. S.'s arguments are simply misleading. The farman clearly surnames Kheloji, and his son Máloji as Ghórpáde and gives their title as Bahádur. As the farman is dated in 1522 A.D. and its seal as well as language clearly show that it belongs to the 'Adílsháhi sultans, Ismáíl Adílsháh who was then reigning must be reckoned as their protege. Now those Kheloji and Máloji with whom Dr. S. identifies these Kheloji and his son Máloji Ghórpáde are surnamed Bhusale; they were not father and son but perhaps cousins; moreover they served, as a rule, the Nizámsháhi sultans and occasionally sided with the Mughal emperor Sháhjahán; besides they lived in about 1630 and not in 1522, the date of the farman. It is, therefore simply misleading to identify the Ghórpáde pair of Kheloji and Máloji with the Bhusale pair and question the contemporaneity and the authenticity of the farman.

About the third point suffice it to say that it is not proper to discard the farman only because it cannot be reconciled to F. I need not go into the details of this point as it has been already dealt with.

Thus it will be seen that Dr. SALETORÉ has not studied the farmans in the original, has unnecessarily believed in the versions given by others, has discarded better versions, has not cared to study and digest the existing material bearing on the subject, has given undue importance to Firírshta and neglected other better sources and finally has drawn hasty conclusions based on the imperfect knowledge of the material.

Poona.

G. H. KHARE

REFERENCE TO NASIR SHAH KHALJI IN A CONTEMPORARY MS.

The Oriental Manuscripts Library (Prācya-Grantha-Sahagraha) of Ujjain (Gwalior) has recently procured a 431 year old MS (Accession No. 5768) of the Viṣṇupurāṇa. The MS is complete and covers 136 folios of country paper of the size 11 x 5 inches written in dark-black ink in Devanāgarī characters. The scribe’s concluding colophon bears some historical interest and reads as follows:—

Folio 136° “………दिनदी भगवानोष्णुपां
हरिर्पदानमार्दिकों स सिद्धि || ४ ॥

इतिहासिक्षुपार्वे पदेश्वरमोधायः || ५ ॥ समाधार्वे प्रेस्तः || एवं समान सिद्धुपुराणं

दुर्भें मभनु || श्रीरम ||

विषमभनु सर्वधर्मः प (८४) हितिनिर्तं भवयं भूतणयः ॥
दोषः प्रमानं नायं सर्वधर्मः जनः शुभो भवयः ॥ ४ ॥

देवो मालाके नवीरस्त्रपते राज्ये जगीकसमिदेः
व्रतसाध्य समीपवलिनी के श्रीराजपीरे नुः ॥

श्रीमानः किल चाहमणकुलः श्रीजोगदेवतामजः
राज्ये तस्य मनोरमे विकुलस्त्राणे प्रजापूरिते ॥

शाके चंद्रगुणाविनिघ्न १४२१ परिमिते संवत्तः त्वीर्तरे
यम्ये हन्तमि वारसाधसमथे माते नामविशिशिते ॥

पशो क्रियते तिवी रविदे ने ...... श्रीतपी
कर्मये लक्षयति सम पुरुषकिंद्रे रामेश्वरः: ‘चंद्रित: ||

श्रीमिरापुरकारः परोपक्षतैलोमुः ॥
श्रीमयहिताच्छायुः: परम (ठार) मिळुः: ॥

अन्नमानवाद्रश का प्रमादन—
बलिबन्धुनर लिखित प्रभाव ॥

तसर्वभन्द: परिश्रवनायवं
श्रायण सुबंधय धि ये लिखितं || श्री: || ४ ॥”

Thus the MS was copied at a village called Jagisā by a Dāsapura Brahmana named Rāmesvara-Pandita who was son of one Reḍa-Pandita and describes himself as extremely pious and benevolent. The village Jagisā is described as lying in the province of Malwa of which a king named Nasira was then the paramount sovereign and as belonging to the territories, charming, thickly-populated and thronging with the families of the twice-born, of a (feudatory) Cāhamāna (i.e. Chauhan) chief who was named Śri-Bhānu, was son of one Śri-Jagadeva and had his headquarters in a town or major village called Śri-Rājapurā (i.e. Śri-Rājapur) in the vicinity of the village Jagisā. The date on which the scribe completed the MS was Sunday the 11th day of the dark fortnight of the month of Bhādrapada in the year 1431 of the Śālavahana era, i.e. about the close of September 1509 A.C. Other minor details, too, of the date are noted.

1. These Gujarati Nāgara Brahmanas derive their clan-name from the town of Dāsapura or Mandasaur in Malwa and are commonly known as Dasore Brahmanas. They are found scattered all over Malwa and belong mostly to White Yajurveda and in some cases to Rgveda.
The contemporary paramount sovereign Nasīra mentioned in the colophon is undoubtedly identical with king Nasiruddin or Nasir Shah, the 3rd Khalji Sultan of Malwa, who ruled from his capital Mandu between 1500 and 1510 A.C.² and is said to have erected³ a number of fine buildings in Malwa, among them being also the Kaliadeh Water Palace⁴ on the banks of Sipra near Ujjain.

This reference to king Nasir Shah is important as coming from the pen of a contemporary Hindu Pandit. Although it does not convey any fresh substantial detail regarding the Sultan, it possibly does not fail to warrant the conclusion that he was held in high esteem by contemporary Sanskrit scholars. We are accustomed to read in the accounts of Mahomedan historians that Nasir Shah was a miserable sensualist, a brutal tyrant and a drunkard to the extreme. Still, all the same, his relations with contemporary Sanskrit scholars appear to be quite cordial and friendly. Had it not been the case, our scribe would possibly have avoided any reference to the Sultan.

By the way, here it may be pointed out that there has already been discovered⁵ at least one Sanskrit work that is specifically attributed to this Nasir Shah. This fact not only substantially seconds the above-stated hypothesis but takes us still further to learn that the Sultan actually extended his liberal patronage to Sanskrit authors who, on their turn, were ready to attribute their own compositions to the Sultan.

I have not yet been able to identify the Chauhan chief Śri-Bhānu and the two places Jagīśa and Śri-Rājapura mentioned in the colophon. As a matter of fact, at present it often becomes very difficult to identify small places of Malwa in old references, as the old province has since been split up into numerous patches, big or small, now scattered over the intermingled territories of the Maharajas of Gwalior, Indore, Dhar, Dewas and several other states. Further, it is also not very clear whether the scribe designates Śri-Rājapura as a town or only as a flourishing village. Even if the place were a town, it cannot be identified with Rājpur, a prominent pargana town of Barwani State in Malwa, as the same has been under the rule of a branch of the Sesodia Rajputs at least from the fourteenth century A.C.⁶ Again, it cannot be identical with Rājpur, the capital town of Alirajpur State in Malwa, as the same has been held since 1437 A.C. by the line of the present rulers who claim to be Rathors and not Chauhans⁷. In case, however, the place under reference is meant to be designated only as a major village, we can with fair justification identify it with the headquarters of Kheri-Rājapur, a small estate in Malwa, which has been recorded as held to this day by Chauhan Rajputs.⁸

Ujjain

SADASHIVA L. KĀTRE

---

3. G. YAZDANI: Mandū The City of Joy, pp. 25, 93, etc.
INSCRIPTIONS OF KATHIAWAD

By

D. B. DISKALKAR

UNA

No. 91

v.s. 1582.

[18-7-1526.

Unā is the chief town of a Mahāl of the same name in Junagadh State. The subjoined inscription is fixed in the eastern dam of the big tank there. It measures, 2′-5″ by 1′-4″. It is in a good state of preservation. Being carefully engraved there are few grammatical mistakes in it.

At the beginning of the inscription the following deities are praised. Brahmā, Viṣṇu, Śiva, Gaṇapati, Indra and other Dīkpaḷas, Sūrya and other Grahas and Pārvatī. Then it mentions that in old times the sage Vālmikī founded, in Valabhīpur, a Kāyaṣṭha family. In that family which was famous for learning, statesmanship, charity, specially in penmanship and was respected by the kings, was born a minister named Narasimhavara, who was devoted to Viṣṇu. His son was the minister Sevā, and the latter's son was the minister Maṭā.

The inscription then gives an account of another Kāyaṣṭha family of equal fame. In it there was a minister named Vījā. His son was Vaśya-raja. The latter had a daughter named Kiṅgī. She was married to the minister Maṭā named above. The couple had a son named Patā.

Patā was made Kāṛbhāri by Ayāz, the Subā over Saurāṣṭra, of the Sultan Mahammad of Ahmedabad. Patā was also given a title 'Māfār-Malik' (Muzfar Malek) and a pākkhi by the Sultan.

This Patā caused a big tank to be made in Unнатаdurg (i.e. Unā) on Wednesday, the 8th of the bright half of Śrāvaṇa in v.s. 1582.

In the concluding portion of the inscription the names of the three wives of Patā, named Lalimā, Dāi, and Haribāi, are given as also the name of the Nāgar Somanātha, son of Kṛṣṇadās, who composed the praśasti and of the engraver Rātnā son of Māhāva.

The easy flow of the language full of alliterations shows that the author of the Praśasti viz. Nāgar Somanātha, son of Kṛṣṇadāsa, was a learned and gifted poet.

Text

1 ॥ अः ्नम्: श्रीगणेशाय ॥ कल्याणं कमलासनं: सुजस्वं व: कः
2 श्रवणं केतेन। गौरीश: बल गौरवं गणपतिनिः सोपिविप्रशं ॥ सवां
3 रातिविनाशाय ककुमामीशाः: हुरशादय:। कुवेदं शुभामिदिरपय
4 मधिकं सुगृदं: श्रेष्ठ:। पति: सतीलविदिगृहीताति ॥ श्रीत: स्वेदहा

* Continued from p. 127 of Vol. III. June 1940.
DHRASANAVEL

No. 92] V.S. 1582.

This inscription is copied from a \textit{Pali} standing near the old temple of Siva, called \textit{Magaderu}, to the east of the village Dhrasanal near Dwarka in the Okhama\-nch\-\-td pr\-nt, in the possession of the Maharaja Gaikwad of Baroda.

1. Drop the line. Such unnecessary strokes are many times given in the record.
It records the death in Dhrāsanavel of Śrī Dharanasesa in a fight while protecting the cows on Sunday, the fifth of the bright half of Bhāḍrapada in v.s. 1582 or (S. 1448).

The epithet Śrī preceding the name Dharanasesa, shows that the deceased was not an ordinary man but was probably a Vādhela or a Vāgherachieftain.

**Text.**

1 संवत 1582 वर्षे शा
2 के 1448 तिथिमाने द
3 बुधग्यो भादपद
4 मासे चौथे पक्षे पंच
5 म्ह्यां विष्णू तरी भौम्बोर
6 जप्सेन संभाषाने...
7 वि ज गापनी...
8 मरण द्रासणविष

**HALVAD**


This inscription is found in a well near the temple of Saranvesvara Mahādeva adjoining the tank in the town Halvad in Dhrangdhra State.

The inscription is important for the genealogy of the family of the Zālā rulers of Dhrangdhra State. It mentions that Zālā is one of the 36 royal (Kṣatriya) families and gives the following genealogy.

Rana Raṇamal = Laliāde
Rana Śatruśalya = Minalade
Rana Jitā = Jitāde
Rana Raṇavāra = Lilade
Rana Bhīma = Primalade
Rana Vāgha = Nīnāde
Rana Rājadhar = Ahikarađe
Rana Rāniga = Kalyānas
Maharana Mānasirihā

The queen Kalyāṇade, mother of Mahāraṇā Mānasimha, was, it is further told, the daughter of Mahāraṇā Sārangde of the Vāghelā family by his wife Virāde. For the benefit of all creatures Kalyāṇade caused a well to be dug up during the time of her son Mahāraṇā Mānasihā on Thursday, the 13th of the dark half of Phālguna in v.s. or S. 1448.

**Text.**

1 || 36 नम्बर धीर्घेनाय नमः धीर्घेय नमः धीर्घेहिमाहिक मुर्मो नमः
2 || भ्यत्रिग्यो संगमलक्षवच्य भीमनपविकर्माः उसिसम्बाहिवं संवत् 1583 वं
3 || वे साके 1448 प्रकालानु सार्थवते विकृतिती फाल्गुनमासी कणापहे 13 वयोद
4 || स्यां लिथीणु सुमारे पेरिद्यान्ये सिद्धांगो व भणे मीनक्षम वहमाने
The following inscription is found in a well at the entrance of the village Velāvdar in Wadhwan State, at a distance of 20 miles from Wadhwan in the north-east direction. It measures 5'8" in length and only 10" in breadth. The letters which are of a big size are very incorrectly engraved. The last line of the record is unintelligible.

It opens with the date, Thursday, the fifth of the bright half of Vaiśākha in v.s. 1584 (Saka 1450) and refers to the reign of the Gujarat Sultan Bahādurshah, and of his feudatory chief Rāpā Mānasānēkaji, evidently of Halvād, the old capital of Dhrangdhrā State. It then seems to record that a woman of Solanki family and resident of Valva caused to be made a well on the abovementioned date.

Text.

1 संवत् 1584 वर्षे साते 1450 व्रतस्तनाये वैशाखमासे शुल्कमं पंचम्यम् बूखास्ते
2 जसरायो तथा राणभीमानसंग बलवर्याय वरेढ हल्कवातव सोळकिकी रण सत रसल
3 सत राव हाना राव पल्ली भाव्य बाई सरसी सत राव चना भाव्य बाई बाई सत
4 बावा भाव्य बाई राव
5 नि सत बेवा पक्की 1 राव वसा राव विरा राव वना राव रावीर बाई बाई बाई

1. The names are quite unintelligible.
2. Curiously enough the र is expressed here by three zeroes as in ancient inscriptions.
SATRUNJAYA HILL, PALITANA

No. 95] v.s. 1587. [7-5-1531.

This inscription is engraved on a black stone slab fixed in the wall of the Ādiśvara temple on the famous Satrunjaya hill near Palitana. It is carefully engraved and is in a good condition. The inscribed portion measures 2'5" by 1'5¾".

This important inscription was formerly published by Dr. BÜHLER in the *Epigraphia Indica* Vol. II, pp. 42 ff.

The record mentions that Bahadur Shah, successor of Muzfar Shah, the successor of Mahamud Shah, was ruling over Gujarat in v.s. 1587. Then is mentioned the name of Majhadkhan i.e. Mujahid Khān Bhikan who, we know, was the Sultan’s viceroy over Sorath. Then the description of the Citrakūṭa hill is given, which was situated in Medapāta i.e. Mewād, where Ratnasirinaha, son of Sangrāmasirinaha, son of Rājamalla, son of Kumbharāja was ruling. Ratnasirinaha’s prime minister was Karmarāj, a detailed account of whose family is next given. He went to the Satrunjaya hill on pilgrimage and there made the seventh restoration and re-built the temple of Punḍarika on the sixth day of the dark half of Vaiśākha in v.s. 1587 or Šaka 1453. For this he had obtained permission of Sultan Bahadur through the good offices of Rava Narasirinaka, the Sultan’s prime minister. The prāṣasti was composed by Pandit Lāvyanasamaya.

It is to be noted that in this record the names of Sikandar and Mahmud II, who ruled for a short time between Muzfar and Bahadur are omitted. The mention of the Mewād kings has added much to the importance of the inscription.

Text.

1 || श्री || स्वप्नित श्रीगौररहरिण्यः पालसाहिष्महिमूडधामभकतार्यायानां पालसाहिष्महिमूडधामभकतार्यायः
2 पालसाहिष्महिमूडधामभकतार्यायाय || संवत् 1587 वर्षं राज्यविपरे पुरस्चर राजामललोकराय 
3 पारे श्रीमानाजयमलियारेण्य श्रीमनकृतवाचारं || देवो द्रव्यांकुश साम्राज्यानं कश्चिৎसुधीनविस्तितं
4 देव जीवालं भुगानिदिननामकः || केतेश्वरशविन्धो विकालकान्तमंडनः || १ श्रीमेदपाटे
5 व्रि मे सुधिविस्तितं || श्रीमनकृतवाचारं विदोषमानसो विराजमानोति समस्तत्वस्याः
6 अविनाश्योपलितवस्याः || जिनबस्तरस्त्राप्रमिभुमिः || २ श्रीमनकृतवाचारं सुधीपलितवस्याः
7 क्रितान्तो स्वभावस्य जोतं जोतानिधिकराः || जिनबस्तरस्त्राप्रमिभुमिः || ३ विकालकान्तविस्तितं
8 भवनाजोत्तुप्रतिप्रमिभुमिः नूपः || वैरियिं समुद्रशी हि वेन पीतः क्षणात विस्तितं || ५

ततुण्डौ राजामानिष्कृतां म
9 इवेवल्ले:। सुना: संगमामल्लोऽस्य संघमाविभाज्यगुप्त:। 6 तत्त्वभूताणि: सिङ्गलस्व-राक्षस।।
10 धुवा रामायणपथम्भ विराज्ये। 7 इत्यं गोपालविग्रही:। श्रीवापासाधितियोऽविदानं।
श्रीरामचरितमिनिः तत्त्वम्
11 पली काध्यम्भुव वयवसाहित्यं। 8 तदुक्षणिन्द्रा [\_] किल राजकेश्वरांगोऽते सुखै-रघुपाने।। श्रीदासबंधे विद्यादे
12 विद्यादे तपस्यावेशी पुराण: प्रसिद्धा:। 9 श्रीसरसदेवनामना तत्त्वेऽपि रामदेवनामाभूतः।
स्नेहपितं: पुरु...तत्त
13 श्री भुवनालालहः। 10 श्रीमोहराजपुजो [चवच? ] रसितम्भ: एव तत्त्वु:। चेताक-तुपो नरसिंहस्तुः
14 [ तो जाते: ]। 11 तत्त्वसहोऽल्ल:। पली तत्त्व:। (स्व) प्रभुक्षुक्षुक्षुका:। तारादेशर
नाना: श्रीलक्ष्मणप्रभु:। 12 तत्त्वसहरित:। श्रीदेवी [\_]।
15 पुजा: कल्याणापारार।। श्रीमी:श्रीमोहराजपुजो।। 13 प्रथमो रत्नाल्पु-चुः। सम्प्रतकोटार:। कामेः।
16 श्रीनिवासकुटना:। तारारो:। श्रीमोहराज:।। कार्तिकः। केन ।। 14 तत्त्वसहित श्रीमलापाल्यवर्षी:। बिस्वदा
सदा। भायो रजनवेशी पुजः। श्रीरामण
17 मांश:। 15 आतांत्व:।। गोष्ठाः।। पतिमका:। दानीवियुगुः।। पद्मापाल्यवेशी:।। पुजी मानी-
कपियाहः।। 16 बंदूराणुः।
18 तीर्थे:। भायो:।। गुरुयांस्वरुः।। बिस्वदा।। गद्वरागराजदेवी:।। पुजो वेदार्थिहों:। हवेय:।। 17
धुरो दशामनामा:। भायो तस्यांत: देवेयुः
19 कपियाः।। देवे\_, रामदेवी: पुजः।। केल्हमितिहों: हवेय:।। 18 आतांत्वो:।। भोजाहुः:।। भायो
तस्यांत: सकलगुण्युः
20 भावधर्मदेवी: पुजः।। श्रीमंड़े:।। जीवायतः।। 19 सदा:। सदाचारत्वभावावाङ्गेवेशी:।। पुजः:।। भावधर्म
21 भगवी:। तेषां:।। जीवायतः:।। सुपुरविमानस्य:।। 20 कमांत्वमायं:।। प्रथमा:।। कपरुदेशी: पुजः
कामले:।। विभाय:।। श्रीभवायी
22 क्रण्वनकोटारः।। कामले:।। पुजः:।। 21 श्रीतीर्थाराजः।। श्रीवरुषायाजन:।। श्रीपुर्वायाजन:।। श्रीमकंकं:।। पुजः
23 विमानाः:।। सर्वेभी:।। श्रुताय:।। ष्टिदा:।। 22 श्रीरामसच्छरावे:।। राजवाल्यापरार्थारः।। श्रीमकंकरिस्थाप:।।
श्रीमराजः
24 व्यवहारीः मले:।। 23 श्रीदासुः।। जयमानीः।। शुल्का:।।।। तस्योऽर्थविभाष्यभाष्यभवास्य:।। चित्तोऽर्थविभाष्यभवाय:।। चित्तोऽर्थविभाष्यं:।। 24 आय।
25 त्य शौरीजे:।। देवे:।। विवेकचार नरायणे:।।।। वस्तु:।। बिवुचोऽपि:।। श्रीवरुषायाजन:।। 25
tस्यांत:।। श्रीभवायी:।। तस्यंगैऽन्त:।।
26 बाध्यारो:।। तत्त्व:।। प्रथम:।। शुद्धांत:।। 26 राजवाल्यापरार्थारः।।।। पुजः:।। श्रीमान्य:।। भवायाजन:।।।। तस्यंगैऽन्त:।।
27 भायेः:।। कपरुदेशी:।। अस्तितव:।। 27 तत्त्व:।। सन्तनपुरुषायाजन:।। श्रीवरुषायाजन:।।।। उदार:।। सर्व-समासों:।। विभाष्यभवाय पुजः।।
28
HAMPAR

No. 96] v. s. 1588 [20-1-1532.

Hampar is a small but old village in the Rājāsitāpur Mahāl of the Dhrāngdhrā State at a distance of six miles to the north of the Rājāsitāpur Railway Station on the Wadhwan-Dhrangdhrā line. To the east of a very large well there is a Śiva temple where the following two inscriptions are found engraved on the lintel of the door. Both of them together measure 22'-10" in length and 6" in breadth.

Both the inscriptions are of the same date and also record the same object viz. the Śiva temple was built by one Jitamāla of the Sōlanki family, on Saturday the 13th of the bright half of Māgha in v. s. 1588 or Śaka 1453 when Mahāmalik Ayajavalli was the viceroy at Hāmpur, evidently of the Gujarat Sultan and Mahārāṇā Mānisāhji was ruling, evidently at Halvad.

Text

(1)  
1 संवत १५८८ वर्ष शाके १४५३ प्रवत्तमाने उत्तरायणे श्रीसृवें
2 ....महामालिक्यादमासासे चल्क्याचे १३ वृद्धोदयां
3 तिथिया शनिवारसे हामपरवातल्य महामलक श्रीआयाज
4 क्षत्रियवराज्ये महाराणा श्रीमानदिहुजीवराज्ये
5 ....व्यापारे क्षत्रियवातिषा परोपकारव सोळे
6 की रात महाजलः झूत रात इंग्या भायां मती झूत रात
7 जितमालेन ईश्वरप्रसाद उद्दिति: ।

(2)  
1 संवत १५८८ वर्ष शाके १४५३ प्रवत्तमाने
2 महामालिक्यादमासासे छा
3 क्षत्रिये १३ वृद्धोदयां त्वथ्या सहिवारसे
4 हामपरवातल्य महामलक श्री
5 अस्तावलः वराज्ये महाराणा
6 श्रीमानदिहुजवराज्ये व्यब १० राजाभी

The rest of the portion is illegible.
NAGICHANĀ

No. 97]                       [14-9-1534.

v. s. 1590

This inscription is engraved on a pillar of a Deri called Gosarā in the village Nagichānā in Mangrol State. It measures 10" by 12".

It records the death, in a fight, of Pithā Anasā, son of Vāsanga, at Nagichānā on Sunday, the 11th of the dark half of Bhādaravā in v.s. 1590, during the victorious reign of Bahādurshah, evidently the Gujarāt Sultan.

Text

1. संवत् १५९० वर्षें मादर
2. या बनि ११ रशि नगचाणामया
3. मे पातसाहा धौषाहावहर
4. साहा विरिरजे गीता
5. वासवगुत अणाणा सं
6. आते मरण सूतार अमर
7. सत सूतार वर्देनी पाँठ

PADA

No. 98]                       [1538.

v. s. 1594.

This inscription is inscribed on a stone slab lying in the small village Pāḍā near Dholkaṇavā, in the Junagadh State. It measures 18" × 13½".

It opens with the date, Sunday the fourth of the bright half of Vaisākha in v.s. 1594 and mentions the names, possibly of the officers, of Sherkhān and Malik Ajījalāuddin. The middle portion of the record is unintelligible. A land consisting of 31 bighas seems to have been granted to some body, whose name is not known. In the concluding portion both the Muhammedans and the Hindus are asked not to violate the grant.

Text

1. संवत् १५९४ वर्षें
2. बहसाह प्रदि ४ रशि बि
3. रघुसाही मातिक भीशाजी
4. जसहोदिल सहाकल (२) मांडण मी
5. ज प[ड] बजराग (२)...अहब
6. ...
7. शा सेदानु भीमत आयमणी मू
8. मि बोधा ११ सेदावंचां पाव जे
9. साने बापू खेनो जे को वंस
10. होवे ते अंवा भोरविचे (२) पाल
11. साहे पलित तरकाणी सूर हीव
12. बाणी गाय लोपि तेहनि...

1. The date does not agree.
BAGASRĀ

No. 99] v.s. 1604. [18-3-1548.

The following two inscriptions are engraved side by side on a yellowish stone lying at the north-west corner of the village Bagasrā (Dheñ) under Junagadh State. The right hand inscription measures 6" by 9½" and the left hand one, 7½" by 9½".

Both the inscriptions are of the same date i.e. Sunday, the ninth of the bright half of Caitra of v.s. 1604 or śaka 1470 and refer to the rule of the Sultan MUHMMAD Shaha. The right hand inscription records the death at Bagasrā of Vāghēlā Vāktā, son of Hibā Mālā, in a fight while protecting the cows. The left hand inscription records that the wife, named Ameñā of that man became a sati. She was the daughter of Kācā Parvata of Bagasrā and his wife Ravibai.

Text

(1)  
1 || 10 || नमः श्रीश्रीति श्री  
2 नृपतिविक्रमं अवं समसातां पंव  
3 त 1904 वर्षं शाखे 1770 प्रवर्त्तमा  
4 नेपालशाह[ह] श्रीमहेंद्रदेशाहनिवेधे  
5 राये अवेस्थ श्री बगस्रामस्य  
6 बाङेल हीयामाला शुत बाँका गो  
7 प्रहे गुटः चैत्र मुढ़ि 9 रिङी श्रीः  

(2)  
1 || 10 || नमः श्रीश्रीति श्री  
2 सति श्रीनृपतिविक्रमार्किरस्य  
3 तीतः संवतः 1904 वर्षं शाखे 14  
4 70 प्रवर्त्तमा पालशाह श्री महि  
5 मुंद्वराशाह व्यज्रे राये अवेस्थ श्री  
6 श्रीमहेंद्रदेशादेस्य  
7 न परावतः तथ्य भार्या बाँड़े रवी  
8 तथ्य पुणी बाँड़े अभाना साहा गम  
9 न हला चैत्र मुढ़ि 9 रिङीः  

KODIDARĀ

No. 100] v.s. 1609. [30-1-1553.

This inscription is engraved on a pēlio found in a small village named Kodidarā, situated near Somanātha Pāṭaṇa. The inscribed portion measures 1'6" in length and 1' in breadth.

It records that the pēlio of Hadīāni Suraja was raised in the village Kodidarā in the reign of Fātasāhā MAHĀMŪḍ at Devapāṭaṇa on Monday the second of the dark half of Māgha in v.s. 1609.

Mahāmūḍ was the Gujarat Sultan, who ruled from 1536 to 1554 A.D. at Ahmedabad.

Text

1 संवतः 1909 वर्षं माहा व  
2 हि 2 लोमे आदे धीवरप-  
3 तने पालसाहा लीविमुः  
4 द्वािशाह...कोविदराः  
5 प्रमे हवीमानी हरवज  
6 पालीभा
WADHWAN

No. 101 ]

v.s. 1613. [26-7-1557.

This inscription is copied from a white stone slab discovered at Wadhwan during excavations of the old palace foundations. The stone is now lying near the State stables in the Darbargaḍh at Wadhwan. The inscribed portion, which is in a good condition, measures 2½' by 2½'. Below it are carved a pig and an ass. Being inscribed in very incorrect Gujarati and also in an awkward manner the meaning of the inscription has to be made out with much difficulty.

The record opens with the date, Monday, the first of the bright half of śrāvaṇa of v.s. 1613 and refers to the reign of Pātshah Ahmad. Names of several officers are then given. They are: Hazrat Suleman Khan, Itimad Khan Ahodi, Mir Hazbar, Malik Ain Hayāli, Malik Nusrat Phal, Malik Agadh, Meheta (?), Rangvala, Arisirihha Sāṅgaṇa, chief (?) of Wadhwan, Mir Abdul Halim, Bakshi of Wadhwan, Desai Āsā, Patel and Talātī. Then it is stated thus—whatever Vaje is due from the pasāītas of the abovementioned town, both Koṭias and Talāvias, this shall be spent by the Talāvias on the Talav (i.e. tank) and the Koṭias on the Koṭ (i.e. fort). Whoever shall infringe these stipulations will be subject to the curse of the cow if he is a Hindu and that of the boar if he is a Musalman.

The Patshah Ahmed mentioned in the record is the Gujarat Sultan Ahmed II, whose Diwan, was the powerful noble Itimat Khan. Zalavad, in which Wadhwan is situated was directly under him. (See Bom. Gaz. Vol. I, Pt. I, p. 260.) The other names are of officers connected with the government of Wadhwan.

This inscription shows the origin of the Kotia and Talavia Kolis. They were pasāītas or landholders and were bound to work for the forts and tanks of the places, near which their holdings were situated.

Text

1 संवत 1913 वर्षे सावणे झ[ "ि १ सो] 2 मे श्रीरामा शक झाल्यावरील पात्तसाह 3 श्री जिहिम्दब विज्राजी ताकेन्ह १ ( ) ह 4 जरत लेल्याने पों श्रीप्रत्येकपान अहोदे मर श्रीनार, मेहेक आन 5 घबराई, मृगुस्त फत, मेहेक अग 6 ध मृगो श्रीरामवस्तुरकाणि: ! घववाण 8 श्री रा श्रीरामसिरियो साफ भुवे 9 भी अवदुह हिमद अफजलहा जब ( !) 10 बाली घववाण देसाईं असळ पाटल

1. A large number of words in this inscription are unintelligible.
DAHISARA

No. 102]  

This inscription is engraved on the lintel of the temple popularly known as Dhingadmalla’s temple in the village Dahisarā, at a distance of three miles from Vavānjiā in Morvi State. The lower portion of the inscription, which measures about 4½ feet in length and only 10 inchess in breadth is illegible.

It seems to record the building of the temple by the wife of Jām Śrī Karanaji of Dahisarā on Tuesday, the fourteenth of the dark half of Śrāvaṇa in v.s. 1622 or Saka 1488.

Karanaji was merely a Bhāyāt of the ruling family of Navānagar, though he is given the epithets Jām Śrī out of respect only.

Text

1 संवत १६२२ वर्ष शाक १४८८ संवतसार प्रबतमाने भावण वदि १४ मौमे अयोध  
2 श्रीद्वावरावस्तव्याख्यामाधीकरणाजी तस्य गृहे मायी  
3 ......रणछोडजीना भरणस्वतःने प्रासाद...

GHOGHA

No. 103]  

This inscription was discovered in the Khāri vāv at the Ghogha port. It was published by Col. Watson in the Indian Antiquary, Vol. VIII, p. 283, from which the following text is copied.

The inscription states that on Sunday, the 2nd of the bright half of Kārtika in v.s. 1634, in the glorious reign of Padishah Śrī Akbar, when Raja-śrī Kalyānrai was in charge of the port and in the reign of the king Visājī ......the vāv of Ghāyanti in the Puti garden was built. The inscription ends with an ass-curse.

The king Visājī mentioned in the record was an ancestor of the Maharaja of Bhavnagar.

Text

॥ संवत १६३४ वर्ष कार्तिकादि २ स्वः पत्रा श्री ५ अकबर बिजयराज्ये हुवाली  
राज्यकालयाराय श्रीशाल राजाविसाजीप्रभाव भाव ? धायंतीती वालय पुरीवादी के ल्याहि हथि  
तथा जेलल कोर महामति यह तेहुनी ग्रीविहिगाहि ॥
MANKHETRA

No. 104] v.s. 1639. [24-1-1583.

This inscription is found in a well called Khetsara in the village Mankhetra, 3 miles to the east of Mangrol. It is engraved on a yellow stone and measures 1' by 11".

The record opens with an invocation to Gapeśa. Then it is stated that the digging of a well, etc. is more meritorious than performing a hundred sacrifices. Then a long genealogy of a family belonging to the Prāgavat community is given in which the sons of Parikṣa (?) Phakā named Parikṣa Ramji, Devadāśa, Ravidāśa, Amidāśa, Acala and Sāring caused a well to be made on Thursday, the 12th of the bright half of Māgha in v.s. 1639 or Śaka 1505. In the concluding portion blessings are given to the builders of the well.

Text

1. श्रीसर्वदेशस्मिन् ॥
2. सिंहायम् [१५] श्रीश्रीमद्यदारामलयं ॥ श्रीमद्यदारामलयं ॥
3. वे तत्क्षेत्रम् श्रीज्ञानवादपरिप्रेयक्षासमुखाय [१५] नवस्य ॥
4. लेकरक्षेत्रविभवानविशिष्टामिति नूङ्गरे पक्षयां [गदा] ॥
5. ब व श्रीसर्वदेशस्मिन् ॥ सिंहायम् ॥ श्रीमद्यदारामलयं ॥
6. वे तत्क्षेत्रम् श्रीज्ञानवादपरिप्रेयक्षासमुखाय [१५] नवस्य ॥
7. श्रीमद्यदारामलयं ॥ श्रीसर्वदेशस्मिन् ॥
8. महत टटर चारसी शुद्ध टटर मंडिलक्षु भूम टटर काहीः ॥
9. न भगवति शुद्ध टटर वर्षाग्रहुत परिश्र विलमात सु ॥
10. त परिप्रेयक्षु शुद्ध परिप्रेयक्षु गणता शुद्ध परिश्र फका शुद्ध परि ॥
11. श्रीरामजी देवदास रविदास अमीदास वध वध वध धारिः ॥
12. श्रीमद्यदारामलयं ॥ श्रीमद्यदारामलयं ॥ श्रीमद्यदारामलयं ॥ श्रीमद्यदारामलयं ॥
13. श्रीमद्यदारामलयं ॥ श्रीमद्यदारामलयं ॥ श्रीमद्यदारामलयं ॥
14. श्रीमद्यदारामलयं ॥ श्रीमद्यदारामलयं ॥
15. श्रीमद्यदारामलयं ॥
16. श्रीमद्यदारामलयं ॥
17. श्रीमद्यदारामलयं ॥

DHROL

No. 105] v.s. 1647. [1-8-1591.

This inscription is engraved on one of the pāliās standing to the north of the temple of Bhūtanātha Mahādeva in the place called ‘Bhūchara Mori’ at a distance of a mile and a half to the south-west of Dhrol. The inscribed portion measures 2½' in height but only 10'' in breadth.

It records the death of a warrior named Bāraḍa Gōlia (?) while fighting

1. Elsewhere the word used in this connection is वैद्युत्.
together with Ajōji against Ājama Khān on Sunday, the 8th of the dark half of Śrāvaṇa in v.s. 1647.

This record refers to the well-known battle that took place at Bhūchar Mori between the armies of Khān Azam, the Gujarat Viceroy of the Emperor of Delhi, and the armies of the Jāmsaheb of Navānagar under Jam Satrasāla’s son Ajoji and his minister Jasā Ladaka. In the fight Ajoji and Jasā were killed with considerable loss to their army.

Text

1 संवत 1647
2 वर्षे सरसा
3 वण वद 8
4 राव गारड
5 ध्रोगोल
6 नामाणी: नो
7 हेवीतु कु
8 बार ध्रो आज
9 सपे भरण
10 धान ध्रो आज
11 मयनी टो
12 दमरणा ग
13 जवर: मेपा
14 पाली अठाक

SATRUVJAYA

No. 106] v.s. 1650.

This inscription is engraved in the porch of the east entrance of the Adiśvara temple on the left hand on the famous Satruñjaya hill. It was once published by Dr. Bühler in the Epi. Ind. II, p. 50.

Text

1 अभ्र के नमा। ध्रोवसी: प्रथम: प्रसु: प्रधिममाण नैपुष्पुर्णायामनास्यत्व स्वतिकर: सुक्षम: विचित्रमकर: श्री[ अनिदि]
2 देव: स व: पद्मालकर: कैरिक रक्षित्वोमस: कर्मोभवहिन्यासविष्ठ्वकृत्वमूः भगवानुः शतुंजयेन्नक
3 शा: || 1 श्रीविद्यार्ण रेशेशब्धसी: बीङ्गाणिनीतवः पाण्ड: प्रसंगमालवर् श्रीवर्धिनान्म: प्रसु: || उत्तरविद्याः
4 इत्तिनिहितावेद वदु: गौरनामान्नी || स्वर्णार्ण भर्मालित्र्यभूतालोभ: रसोविकश्चिनii || 2 आसीत्वासः सत्तविद्वितपदः
5 [ पद ] स्पमाण। तस्मान्दुःविछिद्रमा गणचर: श्रीमान् कुष्मांभिन: || बस्तर्यश्चुता प्रध्यान-धुमना अवापी विचालत्त्वे
6 संतिस्मति मगवतो वीराक्रमोगारिक। II 3 श्रीहस्तविष्ठ: श्रवणविद्व एती सुरी अभूत तदन-कारण याम्यां गाणेवमू
7 विरू वरिकालंबद्रायम्बम्बमारन्वित: श्रवणविद्व एती सुरी अभूत तदन-कारण याम्यां गाणेवमू
8 गाया हिमवाण्यां। II 5 तत्त्वस्यविद्वत: वीराक्रम्यथा। श्रीहस्तविष्ठवाण्यां।
9 II 6 सवस्यानमसमानानां। येवि प्रवलारा वज्रिणे। कुर्णवान कामनेदेशु कुत्ते गाणेवमू।
10 भाग्यज्ञ मधुर। सुशृंचत। जविणे गजना मता। II 8 ब्रम्हु। कमलस्तम श्रीजयद्विलुः।
11 1281 वस्त्रे। II 9 कामेनासिनु। गणे हेम। विमला। सुरंगववन। तत्त्वे सुवर्षीवु।
12 या कामेनासिनु। गणे हेम। विमला। सुरंगववन। तत्त्वे सुवर्षीवु।
13 हरिमृत्तिकं सब्धीकं विवेधं गणे श्रवणिती। स्तोत्रायोणोसारसिमं। II 1 पाथायक्रियक्षायमिन्ये हेमा तेजः।
14 सिं जगतां कल्याण्ये। पदः। प्रवाह इव निर्भरितम्येन। हेमा। हेमासाभित्यदानां
15 वेदार्थं संहं च रंगावति। श्रीजेत्रं शतप्रतिपतिमहासं चौरं प्रतां पुनः। तेषां वीरं सनातनं महुर्पुस्वर-समझम्मांसं ज्ञाता।
16 कामपवयाम्यसमं गोपामाबाखः। II 13 तत्त्वः प्रकटः प्रकान्त्वतिक्षोपोटस्तः
17 हीरदिवस्येवस्यक्षीरितनमं। हीरमायं महद्यं भरेण महतामत्ययुक्तसिमं।
18 मोदपरं। II 14 देशायं गृहस्तोत्त सुरंगववन भाकारितः। सादूः। श्रीपताहि अकर्भरेण
19 …अजयायविकतसं संहं जातो। तेषां महुर्पुस्वर-समझम्मांसं। इव। II 15 चकु। फूटोसरम।
20 …[वै] गौ। हेम श्रमकोक्षमाकास्मुः संहं। अब्धुपकाशक्तप्रमिते। II 16 स्वगोम:। हेम।
21 …लुक्कानां वे। II 16 देश महाशिवपुरहुः महामाकासं सदा न्यायम्। श्रीमान् शाहि-अकर्भरे नर्तरो। [देशायं]।
22 श्रीाचार्यः। श्रीमान्यमहादुहुपतस्यहोलाभारणानित्तिः। कामं कारक्षं सम इच्छाह्यो
23 …[वै] 17 वुहु। [हू] वेदार्थं। सुरी। विवेधितक्षायमानानुचिते। निजसे। वृत्तवर्णं च करे च
24 …[वै] 18 य्यायां। कल्याणां। विमलात्स्वत्तंपुर: हेम। पूण:। शाहि-निवार्यानीतिचित्तकोषी-क्षतिलोकम्यतवज्जु। [हू] चारं त्यक्तु।
25 [म] शक्यमन्नचारणीराजा जनैतिये। त्वज्ञानीच्छुपापूर्वसूक्ष्ममूच्छुरिता। ॥ १६
यद्यां निचवैपृथ्वसहवृत्तयुवधादे।

26 [२] मैये। कृत। लब्ध: श्रीमन्दक्ष्मय:। स्तिनितितिः। सुंदरिपुष्काय:। तकला तत्करम-सारंभमूर्त्तूळ के० नता नीये। जैनम्य।

27 : प्रमली ब तीर्थितिकं श्रुतृज्ञोज्ञे च च। ॥ २० यद्यांसिद्धितितकार कृताङ्गसंपूर्वेणमना:।
प्राचे। । महाजानपारसवाख्यः।

28 मयं बैंसेव वालंबैंतं। वलंकृतमरेण भविष्यति। शाहः: । पुनः । पुत्रतमा बहु।
मन्यदृश्यानस हितसूक्ष्मात्र दृष्टं। ॥ २९

29 यद्यां तर्णितिवेष्य कालितोहसो मन:। फणकी। बिहर्चत्वाहि अक्रामरो: व्यसनयेपापोज्ञो:।
ज्ञान:।। जसे भादानमोचितिं ज्ञाते।

30 : सर्वेषु देशोपि। ह्यूत्वात्तिथिमनमत्तानविचित्रति। श्रीभोगिकमापवत। ॥ २२ ह्यूकायिप-नेयनोईशक्यनुइत्तितिः। ह्युः क्षममासः। (ई०)। भेदवै:।

31 रणदशोमवेदिः तंगा इत्यामोजित्वाः। उद्दीर्ण गमिता यदीयचरन्येरायणगोमुः। अयः।
स्वस्थात बिहार बहुः लोकाकल्पसङ्का।

32 ॥ २३ शारीरिक्षितायापायादुदक्षेत्रोऽवितंपिः। मुसान। यहृदनने मुक्तिरत्नरुपयुः
देशोऽरुः। यतथाः। मुक्तिममारलाबिधमावै:।

33 तैमृभूमिः।। सये:। दासेयमयाक्तियोऽविद्येये श्रुतिये ये यिने।। ॥ २४ तत्त्वमभिमभिभि
रूपयाम हर्तः।। शौम्येः।। सकल्यंतस्म हर्तः।

34 कामोलककक्रुध्यायाः। ज्ञाति।। श्रुतृज्ञका।। विज्ञेयसेनानुद्रेणणः।। ॥ २५ यद्दातपस
माहात्म्ये वच्छदिः किमत: परे। अल्पगायिकने येन जोगीते।

35 सि द्विन:।। २६ सम्पाद्यः।। वितान्युक्तात्मकोपनिविवाहातः।। तेजरिविन:।। भैयर्विनोरिजनातः।।
स्त्रीनीतिः।। कृष्णेनाशात्कालादिमार्गः।। माहात्म्ये यत।

36 रणोधरानमस्वज्ञोस:।। गणिमीयमंगित्स:।। रमण्यानुवेदः।। प्रस्तु:।। प्रश्वविविध्येतवतंत्रः।।
ये च २ ॥ ४ मन्दक्ष्चरणेः।। नियादाकारितः।

37 सादरेः।। शीमामभुपे पुरस्वतरूपे।। व्याम्य गुणमानके।।। मुन्योभविमभितः।। परर्रसो वेगालं
वाफिहे भागां।।। भागादेः ससरे शोरोघ्वन विकामार्गः।

38 इव।। २८ अंहृतं परस्मीरकक्तं संसायधिकोतं कालकालमववस्तिः।। साकातसाहित्यकम्बरस्य सविदः
हेतुमानुपायसंस्त:।। ये:।। सन्मिलित।। (त)।। लोचना विद्येच्छे।

39 इ(४)ययादः।। पिया।। वाहोलावप्रस्तो विज्ञानाभिषेकेऽहि निशाचा इव।। ॥ २ ॥ ४ भैपात्मिः।।
अक्ष्माण्यस्य दस्तिः।। अक्ष्माण्यस्य दस्तिः।। श्रीमाण्यस्य दस्तिः।। श्रीमाण्यस्य दस्तिः।।

40 वरारूरसी।। विज्ञमेथिसम्प्रदानित्विन्चानिव।। सवासाहित्यस्वाधिकारे।। दिज्ञुताः।। 
हृदः।। ये:।। कैलास इहोवहो निजवन:।। सामो।

41 निवन्ये भागः।। २ ।। दत्वाक्रायितविभवम्योगाराजाः।। पुराः।।। यच्चीवादिहक्ष्मारेः।। धरणीशक्रे सत्यार्थे।।
तचकोकविकाल्यावः।

42 हितः।। गायासाधनाभिकं तस्य दृष्टं पुरातां।। व्यतिप्रविष्ट।। ॥ ३२ किः।। 
हृदः।। ये:।। मीठाः।।

43 केवलोक्षितमेनोऽत्तिनोऽधि न च।। भागीया:।। ॥ ३२ यच्चिवादिहक्ष्मारेः।। विभवप्रारासित-
प्रितला तामत्तन्तुः।। लोकातः।। नयायमानुष्यसभास्तिदियारणिः।
भारतीय एकत्त्वाचा समाजात राज्याचा अहंकार -

44. म हस्ताक्षर-मेलिनीमुळे श्लोकोंबिच्या किंवा नुसूसी महत्त्वाच्या अभावाचक नसून दिनांतीला। युवती सूर्यरे-

45. सहस्र महानं मरण युग्माच्या गाटे गुणाचाराची। ते हारा ते अधिक अस्त्राचे कृत्य शर्माचे। ३४ हस्ताक्षर -

46. सुभाषित श्री वीरेंद्र सरस्वती, जो शास्त्रीजीविनीच्या विषयात पुन्नधे। देव-पाल इत्यादीमुळे शिक्षासेवक विभागात शासन निर्देशीक राजस्थान मुंबईमध्ये। [त] त् -

47. कल्याणातील तत्त्वात तजसदृश ताजांशी सर्वात अद्वितीय - ३५ तत्त्वात द्रव्याची आयुधमुळे तजुळे

48. ग्रंथाची प्रस्तुती देव-पाल भावात इत्यादीमुळे शिक्षासेवक विभागात शासन निर्देशीक राजस्थान मुंबईमध्ये। [का]

49. शास्त्रीजीविनीच्या विषयात पुन्नधे। देखील ये ते भावात इत्यादीमुळे शिक्षासेवक विभागात शासन निर्देशीक राजस्थान मुंबईमध्ये। पण -

50. महान संविदा शर्माची वर्मासाठी ती मंत्री बेनकते। ३६ शास्त्रीजीविनीच्या विषयात पुन्नधे। देखील ये ते भावात इत्यादीमुळे शिक्षासेवक विभागात शासन निर्देशीक राजस्थान मुंबईमध्ये। पण -

51. महान संविदा शर्माची वर्मासाठी ती मंत्री बेनकते। ३६ शास्त्रीजीविनीच्या विषयात पुन्नधे। देखील ये ते भावात इत्यादीमुळे शिक्षासेवक विभागात शासन निर्देशीक राजस्थान मुंबईमध्ये। पण -
63 दुर्मूलितप्रभुः मुनिश्रयाहेषु। विदेशु विद्वस्य रुपमतिहः। सवा: द् इत्वसमितैः 

64 गता जिनकाम् ब्रह्म। ४५ योगिनिः यज्ञ महात्स्ते च जिनकाम्। निरोत्सितां विमिषाकां:। 

65 श्री पारसा...वाक्यंविनिः। मूर्तिरहर्हत्-किमचाराति धर्मस्वर्णविनिषयामी। ५१ द्वासैति: 

66 काम न तावतीः। द्वासैति: विनिमाणिक्षात्तामाना। त्रिक्षु ब्राह्मण-परिक्षेत्रेन भरतः। 

67 श्रीमति। विरंगेषु वाक्यानि। विभाषायोपहर्ताहे॥ ५३ यज्ञ चैते च विराज्ते। चलारेश 

68 ताः। भूपालसैं वर्धवितः। ५५ परेषायैः। द्विमाणिक्षानिमाणिक्षानिः। विलंबारः 

69 ह विने किंतु कल्यक्याम्। राज्ञी प्रया निजिनिशानिकाल्यानकः। ५५।। द्विमाणिक्षायुक्तमतानां च तोरणानि। राज्ञी य

70 व्रज विनिशानि मनोहरानि। कि तीर्थंदुराणालक्षयेऽणाकन्या। मंदोरणानि सरसानि 

71 द्विशिशिरिदृशिः रामानि। श्रीमति जिनकामि ब्रह्म। द्विक्षिरिस्विरिश्रीराकृति। 

72 विमाणिक्षानिमाणिक्षानिः। द्विमाणिक्षारिविरिश्चरित्वृति। विनामिक्षानिः। 

73 ॥। ॥। सन्न वनयोक्ति: १६७ विने: सन्न वनयोक्ति:। साहाय्यादि। जन्म- 

74 ॥। ॥। सन्न वनयोक्ति: १६७ विने: सन्न वनयोक्ति:। साहाय्यादि। जन्म- 

75 श्रीमन्ति। भूजान गह प्रीतिसुभविविवाहम्। श्रीमन्ति: विनिस्त्र निद्रावृद्धांसिंच सदा 

76 ॥। ॥। सन्न वनयोक्ति: १६७ विने: सन्न वनयोक्ति:। साहाय्यादि। जन्म- 

77 द्विशिशिरिदृशिः रामानि। श्रीमति जिनकामि ब्रह्म। द्विशिशिरिदृशिः रामानि। श्रीमति 

78 ॥। ॥। सन्न वनयोक्ति: १६७ विने: सन्न वनयोक्ति:। साहाय्यादि। जन्म- 

79 द्विशिशिरिदृशिः रामानि। श्रीमति जिनकामि ब्रह्म। द्विशिशिरिदृशिः रामानि। श्रीमति 

80 ॥। ॥। सन्न वनयोक्ति: १६७ विने: सन्न वनयोक्ति:। साहाय्यादि। जन्म- 

81 द्विशिशिरिदृशिः रामानि। श्रीमति जिनकामि ब्रह्म। द्विशिशिरिदृशिः रामानि। श्रीमति
82 स्वप्नस्मृतिवर्द्धि । योति दितादिकाळाप्रमिति: स्वरूपकपालीर्व । श्रीगांववहयुही- 
मोक्षितमकुञ्जलेन चैरावतानुभवः

83 त: प्रासादविशेषमनोबिन्दकहलालेवं चिरं निवनते ॥ ६५ ॥ वस्ताभिमवस्य वशसुस्वरस्य 
चित्रं ॥ चैव च भविष्यदृशीस्य

84 निरीक्षणीयं । श्रीमतप्रेमिकचन्द्रे । कल्पनोक्षयीपि विषयकमालस्य शिलिपत्रं 
भवितं प्रसिद्ध ॥ ६६ ॥ सदाचारवैद्यानां कमलविज

85 यांनामर्गिया । पद्द्वाराग्राहां भ्रमितव आश्चर्यां । अष्टंगाराचं सौन्दर्यम् द्रुमां 
यां विहितवान । प्रशस्त: । शास्त्री

86 या तस्ते निर्माणकालं विजयं ॥ ६७ ॥ इति सौर्वर्णांकसाहित्ययज:पालोधुतविमललंक 
पन्नवींद्रवीकांमूलाद्वासद्वासित: । श्री

87 वुष्टद्वस्मागम्यान । विनयमयवातरोजस्मिन्दृश्यान् । श्रीमोदिकालकीण्यान् । माधवनानामभिभ 
वातान्मयां ॥ ६८ ॥

(To be continued.)
NON-ṚGVEDIC MANTRAS RUBRICATED IN THE ĀŚVALĀYANA-GRHYA-SŪTRA: THEIR SOURCES AND INTERPRETATION*

By
V. M. APTE, Poona.

ĀG. II. 4. 13:

...Vapāmukhīdya jukuyād: (a) "Vaha vapāh Jātavedah pitṛbhyo, (b) yatraitān, vettha nihītān parēke | (c) medasaḥ kulyā upinānti stravantu, (d) satyā etā āśisāh santu sarvāh svāhā" iti |

Trans....Scooping out the omentum, he should sacrifice it (with the mantra) : (a) "Bear the omentum, O Jātavedas, to the Fathers, where thou knowest them to be settled, afar. May streams of fat flow unto them; may all these wishes be fulfilled; svāhā!"

Context: In the Aṣṭākā ceremony (Sūtra 13th), an animal is killed according to the ritual of the animal sacrifice, omitting, however, the sprinkling and touching of the animal and then follows the scooping out of the omentum.

Sources: As Prof. Stenzler (p. 73) points out, the verse is found in VS. 35. 20. The variations are :—In clause (b), ‘erān' for our ‘etān'; in (c), upa tān for our ‘upainān'. The last pāda is different "satyā esām āśisāh sannamantām". [May their wishes, turn out (true) !]. This version of the last pāda is better as more in keeping with the spirit of the whole verse which is concerned more with the needs and wishes of the Pitṛs, than with those of the sacrificer to which our pāda (d) refers.

The mantra occurs with variations in the following Sūtra-texts also SG. III. 13.3; PG. 3.3.9; SMB. 2.3.18; ĀPMB. 2.20.28; Kauś. 45.14 and HG. 2.15.7.

ĀG. II. 4. 14: Athāvadānānāṁ sthātipākasya ca 'agne naya supathā rāye astānā’ iti ēve |

I (a) "Grīśmo hemanta rtavāh śivā no (b) varṣāh śivā abhayā šaran naḥ (c) Sāṅvatsarodhipatīḥ prāṇado no, (d) ahorātre kṛṣṇatām dirghamānyaḥ svāhā |

II (a) Sāntā prthivī śivamantariṣaṁ, (b) dyaur no devyabhayam no astu | (c) śivā diṣāḥ pradiṣa uddhiṣo na (d) āpo vidyutah paripāntu sarvatah svāhā |

III (a) Āpo marichiḥ pravahantu no dhiyo, (b) dhiitā samudro vahantu pāpam | (c) bhūtam bhaviṣyad abhayam viśvam astu me, (d) brahmādhi-guptah svārakṣaraṇi svāhā |

IV (a) Viśva ādityā vasavaśca devā, (b) rudrā goptāro marutaḥ

Continued from p. 182 of Vol. III, August 1940.
sadantu | (c) ūrjam prajām amṛtam pinvamānah (d) prajāpatṝ mayi parameśṭhī dadhātu svāhā ............| 14 |

Trans: Then (are offered oblations) of ‘avadāna’s (cut-off portions) and the Sthālīpāka (as follows:—) two oblations with the two RV. verses beginning with “Agni lead us” etc. (i.e. RV. I. 189. 1 and 2); (four oblations with the following four mantras): I (a): May summer, winter, the seasons be propitious to us, (b) propitious the rains; safe the autumn! (c) May the year be our life-giving master; (d) may days and nights make our life long, Svāhā!

II. (a) Tranquil be the earth; propitious the sky. (b) May goddess Heaven be our (assurance of) safety. (c) Propitious be the quarters, the intermediate quarters and the upper quarters to us; (d) may the waters, the lightnings protect us from all sides, Svāhā!

III. (a) : May the waters, the rays bear our prayers! (b) May the Creator, the ocean, strike down evil! (c) May the past, the future, may all be safe to me; (d) protected by Brahman, may I pour forth the ‘Svāras’ (i.e. songs in general)!

IV. (a) May all the Adityas, Vasus and Gods,⁴ (b) the Rudras, the protectors, the Maruts sit down here! (c) Augmenting (pinvamānah) vigour, progeny and immortality, (d) may Prajāpati, the highest-placed, confer (these) on me! Svāhā!

Sources of I: The nearest approach in words and sense is in TS. 5.7.2.4 (a) “Grīṣmo hemanta uta no vasantaḥ. (b) Sarad vaṃśaḥ suvitarṇ no astu | eteṣām rūnām śataśāradānām (d) nivāta eṣāṃ abhaye svāma || This mantra accompanies the depositing of the ‘Ājyāṇi’ bricks in the structure of the fire-altar. The general sense—a prayer to the seasons—is the same. That this verse is the influence on our citation is shown by the following circumstances: PG. 3.2.2 quotes a mantra the first two pādas of which are identical with the first two of our mantra and the last two of which are identical with the last two of the TS. mantra! The mantra is quoted in PG. in the Pratyavara- haṇa context and in the same context SG. IV. 18.1 quotes a mantra very similar to the TS. mantra quoted above!

Sources of II. This verse stands as the 11th in the long passage given by STENZLER in his Kristische Anmerkungen (p. 46-7) as found in some MSS at the end of Kanḍikā I. 2. The nearest approach in words and sense is AV. XIX. 9. 1: (a) Śaṃtā dyauḥ, śaṃtā prthivī, (b) Śāntam idam urvanta- tarīkṣam | (c) Śaṃtā udanvātirāpah, (d) Śaṃtā naḥ santvoṣadhiḥ ||—which is a prayer for appeasement and welfare to various deities. PG. 3.3.6 and MG. 2.8.6 also cite similar verses.

Sources of III. This is not traced to any early text; among sūtra-texts Prof. OLDENBERG compares PG. III. 3.6. In MG. 2.8.6 is cited a similar mantra and curiously enough the agreement between the PG. and MG. versions is very close e.g. PG. III. 3.6 = (a) Āpo marīcīḥ paripātu sarvataḥ

1. ‘Devāḥ’ is not an adjective (= divine) as Prof. OLDENBERG takes it.
(MG. ‘viśvataḥ’). (b) Dhātā samudra apahantu pāpam | (MG. ‘abhayaṁ kṛṣṇaḥ’). (c) Bhūtām bhaviṣyadakṣāsadvās avam astu me (MG. has ‘uta bhadrām astu me’) (d) Brahmābhīguptaḥ surakṣitaḥ syām || [MG. reads this pāda as ‘brahmābhīgūrtam (approved of by Brahmā) svarā kṣaṇāḥ’].

Śuṣṭa is the name of a sāman ending in a svarita (circumflex), having no special nidhāna or finale. The chanting of a svāra sāman is prescribed to expiate for any excess committed, previously, in chanting. Though the word is used in the general sense of ‘songs’ in our mantra, there may be a hint of this expiatory character, as there is a reference to ‘pāpam’ in the second pāda.

Sources of IV. This is traced only to Sūtra texts. MG. 2.8.6 and PG. III. 3.6 have both a mantra almost identical with ours, with the following variations:—Both have ‘sarve’ instead of our ‘devāḥ’ in (a); have ‘marutaśca santu’ for our ‘marutāḥ sadantu’ in (b); and have ‘dīrgham āyuh’ instead of our ‘pinvamānaḥ’ (which is rather awkward) in (c). The striking agreement of PG. and MG. perhaps indicates a more faithful version of the original whatever it was.

AG. II. 6.1-4: Rathamāroksyamānāṇā pānibhyāṁ cakre abhi-mrṣed : (a) ‘Aham te pāravapādāvārabhe,’ (b) ‘bhṛadhṛathantare te cakre’ | 1 | (c) "Vāmadevyam aksaḥ” ityakṣāḍhiṣṭānā | 2 | daksinā-pārvābhīyām āroked, (d) "Vāyoṣṭvā vīryenārohāminādriṣayaujasādhipatyaneti” | 3 | raṃmintsamrṣed arāmyskāhanvā daṇḍena, (e) "brahmano vastejasā sanghṛṇāmi satyena vaḥ sanghṛṇāmi” iti | 4 |

Trans. (1) When about to mount a chariot, one should touch the two wheels separately (but simultaneously) with his two hands (repeating the formula) (a) ‘I touch thy two fore-feet; (b) the ‘Bṛhat’ and ‘Rathantara’ are thy two wheels; (2) (one should touch) the two (naves) which hold the axle with the formula ‘The ‘Vāmadevyā’ is thy axle’. (3) One should mount (the chariot) with the right foot first (with the formula) ‘With the power of Vāyu, I mount thee, with Indra’s vigour and mastery, (I mount thee).’ (4) One should reach the reins or the horses (themselves) with a staff if they have no reins, with the formula ‘With the lustre of Brahman I seize you; with Truth I seize you’.

Sources : For formulas (b) to (e), may be compared LS. 2.8.2 and 6-8. If the yajamāna makes a gift of a horse-chariot to the Udghāṭ (the LS. belongs to the Sāmaveda) he accepts the gift in the following manner:—2.8.2 = He accepts the leather-work of the chariot (by touching it) with the mantra ‘Vāyoṣṭvā’. 2.8.6-8 = he touches the right wheel of the chariot with the words ‘Rathantaramasi’, the adhiṣṭhāna (which is the same as our ‘aksādiṣṭhāna or axle-rest in sūtra 2) with the words “Vāmadevyamasi” and the left wheel with the words ‘Bṛhad asi’. PB. (another Sāma-veda Brāhmaṇa) in 1.7.3-4 employs the same formulas in the same context as in LS. above; it quotes in full however the mantra of which only the prātiṣṭha is quoted in LS. 2.8.2 as follows:— “Vāyoṣṭvā tejasā pratigṛṇāmi, naksatrāṇāṁ tvā rūpeṇa pratigṛṇāmi sūryasya tvā varcasā pratigṛṇāmi | " This
mantra though different is highly suggestive of and parallel in purport to our mantras (d) and (e) which really constitute one mantra (in substance), expanded into two, by the two verbs 'ārohāmi' and 'sārīrghrámi' to suit two different acts.

For (a) may be compared AB. VIII. 17.2 'Bṛhadca te Rathantarāh ca, pūrvau pādaub bhavatām' (Let the Bṛhat and Rathantara be thy forefeet). This is addressed to the Āsandī (or throne) which is set before a king in the Rājasūya sacrifice. Our text appears to have taken over this formula as it is in AB., without making the necessary change viz. the dropping of 'pūrvau' (before pādaub) which as applied to a chariot with two wheels is meaningless, though significant in the original (AB. passage) where it is addressed to the Āsandī which has four feet! AB. V. 30.1-4 develops the idea of 'Bṛhat' and 'Rathantara' being wheels by identifying the day with Bṛhat and the night with 'Rathantara' after declaring "Ete vai sarīvatasarasya ca kare, yad ahorātre". (The night and day are the two wheels of the year).

AG. II. 8. 16 : Athainām ucchāriyāyaṁ anu mantravetva: I. (a) "ihaiva tiṣṭha nimitā, (b) tiḷvilāstāmīravatīṁ | (c) madhye poṣasva tiṣṭhantīṁ (d) ā tvā prapannaghāyaḥ || II. (a) A tvā kumarastaruna, (b) ā vasto jāyatāṁ saha) | (c) ā tvā pariśritāṁ kumbha (d) ā dadhnaḥ kalaśairayam itī".

Trans. Over this (middle post) while it is being erected, he should recite the mantras, 'ihaiva etc. (Both the mantras are translated below.)

Context: The Kapḍikā deals with house-building.

The text and interpretation of I. The verse has puzzled both Profs. STENZLER and OLDENBERG. The former ignores the accusative ending 'm' of 'tiḷvilāstāmīravatīṁ' which, in his opinion, must be erased; Prof. OLDENBERG separates the pāda as 'tiḷvilā+stāmīravatīṁ' and then says (p.213) that the correction and translation of the latter word is quite uncertain. I think, however, that the verse admits of a simple and natural explanation as it stands, except that 'Poṣasva' must be corrected into 'Poṣasya' in (c) and 'ā tvā' into 'mā tvā' in (d), as Prof. STENZLER following SG. III. 3. 1, proposes. I may add in support of these two corrections that APMB. 2.15.3 reads 'Mā tvā' like SG. My construction is as follows: The first pāda constitutes a complete sentence ending with 'nimitā'. "Stand just here, set up ('Nimitā' : cf. RV. V. 62. 7e quoted below) as you are". The remaining three pādas make up one sentence. The second pāda is to be separated as 'tiḷvilāstām + īravatīṁ' two accusatives going with 'tvā' in the fourth pāda along with the accusative 'tiṣṭhantīṁ' in the third pāda. The translation is: 'May the sinful not find thee, standing in the midst of plenty (poṣasya madhye), full of welfare (īravatīṁ) and fixed (astām) into holy ground (tiḷvila+astā) as thou art. For this sense of 'tiḷvila' and 'nimitā' compare RV. V. 62.7e: "Bhadre kṣetre nimitā tiḷvile vā = 'set down in an auspicious field or holy ground (tiḷvila)' describing the 'sthūṛā' mentioned in RV. V. 62. 7e, as in our text,—a striking parallel!
Sources of I. Among sūtra-texts SG. III. 3. 1 has a parallel verse (as shown by Profs. Stenzler and Oldenberg), as also APMB. 2. 15. 3 and MG. 2.11.2. The readings in these parallel passages were helpful, as seen above, in correcting the slightly corrupt readings in (c) and (d). I think that the passage AV. III. 12. 2. 6 and 7 has influenced the citations in this and the following Kapādikā e.g. AV. III 12. 6 and 7 correspond to the 2nd verse quoted in this sūtra (II. 8.16) and the verse quoted in II. 9.2 respectively. Therefore it is quite probable, that AV. III. 12.2 which begins 'ihava dhruvā pratitiṣṭha Sāle' may have given a hint regarding our 1st. verse as AV. III. 12 deals with 'house-building'.

The text and interpretation of II :—This verse also is supposed to be far more corrupt than it really is, by Professors Stenzler and Oldenberg who both propose emendations. The necessity for their emendations may be examined in the light of the parallel verses that we have in AV. III. 12. 7 ; SG. III.2.9 and PG.3.4.4 (as pointed out by the two scholars) and also in HG. 1.27.4; MG. 2.11.12 and APMB. 2.15.4.

The only correcce necessary in my opinion is that of 'pariśritaḥ' in (c), into 'parisrutah' as proposed also by the two scholars in the light of the AV. SG. and PG. readings, because the corruption of the latter word into the former is very likely and because the meaning 'the cup of parisrut' suits the verse better and because APMB. 2.15.4 and MG. 2.11.12 have also the same reading. But Prof. Oldenberg's view that 'jāyatāṁ saha' in (b) is a corruption and that too of 'jagadāiḥ saha' in PG. III.4.4 (see his note on pp. 93-94) is far-fetched and quite unnecessary! 'Jāyatām' is too far removed from 'jagadāiḥ' to be a corruption of the latter and is moreover the reading in AV. 3. 12. 7. Besides, the verse yields very good sense as it is, with only one emendation 'pariśrutah' as noted above. I now give my translation :—

"May the young boy (Kumāras taraṇaḥ), may the calf (vatsaḥ) be together (saha) born to thee [ (tvā ājāyatām) i.e. be destined for thee, destined to live near thee. For such use of 'jana' (Jāyate, to be born) with the accusative, compare our mantra in I. 5. 4 'yadiyaṁ kumāri ahbijātā = that to which this girl is born]. . May the jar of 'Parisrut' (lit. flowing or foaming over a kind of intoxicating liquor prepared from herbs) come to thee (the verb from the next pāda being supplied after 'ā tvā'); may it come with mugs of curds."

Sources : The Sūtra-texts having parallel passages have already been mentioned but the earliest version of the mantra is AV. III.12.7 (Prof. Stenzler compares the whole hymn AV. III. 12), which reads (a) "Emāṁ kumārastaraṇa, (b) ā vatso jāyatāṁ saha | (c) emāṁ parisrutah kumbha (d) ādhahnāḥ kalaśair aguh |. The meaning of the word 'Vatsa' and the general sense of our mantra is made clear by AV. III.12.13cd : ā tvā vatso gamet a kumāraḥ, ā dhenavah sāyam āsyandamānaḥ | (May the calf, the young boy, may the cows—come to thee in the evening) as addressed to a 'Sālā' or a house newly-built.
AG. II. 8. 2 : (a) "Rtena sthūnām adhiroha Vānśa, (b) drāghiya āyuḥ pra- 
taram dadhānāḥ" iti |

Trans. "(a) By Rta (Law) mount over the post, O staff; (b) con- 
ferring longer life on us, hereafter".

Context. This mantra is addressed to the ‘bamboo-staff’ while it is 
being mounted (on to the middle post) in the course of the ‘House-building’ 
ceremony.

Sources of (b) : The part or pāda (b) is a well-known verse-pāda of 
the RV. often repeated in the Ṛgveda e.g. in I. 53. 114 ; X. 18. 21, 34 ; X. 115. 
84, being of the nature of a general prayer for long life. It also occurs 
in AV. 12. 2. 30a. Our text in taking over this pāda has changed the 
RV. ‘dadhānāḥ’ plural, Ātmanepada (= choosing for ourselves) into 
‘dadhānāḥ’ (conferring) singular Parasmaipada as it qualifies ‘Vānśa’.

Sources of (a) : This pāda is found in AV. III. 12. 6a [III. 12 being 
the hymn on house-building referred to above] in close proximity to the mantra 
(III.12.7) parallel to the one cited in our II.8.16. So our text has taken 
over the first pāda from this AV. verse and joined it on to another pāda 
in the RV. to make up a new mantra! This is quite in keeping with the 
general practice of Śūtra-texts which, when not citing a mantra from their 
particular Vedic Samhitā, took the liberty of adapting, altering or joining verse- 
parts or pādas from one or many sources to make up a mantra suitable to 
a particular context! Clause (a) is also found in HG. 1 27. 7a, APMB. 2. 
15. 5a and MG. 2. 11. 14a, with the change ‘Sthūnāu’ for ‘Sthūnām’ the 
verse being addressed to ‘a staff mounted on two pillars.’

AG. II. 9. 3-4 :—Sadūrvāsu catasṛṣu śilāsu maṇikam pratiṣṭhāpayel : 
I. “Prthivyā adhi sambhava” iti [3]|

II. (a) “Araṁgaro vāvadīti, (b) tredhā baddho varatravā | (c) īrām 
 u ha praśāṃsatī (d) anirām apabādhatām” iti vā [4] |

Trans. He should instal a water-barrel on four stones overspread 
with Dūrva (grass) with the mantra : I “Arise with [this is the force of 
the preposition ‘sam’ in ‘Sambhava’] (and) on the earth’; or with the 
mantra II (a) : “The arāṅgara chatters on, (b) thrice bound with the straps; 
(c) it, verily praises prosperity; (d) may it drive away adversity.”

Context : After the main structure of the house has been erected, a 
water-barrel is given a place in the house.

Sources of I. TS. V. 6. 1. 4 has ‘Prthivyā Sambhava’ (be united with 
the earth), the reading of MS. 2.13.1 being ‘Prthivyāḥ sambhava’. The con- 
text is very suggestive. In the piling up of the fire-altar, a caru (of wild 
rice with milk) is deposited in the midst of the ‘Kumbha’ bricks with this 
formula. Now TS. 4. 1. 1. 1a reads “Prthivyā adhi ābhara” a formula 
accompanying the picking of the spade in the ceremony of placing the fire 
in the fire-pan. Our formula is evidently made up of parts (in italics above) 
of these two TS. formulas.

Sources of II. Profs. STENZLER and OLDBERG compare AV. XX. 135. 
13. The variations are ‘īrām aha’ instead of our ‘īrām u ha’ in (c) and
'apasedhati' for our 'apasedhatāṁ' in (d). I think however that the influence here is SS. XII. 16. 1. 3, where the verse occurs with only one variation 'apasedhati' in (d), as in the AV., because SS. has influenced many chapters in our text (compare our I. 24. and IV. 8).

The meaning of Aranyaka: Prof. Oldenberg (p. 214) says that the meaning is unknown to him but that it seems to be a musical instrument. Prof. Stenzler translates it as 'schnell-schlinger.' The dictionary (Monier Williams) meaning is "One who bestows praise or hymns the gods." V. S. Apte's dictionary gives the meaning "praising readily (aram)". I think that the key to the meaning of this word is to be found in RV. IV. 58. 3e: "tridhā baddho vṛṣabhoro roravīti". (=The bull (i.e. the fire-god) bound thrice, crackles loudly). A grhya fire was always near at hand in all domestic rites, and then the term is figuratively transferred to the Manika or the metallic water-barrel (bound with straps) from which must be proceeding curious sounds, as it was being installed on the four stones. These sounds are looked upon as auspicious invocations.

AG. II. 9. 5: Athāsminnapa āsecayet (a) "Aitu rājā Varuṇa revatibhir (b) asminsthiṁ teṣṭhathat modamāṇah | (c) ḫrāṁ vahanto gṛṣṭam uksiṁañ | (d) Mitreṇa sākanh saha sam-uṣṭhantu" iti

Trans: He should then pour water into it with the mantra (a) "May King Varuṇa come here with the plentiful (waters); (b) may he abide rejoicing, at this place; (c) bringing prosperity and dripping with ghee (d) may they rest here with Mitra.

Sources: (a) and (b). The first two pādas are found without variation in KS. 25. 5. 28 which is an expiatory verse recited when the Praṣṭātā waters are spilt,—a context suggestive of our context.

Clause: (c) is = Āś. 2. 15. 17e which occurs in the 'Grha-prapadana'—section which is presupposed in our text II. 10. 1. It also occurs in ĀPS. 6. 27. 3 in the same context as in Āś. Among sūtra-texts, MG. 2. 11. 17 has all the first three pādas with unimportant variations. The last pāda then is the only improvisation of our text.

AG. II. 10. 6: Šayati, I: "Yēsām udhaścaturbilam madhoh pūrṇam-gṛṣṭasya ca | tāḥ naḥ santu payasyatir bahvīr gṛṣṭhe gṛṣṭācyah | II. Up.idaitu mayobhuva īrjan caujoṣa bibhratih | duḥānā aksītam payo mayī gṛṣṭhe nivīṣadham yatā bhaṭvamuyuttamaḥ.

Trans: When they (i.e. the cows) are coming back (from the pastur-lands, after grazing), he recites over them the mantra: I "May they whose udders, each with its four holes, are full of honey and ghee, abound in milk for us, many (i.e. multiplying) in our stable, dripping with ghee. II Come hither to me, giving refreshment and bearing power and vitality. Yielding inexhaustible milk, rest with me, in (my) stable, that I may become the highest one.

Sources: These two verses constitute a khila of two stanzas found neither in Aufrecht nor Müller but given in the khila collection of the Kashmir manuscript of the RV. as reported by Prof. Macdonell in his note
to the translation of the Brhaddevatā (verse) VIII. 83 (p. 316. HOS, vol. 6.) :—"Between 'yenedam' (i.e. a khila preceding RV. X. 167, mentioned by him on p. 312) and this (i.e. the Nejameṣa khila), the Kashmir collection has one of two stanzas beginning 'yāsāṃ udhaś caturbilaṃ' and coming before RV. X. 170".

APS. 7. 17. 1 has a mantra the first three pādas of which are identical with the first three of (I), the fourth being 'asmin goṣṭhe vayovrdhaḥ'. The mantra is employed at the Nirūdhapāṣu-bandha (an animal-sacrifice) after the killing of the animal.

The text of the Rg-veda khila (reported by Macdonell), has been printed on p. 129 of 'Die Apokryphen des Rg-veda' by SchefteLOWITZ with the following variations:—'Mayobhuvam' occurs there for our 'Mayo bhuvah', a 'pipratīḥ' for our 'bibhratīḥ' and 'mama gotre' for our 'mayi goṣṭhe' in II.

AG. II. 10. 8 : 

Gaṇān āśāmupatiṣṭhetāgurugaṇānām, (a) "bhūtāh stha, 
praśastāh stha, śobhanāh priyāh ; (b) priyo vo bhūyāsam; śam mayi jān-
dhvam iti |

Trans : He waits upon their herds not including (i.e. when they do not include) the cows of his preceptor with the formula (a) "You are doing well; excellent are you, beautiful, beloved. (b) May I become dear to you! May you see bliss in me"!

Sources: Only MS. 4. 2. 3 has "Praśastāh stha kalyānayah" resembling somewhat our (a), but the mantra as it is in our text is not traced to early texts or any parallel sūtra-text. I think the last sūtra (the 8th) with its mantra is an interpolation for the following reasons (1) There is nothing corresponding to this rule in any other Grhya-Sūtra. (2) The reference to the 'Cows of the Guru' is most surprising as from Kaṇḍikā I. 23 to this Kaṇḍikā (II. 10), the duties of a house-holder are described. (3) The rule itself: that the cow of his Guru should be excluded from the homage which is to be paid exclusively to his own cows is amazing! To avoid this absurd suggestion, if we suppose the implication to be that a different mantra was to be employed in the case of his Guru's cows then that mantra should have followed. (4) The end of a Kaṇḍikā, besides, is an easy place for interpolations and additions, generally speaking.

Kaṇḍikās 1 to 4, in Adhyāya III.

These Kaṇḍikās deal with the five daily sacrifices and 'svādhyāya' in particular. Prof. Oldenburg compares the Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa XI. 5. 6. 1 seqq. for III. 1. 1 seqq; it may be added however that Kaṇḍikās 1 and 4 of the IIIrd. Adhyāya agree so strikingly, not only in substance but also in the wording of their Sūtras and Mantras with the Anuvākas II. 10-14 of TA. that the question of borrowing is hardly in doubt! That some of the citations in these kaṇḍikās are traced only to TA. will be shown later but instances of close parallels and borrowings in the wording and substance of Sūtras are
as follows:—III. 1. 1-2 are parallel to TA. II. 10. 1; and III. 1. 3 to TA. II. 10. 2-6. As regards Kaṇḍikā III. 2, it borrows nearly all its rules, its peculiar terms and expressions like ‘darbhāṇāṃ mahadupastīrya’ and its quotation in Sūtra 2 from TA. II. 11. In III. 3, sūtras 2 and 3 are almost word for word identical with TA. II. 10. 7-8, except for a few unimportant changes e.g. our text substitutes ‘amṛtasya kulyāḥ’ and ‘amṛtāhitibhiḥ’ for ‘medasaḥ kulyāḥ’ and ‘medāhitibhiḥ’ respectively in TA.; the quotation in sūtra 4 is taken over bodily from TA. II. 12. 4. In the next Kaṇḍika (III. 4) sūtras 6 and 7 are nearly identical, word for word, with the corresponding passages in TA. II. 15. 3. 7. and 1 respectively!

AG. III. 2. 2. Vijñāyate “apāṃ vā eṣa oṣadhīnām rasō yaddarbhāḥ, sarasameva tadbrahma karoti”.

Trans: It is known (from the Śruti) ‘This is what darbha grass is: it is the essence of waters and herbs. In this way he makes the Brahman endowed with essence’.

Sources: The whole quotation is traced to TA. II. 11. 3 where it is found word for word but to no other text.

AG. III. 3. 4: ‘Sa yāvan manyeta tavadakātyaḥ paridadhāti: (a) “Namo brahmaye namo astavagnaye, (b) namah prthiviyai, nama oṣadhibhyah | (c) namo vāce namo vācaspataye, (d) namo viṣṇave mahate karomi”’ iti

Trans: Having recited those texts (i.e. the Rcas, Yajus etc. enumerated in Sūtra 1) as far as he thinks (sufficient for the daily lesson), he concludes (by pouring oblations of water) with the mantra “Adoration to Brahman! Adoration be to Agni! Adoration to the Earth! Adoration to the Plants! Adoration to Speech! Adoration to the Lord of Speech! Adoration I bring to the great Viṣṇu!”

Sources: TA. II. 12. 3 and ṚP. 14. 34. 5 are identical verses except that both the texts have ‘bhraṭe’ for ‘mahate’ in our (d). That an oblation is meant to be offered (as Nārāyaṇa says) with this mantra, is made clear by what follows this mantra in ṚP. “Śvāheta āhūtinḥ hūtvā” etc. TA. II. 13. 4 refers to this very verse as the ‘Paridhāṇīya’ or the ‘Closing verse’ of the Śvādhīya.

AG. III. 4. 6-7: Athāpi viṣṇāyate, (a) “sa yadi tiṣṭhan vrajaṁśāṅghaḥ śavāna vā, (b) yāṁ yāṁ kratum adhitē, tena tena hāśya kratum ādhitē | Viṣṇāyate, (c) tasya dvāvānādhyāyau yadātmāsucir yaddesāḥ | 7 |

Trans: Sūtra 6th: And it is known (from the Śruti) “If he, whether standing, walking, sitting or lying, recites any particular ‘sacrifice’ (i.e. sacrificial text), a sacrifice, indeed, has been offered by him, through (the recitation of) that sacrificial text”. Sutra 7: It is known (from the śruti) “There are only two cases for abstention from Vedic Study: when he is impure himself or when the place is impure”.

Sources: The formula cited in Sūtra 6 where (a) and (b) make one sentence is evidently made up of two parts taken from TA. II. 15. 4 and 7
and joined together. Clause (a) is also found in TA. II. 12. 3 which after stating that ‘Śvādhyaṛya’ should be studied in the village mentally, by day or night, or in a forest, silently or loudly adds “Uta tiṣṭhannuta vrajannuatāsina uta ṣāyāno’dhīyātaiva śvādhyaṛyam” | and TA. II. 15. 7 says that ‘svādhyaṛya’ must be studied because ‘Yaṁ yaṁ kratumadhīte’ etc. exactly as in our text. Formula (c) in Sūtra 7 is also taken from TA. II. 15. 1 “Tasya vā etasya yajñasya (the sacrifice in the form of vedic study) dvāvanadhyāyau” etc. as in our text.

AG. III. 6.7 : Kṣutvā jñmbhitvāmanoṁṇaṁ dṛṣṭvā pāpakaṁ gandhamā-ghrāya, aksispandane karnaṁvantane ca, I “(a) sucaksā ahem aksibhyāṁ bhūyāsam, (b) suvarcā mukhena suśrut karnābhyāṁ; II (c) mayi dakṣa- kartu” iti jāpet |

Trans: If one sneezes, yawns, sees an unpleasant sight, smells a foul smell or if there is throbbing of the eyes or noises in the ears, one should mutter the mantra:—

I. (a) ‘Well-eyed may I become with my eyes, (b) resplendent with my face and well-hearing with my ears. II (c) May alertness and efficiency be (present) in me.’

Sources of I : I (a) and (b) are traced to the Nirukta 7. 3 with the addition of ‘bhūyāsam’ at the end of (b), in a discussion of the nature of Vedic Stanzas. It is said there that some Vedic stanzas are mere benedicitions and not praise (‘athāpyāśīreva na stutiḥ’) and then our mantra is cited as an instance in point. Thus though the mantra is not traced to any existing vedic text, it was known to the Nirukta as a Vedic stanza.

Among Sūtra-texts the mantra is found in PG. 2. 6. 19; in MG. 1. 9. 25 with the addition of bhūyāsam (as in N. 7. 3 above) and the later regular form ‘aksibhyām’ instead of the ‘aksibhyām’ of our text, which is an early form found in the RV.

Sources of II (c) : This constitutes a separate mantra though our text has joined it on to (a) and (b), to make up one mantra. APS. 4. 3. 12 has it in an identical form “Jaṇjabhyamāno brūyāt ‘mayi dakṣakrāt’” (If one yawns, one should repeat the mantra....etc). This seems to have been the clue for our text where ‘yawning’ is one of the occasions for the citation. A variation of the formula with no change in meaning is found in VS. 38.27b ‘Mayi dakṣo mayi kratuḥ’ where it is a ‘pravargya’ formula employed when the sacrificer and the priests drink the contents of the ‘Caldron’. This same variant is found in SB. 14. 3. 1. 21; TB. 3. 7. 9. 4; TA. 4. 21. 1 and SS. 7. 7. 16. 8 in exactly the same context as in VS.

AG. III. 6. 8 : Agamaṁyāṁ gatvāyājyam yājajitvā abhojyam bhaktvā apratigṛhyam pratigṛhyam, caityam yūpaṁ copahati, I (a) “punar māmai- tvindriyam, (b) punarāyuḥ punarbhagaḥ | (c) punar dravinamaitu mām | (d) punar brahmaṇam aitū mām svāhā |

II. (a) ime ye dhiṣṣyāsas aṅgayo; (d) yathā-sthānamiha kalpatām | (c)
Vaiśvānarō vāydhānāḥ (d) antaryacchatu me mano (e) hṛdayantararamat-tasya ketuḥ svāhétayājyāhūti juhuyāt |

Trans: If one approaches one’s wife when she ought not to be approached (i.e. when she is in her monthly course), performs a sacrifice for a person for whom it ought not to be performed, eats forbidden food, accepts what ought not to accepted and knocks against a ‘caitya’ column (i.e. a column belonging to a sanctuary or temple near a village; compare ‘caitya-yajña’ in I. 12. 1), one should offer two Āhya oblations with the following mantras: I “Again to me, may come back the power of the senses, again come back (good) fortune; may my wealth come back to me; may my spiritual power come back to me! Svāhā! II These fires here, that have altars (assigned to them), may they be in their proper places. May Vaiśvānarā, the increasing one, the emblem of immortality, restrain my mind within my self! Svāhā!”

Sources of I and II: Profs. STENZLER and OLDENBERG compare AV. VII. 67. 1; but this verse has a general resemblance only to parts of our two verses e.g. its first pāda is nearly the same as our I (a); its second pāda roughly corresponds to I (c) and (d) together; its third pāda to II (a) and its fourth to II (b). The proper source of our I is TA. I. 30. 1—a verse identical with ours except for insignificant variations e.g. it has ‘prāitu’ for our ‘āitu’ in (a); the pādas (c) and (d) are virtually the same as our (d) and (c) with ‘mā’ instead of our ‘mām’ at the end of both.

The source of II (a) and (b) may, however, well be the last two pādas of the AV. verse VII. 67. 1 which reads (c) “Punaragneya dhīṣṇyāsō, (d) yathāsthāma kalpayantām ihaiva” | Our text seems to have made a complete mantra of II by joining to these two pādas verse-parts derived from other sources. These probably are: TB. 3. 10. 8. 9; the last two pādas of this verse read ‘Vaiśvānarō raśnībhīr vāydhāno’ntras tiṣṭhantv amṛtasya gopāḥ|| and are remarkably similar to our II (c) and (d); besides the first two pādas of this TB. -verse are reminiscent of our I. ĀPS 17. 23. 11 is a verse identical with this TB. -verse in its last two pādas that are so similar to our II (c) and (d).

ĀG. III. 8. 9. and 10:—(a) ‘…………āśmanastejo’si ca kṣurma pāḥti ca kṣuṣi ṛṇjaỹīta [9] (b) ‘āśmanas tejo’si śrotam me pāḥti’ kuṇḍale abadhnīta | 10 |

Trans: Śūtra 9. (Having bathed and put on new garments) he gets his eyes salved (āṇjaỹīta is a causal form) with the formula: ‘Thou art the sharpness of the stone; protect my eye’ (śūtra 10): with the formula ‘Thou art the sharpness of the stone, protect my ear’ he puts on the two earrings.

Context. This is part of the ceremony of ‘samāvartana’ (the return of the pupil to his home) in which a bath signifying the end of his period of studentship is taken.

Sources: The first part of (a) and (b) is the same: ‘āśmanastejo’si’ and
is not traced anywhere. It is probably an improvisation of the text itself. It could be addressed to the collyrium or eye-salve because it is rubbed and powdered on a stone and to the ear-rings because they are made of precious stone. The latter part of both (a) and (b) viz., ‘caksur me pāhi’ and ‘śrotram me pāhi’ are found in TS. III. 2. 10. 2 in the offering of the Pratinirgrāhya cups and also in TS. 4. 3. 6. 2 and VS. 14. 17, the context in both places being the laying of the ‘Prāṇabṛṭ’ bricks in the Agni-cayana but the real influence seems to be TS. 1. 2. 1. 2, although only the latter part of (a) is found there because the context is so allied to ours. In the Soma sacrifice, the sacrificer shaves his whiskers to the accompaniment of mantras (parallel to mantras cited in our I. 17. 7. 8) takes a bath, puts on his garment and then salves his eyes with the formula ‘Caksuṣpac caksur me pāhi’. The series of ritual acts here are exactly parallel to those in our text.

AG. III. 8. 16. ‘Anārtosya narātōhām bhūyāsām’ iti srajamapi badhnátā | : Trans. With the formula ‘Free from distress art thou, free from distress may I become’ he puts on the wreath also.

Sources. Only the word ‘anārtā’ is traced to TA. 4. 42. 2 in a slightly similar context. ‘Anārtāṁ devatāṁ prapadye’—I approach the deity free from distress (or health-giving according to the commentator). This is a benedictory formula recited after the ceremony of Dīkṣā with hot water in hand.

AG. III. 8. 19 : (a) ‘Devānāṁ pratiṣṭhe sthāḥ sarvato mā pātam’ ityupāna- hāvāsthāya (b) ‘divas’ chadmaśīti’ chatramadatte |

Trans. He puts on his shoes with the formula: ‘You are the support of the gods; protect me from all sides’; and takes up the sunshade with the formula ‘Thou art the canopy of heaven.

Sources. (a) is found only in ĀPMB. II. 9. 3—‘Pratiṣṭhe stho devatānāṁ mā mā sarśtpam’ (you are the support of deities, do not torment me)—which mantra is employed by ĀPG. 12. 11 in the same context as ours. The nearest approach to (b), is in LS 1. 7. 15: ‘diyavāṁ chadmaśī viśvajanasya chāyā’ (Thou art a divine canopy, the shade for all people), addressed to a branch of the Udumbara tree while it is being raised.

AG. III. 8. 20 :—(a) ‘Venuras, (b) Vānaspatyo’śi (c) sarvato mā pāhīti vān vapam dandaṁ |

Trans. (He takes up) a staff of reed with the formula: (a) ‘Reed thou art, (b) Of vanaspati art thou; (c) protect me from all sides’.

Sources. (b) is found in PB. 1. 2. 4 addressed to a Drope (or vessel of wood) and in PB. 6. 5. 3 addressed to a Soma vessel. In APS 1. 16. 3, the formula is addressed to the cup of Praṇītā waters while it is being washed.

A formula with the same general sense as that of (b) and (c) is AV. 12. 3. 18c. ‘Vānaspatya udvato mā jihīṁśī’ [made of a tree (and) uplifted as thou art, do not injure me] which accompanies (according to Kauś. 61. 22) the pounding of rice-grains with a pestle.

(To be continued.)
MISCELLANEA

WHEN DID BERNIER ARRIVE IN INDIA?

In the Chronicle of Life and Times of François Bernier the following statement is recorded with regard to Bernier's arrival in India:

"1656-1658—Goes to Egypt.....Is compelled to abandon his intention of visiting Abyssinia and sets sail in an Indian vessel for Surat, which he reaches in twenty-two days, most probably towards the end of 1658 or early in 1659."

(Vide p. XX of Bernier's Travels, Constable's Oriental Miscellany, Vol. I, 1891.)

On pp. 2-3 of Constable's Edition, Bernier himself refers to his arrival in India as follows:

"I embarked, therefore, in an Indian vessel, passed the Straits of Bab-el-mandeb, and in two and twenty days arrived at Sourate, in Hindustan, the empire of the Great Mogul. I found that the reigning prince was named Chah-Jehan, or King of the World."

In the above statement of Bernier no date of Bernier's arrival at Surat is found recorded and perhaps on this account in the extract from the Chronicle of Bernier's Life and Times recorded above the Editor uses the words "most probably towards the end of 1658 or early in 1659" with reference to Bernier's arrival at Surat in India.

The question now arises: What is the exact year in which Bernier arrived at Surat? I have not read the French original of Bernier's Travels on which Constable's edition is based but I possess a copy of the English Translation of Bernier's History of the Late Revolution of the Empire of the Great Mogol (with a letter to Lord Colbert) "Englished out of French" and published in London in 1671 (size 3½"×6¼"). In this book which is a contemporary translation of Bernier's Travels we find that Bernier arrived at Surat in A.D. 1655 as will be seen from the following extract:

"Pages 4-5—"These considerations among others, induced me to change my resolution. I went aboard of an Indian vessel; I passed those streights, and in two and twenty days I arrived at Suratte in Indostan, the Empire of the Great Mogol, in the year 1655. There I found, that he who reigned there, was call'd Chah-Jehan, that is to say, King of the world; etc.""

The Editor of Constable's Edition of Bernier's Travels refers to the London Edition of the Travels of A.D. 1671 (vide p. xxvii) but evidently he has not read the above extract which clearly states A.D. 1655 as the date of Bernier's arrival at Surat in India, and consequently he makes a doubtful statement regarding the year of Bernier's arrival in India viz. "most probably towards the end of 1658 or early in 1659". Will any expert in the field of Indian History examine the above contemporary evidence and let me know if the evidence brought forth by me is corroborated by other contemporary evidence? As Bernier died at Paris in A.D. 1688 (22nd September), I presume that he must have seen this Translation of A.D. 1671.

P. K. GODE.
THE PANIS IN THE RIGVEDA.

(Their identification with the Nāga Tribe)

The recent discoveries in the Mohenjo Daro, Chanhu Daro and Harappa have really worked as an eye-opener, and have given a clue in regard to the history of Proto-Indian civilisation. Amongst the many indigenous peoples mentioned in the Picto-phonographic inscriptions (as Rev. H. Heras, S.J., would term them) obtaining in those times, the Nāgas also acquired a prominent place. The Nāgas evidently acquired their tribal name on account of their being the direct worshippers of the Nāga (cobra). Dr. Jayaswal and others have, however, dealt with the problem of the activities of the Nāgas in historic times. And it should be a matter of surprise, indeed, if we are not able to trace their history in the Vedic period also.

The Vedic Aryans always speak of the Dasyus, Dāsas and Panpis as being inimical towards them. The dialogue between Saramā and the Panpis is too well-known to be mentioned again. It has been a matter of great puzzle to all the Indologists who have worked in the field up-till-now as to who were these Panpis. It is a fact worth noting that the Panpis are referred to only in the Vedic literature. They have been termed as Rākṣasas in the Varāha Purāṇa, Adhyāya 16. In fact in the Varāha Purāṇa the dialogue is said to have taken place between Saramā and the Rākṣasas. Apart from this, we are not in a position to trace their history either in Pre-Vedic or Post-Vedic times.

The actual passage in the Varāha Purāṇa referring to the Panpis throws a direct light on their location in those ancient times. The stanza runs as follows—

आगम्यते तद्वादि महात्मन्येन परवताम्।
हिमवन्ते समाधिते सरिष्ठितो नु बस्युष्टः॥


Thus it is evident that the Panpis were located somewhere at the foot of the Himalaya mountains originally. Then, who were these Panpis—the best of the trading class population?

In our opinion a proper understanding and study of the Dravidian literature and history would help us in regard to the solution of many of the problems in the history of Vedic India. Dr. Kittel in his Kannada-English Dictionary has given the meaning of the word Panpi as follows—

Panpi = Tadbhava of Phani, Cobra—Which is the same as Nāga. But the word Phani does not occur in the Vedic literature. Therefore, is it possible that the word Phani is itself derived from the word ‘Panpi’, which is in vogue so long in Southern India.

We agree with Rev. H. Heras, S. J., when he says that the Yadus and Turvasus were the first immigrants in India.1 It was more or less in the period of the Yādavas that the process of Sanskritisation of many of the Dravidian words and terminologies had begun to take place. The Minas were rendered as Matsyas. Eventually the word ‘Nāga’ found an equivalent in the word ‘Panpi’ at their hands. But like the word ‘Matsya,’ the word ‘Panpi’ did not get currency in later literature.

Another fact in support of our argument is that the Panpis are said to have been the worshippers of Ahi-Vṛtra, in the Rigveda. If this be so, will this derivation throw a new light on the history of the Nāgas in the Vedic times also?

A. P. Karmarkar.

SUR LES INFINITIFS VÉDIQUES EN -ASE

By
LOUIS RENOU, Paris.

§ 1. Seul l'examen toujours plus attentif du formulaire, des conditions de grammaire et de style dans lesquelles se présente une forme, permet de faire progresser l'interprétation littérale du Rgveda : il élimine certaines possibilités qui semblent plausibles lorsqu'on envisage un seul passage, mais qui se révèlent comme insoutenables ou du moins invraisemblables dès qu'on a parcouru la totalité des emplois.

Soit le cas des "infinits" en -ase. A examiner l'ensemble de ces formes replongées dans leur contexte, on ne peut manquer de voir quelle est leur configuration, dans quelle ambiance elles se meuvent. L'impression générale ainsi acquise sert de proche en proche à éclairer les cas douteux, à choisir entre des interprétations divergentes, théoriquement possibles.

Les formes en -ase sont un groupe de noms d'action exprimant le résultat —but ou conséquence—par rapport auquel est formulé le procès. Mais cette détermination finale ou consécutive, loin d'être nécessaire, ne se relie que d'une manière plus ou moins lâche à la phrase, laquelle est en principe complète et se suffit sans cette détermination. L'"infinatif" en -ase note, comme dit DELBRÜCK AI. Syntax p. 422, un complément (Ergänzung)—on pourrait dire un supplément—à la formulation. Ainsi visvam jivam 
carâse bodhâyantâ I 92 9 "(l'Aurore) éveillant tous les êtres vivants, en sorte qu'ils se meuvent", ou têna no mja jivâse IX 66 30 "fais-nous la faveur de ce (laît, ô Soma), afin que (grâce à lui) nous vivions".

Il est vrai que dans un groupe d'exemples nous sentons la forme en -ase différemment, plus unie au verbe, de détermination plus nécessaire et plus proche. Ceci se produit lorsque le verbe est ravalé à la fonction d'auxiliaire, type bhîyâse mrgâm kâh V 29 4 "(Indra) a effrayé la bête (Vêtra)". Mais il est à présumer que la valeur finale ou consécutive continuait à être présente au sujet, une phrase telle que celle-là signifiant proprement "il a agi sur la bête en sorte qu'elle fut effrayée". Il s'agit là d'un développement plus rapide de la forme en -ase, en situation favorable, non d'un emploi nouveau.

Avec des degrés variables de resserrement entre l'auxiliaire et l'infinatif, on a ainsi pusyâse dhâh VI 13 5, jivâse dhâh III 36 10, jivâse dhât AV. XVIII 3 63 = 4 54, kṛṇuthâ jivâse VIII 67 17, kṛdhî... jivâse 12, kartâ jivâse I 172 3, caṅśasa étave kṛthâh I 112 8. La coincidence de la racine dhâ- et de la forme en -ase suffit à infirmer la constatation de GELDNER
(n. ad I 141 6) qui réfère dhāyase à la racine dhā- parce que, dit-il, cette racine se trouve plusieurs fois en contact avec cet infinitif.

§ 2. Les conditions, qu'on vient de rappeler, du fonctionnement de l’"infinitif" en -ase, doivent permettre maintenant d’écarter un certain nombre d’interprétations qui entraînent des divergences par rapport à la structure très simple de ce type.

C’est ainsi d’abord que la forme en -ase dépend d’un verbe personnel ou d’un prédicat nominal qui en tient lieu, mais qu’elle ne dépend pas d’un adjectif. Dès lors la correction (sur la base de certains manuscrits) d’ārīṣvantam VIII 51 3 en āvisyantam, que propose GRASSMANN (cf. aussi LUDWIG), et qui aboutit à la traduction āvisyantam nā bhōjase “comme quelqu’un qui est avide de jouir”, introduit inutilement un infinitif dépendant d’un participe non prédicat. La vraie interprétation est celle vers laquelle nous orientent les discussions d’OLDENBERG ad loc. “(Indra en tant que (le dieu) qui s’abstient d’endommager, en sorte que (l’homme pieux) jouisse (de lui)”).

§ 3. L’"infinitif" en -ase ne compte pas de régime à l’accusatif. Ce trait distingue fortement le type en -ase de la plupart des autres catégories d’infinitifs védiques, et souligne sans aucun doute les attaches qu’il conserve avec le nom d’action dont il est issu. La forme en -ase tantôt se fonde sur des verbes qui ne comportent pas de régime, tantôt n’exprime pas le régime que d’après les autres formes verbales on pourrait théoriquement attendre.

Cette constatation nous met en mesure d’expliquer autrement qu’on ne l’a fait quelques passages où un régime accusatif est plausible à première vue. Ainsi X 77 1 sumārūtam nā brahmānam arhāse gaṇam astoṣy eṣāṁ : GRASSMANN (et de même, semble-t-il, LUDWIG) comprend brahmānam comme régime d’arhāse, OLDENBERG reconnaît sumārūtam en cette même, fonction, tandis que Max Müller hésite entre les deux éventualités. Tenant compte du caractère “absolu” de la forme en -ase, nous traduisons sans difficulté “j’ai loué la troupe de ces (Marut), leur bonne nature de Maruṭ, comme (on loue) un brâhmane, en sorte d’avoir des droits (à leur faveur)”. Au v. I. 141 6 GELDNER donne śāṃsam pour régime à dhāyase “pour apporter la louange”. Mais cette interprétation a l’inconvénient de conférer à dhāyase une valeur qui ne s’accorde ni avec les conditions morphologiques du mot, ni avec l’ensemble des passages où il figure. Dhāyase signifie ici comme ailleurs “pour recevoir (ou : procurer) la nourriture (rituelle), pour satisfaire ou être satisfait”, cf. PISCHEL VSt. I, p. 217. Et. śāṃsam se reliera très naturellement à mārtam (BERGAIGNE Rel. I p. 306). Dhāyase est d’ailleurs un datif nominal, comme le montre la présence occasionnelle d’un régime génitif I 94 12, 72 9 V 7 6 et 9.

Dans VIII 4 17 vēmi teva pūsann rījāse vēmi stōtave (v. sur le v. OLDENBERG ad loc. et ZDMG. LV. p. 308) l’accusatif teva est le régime de vēmi, comme déjà DELBRÜCK Ai. Syntax p. 423 l’avait senti : “jet t’aborde en vue d’exalter, en vue de louer”.
§ 4. Dans deux passages la présence d’un régime accusatif est en effet indéniable, mais la forme en -ase d’où il dépend est une seconde personne d’indicatif, non un infinitif. C’est d’une part V 15 4 mātēva yād bhārāse pāprathānā jāmanjanam ḍhāyase cākṣase ca. L’interprétation de bhārāse comme infinitif, imaginée par Ludwig, est en soi peu vraisemblable et la traduction convenable est celle que donne par exemple Oldenberg (Ved. Hymns p. 399) “quand (ō Agni) tu portes comme une mère les êtres successifs, en t’étendant, pour qu’ils soient satisfaits, pour qu’ils voient (la lumière du jour)”.

D’autre part I 25 17 yāto me mādhv āḿhrām kōteva kṣādase priyām. Geldner traduit “ pourquoi le doux breuvage m’a été apporté, en sorte que je goûte (le breuvage) aimé comme (fait) le hotṛ”, mettant le v. dans la bouche d’un malade auquel on donne le soma comme médicament. Cette notion passablement insolite se démontre grammaticalement peu satisfaisante, puisqu’elle aboutit à poser une forme en -ase avec un accusatif priyām. Mais la pensée et la syntaxe sont en ordre si l’on traduit “puisque (ō Varuṇa) tu goûtes comme un hotṛ le doux breuvage aimé que j’ai apporté”.

§ 5. Enfin au v. I 55 3 tvām tām indra pārvatam nā bhōjase mahō nṛṇānāya dhārmanām īrajyasi. Geldner ici à nouveau entend pārvatam comme régime de bhōjase “tu possèdes les assises d’un grand courage, en sorte que tu en jouis comme d’une montagne”. Mais Oldenberg ad loc. a justement observé que pārvatam dépend d’īrajyasi et que cette forme verbale dispose d’un double régime accusatif et génitif comme il advient plus d’une fois dans le Veda : la construction réelle est “comme (on possède) une montagne, pour (1’) exploiter”. Ceci peut paraître d’abord non nécessaire et même inutilement compliqué. Ce devient convaincant lorsque de cette formule tripartite pārvatam nā bhōjase où l’élément central est la particule comparative on rapproche les formules analogues (ā tvā ... huvē) gām iva bhōjase VIII 65 3 “(je t’appelle) comme (on appelle) une vache, afin de tirer profit (de son lait)” (cf. Bercaigne Quar. Hy. p. 34) ou gām nā dohāse (huvē) VI 45 7 “(je l’appelle) comme une vache, en vue de (la) traire”. L’accusatif, comme on voit, dépend du verbe personnel, non de la forme en -ase.

§ 6. L’existence de ce groupement formulaire (auquel serait à agréger harito nāyase I 57 3, gāvām iva śriyāse V 59 3 sumārūtam nā... arhāse cité § 3, peut-être duvāse nā kārāh I 165 14, v. Oldenberg) conduit à éliminer une explication fallacieuse de Ludwig et de Grassmann pour le v. VIII 76 1 ḫuva indram... nā vṛṭjāse. L’un et l’autre voient là la négation nā. La comparaison avec gām nā dohāse huvē précitée montre qu’ils font fausse route. Le sens est “j’appelle Indra comme (celui-là même que je dois appeler), afin qu’il tourne (son chemin et vienne à moi)”. Il y a là une sorte de proposition comparative elliptique où seule demeure la particule : cf. Oldenberg ad VIII 70 3 qui rend compte du fait de manière analogue. On s’achemine ainsi, précisément dans le cadre des formules en -ase, à un emploi quasi expletif de nā : celui qu’on a au v. X 77 1 gāyām astośy eśām
ná sōbhāse "j'ai loué la troupe de ces (Marut) afin que, pour ainsi dire, ils resplendissent" : cf. OLDENBERG ad loc. Max MÜLLER avait déjà noté le caractère "intraduisible" du ná.

De même dans à yát sedāthur dhruvāse ná yónim VII 70 1 "lorsque vous vous êtes installés (ō Ásvin) dans votre séjour comme pour vous y affermir" ; et dans ārīṣyantarā nā bhōjase (déjà cité § 2).

§ 7. Si l'accusatif fait défaut, le datif est fréquent : juxtaposé à la forme en -ase sans que le poète ait la moindre répugnance à accoler ainsi à un "infinitif" une forme de nom d'action purement nominale : kṣāyāya jīvāse X 58 1-12 "pour que tu possèdes pacifiquement (tes richesses), pour que tu vives", carāthāya jīvāse I 36 14 "pour marcher, pour vivre" (il est vrai que les noms en -athāya sont eux aussi des semi-infinitifs WACKERNAGEL Mél. Saussure p. 130 n.), kṛāve dākṣyāya jīvāse (que suit parfois l'infinitif āptē) X 57 4 AV. VI 19 2 XVIII 2 23, dīrgāhāyūtyā cākṣase AV. VI 68 2 TS. I 2 la MS. IV 10 6 etc. Il suit de là que la locution urugāyāya jīvāse I 155 4 ne saurait être comme le veut GRASSMANN "pour un bonheur de vivre illimité", mais avec GELDNER "pour marcher au loin, pour vivre", ce qui cadre fort bien avec d'autres emplois d'urugāyā-. Ni rāṇyāya cākṣase X 9 1 "pour voir la joie" (GRASSMANN, LUDWIG), mais "pour la joie, pour (la faculté de) voir (= de vivre) ".

§ 8. Lorsque le datif juxtaposé est un nom d'être animé, il prend valeur de sujet de l' "infinitif", comme le fait se produit sur une plus grande échelle pour d'autres infinitifs védiques. Ainsi la locution tokya jīvāse VIII 67 12 "pour nos enfants, pour qu'ils vivent" aboutira naturellement à "pour que nos enfants vivent", d'autant que ce groupe de mots est sous la dépendance de kṛdhī "fais (en sorte) " GRASSMANN a mal rendu tout le vers, qui repose sur deux phrases infinitives pivotant sur kṛdhī. De même on a X 35 12 pāśve tokāya tānayāya jīvāse. Dès lors se confirme aisément comme datif le pronom nāh de la clausule fréquente jīvase nāh "pour que nous vivions" (cf. aussi pūrṣyāse nāh "pour que nous prospérons" : na spārase § 9). Cet emploi d'un datif agrégé à la forme en -ase est assez vivant pour qu'au v. III 53 18 on voie un poète délaisser le cadre locatif des pāda a b (bālam dhehi taniṣu bālam anālīṣu) pour poursuivre au pāda c, avec le datif, bālam tokāya tānayāya jīvāse. Ou encore au v. I 146 5 ilēnyo mahā ārbhāya jīvāse où la notion attendue "il est digne d'être invoqué par le grand (comme) par le petit, en sorte (qu'ils obtiennent le droit) de vivre" glisse vers cella de "... invoqué, en sorte que vivent grand et petit" : le terme ārbha-, contigu à jīvāse, se laissant attirer au datif, tandis que mahā- demeure étranger à cette attraction (v. OLDENBERG ad loc.).

§ 9. Y a-t-il place, dans le cadre des formes en -ase, pour un datif régime, comme on a pour d'autres infinitifs védiques, type dhaye hāntavā u "pour tuer le dragon" ? On a cru pouvoir en identifier quelques-uns. La masse des emplois et des habitudes du type en -ase conduit à les écarter. Ainsi d'abord pour le v. VIII 20 8 ise bhujē... na spārase. La traduction
de Grassmann "aidez-nous à boire, à jouer" accumule les invraisemblances philologiques. Il n'y a pas trace ailleurs d'un emploi "impératif" de la forme en -ase ; la racine spr ne signifie pas "aider" ; naḥ ne saurait avoir à côté de spārase une fonction autre que celle qu'il a à côté de jīvāse ou de pusyāse (§ 8). On écartera ainsi encore Ludwig qui traduit bizarrement "zu der speise genuz... zum verlangen (zum hinraffen) sind sie (geschaffen)" et Max Müller "ils doivent jouir de leur nourriture, ils doivent nous aider". En conformité avec l'emploi général de -ase, on obtient aisément la traduction "pour que nous jouissions (bhujē) de la force rituelle, pour que nous soyons vainqueurs". De même jyāsthīya dhāyāse III 50 3 ne sera pas, comme le veulent les traducteurs, "pour exercer la souveraineté" (traduction d'auvant moins pertinente que, comme on l'a vu § 3 dhāyāse est plutôt un nom d'action pur qu'un infinitif), mais "en vue de la souveraineté, en vue de la satisfaction rituelle" ; avrkāyā dhāyāse I 31 13 non "pour créer la sécurité" (Geldner), mais "en vue de la sécurité, en vue de la satisfaction" ou plus verbalement (Pischel VSt. I p. 217 Oldenberg SBE. XLVI p. 23) "en sorte qu'il ait la sécurité, qu'il jouisse des mets rituels" ; indriyāya dhāyāse IX 70 5, 86 3 est "pour la force d'Indra, pour qu'il trouve satisfaction", la traduction, plus aisée en apparence, de Grassmann "pour qu'Indra boive" se heurte à IX 89 6 où figure en même contexte indriyāya seul. Le rôle de la juxtaposition est beaucoup plus considérable dans le RV. que les traductions ne le laissent paraître.

§ 10. Il est évident d'après ce qui précède qu'on répugnera à admettre qu'une forme en -ase soit le prédicat verbal d'une phrase : le v. V 64 4 yād ḍha kṣāye maghōnām stoṭrām ca spūrdhāse ne saurait être avec Grassmann "(puissé-je vous attribuer par mon chant, o Mitra-Varuṇa) ce qui est à conquérir dans le séjour des patrons et des chantres" (analogue Ludwig), mais bien "( . . . ) ce qui est dans le séjour . . . en sorte que je l'obtienne par la lutte". De même au v. suivant qui dit parallèlement svē kṣāye maghōnām sākhīnām ca vṛdhāse "(venez) dans le séjour propre des patrons et de leurs amis, en sorte qu'ils en soient renforcés". On ne voit pas comment Ludwig peut construire mahōnām et sākhīnām comme des génitifs sujets de vṛdhāse. Oldenberg inclinerait à entendre respectivement les vv. 4 et 5 "pour la rivalité des chantres", "pour la prospérité des amis", mais vu la forme et le ton de spūrdhāse vṛdhāse, il y a intérêt à leur laisser l'acception semi-infinitive, autrement dit à ne pas leur adjoindre de génitif régime.

Au v. VI 66 5 (cf. Oldenberg ad loc., Brāhke Fest. Roth p. 121) la forme en -ase n'est pas prédicat mais déterminant d'un prédicat invisible. La traduction postulée par le contexte est "ceux chez qui l'active (Pṛṣṇi) n'a pas (la possibilité) de fournir son lait" nā yēṣu dohāse cid ayāḥ, proprement ("en sorte de se laisser traire"). Sur yāt . . . āyase, v. § 12.

§ 11. Un génitif régime paraît moins évitable au v. I 141 2 qu'aux v. précités V 64 4 et 5 : si du moins l'on groupe avec les traducteurs vṛṣabhāsya dohāse "pour traire le taureau". Néanmoins il est loisible de construire le
génitif avec l'élément qui précède, \textit{trīyam asya viṣabhāsyā dohāse} “la troisième (forme, celle) du taureau, (les jeunes femmes l'ont engendrée) en sorte qu'on puisse (le) traire”.

Le génitif qui dépend de \textit{rājāse} IX 86 36 est un génitif “verbal”, conforme à la syntaxe de cette racine. Quant au génitif régime de \textit{hārase} IX 10 6, il est à sa place, \textit{hārase} étant un datif nominal, non l'infinitif que pose \textsc{Macdonell}, \textit{Ved. Gr.} § 585 n° 1 en l'accentuant \textit{harāse} (aussi \textit{Ved. Gr. for Students} p. 434), \textsc{Whitney} \textit{Skt Gr.} § 973a avec l'accentuation correcte.

§ 12. L'infinitif en \textit{-ase} est sans préverbe. Cette particularité lui est commune en gros avec l'ensemble des noms en \textit{-as-}. \textsc{Oldenberg}, qui l'a notée, indique justement que cette constatation aide à dénier à \textit{vivakṣase} X 21 1 la valeur d'un infinitif. Il reste, il est vrai, deux exemples embarrassants auxquels \textsc{Oldenberg} n'a pas pensé. D'une part VII 66 6 \textit{prā vām mānmānyṛcāse nāvāni}. Les traducteurs (aussi \textsc{Macdonell} \textit{Ved. Reader} p. 123) rendent “que vous louent ces prières nouvelles” ou analogue. On retombe ainsi sur l'inconvénient d'un infinitif en \textit{-ase} qui serait prédicat et avec nuance impérative ou optative. Cet inconvénient sera évité en comprenant \textit{prā} comme portant sur un verbe non exprimé, duquel \textit{ṛcāse} est à son tour un déterminant, soit quelque chose comme “je vous prè (senterai) des prières nouvelles afin de (vous) chanter”. Tout est ainsi en ordre et la syntaxe avec \textit{prā} elliptique est commune au début de \textit{pāda}.

C'est avec raison que précisément \textsc{Geldner} admet cette syntaxe pour un autre passage où figure la forme \textit{āyase} : \textit{prā yād ṛīhiyā ṛāyāse mādāya} IV 21 7 (v. \textsc{Oldenberg} sur d'autres possibilités ; cf. en dernier lieu \textsc{Velankar} J. \textit{Un. Bo.} VI 6 p. 45) “quand il se pré (pare) à la prière, à la marche, à l'ivresse”. Sur la contiguïté du préverbe \textit{prā} et d'une forme en \textit{-ase}, cf. \textit{prā jīvāse} (\textit{yāchanti}) X 185 3 ; \textit{prā} (\textit{tirata}) \textit{ṭuṣyāse} VII 57 5.

Le fait qu'un préverbe est évité devant la forme en \textit{-ase} se mesure aux constatations suivantes : la locution \textit{dirghāya caṅkāse} I 7 3 VIII 13 30 tient lieu de *\textit{vicaṅkaśe}, cf. \textit{vicaṅkaśe} passim ; \textit{prā} devant \textit{jīvāse} est remplacé par \textit{pratārām} \textit{AV. VI} 41 3 XVIII 3 63, 4 54.

§ 13. L'image qui résulte de ces différents traits est celle d'une forme à emploi linéaire, passablement monotone et qui dérive directement des conditions générales fournies en védique soit à l'emploi des noms d'action, soit aux possibilités du datif.

La dissociation morphologique qui s'est effectuée entre cette forme et les datifs nominaux en \textit{-ase}, marquée par la place du ton et par la qualité de la voyelle radicale, n'est, on le sait, pas constante. Plusieurs noms d'action en \textit{-as-} ont le ton suffixal ; quelques infinitifs ont le ton radical ou le vocalisme plein (ce ne sont d'ailleurs pas les plus caractéristiques, à savoir \textit{cākṣase, āyase, spārase, bhōjase} et l'hybride \textit{dohāse}—si l'on élimine des listes d'\textsc{Arnold} ou de \textsc{Macdonell} les formes \textit{kṣādase, dhāyāse, bhārase, saḥyase, harāse} qui ne sont pas des infinitifs). Dans les datifs nominaux comme dans les infinitifs il y a juxtaposition fréquente avec d'autres datifs, situation fréquente en
fin de pāda ou en groupe fermé, dépendance fréquente des racines dhā- et kr-, absence de préverbes. Śriyāse, sobhāse ne se distinguent guère de śriyē ou de śubhē, vrīhāse équivaut à vrīhāya (cf. LANMAN Noun-Infl. p. 557), carāse s'échange avec carāyai.

En l'absence d'une construction d'accusatif régime, si l'on se demande ce qui en fin de compte caractérise comme tel un infinitif, la seule réponse plausible est celle-ci : c'est son isolement, isolement de structure, isolement de la finale -ase du point de vue du paradigme.
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III. r—aui.

420. ṛktas, adv.: with regard to the Rik verses. IV, 17.4.

421. ṛgveda, m.: the Rig-Veda. -das (nom. sg.): I, 3.7.; III, 1.2; VII, 1.4. -dam (acc. sg.): III, 1.3; 15.7; VII, 1.2; 2.1; 7.1; Cf. B. A. U. II, 4.10—Ṛgvedo...vyākhyaṇāny—IV, 1.2.; 5.11; M. U. VI, 32, 33; cf. also Mund. U. I, 1.5.

422. ṛc, f.: lustre; sacred hymn, verse. "Esp. as distinguished from that which is sung (sāman) and from the sacrificial formula (yajus); verse to which a rite or explanation refers." (Macdowell). Pl.: the Rig-Veda. -(nom. sg.): I, 1.2, 4=5; 3.4; 6.1=5, 8; 7.1=5. -cam (acc. sg.): I, 3.4, 9; 4.4. -cā (instr. sg.): III, 12.5; V, 2.7. -cas (gen. sg.; nom.-acc. pl.): I, 1.2; 4.3; III, 1.2; IV, 17.2; VI, 7.2. -ci (loc. sg.): I, 3.9; 4.3; 6.1=5; 7. 1=4. -cāu (nom. du.): III, 17.6. ṛgbyas (abl. pl.): IV, 17.3. ṛcām (gen. pl.): IV, 17.4.

423. ṛtu, m.: fixed time; period, season. -tavas (nom. pl.): II, 5.2. -tūn (acc. pl.): II, 16.2. tusù (loc. pl.): II, 5.1=2; 16.1=2.

424. ṛtumant, a.: possessing the seasons. -mān (nom. sg.): II, 5.2.

425. ṛte, prep.: without; except. V, 1=8.11.

426. ṛtvij, a.: sacrificing regularly; m.: priest. -vik (nom. sg.): IV, 17.9. -viśa (dat. sg.): V, 11.5. -vijas (acc. pl.): IV, 17.10.

427. ṛṣabha, m.: bull. -bhās (nom. sg.): IV, 5.1.

428. ṛśī, m.: an inspired sage; poet-seer; Rishi. -śim (acc. sg.): I, 3.9.

E.

429. e=pron. st. of third pers. See Nos. 442, 448, 449, 451.

430. eka, num. a.: one, alone. -kas (nom. sg. m.): I, 5.2, 4; III, 6.3; 7.3; 9.3; 10.3; IV, 3.6; 9.2; 17.9; VI, 7.3; VII, 8.1; 26.2. -kā (nom. sg. f.): VI, 7.3, 6; VIII, 6.6. -kām (nom. sg. n.; acc. sg. m.): II, 10.2; V, 3.5; VI, 2.1=2; 7.5; VII, 4.1; 5.1. -kām (acc. sg. f.): VI, 11.2; 12.1. -kena (instr. sg.): IV, 16.3; VI, 1.4=6. -ke (nom. pl.): VI, 2.1.


432. ekadhā, adv.: singly. VII, 26.2.

433. ekapāda, a.: one footed. -pāt (nom. sg. m.): IV, 16.3.

434. ekala, a.: alone; one. -las (nom. sg.): III, 11.1.
437. **Ekaśata**, n.: hundred and one. -tam (acc. sg.): VIII, 11.3.  
439. **EkaYana**, n.: union; union-point. -nam (nom. acc. sg.): VII, 12, 4; 2.1; 5.2; 7.1.  
440. **EkaRa**, m.: the sound e. -ras (nom. sg.): I, 13.2.  
441. **EkaIka**, a.: each singly. -kā (nom. sg. f.): VI, 3.4; 4.7; 8.6.  
-kāṁ (acc. sg. f.): VI, 3.3=4. -kasmāt (dat. sg.): V, 11.5.  
442. **eta-**, pron. st. of third pers.: this, this here (n. acc. as adv. : thus).  
esa (nom. sg. m.): occurs 112 times. etat (nom. = acc. sg. n.): 185 times.  
esā (nom. sg. f.): 12 times. etam (acc. sg. n.): 52 times. -tām (acc. sg. f.): 8 times.  
-tena (instr. sg.): 4 times. -tayā (instr. sg. f.): V, 2.7. -tasmāt (abl. sg.): 13 times.  
tasya (gen. sg.): 16 times. -tasmī (loc. sg.): 9 times.  
tasyām (loc. sg. f.): 9 times. -tāu (nom. = acc. du. m.): 3 times. -te (nom.  
du. f.; nom. pl. m.): 21 times. -tayos (gen. du. m.): V, 10.8. -tāni (nom.  
acc. pl. n.): 16 times. -tās (nom. acc. pl. f.): 7 times. -tān (acc. pl. m.): 9  
times. -tais (instr. pl.): VIII, 6.5. -tēsām (gen. pl. m.): I, 10.3. -tēsām  
(gen. pl. f.): 2 times.  
443. **Etad**, adv.: thus. See No. 442.  
444. **EtadātMaka**, a.: having this nature; essence of this (MACDONELL). See. No. 454.  
445. **EtadātMaya**, a.: having this nature. See No. 454.  
446. **EtadUpaniṣada**, a.: having this philosophical (secret) doctrine or  
Upaniṣad. -das (nom. sg. m.): VIII, 8.4.  
447. **Etarhi**, adv.: now; nowadays; then. I, 8.6; 8; VI, 7.3, 6.  
448. **Ena-**, pron. st. of third pers.: he, she, it. -nam (acc. sg. m.):  
occurrent 403 times.  
449. **Evav**, adv.: so, just so; precisely. Occurs 403 times.  
450. **Evamvid**, a.: knowing so; having such knowledge. -vit (nom.  
sg. m.): I, 7.8; IV, 17.8=10; V, 24.4; VIII, 3.3, 5. -vidam (acc. sg.):  
IV, 17.9=10. -vidi (loc. sg.): I, 2.8; IV, 14.3; V, 2.1.  
451. **Evam**, adv.: thus, so; in this way. Occurs 157 times.  
452. **Evamppahant**, a.: thus great. -hān (nom. sg. m.): VI, 12.2.  
453. **Eṣas.** See No. 442.  

**AI.**  
454. **AiTaDātMaya**, a.: having this nature (essence of this). -yam (nom.  
sg. n.): VI, 8.7; 9.4; 10.3; 11.3; 12.3; 13.3; 14.3; 15.3; 16.3.  
455. **AiTaReya**, proper name (m.): patr. of Mahidāsa. -yas (nom.  
sg.): III, 16.7.  

---

1. eko-vimśatyā ādityam āpnoti, eko-vimśo vā ito'sāv ādityaḥ. Ovā-vimśena  
param ādityaj jayati. tan nākam tad viśokam. According to Śaṅkara, "the twelve  
months, the five seasons, and the three worlds; and the sun is the twenty-first."

O.


459. OJASVIN, a. : strong; powerful. -vi (nom. sg. m.) : III, 13.5.

460. OM, in. : sacred syllable. "Om appears first in the Upaniṣads as a mystic monosyllable, and is there set forth as the object of profound religious meditation, the highest spiritual efficacy being attributed not only to the whole word but also to the three sounds a, u, m, of which it consists." (Monier-Williams). Occurs 18 times.a

461. OŚADHI, f. : plant, herb. -dhayas (nom. pl.) : I, 1.2. -dhīnām (gen. pl.) : I, 1.2.a

462. OŚADHIVANASPATHI, m. : herbs and trees. -tayas (nom. pl.) : V, 10.6.

AU.

463. AUPAMANYAVA, proper name (m.) ; patronymic from Upamanyu. -vas (nom. sg.) : V, 11.1. -va (voc. sg.) : V, 12.1.

464. AUHOIKARA, m. : the sound auhoi. -ras (nom. sg.) : I, 13.2.

(To be continued).

---

2. Cf. Egypt. ŏN, Coptic Amn (AMon or AMnRA), and the Christian o'N, O'MEN, AMEN.

NON-ṚGVEDIC MANTRAS RUBRICATED IN THE 
ĀŚVALĀYANA-GRHYA-SŪTRA: THEIR SOURCES AND 
INTERPRETATION*

By
V. M. APTE, Poona.

ĀG. III. 9. 1: I (a) ‘Smṛtaṁ nindā ca vidyā ca, (b) śraddhā prajñā ca 
pāñcanī (c) īṣṭaṁ dattam adhitam ca, (d) kṣatṛḥ satyaṁ śrutam vratam II 
(a) Yadagnēḥ sendrasya saprajāpātikasya sārṣikasya sarṣirājanyasya sapitṛ- 
kasya sapitṛājanyasya samanuṣyasya samanuṣyarājanyasya, (b) sākāśasya 
sātikāśasya sānukāśasya sapratikāśasya, (c) sadeva-manuṣyasya sagandhavrī- 
psarakṣasya, (d) sahāranyaiśca paśubhir grāmyaiśca, (e) yan ma ātmānī 
vratam tan me sarvavrataṁ idamahamagne sarva-vrato bhavāmi svāhēti |

Trans. 1. Memory and reproach, lore, faith (and) understanding as 
the fifth; what is sacrificed, what is given and what is studied; what is done, 
thrust and learning—(all this is my) vow.1

II. (a) The vow which belongs to Agni together with Indra, Prajāpati, 
the Rṣīṣ, with the royalty among the Rṣīṣ, the Fathers; (to Agni together) 
with the royalty among the Fathers, with human beings, with the royalty 
among human beings; (b) (to Agni) with Shine, Over-Shine After-Shine, 
Counter-Shine, (c) (to Agni) with gods and men, with Gandharvas and 
Apārasas, (d) (to Agni) with wild and domestic animals (e)—that vow 
belonging to myself and centred in myself—that is my Universal vow. Here, 
O Agni, do I become (pledged) to the Universal vow—Śvāhā.

Context: With these formulas, the fuel is put on the fire (a ritual act 
referred to in the preceding sūtra III. 8. 21) by the snātaka standing.

Sources: ĀPMB II. 5. 2. 10 is a long passage similar to our I and II. 
Now ĀPMB. II. 5. 2 reads: “Smṛtaṁ ca me'smṛtaṁ ca tan me ubhayāṁ 
vratam.” Similarly II. 5. 3. is: Nīntā ca me'nīntā ca” etc. as above. II. 
5. 4-8 are similar statements with reference to Śraddhā, vidyā, śrutam, satyam, 
tapaḥ and then II. 5. 9. reads ‘vratam ca me'vratam ca tanme ubhayāṁ 
vratam, yad brāhmaṇāṁ brahmaṇi vratam’ followed by a passage similar 
to our II with the omission of ‘sarṣikasya sarṣirājanyasya’ and the addition of 
’sadeva-manuṣyasya in IIa, the complete omission of IIb, the omission of 
’sadeva-manuṣyasya in II (c), the complete omission of II (d) and the 
omission of ‘tan me sarvavrataṁ’ in (e).

This parallel passage shows (1) that Nārāyaṇa’s view regarding the re-
citation of I. as: “smṛtaṁ ca me asmṛtaṁ ca tan me ubhayavrataṁ”


1. Prof. Oldenberg connects the verse syntactically with the following formula 
which is unnecessary. The verse is complete in itself.
for each of the twelve words of the section like 'smṛtam' in the manner exemplified for 'smṛtam' is based on tradition though rejected by OLDENBERG (p. 229. note to III. 9. 1) because APMB. II. 5. 2 above, we actually see the expanded form of the formula; secondly (2) this passage supports the conjecture 'agneḥ' for 'agne' of Prof. STENZLER (adopted by Prof. OLDENBERG) as APMB also reads 'agneḥ'.

AG. III. 9. 6:—Mahādevai bhūtaṁ snātako bhavālītīvijñāyate |

Trans. 'A great being, indeed, is the Snātaka'; so it is known (from the Śruti).

Context. This is quoted in the Sūtra after enumerating a number of things forbidden for a snātaka.

Sources. The citation cannot be traced in this form to any Saṁhitā or Brāhmaṇa (Śruti) but it is always uncertain whether 'Vijñayate' introduces a quotation or the gist of a similar statement on the subject in the Śruti. If the latter is the case, then SB. 11. 3. 3. 7 may be compared: 'Yathā ha vā agniḥ samiddho rocate, evaṁ ha vai sa snātvā rocate— | [Even as the fire kindled shines, so does he who has taken a bath i.e. a snātaka shine....]

AG. III. 10. 2: 'Idaṁ vatsyāmo bho' iti |

Trans: Here we dwell, sir!

Context: The Snātaka now takes leave of his teacher as he is about to make his homeward journey. In doing so, he mentions the name [of the teacher according to Nārāyaṇa] in a low voice and then loudly repeats the formula in our sūtra.

[Prof. OLDENBERG (p. 230) states that this chapter (III. 10) describes the way in which a student has to take leave of his teacher before a journey and has nothing to do with the Samāvartana but it may be pointed out that it is the common practice of Sūtra texts to state general rules (about leave-taking as here, in connection with a particular case (e.g. here the journey of the Snātaka). A comparison of SG. II. 18 which inclined OLDENBERG to the above view shows on the contrary that our text has deliberately made certain changes (e.g. the omission of 'eṣa te brahmaçāri' in SG. II. 18. 3 a formula parallel to our III. 10. 6) to make the rules applicable to a snātaka here. This chapter, besides, follows immediately after a description of the Samāvartana].

Sources. SG. II. 18. 2 has 'Om ahaṁ vatsyāmi bhoḥ' as pointed out by OLDENBERG. HG. 1. 5. 13 has 'Idaṁ vatsyāvaḥ'. Prof. OLDENBERG's suggestion in his note on SG. II. 18. 2. (p. 90) that 'vatsyāmi' (I will dwell) is a sort of euphemism for 'pravatsyāmi' (I will go away) is well-supported by an orthodox practice still prevalent in many parts of India according to which a person departing says euphemistically 'I come now' instead of 'I go now'.

AG. III. 10. 4: 'Prāṇāpānayor upāṁśu' |

Trans. 'Into Inhalation and Exhalation'—(this formula) he (i.e. the student) utters in a low voice.
Sources. Though the point has not been noted by Stenzler or Oldenberg, in my opinion, these two words are the pratika of the formula quoted below in Sūtra 6, because the two words by themselves, would be meaningless and because the student and the teacher repeat nearly the same mantras [compare sūtra, 6, according to which the teacher is to repeat the same Rg-verse (III. 45. 1) which the student repeats (sūtra 5) after this formula]. SG. II. 18. 2 has exactly this formula (i.e., its pratika consisting of two words) in this very context.

AG. III. 10. 6:—Ato vrddho japati (a) ‘Prāṇāpānayor uruvyacās tayā prapadye, (b) devāya savitre paridadāmī’ iti— ||

Trans. (b) The aged one then mutters, ‘Into inhalation and exhalation, (I) the wide-extended one, enter with thee. (b) To God Savitṛ, I give thee in charge.’

Sources. (a) is only traced to a Sūtra-text : SG. 2. 18. 3, as Profs. Stenzler and Oldenberg point out. The former scholar proposes two emendations in formula (a), in the light of the SG. readings :—(1) he adopts ‘tvayā’ for ‘tayā’. This is a necessary emendation to get some sense out of the formula but his second emendation (2) ‘Prāṇāpānā’ for ‘prānapānyoḥ’ is, in my opinion unnecessary for the following reasons :—

(i) The locative dual ‘Prāṇāpānyoḥ’ [It need not be genitive dual as Prof. Oldenberg takes it to be in his translation of sūtra 4] can go with 'prapadye' as well as the accusative [MacDonell : A Vedic grammar for students 204 Bib page 325]. (ii) Very possibly, ‘Prāṇāpānyoḥ’ in sūtra 4 is a pratika of this formula, as I have shown above, which will rule out any alteration of that word here. Formula (b) is found without variation in SB. 11. 5. 4. 3 in an upanayana context : ‘Athaṁ bhiṭṭhyaḥ paridadāti | praṣṭapataye tvā paridadāmī |’ and then comes our formula. The common link between this Upanayana context in SB. and our leave-taking context is that the Ācārya gives over his disciple in charge of god Savitṛ. This same formula occurs in PG. 2. 2. 21 and SMB. 1. 6. 24 in the same Upanayana context.

AG. III. 10. 11 : Yasyā diśo bibhiyād yasmādāvā tāṁ diśam ulmukam ubhayataḥ prādīptam pratyasyen, manthah vā prasavyam ēloḍya : (a) “abhayaṁ mitrāvarūmā mahyamastu, (b) arciśa śatrūn daḥhatam pratiṣṭhyā | (c) mā jñātāram mā pratiṣṭhāṃ vindantu (d) mitho bhīṇḍānā upayantu mṛtyun” iti.

Trans : Sūtra 11. (If in the course of the journey), he should apprehend danger from any direction or person, in that or his direction, he should throw a fire-brand burning at both ends and having twirled a churning-stick from right to left with the mantra “Safety be to me, Mitra and Varuna; having caught hold of the foes, burn them up with your flame. May they not find one who knows (our whereabouts) nor any support; falling out with one another, may they go to death” [Sūtra 12: he lowers it i.e. the churning-stick with the RV. verse X. 84. 7].

Sources : Prof. Stenzler compares AV. VI. 32. 3, from which he has adopted the reading ‘Upayantu’ in (d) although his MSS. ABC read ‘bhindā-
nām ubhayaṁ tu' and DE read 'bhиндāna ubhayaṁ tu' (p. 51 Kritische Anmerkungen). This emendation, is, in my opinion, unnecessary as the reading of MSS. DE gives quite a good sense e.g. pādas (c), and (d) could be translated with this reading: "May they not find a knower or a support but let both, falling out with each other (find) death" the verb 'Vindantu' being easily supplied from the third pāda. Emendations should be resorted to only when a reading makes no sense at all because even though our text may have borrowed the verse from AV., it could, like all Grhya texts, exercise the privilege of making changes in it. In pāda (a), for example, our text has changed the AV. "ihāstu naḥ" into 'mahyaṁ astu' because the speaker is a single person.

AG. III. 11. 1:—"Sarvatobhyādaṁjñāntād aṣṭāv aiyāhutir juhuyād: "I (a) Pṛthivī vṛtā, (b) sāgninā vṛtā, (c) tayā vṛtayā vartryā, (d) yasmād bhayaṁ bhīhemi tadvāraye svāhā | II (a) Antarikṣaṁ vṛtām (b) tadvārayā vṛtam etc III (a) Dyaur vṛtā (b) sādityena vṛtā and so on (there being eight associated pairs in all e.g. IV (a) disaḥ etc. (b) candrasāsa etc. V (a) āpāḥ etc. (b) Varuṇa etc. VI (a) Prajaḥ etc. (b) Prajñā etc. VII (a) Vedāḥ etc. (b) Chandobhiṣṭ etc. VIII (a) Sarvam etc. (b) brahmaṁ etc. svāhā |

Trans. When an unknown danger threatens him from all sides, he offers eight aiyā oblations with the following (eight) mantras: (I) Pṛthivī is covered; (b) by Agni is she covered; (c) With her (i.e. with the help of her) the covered one (and also), the covering one, I avert the danger of which I am afraid II (a) The Antarikṣa etc. (b) by Vāyu...and so on.

Sources. A parallel formula with 'śaṁtā' (peaceful) instead of our 'Vṛtā' is found in TA. 4. 42. 5: I (a) "Pṛthivī śaṁtā (b) sāgninā śaṁtā (c) Sā me śaṁtā (d) ūcām ūmāyatmu | II (a) Antarikṣaṁ etc. (b) Vāyuṇā...III (a) Dyaubu... (b) śaḍityena...and then follows" pṛthivī śaṁtiḥ antarikṣaṁ śaṁtiḥ etc. ...śaṁtireva śaṁtiḥ śaṁtir me astu śaṁtiḥ | tayāhāṁ śaṁtyā sarvaśaṁtyā mahyaṁ dvipade catuṣpade ca śaṁtirī karomi etc"

IV. 3

For the funeral rites in the third kaṇḍikā of this (i.e. the fourth) adhyāya, Prof. STENZLER compares (p. 119) SB. 12. 5. 2. 1. seqq. There is a general similarity in the rites described there, no doubt, but the passage SS IV 14. 17-35 agrees so remarkably with our text in practically every detail of the distribution and the disposition of the sacrificial implements on the dead body (of an Ahitāgni) that one cannot help thinking that the Sānkhyāyana Śrauta Sūtra belonging to the RV. and therefore allied to our text was the model before our text.

AG. IV. 3. 27. Paścāmāṁ urasi pretasya, (a) "asmād vai tvam ajāyathā, (b) ayaṁ tuad adhijāyatāṁ asau (c) svargāya lokāya svāhā"

Trans. A fifth (oblation) on the chest of the deceased (is offered) with the formula (a) "From this one (i.e., the deceased) indeed, hast thou (the
fire) been born (because the Āhitāgni in his life-time kindled and maintained the three fires; (b) May he—so and so—now be born out of thee (to the immortal life beyond). (c) To the Heaven-world, svāhā!

Context. This oblation follows four oblations of Ajya in the Dakṣiṇāgni after the sacrificial implements have been placed on the limbs of the dead body and the body covered with a hide.

Sources: (a) is found in an identical form in JB. 1. 47 which has for (b) a slightly different formula 'eṣa tvaj jāyatām, svāhā' | ; (b) is found in an identical form in ŚŚ. 4. 14. 36, after a formula slightly different from (a) viz. "ayam vai tvām ajanayat" | ; (a) and (b) in a slightly different form are found in ŚB. 12. 5. 2. 15 (a) "Asmāt tvam adhijāto'si (b) tvadayāṃ jāyatām punah". In all these passages (JB. ŚŚ. and ŚB.) the context is the same and the sense is the same.

AG. IV. 7. 11 : Tīlōṁ āvapati : (a) "…………..tilo'si soma-devatyo'
(b) gosave devanirmitah | (c) pratna-vadhik prattah svadyayā, (d) pitṛn imānillokān prīṇāyā hi naḥ svadhā namah. |

Trans : (a) "Sesamum art thou, with Soma as thy deity; (b) created by the gods at the Gosava sacrifice, (c) offered with the Rg-verses containing the word 'pratna' (i.e. RV. IX. 54. 1 seqq.) with faith, (d) propitiate for us the Fathers and these worlds."

The context is the śrāddha ceremony.

Sources : Prof. STENZLER draws attention to Kātyāyana's and Gobhila's śrāddha-kalpa-Sūtras where the verse occurs.

The text and the interpretation of the verse : Prof. STENZLER p. 133 thinks that the verse is hardly right as it stands and draws attention to the different readings of the parallel verse noted above. Prof. OLDENBERG (p. 251) similarly thinks that the reading of several words of the mantra is doubtful. I may point out however that the verse as it stands is not corrupt and yields a very satisfactory meaning, (as in the translation above). In (a) 'tila' is called 'Soma-devatyah' (having Soma as its deity); in (b) it is described as created by the gods at the Gosava sacrifice—which is the name of a type of Soma sacrifice, a variety of the 'Ekāha' (or one-day soma sacrifice). It is but proper that the 'tila' whose deity is Soma, should be described as created at a soma sacrifice. The third pāda (c) then says that the tila is offered ('prattah') with the 'pratna-vad' Rg-verses (containing the word 'pratna'). Prof. OLDENBERG who refers (p. 251) to this meaning of the word as given in the Petersburg dictionary unnecessarily rejects it. Sāyaṇa's commentary on PB. 10. 4. 8, where the word occurs explains that the 'pratnavat' Rg-verses are those beginning with 'Asya pratnāṁ anu dyutam' i.e. RV. IX. 54. 1 seqq. Now the deity of the hymn RV. IX. 54 is 'Pavamāna Soma.' What could be more natural than that the 'tila' whose deity is Soma (pāda. a), who was created at a soma-sacrifice (pāda. b), should be described as offered ('prattah') to the accompaniment of 'pratnavat' verses that are sacred to Soma? For these reasons, I think, our readings should not
be tampered with. Emendation effected by the substitution of the readings of parallel passages are always of doubtful value as each text often altered and adapted the words of a mantra taken from the common stock of Gṛhya tradition in its own way.

AG. IV. 7. 15: Prasṛṭā anumantryayeta: (a) "Yā divyā āpah pṛthivī sambabhūvur, (b) yā antarikṣyā uta pārthivīryāḥ (c) hiranya-varṇā yajñīyōs (d) tā na āpah śanśyōm bhavantu" iti [15]

Trans: Over (the Arghya water) poured out (by the Brāhmaṇas after accepting it) he recites the mantra "The divine waters that have appeared on the earth, the aerial waters, and the terrestrial ones—may these waters, gold-coloured and sacrificial (as they are), be to us welfare (-bringing) and propitious—etc.

Context: The description of the Śrāddha-ceremony continues.

Sources: Prof. Stenzler p. 135 draws attention to the different readings of the parallel verses in Katyāyana's and Gobhila's Śrāddha-kalpa-sūtras but these are texts much later than ours and cannot be classed under 'Sources'. The Mantra is traced to TB. 3. 1. 2. 3. with the following variations:—'payasā' for our 'pṛthivī' in (a); 'antarikṣa' for our 'antarikṣyā' in (b); (c) is a different pāda altogether, viz. 'Yāśām āśādhā anuyanti kāmam' and pāda. (d) is identical. In TB. the mantra is an Invitatory formula for offering an oblation to the 'Pūrvaśādhā' constellation sacred to Yama, which forms a link with our Śrāddha-context. The first two pādas in this very form appear also in TB. 2. 7. 15. 4. making a verse with two other pādas, employed for sprinkling water on the king in the Coronation ceremony. This same is the ritual context of AV. IV. 8. 5th which are also pādas very similar to our first two. It is thus clear that the first two pādas invoking the waters of the 'Dyaus, Antariṣka and Pṛthivī' constituted a popular hemistic made up into different verses by the addition of different pādas. The last pāda is also a very common ending of verses addressed to the waters (compare AV. I. 33. 1 and 4; MS. 2. 13. 1 etc.). Our text then seems to have derived pādas (a) and (b) and (d) from the TB. passage 3. 1. 2. 3. mentioned above. As regards pāda (c), I think it was suggested by the well-known verse: TS. 5. 6. 1. 1 'hiranyavarṇāḥ śucayāḥ pāvakāḥ' etc. whose last pāda is identical with our (d), (a verse repeated in the daily Sandhyā adoration in India even to-day). I do not think that Prof. Oldenberg's suggestion that 'we should read no doubt as the parallel texts have payasā sambabhūvah' need be adopted for the simple reason that the substitution of 'Pṛthivī' (Old Vedic Loc. sing) is probably a deliberate change made by our text to suit the particular context viz. the pouring out of the arghya-waters which are spilt on the ground and thus appear on the earth (Pṛthivī). Besides, emendations should be resorted to only when no sense is otherwise possible.

AG. IV. 7. 16 (a): "Noddharet prathamam pātram, (b) pitrnām arghyapāṭitam | (c) āvṛtāstatra tiṣṭhanti (d) pitarah, śanako'bravīt [16]

Trans: (a) "He should not remove the first vessel, (b) set apart for
the arghya water of the Fathers; (c) and (d):—"covered up, the Fathers remain there" so said Saunaka.

Context: When the Brāhmaṇas have poured out the Arghya-water offered to them (Sūtra 15), the remainder of the Arghya water in the three vessels (mentioned in sūtra 10) is mixed together. This śloka implies that the remainder in the second and third vessels is all added on to that in the first vessel, which (it says) must not be removed (or lifted for the pouring of its contents into another vessel).

Sources: It is a late śloka and not traced to any early work nor is it found in any other parallel Sūtra-text.

Prof. Stenzler in his Kritische Anmerkungen (p. 53) tells us that his MSS DE insert another verse after the 16th sūtra (i.e. the above śloka). I give it here just for comparison with a different version of the same verse in the Trivandrum edition:—(a) "Uddhared yadi cet pātram, (b) viyūrthān vā yadā bhavet (c) tadāsuraṃ bhavecchārdham, (d) Krudhhaḥ pitṛ-gaṇār gataih". In the Trivandrum version of this second verse, pādā (a) reads 'yadā vā tūddhārtam pātram'; (b) is the same, as also (d); in (c) it has 'abhojyam tat' for 'tadāsuraṃ'. It is interesting to note that Haradatta calls both these verses as "yajña-gāthe" i.e. 'stanzas of sacrificial import' like the one quoted in our text I. 3. 10.

ĀG. IV. 7.22: (a) 'Agnimukhā vai devāh, (b) pāṇi-mukhāḥ pitara' iti hi brāhmaṇam

Trans: (a) "The gods have Agni for their mouth. (b) The fathers have hands as their mouth": thus runs a Brāhmaṇa.

Context. A portion of the Sthāli-pāka prepared for the Pīṇḍa-pitṛyajña is besmeared with ghee and offered into the fire with the permission of the Brāhmaṇas or offered into the hands of the Brāhmaṇas. The latter alternative is supported by the quotation.

Sources. For (a) may be compared 'Agnir vai devānam mukham, mukhata eva tad devān prīṇāti' | (p. 100 Bibliotheca Indica edition of the Gopatha-Brāhmaṇa). "Agni is the mouth of the gods; he thereby pleases (the gods) through (their) mouth (when he sacrifices into Agni)."

For (b) may be compared SG. 4. 7. 55 'Pānyāso brāhaṇḍaḥ smṛtaḥ' (The Brāhmaṇa has his hand as his mouth).

ĀG. IV. 7. 30-31: 'Om Svadhocatāṃ' iti visṛjet | 30 | 'asti svadhēti vā | 31 |

Trans: Sūtra 30. (At the end of the Śrāddha ceremony), he grants leave (to the Brāhmaṇas to depart) with the formula: let it be said 'Om! Svadhā'; (Sūtra 31): or 'So be it! Svadhā!'

Sources. These same formulas are found in a number of texts: SB. 2.6. 1.24; GB. 2.1.24; APŚ. 8.15.12; KS. 9.11 and ÅŚ. 2.19.18. These parallel

1. The compound 'arghya-pātitam' can be dissolved, in my opinion, only in this way: 'arghyārtham pātitam'.
passages show that the two formulas (corresponding to those given in our Sūtras 30 and 31) are for 'the leave-granting by the householder and for the response by the Brāhmaṇas respectively, whereas the wording in our text rather implies that the two are alternative formulas, either of which may be used by the householder—the formula for the response being left for inference from the 30th sūtra. I think that our text has made a confusion by putting 'vā' in sūtra 31 instead of 'ca' (!) and that the formula in sūtra 31 is really one prescribed for the formal response of the Brāhmaṇas!

AG. IV. 8. This whole Kaṇḍikā describing the 'Śūla-gava' sacrifice agrees so closely with §§. IV. 17, not only in the wording of some of the mantras cited but many of the sūtras also, that it is almost certain that our text has made wholesale borrowings from the latter text! As a few instances of close agreement may be cited:—IV. 8. 15-16 = §§. IV. 17. 5. and 7; IV. 8. 22, 28 = §§. IV. 17. 7 and 8. Many sūtras are wholly identical or in part; many RV. citations are also the same.

AG. IV. 8. 22: "cataṣṭsu cataṣṭsu kuśasūnāsā catasṭsu dikṣu balīṃ haret (a) "Yāste Rudra pūrvasyāṃ diśi senāstābhya evaṃ (b) namaste astu mā mā himān" iti evam pratidīṣāh tvādēsamam |

Trans. Let him make Bali offerings in (i.e. to) the four quarters, on four wicker-work baskets of kuśa grass (four for each quarter) with the formulas: (a) "Those hosts of thine, O Rudra, that are (stationed) in the eastern quarter, to them this (offering is brought), (b) Homage to thee! Do not injure me!" In this way (i.e. with similar formulas) the offering is directed to each quarter.

Sources: Only a Sūtra text: PG. 3. 8. 11 has similar formulas, Here, in fact, we find all the formulas for the various quarters introduced by words like 'purastāt', 'paścat', 'dakṣinatāḥ' and 'Uttarataḥ', etc., of which a specimen only is given in our text. The context is exactly the same as in our text.

AG. IV. 8. 27 and 28: Uttarato gner darbhavītāsu kuśa-sūnāsā vā šonītaṁ ninayel: (a) "Śvāsinār ghośiṁr vicīnutāh, samāśnivāh, (b) sarpa yadvo'tra taddharadvam'itī [27] athodaṅgāytya (a) 'śvāsināh' [etc. as above, upto 'taddharadvamitī' and then] sarpebhoyo yat tatrāṣg uvadhyam vāvasrutam bhavati taddharantī sarpaḥ [8]

Trans: (Sūtra 27) He should pour out the blood (of the sacrificial victim) on Darbha-mats or wicker-work baskets of kuśa grass to the north of the fire with the formula:—(a). "Hissing Ones! Shouting ones! Seizing ones! Serpents! what here belongs to you, take that! (Sūtra 28):—Then, turning to the north, he offers it to the serpents with the formula "Hissing ones" etc. [as (a) above]. Then the serpents take whatever has trickled down, of blood, or of the contents of the stomach and bowels (of the sacrificial animal), (all that being intended) for the serpents.

Sources. In §§. IV. 17. 7-8, we not only find a similar mantra but the ritual act or context is also very much the same. "...palāśāni prāgudānci nidāhāya, teṣu lohita-miśramūvadhyamavadhāyā Rudra-senābhyyo' nudiśāti [?] [?]

[Original text continues with a discussion on the ritual practices and mantras related to the Sūtra.]
\textbf{AG. IV. 8. 32:} 
\textit{Nāsya grāmam āhareyur "abhi-māruko haīsa devaḥ praja bhavati" iti.}

\textit{Trans.} He should not take anything belonging to it (i.e. the sacrifice to Rudra) to the village (the whole sacrifice takes place outside the village), because ‘this god is harmful to the people’.

\textit{Sources}: Prof. STENZLER (Vorrede III) accepts the suggestion of Prof. WEBER that ‘abhi-mānuka’ should be read for ‘abhimāruka’ (Prof. OLDENBERG proposes the same change on p. 258) in the light of AB. III. 34. \textit{But the AB. passage III. 34 reads ‘anabhi-mānuko haīsa devaḥ praja bhavati’} \textit{[This god Rudra becomes a non-attacker of men if the verse RV. II. 33. 1 from a hymn sacred to Rudra, is recited with some changes]}! It cannot be said that our text has taken the part ‘abhimānukah’ from the word ‘anabhimānukah’ in AB. because it appears to be a quotation from the AB! The Trivandrum edition solves the problem by actually reading ‘anabhi-mānukah’! This reading can be constructed also satisfactorily with the introductory part of this sūtra as well as the preceding sūtra e.g. sūtra 31 says ‘he should not partake of that sacrifice’. Sūtra 32 then says “He should not bring anything of that sacrifice to the village because [thus (i.e. by observing these restrictions)] the god becomes a non-attacker of men” \textit{exactly as it is said in the AB.}, that by reciting the verse RV II. 33. 1 with certain changes, the god becomes a non-attacker of men! Thus if at all an emendation is necessary \textit{(it is not, in my opinion) ‘anabhimānukah’ should be read and not ‘abhimānukah’}. The foregoing investigation into the sources and interpretation of Non-Rgvedic Mantras liturgically employed in the Āsvalāyana Gṛhyasūtra will, I hope, convince scholars that this Gṛhyasūtra (also Gṛhyasūtras as a class) is more a School-compilation than a composition by one or more individual authors. This is clear from the wholesale borrowings of not only Mantras (which were bound to be cited from earlier texts) but also whole chapters and sections from earlier Vedic texts such as the Samhitās, Brāhmaṇas, Arāṇyakas Upaniṣads and Śrauta sūtras. I have also demonstrated, I hope, that a far larger number of passages from earlier Vedic texts betray a definite Gṛhya bias than was thought possible by scholars. I propose to publish in course of time the results of similar investigations by me in connection with other Gṛhyasūtras as the whole material is now ready with me.
THE EPOCH OF THE SO-CALLED HARSHA ERA*

By
DHIRENDRA NATH MOOKERJEE

[In the June number of the ‘Indian Historical Quarterly’ for 1935, Mr. K. G. Sankar wrote an interesting article on the ‘Early Chronology of Nepal’ which helped me a good deal in examining the epoch of the so-called Harsha era.]

There are a few inscriptions in Indian Epigraphy dated in an era which from synchronistic evidence were found to fall in or about the reign of Harshavardhana of Kanauj who, from a statement of Alberuni (A.D. 1036), was supposed to have started an era from about A.D. 606. Hence the era used in these inscriptions was assumed to be dated in the Harsha era of A.D. 606.

Now, let us go deeply into the question of an era started by Harshavardhana of Kanauj. Alberuni states ‘The Hindus believe regarding Sri Harsha that he used to examine the soil in order to see what of hidden treasures was in its interior......that, in fact he found such treasures; and, that, in consequence he could dispense with oppressing his subjects (by taxes etc.). His era is used in Mathura and the country of Kanauj. Between Sri Harsha and Vikramaditya there is an interval of 400 years, as I have been told by some of the inhabitants of that region. However, in the Kashmirian calendar I have read that Sri Harsha was 664 years later than Vikramaditya. In face of this discrepancy I am in perfect uncertainty, which to the present moment has not been cleared up by any trustworthy information.’ (Alberuni’s India, Sachau’s trans., Ch. XLIX, Vol. II p. 7). Alberuni also states that the year 1488 of the era of Sri Harsha is equivalent to the year 1088 of the era of Vikramaditya. From all this it is evident that Alberuni speaks of only one Sri Harsha era, the epoch of which was 400 years earlier than the Vikrama era of 58 B.C. Alberuni searched for this king Sri Harsha in whose name the era was started and found in the Kashmirian calendar that Sri Harsha (-vardhana of Kanauj) was 664 years later than Vikramaditya. From this it is clear that even in the Kashmirian calendar there is no mention of Harshavardhana having started an era but it simply says that Harsha flourished 664 years later than Vikramaditya. That Harsha never started an era seems evident from his own inscriptions dated Sam. 22 and 25 where he does not even state ‘(vijaya-) rājya Samvatsare’—in the year so and so of his (victorious) reign.

Now, if it is assumed that Harsha did not start an era then the question is, to what era do the dates in those inscriptions really belong?

The late Prof. Sylvain Lévi has shown that Bendall’s Gölmaḍhitōl inscription of Śivadeva (I) of Nepal mentioning Mahāśāmanta Amśuvarman

* Read before the first Indian Cultural Conference held in Calcutta in 1936.
is really dated ‘Samvat 518’ and not ‘Samvat 316’ as read by Bendall. As such the date ‘518’ may really be in the Śaka era, equivalent to A.D. 595 about which Sylvain Lévi assumed to be the epoch of a local Nepāla era, the same as the so-called Harsha era. From Stanislas Julien’s translation we know that Hiuen Tsiang visited Nepal not later than A.D. 637 when he speaks of Amśuvarman as ‘Lately there was a king called Amśuvarman....’ clearly indicating that Amśuvarman was dead before A.D. 637. We have Amśuvarman’s inscription dated Sam. 44 or 45. The epoch of A.D. 606, or A.D. 595 of Sylvain Lévi would make Amśuvarman still living after A.D. 639. This shows that none of the epochs is the right one and the late Prof. Kielhorn’s remarks ‘But since for Amśuvarman we have the date No. 1393 of the year 44 or 45, even the adoption of such a new era (epoch A.D. 595) would not meet one of Prof. Lévi’s main objections to the assignment of this (of the year 34) to the Harsha era—the objection, namely, that according to Hiuen Tsiang’s account, Amśuvarman could not have lived after A.D. 637.’ (Dr. Bhandarkar’s List of Northern Inscriptions, p. 189 fn.). Thus it is evident that the epoch of the era must be earlier than even A.D. 595 and hence Profs. Kielhorn and Bhandarkar rightly suspected in their Lists that the era in those inscriptions is yet undetermined. The inscription of Sam. 34 is dated ‘prathama Pausa,’ i.e., the month of Pausa was intercalary this year. On the epoch of the so-called Harsha era (A.D. 606) this date is equivalent to A.D. 640. But there was no intercalary Pausa this year showing clearly the incorrectness of that epoch (A.D. 606). The following remarks ‘Judging by the date of No. 40 the month of Pausha of Harsha samvat 34 would be expected to fall in A.D. 639-40 (in Kali Yuga Samvat—3740 expired), but in that year no month was intercalary. In (Kali Yuga Samvat 3741 expired =) A.D. 640-41 by the rules of mean intercalation, there was an intercalated month which might be called Pausha on the supposition (this supposition would be the very reverse of the supposition made under No. 1351) that it was calculated by the Brahma Siddhānta and named according to the modern (not Brahmagupta’s) rule for naming intercalated months, but which ordinarily would be called Mārgaśira.’ (Dr. Bhandarkar’s List of Northern Inscriptions, p. 190). These are ‘sufficient to show the incorrectness of the epoch (A.D. 606) of the so-called Harsha era.’

Now, we have the inscriptions of the Pratihāra P. M. P. Bhojadeva of Kanauj dated Vikrama years 893, 900, 919 (also Śaka 784) 932 and 933 and also in the so-called Harsha era dated Samvat 259 and 276. Now Vikrama Samvats 893, 900, 919 (=Śaka 784), 932 and 933 are equivalent to Śaka years 758, 765, 784, 797 and 798. If, however, it is assumed that a new counting of the Śaka era was begun after Śaka year 500 then the above Śaka dates should be written as (Śaka) Samvats 258, 265, 284, 297 and 298, and we see that these dates are quite near the other dates 259 and 276 of Bhoja. Thus there is every chance of the epoch of the so-called Harsha era being identical with Śaka year 500 when a new counting was begun.

Now let us see how far this is corroborated by other available evidence.
Rajaputra Vikramasena figures as the dūlaka in the Nepāl inscription dated year 535 and also in the inscriptions of Sam. 32 and 34. This supports the assumption that Sams. 32 and 34 are a shortened way of writing 532 and 534. Thus Sam. 518 of the inscription of Sivadeva (I) mentioning the feudal chief Amśuvarman might also have been written (5) 18.

BENDALL's Sundhārā inscr. of Amśuvarman is dated 'Sam. 34, prathama Pausha.' If Sam. 34 is really Śaka 534 then this date ought to show prathama or intercalary Pausha. Now Śaka 534 current = A.D. 611 (March) and we know that according to the mean sign system the month of Pausha (Nov.-Dec.) was intercalary in A.D. 610. That in this year the month of Pausha was intercalary was also noticed by Mr. SANKAR in his article. But he took the prathama Pausha occurring 2 × 19, or 38 years earlier in A.D. 572 to be equivalent to the prathama Pausha of Sam. 34 and thus placed the epoch of the so-called Harsha era incorrectly in A.D. (572-34, or) 538, the truth of which will be shown shortly. It is thus clear that in Nepāl at that time the year began some six months earlier in Kārttikeya or Mārgasīrṣa (Like all Luni-solar years, the jasi takes the number of the next solar San. Thus A.D. 1900 was Bengal San 1307 current, but the luni-solar jasi beginning on Āswina Krishna pratipad of A.D. 1900 takes the number of the next Bengal San i.e., 1308 current.'—PILLAI's Indian Ephemeris, Vol. I, pt. I, p. 54) and that the epoch of the so-called Harsha era is Śaka 500 current = A.D. 576-77.

From Dhruvadeva and Jishnugupta's inscr. dated Sam. 48 we infer that Amśuvarman was dead before this date. Now (Śaka) (5) 48 current calculated similarly is equivalent to A.D. 624-25 and this date is quite in accordance with Hiuen Tsiang's statement concerning Amśuvarman.

The inscription of Narendradeva's son Śivadeva (II) of Nepāl dated Sam. 119 (month Phālguna) is, therefore, equivalent to Śaka 619 current = A.D. 696. Sylvain LÉVI has shown from Chinese sources that Narendradeva of Nepāl received a Chinese envoy in A.D. 646 and sent envoys himself in A.D. 651. This Narendradeva is apparently Śivadeva II's father. The date A.D. 646 seems to fall in the first part of Narendra's reign and A.D. 696 to fall in the last portion of Śivadeva II's reign. From Jishnugupta's inscription of Sam. 48 (= A.D. 624-25) we know that Dhruvadeva was the Licchavi king of Nepāl at that time. Hence Udayadeva, son of Dhruvadeva seems to be the reigning Licchavi king of Nepāl mentioned by Hiuen Tsiang.

We know from Śivadeva II's son Jayadeva's inscription that Śivadeva II (Sam. 119 = Śaka 619 = A.D. 696) married the grand-daughter of Ādityasena of Magadha one of whose inscriptions is dated Sam. 66. From Ādityasena's inscription we also know that his father Mādhavagupta was a contemporary of Harsha of Kanaūj whose inscriptions are dated Sam. 22 and 25. Thus there cannot be any doubt that the dates in the above inscriptions all belong to the same epoch. Sam. 66 is, therefore, equivalent to Śaka 566 = A.D. 642-43 i.e., during the last days of Harsha and also of Hiuen Tsiang's visit.

The Korean pilgrim Hwui Lun (mentioned by I-tsing) who visited India
after Hiuen Tsiang (A.D. 645) and prior to A.D. 689 says ‘Recently a king called Sun Army (Adityasena) built by the side of the temple (near Mahā-
bodhi) another, which is now newly finished.’ There cannot thus be any
doubt that Adityasena flourished during the last days of Harsha and after
that. Mr. K. G. SANKAR in his article took the epoch of the so-called Harsha
era to be A.D. 538, as such the date Sam. 66 of Adityasena falls in A.D. 604
i.e., in the beginning of Harsha’s reign. From Chinese and Indian contem-
porary evidence such an early date for Adityasena cannot be accepted, for,
we know from Adityasena’s inscriptions that his father Mādhavagupta was
contemporaneous with Harshavardhana. If, however, Mr. SANKAR thinks
that Śivadeva II’s date (Sam. 119) is equivalent to A.D. (538 + 119, or)
657 and Adityasena’s date (Sam. 66) is to be referred to the epoch of A.D. 606,
i.e., equivalent to A.D. 672, then we find that a grandson’s date is much earlier
than that of the grandfather! With Mr. SANKAR’s epoch (A.D. 538) Sam. 22
and 25 of Harsha are equivalent to A.D. 560 and 563. These dates of Harsha
are simply absurd. Hence the theory of Mr. SANKAR about his epoch (A.D.
538) of the so-called Harsha era having originated with Yaśodharman Vishnu-
vardhana is unacceptable. If Yaśodharman Vishnupardhana contemporaneous
with Narasimhagupta Bālāditya and Mihirakula really flourished only 90 years
before Hiuen Tsiang’s time, he should not have made the preposterous mistake
of stating on various occasions that these flourished several centuries before his
time. Hiuen Tsiang could easily have met several aged persons who might
have been eye-witnesses of events occurring 90 years before. No one now will
make the strange mistake of saying that the Sepoy Mutiny (A.D. 1857) occurred
several centuries before A.D. 1936. We learn of Mutiny veterans still living.
From the Hārāhā inscription we know that Suryavarman while he had attained
puberty repaired a dilapidated Śiva temple in (Vikrama) Samvat 611 (or,
more correctly 610-11 = Sam. 589—vide Annual Report of the Lucknow
Museum for the year ending March, 1915, p. 3 footnote) and that he was
born while his father Maukhari Mahārājādhīrāja Iśānavarman was ruling.
This shows that Mahārājādhīrāja Iśānavarman was ruling in about Vikrama
Samvat (611-20, or) 591 = A.D. 534 when according to FLEET’s epoch
Rājādhīrāja Yaśodharman Vishnuvardhana was ruling. Moreover, during
the reign of Mahārājādhīrāja Iśānavarman Maukhari, Mahārājādhīrāja
(Kumāra-) gupta (III) of the Imperial Gupta dynasty was ruling in (Gupta)
San. 224 = A.D. 543 on FLEET’s epoch. All this shows the incorrectness of
FLEET’s epoch (A.D. 319) of the Gupta era and the date of Yaśodharman
Vishnupardhana which forms the basis of Mr. SANKAR’s epoch.

The inscription of Harsha dated Sam. 22 is equivalent to Śaka 522 =
A.D. 599. This date seems to be the first year of Harsha’s reign. Hiuen Tsiang
says that Harsha after his accession to the throne proceeded eastwards and
invaded the states that had refused allegiance and waged incessant warfare
until in six years he had subdued Northern India and then reigned in peace
for thirty years without raising a weapon. That this is true will be evident
from the inscription of Gurjara Jayabhata III dated K. 486 = A.D. 735 (E.
I. Vols. XXII and XXIII) where it is stated that Dadda I (K. 330, 346 = A.D. 579, 595) protected the Lord of Valabhi that had been defeated by the glorious Harshadeva. Now Dadda I’s son, Jayabhata I’s only available inscription is dated K. 355 = A.D. 604. Therefore Harsha must have defeated the Valabhi ruler sometime before A.D. 604, showing clearly that Harsha’s accession could not have taken place in A.D. 606. Therefore, by A.D. 605 he had consolidated his power and this was practically the date from which people acknowledged him to be an Imperial Sovereign. This was the date in the Kashmirian calendar where it was written that Sri Harsha was 664 years later than Vikramaditya. Hiuen Tsiang says that from this date Harshavardhana lived in peace for thirty years (i.e., upto 634 A.D.) without raising a weapon. Curiously, the Ahole inscription of Calkula Pulakeši II dated Saka 556 elapsed (= A.D. 634) speaks of Harsha as having been forced to retire discomfited and in Pulakeši’s subsequent inscriptions his defeat of ‘the glorious Harshavardhana, the warlike lord of all the regions of the North’ finds specific mention with legitimate pride. Now, Pulakeši ascended the throne in Saka 532 = A.D. 609, and in his earlier records there is no mention of his having defeated Harsha. Vincent Smith, therefore, could not accept Fleet’s date of A.D. 612 for Pulakeši’s defeat of Harsha and advocated A.D. 620. But in doing so we have to reject the explicit statement of Hiuen Tsiang that Harsha after his subjugation of the North reigned in peace for thirty years without raising a weapon. Hiuen Tsiang visited Pulakeši’s court sometime after A.D. 634 and speaks of Harsha’s encounter with Pulakeši thus: ‘śiladitya-rāja (Harshavardhana, boasting of his skill and the invariable success of his generals, filled with confidence himself marched at the head of his troops to contend with this prince (Pulakeši)—but he was unable to prevail or subjugate him.’ (Rev. Beal, ‘The Life of Hieuon Tsiang by the Shaman Hwui Li, p. 147). Dr. G. J. Dubreuil in his ‘Ancient History of the Deccan’ (p. 113) advocates a date after A.D. 634 for Pulakeši’s defeat of Harsha.

As for the other longer dates (Sam. 386, 413, 435 etc.) in inscriptions of Nepāl the late Dr. Bhagwanlal Indrajī has very ably shewn in the Indian Antiquary (Vol. XIII, pp. 424-26) that these must be referred to the Vikrama era. From the Kātmāndu inscription of Jayadeva of Nepāl he has shown that from Mānadeva (Sam. 386) to Jayadeva (Sam. 153 = Saka 653 = v.s. 788,) there were twenty (eighteen, according to Dr. Vasak, Hist. of North Eastern India, p. 281) kings. Assuming Sam. 386 to be in the Vikrama era, the interval between this and the date of Jayadeva (Sam. 153 = v.s. 788) is 402 years. This divided by 18 or 20 gives twenty-two or twenty years for an average reign, which is perfectly acceptable. If Sam. 386 be assumed to be in the Saka era then the interval between this and Jayadeva’s date (Saka 653) is one of 267 years which divided by 18 yield only 15 years for an average reign which is too low. This inscription of Sam. 386 is dated ‘on the first tithi of the bright fortnight of the month Jayaishtha of Sam. 386 when the moon stood in Nakshatra Rohini, in the excellent muhura Abhijit.’ Sylvain Lévi took Sam. 386 to be equivalent to A.D. 496 on his epoch of A.D. 110 for a
Licchavi era of Nepāl and calculated the above details to occur on ‘Tuesday, May 1, A.D. 496.’ But May 1 (Jul.) A.D. 496 was Wednesday and the tithi was Śuklā tritiyā. Śukla pratīpad with the above details, however, occurred on Monday, April 29 (Jul.) = Apr. 30 (Greg.) A.D. 496. That Prof. Lévi’s epoch of A.D. 110 is seriously incorrect (in addition to what was shewn by Prof. Kielhorn and stated already) will be shown shortly. In reality Sam. 386 = v.s. 386 = A.D. 328 in which year the above phenomena occurred on the 27th April. It should be remembered that there is no tradition of the use of any other era but the Vikrama and the Śaka in early Nepāl. That these larger dates are in the Vikrama era will be evident from a recently discovered Nepāla inscription of an unknown king dated ‘Sam. 449 prathama Āśādha’ (Sylvain Lévi, Le Nepāl, Vol. III, p. 51) and we know that in Vikrama year 449 current = A.D. 391, the month of Āśādha was intercalary. (Dr. R. G. Vasak in his Hist. of North Eastern India, p. 247 inadvertently dates this in A.D. 392).

We know that Candragupta I (Vikramāditya) married a Licchavi princess (apparently of Nepāl) and with the additional help of the sturdy Nepālese soldiers he effected his conquests through his son Yuvraja Samudragupta and then introduced his era (the Vikrama era). It was quite natural for Candragupta to have visited his father-in-law’s dominions and then after liquidating all the debts of the country he perhaps introduced his era there. The scene depicted in the ruined temple in the Garhūa fort and described by Gen. Cunningham (Arch. Sur. of India Reports, Vol. X, pp.13-15 and plate VII) evidently describes the marriage procession, feasts etc., between the Vaiṣṇava Guptas and the Sun-worshipping (Sūrya-vamsi) Licchavis of Nepāl. Gen. Cunningham could not identify the scene but his description of the scene read along with the plate is so tempting that I cannot but reproduce a few lines from his description. ‘At the left end there is a circular medallion with the sun-god seated in his seven horse chariot’ (evidently the sun-god worshipped by the Sūrya-vamsi Licchavis of Nepāl).... ‘On the extreme right there is a similar medallion with a king and queen seated together in conversation’ (evidently Candragupta I and his queen Kumāradevī). ‘In the middle there is a square panel, containing a male figure with six or eight arms, .......On the ground to the right there is a figure kneeling before him with both hands raised in adoration. This is the principal figure of a long procession......Immediately behind the kneeling figure there is an attendant holding an umbrella over him—an almost certain mark of a royal personage;’ this evidently depicts Candragupta I kneeling before the image of Viṣṇu before he starts for his marriage. Gen. Cunningham remarks on this six armed figure thus ‘As this figure is an object of veneration, it would seem that it must be inteneded for one of the Brahmanical gods’. Then follows the scenes of musicians followed by a party bearing presents, marriage feasts, dancing girls, etc. A second attendant is bending forward with a second offering, followed by a burly man carrying a curved broad sword like the Nepālese Kris.’ ‘Two soldiers armed with the Kris shaped sword bring up
the rear.' All this shows as clearly as possible that these soldiers are none but the Nepâlese soldiers carrying *kukris*. It was thus quite natural for Candragupta to have visited his father-in-law's dominions and then after liquidating all the debts of the country, he perhaps introduced his era there. The author of the Nepâla *vamśāvalī* correctly states the tradition that Vikramâditya came to Nepâl but finding that Amśuvarman's inscriptions are dated Sam. 30, 32, etc., he assumed these to be in the Vikrama era and thus made the singular mistake of stating that during Amśuvarman's predecessor's rule Vikramâditya came to Nepâl.

From the Nepâla *vamśāvalī* we also get the tradition that two generations before Narendradeva (A.D. 646), that is, some 50 years before, in about A.D. 595 (=Śaka 518), the Śaka era was introduced in Nepâl (during Nandadeva's rule). 'This Rājā, having heard that the era of Śālivāhana was in use in other countries, introduced it into Nepâl. Some people, however, in gratitude to Vikramajit, who introduced his era by paying off all the debts of the country, were averse to giving up the use of that era. Hence some continued to use Vikramajit Samvat, and others out of deference to the Rājā's wishes, used the Śālivāhana Śaka.' (D. Wright, Hist. of Nepal, p. 134). The use of two eras only a few years more than a century (135 years) in interval might cause troubles, hence perhaps the figure of 500 was omitted from the newly introduced Śaka era and a new counting was begun. Thus Sam. 30, 32, etc., of Amśuvarman and others were really in the Śaka era with omitted hundreds and it was wrong for Sylvain Lévi in face of the above correct tradition to state that the epoch of the smaller dates was Śaka 518 current (=A.D. 595) and not Śaka 500 current (=A.D. 577). Thus from tradition also we have the use of two eras only—the Vikrama and the Śaka in early Nepâla. The chance of Amśuvarman to have started a new era is impossible, as has been ably shown by the late Dr. Bhagwan Lal INDRAJI, for, Amśuvarman in all his inscriptions styles himself a Sāmanta king. Moreover, the new counting was in use not only in Nepâl but in all Northern India.

That the use of FLEET's Gupta era (epoch A.D. 319) in Nepâl is not supported by traditional or inscriptive evidence will now be put forth.

From the Nepâl inscription of Jayadeva II (Sam. 153) we know that Mânadeva, Mahideva and Vasantadeva were successive kings. For Mânadeva we have inscriptions dated Samvat 386 and 413 and for Vasantadeva dated Samvat 435. The late Dr. FLEET referred these inscriptions to his epoch of the Gupta era and therefore equivalent to A.D. 705 to 754. But we know that during this time Śivadeva II (inscriptional dates Sam. 119 to 143) and Jayadeva II (inscriptional dates Sam. 145 to 153) who were respectively the 14th and the 15th kings after Vasantadeva, as we know from Jayadeva II's inscription, were ruling. This shows that the larger dates cannot be referred to FLEET's Gupta era. Referred to the Vikrama era (as was rightly done by Drs. INDRAJI and VASAK), the interval between Vasantadeva's (Vikrama) Sam. 435 and Śivadeva II's Sam. 119 (=Śaka 619 = Vikrama Sam. 754, is one of 319 years and on an average of 25 years for each reign
we get 13 kings ruling in the interval. Strangely, in Jayadeva II's inscription the names of eleven kings after Vasantadeva are not mentioned, the twelfth was Udayadeva, the thirteenth, his son Narendradeva and the fourteenth, the latter's son Śivadeva II. Hence the meaning of verse 11 of Jayadeva's inscription as accepted by Dr. Vasak and others seems to be the correct one. Dr. Vasak, however, believing in Fleet's epoch of the Gupta era intends to read the dates, 'Sam. 510, 518, 519, 520 and 535 of Bhagwan Lal Indrajit and Sylvain Lévi as 310, 318, 319, 320 and 335. That this reading is incorrect will be evident from the following: Śivadeva I and Amśuvarman's last available date is then Sam. 320 = A.D. 639, according to Dr. Vasak. (The inscription which Dr. Vasak intends to read as '335' also belongs to Amśuvarman but as the portion containing the name of the king is illegible nothing should be discussed now). But the above date (A.D. 639) for Amśuvarman is incorrect for Yuang Chwang who visited Nepal not later than A.D. 637 states 'Lately there was a King called Amśuvarman' showing clearly that Amśuvarman was dead before A.D. 637. Hence those that believed in Fleet's epoch of the Gupta era meant to say that Yuan Chwang may not have actually visited Nepal and therefore his statement on Amśuvarman is incorrect. Even assuming for argument's sake that Amśuvarman was still living after A.D. 637 we find that in A.D. 639 Amśuvarman and Śivadeva I were ruling. Śivadeva I was succeeded by Dhruvadeva who was followed by Udayadeva. Udayadeva's son was Narendradeva who we know from Chinese sources was ruling in A.D. 646. Hence A.D. 639 might be the date of his father Udayadeva but can under no circumstances be the date of Śivadeva I. The date of the inscription which Dr. Vasak wants to read as Sam. 335 is, in his opinion equivalent to A.D. 654-55 i.e., during the reign of Narendradeva. The dūtaka of this inscription is Rājaputra Vikramasena, the same as the dūtaka of the inscription of Sam. 32 and 34 of Amśuvarman and Śivadeva I. Hence Dr. Vasak intends to take the inscription of Sam. 335 to belong to Śivadeva I or his son Dhruvadeva. But as already shown Dr. Vasak should have taken the inscription to belong to the reign of Śivadeva I's great grandson Narendradeva. In that case one has to admit that the same Rājaputra Vikramasena was dūtaka and a Rājaputra from the time of Śivadeva I to his great grandson Narendradeva! Sylvain Lévi intends to take the epoch of these longer dates as A.D. 110. Hence his Sam. 535 = A.D. 645 i.e., only one year before Narendradeva's known date (A.D. 646). Again, his Samvat 520 = A.D. 630 on his epoch. Hence this date might belong to Narendradeva's father Udayadeva; whereas, we know that this inscription belongs to Udayadeva's grandfather Śivadeva I. This shows that Sylvain Lévi's epoch of A.D. 110 is hopelessly in error.

On Sylvain Lévi's epoch of A.D. 595 for the smaller dates Sam. 45 = A.D. 640. After this, in Sam. 48 = A.D. 643 (according to Lévi), we find Dhruvadeva as king. But we know that only three years later in A.D. 646 Dhruvadeva's grandson Narendradeva was reigning. Again, on the epoch of the so-called Harsha era (A.D. 606), Sam. 39 = A.D. 645. The dūtaka in this
inscription of Sam. 39 was Yuvarāja Udayadeva, evidently the son of Dhruvadeva. Whereas we know that only one year later in A.D. 646 Udayadeva’s son Narendradeva was reigning in Nepal, thus vanishing the reign of Udayadeva. Hence Dr. Fleet had no other option but to say that this Udayadeva was not the Licchavi (king) of that name but probably a Thākuri prince of that name. Again, Sam. 45 of Anśuvarman is equivalent to A.D. 651 on the epoch of A.D. 606. Anśuvarman ruled jointly with Śivadeva (I) for sometime who was followed by Dhruvadeva who ruled jointly with Jishṇugupta in Sam. 48=A.D. 654. Thus on the epoch of A.D. 606 either Śivadeva (I) or Dhruvadeva was ruling in A.D. 651. Whereas, from Chinese sources we know that from A.D. 646 to 657 at least, Dhruvadeva’s grandson Narendradeva was ruling. All this shows the utter incorrectness of the epochs A.D. 606 and 595 for the so-called Harsha era. From another consideration the incorrectness of the above epochs will be evident. The date of Jayadeva II’s inscription of Samvat 153 is equivalent to A.D. 759 (on the epoch of A.D. 606). In this inscription Jayadeva describes Harshadeva of Kāmarūpa as ‘a very powerful King, Lord of Gauḍa, Odra, Kalinga and Kosala. Now, Yaśovarman of Kanauj sent an embassy to China in A.D. 731, evidently when he became Lord Paramount of Northern India after his conquest of Gauḍa and Bengal. This Yaśovarman was defeated by Lalitāditya of Kashmir and the Gauḍa King captured, taken to Kashmir and then killed by him seems to be this Yaśovarman. Evidently, after this, Lalitāditya received investiture as King by the Emperor of China in A.D. 733. From this time there was anarchy in Gauḍa and Bengal, there being no ruler there. To end this anarchy the people elected Gopāla (who became the first King of the Pāla dynasty) as their ruler from about A.D. 750. Thus Harshadeva of Kāmarūpa was Lord of Gauḍa, Odra, Kalinga and Kosala before A.D. 731. (The defeat of this Harshadeva by the Kamāṭaka army, evidently of Cālukya Vikramāditya II about A.D. 735 is mentioned in the Shamangad inscription of Dantidurga Rāṣṭrapāla dated Śaka 674=A.D. 752). Thus Harshadeva of Kāmarūpa was no longer Lord of Gauḍa, Odra etc., after A.D. 731, because the very laudatory reference to him could not have been made in Jayadeva’s inscription if on the date of the inscription he was no longer the Lord of Gauḍa, Odra etc. This shows that the date of Jayadeva’s inscription cannot be A.D. 759 (on the epoch of A.D. 606 for the so-called Harsha era) and the same is in error by more than (759-731, or) 28 years i.e., the true epoch of the so-called Harsha era should be about A.D. (606-28, or) 578=Śaka 500. In reality Sam. 153 =Śaka 653=A.D. 730, on the true epoch of the so-called Harsha era.

It will thus be seen that Amśuvarman’s inscriptions are dated in Śaka 510, 518, 520, (5)30, (5)32, (5)34, (5)39 and (5)44 or (5)45 = A.D. 587 to 622, and this date of Amśuvarman is quite in accordance with Hiuen Tsiang’s statement concerning him. Rev. Beal also remarked ‘From Hiuen Tsiang’s allusion one should be inclined to place Amśuvarman’s reign about A.D. 580-600.’ (Buddhist Records, Vol. II, p. 81 fn.).

The date of an inscription of Jishṇugupta and Mānadeva (II) has been
read as Sam. 500 by Sylvain Lévi, the correctness of which is very much doubted by Dr. Vasak. We have the inscription of Jishnugupta and Dhruva-
deva dated Sam. 48 = Śaka 548 = Vikrama Sam. 683. It seems that the
date of the inscription of Jishnugupta and Mānadeva (II) is really
(Vikrama) Sam. 700 = Śaka 565 = Sam. (5)65 = A.D. 642 i.e., just before
Narendradeva. The above Mānadeva (II) seems to be a brother of Udaya-
deva whose name occurs in the Nepāla vamśāvalī immediately after Udaya-
deva.

From the above it will be seen very clearly that true to tradition, in early
Nepāl only the Vikrama era was in use till about A.D. 577 = Śaka 500
when the Śaka era was introduced. But the simultaneous use of two eras
with a difference of a few years was causing trouble, hence a new counting
with omitted hundreds of the Śaka era was introduced. So that the epoch
of the so-called Harsha era is really Śaka 500 current = A.D. 576-77.

It will thus be seen that the conclusion of Dr. Fleet in 1887 "And no
objection could be taken by the Early Gupta kings to the adoption of the era
of a royal house (the Licchavis of Nepāl), in the connection with which
they took special pride; I think, therefore, that in all probability the so-
called Gupta era is a Licchavi era." (Gupta Inscriptions, Intro. p. 136) is
just the reverse of what he expected. In reality there has been found distin-
ct proof of the Licchavis of Nepāl using the era of the Gupta Vikra-
mādityas which began from 58 B.C. and no proof of the use of the Valabhi
era (epoch A.D. 319) which Dr. Fleet erroneously called the epoch of the
era of the Gupta Vikramādityas. Hence incidentally I request real seekers
after truth to decide how far the origin of the era of the Gupta Vikramā-
dityas from a study of the Nepāla inscriptions as shown above, true to Dr.
Fleet's expectations 'But the question of the origin of the (Gupta) era is
one, of course, on which further discoveries, especially if any could be made
in Nepāl, may be expected to throw more light.' (Gupta Inscriptions, Intro.
p. 136) has been traced.

I now append a synchronistic table with insessional dates for clearness.*

In conclusion, I acknowledge my indebtedness to the late Mr. Jogendra
Chandra Ghosh of Calcutta from whom I received much help in writing this
paper.

---

* See next page for table.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Dates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Harshavardhana of Kanauj</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Śaka (5) 22 to (5) 25 = A.D. 599 to 602</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cālukya Pulakesī II.</td>
<td>(Śaka 532 = A.D. 609).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mādhavagupta</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ádityasena</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Śaka (5) 66 = A.D. 643.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>daughter</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vatsādevī</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harshadeva of Kāmarūpa.</td>
<td>(Upto c.A.D. 730.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Upto c.A.D. 731.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yaśovarman of Kanauj</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lalitāditya of Kashmir.</td>
<td>(c. A.D. 732—)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anarchy in Gauḍa and Bengal.</td>
<td>Gopāla, the first Pāla king.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c. A.D. 750—)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Nepāl)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mānadeva (I)</td>
<td>(v.s. 386 to 413 = A.D. 328 to 355)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mahideva</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vasantadeva</td>
<td>(v.s. 435 = A.D. 378)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Nine kings)</td>
<td>Sivadeva (I) and Amśuvarman.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Śaka 510 to 520 = A.D. 587 to 597. Amśuvarman—Śaka (5) 30 to (5) 45 = A.D. 606 to 621. (Śaka 535 = A.D. 612).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dhruvadeva and Jishāugupta.</td>
<td>Sāka (5) 48 = v.s. 683 = A.D. 625.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Udayadeva</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manadeva (II) and Jishāugupta (v.s. 700 = A.D. 642)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Narendradeva</td>
<td>A.D. 646 to 651 (from Chinese sources) = v.s. 704 to 709.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sivadeva II</td>
<td>Sam. 119 to 143 = Śaka 619 to 643 = v.s. 754 to 778 = A.D. 696 to 720.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jayadeva (II)</td>
<td>Sam. 145 to 153 = Śaka 645 to 653 = v.s. 780 to 788 = A.D. 722 to 730.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

P. M. P. Bhojađeva of Kanauj.
1. v.s. 893 = Śaka 758 = A.D. 834-35.
2. Śam. 259 = Śaka 759 = A.D. 835-36.
3. v.s. 900 = Śaka 765 = A.D. 841-42.
4. Śam. 276 = Śaka 776 = A.D. 852-53.
5. v.s. 919 = Śaka 784 = A.D. 860-61.
6. v.s. 932 = Śaka 797 = A.D. 873-74.
7. v.s. 933 = Śaka 798 = A.D. 874-75.
The Early History of Bengal (From the earliest times to the Muslim Conquest)
Vol. I, by Prof. Pramode Lal Paul, M.A. with a Foreword by Dr. R. C. Majumdar, M.A., Ph.D., Vice-Chancellor, Dacca University; Indian Research Institute (Indian History Series, No. 2), 170, Maniktala Street, Calcutta, 1939; Pp. viii + 158, Price — Rs. 4 (Inland); 7s. (Foreign); Size: — 6¼" x 9¼."
(="Magadhas) and Cers. It seems that in the later Vedic period Bengal was inhabited by tribes of a different stock of population from the Brahmanical writers of the above texts and these tribes were avoided by them as far as possible. The Mahâbhârata mentions Vaṅga, Puṇḍra and Āṅga. The Buddhist literature also mentions Āṅga. The history of Bengal from the fall of the Mauryas to the rise of the Guptas is almost dark. Northern Bengal was under the Gupta emperors almost up to the middle of the 6th century A.D. About this time the Gupta Empire broke up into independent dynasties, some of which fought among themselves and thus invited foreign invasions from neighbouring potentates, including one by Harsadeva, who is called King of Gauḍa in an inscription of A.D. 759. The history of the Pāla and Sena Dynasties (pp. 33 to 110) i.e. from the 8th century to the 12th century A.D. is more rich in details than the earlier history of Bengal—This in brief is the history of Bengal touched by the author and reconstructed on the strength of available materials. Written in a clear style and well documented on all important points the present outline of the Early History of Bengal by Prof. Paul would be found attractive even to a lay reader not interested in the dry bones of chronology, the rattling of copper-plates or the vacuous vagaries of the Purânas, which breed controversies in which the public finds no interest as they are inconclusive. We congratulate the author and the Indian Research Institute, Calcutta on this useful publication.

P. K. Gode.

THE LATE SIR E. DENISON ROSS

It is with the deepest regret that the Editors and Publishers of the New Indian Antiquary have to announce the death of Sir E. Denison Ross, the noted Iranian scholar, in September this year. It was only recently that a Volume of Studies organised by the New Indian Antiquary in his honour was published, and a specially bound presentation copy was being sent to him. It is all the more regrettable that the only Volume which was completed, whether in India or Europe, before the war clouds spread over the Western world, could not reach his hands. It is now doubtful if a Presentation Volume will be organized, as intended, by the School of Oriental Studies in London, of which he was the first Director. Thus the Volume of Indian and Iranian Studies remains the unique symbol of the regard and esteem which he inspired in his colleagues, students and admirers.
SOME RARE PORTRAITS AND WASLIS

By

HIRANANDA SASTRI, Baroda.

Collections of specimens of art are of three kinds; those housed in museums, those made by the rich dilettante, and those made by the lover of art. Personally I am not in favour of private collections in spite of being a collector myself. For when paintings, writings, etc., are deposited in museums they become available to the public, and reproductions of them can be obtained, even if with some difficulty. But when they go to the drawing-room of rich amateurs they are beyond the reach of ordinary people or are not even known to exist. They are lost to the student at large. The case however is different where lovers of art are concerned, for they are always ready to encourage art by placing their collections before genuine students and glad to allow them to study the specimens they possess and publish the results of their investigations for the information of the votaries of the muse of art. Such personages might even lend their acquisitions to museums for exhibition, thus making them readily accessible and hence useful to the student and connoisseur alike.

The small art collection in the possession of Sir V. T. KRISHNAMA CHARI comes under the third of the categories I have enumerated above, for it is always available to scholars for study. The collection consists of paintings and waslis, or specimens of calligraphic writing. The waslis are beautifully written. Some of them are signed and dated though the date is expressed symbolically. It is my intention here to publish a few of these specimens.

The Delhi Museum of Archaeology is said to have specimens by more than one hundred calligraphists in its collection. A number of these were made known to the public by Khan Bahadur Maulvi Zafar HASAN, B.A., in a memoir of the Archeological Department of India and in a note on Muslim calligraphy in the Journal of Indian Art and Letters, Vol. IX, pp.60 ff. The ‘Nastāliq’ and the ‘Shikasta’ and the other specimens in the collection under notice are fair examples of some Muslim calligraphic systems. They are reproduced here for comparative study. Such comparison with other specimens will enable us to see how the art developed and declined. Similar specimens are also to be found in other collections also which the late Dr. SMITH mentioned in his History of Fine Art in India, etc. The waslis require study—a patient study, for some of them, particularly those written in the Shikasta style, defy even an expert decipherer!

1. This article has been written in collaboration with Mr. V. H. BHANOT, B.A. (Hons.) (Cantab), M.A., of the Education Department, Baroda.
2. These terms are explained in the sequel.
It would be well to give a few general remarks on the history of the Indo-Persian or Mughal School of painting and the technical names of the calligraphic systems of Persian or Arabic writings.

The Indo-Persian or Mughal School of painting might well be considered to have started in the reign of Akbar. His grand father Bābur is known to have been an admirer of Bihzād, the famous painter of Herat, who was Bābur's contemporary (A.D. 1487-1524). Akbar seems to have been greatly influenced by the paintings of the said Kamāl-ud-dīn Bihzād, and of his pupil ʿAlāʾ Mīrām of Tabrīz. They led him to establish the school of painting generally known by the name of Indo-Mughal.

Though opinions differ, we make bold to assert, with Abu-l Fazl, the Boswell of Akbar, that the Indian disciples of this school produced works which surpassed those of the foreign ʿustāds themselves. Indeed one of these Indian painters is said to have touched up and finished a painting by the great ʿustād Bihzād himself. This was Khwāja Abdul Dāwūd, who was the favourite of Akbar and the ʿustād of Daswanth the Kahār painter of Akbar's court. Khwāja Dāwūd was a master calligraphist as well. Abu-l Fazl gives a list of calligraphic experts, among whom the most eminent in Akbar's time was Muhammad Hussain of Kashmir. These calligraphists followed various styles or systems. Abu-l Fazl has enumerated eight such systems, which were current during the 16th century in Iran, Turan, Turkistan, Turkey and India. These are all distinct styles and can be distinguished from one another by differences in the proportion of straight and curved lines. Akbar's favourite script was Nastālīq, which consists almost entirely of curved strokes. The letters of the Arabic alphabet in which Persian is also written lend themselves to artistic treatment, and the masters of the calligraphic art have been able to produce specimens which win admiration from all and sundry.

The eight calligraphical systems current in the time of Akbar are, according to Abu-l Fazl, as follows:

1. The Suls, (2) the Tauqi'a, (3) the Muhaqqaq, (4) the Naskh, (5) the Raithān, (6) the Riqa'a, (7) the Ghubār and (8) the Tā'aliq. The main styles of Muslim script, however, are four, i.e., (1) Kūfic (2) Naskh (3) Nastālīq and (4) Shikasta. Of these the first two are used chiefly for Arabic, and the other two, for Persian.

The first six styles in Abu-l Fazl's list were derived in A.H. 310 by Ibn-i-Muqlah from the Maqāli and the Kūfic characters. The Ghubār system is also attributed to him. Many ascribe the Naskh method to Yāqūt. The Tā'aliq way of writing is believed to have been derived from the Riqa'a and the Tauqi'a.

The main difference in the form of a letter in these systems lies in the proportion of straight and curved strokes. The Kūfic character consists of one-sixth curvature and five-sixth straight lines, the Maqāli has no curved lines at all—that is why the inscriptions found on ancient buildings.

are mostly written in this script. The Suls and the Nasikh each consist of one-third curved lines and two-thirds straight lines. Of these the former, i.e., Suls is described as Jali i.e., clear, bold, while the other as Khafī or hidden, thin. The Tauqi'a and the Riqa consist of three-fourths curved lines and one-fourth straight lines—the former is Jali and the latter Khafī. The Muhaqaq and Raihan each consist of three-fourths straight lines; the first of these is Jali and the second is Khafī.

Akbar's favourite mode of writing seems to have been the eighth in Abu-l Fazl's list, i.e. the Nasta'liq. It is a round script and seems to have been evolved from the Nasikh and the Ta'aliq scripts which it gradually replaced. The majority of waslis i.e., specimens of calligraphy, beautifully illustrated and mounted on cardboard, are written in this style. It would appear from Abu-l Fazl's writings that Akbar much preferred calligraphy to painting. "Pictures are much inferior to the written letter inasmuch as the latter may embody the wisdom of bygone ages, and becomes a means of intellectual progress." But Akbar was highly interested in the art of painting also, in spite of his predilection for beautiful writing. The encouragement he gave to the art of painting produced some master-painters who even excelled their own ustads. Witness Abu-l Fazl, "More than a hundred painters have become famous masters of the art, whilst the numbers of those who approach perfection, and of those who are middling, is very large. This is specially true of the Hindus; their pictures surpass conception of things. Few, indeed, in the whole world are found equal to them."

These remarks are indicative of the interest which painting must have attracted during the rule of Akbar. The Emperor himself is said to have remarked once that "there are many men who hate paintings but such men I dislike. It appears to me as if a painter had quite peculiar means of recognising God, for a painter in sketching anything that has life, and in devising its limbs one after the other, must come to feel that he cannot bestow individuality upon his work, and is thus forced to think of God, the giver of life, and will thus increase his knowledge."

Evidently it was this exalted attitude of the great Mughal that made possible the masterpieces of painting and calligraphic art to be so numerous during his reign. Like painting, calligraphy was regarded as a fine art worthy of the most serious study, and masters of this skill enjoyed fame throughout Asia in those days. They were careful to sign and date their work, and thus added to the value of their productions. As Vincent Smith has stated, many of the albums in the London collections containing miniatures include hundreds of specimens of beautiful writings in various styles and of different periods, which often seem to have been more valued than the drawings and paintings associated with them. Indeed a long catalogue of calligraphists might be compiled from the collections in England, if anybody would but take the trouble.

Both these arts, especially the art of calligraphy, require patronage to flourish, though this is to some extent true of every fine art. Proper appre-
ciation is necessary in order that it might prosper. Akbar and his two immediate successors patronised this art very liberally, and the waslis produced in their reign are the objects of unstinted praise. The art began to deteriorate later on for want of patronage. Only recently we have again become aware of the beauties of the art. Much of the credit for this must go to Tagore and Havell, who have done splendid service in bringing specimens of Indian painting to the notice of the general public and in revealing the mystic and other meanings connected with them. European art critics and those who follow in their wake take Havell as an extremist in his admiration of Indian art. How far they are justified in this we do not feel tempted to decide. We can only say here that Havell was one of the foremost admirers or connoisseurs of Indian art to whose appreciation of its merits and symbolic interpretation the care bestowed on it in Europe and America is largely due.

It would be out of place to discuss the history of Indian painting here. But that the art has existed in India from very ancient times it is hardly necessary to prove. One must, however, refute any contentions that "the history of painting came to an abrupt stop with the Ajanta Series in A.D. 642" or that "the history of Indian painting between the close of the Ajanta Series in A.D. 642 and the importation of Persian art by Akbar about A.D. 1540, a period of more than nine centuries, is almost a blank." The art was not extinct on Indian soil at any time. Fine specimens of paintings belonging to different periods between these nine centuries have been published and can be shown as evidence vitiating such statements. As regards coinage, too, it would be incorrect to assume that the art of striking mudrās deteriorated and ceased developing in the early mediaeval period in India. Vincent Smith and others have made such assertions as the above, and I cannot help remarking that they must be held to be prejudiced and hasty. In Gujarāt and Rājpūtānā at least, the art continued to flourish, and specimens bearing dates before the advent of the Mughals in this country are known to exist. One must admit, however, that painting was liberally patronised by Akbar and his two immediate successors and some great masterpieces were produced in consequence.

PLATE I (a).

As remarked above the art of painting in India can be traced to hoary antiquity. But this is hardly the case with calligraphy. Indeed, I am not aware if calligraphy as an art was developed in Hindu India as it did in Musalmān countries or in India under the Mughals. Excepting the autograph of the great Harshavardhana engraved in the Banskhera copper-plate, (Plate I (a)), and the royal signatures which frequently occur in Mysore inscriptions (Archaeological Survey Progress Report, 1911-12, pages 109 ff.), hardly any calligraphic specimens worth the name, such as we see written in the systems enumerated by Abu-l Fazl, are known in the case of Devanāgāri at least. Of course, neatly written documents and manuscripts are legion, but they are
(a) 
AUTOGRAPH OF HARSHAVARDHANA.

(b) 
DEITIES CONNECTED WITH THE SYLLABLE OM.

(c) 
JAMI (?).
A YOUTH AND SOME APOTHEGMS.
not analogous to the Tughrā, the Nasta'liq and other ways of writing invented by Musalmāns.

Different modes of writing were known in ancient India, such as the Citra-lipi or the Mudrā-lipi. Yet excepting the way of writing on mudrās, i.e., coins or seals, specimens of other modes are not known. This may be due to the fact that the Brāhmī-lipi and the scripts derived from it were not suited to the requirements of the modes invented by Musalmān calligraphists, who often wrote in a crooked way, so much so that their writing became very difficult to read if not unreadable. The qualifications of good penmanship according to Hindu ideals are, as stated in the Matsya and the Garuda-Purāṇas, or in the Sāraṇigadharapaddhati quoted in the Lekhapaddhati, as follows:—The letters should always be equal, of equal headlines, that they should be round and thick and well connected with the mātrās or vowel marks:—

समान त समकान्वी हङ्गालिनि धनानि महानि च ।
मत्रापुरुष प्रतिवादाति यो जानाति सेलखन्तः॥

These characteristics are contrary to the features of calligraphy noticed in the A'īn-i-Akhbār.

Later specimens of what may be called Citra-lipi are known to exist. They are rather pictures of the subjects of the aksharas. For example, the syllable Om is considered to consist of three component parts, a, u, and m. The letter a stands for Vishṇu, u for Siva and m for Prajāpati. Figures of these divinities may consequently be seen written in the diagram of the Om, as in a picture in my collection which I reproduce below (Plate I (b)). But that is hardly the kind of calligraphy we see in the waslis.

PLATE I (b).

Waslis require a careful and patient study as many of them are extremely tortuous and difficult to read. Sayings like likhe Mūsā pafhe Khudā are indicative of the undecipherable nature of such writings. One has to familiarise oneself with them by seeing as many specimens as one possibly can. For this he must have access to specimens, either directly through museums and private collections or through learned publications.

We turn now to the paintings and waslis in the collection under notice. The best pictures in it are by painters of the Indo-Persian School, excepting one which I would call Persian. This is a portrait of Jāmi, the celebrated poet of Persia who flourished in the 15th century A.D. Jāmi is a nom-de-plume, the real name being Nūr-ud-Dīn Abdul Rehāmīn. He was born on the 7th November 1414 A.D. (23rd Sha'abān 817 A.D.) at a village called Jām in Herāt. His mastery of the Persian language and his knowledge were reputed to be unequalled throughout the Persian Empire, and he enjoyed great respect for his erudition from the Princes of his time. More than 44 works were written by him—his poem on the loves of Yusuf and Zulekhā is one of the finest compositions in the Persian language. Jāmi died at the advanced age of 81 lunar years, on Friday the 9th November 1492 A.D. (18th Muharram 898 A.H.).
PLATE I (c).

This picture (Plate I (c) ) bears some texts written on it. They are as follows:—

Jāmi's portrait. Top and bottom lines:

کین ہے نظم اندوز نو است
"Jāmi had no desire for fame,
All this verse is in new style."

Right and left margins—

قلت مالک لا تذکر ایاك فقال إن نک یہی راجا یخانی قسمه وان امن (اہم) امرأ

I said, "How is it that thou dost not say anything about thyself?" He replied, "My father is a person who is proud of himself, but my mother is of lowly spirit." It was said to a learned man that he should take his share from the world, for he will pass away.

Most of the inscriptions written in such miniatures, it may be remarked here in passing, have little to do with the pictures they are written upon. In the case of Jāmi, too, this remark holds good to a certain extent. He was a great Sūfī, and the words قصد شیرت جای ذراع را سبلت could apply to him. But the writings in the margin, however, would not. He was a well-known person. His father was Maulānā Muhammad or Ahmad Isfahānī. He was remarkably polite, of a very gentle disposition, and endowed with extensive learning. Even princes who were themselves men of erudition and exalted talents have lavished the most unbounded praise upon Jāmi. A scholar and profound Sūfī like Jāmi would not describe his mother as is done in the inscription on the painting. This means that the writing cannot be contemporaneous with the portrait.

The figure has a marked resemblance with the portraits of Persian dignitaries which are published elsewhere. We have no means of ascertaining whether the picture is a genuine portrait of Jāmi or not, apart from the name جایی written in the top line. Judging from the evidences of style, dress, etc. there would seem to be little against accepting it as an actual portrait. In all cases, however, it will be a matter of belief or opinion and we might leave the point there.

Some of the texts of these waslis are of the nature of what we call subhāshitas in Sanskrit, i.e. apophthegms. They may aptly be used as quotations for adorning a speech. The stanzas written on the accompanying representation of a youth of unknown identity are of this kind. There is no label on it. The inscription in small letters above the head of the young

4. I am indebted to Mr. G. Yazdani, Director of Archaeology, Hyderabad, for these readings and their translation.
5. See postscript.
6. I am told of another portrait of Jāmi which differs from the present one in many details. I have not, however, been able to see this portrait,
BAHAVUDDAULAH (?)
Nawab Shahista Khan.
man simply says that it is the result of Indian penmanship in black. The verses are written in Thulth characters and in Arabic. The three lines in bold Thulth characters are in praise of the Prophet and the intervening lines in small letters are general expressions. The short line written towards the right corner is also of the same nature. Evidently it is addressed to God. The opposite side gives the name of the scribe saying, “It is in the handwriting of ‘Abdulla Tabhaḵī”. Who this person was I am unable to establish. No date seems to be given anywhere on the picture.

PLATE II.

(1) ْكَلَّ مَدِحٌ فِي الْبَنِي مَقْصَرَا وَأَنْ بَنِي اَلْقَتَةٌ عَلَيْهِ
(2) صَبِعَ نَصِبُ مَدِحٍ مَدِحَ صَفْحٍ سَوَاحَ
(3) ذَٰلِكَ الْبَنِيَّ بَالْذِي مَوْاهِلَ فَاكَٰنَ مَقَايِبَ

Translation.

(1) "Every praise in respect of the Prophet falls short even if the person who is praising may exaggerate;"
(2) "Bright, sincere, transparent, winner of praise, conniver, valiant"
(3) "Verily God has praised him according to his worth; he has no match."

PLATE III.

Another noteworthy picture is a portrait—a very lifelike representation of some Musalmān dignitary. The label on the top in Persian calls (Plate III) him (Baḥāvuddaulah, but does not throw any light on his identity. The label in Persian says it is drawn in India. The picture occupies the top portion. Below it there are two panels containing fourteen lines of Arabic verse, seven lines to each panel. In the margin opposite to the right leg of the portrait there is a name which might be read as Nisad Khān. Whether it stands for the calligraphist or for some other person it would be hazardous to opine.

PLATE IV.

There are four more pictures in the collection requiring special notice. They are reproduced below. One purports to represent the Darbār (Plate IV) of Bābur. His name is written in the Persian script at the top. The phrase Kār-i-Hind is also given towards the right corner at the top. These words are meant to indicate that the picture was drawn in India. Who the painter was is not stated. The picture must be the work of some master painter whose name I am unable to find. That the picture is an early Indo-Persian work cannot be doubted. The central figure seated under a canopy and on a couch represents some royalty probably early Mughal. It bears a resemblance to the portraits of Bābur in several of the pictures that are reproduced in "The Memoirs of Baber" by F. G. Talbot, published
in London in the year 1909. At the same time it must be admitted that our picture does not resemble some of the other portraits in this very book. The translator of "The Memoirs of Baber" avers, however, that the portraits of Bābur shown in the illustrations of his book must be accepted as authentic, as there is sufficient resemblance between the several pictures to warrant such acceptance. We shall have to admit that such representations might not have been drawn in front of the person sought to be portrayed, as is usually done nowadays by giving sittings to the painter. They might sometimes have been drawn from memory. The same is the case with the portraits of Nūrjahan, the famous Mughal Empress, for instance. All her pictures differ from one another and would lend support to the view that the Mughals did not give sittings for their portraits in violation of the injunction of the Qur'ān.

**PLATE V.**

Another picture in the collection purports to represent Shâh Shujâ’a, (Plate V) as is shown by the labels on it. This Shâh Shujâ’a (شجاع) must be the youngest son of Taimūr Shâh, the son of Ahmed Shâh Abdâli. He was sent to Kashmir by his brother Muhammad Shâh and imprisoned in the Kohi-i-Mirân fort in A.D. 1812 whence he was released in 1814 by Maharaja Ranjit Singh and detained in Lahore as a prisoner till he escaped to the British territories. He was placed on the throne of Kabul by the British Government in 1839 but was murdered by his nephew in A.D. 1842. I do not think he should be identified with the Sultan of the Muzaffarians or any other ruler of this name.

**PLATE VI.**

Then comes the picture of Nawâb Shâista Khân (Plate VI) on horseback. It is full of vigour and quite lifelike but for the pose of the leg, which looks shorter than what it should be. The label calls the subject of the painting Shâistâ Khân and if it names him correctly he must be identical with the Mughal Subedar of Deccan who was attacked by Shivaji in his camp at Poona and fled through a window. Vincent Smith also reproduces a portrait of him, but the present picture bears no resemblance to Smith’s picture. This would strengthen our view that the Mughals and other Musalmâns were unwilling to sit for portraits which were consequently drawn from memory only.

**PLATE VII.**

The last picture we should like to mention here is of a young prince of Arabia (Plate VII), if one is to be guided by the labels. Whether he is an imaginary figure or stands for some historical person we have no means to determine. But that it is an artistic and well-executed drawing cannot be denied though the face is too boyish for the long whiskers we see on it. The figure stands between two texts written above and below. The left corner at
A SPECIMEN OF CALLIGRAPHIC WRITING.
ANOTHER SPECIMEN OF CALLIGRAPHIC WRITING.
THIRD SPECIMEN OF CALLIGRAPHIC WRITING.
the top gives the name of the poet which seems to read Shāh-Mīr. Both the
texts are written in Shikasta.

PLATES VIII & IX.

As to the waslis proper, that is, the calligraphic writings as such, of
which three (Plates VIII to X) are reproduced here, one (VIII) seems to
give the date in the words دَخْطَر كَرْدِنَد which according to the Abjad
way of reckoning would mean 962 (A.H.) i.e. 1554-55 A.D. Below the date is
written the name of Muhammad Kāzim who might have been the calligra-
phist or the composer of the Persian verses written in beautiful Nastāliq
mode. The second wasli (Plate IX) is written on the back of the picture
of what the label calls Bābur’s Darbār.

PLATE X.

The text of the third wasli (Plate X) has two couplets in Persian and
according to the subscript, was written by one Muhammad who describes
himself as Mehjūrul Khidmat (?) i.e. one who is away from service.

If this note can persuade persons who possess such collections to bring
their art treasures to the notice of scholars interested in the subject we shall
consider ourselves to be amply rewarded. Many States as well as private
individuals in this vast country are known to possess them. They very often
keep them to show to select personages in order to earn their good-will.
Numbers of them are sold for high prices and go to distant lands, never to
be heard of again. And only genuine love of art, true devotion to the Muse
of learning, can check it and keep these treasures within the reach of the
votaries of knowledge.

Postscript—

While correcting the final proofs of this article I had an opportunity
of consulting Sayyid Mahmudmiyan Ahmadmiyan Kazi, M.A., Professor
of Persian in the Baroda College. He has kindly made two suggestions which
I consider valuable and should like to place before scholars in the form of
this postscript. I think he is right and I would gladly change my remarks
accordingly. The epithet of ٍضَيَّفِه, etc., he takes in the sense of “a frail
old woman.” This does not imply any insinuation but would be quite approp-
riate especially when a sūfī like Jāmī is speaking of his mother. In that case
my remarks about the contemporaneity of the text will have to be modified.
As to the wasli reproduced in plate VIII he will calculate the date from the
words دَخْطَر كَرْدِنَد and not from دَخْطَر كَرْدِنَد In that case the date would be 1134
A.H. i.e. 1721 A.D.
JUXTAPOSITION ET COMPOSITION DANS LE RGVEDA

By

LOUIS RENOU, Paris.

L'un des traits qui marquent la langue du RV. est qu'on y trouve juxtaposés des éléments nominaux entre lesquels la relation attendue est celle qui existerait entre un substantif et son épithète, entre un nom déterminant et un nom déterminé. Le cas qu'on peut prendre pour type est l'expression sōma in māde I 80 1 "dans le soma, dans l'ivresse", c'est-à-dire "dans l'ivresse du soma", cf. māde sōmasya I 85 10 et passim.

Des cas analogues ont été relevés notamment par PISCHEL et par GELDNER ; PISCHEL les rangeait sous la rubrique de l'hendiadyoin (cf. Ved. Stud. I, Sachverz.), GELDNER inclinant vers la notion de composés ouverts "offenes, loses Compositum" (Ved. Stud. II et III, Sachverz.; Kommentar, Index; notes à la traduction du RV., passim). L'un et l'autre terme sont inadéquats. L'hendiadyoin est une figure de style d'un emploi limité, la juxtaposition védique est un trait de langue général ; l'hendiadyoin suppose en quelque manière la fragmentation d'une expression unitaire, le type sōme māde se réalise seulement (comme l'a noté OLDENBERG Noten ad VI 66 11) là où chaque membre pris à part donne un sens valable et suffisant. Quant à la composition "ouverte", elle implique cet enseignement que le type sōme māde repose sur d'anciens composés dont éléments se seraient dissociés. Ce ne peut être exact, dans la majorité des emplois, pour la langue du RV., étant donné que les composés de même structure que ces formations ne sont attestés le plus souvent qu'à une date ultérieure. Il faut voir bien plutôt dans un juxtaposé comme sōme māde les témoins d'un stade pré-compositionnel.

Les formes en question sont passablement nombreuses. Un examen minutieux du RV. à cet égard en ferait sans doute ressortir d'autres : il est visible qu'en mains endroits l'interprétation de formes juxtaposées comme types pré-compositionnels facilite l'intelligence d'un passage.

Bien entendu, il ne faut retenir, dans l'immense masse des emplois juxtaposés, que ceux dont les éléments comportent entre eux un rapport de dépendance ou de détermination. Le cas normal est que l'un des deux termes précise l'autre ; nous sommes sur le plan de ce qui donnera dans la langue postérieure au RV. (WACKERNAGEL II 1 p. 250) des karmadhāraya : cf. GELDNER Ved. Stud. II p. 280 qui rapproche cl. duḥkhāyantra = duḥkham eva yantram. On peut citer avec des nuances diverses et des probabilités également diverses gṛtām ānnam II 35 14 "nourriture consistant en beurre" havīsā gṛtēna II 10 4, sōnam āśīram X 49 10 (contesté OLDENBERG Noten I p. 411 n.) La coexistence d'expressions comme gṛtāvad āhavī X 14 14 indique quel est le rapport des deux termes en présence,
A sōma in māde précité se laisse joindre r̥āṇāya...mādāya ("pour l'ivresse réjouissante") PISCHEL Ved. Stud. I p. 66) III 47 1, cf. mādo r̥āṇyah X 29 3.

Un groupe s'établit autour de la notion de gīr- "chant" ou analogues: dāvo gīrāh I 14 1 ("Lobreden" GELDNER), arciśa...gīrā V 17 3, rīcā gīrā VIII 27 5; vīprobhīḥ...māmabhīḥ I 127 2 VIII 60 3 = vīprāṇām ma. Cf. aussi ślokaṃ ghōṣam X 94 1, tristūbhham īṣam VIII 7 1, 69 1 "une force (i.e. un chant) consistant en tristūbham", cf. PISCHEL I, p. 197 n. 1 qui allègue encore arkās tristūbah IX 97 35. Vīpo rātnā III 3 1 est sans doute à entendre avec GELDNER "Redeperlen". On peut rapprocher māṇmā...vayūnāni II 19 8 "prière (qui suit) les voies rituelles" (analogie PISCHEL I p. 301).

Le mot gīr- se juxtapose aussi avec barhāṇā IX 10 4 "avec la force annihilante, avec le chant", cf. RÖNNOW BSOS. IX p. 65, et le même mot barhāṇā avec śivas I 52 11, RÖNNOW p. 58.

Cet état de choses aboutit parfois à des locutions stables, ainsi yajñām adhvarām qui désigne le sacrifice sous son double aspect oratoire et pratique (NEISSER Wörterb. s. v. adhvarā-).

Le phénomène n'intéresse pas uniquement les noms d'action; des noms d'agent y sont concernés, ainsi devām rīvijām I 1 1 (et ailleurs), debā duṭāh X 98 2 "messager des dieux" SIEG Sagenst, p. 138 n. 4, druhyāv ā jāne VI 46 8 et autres locutions analogues. C'est ici qu'interviennent les expressions gāvo dhenuvāḥ, proprement "des vaches qui sont des laitières", ou staryō gāvāḥ TS. āvīr vaśa citées WACKERNAGEL II p. 250 : nous sommes à l'origine des composés du type dhenustari, vaśabadhenu, qui entrent dans la langue à partir du YV.

GELDNER II p. 280 a noté la fréquence de l' "asynède" avec le mot tāmas- : le cas le plus notable est tāmasi harmyē V 32 5 "dans la demeure des ténèbres" (mort ou enfers, GELDNER ZDMG. LXXI p. 338 n. 1).

Cf. encore ātyena pājasā II 34 13 "sous la forme d'un cheval" : un tel juxtaposé ouvr la voie aux inombrables composés en "rūpa- du classique; māricāḥ pravātāḥ X 58 6 "espaces pourvus de rayons lumineux", śrīyā hiranyaiḥ I 122 2 (PISCHEL II p. 199, qui renvoie à son article de GGA. 1895 p. 448), ēnasab...ūrātāt IV 12 5 "prison consistant en (ou : résultat de) péché" (GELDNER II p. 280 OLDENBERG ZDMG. LV p. 318), vārūthe gābhastau II 18 8 (GELDNER III p. 180), vayūnāni bhōjanā X 44 7 "jouissances consistant en les voies rituelles" (PISCHEL I p. 303, qui cite gātra vayina I 162 18). Gotrā...gāḥ III 30 21 "troupeaux de vaches", cf. avec la détermination grammaticalement exprimée gāvāṃ gotrām II 23 18 gotrā gāvāṃ VI 65 5. Budhne...yōnau IV 1 11, 17 14 (PISCHEL II p. 214), kṣāma budhṇām IV 19 4 ("Erboden" GELDNER), pāṣṭisāḥ...yōnau X 46 6 "au sein des demeures" (cf. la double construction juxtaposée ou subordonnée avec mādhyā : mādīyae...samudrē VII 68 7, apāṃ mādīyae VII 89 4), dārah drīḥā VI 17 6, vāyō śūsah VI 63 7, sūṣmaḥ...jāmbhebhiḥ VII 7 2 (GELDNER I p. 114) šacīyāṃ...cjaū X 61 1 (PISCHEL I p. 76), īrāyāṇṣi
...rājāṃsi X 75 7 “l’étendue des terres” (cf. GELDNER II p. 266), ánirām
...kṣūdhām VIII 60 20 (GELDNER II p. 291), śūdam...rāsam (= rāsavantam) TB. I 2 1 3 (PISCHEL I p. 72). Des faits de ce genre dispensent de chercher dans devān juxtaposé à jānma I 71 3 (en dépit d’Oldenberg) VI 11 3 autre chose qu’un accusatif pluriel au sens d’un génitif déterminant.

Un petit groupe se forme autour de noms d’armes : īṣuk...asanā X 95 3 et śāryām asanām I 148 4 (GELDNER I p. 266 II p. 280) ; cf. aussi sāyakam...vārām I 32 3, 84 11, hetim tāvīsim X 142 3 (PISCHEL II p. 207), tāpuśim hetim III 30 17 VI 52 3, peut être gābhastim aśānim “une main (qui est comme) une fronde” (cf. GELDNER, OLDENBERG) I 54 4.

Dans plusieurs cas cette juxtaposition, quelle que soit la valeur originelle des termes en présence, aboutit à associer deux synonymes : kṣām...pṛthīvīm I 67 5, bhūnim pṛthīvīm V 85 4 (et analogues), adrāyāh parvataḥ X 94 1 (et ailleurs), pārvo giriḥ I 37 7 ; cf. aussi grāvā...ādriḥ AV. V 20 10 et BLOOMFIELD ad loc. Cette association se présente exclusivement aux cas directs.

La constatation d’emplois ainsi définis n’est pas sans importance quand il s’agit de discriminer la valeur adjective et la valeur substantive d’un nom. A parcourir le dictionnaire de GRASSMANN, à suivre certains traducteurs, on serait amené à conclure qu’un grand nombre de mots qui en vertu de leur emploi normal ou des conditions morphologiques sont des substantifs peuvent aussi de façon occasionnelle fonctionner comme adjectifs. Or, lorsqu’on observe le contexte on s’aperçoit que la plupart du temps ces fonctionnements d’adjectif sont instaurées par méconnaissance d’un emploi juxtaposé. Ainsi GRASSMANN confère au mot vīp- “incantation” l’acception de “begeistert” pour le seul passage V 68 1. Il y a là, simplement, un emploi de substantif juxtaposé : vīpā gīrā “le chant, à savoir l’incantation”. De même tāj- “élan” signifiera “l’élan du chant” dans tujā gīrā V 17 3, non “mit kräft’ gem Liede” ; tān- “durée” vaut comme substantif dans tānā gīrā I 38 13 II 2 1 “la durée du chant” c’est-à-dire “un chant comportant une durée”. De même sūktā- dans sūktāyā vācase IX 90 6 est l’équivalent sous forme de juxtaposé de ce qu’est en tapuruṣa sūktavākā-, en bahuvrihi sūktāvāc-.

Suśma- n’a nulle part le sens de “stark” que lui attribue GRASSMANN : on a cité précédemment la juxtaposition suśmaḥ...jāmbhebhiḥ ; suśmaḥ...mādaḥ IX 79 5 “l’ivresse en tant que force” ; suśmāḥ I 52 4 est un nom d’action pluriel sujet, comme on a si souvent dans le RV., notamment dans la catégorie des noms en -ī : īḍāyāḥ, rāḍāyāḥ, abhiṣṭāyāḥ, abhiṁāṭāḥ. La notion de nom d’action est vaste dans les mantra ; ces noms sont en mesure de fonctionner librement comme sujets, sans qu’il faille pour autant multiplier les emplois d’agents ou d’adjectifs. Les Marut sont les “ébranlements” (du ciel) dhūtāyāḥ ; on nous parle des “faveurs” (rāḍāyāḥ) et des “dèfaveurs” (ārāṭāyāḥ) comme d’entités personnelles (cf. I 29 4). Les noms-racines féminins du type dviṣ- niḍ- riṣ- dhūḥ- etc. sont des “hostilités” agissantes : la traduction par “ennemis” peut être une commodité pour nos langues, elle ne répond à l’instauration d’aucune catégorie grammaticale dis-
tincte. De même tāpus-, qui est juxtaposé à aghā- ou à virjināni "le mal" comme il est composé avec vadhā- dans ātapurdha- "dont l'arme de mort est un feu qui brûle". Le mot aghā- lui-même est substantif, non adjectif, et le composé aghāsāmsa- "dont la parole est le mal" se trouve résolu en aghā... śaṁśaṭ I 166 8 (cf. GELDENER ad loc.).

Ṛtā- n'a pas d'emploi adjectif authentique, du moins dans le RV. ancien (cf. NEISSER Wörterb. s. v.): encore une locution comme rtās kaviḥ VIII 60 5 (ṛtāḥ kaviḥ IX 62 30) avec son-as final laisse-t-elle supposer un semi-composé *ṛtaksavi- comparable à ṛtaspate La locution sārdhāya... ṛāya IV 3 8 n'est pas distincte de sārdhām ṛāṣya VIII 7 21 et on ne gagne aucun avantage à rendre ṛtēna ṛtām niyatam IV 3 9 avec GELDNER "die durch den Ritus bestimmte, gesetzmässige (Milch)": il est visible que le lait est le ṛtā- de la vache, comme au vers précédent la troupie des Marut est identifiée au ṛtā-. Le mot ṛtā- se prête précisément à la juxtaposition : ṛāya ṛāya V 20 4 ṛtām dharuṇam V 15 2, et cf. dāhrmaṇ dharuṇe ibid. et X 170 2, etc.

Le krātu- "héros" de GRASSMANN est à éliminer : le krātu- est une certaine forme de "pouvoir" qui est tantôt considérée comme possédée par telle divinité, tantôt identifiée à cette divinité même, type sā hi krātuḥ sā māryaḥ sā sādhūḥ I 77 3 "il est la force, il est le jeune homme, il est le bon" (ou = sā hi *sādhukratuḥ ?).

Lorsqu'on a réalisé l'importance de la juxtaposition, il devient facile d'interpréter les infinitifs datifs apposés du RV., soit (avec un datif nominal sujet et un autre datif régime) īndrāya... pātave mādāya IX 11 8 "pour qu'Indra boive le breuvage enivrant." On voit à quel point il est défectueux de parler d'attraction. Nous sommes en présence d'un type particulier de juxtaposition, en situation favorable. On sait que cette juxtaposition est attestée non seulement avec les infinitifs caractérisés en -tave (-tavai) -e-mane (-vane), mais encore avec les pseudo-infinitifs en -taye (indrāya pītāye IX 32 2) et les pseudo-datifs en -adhyai (sāhase sāhadhyai VI 1 1); de même on a le génitif apposé à l'infinitif en -toḥ l'ablatif apposé à l'infinitif en -aḥ, DELBRÜCK Al. Syntax p. 88 et 418 LUDWIG Infinitiv p. 32 GAEDICKE Accusativ p. 253.

Une autre forme de juxtaposition est celle qu'on trouve en phrase comparative : le type sīndhur nā kṣodāḥ I 65 6, 66 10, 92 12 II 25 3 "comme le bouillonnement du fleuve" a été identifié dès BERGAINNE Mél. Renier p. 93. Déterminant et déterminé sont au même cas, en l'occurrence au nominatif. Les emplois relevables sont apō nā kṣodāḥ I 180 4 (identique à sīndhur nā k° précité, et montrant à quel point il serait vain de poser comme font certains un génitif sing. apāḥ ; sur l'existence d'une flexion sing. de ap v. BERGAINNE op. c. p. 96 n. (l NEISSER Wörterb. s. v.), vāyō nā śṛēṣṭha V 59 7, girīr nā bhūjma I 65 6, āyur nā prānaḥ I 66 1, pāyō nā dhemūḥ I 66 2 (cf. OLDENBERG), gāvō nā vṛajām I 92 4 (mais cf. OLDENBERG), gāvō nā yāthām VIII 46 30 (yāthēva pāśāḥ IV 2 18 V 31 1 VI 19 3, en soi équivoque, pāśāḥ pouvant être génitif sing. ou accusatif plur., est sans doute à agréger à cet
ensemble), rátho ná vāyūḥ III 49 4, ěro ná ráthah IX 94 3 (cf. OLDENBERG), girāyo ná āpah VI 66 11 (contesté OLDENBERG), śuryo ná cākṣuḥ V 59 3, śuryā ivopāṭik IX 54 2 VIII 91 15 : ces deux derniers emplois éclairent à leur tour d’une part śuro ná sandikh I 66 1 (où théoriquement śurah pourrait être le génitif de svār-), d’autre part svār ná jīvōtiḥ (où svār pourrait égalem-
ment avoir valeur de génitif, WACKERNAGEL III p. 314 ; sur le cas de svār dīśke, v. OLDENBERG Noten I p. 73) ; enfin usūrīva rāṣyaḥ VIII 85 8, āṁmēva vātah I 34 7. Il y a là un procédé de style auquel certains Ṛṣi semblent s’être amusés ; il suffit de voir l’usage que fait de ces formules Parāśara, auteur de I 65 et 66. et comment il combine ce type avec le groupement substantif + épithète, ainsi I 66 1 avec rayir nā citrā nityo nā śunāh, tākā nā bhāruḥ.

On ne retiendra pas l’hypothèse de GELDNER Ved. Stud. III. p. 32 qui voit dans le juxtaposé āhutam rījasānām I 96 3 un avant-coureur des karma-dhāraya class. due type snātāmulipta-.

Mais un tout autre aspect de juxtaposition se laisse percevoir dans les mantras : on formule au moyen d’un substantif accompagné d’une épithète ce que la syntaxe de la phrase conduirait à formuler au moyen d’un bahuvrīhi. Le fait a été noté par WACKERNAGEL II p. 288 (repris MACDONELL Ved. Gr. p. 175) qui voit là à juste raison les débris d’un stade pré-compositionnel. Une association de mots telle que varāhām...tvesaṁ rūpāṁ I 114 5 “le sanglier, (sa) forme menaçante” donne l’exact équivalent de ce que sera* tvesarūpam en classique. De même tvācān kṛṣṇā I 130 8 IX 41 1 “les hommes à la peau noire”, cité déjà par OLDENBERG Religion d. Veda p. 154 auquel renvoie SCHULZE Schriften p. 656 n. 2 (moins directement, on a aussi kṛṣṇām ca vāṃm arunām ca I 73 7, cf. kṛṣṇāyoni- épithète des dāśi-) ; dīnā dākṣāh IV 24 9 “les hommes aux capacités faibles” (cf. OLDENBERG et le bahuvrīhi dīnādakṣa-). Sur urūḥ kākṣaḥ VI 45 31, v. WACKERNAGEL et OLDENBERG.

Des faits de ce genre sont certainement assez nombreux ; il n’est pas certain que les poètes védiques ne les aient pas sentis comme une expression parfaitement normale, tant est intense dans le RV. le pouvoir “personnel” des mots abstraits ou des noms d’object.

Souvent la forme sous laquelle se présentent ces pré-bahuvrīhi est un peu différente : l’emploi du groupement substantif + épithète forme une sorte de rupture syntaxique : ainsi aruṣāṭīpo rūṣad asya pājaḥ...ajaniṣṭa III 29 3 “il est né, ayant une rouge crinière, éclantante est sa forme”. On voit ce que gagne en vigueur ce glissement vers l’expression analytique. De même śvenāsya pakṣā hariṇāsya bāhā (...te) I 163 1 (cf. Kommentar), hīranyakṣīrgō ’yo asya pāḍā 9, pṛśadaśvāsō vānayo ná ráthāh I 186 8, anantām arnād rūṣad asya pājaḥ I 115 5, suparunām vaste mṛgā asyā dāntāh VI 75 11, rāruṣīrṇy ātho yāsya āyo mukham 15, pīṣāṅgarūpaḥ...aṁdrāh śūṃaḥ AV. IX 4 22, peut-être kṛṣṇām niyānam (kārayaḥ...dīvaṃ út patanti) I 164 47, cf. āśitavarnāḥ au passage correspondant de TS., et cf. kṛṣṇāyōma-. La locution hīranyanirṇig āyo asya sthānā V 62 7 semble bien d’abord faire corps avec les précédentes (et cf. āyasthānam 8), mais comme le substantif sthānā est le sujet du verbe qui suit, il vaut mieux entendre āyo asya sthānā
comme une juxtaposition du type karmadhāraya “sa colonne (faite d’) airain”.

Cf. encore virēnyāh krātuh (indraḥ) X 104 10, krātum nā bhadrām IV 10 1, ēkaṃ krātum VI 9 5, bhāṃ kṣāyāh VIII 15 9 (que significativement BR. proposait de corriger en *bhāṭāksaya-). Une expression à part est celle du v. I 108 4 barhīr u tistirānā “vous à qui on étend le barhīs” : elle semble avoir décomposé maladroitement un *tistirāṇabarhīs-, qui toutefois ne serait guère admissible dans la langue du RV, que sous la forme *stīrṇabarhīs- ; ce n’est pas un hasard si barhīr u tistirānā est précédé dans le texte d’une partie par ānajānā d’autre par yatāsrucā.

Toutes les formes qu’on vient de passer en revue attestent à notre avis plutôt des emplois libres de juxtaposés que des composés “résolus” à la manière où l’entendait GELDNER. Des “résolutions” authentiques de composés, il n’y en a qu’un fort petit nombre dans le RV. Il faut naturellement mettre à part le cas des devaśāyanda où l’autonomie de chaque membre (type dyāvaḥ yajñadhṛprāthīvi VII 53 1, v. les exemples chez WACKERNAGEL II p. 151) a été préservée par sa finale même et par la coexistence du “duel elliptique” : mitrā ou prāthīvi. Dans bien des cas, loin d’être une “résolution” de dvmanda, la forme juxtaposée est plus ancienne que la forme composée, ainsi dans krātve dāksayā I 111 2 et passim (à coté de la relation de dépendance krātvā dāksasya III 23 3) à quoi succède krātudāksau VS., daksakratā TB. ; analogues WACKERNAGEL II p. 154, 156.

Hors des dvmanda, on a identifié comme composés scindés śuṇās cic chēpam et nārā ca śaṃsam (nārā vā śo) : le premier membre avait son autonomie désinentielle et accentuelle, et l’élément scindant n’est qu’une particule atone qui tendait naturellement à occuper la seconde place. La résolution est donc minime. Des cas un peu plus remarquables sont tjur ic chāṃsah II 26 1, scission d’un bahuürhi *tjuṣamsa-, et drōghāya cid vācase VI 62 9 “dont la parole est trompeuse” (cf. droghavāc-).

Il est probable d’autre part que plusieurs noms propres résultent d’une scission analogue : pājṝya śāmne VIII 4 17, 6 47 (cf. OLDENBERG), rūsato vāpsasaḥ I 181 8 (id.), jārataḥ kāṃnam X 80 3 (id.), peut-être vṛto susāmne VIII 23 28 et ailleurs (id.) : ceci préludant aux fantaisies des kāyya du type dāsa-pūrvaratham Ragh., hīranyapūrvaṃ kaśipun Śiś. (et cf. South Ind. Inscr. I p. 166 n. 6).

On trouve encore les formes suivantes : vajra sāyaka X 83 1, 84 6, c’est-à-dire *vajrasāyaka “toi qui as le foudre pour arme de jet” (cf. sāyakam... vājram précité) : la correction, qui ne porte que sur le padapatha, est à vrai dire aisée, cf. OLDENBERG.

Mānasā javēṣu X 71 8 semble une mauvaise résolution pour mānojāvēṣu “rapides comme la pensée” : le glissement a pu être facilité par le fait que le comparatif de mānojā- mānojāva(s) - était normalement mānaso jāviyān (aucune forme composée n’est attestée lorsque le dernier membre serait un adjectif en -(I)yāms-).
OLDENBERG admettrait pour expliquer divi ksāyaṃ III 2 13 X 63 5 un emploi adjectif de ksāya : cet emploi est peu vraisemblable puisqu’il se limiterait à cette locution qui se présente d’autre part sous l’aspect d’un bahuvrihi dans divi kṣaya-, cf. WACKERNAGEL II p. 289. Divi ksāyaṃ (cf. encore ksāyo divi VIII 64 4 divikṣit-X 92 12 divi kṣyaṃta VII 64 1 ) représente la scission de dikṣaya-. Dans le cas de divo nā sādmamakhasam I 18 9 divi sādmabariṣaḥ I 52 4 (cf. OLDENBERG) "ayant pour makhā- ou barhis- un siège céleste", où ce qui devrait être un premier membre de composé (divi) demeure hors de la composition, on s’achemine vers les cas de rection extérieure, presque tous post-rgvédiques, amplement décrits chez WACKERNAGEL II p. 31. Sur divā ā pṛṣṭhayāvane V 54 1, tirās cid aryāyā V 75 7, v. OLDENBERG (sur ce dernier ex. aussi THIEME Fremdling p. 85).

Tantôt supposant une composition déjà faite, tantôt et plus souvent précédant le sta de compositionnel, les formes du RV. sont en tout cas les prédécesseurs des phénomènes de résolution que M. Helmer SMITH a notés en pali sous la désignation imagée de split-compound (Critical Dict. I p. XXVI BSL. XXXIIIP p. 172 n. 1). Les textes bouddhiques en skt mixte en abondent ; nous fondant sur les notes de WELLER Zum Lalitav. nous trouvons pour ce texte usñāni saṃsparsāni (gātrāni) 17 13 (śītasaṃsparsa 14), khādanīyaṃ bhajanīyaṃ āsvādaniyākalpikānāṃ 2 22 (cf. 58 5, 123 17) ; mise à l’extérieur d’une épithète se rapportant à un premier membre de composé 127 5, 256 1 ; résolution dans des expressions contenant des noms de nombre 31 10, 61 19 (cf. 63 1), 84 1 et 7 ; cf. enfin 429 8 et 13. D’ailleurs l’adjectivation des noms des dizaines, de cent et de mille dans toute la tradition skt (type viṃśatyā ...hāribhiḥ RV. II 18 5 et avec égalisation de nombre śatalīr̥ṣaḥ I 53 8, WACKERNAGEL III p. 362, 373) est un phénomène qui s’explique en fonction de la tendance générale à la juxtaposition.

Pour le MhVu, WELLER p. 14 renvoie à I 3 12 (cf. la note de SENART), 29 3 (note), 31 12 (ou SENART revoie encore à 199 7), 60 14 (note) et passim. Les expressions du Lal. que SENART cite I p. 396, mahāpadmo yathodbhavaḥ et gāṅgā yathā vālikā sont identiques au type sīndhur nā kṣodāḥ du RV. Cf. encore SENART I p. 466, 499 etc.
INSCRIPTIONS OF KATHIAWAD*

By

D. B. DISKALKAR, Poona.

UNA


The following inscription is found in one of the deris in the Shahabāg at Unā, the principal town of a mahal of the same name in Junagadh State. It measures 1'-4" by 1'-1" and is in a good condition.

The inscription opens with the date, Wednesday, the fifth day of the dark half of Kārtika of v.s. 1652. It then mentions that the Emperor Akbar, hearing of the great fame of the Jagadguru, the Jain Acārya Hiravijayasūri, invited him to Delhi and received him with great respect. After listening to his lectures on Jain religion he presented him with a collection of books and issued the following edict: "No one should fish in the tank called 'Dāmar'. For six months in a year animals should not be killed. The tax levied on each individual (per capitā mundiśrvo Guj.) on the Šatrunjaya hill is discontinued for ever. The Jhijja tax is repealed. In the whole empire the property of a deceased (without an heir) should not be confiscated to the crown. Imprisonment should always be avoided (as far as possible). Truth and other virtues should be inculcated in the minds of all the people." Thereupon Hiravijayasūri made a pilgrimage to the Šatrunjaya along with the whole Saṅgha, and left his etheral body on the eleventh day of the bright half of Bhādaravā (of v.s. 1651). Meghā caused his footsteps to be set up in a Deri, the consecration ceremony of which was performed by Vijayasena-sūri, on the date mentioned at the beginning i.e., in v.s. 1652.

In the reception given to Hiravijayasūri by the Mughal Emperor Akbar the Jainas seem to have considered too great an honour to their religion. For in a number of inscriptions of this period, wherever the name of Hiravijayasūri occurs this fact is recorded with a special pride.

Text

1 ॥ ९० ॥ स्वति भद संवत १६५२ वर्ष कार्ति वदि ५ बु [ चे ]
2 गेचों जगदुख्यां संग्रामश्रीमानाक्षणगाण
3 अध्यात्म चक्रकलितहराजिष्ठामर्याझिरत्त्रूपां हक्ककरासिम
4 भानेन: गुजरजन्वाट बिलरीमंडळ सबुमानमाकार्य धरोपदेशा
5 कर्णनुसंक पुस्तकमंडळसंगे दायारिशानसलसरो मत्तर्य
6 चकितहरियं भवसंस्कारानामार्फते सबंदा भोशनुज्ञायतीयथ
7 द्वाघनिर्माति निर्मातात्मनं जितजिताधिकारकर्तातं निजसकुलोद्भो दा

* Continued from p. 210 of Vol. III.
SATUNJAYA
v. s. 1652

This inscription is engraved round a pair of pādukās in a small temple to the west of Adīśvara Bhagavān temple. It was once edited by Dr. Bühler in the Epi. Ind. Vol. II, p. 59 (No. XIII).

Text

This inscription is engraved round a pair of pādukās in a small temple to the west of Adīśvara Bhagavān temple. It was once edited by Dr. Bühler in the Epi. Ind. Vol. II, p. 59 (No. XIII).

HĀMPAR
v. s. 1656.

Hāmpur is a small village in the Rājasīṭā pur mahal of the Dhrāṅgdhrā State. In the temple of Bhīḍa Bhanjana Mahādeva to the east of an old well, the following inscription is found engraved below the inscription of v. s. 1588 noted above. The inscribed portion measures 2'-5" in length and 6" in breadth.

It records that Umābai and her sons belonging to the Solanki family caused the temple of Sīva in Hāmpar to be built on Sunday, the fifth day of the dark half of Māgha in v. s. 1656 when MAHĀRĀṆĀ CANDRASENJI was ruling (at Halvad).

Though the wording of the record shows that the temple was built (newly) it was in fact repaired by the lady. For just above this are two
records of v.s. 1588 which speak of the repairs of the temple in that year. It seems therefore that the temple was once more repaired in v.s. 1655 by Umābai.

**Text**

1 संवत १६५५ वर्ष मास मास्के कण्यापक्षे ५ रवी
2 महाराणा श्रीचंद्रलेख्नाथ श्रीहाम्पेर। सोलंकी दासा भाषा वा
3 ह ऊमा सोलंकी रात जसा तथा देशा जीवा तथा पूजा तथा धाता
4 वेनेवीप्रासाद कीचो श्री:

**DHRANGDHRA**

No. 110] v.s. 1657. [28-4-1601.

This inscription is inscribed on a stone slab bearing the representations of the sun and the moon above the inscribed portion. It is preserved in the Huzur Office at Dhrangdhra. The inscription measures 1'8" in height and 13" in breadth and is broken in two parts in the fifth line. It records that on Tuesday the 5th of the bright half of Valśākha of v.s. 1657 the king (of Dhrangdhra) granted 95 acres of land in the village Pimariyāḍi to one Prāgji of the Nanduvāṇa family at the suggestion of Rao Bhārmalji.

The king Rāo Bhārmalji is probably the Cutch king of the name who ruled from v.s. 1642-1688. But his relation with the Zālā king is not exactly known.

**Text**

1 राभो श्रीभारामलजी
2 वनस्पत मोने पीमारिय
3 डी ? ग्रामे नंदवाणा पी
4 तांबर तथय पुन अभाजी
5 नाम प्रागाजी
6 १५ अकोरे आ राजने आ
7 पी झोलमठ जेसस वा
8 द आपि पुजाना हुक आ
9 पो आंबः-राक आपि संब
10 त १६५७ वरि बेदशन सू
11 द ७ ग्रामे आपि सती आपि
12 बाई श्रीकमाजी आपि

**KONDHA**

No. 111] v.s. 1663. [1-5-1607.

This inscription is engraved on a stone slab built in a niche of the Konḍhesvara Mahādeva temple to the east of the village Konḍha at a distance of fourteen miles to the south-west of Dhrangdhra.

The inscription, which is very useful for the history of the Zālā rulers of Zālāvāḍ opens with the date, Thursday, the fifteenth day of the bright half
of Vaiśākha of v.s. 1663 or Śaka 1529. Then after an invocation to Gañeṣa, the goddess of speech and the ancient preceptors, the poet goes on to describe the Zalla i.e., Zālā family. The first king mentioned is Raṇamalla, from whom by his wife Līlādevi, Satruṣalya was born. His son by his wife Minaladevi was Jita. The latter's son was Raṇavīra, whose son was Bhīma. The latter had by his wife Primaladevi a son named Vāgha, whose son was Rājadhara. Rājadhara's son by his wife Ahikaradevi was Rāṇa, i.e. Rāṇiga. Rāṇa's son was Varasimha, who by his wife Amrattaidevi had a son named Bhīma. The latter by his wife Kaśmiradevi had a son named Udayasimha, whose son by Līlādevi was Kalyāṇa. In the reign of this king, who belonged to the Zālā family, which was one of the thirty-six royal families, Kaśmiradevi, wife of Mahārāṇa Bhīma, (and grandmother of the king Kalyāṇi), caused the temple of Kuhunḍhēsvara Mahādeva to be built in the year 1663 of the Vikrama era. Kaśmiradevi was also called Vihinabai and was the daughter of the Jādejā king Muhuṭa, son of Meheramaṇa and grandson of Raṇamalla.

The Ḵalavad inscription of v.s. 1583 published above gives the genealogy of the rulers of Zālāvāḍ from Raṇamalla to Rāṇigade, together with the names of their queens. This inscription gives the same genealogy. But after the king Rāṇiga names of four successive rulers are given, who are not found in the main line which was continued with the king Mānasimhaji, the son of Rāṇiga by his wife Kalyanadevi. This inscription thus shows that Rāṇiga had another son named Varasimha from whom another line ran in which Kalyāṇi was born. The ruler in the main line at the time of this inscription was Candrasimhaji, whose name is not mentioned in this record probably because Kalyāṇi was more or less an independent ruler.

The name Kuhunḍhēsvara of the Mahādeva seems to have been given after the name Kondha of the village, where the inscription was found, or it may be that the village was called Kondha after the name of the Mahādeva.

Text

1 थो नमः: श्रीमहारणते वि वर्ति श्रीजयों मंगलमुदयस्व || स्वर्ति श्रीमहास्मिकम्
2 कैसमयात्तीत संवत् १६५३ वर्ष शाके १५२९ प्रवर्तमाणे उत्सर्यवे (वे) वसंतकटी
3 महामांगलयंदे वैशाखः (खः) माते
4 श्रीसि गुप्तविर परण || गमानं || प्रणमय सम्प्रप्येश्व ज्ञानविशुद्धसम् || ४ ५ अगलेय
5 शुङ्कल्य गुणानि महर्षियोऽस्मात् गुणानि महर्षियोऽस्मात्
6 वांस्तो उच्चमुङ्गलिताः || तो || राममहोंते-तात्तिनितात [खूः] || २ ५ ५ ५ ५... ने
7 राममहोंते जाः श्रीहल्यापार: || तिम्र || छुः [वन ते]
8 भुवनास्वाय पादसुम: || कुलके [धा] हिन्नवी तीव्रदेशी || २ ५ ५ ५ ५ ५... मीलदेर्यायः कुलना... श्रीत्वलक्ष्यमिति बाब्रि...स्थानो...
This inscription is found in the Nāgeshvara temple at Jamnagar. It records that Nākubai, wife of Kumāra Śrī Jasavantśīmhjī, son of Mahārāja Jām Śrī Śatrūśalyajī made a grant of four ‘parajas’ (?) of land in the village Galapādar to the temple of Nāgēsvara on the fifth day of the bright half of Vaiśākha in v.s. 1666. The land was purchased from Māk-vānā Mahiā for 1680 ‘Mahamudi’ coins.

Another inscription dated v.s. 1670 Vaiśākha Sud 11 Bhauma found in the same place states that ‘Bai Nākubai purchased some more lands and bestowed them upon the Nagesvar temple. A third inscription dated v.s. 1670 Magasir Sudi 2 Guraau says that a dēri was built there by Damodar Gora for 520 koris.
Text

1 संवत् १६६६ वर्षे बढ़्े[शा] य सुदूर ५ दिने महाराजा श्रीजाम
2 श्रीसन्तकर तथा कुमार श्रीसन्तकर तथा मीरापीरान (४) कीमा
3 तथा भाया बढ़ नाकू श्रीनगेशरने प्रसादे भोमी पराज (५)
4 ४ मोजे गल्पारकमे आपी सही आचार्यकारक आपी
5 वे सीकनी मोमी हीदुआणे गाभी नकाराणे सुमारे न कहुँगी
6 बकुवा दता राजमी समामिन यस्य यस्य यदा भुझी
7 तथा तथा तथा फल। मक्काणा महीआणीं भरती लीची बेचाती
8 मुदी १६४० मादे लीची गारात विष भरणा
9 ...शी आपी शुरंग महत्तु श्री: ||

GALÄ

No. 113

v.s. 1668. [23-2-1612.]

Gälä is a village at a distance of eight miles to the east from Dhrangdhra. In a niche in the left hand wall of the Jain temple there is fixed a stone slab containing the following inscription. The stone is broken into two pieces but the loss caused thereby is very little. The writing portion measures 15½" by 11¾".

The record opens with an invocation to Sarvajña, which shows that it is a Jain record. Then the date is given which is the second day of the bright half of Phālgunī of v.s. 1668 or Śaka 15[33]. Then the name of the emperor of Delhi, whose name is missing but who must be Jehangīr, also called SALIM as in the next inscription, is given followed by the name CANDRASENJI who was evidently the Zālā ruler of Zalāvād. Then follows a succession list of Jain Ācāryas, which is thus—Sudharmasvāmi—Ānandavimalasūri—Vijayasenasūri—Hiravijayasūri, (who was honoured with the epithet Jagadguru by the Emperor Akbar), Vijayasenasūri. Under instructions from this last Ācārya Mehetā Dharmadāsa and his brothers, residents of the town Gälā in Zalāvād, and belonging to the śrimālī community and Vṛiddhī Sākhā, caused the temple of Pārśvanātha to be built, on the abovementioned date.

Though Gälā is an insignificant village now there is no doubt that it was once a flourishing town even up to the time of the present inscription. For an inscription of v.s. 1193 belonging to the reign of the powerful Caulukya sovereign Siddharājā Jaisimha and two inscriptions of v.s. 1201 and 1249 of Kumārapāla and Bhīma II respectively are found in a ruined temple outside the village. (See JBBRAS. XXV. p. 322 and Poona Orientalist Vol. I, p. 40 and Vol. II, p. 44).

Text

1 ...। श्रीसन्तकर(य नाम)।। स्वर्पित श्रीविक्रमर [सं]वर्ष १६६८ वर्षे शाके १५।
2 १३ महत्तमानें। अत्तु (में) गले श्रीसूयें फालनुमाणे। शुक्लेये हृतियातिथी।
3 उत्तरांद्रनन्दने शुक्लनामनियों शुभङ्ग। विजितानेकक्षितिपालभुपाल पादभाषा
4 हि श्री ६ [संजितम*] शाही विजयसिंह राज्ये त... मृति श्री ६ चंद्रशेषनाथी
5 विजय...[प्र] वादत: श्रीमनधवीरसिंहार[प्र] विराजपे श्रीचुम्मस्वामि तत्परे
6 —गाँठ—शालापागुमणावाणनको मणिश्रीमादान्त्विजयमूर्ति तत्परे श्री ६
7 विजययुगानन हाताशाही श्रीवर्मनभरायुरे काजुकविन्धशाही श्री ६
8 [हीरक्षिण]युगस्तिरहीरकालमाला...भारक श्री ६ विजयश्रीमानसिंहरायागुप्ते
9 —हलालवाड़ीदेशे माठायामात्रावस्तव्यात्मकीगीतापालिकाती देवशालायां में.
10 —भारी वीरारो बुद्ध मं। चंद्रा भारी कर्पोडे चुत मं। अपहरे भारी नवरंगे
11 —मं। चामन्नदार भारी चमन्नदे मं। चामन्नद मं। चामन्नद मं। गिरा भारी जिमणादे मं।
12 —कर्णाजी बुद्ध इत्योऽन बुद्ध भारी बाल्या। मं। इत्योऽन भारी सर्पाः पृथ्वी।
13 ——... वे पारिवारुखें मं। अपाहरामा श्रीपादक्षेत्रसाद: कारित:
14 ——... श्रीधामस्तम्भविद्यौतित सिद्धांत वालोजी: II श्रीकृष्ण—
15 पुरातत्त्व सूचिवार लाका लघीत श्रीरस्तु II

DADAR

No. 114] [12-2-1613.

This inscription is found in a Śiva temple in the village, Dādar, under Navānagar State. It measures 2'-1" by 9".

It opens with the date, Friday, the third day of the bright half of Phālguna in v.s. 1669 and refers to the rule of the emperor Salim Shah and of his feudatory (Mahāmanḍlikā) Jām Satruṣāyēnī. On this date Sadāśiva, son of Thākur Khīmā and his wife Karamāde caused a Śiva temple to be built.

Text

1 श्रीप्रेमाय नमः [१४] संवत् १६
2 ६६९ वर्ष फळ्ळमासे शुक्र
3 पक्षे श्रीतीया शुक्लसारे
4 पातसाही श्रीदालमसाही
5 विजये राज्ये माहारण्डकी
6 क मोरहाणप्रतिचालक
7 जामशी सत्रसल्ल्जी
8 राज्ये II मंदिरागाढाती
9 व शाकक्षिस गोरे ढाक
10 र शीता भाग्यी बादो कर
11 मादे तथा सुख सदाशी
12 व सेवक प्रसाद कुयां [१४]
13 ढाो। वाहा भाग्यी बाद
14 [कृ] दादे। भांतु ढाो व [जा]
15 ढाो। विष्णुदत। वाहा
16 सुख माहादेव। II सदा

* Or perhaps Jehangir.
GOGHĀ

No. 115) v.s. 1672. [18-1-1616.

This inscription is found in the Kālikā temple, in the western part of the port Goghā.

It records the building of the Kālikā temple on Thursday, the tenth of the bright half of Māgha in v.s. 1672 or Saka 1537 by Kūkī, wife of Soni Haridāsa, son of Vejā, in the time of the emperor Selimshaha Bāmanī and of the Pancakula in the port Goghā, consisting of Vazir Kasamkhān, his Thānādara Thakur Uddhavadās, Kāji Shah Muhammad, Girāsia Akherājji, Desai Somaji, Vādhelīa Hamir, Vyavahari Visā Kalyānji and Thakur Virji, Dhruva Premji and Haraji, etc. The lady also made regular arrangements for the permanent administration of the temple.

Text

1 भूगोलनाम: || भूभूबाकाली महाभस्मी महासरस्ती 2 प्रसादभाइ श्रीपरामागमलभ्यंदयू || पातसाह श्रीभी 3 वांगियात्साग भीरहस्तेमात्सागभिजवसय े अर्थे भीरोय वेला 4 कुछे अभय हवाले वजीरियाल भीराययाय सिलायत 5 भागे ठाणे रात्शाहीवन्दस काजायलश्य || भागे महान मरात्शाशा 6 राजभी अपिताराजगी देसाई माह सोमनी बाहेरीया हुमीय बेहेपे 7 वारीया विसा कल्याणगी तथा ठाकुर बीरगी तथा दृष्टेमति तथा 8 हुरवी एवं पंचकुलत्रतिती दिशायत्यांत प्राप्ते दिश्य वभावात- 9 ण लिखिते || संवत 1672 वर्ष तस्तत शाहिबाहानाके 1672 प्रब- 10 तैमाने उत्तायाय गते भीरुपेय शाकिरहड़ती माहामालमयायादायमा 11 ने शुक्ले पसे 15 दस्मीया तिथिगुरुंता अन्त्र दिने भीरीमाल्हादा 12 तीय सोनी बेडा तस्ते सोनी हरिद्वार तस्ता मार्या बाई कीकोने 13 अर्थ प्रासाद कारापिता बाई कीकोनी माला बाई बचवार गिरा सोनी 14 राम आलु सोनी भोमण असिन प्रासादे देश वच्छल ते भलीति || 15 बादसाही-सादी 1672 वालशिसात एलर्कायाप्रायम || असिन प्रासादे भे 16 भाषा: सेवकोऽन्त श्रीरस्तु || लेपकाठययोः कल्याण मुहात || 17 मोझातिय तिरित्य व्यास कक्कुलमूळीया || भी || 18 असिनप्रासादे नियम सत्तालिपाठ्ययादाण तसिन namān नामानि लिखि 19 वेले पंक्ता नसरी तथा देने वाच का तथा भावय भीमंजी........ 20 भीविकरात। || भेष जसवांत भेष तल्लाेहास त वेदों || 21 भी भी || समस्वतन कल्याणसु 22 ....सोनी माह व सोनी राहत सोनी शीसदास
VARTEJ
No. 116]  
V.S. 1674.  
[25-10-1617.

This inscription is engraved on a pāliū lying near the Darbargadh at Varje near Bhavnagar. The inscribed portion measures 12" by 8".

The object of the inscription is to record the death of a Sati belonging to the Kandoljā Brāhmaṇa community on Saturday, the first day of the bright half of Kārtikā in v.s. 1674 or Śaka 1539. In the eighth line of the record the name of Rāwal Dhunajī seems to be engraved. He granted a sum of rupees for raising a memorial stone and a deri over it in honour of the Brahmīn lady.

Dhunajī was son of Visoji, the Gohel chief of Sihar to whose family the Maharaja of Bhavnagar belongs. Dhunajī was killed in a fight with the Kathis in 1619 A.D.

This inscription was formerly published on p. 165 of the Pkt. and Skt. Inscr. of Kathiawad.

Text

1 स्वति भृजंयो मासार्थयुदयवध  
2 संवत् १६७४ वरेण शाखेक १५४९ प्रवर्तमान  
3 मे...नानम संवतसरे गहुराण...भीसुम  
4 दारालाल्यो मातेबराकारिकमाते श्राद्ध  
5 पक्षे ६ तिथ्यो शानिवासरे दने...वय  
6 वनीसमये शाकंडोलाजालया...  
7 पाकार्यवरणप्रारंभे गुल्ला तथा मुखना  
8 वसितबे [न] बुढा [राजोरा घुनाजीरु]ग दत्ता  
9 मन...तिमयं नत्ता...  
10 लगे...बर्दली

SATRUNJAYA
No. 117]  
V.S. 1675  
[7-4-1619.

This inscription is engraved on the north wall of a temple near the Hathipola in the Vimalavasahi Tūrīk. It was once edited by Dr. Bühler in the Epi. Ind. Vol. II, p. 64 (No. XXI).

Text

1 ओ! स्वति भृजस्तमतादि न विषयविहराननन्! न भास्य यो बृहकोपि न रक्ष: स जिन:  
2 निमये १ संवत्  
3 १६७५ वरेण शाखेक १५४९ प्रवर्तमाने। सम्मदेशांगारहार्थारतिकोपमम। अनेकेक्या-  
4 गहुराण...नयोदिवसं...  
5 समयः [२] अवशेषितविहरायम। वर्गशुकुलानाातमम। बुन्यस्माणमणिभ्यात। चतुरन्यिरर-  
6 जितम्। १। युममम तत्र राजा  
7 प्रवासति भृजस्तमताभिषो दुष्यः। यामभीशशुशालिङ्कुलांलापरमोमणि। ४ वतम्यापन-  
8 संताप संतात। इति ताप
24 वैः विनायक विनायकरत । उच्चेदुतः किनेषीद्वि । हंस्येवधिको यतः। रूपैः श्रीतीर्थी- । राजायं राजेत सा।
25 वतसकः । प्रतिमा । व्यापितास्तत्र श्रीसैगंसयासुलाईरामः। रूपः।

SATRUNJAYA

No. 118]  
v. s. 1675  

[16-4-1619.

This inscription is engraved on the round pādulīs in a small temple in the north-west of the Kharataravasi Tunk. It was once edited by Dr. BÜHLER in the Epi. Ind. Vol. II, p. 60 (No. XV).

Text

सं. 1635 वैशाख चुति 13 तिथि चौथारे* दुर्मिलअद्वीताव्रीयकार्यसंहिताय सवाईविज्ञापियम्। श्री ।
अहंम् अद्विताव्रीयकार्यसंहिताय सवाईविज्ञापियम्। श्रीवनसैणवानिर्धारितारन्यायसंहिताय से माईक भाया।
नाम पुनः संहिताय से माईक भाया। राजदे पुनः संहिताय ब्रह्मीकैन भाया।

जैमी पुनः विदुयं वाञ्ची कोविकृष्णाविज्ञापियैसंहिताय स्वर्यकारितान्यायसंहिताय सवाईविज्ञापियम्।
बिमलाचोपरि नाम राजसत्तावरं विश्वासाय कश्चिनावरं श्रीवनसैणवानिर्धारिताय सवाईविज्ञापियम्।
कारिते प्रतिपिते च श्रीवनसैणवानिर्धारिताय श्रीवनसैणवानिर्धारिताय सवाईविज्ञापियम्।

MATHAK

No. 119]  
v. s. 1677.  

[4-1-1621.

This inscription is engraved on one of the two pādulīs standing in a deri situated in the north-west boundary of the village Māthak in the Caradvā mahāl of the Dhrāṅgdrāh State. The inscribed portion measures 16" by 14½".

It records the death of Kumāra Śri Bhōjarāja, son of Mahārāṇā Śri Candrasenji and his queen Bhagatābāi coming from the Pārama family, on Thursday the seventh tithi of the dark half of Pauṣa in v. s. 1677 or Śaka 1542. Thereupon Bhōjarāja’s wife named Vhālibai, daughter of Cāvḍā Ratanji and his wife Kanakabai, became a Sati.

Kathiaewad Gazetteer (p. 426) gives names of only six sons of Mahārāṇā Candrasenji, but this inscription states that he had a seventh son by his wife born in the Pārama family. Bhōjarāja died in the lifetime of his father.

* There are six more inscriptions engraved on different places on the hill which are of the same date, refer to the rule of Akbar and record the same kind of Jain endowments.
This inscription is engraved on one of the two pāḷas standing side by side near the temple of Mahālakṣmī in Vāṅkāner. The right hand pāla, which contains this inscription, has a male figure evidently of Rāṇā Sartānji, whose death is recorded therein, and the left hand pāla has the female figure, evidently of the queen.

It records the death of Mahākumāra Śrī Sultānji (Sartānji), son of Mahākumāra Śrī Prithvirājji, son Mahārāṇā Śrī Candrasenji, son of Mahārāṇā Śrī Raisimhji, son of Mahārāṇā Śrī Mānji, on Monday, the 10th day of the bright half of Caitra in v.s. 1679 or Saka 1545. Thereupon Mahākumāra Saratānji’s wife named Prāṇavatībai, daughter of the Rāṭhōd king Kalyāṇamalla, son of Nārāyanapāṇa, of Idargadh, became a Sati.

This inscription is important as it records the death of Sultānji, founder of the ruling family of Vāṅkāner, Mānji, Raisirnjji and Candrasenji were the rulers in the main line of the Zālās ruling at Halvad. Candrasenji’s son Prithvirājji by his queen from Bhāḍli, was the rightful heir to the throne being the eldest. But his step brothers Aśkaranjii and Aamarasirnjji desirous of supplanting him called in the aid of the Ahmedabad Subadar and imprisoned Prthvirājji. He was taken to Ahmedabad, where he died. His son Sultānji with the aid of the Jam conquered the paragana of Vāṅkāner from the Mahias and Bābrias and founded the line. In 1623 A.D. when he was starting for Idar to fetch his wife he was attacked by the Halvad force, and was slain fighting valiantly.
Kalyānamalla, the father-in-law of Sultanji was the fourth son of Nārāyandās, who succeeded Arjundās on the Gadi of Idar.

**Text**

1 स्वस्ति धीमान्तविकमक्षमयाती[त]
2 संवत 1579 वर्ष धीमान्तविकमक्षमयाती
3 शाक 19745 प्रवत्तमाने उतारामन
4 [ग]जे धीमान्तविकमक्षमयाती महामाग
5 [ल्य]प्रद मासोतम चैत्र छद्द १० सोमे
6 महाराजधीमान्तविकमक्षमयाती
7 रायशंभाजीहुत महाराजधीमान्तविकमक्षमयाती...।
8 जीपुत महाकुण्डलीधीराजीहुत
9 तमहाकुण्डलीधीराजीहुत रायशंभाजी...
10 ...दिलागत पाम्या | दहे भांगी राठ
11 दय बाई धीमान्तविकमक्षमयाती बाईमे सह
12 गमन कोधू | गड इंडर रवादी
13 नारायणवासजी हुत रायशंभाजी
14 कत्याणमहाजीनी घुनी प्रण
15 बती बाई महाकुণ्डलीधीराजीहुत साधि
16 गरण पड़र | गजधर रीढ़ा सूत राम
17 जीरे बेहरी करी तथा गजधर रुप घर घुत घीमा

**KĀLAVAD**

No. 121] v. s. 1682. [20-9-1625.

This inscription is engraved on a stone slab fixed in the Śiva temple near the Sitalā Mātā’s temple in Kālāvad, which is a walled town in the Navānagar State at a distance of 28 miles to the south-east of Jamnagar. The inscribed portion measures 17½” by 10½”

It opens with the date, *viz.* Tuesday, the 14th day of the dark half of Bhādrapada in v.s. 1682 or Saṅka 1547 and refers to the victorious rule of Mahājām Lākhājī born of the Yadu family and of Jām Vibhājī, the brother, and heir apparent of the former, when a Brāhmaṇa Upādāya named Vāsāṇi belonging to the Nandvāṇā community caused to be made, in company with several members of his family, a temple of Śiva and Viṣṇu and one of Hanumān the god of celebates. The inscription then gives a verse wishing long life to the temples, followed by the date expressed again in words.

As we know that Ranmaljī succeeded Jām Lākhājī (see p. 570 of Kathiawad Gazetteer) to the gadi the mention in our inscription of Lākhājī’s brother Jām Vibhājī as his heir apparent is to be considered merely as a
formal way of speaking that the king was looking after the State business in consultation with his brother.

Text

1 ख्यति श्रीवंशी मंगलामुद्रयष्ट। श्रीमति पुत्रिकामाः समायात संतुत १६८२ वर्षे शाके

कुक्तं

2 वर्तमाने देशलयाने शारदी माधवज्ञानस्ये चतुर्दशिका हिंदी गदी २६ श्रीमद्वरारे उत्स

3 रामाराज्ये गदी २६ श्रावणानुसार सोगे गदी ५५ शक्तिकारणे गदी २६ एवम् विंचितद्वृत्ती

श्रीमद्व

4 वंशोदयः महाभाद्वाधिकारीविजयराजे तत्स्व भ्राता कुमारपदे श्रीविभाजीवेश्वर

राजेन्द्र

5 गंगातीय गुरउमककुरुखुसुव उपाध्यायश्रीदासा सत्तुत उपाध्याय श्रीकृष्णा तत्स्व भारी

बाई पद्धा तत्तुत दो

6 खा तथा भूतर तथा बाई मेही तथा पीतांकर श्रीकाल्लभसुवधेव भूतरामज्ञानदा

7 तथा भक्तिवाद एवं विवेक पुरुषीच्चक्षणा उपद्याय वाचणे श्रीकृष्णाधिबाचन अन्धाना

8 की श्रीवाचार्याचरणे तथा श्री हर्षमानं प्रासद सेवणें कीहुं संपूर्णं कारत नी श्रीकृष्णा

9 विष्कम चरण पामा। श्रीचन्द्रचन्द्र श्रीसचिवते: प्रासादार पुष्पादे दीपमातुरसु गम्भीरसंहारता

10 नि भवं दुः उत्तरे कर्मनिर्मित्तमेध दीपस्थ। प्रासादा हुं भूतराम सदुपरिमाणा।

11 प्रासादुद्वु नाम राज्य: ( ? )। सकलारिथिकवः सहिता दशा सतीतवेदंशक्तेव विराजते

12 गनात्मकनन्वत स्वतंत्रतस्वतात् तवअरे नी विराहते।। २।। संबंध में गणनसंवेदुस

13 हिन्दी मस्ते मस्तवे हिते चाँदे रिकारस्फूती कुंजेन सहितेन्दुरे शारदै।

14 सोगे ब्राह्मणावे च करणे शाये सिपेरे राज्यां प्रासादे च विवस्त्र पृणि

15 ब्राह्मणाचार्याचरणे दुर्जय:।। २।। ब्राह्मणाचार्याचार्यास्तानी प्रासादादेः च

16 रक्षाता।। यो ही ख्या प्रायायः यो नरक यातरक्ष्या।। ३।।

KUÅA

No 122]

v. s. 1682 [26-11-1625]

This inscription is taken from one of the pālīs standing in a line in the compound of the Śiva mandir, which is behind the masjid in the town KuÅ, also called Kankāvī in the Dhrāṅgdrā State.

It records the death in a fight while protecting cows, of Zālā Gopālji, son of Surāji, son of Lākhāji on Saturday, the seventh day of the bright half of Māgasar in v.s. 1682. The deceased was only a Girasia of the ruling family of the Zālās of Dhrāṅgdrā.

Text

संवृतत १६८२ वर्षे मागसार

सद ३ सने ज्ञाता श्रीलालाचा मुँळता ते मुंताहीं नूत गोपालाचा ती मिती बाहरे स्थरी शिवा
SATRUNJAYA

No. 123] v.s. 1683. [30-1-1626

This inscription is fixed in a niche in a temple in the Vimalavasā Tuahik on the left hand between the Vāghānappola and Hāthi-poja. It was first edited by Dr. BüHLER in the Epi. Ind., Vol. II, p. 68 (No. XXVIII).

Text

1 षबल १६८३ वर्षः। पार्तिसाह्यःजिद्धागिरिभ्रोतस्मलेमसाहभूमिसाहकार्वलबिज्ञर[अवे]॥
2 श्रीचकेश्वरी नमः। अन्नवर्षोपाय: श्री ५ श्रीहेममूर्तिगणित्सुहुल्यो नमः॥श्री
3 अवेन:। स्न्हित श्री: शिवाकंरापिप गणान्तः। सप्तास्तुनः॥ शिव:। शंभुरीभर्रण
4 मनवेन:। चवको छूप्पीको सखः। गंगोमापत्तरकांताविषिः। लोकः। हृताधिकानो। खो: तो न परे
5 भिये सा
6 जिनन:। श्रीनामपरसुस्ते मे। १ उपचुट्टीरंजः:। कुलकर्मित:। संतापदोपा:॥ सीम्य: प्रासस-
7 याधतिकदः:। श्रीश्रीरामकोज्ज्य:। गीरानोमुहसुरपारकत्तत्ते। जैवालुक:। प्रागिनः। चन्दः।
8 [कम्]
9 ब्रह्मचरीती नालः। स श्रीनिर्गुप्तापिए शुधु चक्रेवतीनकपलिमीः। लोके भवत्स्वयापिए। सुमनसि
10 ब्रह्मचरीती नालः। स श्रीनिर्गुप्तापिए शुधु चक्रेवतीनकपलिमीः। लोके भवत्स्वयापिए। सुमनसि
11 ब्रह्मचरीती नालः। स श्रीनिर्गुप्तापिए शुधु चक्रेवतीनकपलिमीः। लोके भवत्स्वयापिए। सुमनसि
12 ब्रह्मचरीती नालः। स श्रीनिर्गुप्तापिए शुधु चक्रेवतीनकपलिमीः। लोके भवत्स्वयापिए। सुमनसि
13 ब्रह्मचरीती नालः। स श्रीनिर्गुप्तापिए शुधु चक्रेवतीनकपलिमीः। लोके भवत्स्वयापिए। सुमनसि

HALVAD

No. 124] v. s. 1683. [11-5-1626

This inscription is copied from a pillar of a deri to the east of the Bhavani Mātā’s temple in Halvad.

The inscription records that Mahārāṇa Candrasenji, son of Mahārāṇa Raisimhji, and grandson of Mahārāṇa Mānji died on Thursday, the tenth of

* The Jain Patṭāvali is given in the intervening lines.
the dark half of Vaiśākha in v.s. 1683 and a deri in his honour was built by Mahārāṇā Amarasinghji.

The rulers mentioned in the record belong to the Zālā family of Halvad.

Text

1 संवत १६८३ वर्षे
2 बहुसाप वद १० ग
3 रजसर महाराण
4 ण ध्रीमानजीसूत
5 माहाराण=श्री रावत
6 ध्रीवी सूत माहाराण
7 ध्रीवेंद्रसनजी हरी
8 मणे पांमा तेनी डेरी
9 माहाराणा ध्रीवासर
10 संचतीह करावी
11 गतचर राजचीो
12 डेरी करावी

(To be Continued).
POST-VYĀSARĀYA COMMENTATORS (NON-POLEMICAL)

By

B. N. KRISHNAMURTI ŠARMA, Annamalainagar.

1.—RAGHŪTTAMA TĪRTHA (1557-96)

We turn now to the host of influential commentators, who have, in their own way, contributed to the growth and spread of the Dvaita Vedānta and its literature. Their number is much greater as already observed, than that of the polemical writers noticed in the preceding section. While the latter worked so hard to make Dvaita Vedānta known as a powerful limb of Indian Philosophy, the commentators now to be mentioned played an equally valuable part in making the works of Madhva and his early followers, better known and understood within the fold of the Ācārya and kindling popular interest therein by writing lucid commentaries and glosses on the works of their predecessors, and rendering them less tiresome and more easily assimilable. One such early writer was Raghūttama Tīrtha.

Raghūttama is one of the honoured Saints of the Madhva calendar. Nothing is known about his parentage or early life, save that he was recruited to the Sannyāsa-āśrama directly from his Brahmacaryāśrama. He succeeded to the Pontificate of the Uttarādī Mutt in 1557-8, which he occupied for thirty-nine years till his death in the cyclic year of Mannaṭha. He was thus a close contemporary of Vijayindra and Vādirāja. He was obviously a Kannāḍa-speaking Deśastha-Brahman of Bombay-Karnatak and possibly a native of the Bijāpur district.

Raghūttama is said to have studied for some years after his ordination under a learned Pundit of the name of Varadarājācārya at Maṇḍūr. The

1. I use the term “Deśastha” in its true, original and only correct sense of an inhabitant of the Desh as opposed to the Konkan—in which sense it is invariably used and understood in the Bombay Presidency—whence it came to the South. It has absolutely no linguistic connotation but only a geographical one. There is thus no justification for the loose and altogether vicious use of the term in the Madras Province now, to denote only a Mahārāṭṭi speaking person. This was due originally to sheer ignorance of facts which has lately developed into a desire to monopolise the term, on the part especially of most of those Mādhva Brahmins who now speak a debased Mahārāṭṭi in the South but whose original mother-tongue at the time of their migration from the North (in the 17-18th centuries) was demonstrably Kannāḍa. From Raghūttama down to present Pontiff Satyadhyāna Tīrtha, the Svāmīs of the Uttarādī Mutt have without exception been recruited from the Kannāḍa-speaking “Deśastha” Brahmin families of Bombay-Karnatak.

2. This Pundit was the first of the Ādya family of scholars, whose descendants now enjoy “first honours” at the Uttarādī Mutt. For the works attributed to Varadāchārya see Appendix III.

3. A village on the southern bank of the Bhimā river, on the Nizam’s border of the Inḍi taluq of the Bijāpur district, which I was able to visit on 11-1-38,
Pundit's treatment of his disciple seems to have terminated the studies rather abruptly.

Tradition ascribes to Raghūttama certain innovations in the Mutt routine and additions to Pontifical paraphernalia. He seems to have spent the latter part of his life at his Mutt on the S. Perṇār at Tirukoilūr (South Arcot Dt.) where he passed away and where his mortal remains lie entombed. To this day special reverence is paid to his memory and hundreds visit his tomb at Tirukoilūr. He was a scholar of great weight and taught many disciples among whom were (1) Rāmācārya, the author of the Taranīgīrī and (2) Vedeśa Bhikṣu a prolific commentator.

Works.

Raghūttama's works are seven in number. They are all of them extant though only two have so far been printed. They are all in the nature of commentaries on the earlier works of the system. "Bhāva-bodha" is the general title of a majority of his works and Raghūttama himself is usually called "Bhāvabodhayācārya" or "Bhāvabodhayakāra."

(1) Viṣṇutattvatriṃśa-Tikā-Bhāvabodha (m)

This (Mysore O. L. C. 1906) is Raghūttama's gloss on the VTN-commentary of Jayatīrtha, in about 1200 granthas. The author quotes from the Pramāṇa Paddhati of Jayatīrtha and culls pratiñkas regularly from the original commentary of Jayatīrtha.

(2) Tattvaprakāśikā-Bhāvabodha (m)

This is a super-commentary on the TP of Jayatīrtha, which is preserved both at Mysore (O. L. C. 323) and at Madras (O. L. R. No. 878). It is a voluminous commentary running to nearly 8100 granthas. The gloss is quoted and criticised by Jagannātha Tirtha in his Bhāsyadīpikā. The author quotes also the passages of the Nyāyavivarana commented upon by Jayatīrtha in his TP without introducing the actual words thereof, and from the Candrikā.

(3) Nyāyavivarana-Tikā. (p)

This direct commentary on the Nyāyavivarana of Madhva, in the continuation of Jayatīrtha's commentary on the same from B.S. i, 3, 1 onwards has been printed and published from Uḍipi.

(4) Nyāya-ratna-sambandha-Dīpikā (m)

A Ms. of this is preserved in the Mysore O. L. C. (C. 1557). It runs to some 1200 granthas and is in the nature of a commentary on the AV showing at the same time, the inter-connection between the words of Madhva and the

4. See Bhāsyadīpikā (Madras) p. 237 and Bhāvabodha i, 1, 3; and p. 438 and Bhāvabodha ii, 1, 18.

4a. See 1, 2 p. 48b (MS).
sūtras of Bādarāyana. It also indicates the Pūrvapakṣa and Siddhāntaśāstrāyas involved at each step. The scope of the work is thus indicated:

अनुवादकारकूट्तोऽकारा  भाषाविवरणम्।
जयमुनिकारकूट्तोऽकारा  दृष्टिसमुद्रम्॥

(5) Vivaranoddhāra (m)

This is a gloss on those passages of the Nyāyaviveka which have been commented upon by Jayatīrtha in his TP without introducing the actual words thereof, into the body of his text. A Ms. is preserved at the Tanjore Palace Library (XIV. 7841).

(6) Bhādārānyakopāniṣad-Bhāṣya-Ṭīkā (p)

Raghūṭtama’s magnum opus is his commentary on the Bhāṣya of Madhva, in 9000 granthas, published as early as the year 1907. He gives both the “bhāṣyārtha,” and the Khanḍārtha of the Upaniṣad i.e., to say, he has commented upon the bhāṣya of Madhva as well as upon the passages of Upaniṣad itself, independently and in a connected way. The most striking feature of the commentary is the large number of quotations from the Bhādārānyaka Bhāṣya of Śaṅkara which Raghūṭtama gives in order to contrast the interpretations of his school with those of the Advaita which are sometimes criticised by him (P. 41):—

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>P. 7</td>
<td>(Anandārāma edn.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>P. 20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 b</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35 b</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35 b</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36 b</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>207</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>274 b</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

He has incorporated into his work many passages from the commentaries of Jayatīrtha on the Kathālakṣaṇa (see Raghūṭtama, pp. 199-200), AV (see R. 308 and Sudhā 115 b) and the Isā Up. (see R. p. 348). He makes an interesting reference to the views of his teacher Raghuvaryā Tīrtha on the interpretation of the term “गोष्ठ” (Brh. iii, i, p. 166, line 17): गोष्ठे यक्षासमीषय इति

स्वामिनः:

5. See the colophon: इति श्रीमद्भक्तीर्थवरण प्रदशितम्-ततप्रकाशिकम्-न्यायविवरणोद्वर

| Vide also the remarks of Rāghavendra in his TP-Bhāvadīpa 25, lines 22-23; i. 4, 13, p. 233 (Bombay). The editor of the T. P. L. Catalogue has not properly understood the scope of this work of Raghūṭtama.
(7) Gitābhāṣya-Prameyadīpikā Bhāvabodha (m)

This is the author's gloss on Jayatīrtha's commentary on the Gitā-Bhāṣya of Madhva. A Ms. is preserved of this work in the Mysore O. L. (116 Nāgarī) and extracts from the gloss have been given in Pandit T. R. Kṛṣṇācārya's edn. of the Gitābhāṣya-Bhāvaratnakāosa of Sumatindra Tīrtha.

2.—Vedeśa Bhīkṣu (C. 1570-1620)

Vedeśa Bhīkṣu describes himself in his works, as a disciple of both Raghūttama and his successor Veda-vyāsatīrtha. The latter has been confounded with the famous author of the Nyām. by Keith\(^6\) and Aufrecht.\(^7\) But a careful scrutiny of the introductory verses and colophons to the works of Vedeśa would make it clear that he had nothing to do with Vyāsatīrtha of Nyām. fame:

1. रघुमुन्नमृतो भावो जयमुनेश्वरः।
वेदेशाभिविधा वायुविभावतीर्थसिः।

(Kathālakṣaṇa gloss)

2. सर्वसवन् रघुमुन्नमृतो जयमुनेश्वरः।
श्रवणेऽवेदव्यासतीर्थसिः।

(Gloss on Pramāṇapadādhati)

3. नैत्री रघुमुन्नमृतो जयमुनेश्वरः।
वेदव्यासतीर्थपुष्पवादिष्ट्यवेदेशाभिविधासिः।

(Colophon to the c. on Chān. Up. bhāṣya)

4. गुपप्रस्तावातिभवोहिन्दुस्वत्सर्वततिविद्युत्सिः।

(Gloss on Tattvodyota-ṭīkā)

Nothing is however known about the personal history of Vedeśa. The epithet Bhīkṣu taken up by him shows that he was a Sannyāsin. Like his teacher Raghūttama and Vedavyāsa, he too was doubtless a Kannāda-speaking Deśastha Brahmin. He lies entombed at Maṇḍūr, where Raghūttama himself and his predecessors are known to have prosecuted their studies earlier. He has nine works to his credit which are all of them illuminating commentaries, some on the Upaniṣad-bhāṣyas of Madhva and the rest on a few of Jayatīrtha's works. All save three of his works have been printed.

(1) Tattvodyota-Paścikā-Gloss (Ṭippaṇa) (p)\(^8\)

This is a gloss on Jayatīrtha's c. on the Td. of Madhva, running to 1650 granthis. It throws fresh light on many pages of the original. Vedeśa quotes several times from earlier commentaries in the field\(^9\) and sometimes criticises them.\(^10\) He has quoted also from the Samkṣepa-Sūrīraka\(^11\) (1,167)

---

6. MILL Mss. 90 (Bodlien Cat. p. 62, Col. 2).
8. Bombay 1898 and Belgaum.
9. Pp. 11, lines 10, 22, 17, 10-12; 23, 13-14; 24, 4; 25, 14; 40, 5-10; 43-4.
and the Saptapadārthī of Śivāditya and also possibly a commentary thereon.  

Similar glosses on (2) Jayatīrtha's commentaries on the PL and the (3) VTN. have been attributed to Vedēśa but so far, no Mss. of these have been brought to light. (4) The gloss on the KL has been published (1900).

(5-8) Glosses on the Upaniṣad-bhāṣyas.

Vedēśa has commented on four of the Upaniṣad-bhāṣyas of Madhva; the Aitareya, Chāndogya, Kaṭha and Talavakāra (p).

The first is available only in Mss. That on the Chāndogya entitled "Padārthakaumudi (p) is the biggest running to 6000 granthas. The gloss on the Kaṭha (Bombay 1905) quotes from and criticises the bhāṣya of Śāṅkara on this Up. These references are valuable not only for comparative study of the two rival bhāṣyas but also for establishing the genuineness of the c. ascribed to Śāṅkara. The author gives both the Bhāṣyārtha and the Khaṇḍārtha of the Upaniṣad.

(9) Pramāṇapaddhati-Vyākhyā (p) D.

In the course of this gloss on the Pramāṇapaddhati of Jayatīrtha, in 1400 granthas, Vedēśa is found to quote nearly seven times from Vijayindrā Tīrtha's commentary on the Pramāṇapaddhati and criticise it thrice. He refers also to another commentary on the original (pp. 40 and 131) which is yet to be identified.

Vedēśa's works are all of them well-written and afford valuable help in understanding the originals. He has every right then to be regarded as one of the leading commentators of the Dvaita school.

3.—Viśveśvara Tīrtha (C. 1600)

There is reason to identify Viśveśvara Tīrtha, the author of a commentary on the Aitareya-Bhāṣya of Madhva, with the fourteenth Svāmi of the Pejāvar

12. तव 'प्राणसंवाक्ष्यामाकृतिः' इति। प्राण चंद्रेश्वाभाव: प्रागाभाव: तद्विरुत्व  
प्रवेशः: तत्त्वप्रवृत्तव्यासस्यामाविकमिति तत्त्वग्राही। (39, 7).


14. P. 3, 6-19, i, 1, 20 ; P. 8, 8, 9 ; 1, 2, P. 17 ; 28 ; 36, 11, 18 ; 41, 11.

15. (a) केवलतु—‘हेतुवा भाष्योपयोगमाकृतिः’ इति। प्रिय (iii, 1).

(b) केवलतु—‘नन्दे भाष्योपयोगमाकृतिः’ इति। प्रिय (ii, 78) (c) केवलतु—‘हेतुवा भाष्योपयोगमाकृतिः’ इति। प्रि (iii, 1) (d) ‘विपरितं’ ‘तत्त्वविनिर्देत्र’ "येक्षरी" । (iii, 1) (e) "सर्वौपदेशः" इति। प्रि (P. 102 cf. Vij. p. 148).

16. (a) एतकत तद्विन्त्र निरस्तः यत्रनिःस्युथम—'तव तथा प्रतिपत्तिसमाविष्टत्वाद्विविष्ठपः स्वपनमाविन्त्रति नालधेनुपपणेऽधेनुपपणेऽधेनुपपणे। प्रि (i, 1) (b) इति। प्रि (ii, 66 Cf. Vij. p. 65 (b) ii, i. and (c) Vedēśa P. 122, 14-17.
Mutt of Uḍipi. He was presumably a contemporary and disciple of Vādirāja Svāmin of the Sode Mutt.\textsuperscript{17} That he was considerably later than Jayatīrtha is proved not only by the existence of an epitome of the latter's Nyāyasudhā by Viśveśvara (Pejāvar Mutt Mss 330, Nagari Palm-leaf) but by the striking resemblance which the fourth introductory verse in his Aitareya-gloss (Mysore O. L. C. 1048) bears to the second one of Jayatīrtha's NS\textsuperscript{18} :—

\begin{quote}
Cf.

\begin{center}

\begin{quote}

\begin{flushright}

Viśveśvara does not refer to any earlier commentary on the Aitareya-bhāṣya. His is a clear and forcible style and his explanations are always brief and to the point. His commentary is therefore eminently readable, though for some inscrutable reason it has fallen into complete oblivion. More than three Mss. of it are available in the T.P.L.

4.——YADUPATI ĀCĀRYA (c. 1580-1630).

Yadupati alias Yādava Ācārya, was a distinguished pupil of Vedēśa Bhikṣū.\textsuperscript{19} He wrote several commentaries on the earlier works of his school the chief of which is the one on the NS. called Yādupatya after the author. The commentary is very popular in Pandit circles.

Yadupati was a Kannaḍa speaking Deśastha\textsuperscript{20} Brahman of Yekkuṇḍi in the Saundatti taluq of the Belgaum district. His descendants are said to be
\end{quote}
\end{flushright}

\end{center}
\end{quote}

\begin{quote}

\begin{center}

\begin{quote}

\begin{flushright}

17: This is supported by one of the scribe’s verses in the Ms. of Vādirāja’s Gurvarhatipīkā (Mys. C-1057) :—

\begin{center}

\begin{quote}

\begin{flushright}

18. Needless to point out that KEITH (introd. to Ait. Aranyaka, Oxford p. 12) is wrong in making Viśveśvara a contemporary and immediate disciple of Madhva himself! Viśveśvara also imitates Jayatīrtha’s phrase: अन्त्येऽर्थ्यम् व्यास्यतानि... इ (TP introd.) in his Ait. gloss.

19. Cf. इति श्रीभद्देशातीर्थी पृष्ठार्द्धिक्रियेण यदुतिना विनिन्तायां सुभाषितम्... इ (colophon)

20. Vide f. n. 1 ante for the proper significance of this term that is being so systematically misused in the South.

\end{quote}
\end{flushright}
\end{center}
\end{quote}

\end{center}
\end{quote}
living. The S.K. gives his father's name at Yādappaya (p. 182). It further states that Yadupati's elder brother Rāmappa received sannyāsa from Vedavyāsa Tīrtha and that he subsequently became his brother's teacher in Vedānta. This teacher was presumably the same as Vedeśa Bhiksū the distinguished commentator and acknowledged Guru of Yadupati. The latter was thus a contemporary of Vidyādhiśa Tīrtha of the Uttarādi Mutt.

Not only was Yadupati a distinguished scholar himself, but a trainer of equally able disciples. Among his pupils may be mentioned (1) Bidarahalli Śrīnivāsa Tīrtha, (2) Šarkara Śrīnivāsa and (3) Umarji Tirumalācārya, who have made lasting contributions to the philosophical literature of the Dvaita.

**Works**

Nine works of Yadupati are available of which only two have been printed. His (1) gloss on the Tattvāsankhyāna in 300 granthas, is preserved at the T. P. L., whilst his (2) gloss on the Tattvodyota is available at the Mysore O. L. (C7).

(3) *Nyāyasudhā-Ṭippati.* (p. D)

As already observed, the c. on the NS. is the most important work of Yadupati. It is an adequate c. on the original bearing the stamp of scholarship and originality on every page. The author shows himself deeply versed in the grammatical learning of his days which he brings to the support of the interpretations of his school. His com. is distinctly anterior to that of Rāghavendra Swāmin and perhaps also that of Vidyādhiśa. He tries to overthrow the objection raised by some critics (presumably Appayya Dīkṣita) alleging misrepresentation of the Mīmāṃsaka view in the AV i, i, 1 by pointing out that the author of the AV, has in view the followers of the Prābhākara school of Mīmāṃsā, who do hold the view attributed to them by Madhva:

अत्र कबिदाह—'भावार्थेन वाक्येददश्य छह्लाव, प्रहते व वाक्यात्मावनयम् एकलाव, नाभवनरवाक्यायमरो जीत्यत्' इति। ततुच्छलम्। न हींदे मानानु, प्रव्वसावसोऽस् च किंचि, प्रामाण्यानुः।

*Yadupati also from a number of earlier commentators on the NS (i, 1, 1, p. 79; i, 1, 1, p. 7; i, 4, p. 152; and i, 1, p. 37 and 43) as well as from a c. on Sanīkṣepasārātkā (40).*

As an instance of Yadupati's alertness may be mentioned his interesting remarks on the Uṇādi Sūtra. अदिभुतम् हत्व (V, I) quoted by Jayatīrtha in his NS, (i, 4, p. 228, Bombay) in support of Madhva's interpretation of the term "मायामाचरम्" which is sought to be be

21. This objection has been met by a number of other commentators also like Vidyādhiśa and Vijayendra.
derived from two roots मि and ७१४० The point is that शंि मुिो हृिचि is the reading generally accepted and found in the printed texts of the Unādi Sūtras. Yadupati is aware of this for he quotes from one of the commentaries on the Unādi Sūtras (presumably Śvetavana’s : vide Madras Uni. Skt. Series, VII, pt. i, p. 210 text B.) ; but points out at the same time that the reading given by Jayatīrtha is the more ancient and genuine one, being found in some Mss. and certain commentaries also. It is however unknown to both Nārāyaṇa and Śvetavana and probably the same was the case with Ujjvaladatta. It is however very unlikely that the reading quoted by Jayatīrtha is a myth for he is a scrupulously honest and very careful writer. Yadupati’s remarks are faithfully echoed by Keśavācārya.

Yadupati wrote two works on the Bhāgavata-Prasthāna (4) a c. on the Bhāgavata-Tātparya of Madhva of which Mss. are preserved at Uḍipi and in the Mysore O. L. (B. 194 B 200).22 His c. on (5) chapters I-IX, of the Bhāgavata Purāṇa has been printed and published from Dharwar. The Mysore O.L. (C 1866) has a Ms. of his (6) c. on the Yamaka-Bhārata. His minor works are four : (7) a c. on the Sadācāramṛti and three Stotras : (8) Viṣṇu-sotra ; (9) Vedavyāṣastotra or Gadya ; and (10) a Karāvalambana Stotra in 30 verses (S. M. p. 104-12).

5.—SUḌHĪNDRA TĪRTHA (1596-1623).

In Sudhindra Tīrtha, the disciple and successor of Vijayīndra Tīrtha, we have a different personality altogether from those to whom we have hitherto been accustomed. For one in his position, Sudhindra was a person of peculiar tastes and equipment. He is one of the few writers in Dvaita Literature who have cared to look beyond their noses into realms other than those of Theology and Metaphysics. Kavya and Alamkāra seem to have been the forte of Sudhindra on both of which he has left us works of real merit, which stand out like oases in a dreary desert of theological writings. The Dvaitins have often been accused of a lack of interest in anything but their own faith and nothing proves the truth of this accusation so well as the fact that posterity has allowed to sink into oblivion even the few works of purely literary interest left by writers like Trivikrama Paṇḍita, Vijayīndra, Sudhindra and Sumatīndra.

DATE.

As already mentioned Sudhindra was the successor of Vijayīndra and the Guru of Rāghavendra Svāmin, on the pitha of his Mutt. The Rāghavendra Vijaya of Nārāyaṇa speaks of him as having been honoured with a Ratanābhiṣeka, by the Vijayanagara King Venkaṭapatirāya.23 He is also reported in the same work, to have enjoyed the patronage of Raghunātha Nāyaka of Tanjore. He died in 1623 at Anegondi on the banks of the Tungabhadrā and his mortal remains lie entombed at Navabhrāndava alongsides the tomb of Vyāsaraṇya.

22. The MSS. available cover but the first five Skandhas.
23. Vide also the S. M. (p. 308), verse 8, of Vādindra’s Gurugunastava.
Works

Besides two works on Alankāra and a drama, tradition ascribes to Sudhāndra a c. on the Tarkatāñḍava, entitled Yukti ratnavali. This is corroborated by Nārāyaṇa who mentions in his biography of Rāghavendra (VII. 49-50), (1) a c. on the Tarkatāñḍava, (2) com. on II and XI Skandhas of the Bhāgavata and a drama, probably the same as Subhadrā-Dhanañjaya :—

व्याख्यावाचारांभवन बहुधर्मान्य रतकांस निम्मे धीमूर्दद्र त।
व्यापनैन्द्र व्याख्यावाचारांभवन्य षां अन्येखी वाचारां ब।
× × × नावके विचाराद म।
(1) Alankāra-amañjari (m)

This is a manual of Śabda-Alankāras, by Sudhāndra of which we have a palm-leaf MS. in the Tanjore P. L. (no. 5129-30). One of the later successors of Sudhāndra, Sumatīndra, wrote a commentary on this work. The commentary is known by the name of Madhu-dhārā (alias Alankāra-amañjari vyākhyā). Both the commentary and its original are preserved at the T.P.L. But the Editor of the Descriptive Catalogue of the T.P.L. has, in ascribing the Alankāra-amañjarīvyākhyā to Sudhāndra, confounded the author of the original with the commentator. The commentator himself refers to Sudhāndra as the author of the original and speaks of himself as the author of the commentary Madhudhārā on it :

श्रीमधुधारान्तर्वतीन्तर: व्याख्यावाचारांभवन्य मूलान्तर्वतीन्तर: म।
व्याख्यायं मधुधारार्यम् विचारान्तर्वतीन्तर: म।
× × × अनेकान्तर्वतीन तत्ववान्तर्वतीन वाचारां विच: क्ष:।
× × × मधुधारार्यमान्तर्वती × × × (p. 2972, T. P. L. Cat.).

Sudhāndra deals with bandhas etc., and many passages from this work are quoted by Sumatīndra in his c. on the Uṣākaraṇa. It would appear from these quotations that Sudhāndra's illustrative verses were in commemoration of the greatness of his Guru Vijayāndra. An express statement to the effect is also made by Sudhāndra in one of the introductory verses :—

अध्यायावाचारांभवन मूलान्तर्वतीन्तर: म।
प्रेमसाधवायात्मा मूलान्तर्वतीन्तर: म।
(4) Alankāra-Nikaṣa (m)

This is a treatise on Arthālankāras (like Upamā, Rūpaka, Dṛṣṭānta, Viśeṣa etc.) by the same author, composed most probably as a complement to

24. GVL. Cat.
25. इति × × × श्रवान्तर्वतीन्तर: व्याख्यायां समासम म। (MS)
26. श्रवान्तर्वतीन्तर: व्याख्यायां समासम । इति क्ष:। (MS)
27. Madras O. L. Cat. No. 129776 (Grantha MS). It is the same work as is wrongly entered as "Alankāra-nikaṣa" of "Sudhendra", by Oppert 4797 (Catalogue.
the *Alankāramañjari* and as a set off to the *Kuvalayānanda* of Appayya Diksīta. The author is called "Kavi-kaṇṭhīrava" on the title page of the Ms. The work runs to 2706 granthas and contains verses as well as prose explanations of them. The author wields a fine alliterative style. He says that the work is meant for the use of earnest students of *Alankāraśāstra*:

अलंकारशाष्ट्रभाष्यासेच्छुनामवल्लोपकाराय मुद्रीन्द्रयोगिनिकरिताल्प्लारतिनिकवस्योब्धेण मन्यः ॥

(5) *Śāhitya-Sāmrāṭya* (m)

AUFRECHT notices a work of this name (Rice 288) ascribed to Sumatīndra Tīrtha. The Catalogue of the Gopal Vilas Library (of the late Dewan Bahadur R. RAGHUNĀTHA RAU) at Kumbakonam, ascribes it to Sudhīndra. Another Ms. of the work is reported from the Rāghavendra Svāmi Mutt library at Naṅjángūḍ (Mysore Arch. Rep. 1917, p. 17) and (wrongly?) attributed to Sujānendra Tīrtha. There is yet another *Śāhityasāmrāṭya* (alias *Raghu-

(6) *Subhadrā-Parāṇāya* (m)

A damaged fragment of a drama of this name, ascribed to Sudhīndra, is preserved at the Madras O.L. (Vol. XXI, D. C. No. 12729). The Ms. (which is in Nandiṅāgiri) runs to 124 pages of 6 lines each and contains some two Acts.

तदन्तवासिना सुधीन्द्रयवतीन्द्रेण विरचितं ॥ × × ×

आयय—मन्वेदानी कल्ययदुमुनिगतववृक्षरवतं श्रुत्यपरिणयनातिकसित ॥

A Vidūṣaka Tumburu, Nārada, Satyabhāmā and Arjuna are some of the characters that figure in the play which contains passages in Prākṛt also.
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NOTES OF THE MONTH

It is indeed a matter of satisfaction that the Progress Report of the Bharatiya Vidya Bhavan of Andheri for the period covering November 1939 to October 1940 records, despite the conditions of war, a steady progress towards its main objectives. During recent years the need of studying our ancient culture dispassionately in a scientific manner has been realized more and more and the coming into existence more or less simultaneously of the Bharatiya Vidya Bhavan in Bombay, the Deccan College Postgraduate and Research Institute in Poona, Sri Venkateswara Oriental Institute at Tirupati, and the two schemes of research in Gujarati and Kannada antiquities respectively at Ahmedabad and Dharwar, is a welcome augury of this movement. We trust that the conjoint and collaborative efforts of these institutions, when co-ordinated according to plan, will achieve a worthy object and place before the scientific world a synthetic and analytic study of the different phases of Indian Culture.

During the year under report the Bhavan has not only supervised the activities of its constituent institutes like the Shri Mumbadevi Sanskrit Pathasala, but carried on independent research. The English and Hindi-Gujarati journals Bharatiya Vidya published under its auspices have already made a mark on the scholarly world. The Bharatiya Vidya Series has been inaugurated by publishing Visuddhimagga under the editorship of that well-known Pali scholar Professor Dharmanand Kosambi, whose text in Roman script is in print but not yet published in the Harvard Oriental Series. Extension Lectures which form part of the general activities of the Bhavan have been very popular, and some of these have been printed in the Bhavan’s journals.

Now that the foundation stone of the permanent headquarters of the Bhavan has been laid we trust that the Bhavan will grow from strength to strength and bring laurels to indological studies and research.

*

The University Phonetics Association of the Mysore University is to be congratulated on its new publication: The Bulletin of Phonetic Studies, the first issue of which we have just received for October 1940. First founded in November 1938 the Association has been carrying on sure but silent work before launching upon its publishing activities. While Phonetics as a science has made great progress in the West, and was indeed one of the early sciences developed in India as witnessed in the Prātiśākhya, recent years have seen its decadence in India. It is therefore a matter for congratulation that the Mysore University is taking a lead in these matters. We are hopeful that the Phonetics Department of the Punjab University started by Mr. Firth, the Linguistics departments of the Calcutta University and the Deccan College Research Institute will now co-operate with the Mysore University in bringing up the scientific study of Phonetics to a high level of efficiency.

This inaugural issue of the Bulletin of Phonetic Studies contains the following papers: Foreword (1), Report of the Activities of the University Phonetics Association by B. S. Kesavan, Secretary (2-4), Phonetics and the teaching of English by Prof. W. G. Eagleton, the President (5-10), English as the Kannadiga speaks it by T. N. Sreekantaiya (11-19), and the Vedic Circumflex by N. Sivarama Sastry (20-31). The Bulletin is neatly printed by the Wesley Press and Publishing
House of Mysore, and is priced moderately at Re. 1 per issue. Full Membership of the Association is open to the staffs of the Mysore University institutions. Associate Membership is open to all other persons interested in Phonetics at an annual subscription of As. 8 only. Members receive the copies of the Bulletin gratis.

According to Circular Letter No. 2 issued by the Hon. Secretary of the Fourth (Lahore) Session of the Indian History Congress, the session will assemble at Lahore on Monday the 16th December 1940, and will continue its meetings on the two following days. Two excursions to Taxila and Harappa have been arranged on Wednesday the 18th, and there is a possibility of organising another one to Mohenjodaro if more than twenty members express their desire to go there.

The subscription for membership is five rupees (Rs. 5) and should be sent to the Hon. Secretary, Professor J. F. Bruce, M.A., University Hall, Lahore.

We take this opportunity of wishing the Congress every success in its manifold activities.

---

**REVIEW**

_Kaṁsavaḥō of Rāmapāṇivāda_, Edited, with Introduction, Sanskrit Chāyā with foot notes, Index of verses, Glossary of words, English Translation, Notes and Index of Proper Names, by Dr. A. N. Upadhye. Crown pp. 42+51+38+5+35+31+47+2.

To a student of Indian linguistics, the importance of the study of Prākṛt works produced by scholars belonging to districts where Non-Indo-Aryan languages are spoken, cannot be overstated, inasmuch as it may throw considerable light on the development and practice of the language in a different environment. Such a study may be calculated to be even helpful in accounting for points of phonological and semantic interests unrecorded in the literature of its homeland. The Prākṛt works of such an erudite scholar as Rāmapāṇivāda, no doubt, deserve to be brought to light; and Professor Upadhye has to be congratulated for his laudable efforts in bringing out an excellent edition of _Kaṁsavaḥō_, hitherto known to scholars only through catalogues and manuscript libraries.

Professor Upadhye’s Translation and Critical Notes are characterised by earnestness and precision. The Editor will be seen to have handled admirably the limited material that has been made available to him in the matter of the constitution of the text. The observations on the Prākṛt dialect of _Kaṁsavaḥō_ evince Dr. Upadhye’s elaborate and scientific knowledge of the phonology and structure of the Middle Indian tongues.

It may, however, be pointed out that much of the details about Rāmapāṇivāda set forth by the Editor in the Introduction appears to be a medley of incidents and facts connected with the lives and activities of two different poets namely Rāmapāṇivāda and the great Malayāḷam poet Kuṭijan Nambyār. The confusion seems to have arisen from the Editor’s relying to the full, upon the information furnished by Messrs Mahākavi Uḷḷūr S. Parameswara Iyer and M. R. Balakrishna Warriner who cling steadfastly to the view that the two poets are identical. Their opinion is based upon disconnected traditional accounts of little historical value and is wholly unsupported by internal evidences of any kind. In an article contributed by me on the subject to the Malayāḷam Journal Sahyādaya, I have shown that the
Sanskrit passages occurring in Kuñjana Nambyār’s productions are, for the most part, defective and impossible, on that score, of being attributed to a Sanskrit Scholar of such a thoroughness as the author of Rāghavīya or Sītārāghava. Further, the Prākṛt used by Kuñjana Nambyār in one of his works has also been pointed out by me as being quite different from the one employed by Rāmapāṇivāda. The substitution of Sanskrit s, ś and ṣ by ś and of Sanskrit r by ṛ as sañīla- (Sk. śarīra-), māsiṇa- (Sk. māṣya-), māṇuṣa- (Sk. mānuṣa-), dōṣa- (Sk. dōṣa-), sōḍī- (Sk. sōrī-) and vīḷa- (Sk. vīra-) is a regular feature of the Prākṛt of Kuñjana Nambyār while Rāmapāṇivāda’s Prākṛt very seldom exhibits a change in this direction. Besides, Kuñjana Nambyār’s works form social satires and are replete with side-splitting humour whereas Rāmapāṇivāda’s works are characterised by dignity and a high level of seriousness. I am sure if Dr. Upadhye had cared to make a comparative study of the two authors on the lines indicated, he would have arrived at the same conclusion.

As regards the Editor’s observation concerning the Chāyā on page 50 of the Introduction, I do not see my way to believe, as the Editor thinks, that the Chāyā takes some liberty with the verbal forms of the text. The fact that the forms of the Present are substituted by those of the Imperfect and Perfect, is itself sufficient proof to show that the Present forms of the text are used in the sense of the Past. If the poet had only wanted to convey the idea of the Present, he would never employ the Past form of the verb in the Chāyā. The Present forms given as footnotes under the Chāyā, I am afraid, do not serve, therefore, any useful purpose. I may also draw attention to a similar extensive usage of the Present in the Prākṛt poem Sauricarita by Śrīkanṭha (Travancore University O. Mss. Library, Trivandrum, No. L. 105). See leaf No. 12 front side commentary ‘pasavaḥ pṛśūta’ under the verse beginning with Khañākhañam; leaf No. 12 back, commentary ‘vadājī ēvamēvaṇca avardhata’ under the verse beginning with Aha so vāmahiśñam; and leaf No. 14 back, commentary ‘na naṇḍoṇa na anandayat’ under the verse beginning with tassa kivā. It will thus be seen that it is not so much the question of the Chāyā not according with the text that deserves notice, as the grammatical problem. The sanction of Prākṛt grammarians for such a usage is a matter to be investigated, and perhaps Dr. Upadhye is the fittest person to enlighten us on the point.

A word has to be said on the diacritical marks adopted by the Editor in transliterating the Prākṛt words. So long as Prākṛt distinguishes between short and long ः and short and long ः, I am inclined to think that it will be more scientific to differentiate these in writing. Where there is only long ः and long ः as in Sanskrit, there may not arise any occasion for confusion. Nevertheless, even in Sanskrit, to be more scientific, one ought to use the diacritical marks indicating length for ः and ः as ṇ and ṇ. But to write acchera (p. 35 Introduction) and pekkha (p. 46 Introduction) using the same e, and mohā (p. 35 Introduction) and kocca (p. 36 Introduction) using the same o does not seem to be desirable. That ब्रह्मā and अवह are to be pronounced with long ः and long ः is obvious from the lines aho kimacchēraminam samuggaē (I, 10) and gōṅe bāla-dīnēśa-mōha-mohā (II, 45).

The appearance of the book is fascinating. May it have the success it so richly deserves!

Trivandrum.

K. Goda Varma.
CAKRAVARTIN

By

K. A. NILAKANTA SASTRI, Madras.

Recently I had occasion to examine the rôle of the conception of Cakravartin in ancient Indian thought and to point out that Kautilya gave a practical turn to this quasi-mythical conception by adumbrating the idea of the Cakravarti ksetram confined to India proper. The idea of Cakravartin had, one may well believe, a long history and was the complex result of the coming together of many lines of thought, not all of them exclusively Indian in origin. To distinguish clearly these different lines from one another and to trace the early stages of their evolution or to determine the steps by which the final result was attained may not be easy with the limited data at our disposal. But some attempt may be made to gather the important texts bearing on this interesting conception and see how far they serve to elucidate the antiquity and the origin of a few at least of the different elements that have gone into its make-up.

The Vāyu Purāṇa ch. 57 (Ānandāśrama edn.) has a striking passage on cakravartins whom it assigns to the Tretā Yuga, and we may well start with this:

prajāyante tataḥ śūrāḥ āyuṣmanto mahābalāḥ
nyastadaṇḍa-mahābhāgāḥ yajvāno brahmavādinaḥ (64)
padmapatryatākṣaś ca prthūraskāḥ susaranhitāḥ
simhāntakā maḥāsattvāḥ mattamātaṅga-gāmināḥ (65)
maḥādhanurduḥrāścaiva tretāyām cakravartināḥ
sarvalaksanāḥ sampannāḥ nyagrodha-parimanḍalāḥ (66)

* * *
cakram ratho manirbhāraya nidhirāṣvā gajastathā
saptāṭiśayaratnāni sarveśām cakravartinām (68)
cakram ratho manīḥ khadgam dhanūratnāṁ ca pañcamam
keturnidhiśca saptātte prāpaṁnaḥ prakīrtitāḥ (69)
bhāraya purohitaścaiva senānī-rathakṛt ca yāḥ
mantryaśvaḥ kalabhaścaiva prāṇīnaḥ samprakīrtitāḥ (70)
ratnānyetāni dvīvāni saṁsiddhāni mahātmanāṁ
mantryaśvaḥ kalabhaścaiva prāṇīnaḥ samprakīrtitāḥ (70)
viśnoparamśena jāyante prthivyām cakravartināḥ
manvantareṣu sarvesu atitānāgatesu vai
bhūtabhavyāni yāniḥ vartamānāni yāni ca
tretāyugādiṣvēkatra jāyante cakravartināḥ (73)

1. See Jacobi on Cakravartin in ERE; and s. v. Cakkavatī in Abhidhāna-rājendra.
bhadrāṇīṃīṃi yeśāṃ vai bhavantīha mahīṣītām
adbhuṭāni ca catvāri bālam dharmāḥ sukham dhanam
(74)
anyonyasyā’virodhena prāpyante vai nṛpaiḥ samam
artho dharmaśca kālmaśca yaśo vijaya eva ca
(75)
aiśvaryenaṃmādyena prabhūṣaktyā tathaiva ca
annena tapasā caiva ṛṣīnabhibhavanti ca
(76)
balena tapasā caiva devadānava mānuṣān
lakṣaṇaścāpi jāyante śarīraśair-amānusāh
keśāstärthā lalaṭōrṇā jihvā cāsyapramārjanī
tāṃraprabhoṣhadantoṣṭhāh śrīvatsāścrodhāvaromaśāh
(77)
nyagrodhāparīṇāḥśca simhakandhas-sumēhanāh
gajendragatayaścaiva mahāhanava eva ca
(78)
pādayoṣ-cakra-matsyau tu śāṅkha-padmāu tu hastayoḥ
pañcāśīti-sahasrāṇi te bhavantyajarā nṛpāḥ
(79)
asāṅgā gatayas-ṭeṣām catasarā-cakravartinām
antariṣke samudre ca pāṭale parvateṣu ca
(80)²

This long passage, one of the most comprehensive known to me, is easily
seen to fall into several distinct parts which are assembled together rather
loosely. The first three verses (64-66) are quite a general description of the
appearance and attainments of the Cakravartins of the Tretā Yuga, who
are also called mahādhāmanurdharas, a term we shall come across in another
text. The four next (68-71) give a description of the ratnas (jewels) of the
Cakravartin, and this description first enumerates seven ratnas, and then
gives another list of fourteen, grouped into seven live and seven inanimate
ratnas. Verses 72-76 deal clearly with one distinct aspect of the Cakravarti
idea. Here the emphasis is on the parallel between the protective functions
exercised by the Emperor in the State and by Viṣṇu in Cosmos, and the
index of successful monarchy is found in adbhutāni, aiśvarya, prabhūṣakti, and
the monarch is exalted above the sages, gods and men. Yet another idea,
that of the Cakravartin as Mahāpuraṣa with distinguishing marks on his body,
forms the subject of verses 77-79, and the bodily marks are named which re-
mind one strongly of similar statements in Buddhist and Jain works. Last-
ly, verse 80 gives expression to the miraculous potency of the Cakravartin's
car to travel freely everywhere, on water and air as well as on land, without
experiencing the difficulties felt by the vehicles of ordinary mortals.

2. Cf. Brahmapāṇḍa II. 29, 69-88 and Matsya 142, 62-73. These passages are
identical with the verses cited above, with variations due generally to copyists'
errors. I have not felt it necessary to detail these casual variations in reading
which are of no value—Jñāhastā e.g. occurs as Tālahastā in the other texts. So far
as I can judge the Vāyu text of this passage is the best and most comprehensive.

For tāṃraprabhoṣhadantoṣṭhāh which seems obviously corrupt, Br. has tāṃraprabhoṣhanetraśca, and Matsya gives the whole line as: śyāmaprabḥāḥ caturdamsṛṭrāh
swaṁśāścrodhvaretasāh, in which the second half is a bad surmise of a scribe at his
wit's end.
The Puranic lists of Cakravartins have been collected and discussed by Pargiter in his *Ancient Indian Historical Tradition*, and the lists of monarchs who performed the Rājasūya and Āśvamedha given in the Brāhmaṇas are well known. There is also a list of mahādhanurdhārāscakravartinah in the Maitrāyaṇi Upaniṣad; it begins with Sudyumma and ends with Bharata-probhṛtayāḥ showing that the list is only illustrative and not exhaustive. Most of the names in these lists are mere names to us, though we have a considerable number of legends centering round some of these names, particularly that of Bharata. The attempts so far made to treat them as historical and to determine the order of their succession cannot be taken to have succeeded.

The tradition relating to the *ratnas* is equally ancient, perhaps even older. We have the ratnīnāṃ havīṃṣi, special offerings made in the houses of the ratnīns in the course of the Rājasūya. There are several lists of these ratnīns which are collected and discussed in the *Vedic Index*; it will be noticed that these lists vary considerably, though all of them refer to ‘people of the royal entourage’ as the authors of the *Index* put it, and all lists name many more than seven persons. It is a question however what exactly is the relation between the terms ratna and ratnin. It is tempting to accept the *prima facie* view that they were identical as Keith does, and to suppose that the lists of ratnīns that have come down to us belong to a period when the number of ratnas had not yet been defined; and on this view, it may even be argued that ratna originally meant, as pointed out in the *Vedic Index*, not a jewel in particular, but a precious object, and that in relation to the king the term was applied to the most valued members of his entourage. When later the meaning of ratna as jewel came into vogue, it would seem, the application of the term in relation to the king was extended to some highly valued inanimate treasures, and the grouping of the ratnas into live ratnas and lifeless ratnas was begun. But this is certainly not the whole story. For the standardised account of the ‘seven jewels’ of the emperor seems indeed to go back to a great antiquity. The Bṛhad-devatā, c. 400 B.C. according to Macdonell, contains this verse:—

Cakram ratho maṇīr-bhāryā bhūmiraśvo gajastathā
etāni sapta ratnāṇi sarveṣām cakravartinām V. 123.

Notice that this verse gives bhūmi in the place of nidhi of the Vāyu Purāṇa verse No. 68 above. Macdonell has pointed out that the śloka is meant to explain sapta ratna in RV vi, 74.1, which reads:

6. I 5.
7. Macdonell and Keith: *Vedic Index*, ii, 199-201. It may be noted that Tāṇḍ. Br. xix, 1.4 mentions ‘eight viaras’ who uphold the kingdom, rāṣṭram samudyacchanti;—cf. councils of ‘eight ministers’ aṣṭapradhāna of later times.
8. Rel. and Phil. of the Veda, p. 341.
Somārudṛā dhārayethāmasuryam pra vāmiṣṭayo’ramaśnauvantu
dame dame sapta ratnā dadhānā śam no bhūtam dvipade śam catuṣpade.

Likewise the second half of RV v 1.5 reads:

dame dame sapta ratnā dadhānō’gnirhotā niśādā yajīyān

In these verses Rudra-Agni is said to endow each household with the seven ratnas. What these seven ratnas given to each household by Rudra-Agni were, we have apparently no means of elucidating now. The explanation of Śaunaka given in the verse from the Bṛhad-devatā is obviously a relatively late one and can hardly be accepted as explaining the sapta ratna of every house. This explanation moreover is not given at RV. v, 1.5 where it occurs first but at vi, 74, because at this point it serves as a convenient introduction to the story of an emperor which follows in the Bṛhad-devatā. Śāyaṇa’s comment at vi, 1.5 reads: dame dame tattadyāgaghrē sapta ratnā ramaṇīyāḥ sapta jñātāh dadhānāḥ dhārayamāṇāḥ athavā yajamāněbhyaḥ saptavidhūni ratnāni
dadhānāḥ. Thus he interprets the expression alternatively as ‘the seven beautiful flames’ of Agni, or the seven precious things given to the sacrificer by him. In dealing with the similar passage at vi, 74 he definitely attributes the sapta ratna to the gods addressed in the hymn, Soma and Rudra, and says : api ca yuvām sapta ratnā ratnāmi dadhānā dhārayantau. Among modern commentators LUDWIG.za interprets the phrase to mean ‘sieben freuden,’ i.e., seven pleasures or gratifications, and says in his notes: according to GRASSMAN, he (Agni) had seven treasures, but the seven treasures are however only one treasure. GRASSMAN in his Wörterbuch suggests that ratna is connected with rā and means a thing presented, which is also the view held by the authors of the St. Petersburg Lexicon where RV. v. 1.5 is cited. GRASSMAN’s translation of the phrase in both the contexts is quite straight and assumes that the gods invoked presented the seven treasures to each householder: In Jedeur Hause sieben schatze schenkend sass Agni meder als cler beste opfrer (v. 1.5). In Jedes Haus legt eure sieben schätze; seid uns zum Heil, den Menscham und den Thieren.a

Śaunaka’s verse is thus the earliest clear reference to the ‘seven jewels’ of the Cakravartin; but the expression Saptā-ratna is Vedic. It has often been suggested that the idea of groups of seven is traceable in the last resort to Babylon, and that in the recurrence of this figure in Indian ideology we must recognise evidence of Babylonian influence on Indo-Aryan thought. In the number of days in the week, of holy ṛṣis, of lokas, of the walls (prākēra) surrounding a large temple and so on, the number seven does play a conspicuous part; and there is reason to think that this feature was really of Semitic origin. It is not impossible that the sapta ratna of the Rg Veda is another such instance, for the earliest contacts between Indo-Germanic peoples

10. No. 341.
11. GRASSMAN: Rig Veda, i, pp. 161 and 300.
12. KIRFEL, Die Kosmographie Der Inder, p. 32.
and the Semites have been traced to the middle of the second millennium B.C.

Before leaving the significance of the jewels and their number, seven, we may note that Przyłuski has argued that not only this number, but the entire notion of the Cakravartin is to be traced to Babylon. Buddhist descriptions of the residence of the Cakravartin represent the town as surrounded by seven enclosures of different colours at the centre of which stands the royal palace. These walls enclose a park containing trees entirely made up of precious substances. One recognises in such accounts the seven walls of Egbatana, comparable to the stages of the Babylonian Zikurrat and the image of the Garden of Eden. The notion of Cakravartin, inexplicable in India cut up into a multitude of petty kingdoms subject to local rājas, had its origin in Babylon where the king was a universal sovereign conceived in the image of God.

The first historical empire in India was that of the Mauryas and there are clear traces of Persian influences on the imperial polity and organisation of the Mauryas. Przyłuski’s line of thought seeks to trace these influences to their ultimate origins and I think that, in general, there is much to be said in its favour.

If the ‘seven jewels’ mark the preéminence of the emperor after he becomes one, a number of physical characteristics mark him off even at his birth as a mahāpuruṣa distinct from other men. The idea of the mahāpuruṣa and his rôle in the world’s economy has been worked out with tedious elaboration by the Buddhist schools in their canonical works, and the comprehensive elucidation of these texts by Burnouf in Appendix VIII of Lotus de la Bonne Loi is well worth studying for any one who seeks a clear and authoritative presentation of the details on this extensive subject; for besides the thirty-two laksāṇas, we have also eighty anuvyañjanas or secondary marks of beauty, making a total of 112 physical characteristics of the mahāpuruṣa. Hindu thought accepts some of these characteristics and employs them apparently in a haphazard way in the descriptions of avatāras, heroes and emperors, but does not seem to have ever attained the systematic thorough-

14. I have not read the article on La ville du Cakravartin, Influence babylonienne sur le civilisation de l’Inde (1927), but depend on its abstract given at p. 500 of BEFEO, Vol. 34. I may make two observations here. First, the seven enclosures of diverse colours are not confined to Buddhist accounts in India, but are known to Brahmanical literature, particularly of a tantric variety. I would mention the description of Lalitāpura, the abode of the Devī Lalitā, in Brahmāṇḍa Purāṇa IV, 31. 34-80. Secondly, Przyłuski may be right to derive Egbatana from Assyrian, bitāmu, bitāmau, meaning ‘palace’ with the prefix hāg-. But I doubt very much the connections he seeks to establish between this group and Potali, Potala, Potalaka on the one side, and Patala, Pāṭaliputra on the other, as well as Patna, Patana, pattana, and pāṭaṇa. It is well known that Pāṭalī in the name Pāṭaliputra (pura) is often taken to be either the flower of that name whence Kusumapura, a fairly early name for the city, or a goddess so designated.
ness of Buddhist scripture. The Viśṇu Purāṇa for instance in narrating the birth of so celebrated an emperor as Prthu is just content to say:

\[
\text{haste tu dakaśine cakrāṁ dṛṣṭvā tasya pitāmahāḥ}
\]
\[
\text{Viṣṇor-amśam Prthuṁ matvā paritoṣāṁ pariṁ yayau}
\]
\[
\text{Viśṇucakram kare cihnam sarvesāṁ cakravartināṁ}
\]
\[
\text{bhavatyavyāhato yasya prabhāvastrīdaśairapi.}
\]

The verses from the Vāyu Purāṇa cited above, on the other hand, employ many expressions which are identical or closely similar to the lakṣāṇas or anuvyāñjanas of Buddhist literature, and it may be interesting to trace these here, giving references to BURNOUF'S discussion of the terms themselves or their counterparts:

\[
\text{Padmapatrāyatāksāḥ—cf. A. 57. Viśālanetraḥ.}
\]
\[
\text{Susamhitāḥ—cf. A. 28. Susamāhitagātraḥ.}
\]
\[
\text{Mattamātaṅgagāminah—cf. A. 29. Suvibhaktagātraḥ.}
\]
\[
\text{Nyagrodhaparimalandāḥ—L. 20. Nyagrodhaparimalandāḥ.}
\]
\[
\text{Keśāṣṭhitā—L. 1. Uṣṇīṣaṭiṣṭhakāḥ.}
\]

I take this term Keśāṣṭhitā from the variant reading given in Ānand. ed. of the Vāyu. The body of the text has Keśāṣṭhitā which will go with lalātornā that follows, but make no intelligible sense. As may be expected, the Matsya and Brahmāṇḍa offer no help. Matsya has Keśāḥ sthitāḥ and Br. improves it into Keśāḥ snāgadhāḥ. In elucidating the term uṣṇīṣaṭiṣṭhakāḥ BURNOUF considered several alternative explanations in the light of the various authorities cited by him and came ultimately to the conclusion that, as indicated by his Tibetan authorities, the term meant that the mahāpuruṣa's head is crowned by a protuberance of the skull—"sa tete est couronnée par une protubérance (du crane)"). This interpretation has found universal acceptance since, and is supported by the Buddha sculptures. It seems to me that Keśāṣṭhitā also means exactly this; literally it can be rendered:

15. Citations from works on Sāmudrikālakṣāṇa are found in Lexicons like the Sabḍakalpadruma. There are some published works of this class and many mss. Varāhamihira's Brhat samhītā ch. 69 on Pañcamahāpuruṣalakṣāṇas seems to stand by itself. Laksāṇas are also treated of in medical works like the recently published Kāśyapasamhītā.


17. In the following list L = Laksāṇa, A = Anuvyāñjana.
'having a bone in the midst of the hair on the head', and this is the reason why I have suggested this as the correct reading.

It may be noted further that as in the Lalitavistara account of the Buddha, this figures as the first of the Lakṣaṇas in a deliberate enumeration of superhuman physical traits of the cakravartin following the statement: lakṣaṇaiścā'pi jāyante śāriṣastraiḥ-amānuṣaiḥ so that the position of the attribute furnishes some reason for seeing in it an equivalent of uṣṇīṣastrakātā.

* Lalāṭornā—

* Jihvā cāsyapramārjanā—

* Tāmraprabhoṣṭhadantoṣṭāḥ—

* Śrīvatsāḥ—

* Ṛdhvaromaśāḥ—

* Ājanubāhahavah—

* Jālahastāḥ—

* Vṛṣāṅkitāḥ—

* Nyagrodhaparināhāḥ—

* Simhaskandāḥ—

* Sumehanāḥ—

* Gajendragatayah—

L. 4. īrṇā bhruvor-madhya jātā himarajata prakāśā.

L. 12. prabhūta-tanujihvah. 

Br. has Tāmraprabhoṣṭha netrāśca, which seems better.

A. 17. bimboṣṭhaḥ, Dharmapradipikā having rattotthata. 

A. 80. śrīvatsa - svastika - nandya-varta-vardhamāna-samsthānaveṣah.

L. 22. Udhhvāgrā - 'bhipradaksināvartaromā, for which Dharmapradipikā has uddhagalomo. 

L. 18. sthitah 'navanatapralambā-bāhuḥ. BURNOUF cites the Dharmapradipikā as saying here: tthita-kova anonamanto ubhohi pānita-lehi jaunukāni parimasati parimajjati. 

Also A. 22, paralambabāhuḥ. 


A. 37. has rṣabhavat-samantraprāsidiḥ, a term by no means clear, and not a close parallel either. 

This is a repetition in the Purāṇa, see above.


L. 23. Kośopagatavastiguhyāḥ. 

See under Mattamātāṅgagāminah above.
Mahāhanavah—

Pādayoścakra-matsyau, hastayoh śāṅkha-padmau—


A. 31. Adhāh karma talayōscakre jāte citre arcismati prabhāsvare site sahasrāre sanemike sanābhike.

This detailed comparison of the Purāṇa text with the Buddhist texts shows that in spite of the differences noticed between them we may well believe that they give only different versions of more or less the same set of ideas that prevailed upon the subject. The Puranic list is selective and gives only a part of the attributes as may be seen by turning to the full lists discussed by BURNOUF. But there is little room to doubt the identity of the ideal of mahāpuruṣa entertained by both the sets of texts; and it must be confessed that a person who possessed the attributes listed by these texts may not exactly tally with notions of manly beauty current among us to-day. And it is curious to note that the commentary on the Mahāpādāna sūttanta explains the traits of long fingers and toes with the remark: ‘And all four, fingers and toes, are of equal length, like a monkey’s.’ It is clear that we do not possess the key at present to the satisfactory elucidation of the conventional ideal of a mahāpuruṣa. BURNOUF indeed wrote: ‘The reader acquainted with the principal productions of Brahmanical literature will recognise here for the first time the sort of beauty that Indians attributed to their heroes. The description of the characteristic traits of a great man (Mahāpuruṣa), as the Buddhists conceive him, has been carried out according to the ideal type of beauty imagined by Indian poets. I add that these traits that we shall find scattered in the productions of Brahmanic literature are exactly those that according to the best informed observers of our time still exist among the highest ranks of the Indian population.’ I am somewhat sceptical of any one being able to demonstrate that these ideal traits are drawn from life, and feel more at one with BURNOUF when he says that there is here a medley of traits belonging to both the sexes, perhaps we might add ‘and to some animals’, that seems shocking to us.

However that may be, this type became among Buddhists the external sign of the most perfect wisdom or of unlimited power. Such a mahāpuruṣa would become either a Buddha or a Cakravartin, and there is no third alternative: ‘to one so endowed two careers lie open and none other’, dve gati bhavato na tṛṭiya. If he renounces domestic life, he becomes Buddha; ‘if he lives the life of the House, he becomes Lord of the Wheel, a righteous Lord of the Right, ruler of the four quarters, conqueror, guardian of the people’s good, owner of the Seven Treasures. His do these seven treasures become, to wit, the Wheel treasure, the Elephant treasure, the Horse treasure, the Gem treasure, the Woman treasure, the Steward treasure, the Eldest Son treasure making seven’.

The enumeration of the seven treasures varies in different accounts, though the Buddhist books adhere to the details in the conventional text just cited from the Mahāpādāna sūtra. Our Purāṇa text gives an alternative account of fourteen treasures, falling in two groups of seven each. The genesis of these texts and the exact course of their development can no longer be traced; it will be noticed, however, that some of these treasures like Horse, Elephant, Mani, and even Woman, recall the legend of the churning of the ocean for nectar—amṛtamathana, in the course of which they issued one after another from the sea before amṛta was secured; others like the steward, purohita and so on clearly recall the ratnīnīs of the Vedic period.

It is also of some interest to note in this connection that in the Royal Terrace at Ankor Thom there was discovered by M. Marchal in 1916 a curious image in high relief of a horse with five heads, very imposing by its dimensions. The debris of another horse not less imposing and with seven heads was discovered near the same monument in 1917. The sculpture of the five-headed horse is reproduced in pl. xxi of the Bulletin de l'École Française d'Extreme-Orient (Vol. xxviii), and no apology is needed for reproducing here (in translation) the accompanying description of the sculpture by M. Goloubew and his discussion of its significance.

"The giant horse which is in the middle of it, shows its front, very much shortened, its chest swelled and full of assurance, on its fore limbs whose massive forms remind us of the legs of an elephant. The central head is a little bigger than the others. The ornaments of the animal are similar to those worn by gods and kings. They comprise a conical mukutam surrounded by three lotus-form circles, a large pendant necklace, and a double pair of bracelets around the legs. Besides, each bridle is taken up to the eyes and at the point where in certain idols a frontal eye is shown, a flower with four petals is fixed to the forelock which sprawls like a palm-leaf. One more detail which merits our attention for a moment is added to these: on the top of each head, two locks of hair are rolled around the ears and passed through two gold rings, ornamented with pearls, above which is a little pointed horn. The significance of this detail is not clear to us: It does not appear to be borrowed, nor is it the customary ornament of the Khmer idols, nor does it belong to those horses, which are seen on the bas-reliefs of Ankor. But it is perhaps only a simple fancy of the sculptor, suggested by some coiffure of the period.

"What myth is recalled by this curious representation, and what is the name of the mysterious horse? What may appear beyond doubt is the fact that we have before us not a theme of ordinary decoration, but a scene of adoration, and the hero is manifestly a horse of king Cakravarti, an aśvavatana. The latter receives all the honours due to his high rank. The triple parasols shade his heads, to the right and left. Dancers accompany him, and some demons with menacing looks, armed with the staff (danāda) clear his road paved with lotus from all intruders. And crouching between his fore hoofs,
armed with a scraper is seen a horseman, one who doubtless gathers the ambrosial drug of this sacred beast."20a.

If this interpretation of the equine sculpture of Ankor Thom is correct, we have evidence of the prevalence of the conceptions of the Cakravartin and his attributes in the kingdom of Kamboja in the tenth century A.D. And in fact evidence dating from a time several centuries earlier is seen to point to the same conclusion. PELLOTT21 has drawn attention to an interesting fragment preserved from the writings of two Chinese ambassadors who visited Fu-nan, the predecessor of the Kambojan kingdom, about 245-50 A.D. This fragment22 from the description of foreign countries by one of the ambassadors K'ang T'ai by name, reads: 'They say in the foreign countries under heaven that there are three affluences, the abundance of men in China, that of jewels in Ta-ts'in, and that of horses among the Yue-tche'. To understand the significance of this text, the reader must recall a similar passage in the celebrated work of Hiuen Tsang which contains a comprehensive review of some legendary notions of cosmography and polity that seem to have a direct bearing on the subject of our study: Says Hiuen Tsang:23

"In the ocean, resting on a golden disk, is the mountain Sumeru composed of four precious substances; along its middle the sun and moon revolve and on it the Devas sojourn.

"Around the Sumeru mountain are seven mountains and seven seas and the water of the seas between the mountains has the 'eight virtues': outside the seven Gold Mountains is the Salt Sea. In the sea (or ocean) there are, speaking summarily, four habitable islands, viz. Pi-t'i-ha Island in the east, Chan-pu Island in the south, Ku-t'o-ni in the west, and Kou-lo Island in the north. The influence of a Gold-wheel king extends over these four islands, a Silver-wheel king rules over all except the north one, a Copper-wheel king rules over the South and East Islands, and an Iron-wheel king bears sway only over Chan-pu island. When a "wheel-king" is about to arise a gold, silver, copper or iron wheel, according to the Karma of the man, appears for him in the air and gives him his title while indicating the extent of his dominion".

Here we see clearly the Buddhist conception of the earth as made up of Four islands in the four quarters and of the universal cakravartin and his lesser compeers. The pilgrim then describes the Anavatapta lake in the centre of Jambudvipa as he puts it, which should be regarded, as WATTERS observes, 'as a thing of fairy land, as in the Earthly Paradise or Garden of Eden'. This lake is adorned with precious metals and substances on its sides, and four great rivers flow out of it, one on each side through the mouth of a specified animal. The whole description may be tabulated thus:

20a BEFEO, xxviii, p. 230 and plate opposite.
East  South  West  North
Silver  Gold  Lapis lazuli  Crystal
Ox  Elephant  Horse  Lion
Ganges  Indus  Oxus  Sītā
S. E. sea  S. W. sea  N. W. sea  N. E. sea

The pilgrim next speaks of the Four Lords (sovereigns) who divide Jambudvīpa in the absence of a Cakravarti over that island. The facts given here may be shown thus:

South (India)  West  North  East (China)
Elephant lord  Lord of Precious substances  Horse-lord  Man-lord

Though Hiuen-Tsang's account gives the names only of the Southern and Eastern kingdoms, we get the names of the remaining from another contemporary account cited by Pelliot in a note at the end of his memoir on the Four Sons of Heaven. One of Hiuen-Tsang's assistants who aided him in his literary work after his return from India was Tao-Siuan, and he says (c. 664-67 A.D.) explicitly that the Western kingdom over which the lord of precious substances ruled was Persia, and the Northern kingdom of the lord of horses was called Hien-Yun (i.e. Hiung-nu, here Turcs, etc.)

It will be seen that the theory of the four sovereigns is founded rather more in the facts of history and geography than the mystical conceptions of the Anavatapta lake and Cakravartin; still there are some elements in common between them. In his interesting paper Le Symbolisme du Pili er de Sarnath, Przyluski considers the relation between these theories and observes: 'The myth of the lake Anavatapta and the four rivers supposes a division of space in four parts. The theory of the four sovereigns rests on an analogous basis. The two tetrads must have reacted on each other'. The chances of contamination were very great between the series of the four symbolic animals (of the lake) and those of the four sovereigns: the two series had the horse and the elephant in common and both took up particular directions in space. We can understand, in such conditions, that man, the attribute of one of the sovereigns, could take the place of one of the symbolic animals.  

However that may be, K'ang T'ai and Hiuen Tsang are doubtless speaking of one and the same thing though at a great interval and with many differences, the most important of them being the omission of India with its elephants. Well might Pelliot ask: 'Did India figure in this narrative originally and K'ang T'ai misunderstand what he heard? Or did India originate

this saying on its three neighbouring empires leaving herself out of the reckoning." 28

But this tradition of the four kings occurs in all its fulness in a Chinese work of 392 A.D. This work Che eul yeou king, a short resume of the mythical genealogy, the youth and the first twelve years of the ministration of the Buddha Sākyamuni, was rendered into Chinese by a monk from central Asia, Kālodaka by name.29 In a sort of Appendix to this work we read:

"In Yen-feon-li (Jambudvīpa) there are sixteen great kingdoms, with 84,000 walled towns; there are eight kings and Four Sons of Heaven. In the east there is the son of Heaven of the Tsin (=China); there the population is prosperous. In the South, there is the son of Heaven of the kingdom of T'ien-tchou (India); the land there produces many renowned elephants. In the west there is the son of the kingdom of Ta-ts'in (Eastern Mediterranean); this land abounds in gold, silver, jewels, jade. In the North-West there is the Son of Heaven of the Yue-tche (Indo-Scythians); the land there produces many excellent horses."

The sixteen mahājanapadas of India of the Buddha's time and the eight kings who partook of his relics are well known. But the account of the Four Sons of Heaven was not so well-known until Pelliot drew attention to it, and pointed out at the same time that this tradition was repeated by the Emperor of China to the Arab merchant Ibn Wahab about 872-5 A.D. as recorded by Abu Zayd Hasan.30 The tradition is thus traceable to fairly early Buddhist sources of Indian origin; it has also had a long career in India in subsequent times when it underwent many modifications as its original significance was forgotten. When the titles Gajapati, Aśvapati and Narapati occur in the literature and epigraphy of the period or among the titles of Mahārāṇa Kumbha as:

gaja-nara-turāṇgādhiśa-rājat-tritaya-toddaramallena

we see how far we have moved from the ideas underlying the text of Kālodaka cited above.31 And it is worth noting that the earliest account of this tradition so far traced is that of K'ang T'ai who heard of it in the third century A.D. in Fu-nan, 'one more indication' as Pelliot puts it 'of the active exchange of ideas, legends and beliefs as well as products between Western Asia and the Far East by way of the Indian ocean'.32

31. Colophon to Rana Kumbha's Commentary in *Gita Govinda*. I owe this reference to Dr. C. K. RAJA. Lassen cites recent traditions connecting the notions of aśvapati etc. with the break-up of Pāṇḍava empire *JA*. ii, 27-8.
32. Pelliot adds that K'ang T'ai also met an envoy from India who brought to the king of Fu-nan four horses of the country of Yue-tche. He also suggests that K'ang T'ai himself might have been of Sogdian origin and travelled to Fu-nan by way of India and the Sea—*ib.*, pp. 123-4.
There is an important passage in the Kathā sarit sāgara on the mythical king Vikramāditya which deserves to be reproduced here:

Vikramāditya ity āśīrd rājā Pāṭaliprutake | |
tasyābhūtām abhipretā mittre Hayapatirmṛpaḥ | |
rājā Gajapatiścobhau bahvaśvagajasādhanau | |
śatru Narapatir bhūri-pādatas-tasyā cābhavat | |
mānino Narasimhākhyāḥ Pratisthānēsvaro balī | |

PRZYLUŚKI who cites this in his paper on the Sarnath pillar notes that only three kings appear here and suggests that the Ratnapati was perhaps forgotten after the titles of the king came to be connected with the traditional divisions of the Indian army into corps of chariots, elephants, horse and infantry.

We have thus a long history of the ideas relating to monarchy and imperial rule, in which fact and fancy, religious symbolism and material conditions obtaining in different lands, acted and reacted on one another, and old ideas took new shapes as old associations were forgotten and new ones came to be entertained. There was in general a tendency to substitute the known and the familiar for the mystic and recondite whenever the latter was not correctly understood. But he would be a bold man who would attempt to trace in any detail the various steps in this complicated process. We may trace the beginnings and study the affiliations of ideas; get cross-sections at particular points where the evidence is favourable to this; we can see something of the final result. As for the actual history of it all, we have not the material for hazarding even intelligent guesses at the truth.

To return once more to our basic text. Some of the Purānic expressions employed of the cakravarti attribute to him other amenities and capacities. Thus the vague sentence bhadrānimāni teśām vai bhavantiha mahākṣitām, these kings will have here these auspicious things, may contain a reference to the aṣṭa-mangalas, eight auspicious things, of which again different lists are given by different authorities. Again, the four abhutas and the asimādi aisvāryas and so on, take us to yet another sphere, viz., that of a siddха who has accumulated miraculous powers by the successful practice of yoga. And the statement that the cakravartins excel the rṣis by their tapas need cause no surprise after the description of their eminence in so many directions.

One of the most interesting among the relatively late references to the Cakravarti tradition occurs in a Tamil Jaina work, of about the thirteenth century A.D., the Jivasambodhanai, which is being edited by my friend and colleague in the Tamil department of the University, Rao Saheb S. Vaiyapuri Pillai. The work is in the form of Vepbā verses connected by a running commentary, generally written in prose, but occasionally in verse also. Both text and commentary are evidently the work of one author, as the text taken by itself often gives no intelligible meaning without the connecting links furnished by the prose passages. Now verses 65-70 of the opening section of this
work contain an elaborate account of Sagara and his imperial attributes, and
I give below a detailed analysis of the verses and the intervening commentary:

65. Sagara, a famous 'wheel-king' of Ayodhya, in the Bharata Kṣetra
of Jambudvīpa divided into separate regions by the seven Kulaparvatas.

Com. Sagara was Śaṭkhaṃḍādhipati. The term Sakalacakravarti is ex-
plained thus: 'one who rules a crore of grāmas is a makuṭaṇvardhana; the
suzerain of 500 makuṭaṇvardhanas is an Adhi (ka) rājān; of 1000 a mahārāja,
of 2000 an ardhamanḍalika, of 4000 a maṇḍalika; of 8000 a mahāmanḍalika,
of 16,000 an ardhaacakravarti or vāsudeva, and of 32,000 a sakalacakravarti'.
And such was Sagara who had 96,000 queens, 360 cooks, 360 physicians, three
and a half crores of bandhus (relatives), besides 16,000 gaṇabaddhadevas who
acted as his body guards.

66. Elephant, lion, āḷī (a fabulous animal), king-kite, moon, fish,
poison (?), makara, lotus, śivan, conch, peacock, and pitcher were put on his
banners.

Com: Besides these a bheri, mṛdang, throne, stars, fly-whisks, pañca-
mahāśabdas and other innumerable insignia of royalty were also there.

67. Possessor of the inexhaustible nava-nidhis, measuring at the least
eight yojanas in height, twelve in length and nine in breadth.

68. The names of the nine nidhis (1) vaṇḍogai, (2) mānogai, (3) pin-
galigai, (4) padumai, (5) saṅgai, (6) vēsaṅgai, (7) Kāḷai, (8) mākāḷai,
(9) sarvarada (na)m, (Sarvaratham).

Com: details in verse of the powers of each of the nidhis, thus—(1) will
yield food-grains, cardamom, pepper etc.; (2) arms of war including bodily
armour; (3) ornaments for men, women, horses and chariots; (4) textiles, fly-whisks etc.; (5) cool wind, sandal paste, scented water, shade etc.;
(6) instruments of music; (7) speech, letters and astrology; (8) agriculture,
trade and the arts; and (9) precious stones of all sorts and the seven kinds
of metals. All these nidhis are at the beck and call of the cakravarti.

69. The fourteen ratnas named—first the seven live ones viz., horse,
elephant, carpenter (cf. rathakṛt in the Puraṇa list), woman (bhāryā of the
Puraṇa), commander, kāvalan or bhanḍārī (i.e. treasurer who takes the place
of mantri of the Puraṇic list) and astrologer (cf. Purohit of the Puraṇa);
then the seven non-living ones (this list differs considerably from that of
the Puraṇa) viz., kākaṇi, cakra, leather, cuḍāmaṇi, danda, umbrella and sword.

Com: description mostly in verse, of the nature and use of each of these
ratnas in order. Only the peculiarities need be noted here: The 'horse'
(mā) is not the ordinary horse, but a fabulous animal of the emerald hue
which roams over the entire field of battle simultaneously meeting all opposi-
tion of the fighting units put in the field by the enemy; the carpenter is really
an architect of great capacity who could plan and execute all types of buildings
and towns; the Kākaṇi gives out bright light like the sun and the moon; the
leather spreads itself over water at the king's command for a distance of 48
kādams; cūḷamaṇi is a protection against poisons and magic; the dāṇḍa levels the ground perfectly.

70. He is unrivalled in his wealth, beauty of form, courage, strength, and the glory of being guarded by Devas.

Com: 84 lakhs of auspicious elephants (bhadrakāla), same number of chariots of war, 18 crores of horse, 84 crores of infantry and other paraphernalia attended on Sāgara.

Perhaps the attribution of so much puissance to a mythical ruler like Sāgara in a late scriptural work of the Jainas should cause no surprise when it is recalled that in a much earlier work of the Baudhāyas, the Mahāvamsa, which professes to be a historical chronicle, we find the Mauryan emperor Aśoka already endowed with the power to command the services of the devas and nāgas, birds and beasts for the fulfilment of the daily routine of his life.33 When exactly this practice began of endowing cakravartins with miraculous powers, it is not easy to determine now; but as has been pointed out by Przyłęski, it is necessary to guard ourselves against the notion that this was always so. ‘In the beginning’, he says,34 ‘the Cakravartin was without doubt a king more powerful than his neighbours, exercising his power over an extensive but still limited territory. Then this real notion was transported in the domain of legend; they imagined fabulous kings, masters of the universe, commanding all kinds of creatures’. Przyłęski then proceeds to use this conclusion as a canon of criticism for dating his texts on Aśoka, holding that a text which admits any defeat or discomfiture for the Emperor must be taken to date from a relatively earlier period when the conception of the unlimited power of the Cakravartin had not yet come into vogue. But there seems to be room to doubt the validity of both parts of Przyłęski’s thesis—that regarding the relation between historical fact and quasi-religious theory, as also that about the priority of certain texts to others on the score of their accepting limits to the power of the emperor. The relative chronology of literary texts is always a difficult problem, and the undoubtedly early character of some of the texts we have considered in the course of this paper and others which may be easily produced, may well raise a doubt if Przyłęski’s ground here is as sure as he seems to have thought.

34. La legende de l’Empereur Aśoka, p. 102.
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I. INTRODUCTION.

The discovery and the publication within the last two decades of a number of ancient Malayālam prose manuscripts have revealed the existence of quite a respectable prose literature for Mal. in the earlier stages of its history. The publication of these works [Dūtavākyam, based on a 14th century Ms.; Brahmāṇḍapurāṇam gadyam, based on a 15th century Ms.; Bhāgavatam bhāṣa, based on Late Mal. Mss.; Uttararāmāyaṇam gadyam, based on two Mss., one of which is a 16th century Ms.] has dispelled once for all the impression that the only prose compositions that existed in Kērala prior to Kōyiltamburāṇ's "Akbar" (early 19th century) were only a few commentaries written in pedestrian prose besides the so-called "gadya" of the campus, which "gadya" is after all only thinly concealed "padya" in Dravidian metres.

The early prose works that have been unearthed within recent years are not devoid of literary beauty and artistic excellence. Here and there in these works, one comes across passages of rare vigour and appeal, though side by side with such brilliant patches the old clichés also abound.

All these prose works appear to have been written by scholars who wished to popularise religious and puranic lore among the masses who were not acquainted with Sanskrit. The influence of tradition on these authors was so strong that the language employed by them cannot be said to represent the actual colloquials of the respective periods, though colloquial elements exist also in varying proportions in the different texts.

The recently published prose work called "Varttamāṇappustagam" written by an eighteenth-century Malayāḷi Christian, is however written in a language that is nearer allied to the colloquial speech of the author. The
author, Pāgēmmakkal Tōmā-k-kattāpār, gives in this work a graphic and circumstantial picture of the itinerary and experiences of Karivyāṭṭi Yauseppu Malpān who, accompanied by the author himself, undertook a journey to Rome primarily with the object of memorialising the Pope regarding the need for freeing the Catholic Syrian diocese of Malabar from the domination of European missionaries and for conferring on the Kērāḷa Syrians autonomy in the government of their own religious affairs. This Malpān appears to have been a man of such extraordinary independence and firmness of purpose that defeats or temporary reverses did not daunt him in pursuing his self-imposed task of liberating the Malaṅgara Syrian community from the domination of European missionaries. Tōma-k-kattāpār, the author of the Varttamāṇa ppustagam, who practically acted as the Secretary, shared his chief’s hatred of European missionaries, as is shown by his powerful indictment of their “tyranny” in Malabar.—The book is written in a very vigorous style and it bears the stamp of sincerity on every page. The language used in the work is based on the colloquial current at the period in the regions occupied by the Syrian Christians (viz. North Travancore and South Cochin).

The colloquial that was studied by some of the European missionaries who came to Kērāḷa during this period was this same colloquial of the Catholic Syrian community. The language used in the eighteenth-century Saṅkēpa-vēdārtham which has been proved to have been written by an Italian Carmelite friar who knew Mal. fairly well and who got the work printed in Rome in 1772 after getting the Mal. types cast in Rome itself, is (except for some peculiarities of syntax) fundamentally the same as the speech of the Catholic Syrians of the time.

This Carmelite friar also wrote a Latin work called “Alphabetum grandonico-malabaricum” dealing with the letters of the Mal. alphabet (Ārya Elutta) and their sound-values (so far as he could observe them). This book contains a Preface (written by J. C. Amadutius) followed by eleven chapters (besides a Prologus) written by Peanius himself. In the Preface, Amadutius deals in general terms with Malabar and Christianity, offers a few observations on Kērāḷa literature, mentions the names of the Mss. of religious and secular works of European missionaries and Indian priests, kept in the archives of Italy and other parts of Europe, and concludes with a brief discussion of the question of Kērāḷa and St. Thomas, the apostle. In the Prologus, Peanius treats about a variety of topics, in the treatment of some of which he makes mistakes.¹ The Prologus is followed by eleven chapters dealing consecutively with the following:—vowels, simple consonants, consonants embodying superscripts and subscripts denoting vowels, conjunct

¹. For instance, Peanius attempts to distinguish what he calls “Grandonic” from “Sanscrudonic”, though he is forced to admit that the distinction is only one of script employed in the writing of works.

Again, in the course of a few very superficial observations on Mal. grammar, Peanius wrongly equates the genitive case to the dvitiya, the dative to the tṛtiya, the accusative to the caturthi, and so on.
consonants, consonantal geminates, absolute consonantal finals, different consonantal groupings, correct pronunciation of consonants, "letters" wanting in Malayalam, shapes of Mal. numerals, and a few extracts from Mal. religious writings.

I have also referred, in the course of the following pages, to a Mal. translation of the four gospels, printed at the Courier Press in Bombay in 1810, which contains numerous words and forms that are similar to those met with in Varttamappustagam and Samksæpavëdârtham. This translation, I am told, was made by a Jacobite Syrian Rambân of Central Travancore at the instance of Buchanan. The rendering is said to have been made directly from the Syriac Bible. Though many old Mal. words, forms and usages are used, there are also peculiar corruptions, strange constructions (due to the influence of the syntax of Syriac, I am told) and artificial transmutations that definitely betray the interference of non-Malayâlis. The full circumstances in which the translation was printed in Bombay might perhaps explain these artificialities. Notwithstanding these defects, I find in this translation a number of old words and forms identical with, or very similar to, those used in Vartt. and Samksæpavëdârtham.

Another Christian work of this period, a few passages from which have been extracted by Dr. P. J. Thomas in his book on the "Christian Literature of Kërala", is a Mal. rendering of the rules, injunctions and prohibitions, issued by the Synod of Diamper; the Mal. translation is said to have been made in the 17th century (?) by one Câkk{o}-k-kattanâr. So far as I can judge from the extracts supplied by Dr. Thomas, the language of the Mal. rendering is very much the same as that of other 17th and 18th century Christian compositions.

Here I must refer also to two dictionaries of this period (roughly speaking) which were composed by Christians and which may be presumed to embody words and expressions current in the language of the Christians.

The Portuguese-English and English-Portuguese Dictionaries, called by Gundert the "Verapoly Dictionaries", are (to cite the words of Gundert who has freely utilised the materials of these dictionaries for his own work) "very valuable works compiled by the Portuguese and Italian missionaries of Verapoly, which though completed in 1746 rest upon materials accumulated in the 17th, perhaps even the 16th century, and rank as the oldest monuments extant of European scholarship in India."

No copy of this work is available to-day; but the numerous items cited by Gundert in his work sufficiently indicate that the work may have been mainly based on the language of the Christians. It will be seen from the section on vocabulary below that most of the words (from the Christian texts Vartt., SV and even BG) are represented in the Verapoly Dictionaries.

The other dictionary to which I refer here is the one composed by the Rev. B. Bailey (of the Church Missionary Society). Though the work was printed in 1846, the materials were collected (as Bailey observes in the Preface) somewhere about 1816, and so the language should have been
closely allied to that of the 18th century. The title of the book indicates that both literary and colloquial words were incorporated. Though Bailey was a Protestant missionary, his dictionary contains numerous words that occur in Vartt. and in SV: e.g. cemmōrta, titadi, patṭāna, camayam, caradam, jagmādharam, hiddham, yāvāna, vyāpti.

In the following pages I shall discuss the phonetic and palaeographic data furnished by Peanius' book “Alphabetum Grandonico-Malabaricum” (abbreviated as P Alph), and also analyse the linguistic peculiarities of the following texts:

“Saṃkṣēpavēdārtham” (abbreviated hereinafter as SV.)

“Varttamānappustagam” (abbreviated hereinafter as Vartt.)

Jacobite Syrian Gospels printed in Bombay in 1811 (abbreviated hereinafter as BG).

Now, the language used in these books (i.e. Varttamānappustagam, Saṃkṣēpavēdārtham as also the language discussed and excerpted in Alphabetum Grandonico-Malabaricum) has a number of common linguistic peculiarities (which I have classified below). Whether all these peculiarities were exclusive to the dialect spoken by the Kērala Christians of the localities mentioned above during the period under reference is a matter that requires further investigation. Prima facie one would expect that the cultural separation of the Kērala Christians from the Hindus, so rigorously enjoined and enforced by the Synod of Udaiyampērūr in 1599 should have brought in its wake the “crystallization”, so to say, of a number of linguistic peculiarities in the dialect of this community.

It has to be remembered in this connection that prior to the Synod of Diamper the Christians had unrestricted intellectual contacts with the Hindus, as is shown abundantly by the large number of Hindu usages condemned by the Synod as unworthy of orthodox Catholic Christians.

It is quite possible that the influence of European missionaries and of the increasing popularity of the study of Latin and Portuguese may have contributed to the creation of some syntactic and vocabularial peculiarities in the “learned” dialect; and once such peculiarities arose in the language of learned priests, they may have tended to percolate in some measure to their parish “flocks” whom the priests “fed” and “tended.” All this, however, requires to be checked by further investigation along the following directions:—(a) comparison of the features of this speech with those of other communities during the same period, and also with the language spoken today by the Christians of the same localities; and (b) an intensive inquiry into the influence which the syntax and vocabulary of Latin and Portuguese (the two chief European languages popular in Kērala during the period)

---

1. The reference made, in the chapter on vocabulary, to the Verapoly dictionaries and Bailey's Dictionary are indicated respectively by the abbreviations VD and Bailey enclosed within square brackets.
may have exercised on the language of at least the learned Christian writers of the period.

It is not my intention in these pages to determine to what extent the peculiarities of the language of the texts under reference were exclusive to the Christian community. The materials available are far too scanty to enable me to do this. I have, therefore, chiefly contented myself with discussing the peculiarities of the language when viewed in comparison with the modern standard Mal. colloquial of the Cochin State (i.e. the speech with which I am best acquainted). Here and there in the chapter on vocabulary, I have tried to connect the works with the social and religious life of the Christians.  

II. PEANUS' TRANSLITERATION.

The system of transliteration adopted by PEANIUS for the representation of Mal. sounds through Roman symbols is interesting.

A

In the lists of vowels and consonants, PEANIUS distinguishes the "nomen" of each sound from its "potestas". He attempts to reproduce the names given to the sounds when the letters of the alphabet are taught or reproduced in Kērala in the orthodox way.

According to this orthodox system of "naming" the letters of the alphabet, the following are some of the values still heard among old Aśāg's or preceptors.

(i) Long vowels are "named" āa, īi, ūu, kāa, kii, and so on. PEANIUS' transliteration "āā", "kii" appears to reverse the values. PEANIUS may have mistaken the slight pausal accent of the short final for increased length.

(ii) ē ī ī ā are, according to the orthodox system of naming in Kērala, ēru, ēruu, ēlu, ēluu. PEANIUS gives "ıru", "iruú", "ilu" and "iluú".

(iii) The anusvāra is am. PEANIUS has "am".

(iv) The visarga is ah. PEANIUS gives "ah" "finalis aspirata".

(v) Consonants when "named" always incorporate a : k is ka, and so on.

(vi) The absolute finals l, r, l, n,  are "named" ul etc., or as il, etc. today.— PEANIUS gives the following: "el", "er", "el" (= el).

1. So far as one can say now, the effect of the cultural separation on the language of the 17th and 18th century Kērala Christians may have made itself felt more in the departments of vocabulary and syntax than in phonology and morphology. In the two latter spheres, the effect of the cultural separation may have been largely to isolate collectively a body of native features originally current in the speech of the entire area.

In vocabulary, new adaptations of old words and the association of new meanings with old words, made in order to convey orthodox Christian religious ideas, may have been unique. In syntax, the influence of foreign speeches (Portuguese and Latin) may have been specially active in two directions: (i) non-Dravidian government of cases in learned words, and (ii) religious phrases and constructions, literally translated from European languages.
"iz" (= il), "en" (= en), "en" (= en) and "am"; he gives also "il", "ir", at p. 65 of his book.

(vii) ky, cy, py, uy are all k façon, ci façon, pi façon, vi façon, etc. (with a half-long value for i) when "named" by Asan's even to-day.—PEANiUS mentions these "names".

(viii) Consonant groups with r as the second constituent are evaluated as kéra (for kr), péra (for pr), and so on.—

Similarly kr, pl, etc. are kela, pêla, etc. ; and kv, tv, rv, etc. are kûva, etc. PEANiUS mentions them all.

(ix) Consonant groups formed of r followed by other consonants are "named" erkha (for rk), erppa (for rp or rpp), etc.—PEANiUS has "erkka", etc.

(x) Long consonants like kk, cc, etc. are ikka, icca, etc. ; these are also mentioned by PEANiUS.—Today ukka, usca, etc. are alternative values I have heard.

(xi) PEANiUS gives "inda" for both ud, ud, and ud ; "itta" for both t and t ; and "illa" for both l and ll. "ippa", "imma", "igna" (for ün), "inga" (for ün) are other transliterations used by PEANiUS.

B

As for the transliterations of the actual values or "power" of the sounds, the system adopted by PEANiUS calls for the following comments.

(i) The length mark is not consistently or uniformly indicated by PEANiUS. The marks of the accent aigu and the accent grave are often confusedly interchanged.

(ii) Apart from the length-marks referred to above, no diacritics or special ligatures are used by PEANiUS, so much so that the same symbol stands for different sounds, as when the symbol "s" stands for s and z or "t" for t, t, etc.

(iii) The diphthong ai is transliterated both as "ai" and as "ei".

(iv) mrgam, etc. (with r) are transliterated as "mrugam" "kruva" (with u following r).

(v) Mal. nü is represented as "ng" though, as I have already observed, there is no element of explosion at all in this group. The common transliteration of this Mal. group is even today "ng" when no diacritics are employed ; cf., for instance, the place-name "Angadippuram".

(vi) Mal. c is represented as "ci" in accordance with the Italian system of representation where the palatal character of c is thus distinguished. Similarly, Mal. j is "gi".

(vii) Mal. nü is transliterated by PEANiUS as "gn", since this symbol-group in Italian has the value of a palatal nasal very much resembling the Mal. sound in phonation.

(viii) The aspirate plosive consonants appear as "khh" "ggh" "tth", "ddh", etc.—I may say that the Kërala evaluation of aspirated plosives, es-
pecially when deliberately uttered, certainly strikes the hearer as embodying a long or half-long stop element.

Unaspirated voiced plosives are also sometimes represented with an ʰ following as in “visarggham”, “pūghkHELLAye”, etc.

(x) The fricative g is represented as “j” according to the old Italian method of writing.

(xi) The fricative t is represented as “sci” which is the nearest Italian symbol standing for this fricative.

(xii) l is symbolised as “z” by PEANiUS.

(xiii) While “lg” is the transliteration of the group formed of l and short k, the symbol “llk” is used when long kk follows l; similarly “yg”, but “ykk”.

These symbols used by PEANiUS represent actual pronunciation, just as his “lp” also indicates the voiceless value of p in actual speech, even though it is short.

The voicing of the plosive is correctly indicated in “nd” and “yd” (native Dravidian).

It is quite interesting to note that while the Skt. groups “st” and “pt” show voiceless p, the representation “kd” for the Skt. group constituted of k and t (as in sakti) shows how in the Malaȳlaki evaluation of this group the t was partially voiced in PEANiUS’ days just as it is today. Sakti, bhakti are often heard as sakkudi, bhakkudi today.

(xiv) Though at p. 86 PEANiUS has only the symbol “r” to represent r, he distinguishes ṛ (at p. 72 of his “Alphabet”) by representing it as “ṛr”, and in the excerpts given at the end of the book he transliterates r as “ṛ” in instance like mariamā, porukka, pirāhna, etc. At p. 86 itself, PEANiUS distinguishes r from ṛ by the phrase “asperum valde”.

III. PALÆOGRAPHY.

Through the efforts of PEANiUS, Mal. types were for the first time cast in the Press of the Propaganda in Rome in 1772, as referred to by Amadutius in his Preface to PEANiUS’ “Alphabet”. PEANiUS’ description of the symbols of the letters of the Mal. alphabet in his work is invaluable for the study of eighteenth century Mal. palæography. Many of the symbols are similar to those used today; but there are striking divergencies deserving of notice.—These peculiarities are given below. I also indicate below the resemblances and differences between the symbols given by PEANiUS and those employed in the late 16th century manuscript (now being edited by me in the columns of the Bulletin of the R. V. R. Institute) containing the text of Kuṇaḷ and a Mal. translation thereof.

1. Long ē and long ď are not symbolically distinguished from the corresponding short sounds. PEANiUS indeed refers to the existence of symbols for long ē and long ď, of which the former is like the modern symbol while the latter is represented in two ways, one of which is peculiar in that the length is marked by a loop inside; but PEANiUS points out: “hic scribendi modus ab omnibus constanter non observetur.”
In inscriptions and mss. of an earlier period, long ȫ and long ǝ were not symbolically marked off from short e and short o.

The observations of Peanius show that in the eighteenth century there already existed symbols for the long sounds, but these were not commonly used. Down till the end of the nineteenth century the old practice of using the same symbol for the long and the short sounds appears to have persisted.

2. The candrakkala symbol introduced today (at the right-hand top of the symbols of the consonants preceding) in order to denote the Malayalam pausal ǝ came into existence only in the nineteenth century when Gundert and the Mangalore missionaries suggested the adoption of such a symbol to mark off the ǝ from u.

The pausal ǝ is not distinguished by any special symbol in old works; on the other hand, the practice was to use either the consonantal symbol with the ligature for u embodied (as in the oldest mss. and inscriptions), or the consonantal symbol without any ligatures as if the sound ǝ here was a weak accented a (as in manuscripts and documents of the Late Old Mal. and New Mal. periods).

Peanius invariably adopts the latter practice wherever the pausal ǝ occurs; in non-pausal positions where the sound is more like a close u, Peanius uses u itself as in kāttu kōltuṇaḥ, etc., though not consistently, since there are phrasal units like valattu bhāgatta also.

The manuscript of Kurja mixes up both the practices (mentioned above) indiscriminately.

3. The symbols used here for tū and rū differ in the fact that in the former the outward loop on the right is on a much lower level than in the latter.

4. The usual symbol for kṛ is different from what is used today, though Peanius refers to an alternative symbol corresponding to the one used today.

5. The symbols of niḥ and niḥ are distinguished only by the fact that the latter has a loop between the two bends on the extreme right.

This is true of the representation in the ms. of Kurja.

6. Long āc is represented in Peanius' works by two c symbols, one being placed above the other.

In the ms. of Kurja, the symbol is different: the initial curvature for the symbol for c is repeated twice and placed on the same level.

7. In Peanius' works the symbol for the absolute finals r, l, Ṽ, and n are all similar to modern symbols. That for ṭ alone is old. In the ms. of Kurja the symbols mark the transition stage from the practice of the insertion of a circle on the top of the consonantal symbol (as in Tamil even today) to the modern Mal. practice of connecting the end of the consonantal symbol with the dot by means of a line or loop.—In the ms. of Kurja, already the modern symbols for the absolute finals l and ṭ (modifications respectively of original symbols for absolute final t and ṭ of Skt., which developed the respective sound-values of l and ṭ) are very clearly anticipated; and the
symbol for final m is either an “anusvāraṇappāḷi” as in modern times, or the symbol for m with a dot above.

8. The symbols for native internal consonant groups formed of homorganic nasals and plosives were of two types in ancient times in Ārya. Elutte:—either the anusvāraṇappāḷi followed by the symbol of the voiceless plosive concerned, or special conjunct symbols in which the ligatures for the nasals and the voiceless plosives are entwined.

Both varieties are to be found for īg and mb in Pæanius’ works; but for native internal ṣd, īj and ṣd, only the conjunct symbols are common.

So far as Skt. words are concerned, the internal consonant groups formed of homorganic nasals and voiceless unaspirated plosives are generally represented in either of the two ways mentioned above, particularly for īk, īc, īt; but for consonant groups formed of nasals and voiced plosives (whether simple or aspirated) and of nasals and voiceless aspirated plosives, the former practice alone obtains.

9. The symbol for ṣd deserves special notice. Both Pæanius’ representation and that of the ms. of Kuraḷ have two ṣ symbols (apparently, with a view to the alveolar plosive being marked off clearly thereby), while in modern representation only one ṣ-symbol is embodied.

There is however one difference between the symbol for ṣe used by Pæanius and that found in the ms. of Kuraḷ: while Pæanius arranges the symbols in the order of pulli (ligature) for e followed by the symbol for ṣ and then by the two ṣ-symbols, in the ms. of Kuraḷ the symbol for ṣ is placed first and it is followed by the ligature for e and then by the two ṣ-symbols. This latter practice is common in the oldest mss.; and this follows the Tamil arrangement of symbols.

10. The symbols for tru kru, šru, srũ have two loops on the right to indicate the incorporation of the vowel ū. When long ū is incorporated, the curvature used for rū is added.—The Kuraḷ ms. shows the same symbols.

IV. PHONETICS.

Vowels

1. In accented positions, a has its “correct” value, as Pæanius’ transliteration shows; but in unaccented syllables the sound becomes centralised to æ and then frontalis in the direction of e in the neighbourhood of front consonants:—“ramen”, “peretta”, “siven”, “paler”, “putrer”, etc.

2. The symbols and ligatures denoting u stand for (i) fully lip-rounded ū in accented positions (as for instance in radical positions of words); (ii) as the final of the Mal. tense-finites; (iii) the centralised u which is the actual value (in unaccented positions) of what in writing is represented with the ligatures for u; (iii) the lip-spread w occurring in words like pāruṇi, etc.

Pæanius uses “u” throughout for all these sounds.

3. The “neutral” vowel ṣ occurring in Mal. as the final of certain words and forms is represented in these texts by the symbol of the preceding con-
sonant being shown without any “vocalic” ligatures as if the vowel sound involved here is an unaccented $a = \sigma$. PEANUS adopts this practice.

Mal. $\sigma$ is a value which appears in the following other contexts also:—

(i) The value of unaccented $a$ in medial positions of words and forms; as already observed above, the $\sigma$ is frontalised in the direction of $e$ in the neighbourhood of palatal consonants, in which case the symbol for transliteration used by PEANUS is $e$.

(ii) The $a$ appearing immediately after initial $y$, $r$, $l$, and voiced plosives of Skt. loans, and after native initial $r$ (in $\text{rando}$) and $c$ (in a very few words like $\text{cari}$, $\text{cali}$) has the value of $a$ or frontalised $\sigma$ or $e$ (the last value being very frequent in the mass-dialects). PEANUS uses “$e$”; and the mss. of other texts also show $e$ sometimes in the spelling.

(iii) The unaccented $u$ in medial unaccented positions and in the neighbourhood of retroflex sounds has often the value of an $a$, as in colloquial $\text{kodotta}$, $\text{veotto}$ and in literary $\text{arao-kk}$—(<older $\text{arau-kk}$), $\text{karo-kk}$ (<older $\text{karu-kk}$), $\text{okkao}$ (<older $\text{olkko}$) etc. This is not marked off anywhere in the texts under reference.

(iv) The unaccented $o$ in the colloquial $\text{ippolo}$, $\text{appolo}$ loses the lip-rounding and tends to become $\sigma$. This is shown by the spelling indicating $a$ ( = $\sigma$ in unaccented positions).

(v) The $a$ of $\text{allbo}$, when occurring in unaccented positions, has the value $\sigma$ or $e$. The spellings in the mss. of the texts, and Peanus' transliteration shows $\text{allbo}$ and $\text{ellbo}$.

PEANUS consistently uses the spelling “pad-” (for modern $\text{pad}$-) in SV and Alph., but transliterates it (in his Alph.) as “ped.” Since the value $\text{pad}$- had arisen fairly early in Mal., it is possible that PEANUS followed mere tradition in using the spelling “pad-”.

4. There is no distinctive anusvāra sound in native Mal. The anusvāra that forms a part of the alphabetical classification of Ārya Eijūta and for which the śūnya symbol is used, has the value of (i) $m$ before vowels (in external sandhi), before pauses and before $y$, $r$, $l$, $s$, $h$, $s$, and (ii) a vargāntya nasal before plosives (both in external and in internal sandhi). In native words, the use of the śūnya symbol in final positions of words or in internal positions (in which latter the use of the symbol is rare today, though in old manuscripts it is sometimes met with) is purely graphic, since the value given to it is that of an $m$ or of a vargāntya nasal according as it is followed by the one or the other of the sets of sounds referred to in the above scheme.

PEANUS observes: “Littera $\text{am}$ quae nobis consona esset, apud Malabares vocalis habetur, sicut et in Bramhnicis elementis $\text{ang}$ vocalibus annumeratur.”

The reference to the evaluation “ang” of the Brahmins is very interesting. To whom does he refer when he speaks of Brahmins? Elsewhere in the course of the book he refers to the “Brahmin professors of the University of Trichur,” and these very probably are Nambūdiri scholars connected
with one or other of the Mathas of Trichur. It may however be noted here that the evaluation of the anuvāra by the Nambūdiris when reading or reciting Sanskrit is different from that of the other communities in Malabar. The sound-value given by Nambūdiris for the anuvāra before r, ś, s, h, v is always that of a nasalized v or sometimes almost a labio-dental m, as in saṃrāmbham, saṃviyam, saṃvāram, saṃvādam; before y and l, nasalized y and nasalized l are respectively used, as in seyyula, imallogam; etc.

Peanius, curiously enough, classifies the anuvāra symbol among consonants also, and makes the following observations: “Littera o am eadem est, ac consona finalis m apud Latinos. Sic sambhramam metus; samvambham superbia.”

Peanius adds: “In medio tamen dictioes aliquando sonat, ut n, quod praesertim accidit, cum invenitur ante litteras k and p: tunc enim fit ng, nb; unde engilium quamvis ;sangadām afflictio; sanbatta divitiae.”—These observations suffer from a confusion of ideas. So far as Sanskrit words like sankata- and sampat(ia) are concerned, in the Malayālam representation of these and other similar Sanskrit words, the anuvāra symbol is never given the value of n. Before -k in internal positions, the value of the anuvāra is always that of the vargāntya ū; and similarly before p the anuvāra is evaluated as m.—As for native forms in internal positions, forms like engil munbeh which have ū before the plosives concerned and which are pronounced “correctly” with this ū by many had also “corrupt” values in the mass colloquials which convert the ū to the vargāntya’s corresponding to the plosives following. This assimilation of ū to vargāntya’s started very early in Mal. as a colloquial feature; and the symbols for original ng and the ng < ng and for original mb and the mb < mb were either conjunct ligatures or the anuvāra symbol followed by the symbols of the plosives. In “correct” pronunciation, the ū of munbeh is still heard, while in engil the modern pronunciation shows only ng.

The conjunct ligatures for ng and mb used in Peanius’s time (and today) are actually formed respectively of the symbols for ū and k and of those for ū and p. It is perhaps this fact (along with the alternative values like munbeh and munbeh) that led Peanius to make the unwarranted generalisation that the anuvāra symbol followed by k and p has the value of ū.

5. The visarga h which appears in the orthodox classification of the sounds of the modern Mal. alphabet is correctly explained by Peanius as a sound which “cum aliqua levi aspiratione, atque conatu proferatur; illi enim duo circuli quorum alter alteri supereminet in fine additi sunt signum conatus et aspirationis, qua littera pronuntiatur, clara tamen, et aperto voce.”

Medially, however, in the common evaluation in Kēraḷa of words like dukkham, antahpuram, the visarga is evaluated as a mere breath (or as a

1. Following this wrong rule, in the excerpts at the end of the book, Peanius wrongly transliterates tamburān as “tamburan”, kumbid- as “kumbid-” etc.
suspension of voice), and the plosive following is doubled. These facts are noted by Peanius: "Si vero in medio dictionis inventiuntur dicycli, ut in hac voce duhhkkham tristitia, denotant ipsi suspensionem vocis in anteriori littera pronuntianda, atque conatum, quo subsequens efferi debet."

The difference between the visarga and the initial and medial h of Skt. is not of course expressly pointed out by Peanius; but the terms in which he has described the phonation of the visarga, together with the description of h as "h germanico ore prolatum" show that Peanius did note some difference. It may be noted here that in the Keralā evaluation of Skt. loans, initial h is partially voiced, intervocal h is fully voiced and the final visarga is voiceless.

The question whether the visarga should be classified among vowels or among consonants appears in the days of Peanius to have been subject to dispute, as the following observations of his indicate: "Nec video, cur hac littera inter vocalium numerum a quibusdam non adscribatur, cum inter vocales distincte eam tradant tam Bramhanes magistri in praeclara Universitate Tricciuensi, quam ceteri Grammatici Malabares in ipsorum Scholis kalari vulgo dictis, et jure quidem."

6. ai and au are recognized as diphthongs by Peanius: "Quare litterae ai, vel ei et au, quae debent exacte proferri, ita utraque vocalis distincte audiatur, potius dicendae sunt Diphthongi, quam vocales."

The alternative value ei for the diphthong ai is interesting. The value of ei seems to have existed from a very early period for this diphthong; and it is the existence side by side of both values, that gave rise to forms like 'aido for ceydo (common in inscriptions and in old Mss.), mai for mey body', aidaido (= eyd-eyda) in Uttarāram gadyam.

Among the present texts, Vartt. has hai for hey and mai for mey, and SV uses caī- for cey.-

Consonants

Peanius devotes two chapters to the description of consonants; in one he refers to the absolute consonantal finals of Mal., and in another entitled "De recta pronuntiandi ratione" he tries to indicate some of the sound-attributes of Mal. consonants by comparing them to European sounds known to him. At the outset he says "de earumdem litterarum vi, ac recta pronuntiandi norma aliquid attingamus, potius quam explicemus; in aliquibus enim Malabaricē Lingue litterarum sonus Latinis litteris exprimi hauquaquam potest." And at the end of the chapter he again administers the advice: "genuinus enim ipsarum sonus non scriptis sed vocē est acquirendus."

This chapter is full of interesting and acute observations which do credit to this eighteenth-century Malabar missionary.

1. Medially k is pronounced "like g" "as in maghen "filius."

This is a correct description of the intervocal value of the velar stop in Malayālam. It is voiced; and the area of actual occlusion is slightly reduced, with the result that a fricatival phonation immediately precedes and follows
the voiced plosive.—Medially, the sound has a clearer fricativeal element than when it is initial; this is what has misled some European scholars into thinking that medially the sound is a pure fricative.

2. "\( Kh \) pronuntiatur, tamquam duo \( kk \), et profertur cum aliquo conatu, et aspiratione." In the attempt to bring out the aspirate element of the sound, the tendency to elongate the stop is common in Kērala.

3. PEANIUS adverts to the absolute consonantal final \( k \) of Skt. words, and observes that this is "quoddam \( k \), quo solum utuntur in poesi, ac in ipsorum Grandonicis scriptis; ipsius sonus efferatur in interiori gutturo."

4. Mal. \( n \) which PEANIUS wrongly transliterates as \( ngh \), is the velar nasal. There is absolutely no explosion in the mouth, but the air is allowed to pass continuously through the nose, the release of stoppage in the mouth being gradual.

PEANIUS says that the sound is pronounced "attracta retrorsum lingua, ita tamen ut \( g \) vix audiatur."

5. Mal. \( c \) is compared to the Etruscan "\( c'\)" and the transliteration used by him for this sound is "\( ci \)."

\( j \) is "ut \( gi \) Italicum, leviter tamen in gutturo expressum."

\( ñ \), "ut \( gn \) Italicum, efferatur prope dentes cum aliquo narium ministerio."

This series of sounds in Mal. may be brought out either by the foreblade touching the alveolar region or (what is not very common) the tongue-tip touching the frontier between the alveolar and palatal regions.

6. Though PEANIUS transliterates the retroflex sounds \( t, ñh, d, ñh, n \) without any distinctive diacritics, he has noted the retroflexion of the tongue in the articulation of these sounds: "huius litterae sonus... est autem Europis admodum difficilis, ac pronuntiatur inversa omnino retrorsum lingua, adeo ut interiorem palati summitatem attingat."

7. \( t \) is compared to Latin \( t \) (as evaluated by Italians and other continentals of Europe), because \( t \) is in many countries of Europe given the value of a dental in which the area of occlusion is fairly large.

PEANIUS evaluates the intervocal sound as \( d \); in actual value there is a slight fricativeal element immediately preceding and following the stop, as a result of the area of contact (for the stop) being reduced in intervocal positions.

8. PEANIUS' description of Mal. \( n \) is inadequate and unsatisfactory. He refers only to one \( n \) which he compares to a "clear Latin \( n \)." Perhaps his European ear was unable to detect the difference that actually existed between Mal. \( blade \) dental \( ñ \) and the point-contact alveolar \( ñ \).

9. \( r \) (post-dental) and \( ñ \) (palato-cerebral) are, however, distinguished by PEANIUS: "\( r, ut ñr; dulciter tamen, et teneerrime profertur prope dentes, isdem quasi compressis\)"; "\( r, asperum valde, et durum.\)"

10. It is strange to hear PEANIUS observe that Mal. \( v \) is like \( b \) "ali-quando," and to see the initial \( v \) of words like \( viral \) uniformly transliterated in
the "Alphabet" as b. I also find in SV sometimes Mal. spellings like bā (for vāy), bīsam (for the Skt. loan viṣam) etc. Perhaps the bilabial value of the Mal. v. struck his European ear as nearer to b than to the labiodental v which is so common in European languages.

11. s is described thus: "inter s et z pronuntiatur, inflexa ad palatum lingua cum aliquo sibila."—The reference to the sound being midway between the voiceless [s] and its voiced variety means that the sound was partly voiced in the utterance of the speakers. Even to-day this is true of the folk-colloquials. The retroflex nature of the sound is also adverted to by Peanius. While he describes s as being produced with the tongue turned to the palate, with a certain amount of hiss, he distinguishes s as being produced "prope dentes",—a distinction which is quite correct.

12. For l, Peanius refers to the retroflexion of the tongue.

13. The continuant l, the phonation of which is so difficult for non-Malayālis and non-Tamilians, is described thus: "quasi s Latinorum, dentibus labiisque vix apertas pronuntiatur, retracta tantillum lingua."

The retraction of the tongue is only just indicated; the essential features of the sound are not fully described. In Chapter VI, Peanius says that this sound is pronounced "cum aliquo sibilo"; perhaps what he refers to here is the passage of a stream of air, which (it must be stated) never amounts to a hiss because of the large space between the tongue and the mouth-roof.

14. The long voiceless alveolar plosive tt is only imperfectly described in the following terms: "si vero hac littera r (=r) duplicetur, efformatur duplex tt, quod effertur compressis quasi dentibus, lingua ipsos impellente."

The alveolar nature of the sound appears to have escaped the notice of Peanius.

V. PHONOLOGY.

The changes mentioned below are mostly those characteristic of colloquial. The language of Vartt. is largely based upon the colloquial dialect, though there are attempts made here and there to employ literary and rhetorical flourishes. The saeva indignatio, however, makes the writer drop the artificial mask in most parts of the book. SV attempts to be literary and dignified, but remains largely "colloquial". The authors of these works were not influenced by the "classical" literary style of Mal.—This fact is proved by the use of colloquial phrases and expressions and also by the adoption of phonetic spelling for the following types:

(a) The Tam.—Mal. evaluation as frontalis o or as e, of the a immediately following voiced plosives or r, y, l, kṣ (in radical syllables of IA words) is embodied in the spelling of numerous forms like gerbhini, jehu, yejamānaṃ, resi-kk- (Skt. rasa), reñippa, ksemi-kk- (Skt. kṣama), kṣeyam, behu, etc.

Native cari- and cali are colloquially evaluated as cari- or ceri- and coli or celi; the forms are spelt cari- and celi in Vartt.
(b) The colloquial change of i to e and of u to o when i and u of initial accented syllables are immediately followed by a short consonant and an open vowel in the next syllable, is embodied in the spelling of words like herappē, koralla, orakkam, colali-kōṭta, etc.

(c) The assimilation of voiced plosives to the homorganic nasals in adaptations of Skt. groups ṅg, ṇd, ṇḍ is shown in the spelling of forms like vahhīcchā (Skt. vant-), caṇhīrāṇ (Skt. canda), reṇīppō, bhaṇṇāram, māṇnāpam.

(d) The change of r to ṛ is embodied in the spelling of forms like curūdi (Skt. śrutī), puttarān, attarayum [BG].

(e) PERNUS' transliterations "ramen" (for rāman), "peretta" (for pērētā), "kaleri" (for kolāri) show how in spelling the tendency in colloquials for unaccented a (= ṣ) to become frontalised towards e was embodied.

**VOWELS**

1. Both -allō and ellō (< allō) exist side by side.

2. In the final syllables of karaccīl, cācčīl, tigaccīl, the i is derived ultimately from original a. The unaccented position together with the neighbourhood on either side of palatal consonants has brought about the change.

3. The lengthening of the final -a of Mal. polite imperatives (old optatives), as in kolgā, celgā, edukkā, is common in other 18th century texts.

4. (Kūda-p-) purappugal shows u (< i) on account of the influence of the bilabial.

5. "Vulgar" colloquialisms like the following in which i appears instead of u in the neighbourhood of palatal consonants, occur in the texts:—cimaṭugal, perima, etc.

   orīkhal, iri-kk, tōriga, tariga, orimādo, occur in literary Mal.

6. Ketētō, kitētō (with centralised i), kutō, kitō are common colloquial variants of the phrasal expletive kētō 'did (you) hear?' used frequently in conversation. Owing to the weakening of the syllable containing ē, allegro-forms like the above are common in the colloquials. The spelling kitō used in Varṭt. stands for one of such colloquial forms.

   ellappālam, ippolam, appālo show the unrounding of the original o and the production of a variety of a.

7. o is raised to u in the forms kula (for kola 'murder', perhaps under the influence of word kula which means 'bunch'), mūlī (for mōlī 'statement' 'word'), puli (for polī 'falsehood').

8. Old -ai of verb-bases appears as -e in forms like kurecco, ude-kk, are-cca, etc.

9. Final ṣ (< older w) has become still further opened out to a in forms like the following:—āṇṇāla-y-āyirikkuṇna

   paṭṭāṇa-y-um
   bhaṇṇappāḍa-y-um
   muska-y-um
   ṣṇadappāḍa-y-um
The change is attested by the use of the glide -y- before the samuccaya um; if the old ə had been preserved, then it would have been elided.

This change is not absent in the other colloquials: patṭāṇa [ < pāṭāṇa < pāṭāngu ], aṇṇa [ < aṇṇa < aṅgu ], aṇṇa [ < aṇṇa < aṅgal(u) ], peṇṇa [ < peṇṇa < pengal(u) ], vāyppa [ < vāyppa ]

Some of these forms with -a are used in the literary dialect also.

10. Instances of vocalic contractions shown in the spellings are the following, all of which are common in other colloquials also:—

-ōlum [G] < -ōlavum; ōlôm, appears beside oḷam already in K Bhāg. and K Bhṛ.—ōlum is a variant that occurs in SV and Vartt.

< okkēne < okka-y-ig-e [ accusative form ]
kaḷē < kāla-y-e [ accus. ]
kaḷudē < kalud a-y-e [ acc. ]
pūjäyi < pūja-y-āyi
rakṣillāṇu < rakṣa-y-illāṇu
sainādilla < sainādi-y-illa
ammāguhṇa < amma-y-āguhṇa
cemmōrtta < cemmuv-varutta 'what brings about prosperity' 'religious benediction'.

(To be continued.)
INSCRIPTIONS OF KATHIAWAD*

By

D. B. DISKALKAR

MŪLĪ

No. 125] v. s. 1685 [25-1-1629

Mūli is a fourth class state in Zālāvad. The Thakur of the State is a Paramāra Rajput. The following inscription is found in the Sun temple, popularly called Māndavārāī temple in Mūli. It is in a good condition and measures 16" by 15".

The first five lines of the record are devoted to the praise of Gaṇapati, Sūrya and other deities. Then follows a verse descriptive of the greatness of the name of Rāma. Then the date is given, viz., Sunday, the 11th day of the bright half of Māgha in v.s. 1685 or Śaka 1550 the sarīvatsara being Īśvara, when in the victorious reign of the emperor Shah Jahan and of the paramāra king Rāmji, Gopāla son of Bhagavatidāsa and his wife Amulā of the Nandūāṇā community caused the temple of Māndapārāya to be made. This is again expressed in a verse.

Text

1 || श्रीगणेशाय सम्म: || श्रीसरसे नाम: || श्रीपरमगुर्ज्यो नाम: || ॐ नमः परमात
2 ने नाम: || स्वस्त श्रीजयो मंगलामुनि यथा || वा ब्रह्मविद्वेदातिविदेवाशति || पर: प्र
3 चानु युवन तयाः || विवहारात: कारणमीरश्वरा चा || तथैं नमो विवदि
4 नामायय || 1 || नम: सयेचे जगदेकुचुरुः || जगदप्रसुविशिष्यिता
5 शहेते: || सयेमय: विगुणागताचारिण: || विवस्तिनारायणयः
6 रामने: || 2 || कल्याणानां निधानां कलिमभागनां पावने पावना
7 नै: || पावे युनुमुहो: सपदे परत्प्रमा श्च: प्रक्षिप्ततर्: || विवाहाः
8 मस्तानेमेक कविकरतलताय तोसिनां ध्यानामया: || वीरेन् चर्रमुसताय
9 प्रभवतु भवताः मातृ: रामाय रामाय || २ || श्री[म]ृपविकासांसमय
10 तीत: || संवत १६८५: वर्ष शाक: १५५० प्रवैत्तमने शाक्विनानन
11 श्री कार्यापितो || श्रीधरेनाय: संवतारे उत्तरायन(ण)पते श्रीसुवृह
12 श्रीकिरेभूती महामांगलोपदे मायोत्तमे मायमे दहलज्ञेष्व: अका
13 दस्य: पुष्पाणि रविवाराणे आधानाने: || पाताः[ही]दादाहाजान
14 [अद्वृत्त] बाइविज्यराये परमाराय: श्रीकारमाजी वि[वराज्ञेन्दु]
15 आनाजातीय मादेकरीवेश्चाइह: भयान बाई कनी: तस्तु: मादे
16 का देवा श्रु: भयान बाई ल्याइदि: तस्तु मादेका गोपाल श्रु: भा
17 श्री बाई देवकी तस्तु: भयान तस्तु: एयी भयान बाई अमुला नं

* Continued from Vol. III. p. 288.
GADHAKA

No. 126 v. s. 1687 [15-3-1631]

This inscription is copied from one of the pāliās standing near the Koṭhāri Vāv at Gaḍhakā in the Khambhāliā Mahal of the Navanagar State.

The inscription records the death on Tuesday, the eighth of the dark half of Phāgaṇa of v.s. 1687 of Jāḍejā Hālā Śrī Rāhabhji, in a fight at Gaḍhakā.

Some other pāliās record the deaths of other warriors on the same date. Hālā Śrī Hardholji was one of them.

Text

1 संवत् १६८७ वर्ष पा
2 गण व ८ मम जागजा
3 हाला श्री राहभजी ग
4 खक भमे देवातान पा
5 मा हे।

MANGROL

No. 127] v. s. 1687 [5-5-1631]

A bilingual (Persian and Sanskrit) inscription is lying in the Deli of Sadmiyā in Lalpura in the fort Māngrol. The Sanskrit version is very much damaged so that it cannot be wholly read. It measures 12½" by 2½".

It opens with the date, Monday (?) the 15th day of the bright half of Vaiśākha in v.s. 1687 or Śaka 1552 and refers to the reign of the emperor Salīm Shah. It then mentions the name of the viceroy appointed over Saurāṣṭra, but unfortunately his name is missing. In the last line are preserved some letters of an imprecatory verse which shows that a grant was made by this inscription.

The Emperor of Delhi at the time of this inscription was Shah Jahan and not Selim Shah which is the other name of Jahangir. Such a mistake is excusable in this distant part of the country.

Text

1 ॥ संवत् १६८७ वर्ष शाहक १५५२ प्रत्तमाले वहलत्हती महामांगलयप्रदे
2 वैशाखमासे थ्रुक्तप्पे १५ सोमे* अय भीम...पतालाल श्री ७ रहममहालविजया

* The week day does not agree unless सीम्ये is meant. There was a lunar eclipse when the grant was made.
3 ज्ये सौराष्ट्रेशे...दमान व्यापार व तस्य द्रा...री अमल...मान
4 मई...भैवाल...व्रतस्थ। दुरं मगवु...।
5 बहुमिन बहुवा भुक्ता राजभि...रा। वर्ष वर्ष यदा भूमि। तस्य तस्य तदा फलं।

KUĀ

No. 128 v. s. 1687 [15-6-1631]

This inscription is copied from one of the pāliśas standing in the compound of a Śiva mandir behind the masjid in Kuā in the Dhrāngdhrā State.

It records the death in a fight while protecting the cows, of Zālā Bhimji, son of Gopālji, son of Surāji, son of Lākhāji, on the 11th day of the dark half of Jyesṭha in v. s. 1687.

Text

संवत १६८७ वर्ष जेठ वद
११ देमे खळा धीलाखाजी
सूत मूराजी सूत गोपाल
जी सूत भोमजी मंदौनी
बाहरे स्वरा चिना

DAHISĀRĀ

No. 129 v. s. 1688 [19-10-1631]

This inscription is copied from a pālia standing on a platform outside the northern gate of the village Dahisāra, at a distance of three miles from the sea port town Vavānia in the Morvi State. The length and breadth of the inscribed portion is 15".

It records that Rūḍibai, wife of Avādi?—Alodhā? became a satī on Wednesday the fifth of the bright half of Kārtika in v.s. 1688 or Śaka 1553 in the time of Mahārāja Bhojarājji.

Mahārājā Bhojarājji must be the son of Mahārao Bhārimalji of Kaccha, who seems to have the village in his possession at the time.

Text

1 संवत १६८८ वर्षे साके १५५३ प्रवर्तमान[व]े
2 दक्षान्यनगते धीरसूचे सरसरीती माहा
3 मोगल्पुन्यव्रतसातम करतक मस
4 गुहशैवे पंम्मरे ५। वार वुच अवाडी वा
5 भेरे तेढे माहाई बाई नाग चुट [स] हु
6 त अवाडी आलौका। भारवा महातरा बाई
7 युद्दी तत्स पिता महाओता साहानी पूर्वी
8 सामवन कीया है
9 बाहरे दुःदे दरी मंदौवी छ माहा
10 राये धीरोजऱाजजीवे. . . . .
BILESHVARA

No. 130] v. s. 1688 [11-5-1632

This inscription is engraved on a pāliā near the temple of Bileśvara Mahādeva at Bileśvara in the Barḍā hills at a distance of 8 miles from Rāṇāvāva in the Porbandar State. The inscribed portion measures 15″ in length and 5″ in breadth.

It records the death of Kāthi Sumā (?) in a fight with the Muhammadan (Kābuli) Ayakhān on the second day of the bright half of Jyeṣṭha in v.s. 1688.

Text

1 स्त १६८८ वर्षे जेत सद २
2 कायस्मी एयराने काळी सुम जा
3 गरो धींढो जीहा मरण धींढु छे

DHUA

No. 131] v. s. 1688 [9-6-1632

This inscription was originally found in the Lakṣmī Nārāyaṇa temple in the village Dhuā under the Dhrāngdhrā State, but it is now lying in the house of a Nandvāṇā Brāhmaṇ in Kālavād. The engraved portion measures 1°9″ by 11″. It is full of grammatical mistakes.

At the beginning of the inscription is given a verse invoking blessings of long life to the person who, as the latter portion of the inscription states, caused the Lakṣmī-Nārāyaṇa temple to be built. It then refers to the reign over Vāṅkāner Pargāṇā of Raisinhji, son of Mānsinhji, and then states that Thākar Krisṇadāsa of the Nandvāṇā community caused a temple of Lakṣmī-Nārāyaṇa to be built in the village Dhuā, which was owned (as a girās) by Zālā Bhūpatijji son of Mokāji, on the second day of the bright half of Aśāḍha in v.s. 1688. The construction of the temple was begun on the second day of the bright half of Vaiśākha in v.s. 1685.

The inscription gives the date v.s. 1688 for Raisinhji son of Mānsinhji, the Zālā ruler of Vāṅkāner. But Raisinhji came to the gāḍi in 1653 A.D. as the Kathiawar Gazetteer (p. 697) states. Hence it seems that the mention of Raisinhji is due to his looking after the state business during the time of his father in Mahal Niyāl (?) wherein the village Dhuā was situated.

Text

1 ते नमः श्रीगणेशायमः || याबद्ध्निष्ठतेरया बहुती दुरंदी जाह्वी पुष्यतोय || याबलाका
2 श्रामयें तपति दौनकोरो भासनारो एकपार || याबद्धबंडूनतीसविक्षणमिव बसैते नेहस्यं तावत्र पुज
3 पृष्ठस्वरुपहरिवो जीव विश्वमार्गादाव || 1 मोहे याबलेर्जच्छने रण श्रीमानसंघकरी
4 तत्स्य पुजः रण श्रीरामपुष्ण

1. The spelling mistakes are not corrected.
4 जी श्रीमाहादुभाषणानुसार श्रीमाहादुभाषणानुसार बंद । बौद्ध श्रीमाहादुभाषणानुसार बंद ।
5 लघु जीवनरूप । लघु जीवनरूप ।
6 श्रीमाहादुभाषणानुसार श्रीमाहादुभाषणानुसार बंद । बंद ।
7 रायानविना वार । रायानविना वार ।
8 श्रीमाहादुभाषणानुसार श्रीमाहादुभाषणानुसार बंद । बंद ।
9 श्रीमाहादुभाषणानुसार श्रीमाहादुभाषणानुसार बंद । बंद ।
10 चाली भाषण । चाली भाषण ।
11 चाली भाषण । चाली भाषण ।
12 चाली भाषण । चाली भाषण ।
13 चाली भाषण । चाली भाषण ।

HALVAD

No. 132]  v. s. 1690  [30-3-1634

This inscription is copied from a pālī standing in the sixteen-pillar deri to the north-east of Bhavānī Mātā’s temple in ‘Rājechara’ to the east of the town Halvad.

The inscription records the death of Mahārāṇā Asakaranji on Sunday the eleventh of the bright half of Caitra in v.s. 1690.

Text

JHINJUVĀDA

No. 133]  v.s. 1692  [28-2-1636

[6-3-1636

This inscription is engraved on a stone slab built in the kotho near the temple of Rajabai Mātā in Jinjhuvarā, which is sixteen miles north of Khāra-ghodā Railway Station. The inscribed portion measures 3 ft. in length and 1¼ ft. in breadth.
It records that a ruler—whose name is missing—of the Makavāṇā family repaired the fort and built the kotho, etc. at great cost on Sunday, the third of the bright half of Phāgaṇa in v.s. 1692.

**Text**

1 संवत १६९६[३] वेश फागणमासे सुखवर्षे रविवासरः वा
2 स हंस्वादा...महामभो नवरत्रा राज मकवाणा
3 वसे रा...महाराजाः गढ सम...
4 व कृमणो वो शास्यांकाली करारो आयमणी राजनो कौरो
5 ...करारो चोगादै कोटास् धीमा हो क
6 रायां गढळेढे इव बने बर्चो उगमणी राय जति करारी गढ

**JAMANAGAR**

No. 134] v. s. 1696 [14-2-1640

This inscription is engraved on the pedestal of the image of Sambhavanātha in the Comukha temple opposite the Rājasīśa temple in Jāmnagar. In the central part of the inscribed portion is carved a beautiful figure of a galloping horse on which are engraved the letters 'श्री संभवनाथ विवर्त्'. The inscribed portion, which is in a good condition measures 3'4" in length and only 5" in breadth. The poet, who composed this inscription, but who has not given his name, seems to be a learned man.

The record opens with the date, which is Friday, the 3rd of the bright half of Phālguna of v.s. 1696 and refers to the reign of Jām Lākhājī of the Yadu family of Nāvanagar. Then the name of Āryarākṣitaśūri is given, who was descended in a regular line of succession from Lord Mahāvīra, in the Ancala gaccha. His successor was Dharmamūrtisūri, who was again succeeded by Kalyāṇśigaraśūri. Under his instructions Sah Rājasi son of Tejasī son of Bhojā, son of Hirā, son of Narapāl, son of Samarā, son of Munṭā, son of Jāhala, who was the son of Sah Udā of the Nāgada gotra and Usakeṣa (i.e. Osvāl) community, caused an image of Sambhavanātha to be set up. In the latter portion of the inscription the qualities of Rājasi are described and an account is given of his family as also of that of his younger brother Sah Nensi.

**Text**

1 संवत १६९६ वेश कालन सुह शुक्र श्री अनवम्या श्रीमद्वांशोल्स शास्त्री-
2 ले विविभाषाश्रीविद्वानं श्रीवास्तवमण्डे श्रीभक्तम्या हृदयमयमण्डे श्रीमद्वांशोल्स शास्त्री-
3 प्रसादारूढान्तमहकतिस्तिमानोपमानधरम्विविष्कंशस्यामण्डे श्रीमद्वांशोल्स प्रथमः
4 न अनुक्षेपणं सकलप्रभाणात् भूमिकार्यमिति सम्पूर्ण सर्वकालिकमिति विविधविषयमण्डे
5 प्राणान्तममानं तत्व्यानं विविधविषयमण्डे श्रीमद्वांशोल्स प्रथमः कारणासमस्या रूपः
WADHWAN

No. 135] v.s. 1699 [21-4-1642

This inscription is engraved on a pāliya called ‘Rāṭhod Māno pāliya’ (the memorial stone of the Rathod mother), in Wadhwan city. Many of the letters in the record, which measures 1’-8” by 1’-5” are too much weather-worn.

It records that Rājooji’s queen, who came from the Rāṭhod family became a sati at the death of her husband on Thursday, the second of the bright half of Vaiśākhā in v.s. 1699 or Saka 1565.

The king Rājooji, mentioned in the inscription was the younger brother of Sultānji mentioned in the Vāṅkāner inscription of v.s. 1679. He founded the Wadhwan house and his brother did the Vāṅkāner house.

Text

1 Ṣhīgāṇeṣṭhram nam: śatita śrījñyōmba
2 Ṛmaṇḍubha s. 1999 vartaye shaakte 95
3 95 (غير) vartaye uttaraye gane śrīprīya yahīt
4 śrītō mahāpramāṇyāḥpramāṇośeśe śiśeṣeśeśe
5 śruṭākṣhe 9 gūlāṣe māhāraṇa [vṛssheṇaṇe]
6 tathā bhāya baie pu...ṣatū[...puḥṣyāraṇeṇa]
7 ...śrī tathā bhāya baie...tathā ṣṭut
8 śrīraṇojī.........................
9 śrī raja rathōd śrī...ṣatū ṛṭhōd śrīd
10 svarajātī tathā bhāya baie ṛṭhōdaṁ tathā ṣṭutā baie
11 śrīraṁkauśe sāgavane kōVe baie bhavate k
12 śāmatva bhavate...?

RAJASITHAPUR

No. 136] v.s. 1700 [25-6-1644

This inscription is engraved on a white marble stone fixed in a niche of the Śiva temple near the temple of Lakṣmī-Nārāyaṇa in the town Rājsithāpur, formerly called simply Sithā in the Dhrāṅgdhrā State. The inscription is very incorrectly engraved. It measures 12¾” by 20”.

It opens with the date, Tuesday, the second day of the bright half of Aśādha of v.s. 1700 or Saka 1566 and refers to the rule of the Emperor Shah Jehan (of Delhi) and of the king Amarsimhaṭi, son of Māhāraṇa Candra-
SENA of Zālāvād with his capital at Halvād, when Libāda Goiā (??) of Parāmāra family at Sīthā caused temples of Viṣṇu, Siva and Hanumān to be built.

The epithet छापति used with Shahajehan in this inscription deserves to be noted. It is well known that Sivaji began to use this epithet just about this time.

Text

1 क्षणाथाय नाम मुत्मा श्रीहरीहर नाम स्वरूपती
2 अनमाया || संवत १७०० वर्षे शाके १५६६
3 प्रभ्याचे उत्तरांगजी आपात ध्यान
4 २ जीयाका २ २५ तदोपरलं दीतियांयु पुष्य
5 दिन्दु मोमवङ्गे पुष्यमहाना घट्या ५० २४
6 हरियु नामयोऽघटीया २१ २५ ते दन प्राता
7 द सांपुण्य श्रीहरीहरन प्रसाद हृदनंतन
8 प्रसाद उदगर की[चु] परिशा एकोरतस्य अवा
9 च (??) छापती पतसाहा श्रीसाहाजांिन देव
10 पती श्रीभोमपालक हाालावाई श्रीहरवत्के मा
11 हर्षणे श्रीचंद्रसेनना सूत वज्रराज श्रीअमरसंवजी
12 जैहव्या जयपुत श्रीस्वयामांि परमार्कोशवतवा
13 सूत चदा सूत वीभा सुत लीलवाकुंगत सूत हलवर
14 भेषे भारजा तु अरमेचवाई सूत लीलवजमल संप
15 नाशा अजमल प्रेषे भारजा अभकतहाशा नागी
16 आंगी अनवाई सूत चार ४ तेमाल लीलवगोहि...
17 कराँभु गोझीमाघि भारजा वृक्काना राठवा...
18 ई महमदे तस पुत्री अमलावाई दूतीए...भार
19 जी सीरवालमदे बाँढ़े [२५] टीए भारजा चाल्हादा
20 भार बाँढ़े तस पुत्र सच अरजन चालबहुत
21 वेदान करनार गजधर रामजी आर्यंद अनामाई

BEYT

No. 137] v.s. 1702? [1645-46]

This inscription is found near the ruined tank called Juni Sankhatalai in the small island called Beyt Sankhodhār near Dwarka. It measures about 16" by 11".

In the third line the name Vikramasinhha is given probably of the king of the place, who fought with the enemies for the protection of women, children and other people. The object of the inscription seems to record the death of a man, who fell in the fight in v.s. 1702 (??).

Text

1 संबत [१५२२] कबे...
2 ....छापते प्रतिच...
3 मो श्रीविक्रमसीढ़...
4 ...श्रीवालंद्रिप्रवर्तकेश्वर...
5 ...राजा [पीमाणदेव १]...
6 ...पणाणीआ....
7 शुरु: || छूँस महबुबः

KHARVA

No. 138] v.s. 1715. [8-5-1659

This inscription is found in a well to the west of the village Khārvā, three miles to the south-east of Dhrol. The inscribed portion measures 1' 5" in length and 1' in breadth.

It records that on Sunday, the thirteenth of the dark half of Vaisākha in v.s. 1715 in the reign of the Jādejā king Janaji, evidently of Dhrol, a well was built in Khārvā a village dedicated to the god Śiva by Bhānji, Ganga-dāsa and Karama, sons of Patel Ratnā at the total cost of 1250 koris.

Text

1 संवत् १७१५ वर्षं बैसाथ
2 वद १२ रत्नी जावेंज़ा भीजणजी
3 ना राज अविचलर्थता रतना स
4 त भण्ड तथा सत गंगदस क
5 रमण वाव करावी छ सदाथ
6 बगाम गाथा क ८२५ क
7 श्रीमान देवराज वण ४२५ वर्ष
8 हे १२५० श्री

SHEKHAPAT

No. 139] v.s. 1719. [16-2-1663

These two inscriptions are copied from two pāliās, raised in a deri in the village Sekhapāt in the Jamnagar State.

Both the inscriptions are of the same date. The first records the death in a fight at SEKHAPAT of Jām RĀJASIMHJI on Monday, the third day of the dark half of Phālguṇa in v.s. 1719 or (Saka 1584). The other inscription records the death in the same battle of Kumāra BĀMANIYĀJI, son of Jām RĀJASIMHJI by his wife Čāpjibaí.

At the death of Jām Ranmalji in v.s. 1717 without any issue his brother Raisirmhji, who was staying at Āmarana succeeded to the gādi; but Ranmalji’s widow did not like this. Through her brother she invited Kutubuddin, the subā of Ahmedabad to invade Nawanagar. In the fight that ensued Jam Raisirmhji was slain as stated in the inscription, and Nawanagar fell into the hands of the subā.
Text

(1)
1. श्रीमणिाय नमः संवत् १७१९
2. भरें शाके १७०४ प्रवत्तमाने रवि
3. उत्तरापरे गते श्रीसुमृत शिफर
4. स्ता महामार्गायत्र मसौ
5. तम पत्रुमाते कप्रपधु तुति
6. या तथाव वारै श्रीसमवासरे त दि
7. ने जामभी ७ राजसिजजी रणे
8. मुंे श्रोपपात युघे रत्न स्वर्ग प्रा
9. स: श्रीधरम भावु भी
10. कल्याणमत्तु [16]

(2)
1. श्रीमणिायमम: संवत् १७१९
2. भरें शाके १७०४ प्रवत्तमाने र
3. वि उत्तरापरे गते श्रीसुमृत शिफर
4. विरसतैः महामार्गायत्र
5. मासोमैं पत्रुमाते क पन्ने रत्नावासरे त दि
6. पन्ने वशत्तीम तिथौ भी
7. समवासरे तदने जामभी ७
8. राजसिजजी तस्य जाई वाई भी
9. चापोजी तस्य कु अरभी ५ वाम
10. निषाजी रणमुहे गुप्त श्रवन स्वर्ग
11. मै प्रास: श्रीधरम भावु।

BEYT
140]
v.s. 1720 [9-1-1664
This inscription is copied from a pāliā standing in front of the temple of the new Sankhanārāyaṇa temple in Beyt. It records the death, of Rānā Akherājaji, son of Rānā Sanghrāmji, evidently the Vādhel Rānā of Aramā and Beyt, in v.s. 1720 Bhādarava Sud 1.

Text

1. संवत् १७२० भादरवा
2. सुदर १ राणा संभावजी शुल
3. राणा अस्तेराजजी मरण पामा

ANINDARĀ
No. 141] v. s. 1721 [10-5-1665
This inscription is engraved on a white stone built up in the Bhāna well in the village Apidarā in its western part, at a distance of 8 miles to the north of Wadhwan. It measures 11" in height and 8¼" in breadth,
It records the building of a well in v.s. 1721 (or Šaka 1587) on Wednesday the 6th of the bright half of Jyeṣṭha, by Bhānji of the Jhālā family, who was son of Lakhmanji, son of Khetāji, son of Sādalji, son of Āsoji, son of Jodhāji. Bhānji’s mother was Bai Lāchu, daughter of Rāṇā Nāranjī, son of Bhavānji, son of Mōnguji, and his wife was Pārvati. His three sons were named Sādalji, Vāghalji, and Hamirji.

**Text**

1. śrīgopānāyanaṃ: śvast śri jay
2. मंगलमयदेवी संवत १७२१ वर
3. श्रेष्ठ साके १६८५ प्रवत्तमाने उत
4. रायने गते श्रीसुभय ग्रहम
5. श्रीत उपमंगल्यस्वदेवातृधातृ
6. तम जपमास सुहंस्यश्रुतमय प्रभा
7. छदीन वंधवारे जनक
8. श्रीहिमालय [श्री]झालाव राणा चुत जो
9. भाजी चुत आसोजी चुत सादाल
10. जो चुत पताकी चुत लघुस्पष्टी
11. चुत भारती भारत बाई पार
12. वती चुत सादली तथा बाध
13. जो नया हमिरजी, मसालपञ्च रा
14. न श्रीमंगुजी चुत नवनजी छ
15. त नाराजजी चुत बाई लाँढ़वाई
16. चुत वापेला सुचानी वापेला भा
17. नारी कुजी संहुरण कर छे
18. लखारे गोरुकट सकाट दसकट

**HALVAD**

No. 142] v.s. 1722 [29-1-1666

This inscription is copied from one of the pāliās standing near the thirty-six pillared deri in Halvad.

It records the death of Gehel Lākhāji who was son of Āsāji by his wife Potbai and grandson of Gehel Chachājī on the eighth day of the bright half of Aśvina in v.s. 1722, while fighting on behalf of Mahārāṇā Gaja-sīnhjī, evidently the Zālā ruler of Halvad, who reigned from 1661 to 1673 A.D.

**Text**

1. श्रव १७२२ आसा छुद
2. 8 दने गोरुकट छछाजी छु
3. त आसोजी भारता
4. पोतबाई चुत गो
5 हेल लप्राजी महाराण
6 श्री गजशंभजीने काप्ता आ
7 वा छ.

MULI
No. 143] v.s. 1735 [14-8-1679
This inscribed pālia is standing in the pādar of Muli. It records that Pāthak Dhanji son of Lilā stabbed himself to death on hearing of the death of Paramāra Visāji, on Thursday, the second of the dark half of Śrāvaṇa in v.s. 1735.
This Visāji (or Visoji) is probably the youngest brother of Bhojrajji II, the Paramāra ruler of Mūli. (see Kathiawad Gazetteer p. 556).

Text
1 स्वतम भीभवत १३३५ वर
2 ने भालग बद २ युग्मासरे पा
3 ठक लोलानुत पाटक घा
4 नजीके कटारी परमार
5 दीसाजीने (?) उवरे गले भा
6 जी छे हरीशरण घया
7 छे

BEYT
No. 144] v.s. 1738 [31-5-1682
The pālia bearing the following inscription is standing half buried in the ground near Lakṣmīji’s vakhār in Beyt Śankhoddhar. It has the sculpture of a king riding on a horse and with a sword in his raised right hand. The saddle, the reins and the ornaments of the horse are very exquisitely carved. Behind the king is standing a servant holding an umbrella over the king’s head. The inscribed portion, which measures 16½” × 15” is illegible in the lower portion.
It records the death of Rāṇā Bhīma, most probably a Vāḍhel king, on the fifth day of the bright half Jeṭha in v.s. 1738.

Text
1 :॥ संवत १३२८ वर
2 ने जेट छद ५ दोमे रा
3 णा श्री ७ मीमबी
4 ...श्री: श्री

GADHAKĀ
No. 145] v.s. 1740 [20-10-1683
This inscribed pālia was found in the village Gadhakā. It records the death of Sutār Parbat while fighting against the Vāghers in GADHAKĀ
along with Jádejä Kuberji, on the 11th day of the bright half of Kārtika of v.s. 1740.

Nothing is known of Kuberji. He seems to be a bhāyāt of the royal family of Nawanagar.

**Text**

1 संवत् १७४० वर्ष कार्तिक मृ
2 रि ११ दीने सुतार परशु सुबंधका मृ
3 मोळ वारोरो साथे मामलो यांते जाहिजा
4 री कुबेरजी पासे देवातन पा मा छे
5 साथ रीमुरजनी देवातन पा

MALIA (Miyāṇā)

No. 146] v.s. 1740 [12-11-1683

This inscription is copied from one of the two pālīas standing near the Kanabi Nākā in Māliā (Miyāṇā), the capital of a fourth class state in Kathiawad. The inscribed portion engraved in bad Gujarati characters, measures 1'-3" by 1'-1".

The inscription states that on Monday, the third of the bright half of Māgasar in v.s. 1740 Mehetā Virji Vachāni was slain while defending the town Māliā against the armies of the Zālā (king) Candrasālji (i.e. Candrasingji) in the time of Jádejä Ravāji.

Jádejä Ravāji must be the brave son of Rao Rāyadhanji of Kachha, who conquered Morvi from the Nabab of Junagadh, and was looking after the government in the time of his old father. He was murdered by his brother Prāgmalji. His son Kāyāji afterwards became the founder of the Morvi State. Zālā Candrasālji, was most probably Candrasingji, the powerful ruler of Vankaner.

**Text**

1 संवत् १७४० वरामे मागस
2 र छुद २ समे म० वाररजी व
3 छाणी गामने काम अव छे ज
4 रजा अंबरज न बरम हा
5 ल संदर्सतज्ञ कट
6 टक अमतार मरा छ
7 मज मतदान कम अ
8 व छ।

MAVĀṆA

No. 147] v.s. 1745. [1-2-1689.

This inscription is copied from a pālīa standing in the northern part of the village Mavāṇā, in the Kambhālia Mahal of the Nawanagar State.
It records the death of the Pindaaria Rana in a fight with the Vaghers on Friday, the seventh of the dark half of Magha in v.s. 1745.

**Text**

1. संवत १७४५ वर्षे माहा बढी ७ चौहे दिन।
2. दारीया रणो बाघर साथे मामलो धीरो।
3. तीनं देखतन पामो छे। साथ श्रीसुसूजनी।

**BADI**

**No. 148**

v. s. 1748  [22-11-1691.]

This inscribed *palia* is standing by the side of the river near the village Badi in the Gogha Taluka, in the south-east of Kathiawad. The inscribed portion measures 8" by 9".

It records the death of Raval Sursinhji son of Raval Jivanji and grand-son of Raval Sarangji, on the 12th day of the bright half of Magasar in v.s. 1748, while fighting against the Muhamedan armies under Daudkhani. Sursinhji was the sister's son of Vaghelia Bharaji Makundji, and the nephew of Raval Satrusalyaji and Hamirji.

The Raval Satrusalyaji mentioned in the record was for some time the ruler of Sikar but was ousted by Akheraji, after which he was granted the *tapa* of Bhandaria. His younger brother Hamirji conquered Kukad from the Ahir and founded the village Dihor.

The inscription was once published in the Prakrit and Sanskrit Inscriptions of Kathiawad on p. 166.

**Text**

1. संवत १७४८ वर्षे मागसार शद १२ दने रावोबंध
2. शारांजी झुन रावत जीवणजी झुन रावो
3. हूँ झुरसंध्याि, बाईला भाराजी मरक्कं
4. जीना भाणेन, तरक सैनी दादमाननी
5. कोज शामा खडी मुआ...रावत शातरशा
6. ठजी तथा हमीरजीना मतरोजा

**JHINJUVADA**

**No. 149**

v. s. 1748.  [9-5-1692.]

This inscribed *palia* is found in Jhinjuvada, a very old and historically important town which is situated at a distance of one mile to the east of the little *Ran* of Kaccha, and sixteen miles north of Khairagod Railway Station.

The record opens with the date, Monday, the third of the bright half of Jetha of v.s. 1748 and mentions the names of Maharan Gajasimhaji son of Sabalasimhaji, son of Jesa, who was son of Hamir. The name of the son of Gajasimhaji and the further portion of the inscription is illegible.
HALVAD

No. 150] v. s. 1749. [5-5-1693.

This inscription is copied from a pālia standing near the thirty-six pillared deri at Halvad.

The inscription records that Gohel Vasāji son of Gohel Karanjī by his wife Jivibai, and grandson of Gohel Govindji was slain in a battle while fighting on behalf of Mahārāṇā Jasvantsimhji, on the tenth day of the bright half of Vaiśākha in v.s. 1749.

Mahārāṇā Jasvantsimhji was the Zālā ruler of Halvad, who ruled from 1683 to 1723 A.D.

KHAMBHIALIA

No. 151] v. s. 1749 [5-5-1693.

This inscription is engraved on a pālia raised in one of the Deris to the north of the temple of Kambhanātha Mahādeva in Kambhālā in the Nawanagar State. It records that a Gugal Brahman woman named Lādbai became sati at the death of her husband, Sankar Raghunātha on the 10th day of the bright half of Vaiśākha in v.s. 1749 (or Sāka 1615).

Text
GOPANĀTHA

No. 152

v. s. 1750.

This inscription, measuring 7" in length and breadth is found in the well to the north-west of the celebrated temple of Gopanātha in the possession of the Maharaja of Bhavnagar.

The inscription records that a well was built by a Mahārāṣṭra Brahmaṇāraṇī named Ananda on Monday, the twelfth of the bright half of Aṣāḍha in v.s. 1750. The political connection of the Marāṭhās with the province had not yet begun.

Text

1  श्रीसदस्थिवाय नमः
2  संवत् १७५० वर्षे अ
3  शाह झु. १२ सोमवास
4  रे दक्षिणी माराण्डू
5  श्रीचारी आनंद
6  विण्णप्रसादत् भो
7  पीनाथ कुपास्यधी वा
8  पी संपूर्ण शुभं महत्

(To be Continued.)
NOTES OF THE MONTH

It is proposed to present a *Volume of Studies in Indology* to Prof. P. V. Kane, M.A., L.L.M. of Bombay in appreciation of his services to the several branches of Sanskrit learning, on 7th May 1941, when he will be completing his 61st year. A representative committee of Indian scholars was organized early in May 1940 to carry out the work of the proposed volume under the chairmanship of Dr. V. S. Sukthankar, M.A., P.H.D. The editors of the *New Indian Antiquary* are the Editors of the above volume, while the work of publication of the volume has been undertaken by Dr. N. G. Sardesai, L.M. & S. the enterprising Proprietor of the *Oriental Book Agency, 15 Shukrawar Peth, Poona 2 (India)*. Numerous representative contributions to the above volume have already been received by the Editors and the printing of the volume is proceeding apace. Scholars and libraries wishing to register their orders for copies of the volume may write to the Oriental Book Agency.

* * *

With effect from August 1940 the University of Bombay started the publication of their official organ viz. the *Bombay University Bulletin* of which two quarterly issues for August and November 1940 have already appeared. This organ "will give news of the University and of the Colleges, Schools and other institutions affiliated to or otherwise connected with it. It will also maintain contact with the general public."

It is now more than eighty years since the Bombay University began to function as a small examining body. "It has now become one of the biggest Universities in India combining teaching and examining functions and offering courses of study in a variety of subjects, cultural, scientific and technical". These remarks of Mr. R. P. Masani, M.A., the present Vice-Chancellor of the University introducing the first number of the *Bulletin* are quite apposite. We also note with satisfaction the declared aim of the University "to take the University to the door of the public" by keeping in touch with the general life of the people and by expanding the scope of its influence with a view to maintain close contact with the literary, professional, industrial and commercial organizations functioning within the sphere of its operations.

The two issues of the *Bulletin* before us contain varied matter under such headings as (1) Editorial Notes, (2) Obituary Notices, (3) University News, (4) Elections, Nominations and Appointments, (5) Ordinances and Regulations, (6) Inter-University Board Discussions, (7) Excerpts from Convocation Address, (8) Programme of Examinations, (9) Prize competitions, (10) News about Colleges, Schools, other Universities, (11) News of general interest etc. The information supplied under the above headings is useful so far as it goes to the University and its affiliated institutions etc. but the news supplied under these headings has no immediate bearing on the general life of the people and hence it cannot create interest in the general public not closely connected with the inner working of the University. If the Bulletin is "to attract the attention of the general public" as stated by the Vice-Chancellor it must not be a mere Gazette of University activities but should contain some section of educative value to the general public. We feel confident that our present scholar Vice-Chancellor will be able to combine in the Bulletin both the official news and educative matter for the student and the general public respectively so as to make the University loved and respected by all sections of the educated public.
PARAMĀRTHASĀRA OF ĀDIŚEṢA

By
S. S. SURYANARAYANA SASTRI, Madras.

I
param parasyāḥ prakṛter anādīmā ekam nivīṣṭam bahudhā guhāsū |
śarvālayam sarva-carāḥ-śarastham tvām eva viṣṇumā śaraṇam
prapadye ||

TRANSLATION

I
O Viṣṇu, who art more primal than primal nature (as responsible for the
reality and manifestation alike of the latter),* who art beginningless and one,
yet art many as it were since thou) hast entered in manifold forms the caves
(which are impenetrable, since they are fragments of the indeterminable and
hence imponderable māyā), who art the substrate of all (as their ground,
accounting for their existence and manifestation), who art present in all,
movable and immovable, Thee alone (who art ever immediately present as
the Self) do I seek as refuge.

NOTES

I
The invocatory verse introduces the reader to Brahman in both the sāguna and
nirguna aspects. The very appellation, Viṣṇu, indicates the sāguna aspect. This
same Viṣṇu, who is sought after as the refuge, is also the absolute substrate of the
world, movable and immovable. Material diversity can no doubt be reduced to and
understood as an evolution from homogeneous primal matter, prakṛti, as it is called
in the Śāṅkhya system and also in the present manual. But matter being non-
conscious and inert requires to be manifested; else it would not be cognised at all.
Being non-intelligent, it has to be guided in its evolution by intelligence (cātanyā).
Further, it will be seen on inquiry that the act depends on cit for its
very existence, not merely for its manifestation. For, assuming an ultimate
dualism of cit and acit, opposed to each other, as subject and object, how
can the former ever know the latter? Knowledge implies and requires an intimacy,
an identification, which cannot be secured so long as subject and object are merely
left over each against the other. The difficulty may be exhibited in many ways,
but the following may suffice. When A is said to know B, is B wholly unknown
to A or wholly known? Not the latter, since knowledge is always of the novel;
in the case of the already wholly known, a knowing process will be merely re-
iterative and purposeless; there will be really no knowledge. Nor is B the wholly
unknown; we just had to note that the knowing process is purposeful; how can
there be a purpose, a desire to know, formed in respect of the wholly unknown?
Evidently, we have to compromise and treat B as partly known and partly unknown.
But with this we are no nearer a solution, since the questions we raised will recur

* The words in brackets in the translation are supplied here, as in the rest of
the book, for the most part from the Commentary of Rāghavānanda (published in the
Trivandrum Sanskrit Series, No. 12).

1. K: ...parastham gahanād anādīm.
2. K: śambhum
with regard to each part. In relation to the part known there can be no knowledge while in relation to the other part there cannot be the desire to know. This latter desire seems indeed to be inconsistent both with knowledge and with ignorance. The difficulty is persistent and insurmountable, so long as knowledge is conceived as an external relation between a subject and an object. Is knowledge at all possible? Certainly. The self knows itself; it cannot doubt or deny itself, since it is the self of him who doubts or denies. But the self is self-luminous, it is not known as an object to a subject; it is itself knowledge, neither the object nor the subject thereof. Whatever is cognised succeeds in being cognised, only in so far as there is revealed its identity with the intelligence which is knowledge; and this could not be the case, if the object were really independent. It is because object and subject are both abstractions from the one intelligence, it is because both alike are super-impositions on the basic infinite identity, that the knowing relation is at all possible.

A relation exists either between independent terms or between related terms. If they be independent, the relation would require other relations to connect it to the terms; thus there would be infinite regress. If already related, are they related by this same relation? If so there is the defect of self-dependence. If by another relation, with regard to that too our inquiry will arise, leading again to infinite regress. Relation thus presupposes a non-relational substrate. And this substrate must be self-luminous intelligence, since the non-intelligent, as dependent on intelligence for manifestation, cannot be non-relational. Thus the basic reality has to be of the nature of intelligence which accounts for both the existence and manifestation of the non-intelligent, called primal nature or mâyā. Hence it is that Vishnu is said to be more primal than primal nature.

The real, being non-relational, is beginningless and one. What is not a term in a relation cannot be a member of a temporal series. Time is in it, like other relations. If it had a beginning it would be an effect, whereas the causal relation itself is but an appearance superimposed on the real, as will be evident from its failure to be intelligible in the last resort. The causal concept seeks to make change intelligible by discovering the element of identity in the change. It is because of the importance of identity and continuity that the creationist view of the effect as wholly new is condemned by the followers of the Sāṅkhya, Vedânta and allied schools, who maintain that the effect is pre-existent in the cause, requiring only to be manifested and not created. But the advocates of the effect as pre-existent (satkāryavāda) do but postpone the difficulty. The effect that is manifested, does it pre-exist as manifest or as non-manifest? Obviously not the former. If it exists as non-manifest, does the manifestation make any difference to the effect or not? If not, it is irrelevant, and an irrelevant factor cannot avail to make a fundamental difference between cause and effect. If it does make a difference, then the manifested effect is not the same as the non-manifested one and there is no justification for treating the effect as pre-existent in the cause. Further, this identity we seek between cause and effect, has it any limits? The effect is something produced; if the cause should be of like nature, should it not also be something produced, i.e. an effect in its turn? If we admit this, we are committed to an unending series of causes and effects, with no chance of an ultimate explanation. If so much identity is not required, why should we not admit as much discreteness between cause and effect as is involved in the creationist’s view that the effect, prior to production, is non-existent? Because of these and other such difficulties we hold that the real is beginningless.

It is also one, since for the reasons mentioned it is non-relational, and a plurality is necessarily in a relation at least of separation. The usual dialectic of difference takes the following form. Ultimate plurality is unintelligible, since apart from difference there can be no manifold. Difference cannot be conceived either as an
attribute of the particulars or as their very essence. If particulars A and B are distinct as having difference for their attribute, then we have to admit that, at least in so far as they have this attribute in common, they are identical, i.e., non-different. In other words, the attribute of difference in so far as it is really possessed by the alleged differentia, makes them non-different; this is absurd. Further, the quality of difference, is this different or not from the particulars alleged to be different? If not different, we merge the quality in the substance; thus A would be identical with difference-of-A-from-B and B identical with difference-of-B-from-A; A in other words would be identical with B. If the quality is different from the particulars, we have interposed, between the particular and its difference, another difference; this again will be separated from the terms by another quality of difference and so on ad infinitum. Nor can difficulties be avoided by treating difference as the essence of the particulars. That whose very nature is difference cannot be one; the doctrine of difference as essential cannot therefore allow of the recognition of any unit, not even a primal atom, since this too should fall apart into distinct parts; similarly of its constituents ad infinitum; and in the absence of any unit, there can be no manifold either; the very insistence on difference serves to abolish difference.

Multiplicity, however, is not unreal; for it is immediately experienced; and what is unreal, like the barren woman’s son, cannot be an object of immediate cognition. Nor can it be real, as we have seen, since it fails to stand analysis. It is experienced, yet it is sublated; what is real, like the self, can never be sublated. Diversity therefore can be neither real nor unreal. It is a product of Nescience (mâyâ or avidyâ), which obscures the unity and projects a multiplicity.

Such obscuration and projection constitute error; and error refuses to admit of explanation in terms of the real or the unreal. The rope-snake cognition is not of the real; for then the snake should continue to be perceived for all time and by all people; sublation would be impossible. Nor is it of the unreal, since the unreal cannot be immediately apprehended; much less can it cause trepidation and flight. Two possible ways suggest themselves out of this impasse. One is to admit the reality of the content of the erroneous cognition, but not as cognised i.e., not here and now. The snake is real enough, but not as I perceive it, in the rope; it will be found in its own appropriate hole, ready to cause not only fear, but more serious damage to those who approach. What fails us in erroneous cognition, then, is not the content, but the mode. If we cognised the snake as in its hole and the silver as in the cash box, instead of perceiving them in the rope and in the nacre, there would be no delusion. Delusion is not the cognition of the unreal (asat-khyâti), but the cognition of the real as otherwise than it is (anyathâ khyâti). Such a view has a good deal to commend it. It does not do violence by asking us to believe in immediate experience of the unreal. It is patently verified in those cases of delusion where there is a transference of properties because of proximity etc., e.g., in the erroneous cognition of a crystal as red, because of the proximity of a China rose; the crystal is real, but not as red, and redness is real, but not as a property of the crystal. In such cases, however, both constituents of the delusive cognition—the crystal and the red colour—are present before us, capable of immediate apprehension through sense-contact. But in the apprehension of nacre as silver, silver is not present here and now so as to be perceived; and yet there is immediate (aparokṣa) apprehension of the silver; for, we put out our hand to grasp it, and the induction of such activity is intelligible only in the case of what is immediately apprehended. One may postulate some super-normal mode of sense-contact with even that which is not present. This, however, is an unproved and needless hypothesis. If its possibility be admitted for all, there would be no distinction between cognitions of the present and the not-present; if the capacity be restricted to a few, yogins and the like, the widespread phenomenon of delusion
would still have to be explained. Further, in the case of delusions, like the perception of a double moon, there is not a real second moon to serve as the content. Hence the admission of a real content, so long as it is not real here and now, does not go very far to solve our difficulty. And, if the content be real here and now, the cognition should not be erroneous.

The denial of error and the doctrine that all cognitions are valid constitute the other possibility. In what is called delusion one may distinguish a perceived and a remembered element; the glitter is perceived, the silverness is remembered. Either element is valid in itself and their mere combination cannot result in invalidity. What happens is that in the case of the remembered factor, the fact of its being a memory-impression is forgotten; its memory-ness is lost. We act as if the two factors are on a par; the result is error and confusion in practice (vyavahāra), though the cognition, as cognition, is all right. Such a valiant attempt to banish the elusive negative element deserves success, but does not achieve it. There is still the loss of memory-ness to be accounted for. A number of causes may be postulated, e.g., passion, fear, greed, sense-defect, etc.; but the essential feature is still negative, a loss. To what does this negative element correspond in cognition? It will not avail to say that the negation and failure belong only to the realm of practice, not to cognition. We fail when we put out our hand to grasp the silver; but did we apprehend it as silver before the activity in question? If not, then, that and other similar acts would be unintelligible, not being prompted by the only adequate cause, viz., immediate cognition of the appropriate content. If, on the other hand, there is apprehension as silver, the negative element has entered into the cognition itself and coloured it. It can no longer be maintained that, while the cognition is valid, practice alone is faulty. Non-discrimination (akhyāti) is not merely a conative but also a cognitive defeat; and we have still to account for this defeat without admitting the reality or the unreality of the content.

Another variety of the last-mentioned view maintains that all cognitions are valid, since all contents are so mixed up in the course of evolution by quintuplication of the elements,* that every object contains in itself in fractions however small the natures of all other things. Where nacre is recognised as silver, the former contains in itself some infinitesimal amount of silver; as relating to this the cognition is valid, though as referring to a larger quantity of silver, it fails us in practice. It is not that the silver-cognition has any unreal content; the content is real though practically inadequate. Here too the negative factor is not suitably accounted for. Our cognition is of silver, not of infinitesimal silver; in the latter case, practical activity would not result. The real content (admitting quintuplication which is only a hypothesis) falls far short of the cognition; and the inadequacy is not merely practical; the negative element enters into the cognition and calls for explanation.

It is because of such difficulties that the advaitin postulates māyā or avidyā to explain error. Error has a content; but, for the reasons already noted, the content cannot be characterised as real (sat) or unreal (asat). Nor can it be a combination of the two, as that is self-contradictory. The content is māyā, which, not being exclusively determinable as real or unreal or real-and-unreal, is said to be imponderable, indeterminable (anirvācya), and spoken of as a cave.

*A process wherein each of the five elements is divided into two parts, and one of the parts subdivided into four, before there is intermixture and the production of the things as we know them; thus, one half of the earth-element combines with an eighth each of water, air, fire and ether before there results what we know as earth; similarly, one half of the water-element combines with an eighth each of earth, air, fire and ether; and so on. As a result, every object of cognition has in its composition fractional elements of all other objects; hence no cognition can wholly fail of its content.
II
ātmāmburāśau nikhilo 'pi loko magno 'pi nā 'cāmati ne 'kṣate ca |
āścaryam etan mṛga-trṣṇikābhe bhavāmburāśau ramate mṛṣai 'va² ||

III
garbha-grha-vāsa-sambhava-jaṃma-jarā-marāṇa-viprayoga-'bdhau |
jagad ālokya nimagnam prāha gurum prāṇijaliḥ śiṣyāḥ³ ||

IV
tvam sāṅga-veda-vettā bhettā² saṃśaya-gaṇasya ṛta-vaktā⁴ |
saṃśārā-'ṛṇava-taraṇa-praśnam⁵ pṛchāmy aham bhagavan ||

II
The entire world (of conscious beings), though plunged in the ocean of 
Self, sips it not, nor even glances at it; (yet) it delights but delusively 
in the mirage-presented waters of migratory existence; lo! mysterious is 
this.

III
Seeing the world sunk in the ocean, consisting of entry into the womb, 
birth, old age, death and parting, a certain disciple (desirous of knowing 
the real, approached and) said thus to a preceptor, with folded hands.

IV
Thou art the knower of the Vedas together with their aṅgas, the destroyer 
of the host of doubts (about the sense of the Scriptures), and the expounder 

This nescience is collectively one; but each individual empirical self (jīva) 
has his own limiting adjunct, that is to say, his particular bit of nescience. Else 
when one slept all would sleep; and on the release of one, there would be universal 
release. Hence the reference in the verse to ‘caves’ in the plural.
The self-luminous single intelligence that is the substrate of diversity and 
the inner ruler of the apparently finite and multiple jīvas, is here addressed as 
Viṣṇu, since it is all-pervasive; because of this pervasiveness it is ever present; 
ence the appropriateness of appealing to Viṣṇu as the sole refuge.

II
The first verse states the nature of the Self, the second verse that of matter 
or the non-self (Prakṛti). It is thus indicated that what is commenced here is 
the inquiry for discriminating puruṣa from prakṛti. The terminology and approach 
are characteristic of the Śāṅkhya system. Hence the plausibility of the ascription 
of the work to Patañjali.

III
This verse indicates the qualifications of the disciple—that through merit 
and study he should have learnt to distinguish the permanent from the imperma-
nent, know that the apparent worldly pleasures do but occasion misery, turn 
away from them, desire to know the real Self alone, and possess the Scripturally 
declared qualifications of self-restraint, contentment, capacity to bear up against 
physical ills, desire for release &c. Such a one looks for a preceptor in a jīvan- 
mukta, and approaching him in the prescribed manner asks as follows.

1. This and the preceding verse are not found in B, P or V; nor does K have 
any verse to correspond to this.  
2. This is the first verse in P.  
3. P : chettā (v. 2)  
4. P : ṛtam vaktā (v. 2)  
5. P : taraṇam praśnam (v. 2)
V
dīrghe ‘smin saṃsāre saṃsara-ataḥ kasya kena sambandhaḥ |
karma śubhā-'śubha-phaladam1 anubhavati (nu) 2 gata ‘gatair iha kaḥ ||

VI
karma-guṇa-jāla-baddho jīvaḥ saṃsara-ataḥ kośakāra iva |
mohā-'ndhakāra-gahanāt tasya katham bandhanān mokṣaḥ ||

VII
guṇa-puruṣa-vibhāga-jña dharmā ‘dharmāna na bandhakau3 bhavataḥ |

iti gadita-pūrva-vākyāḥ prakṛtim puruṣam ca me brūhi4 ||

of the Truth. To thee, O, revered one, I put this question relating to crossing over the ocean of migratory existence.

V—VII
For him who migrates in this limitless saṃsāra (migratory existence), whereby is there relation thereto? Who is it that by passing and repassing here (in these three worlds) experiences the karma that gives fruit, auspicious and inauspicious? Who is the jīva that migrates (as some say) bound in the aggregate of karma and guṇa (sattva, etc.), like a silkworm ['spider' says the commentary] in a cocoon [web?] made of filaments of its own creation? How, for him, is there release from bondage which is difficult to overcome, being of the nature of the intense darkness of delusion? For him who knows the distinction between puruṣa and the guṇas, how is it that merit and demerit are not causes of bondage? Along with (the answers to) these questions, tell me about prakṛti and puruṣa.

IV
The ‘āṅgas’ are the well-known subsidiary disciplines, viz., Phonetics, Liturgy, Grammar, Prosody, Etymology and Astronomy. The “Truth” is the real Self expounded in the entire Vedānta and denoted by terms like Bhagavān and Brahman.

V—VII
The Self is self-luminous intelligence; it is pervasive and infinite. What is it then that is subject to transmigration? Self-certitude belongs to my existence, while it is my own self that appears to be bound to suffering. How is this intelligible? If the suffering be said to be an appearance due to māyā that is constituted of the guṇas (strands, constituents) sattva, rajas and tamas, how is one to account for the association of the self with māyā? It may be set down to karma, i.e. the activity of the Self, and its consequences proximate and remote, patent and latent. But why should the perfect Self act at all? It has no need to satisfy, no motives to prompt, no desires to fulfil. Activity must be due to avidyā, while the association with avidyā has itself to be accounted for by activity (karma). Assuming that the association has somehow come about (unintelligibility, the advaitin would claim, is an ornament, not a defect in the case of avidyā).

1. P: phaladam (v. 3).
2. P: reads ‘anubhavati’ without the emendation suggested by the editor of T.
3. P: bandhakau na (v. 5).
4. P: iti gaditaḥ prakṛtim puruṣam ca me brūhi (v. 5).
VIII
ity ādhāro bhagavān prṣṭah śīyeṇa tam sa ho 'vāca |
viduśām apy atigahanam vaktavyam idam śṛṇu tathā 'pi tvam |
IX
satyam iva jagad asatyam mūlaprakṛter idamṛ kṛtam yena |
tam praniḥ patyo 'pendram vakṣye paramārthasāram idamṛ |
X
avyaktād aṇḍam abhūd aṇḍad brahmā tataḥ prajā-sargaḥ |
māyā-māyai pravṛttiḥ samprhiyata iyanṛ punaḥ kramaśaḥ ||

VIII
The revered one, the support (of the world, i.e., Adiśeṣa), being thus questioned by the disciple, said to the latter: This which is to be expounded to you is difficult even for the learned (to comprehend); yet (I shall expound it to you;) listen!

IX
I shall expound this Paramārthasāra, after rendering obeisance to Upendra (Viṣṇu), by whom, because of primal nature (i.e., his own energy), this non-real world is created, as if it were real.

X
From the unmanifest (as subjected to the glance of the Supreme Person) arose the Cosmic Germ; from the Germ (arose) Brahmā; thence (resulted how can this whose origins are indeterminable have an assured end? What is the certainty of release? If you appeal to the evidence of persons alleged to have found release, the jīvanmuktas, how is it that they continue to live and act among us, in spite of their reported release? Will not action serve to bind them afresh? If not, whence their immunity? Such is the string of questions put by the reverent but inquisitive disciple.

The word guṇa is used here, as in Śāṅkhyā texts, to signify a constituent, not a quality. It is possible that the usage primarily derives from a doctrine according to which the qualities themselves constitute the substance, instead of inhering in 'a something I know not what' as their substrate. Such a view is clearly enunciated and defended by the Saiva Siddhāntin.* However this may be, consistently with the general Śāṅkhyā approach, our present text uses 'guṇa' in the sense of a constituent.

X
The Vedānta agrees with the Śāṅkhyā in recognising a primal non-differentiated matter wherefrom the manifold evolves. The former insists, however, on intelligent guidance of the evolution; it is not a mere unconscious process, like the secretion of milk by the cow. Hence the commentator's reference to the "glance

* See further an article by the present writer on 'Substance and Attribute in the Saiva Siddhānta' JORM, VIII, 97.

1. P : kaśityādhāro; in the reckoning of this text, this is the sixth verse; the second verse in K uses the words "ādhāram bhagavantam", which are explained by a commentator, Yoga Muni, as referring to Śeṣa.
2. P : omits "idam" (v. 7).
3. This verse is cited in LM, p. 280.
4. The corresponding verse in K mentions four aṇḍas (āndacatusṭaya); this is verse 1 in B and V.
5. P : māyā-mayaḥ kalpante samprhiyate (v. 8),
XI
māyā-mayo 'py acetā1 guṇa-karaṇa-gaṇah2 karoti karmāṇi |
tadadhishṭāta dehi sa cetano 'pi na karoti kiñcid api3 ||

XII
yadvad acetanam api san-nikaṭasthe bhūmade bhrāmake bhrāmati loham |
tadvat karaṇa-samūhaś ceṣṭati4 cidadhishthite dehe5 ||

the creation of beings (movable and immovable); the activity (of the 
Creator) is of the nature of māyā; this (creation) is again re-absorbed in 
(reverse) sequence.

XI
The aggregate of guṇa and karaṇa (i.e., the body), which is a product 
of māyā (as inspired by Isvara), though non-conscious, performs deeds 
(good, bad and mixed); the controller thereof, the embodied one (the jīva), 
though he is intelligence, performs no (deed) whatsoever (since activity in-
volving a change of nature is impossible in the case of him who is of the 
sole nature of intelligence).

XII
Just as iron, though inert, moves in the proximity of the lodestone, 
similarly, when the body is controlled by intelligence (through the adoption 
of the Supreme Person " and the inspiration of Isvara, in this verse and the next.

According to the commentary, the second line has to be rendered thus: this 
creative activity of the Person who has māyā for adjunct is briefly expounded 
in this sequence by the learned, e.g., "nārāyaṇaḥ paro 'vyaktād aṇḍam avyaktas-
sambhavam" etc.

XI
Activity is characteristic of intelligence; the non-intelligent, i.e., māyā, is 
per contra inert. But strangely enough, what we mean by activity in the empirical 
world is entirely a product of the body. It is the body which is born and dies, 
which longs and strives, which achieves and rejoices or is miserable; all these are 
characteristic expressions of the guṇas—sattva, rajas and tamas—compounded 
in varying proportions, and manifest through their own products, the organs, in-
ternal and external, the antahkaraṇas and the indriyas; spirit no doubt is active, 
but its functioning is free and not delimited in space and time, these latter being 
partial and defective manifestations of that intelligence. In that integral experience 
there is no distinction of cause or consequence, agent or act; hence intelligence, 
though the controller of activity as the substrate thereof, cannot be treated as the 
agent.

How can the inert be active? To this the answer is furnished in the next 
verse.

XII
The analogy of iron and the lodestone is common to the Sāṅkhya too. The 
point of the comparison lies in the induction of change in what is proximate without 
any change in that which induces. The present text, however, goes a step further 
in treating intelligence as what is not merely proximate to, but is also the con-

1. P: acetano; ninth verse in its 
   reckoning. 3. V and B omit "api" (v. 2).
2. V : gaṇam (v. 2); B : guṇa-
   kara-gaṇam. 4. P: ceṣṭate (v. 10).
5. This verse corresponds to V-3 
   and B-3.
XIII
yadad savitriy udite karoti karmāni jīvaloko 'yam |
na ca tānī karoti raviṇa kārayati tadvad ātmā 'pi1 ||

XIV
manaso 'haṅkāra-vimūrchitasya' Caitanya-bodhitasye 'ha |
puruṣā-'bhimāna-sukha-duḥkha-bhāvanā bhavitā mūḍhasya ||

of misconceptions like ‘I am a man’), the aggregate of the organs (i.e., the body) becomes active.

XIII

Just as this world of living beings performs deeds when the sun rises, and it is not the sun that performs them or causes them to be performed, so too is the Self (not an agent in any way).

XIV

Of these (māyā-products), for the manas, which has become the object of individuation (egoity) as illumined by intelligence (identified with manas),

troller of matter. Intelligence being infinite and pervasive, there is nothing wherefrom it is remote. Matter, for the advaitin, is not alien to spirit, but a superimposition on spirit, due to the failure of spirit to know itself; hence there is not for matter even as much foreignness as in systems like the Śāṅkhyā. The problem which these systems have to face may be put thus: If mere proximity can induce matter to evolve, evolution would never cease and there would be no release (kāivalya), as the infinite spirit can never cease to be proximate; if some kind of control be admitted as necessary, it is not intelligible. What form of control could exist as between two wholly foreign entities? Some community of nature is necessary as between director and directed. The advaita concept of matter would thus seem to be in a more advantageous position. But here again it may be asked how matter can ever cease to evolve, inasmuch as spirit, to which matter is not foreign, is always, in proximity and presumably exercises control all the time. To that the reply is as follows: matter, which is neither real nor unreal, is proximate to spirit as a superimposition thereon; for superimposition there is needed identification of the self with the not-self; such identification is possible and actual because of beginningless nescience; what is called control by spirit consists just in this identification (appearing in such forms as ‘I am a man, a brahmin, old, lame, blind of one eye,’ etc.); this nescience is destroyed with the onset of knowledge, i.e., self-realisation; the control of matter as well as matter itself ceases therewith, and thenceforth there is neither evolution nor bondage. An obvious question is how the erroneous identification ever started; to which the equally obvious answer is that it did not ever start, as it is beginningless like time itself.

XIII

The commentator says that what binds the Self to samsāra is the body, the puryaṣṭaka, composed of the following eight factors: (1) the five karmendriyas (2) the five Jñānendriyas, (3) the four beginning with manas, making up the internal organ, (4) the five vital airs, prāṇa etc., (5) the elements, ether etc., (6) kāma, (7) karma, and (8) tamas. The authority for this enumeration is not

---

1. This corresponds to V-4 and 2. P.: mūrchitasya (v. 12); B: B-4, V.: dvārā murchitasya (v. 5).
XV
karta bhokta drastrap' smi karmanam uttamaadinaam
iti tat svabhava-vimalo 'bhimanyate sarvago 'py atm
dvad dhatte yatho 'malah sphaatikah

cnadya upadher gunabhavitasya bhavam vibhur dhatte

XVI-A
adarase mala-rahite yadvad reptam vicinute lokah
alokayati tatho tma visuddha-buddhau svam atmnam

there comes about, in the case of the foolish, the concept of being a person,
an enjoyer and a sufferer.

XV
Therefore (because of this concept), the Self, though pure and omnipresent
by nature, entertains the concept "I am a cogniser, I am the agent
in respect of acts, good (i.e., enjoined by the Vedas) and otherwise, I am
the experiencer (of the fruit)."

XVI
Just as a clear crystal takes on the colours of diverse coloured objects
(in proximity), even so the all-pervasive (Self) takes on the nature of the
adjuncts produced by the gunas (prakrti).

XVI-A
Just as people in the world look for (their own) form in a mirror free
from impurity, even so does the Self look for itself in the pure intellect.

cited by name. There is some similarity to the enumeration in Bhoja's Tattva-
prakasak, v. 12.

XV
"Cognisership" is mentioned before "agency" in the translation, in conformity
with the logical order adopted in the commentary.

XVI
The adjuncts are explained as the state of a divine being, a human being
etc.; this is the sense of the second line of the corresponding verse in Abhinavagupta's
work.

XVI-A
Both in the Sankhya and the Vedanta, the intellect (buddhi), as essentially
of the nature of Sattva, is considered capable of reflecting the Self. The Self in itself

1. B, V: api (v. 6).
2. V and B omit "iti" (v. 6).
3. B: vimalabhimanyate (v. 6).
4. P: varnam (v. 14) V: varn
d (v. 7).
5. V and B: sphaatikam (v. 7).
6. P: guptato bhavitasya (v. 14). verse 17, not in T; the corresponding
Corresponds to verse 6 in K, verse in K reads:
aadarase mala-rahite yadvad vadam vibhati tadvad ayam
sivaakti-pata-vimale dhi-tattve bhathi bhara-rupah"
XVII

gacchati gacchati salile dinakara-bimbam¹ sthite sthitim yāti |
antāḥ-karane gacchati gacchaty ātmā 'pi tadvad iha² ||

XVIII

rāhur adṛśyo 'pi yathā śaśi-bimbasthaḥ prakāśate jagati |
sarva-gato 'pi tathā 'tmā buddhistro drśyatām eti³ ||

XIX

sarvagatam nirupamam⁴ advaitam tace⁵ cetasa gamyam |
yad buddhigatam brahmaḥ 'palabhyate śiśya bodhyam tat ||

Here (in the world), the solar orb (reflected in water), moves (as it were) when the water moves, and attains quiescence (as it were) when (the water is) still; similarly, the Self too (reflected in the internal organ) moves (as it were) when the internal organ moves (and attains quiescence as it were, when that organ is still).

XVIII

Just as in the world, Rāhu, though invisible, becomes visible, as present in the lunar orb (it obscures), even so the Self, though omnipresent (and hence not an object), yet, as present in the intellect, comes to have visibility (i.e., the nature of an object of cognition).

XIX

That Brahman which is present (as reflected) in the intellect and is consequently cognisable by the intellect (through the I-cognition), that should be understood to be omnipresent (unlimited in respect of space, time, or other entities), unparalleled (bliss), and non-dual (consciousness, devoid of the three kinds of difference).

is essential knowledge, without distinctions of knower, known and knowing. Where it is knower, it is so in respect of cognition, i.e. itself as reflected in the intellect.

XVIII

The example of the perception of Rāhu is employed elsewhere by the advaitin with greater force and appropriateness to illustrate the cognition of nescience; as non-intelligent it cannot manifest itself; what can manifest is intelligence, which it obscures; yet in the very process of obscuration there is manifestation of itself as obscuring.

XIX

Difference may be from another belonging to a wholly distinct genus (vijātiya bheda) or only to another species (sañjātiya bheda); or it may be a plurality in the entity itself (svagata bheda).

   sarvagato 'py ayaṁ ātmā viṣayāśrayaṇena dhīmukre || (v. 8).
4. B, V: tanmiṣṭham (v. 11) 5. P: tāc ca (v. 18); V (v. 11);
   B (v. 11).
XX
buddhi-mano-‘haṅkārās tanmātre-‘ndriya-gaṇās ca bhūtagaṇaḥ |
saṃsāra-sarga-parirakṣaṇa- kṣamā prakṛtā haṃ hīṃ ||

XXI
dharmā-’dharmau sukha-duḥkha-kalpanā svarga-naraka-vāsās ca |
uptatti-nidhana-varṇā-’śramā na santi ’ha paramāṁthee ||

XXII
mṛga-ṭṛṣṇāyāṃ udakam śuktau rajatam bhujāṅgamo rajjvām |
taimirika-candra-yugavaḥ bhrāntam nikhilam jagad-rūpam ||

The intellect, manas, individuation (egoity), the aggregate of (five)
subtle elements and (ten) organs (sensory and motor), and the aggregate
of (five) gross elements, these products of prakṛti have the capacity to bring
on and maintain the (cycle of) migratory existence; (hence) they are to
be abandoned (as of the nature of the not-self, by those who seek release).

XXI

Here (in the Self), there is not in reality merit or demerit or the expe-
rience of (their fruit, viz.) pleasure or pain, or residing in heaven or hell
(for the sake of that pleasure or pain) ; nor is there birth or death, caste
or order (of life).

XXII

Like water in the mirage, silver in nacre, serpent in a rope, and the
double moon produced by (the optical defect) timira, the entire world-phen-
omenon is a delusion.

XX

In the Sāṅkhya, prakṛti is assigned both the functions of binding and re-
leasing; such an exalted notion of prakṛti is difficult to assimilate, and less ac-
ceptable than what is set forth here.

XXI

Here, again, there is an improvement on the Sāṅkhya view, which, while hold-
ing that in truth no one is ever bound or released (SK, v. 62), yet maintains
a plurality of spirits, because of the varying incidence of birth, death etc. (SK,
v. 18).

XXII

The commentary sets forth the inference of illusoriness based on being object
of cognition, being finite, and being inert (non-self); the example (udāharaṇa) in
each case is nacre-silver. Illusoriness is defined as sublatability by knowledge of the

1. P : saṃbhūtagaṇaḥ (v. 19); V : sukha-duḥkhe (v. 20).
2. V : Prakṛtāḥ (v. 12).
3. V : saṃbhūtagaṇaḥ (v. 19); B (v. 12).
4. Corresponds to verse 29 in K :
tadvad dharmā-’dharma-svar-nirayo-’ṭpatti-marana-sukha-duḥkham |
varṇā-’śramādi ca ’tmany asad api vibhramabāśad bhavati ||
6. P : akhilam (v. 21); this is the p. 259,
XXIII
yadvad dinakara eko vibhāti salilā-śayeṣu sarveṣu |
tadvat sakalo-śpadiṣṭaḥ avasthito bhāti paramātmā ||

XXIV
kham¹ iva ghaṭādiṣva antarbhāhīḥ sthitam brahma sarvaśīṃdeṣu²
dehe 'ham³ ity anātmanī buddhiḥ saṃsāra-bandhāya ||

XXV
sarva-vikalpaśa-hīnaḥ suddho buddho⁶ 'jarā-‘marah śāntah |
amalaḥ sakṛd-vibhātās⁷ cetana ātmā khavad⁸ vyāpi⁹ ||

XXIII
Just as the one Sun appears in all sheets of water, so does the (one) Supreme Self appear as present in all adjuncts (i.e., aggregate of body and organs).

XXIV
Like ether in pots etc., is Brahman present in all bodies; (hence) the cognition "I" in respect of the not-self, the body, (is but a delusion which) serves to bind one to (the cycle of) migratory existence.

XXV
The intelligent one is (certainly) the (Supreme) Self; (for) it is free from all indeterminacy (being the witness of all doubts); it is pure (unlike the body, associated with diverse impurities); it is conscious (unlike prāṇa);

substance; the illusoriness of illusoriness is discussed; and the inference of illusoriness is said to be ātmagātata (self-destructive) like āgama, as exemplified in "ne ha rānā 'sti’"; this text too is not real as a duality over against Brahman; self-destruction is illustrated by the faggot that starts a fire destroying itself as well as other things; the illusory does not have to make known the real, since the latter is self-manifest; the illusory can and does serve to remove the illusory, as when, in respect of a rope, the illusion that it is a stick may remove the prior illusion that it is a snake; practical efficiency is possible in respect of and with even a greater degree of reality, e.g., the use of a reflection of one's face in a mirror, imagining Viṣṇu in a sālagramā etc.; if illusoriness be not granted, there is contingency of non-release, since what is non-illusory and cannot be sublated will persist as a cause of bondage, actual or potential.

XXV
The syllogism implied is "The jīva is but the Supreme Self, because of being free from indeterminacy, etc.; pot etc. are the negative example." That is to say,

1. V : svam (v. 16), explained in Telugu as "tānuvalenē, like oneself" ; this is obviously due to a misreading of "kham" in Devanāgarī script.
2. B : khaṭ菩提ṣu (v. 16).
4. B : V : deho 'ham (v. 16).
5. B : V : viṇkalpānā (v. 17)
sarva viṇkalpāna-hīnaḥ suddham śāntam vyayo-‘daya-viḥinam |
yat paratattvam tasmin vibhāti śat-triṃśadātmā jagat ||
XXVI
rasa-phānita-sarkarikā- gujā-khaṇḍā1 vikṛtayo yathai 've 'kṣoḥa ||
tadvad avasthā-bhedaḥ paramātmasya eva bahu-rūpāh4 ||

XXVII
vijñānā-ntaryāmi-prāṇa-virāḍ- deha- jāti-piṇḍā-ntāḥ |
vyayahārās tasyā 'tmanya5 ete avasthā-viśeṣāh6 syuḥ ||

it is decayless and deathless (unlike manas which lapses in sleep etc.); it
is quiescent (unlike the cogitator series subject to perpetual change); it
is taintless (unlike the void which is obscured by the taint of saṁvṛti,
obscuration, while the self is the witness even of that); it is ever-shining (un-
like the self of the Logicians, which is itself inert and possesses cognition
only as a quality); it is pervasive like ether (unlike the selves admitted by
the pluralists).

XXVI-XXVII
As of the sugar-cane there are different forms (such as) the juice, molases,
sugar crystals, jaggery and pieces thereof, even so of the (one) Supreme
Self there are diverse forms (as it were), viz., (Pure) Consciousness (which
has not suffered distinction as intelligent or inert), the internal ruler, the
prāṇa (the Jiva, who is Consciousness reflected in sattva-predominant pra-
krīti), the collective cosmic body, and individual bodies characterised by
generic qualities (like humanity, etc.); these diverse forms of that
say, what is not the Supreme Self, e.g. a pot, is not free from indeterminacy, being
subject to alternative specifications, as to which there is always doubt. Empirical
duality being granted, there is no drśṭāntāsiddhi; hence, the opponent cannot ask
"since there is nothing other than the Supreme Self, how can there be any example
of what is not that Self and not free from indeterminacy?" Nor can supremacy
as a probandum be denied, since what is non-established cannot be denied; as
Maṇḍana says "labdhā-rūpe kvaṇcit kičit tādrg eva niṣidhyate." That is to say,
that which is denied and that in relation to which there is the denial should be
already established; there can be no negation either of an unknown counter-corre-
late or in relation to an unknown locus. If the jiva be not the Supreme Self,
there is the contingency of either of them being not-self (anātman); and this is
not acceptable.

XXVI-XXVII
The internal ruler and the jiva are the intelligent modifications of Pure Con-
sciousness; the collective body and the individual bodies are the inert forms. The
illusory transformation of Consciousness into inert forms is possible, because of
māyā; the relation of māyā is also due to māyā; this does not lay it open to the
defect of self-dependence, as it is of the nature of māyā, in the last resort, not to be

1. P : khaṇḍādyāḥ vikṛtayo yathay he sarve paramātmahanā śambhoḥ (v. 26).
kṣoḥ (v. 25).
2. K : khaṇḍādyāya yathe 'kṣu-rasā 26; B. (v. 19), also LM citation
eva (v. 26).
3. P : paramātmana (v. 25).
4. V : bahu-rūpātmā (v. 18); K :
5. P : vyahāra-sthāsyā 'tmana (v.
6. K : vyahāra-mātram etat paramār-
thena tu na santy eva (v. 27).
XXVIII
rajjvām nāsti bhujaṅgaḥ sarpa-bhayam bhavati hetunā kena |
tadvad dvaita-vikalpabhrāntir avidyā na satyam idam1 ||

XXIX
etat tad andhakāram yad anātmany ātmatā bhrāntyā |
na vidanti vāsudevam sarvātmānam narā mūḍhāḥ2 ||

XXX
prāṇādy-ananta-bhedair ātmānam samvitatya jālam iva3 |
saṃharati4 vāsudevaḥ svavibhūtyā2 'kriḍāmāna iva4 ||

self (which is pure consciousness) are different (only because of differences) in empirical usage.

XXVIII

In the rope there is no snake; to what cause, then, is the fear of the snake due (if the illusory have no practical efficiency)? Even so, duality and its delusive presentation are but nescience (the consequence of ignorance of the non-dual self); (hence) this (duality) is not real.

XXIX

This is the darkness (of nescience) whereby selfhood (is) delusively (ascribed) to the non-self; (hence it is that) foolish men (who have not enquired into the real Self) do not know Vāsudeva, the Self of all (to be such).

XXX

Vāsudeva (Brahman that is of the nature of Consciousness), as if desiring to sport (with himself) through his own energy (māyā), spreads him-logically intelligible through and through; "durghaṭatvam avidyāyā bhūṣaṇam na tu dūṣaṇam."

XXVIII

The commentator quotes from Iṣṭasiddhi (p. 47) "sattve na bhrānti-bādhau stām nā 'sattve" &c; there would be neither delusion nor sublation in either case, if the delusion were real or if unreal; for the real cannot be sublated, while the unreal, like the square circle, cannot be the object of immediate cognition.

XXX

Hence it is not as if there are independent real finite consciousnesses different from and apprehending Vāsudeva. For the view that creation is an act of sport, as it were, see Ved. Sū., II, i, 33.

1. K: trāsam kurute ca mṛtyu-paryantam | bhrānter mahatī śaktir na vivekant ūmā nāma || (v. 28).
2. K: bhāveṣu prakāsāmahatī | ātmānātiriktesy api bhavatī anātmā-'bhimāno yam || (v. 30).
This and the preceding verse are cited in LM, p. 296, with the substitution of "janāh" for "narāḥ" in the last line.
3. Cp. K: jālena jālakāra iva (verse 32); P: indra-jālam iva (v. 29); the first half of this verse in the P version is cited in LM, p. 280.
4. P: upasūnharati (v. 29).
5. P: svabhūtyā (v. 29).
tribhir eva viśva-taijasa- prājñaīh |
ādi-madhya-nidhanā- khyaiḥ |
ja grat-svapna-suṣuptair bhrama-bhūtais chāditam turyam2 ||

XXXII

mohayatī 'vā 'tmānam svamāyayā dvaita-rūpyā devala4 |
upalabhate svayam evam guhā-gatam puruṣam ātmānam ||

XXXIII

jvalanād dhūmo- 'dgatibhir vividhā 'kṛtir ambare yathā bhāti |
tadvad6 viṣṇau sṛṣṭih svamāyayā dvaita-vistarā6 bhātī7 ||

self out, as a (spider its) web, in endless diverse forms such as prāṇa (the internal ruler) and the rest (viz., all jivas and bodies collective and individual), and destroys (i.e., takes up all of them into himself, after destroying the ignorance about himself through the knowledge that is himself).

XXXI

(He spreads himself out) in the three forms, Viśva, Taijasa and Prājña, (related to three states of) waking, dreaming and sleep, which are called (respectively) origination, the intermediate stage (of preservation) and destruction; by these same (three, though) delusive, is concealed (as it were) the fourth (the real light that is the Self).

XXXII

In this way, the shining one (the Self) himself deludes the Self, as it were, through his own māyā, and (again) realises (as it were) the Self, the person who had been hidden in the cave (of nescience).

XXXIII

Just as different forms (black, white, etc.) appear in the ether (which is colourless), because of (the colour of) the smoke rising from fire, even so does this creation, the expanse of duality, appear in Viṣṇu, through his own māyā.

XXXI

For further light on the three states and the three forms of consciousness, reference may be made to the Māndukya Upaniṣad and the first chapter of Gauḍapāda's kārikās thereon. Dreaming is referred to as the intermediate stage; compare the term “sandhiḥ” in “Sandhye sṛṣṭir āha hi” (Ved. Śū., III, ii. 1).

1. P inserts “taih” (v. 30; also B and V (v. 23).
jāgrat viśvam bhedāt svapnas tejan prakāsa-māhātmyaḥ | prājñaḥ svapnā-vasthā jāna-ghanatvat tataḥ param turyam || (vs. 34, 35).
3. P: ātma na (v. 31).
4. P: devam (v. 31).
5. V: tad (v. 25); B: tadvispoḥ

P reads turīya (v. 30); B, V: turya (v. 23).
7. This verse is cited in LM. p. 272.

(to be continued)
INSCRIPTIONS OF KATHIAWAD*

By

D. B. DISKALKAR, Poona.

KHAMBHĀLIA


This inscription is engraved on a pālia in one of the Deris near the temple of Kambhānātha Mahādeva at Kambhāliā in Nawanagar State.

It records the death of the prince Vibhāji son of Phulji by his wife Yāsuji, and grandson of Jām Rājasimhji on Saturday, the 13th of the bright half of Kārtika in v.s. 1751 or Śaka 1616.

Jām Phulji, mentioned in the inscription, is the younger brother of Jām Tamāci, the ruler of Jāmnagar from whom he had received Bhānyavād in girās. It will be seen therefore that the prince, whose death is recorded by this memorial stone does not come from the direct line of the rulers of Jāmnagar.

Text

1  श्रीमणि जयति समाग
2  स्वस्ति श्रीमण्डिक्षिम्ब श्रीक स
3  महातिस संवत १७५१
4  नते श्रीगोविङ्गाहनकत्ता
5  के १६१६ प्रवतयाने दक्षिणाय
6  न गते श्रीसी देउनंत्रनी
7  श्रीमहामोक्षप्रदोतसित
8  मे कारतिकमासो शुतकपेक्षे
9  श्रीगौविं १२ शतावासरे या
10  म श्री ५ राजसिंहजी तत्कुत
11  राजसी ५ पुलजी तत्स्य भावो भा
12  है राजसी यथौही तत्स्य जात
13  श्रीम म श्री ५ विमाजी त-प्रामे श्री
14  कमलासुयकोहरिषन्नाय
15  विम्रास श्रीरस्तु

THĀN

No. 154] v. s. 1752. [22-4-1696.

This inscription is copied from one of the sixteen Pālias in the pādar of Thān. The inscribed portion measures 2' in length and 1'-2" in height.

* Continued from p. 353, of Volume III.
It records that when the Cutsch armies had attacked Thān Bhagavat-
simghji, son of Gopālsimhji, son of Śeṣamalji, son of Vajerajjji, fell in the
battle while repelling the attack.

The genealogy given here is that of the Lakhtar family founded by
Vajerajjji’s father Abheerajjji. As we know that Karanapsinhji, succeeded his
father Gopālsinhji to the gādi of Lakhtar, Kumār Bhagavatpsinhji, whose
death is recorded by this inscription must have died in the lifetime of his
father or he may be a younger son.

Text

1 सावता १७५२ वर्षा बड़सख हृदि १
2 दाना राणा श्रीमानजाजाजी साता राणा
3 श्री सातसमालाती साता राणा श्रीगो
4 पालाृतांवचारीना काहरा श्रीभाभावाता
5 सातहाजा श्रीधानागाण्डा काण्डा कादाका फ
6 राकारा ? ततरा कामा आवा छा श्रीरजरने बासा

RĀVAL

No. 155]  

v. s. 1753. [15-5-1697.

This inscription is fixed in the wall above the gate of the fort at the
town Rāval in the Jamnagar State. The inscribed portion, which is in
a good condition, measures 2'-9" by 12½".

It records that the fort of Rāval in Hālār Deśa was caused to be
built, on Saturday, the fifth of the bright half of Jyeṣṭha in v.s. 1753
(Śaka 1619) by Jām Lākhāji, son of Tamāci and grandson of Rājasimhji,
of Yadu family, which is one of the 36 royal families. Jām Lākhāji is said
to have conquered the territory to the south of his kingdom and was
ruling at Navaṅagar.

This inscription shows that the statement in the Kathiawad Gazetteer
(p. 571) that Jām Tamāci built the fort of Rāval in 1679 A.D. is wrong
in both the points. It was Jām Lākhāji, who built the fort in 1697 A.D.

Text

1 श्रीमहागणिते नमः II याब्धूषीतरणा वहिति सुरनद्री जाहवी पुष्पतो
2 यस्य वायकाशामां तपस्ति दिनकरो भार्करो लेककालः II याब्धूषीर्यालेक
3 श्रीमानंकमिमयं वर्षीते मेहवंशं तावलं पुष्पगौँः स्वजनपरिषेत राज्यलक्ष्मीवि
4 लक्षि : II । II श्रीमनुष्पविकरक सामरातित ॥ संवत १७५२ वर्षे श्यामे १६९९ प्रकर्ष
5 माने उत्तरायण(?) मये श्रीमुखी श्रीमोहिनी मालरिके ज्योतिषी शकुघळे पंचम्या तिपां ब्रा
6 निवर्त वद्याद्रेष्टो राभ्यग्रामे पद्मविषदाजकुलश्रीरोमणियादब्रवस्तोहृल जामभी

1. How full of mistakes the verse is can be easily seen. There is no verb. This
verse is also used in No. 131 above.
7 ७ राजसिंधजी गुल जाम श्री ७ तमाचीजी गुल महाराजाधिराजजी एवं विद्वानकालेन गोवाणा
8 विद्वानकालेन नूतननगरविषयवर्ती जामदी ५ लापाजीकेन दक्षिणागिर्जितला श्रधुप
9 राजयं हुता स्वकीर्तनेवोऽ [भौत] इदमाह धर्मापालनं राजसुः कारति: || श्रीकुम भवतु।

GUNDI

No. 156] v. s. 1755. [21-1-1699.

This inscribed pālia is lying in the village Gundi, at a distance of four miles from Ghoghā. The inscribed portion measures 1'-2" by 8".

It records the death in a fight of Gohel Kānoji son of Lākha on the second day of the bright half of Caitra in v.s. 1754 (4-3-1698). A deri in his honour was built on the second day of the bright half of Māhā in v. s. 1755.

Kānoji was an ancestor of the Mahārājā of Bhavnagar. He succeeded his father Vijoji to the gādi at Umrālā, which was then the capital of the Gohel chiefs.

Text

1 स्वतः १५६ वर्षे बहुत श्रीद
2 २ बने मोहेल कानोजी लाधाणी
3 गाम भेकते जूठी देखन्त रथ भाग
4 चे धीराकरणे स्वतः १५५६
5 माहा भीद २ देरी बंधाभी छे।

BERAJA

No. 157] v. s. 1756. [3-10-1700.

This inscription is found in the temple of Śiva in the western part of the village Berajā near Bhalsāna in Navanagar State. It measures 1'-3½" by 1'.

It records that on the second day of the bright half of Āso (Āśvin) in v.s. 1756 Jādejā Devji, son of Phalji caused the Śiva temple to be built. The inscription then mentions some names, whose connection in it is not clearly known: Jām Vibhā, Jām Rāval and Kumārs Nāranji, Lakhāji, Vāghji and Mānji. These seem to be Bhāyātās of the royal family of Jāmnagar. Devji is probably the brother of Vibhāji mentioned in the Kambhaliā inscription of v. s. 1751, published above.

Text

1 धीमसामाज नमः। स्वतः १५६ वर्षे असो सद
2 २ बने जवेजा धीवालकौतुक जवेजा धीवेजी
3 अे सीवनी देरी करावी ५ फलप्रमाणी
4 धीमीं भाणाणी भाण जाम बीमाणो
THAN

This inscription is engraved on one of the 16 pāliās, lying outside Thān. The inscribed portion measures 2’ in length and 11” in breadth. The letters are very badly engraved. The script is more of the Gujarati than of the Devanāgarī form.

The inscription records the death, while protecting the cows, of Zālā Sangrāmasīmḥji, son of Śeṣamalji, son of Vajerājji, son of Mahārājā Abherājji, on Friday the 13th of the dark half of Bhādravā in v.s. 1757 or Śaka 1622.

The genealogy given here is that of the Zālā chiefs of Lakhtar. Abherājji, who was the son of Candrasīrīihji of Halvard received Lakhtar in giras from his father and founded the family which reigns to this day. As we know that Gopālsīrīihji, son of Śeṣamalji, succeeded to the gādi of Lakhtar it is clear that Sangramasīrīihji, son of Śeṣamalji, who died in v.s. 1757 as the present inscription says must be a younger son of Śeṣamalji. (See No. 154 above).

Text

2 जयमाने माहेष विद १२ छुके महाराज
3 भी ५ अर्धराजजीवन हित विद शे ५
4 शारमलजीत समग्रमसवजी झाला गायनी
5 बाहरे वधा त्यां तेम जानो यथे त्याहि काम
6 आज्या स्वरूपना लोकना भरणी के सत्यार्णमहिष

DIHOR
No. 159] v. s. 1758. [8-2-1702.

This inscription is found in the temple of Mahādeva at the village Dihor, which is at a distance of six miles from Talajā under the Bhavnagar State. It measures 12” by 7”.

It records that Rāval Hamīrji, son (?) of Rāval Gajasīmḥji caused the temple of Mahādeva to be built on Sunday, the seventh of the bright fortnight of Māgha in v.s. 1758.

Rāval Hamirji is most probably the younger brother of Rāval Satrasālji, mentioned in the Bādi inscription of v.s. 1748. But their father’s name is given in the Kathiawad Gazetteer (p. 389) as Govindji. Who was Rāval Gajasīrīihji, then, mentioned in the present inscription?
The inscription was once published in the *Prakrit and Sanskrit Inscriptions* of Kathiawad p. 166.

**Text**

1 श्रीगणेशायानम्
2 श्रीमहादेवजीनां स
3 रसादात पाइने (??) कराँवु छे मोजे
4 श्रीदीघरा मारवत श्री गजस्वंगजी
5 ना ......श्री
6 मीरजींके कराँवु छे संवत १५५८ वर्षे माच वद ७ रवेद दने श्री

**NAGICANÄ**

No. 160] v. s. 1758. [24-5-1702.

This inscription is engraved on a *palia* found in the village Nagicänä. It measures 11½" by 14¼".

It records that Pithã Ranmal son of Vejänanda fell in a battle in the village Nagicänä on the 9th day of the bright half of Jetha in v.s. 1758, during the reign of the emperor Aurangzeb.

**Text**

1 : नामो एम्बत १७
2 ५.८ वर्षे जेट छुट
3 ६ दने पातसा श्री
4 अवरंगजेब वजा
5 राज नगेचणा गरा
6 मै पौधा वेजांसंद
7 छुट रणमल सग
8 रामे सरीर पाठिवु

**BHÄVNAGAR**


This inscription is found in the temple of Nilkantha Mahadeva in Bhävnagar city. It measures 17" by 4½".

It records that the temple of Nilkantha Mahâdeva was built by Seth Bhagvân, son of Seth Kalyâna, by his wife Rakhmai, of the śrimâl community and Lagha Uskhâ, on Saturday, the 13th day of the bright half of Mâgha in v.s. 1768 or śaka 1633. Seth Bhagvân belonged to the village Vaḍvâ, which was in the possession of Jâdeja Satâji son of Kalâji.

**Text**

1 श्रीगणेशाय नमः II स्वर्ति श्रीसंवत् १७६८ वर्षे शाके १६।३३ प्रवत्तमाने माचुड़ी द्रौ
2 १२ श्री भ्रूमालदाताय वनस्पतायां श्रीकृष्णाणमेष्ठि रणमाइ तस्मूति: श्रेष्ठिः ५
3 भ्रात्रोन इदं देवतां कारिन्ला नीलकंठ सदाबिनन् एहं तत्तपथकं देव
4 छ तथा तलाव सदाबिनन्तं हृम्में च चैत। साधारण भ्रूमालदाताय महिमा प्रकट कीषु के
5 वनस्पतांमें निवास तथा जाडेजा श्री ५ लहाजी तथा जाडेजा श्री ५ शाताजी राजने
BHĀṆĀVAD

No. 162] v. s. 1771. [27-4-1715.

This inscription is copied from a pāliā lying in the village Bhāṇavaḍ in the Nawagar State.

It records that Kumār Jethiśi belonging to the Yadu family fell in a battle on the 13th day of the dark half of Caitra in v.s. 1771 (5-4-1715). His pālin was raised on Wednesday, the 5th of the bright half of Vaiśākha. Jethiśi was only a Bhāyāt of the royal family of Jamnagar.

Text

1 श्रीगणेशाय नमः। स्वस्त श्रीजे
2 यो संगलम्युदयध श्रीम
3 शृणुविकामाणे संवत्
4 १५७१ वर्षे प्रवर्तमाने
5 रवी उत्तारायणगेते श्रीश्येष्म महामं
6 महाबद्धानोत्तम चहन माते कथ
7 पसे तिथि १२ दिने बहुवन्दनफळ कह
8 रवीजेदीजी रणसंघामे महाबली ? चाराबेशे हरी च
9 रण पाम्या के प्रतिष्ठा बैला छुदि ५ बुधे प्रतिष्ठो
10 श्री खुर्म भवतु श्रीजयः। श्रीकल्याणमस्तु।

THAN

No. 163] v. s. 1776. [31-8-1720.

This inscription is copied from one of the Pālias in the northern pādar of Thān.

It records that Kumar Śri Pratāpśirihji, son of Rāṇā Sangrāmasirihji son of Rāṇā Śesamalji, son of Rāṇā Vajerāji, son of Rāṇā Abherāji, fell in a fight, against the enemies who had invaded Thāngadh, on Wednesday, the 11th of the bright half Bhādravā in v.s. 1776. Kumāra Pratāpśirihji was the sister's son of Paramāra Akherāji, son of Nāyāji.

It may be noted that Kumāra Pratāpśirihji was only a bhāyāt of the ruling family of Lakhtar, as his father, who was killed in v.s. 1757 (See No. 153 above) was a younger son of Śesamalji.

Text

1 संवत् १५७६ न वर्षे
2 मदवन सद १० ना बच
3 दन राणश्रीबामरा
4 जजी सत राणश्रीव
5 जराजजी महत राण
6 श्रीसंससर्वजी
7 सत राणा संगरमलधजी
HALVAD

No. 164] v. s. 1779 [1-4-1723.

This inscription is copied from a pālia standing near the thirty-six pillared deri in Halvad.

It records the death of Mahārāṇa Jasvantsirñhji, son of Mahārāṇa Gajasirñhji, and grandson of Mahārāṇa Megharājijī, evidently of Halvad, on the seventh day of the bright half of a Caitra in v.s. 1779.

The Kathiawad Gazetteer states that Jaivantsirñhji ruled till 1718 A.D., which in the light of this pālia seems to be wrong.

Text

1 श्रीगणेशाय नमः संवत् १७७९
2 वर्षे वहतर छुदे ७ दनें माहाराण
3 श्रीमेहराजजी महाराण श्री
4 गजांगजी महाराणभोजस
5 बंतसांगजीनी देही छे। श्री

SIYANI

No. 165] v. s. 1781 [15-7-1724.

The following inscription is engraved on a marble stone fixed in a deri on the bank of a tank to the south of the village Siyāṇī in the Limbdi State.

It records that Kumār Śrī Adājī (Aderājji) son of Bai Rūpakuvār born of a Cāvdā family caused a deri to be made in honour of Mahārāṇa Bhojārājji on Wednesday, the 6th of the bright half of Śrāvaṇa in v.s. 1781 (śaka 1646).

Text

1 श्रीगणेशाय नमः॥ श्रवित श्रीज
2 शो मंगलाभुद्य स्वत्स श्रीमनि
3 कमालसमालि सतव १७५१ वर्षें
4 शाेके १६४६ प्रवर्तिनि दक्षणांग ग
5 तें श्रीबुद्धे वयारात माषोऽमा श्रावण
6 मासे छुफळपक्षे ६ पदी बुधवारे ना
BHADROD
No. 166] v. s. 1792 [30-6-1736.

This inscription is found in the Bhadresvara Mahādeva temple at Bhadrod, a very old village at a distance of 4 miles to the north-east of Mahuva in the Bhavnagar State.

It records that during the time of Vālā Khengārji the temple of [Bhadresvara] Mahādevā was built by Gusāis Rūpabhārati and Jegamabhārati, on Wednesday, the third of the bright half of Āśāḍha in v. s. 1792, at a cost of 1125 koris.

Vālā Khengārji was a descendant of Vājā Hemalji, son of Cāmprājvālā, who ruled at Bhadrod. Khengārji entertained many Vanāra Ahirs in his service. Being much oppressed by them, they united together seized and bound him and threw him into the bonfire lit on the occasion of the Holi and burned him to death. (See Kathiawad Gazetteer p. 517).

Text

1 श्रीगणेशसाये नमः: कोरी १२६ जे रामभारी
2 नंबत १२६२ वाणवनान् करघ एसाज्ज हाँ
3 नै मुनाबे देह संपूरण कौंडूं छे गुशा
4 नै रामभारी तथा गुसाई जेहमता
5 र्थोभे चणालू छे बाज्ञा खेगारजीनी
6 बारम्बा काम धीरूं छे माहाभेदा नो
7 रु हटूं ते माहाभेदा काम आदुं छे
8 गुसाई हीरा भार्या तथा गुसाई भीम
9 परी तथा बाज्ञा बाध्यम तथा बाज्ञा धीरजी
10 नी दीवनि ठेढूं छे सलाट मीठा चायुं छे पारे
11 ख हरी पीतामर माफ माफ छे खुम मन्तु

LIMBDI
No. 167] v. s. 1793 [28-3-1737.

This inscription is copied from one of the pāliás standing on the bank of a tank at Limbdii. The inscribed portion measures 1½ by 5½”.

It records the death of Kumāra Śrī Beherājji on Monday, the eighth day of the bright of Caitra in v. s. 1793 or (Śaka 1659).

Text

1 स्वहित श्रीमण्डुकमाकेसमयालित संवे
2 ते १२६२ श्रीमण्डुकमाकेशहृष्टात मायके
3 १२६२ प्रज्ज्वलनं चेन्माय कृष्णयक्षम तिथि २ सो
4 मवासरे कुवरश्रीचेद्राजीनो पालियो छे
LOLIYANĀ

No. 168

v. s. 1794

[9-5-1738.

This inscription is engraved on a stone slab fixed in the outer portion of the eastern wall of the Śiva temple in the now ruined village Loliyana in the Vāḷā State at a distance of about 7 miles to the north-west of Vāḷā. The inscribed portion measures 7" by 5½".

It records that DAMĀJI GAIKWAD built the Śiva temple on the second day of the bright half of Jyeṣṭha in v.s. 1794.

Damāji Gaikvad is the founder of Gaikvad family of Baroda. The inscription is in the Marathi language.

Text

1 ॥ धौलीवर
2 ॥ तत्त्व ॥ दामाजी गा
3 ॥ यकवाड नीरतर
4 ॥ समत १७९४ अष्ट
5 ॥ घुट जोज

LIMBDI

No. 169

v. s. 1794

[17-5-1738.

This inscription is copied from a pāliā standing on the bank of a tank in Limbdi. It measures 1' 5" by 4½".

It records the death of Kumāra Śri AMARASĪMHJI on Wednesday, the 11th of the bright half of Jyeṣṭha in v.s. 1794, Śaka 1660.

Amarasīmji was the younger brother of Harbhamji, the ruler of Limbdi. He was killed while fighting with the Kāthis of Pālīād (Kathiawad Gazetteer p. 534).

Text

1 ॥ संवत १७९४ शाक १६६० ज्येष्ठमास धृ
2 ॥ कल्पके तिथि १४ कुकुरसारे कुकुरधीभ\n3 ॥ मरसंघजीतो पालियो चोडो हे॥

MORVI

No. 170

v. s. 1797

[21-11-1740.

The following two inscriptions are engraved on two of the many pāliās standing in the crematory to the north of the Morvi City. The first measures 2' in length and 1' 2¼" in breadth, and the second 2'-1" in length and 7" in breadth. Both of them are incised with big letters and are of the same date, viz., Friday, the 14th of the bright half of Māgassara in v.s. 1797 (Śaka 1662).

The first inscription records the building of the Deri of Thākur ALIYĀJI, son of KĀYĀJI of the JĀDEJĀ family. The second inscription records the

* This letter is engraved here through mistake.
erecting of the pāliā of Jādejā Visāji, son of Bhārāji, while fighting together with Thākur Alīyāji.

The event referred to in these records is that Thākur Alīyāji, son and successor of Kāyāji of Morvi was treacherously murdered by Hāloji, the Girasia of Paḍadhari, when Alīyāji was returning from pilgrimage to Dwarka (See Kathiawad Gazetteer p. 549).

Text

(1)

1 संबं १६०३ ना वर्षे सावे १६
2 ६२ प्रवर्तनाने रवी दक्षणाने गृवे
3 भीसूरू मोहामोगळ पह्लावकारी [ मा ]
4 गसरमारे उक्तस्प्रे १४ चुकावास
5 डे ठाकर श्रीकांडिङाझी सुत जाडेजा भी
6 अलइङाजीनी केरीं संपुरण करी पालियो...

(2)

1 संबं १६०३ वर्षे सक रवे (१६६२) मागसर सुद १४ वा
2 र सोकर जाडेजा सह[हे] भाराजी सुत वीसाजी का
3 य भावा ४ ठाकर श्रीअलिङाजी अगल काम
4 आव्ये के शाहे वीसाजीनो पालियो उमे कीषे हे

WADHWAN

No. 171

v. s. 1797 [20-8-1741].

This inscription is copied from a pāliā standing in the place called after ‘Hādimā’ in Wadhwan. It measures 12¾” by 16”.

It records that DEVAKUVARBĀI, daughter of HĀDĀ AMARSIMHJI burnt herself (i.e. became sati) with her husband, MAHĀRNĀ ARJUNSIMHJI on Thursday, the 5th of the dark half of Srāvaṇa in v.s. 1797. The deri was built in her honour by the MAHĀRNĀ SABALSIMHJI, son of ACHĀBĀ (?), of the Paramāra family.

Text

1 श्रीमालाहव नमः स्वसति श्रीमालपविक
2 मालसमाती संबं १६०३ शाये १६६२
3 प्रवर्तनाने दक्षणाने गते श्रीसूरू वर्षपत्तो
4 मालबाजमार श्रीवक वंदे ५ दुरी हिंदी
5 महाराज श्रीअलिङाजीसाजे हाडापी
6 अमो र* ]सिउजी सुता बाई श्रीवकवंद सागवन
7 न लोषे हे || परमाजी श्रीवकमुत
8 महाराजस्वातसिउजीजे प्रसाद का
9 राजीढे हे श्रीसतु || कल्याणसतु ||
BEYT

No. 172]

Date Lost.

This inscribed slab was found in the Rāmavādi on the bank of the Ranchod talav in Beyt-Sankhoddhār.

The inscription is in Marathi and records that the tank was dug up by Bhagavant Dādā Kulkarni, inhabitant of Jāmb Jalgaon in the Wai Deśa and in the employ of Samsheer Bahadar Subhedar Damāji Gaikwad, son of Pilāji.

A Gujarati inscription on white marble fixed in the right hand wall of the stairs to the Rancho talav shows that in subsequent times when this tank which was called Dāmāsar was out of repairs it was rebuilt in v.s. 1861 by Bābāji Appāji Kalambe of Satara. It is clear from this that the present Rancho talav was originally called by Dāmāsar.

A question arises here how could Damāji, son of Pilāji, who ruled from v.s. 1788 to 1824 have built a tank in Beyt which was conquered by the Gaikwads in v.s. 1873 (1817 a.d.)?

Text

1  शोरणशायनमि । शोरणशोबरय।
2  श्रीभारवेंत दादा...कुलकण मौजे
3  जाब जलवाव प्रांत बांध देश दी
4  मत फिलावते दमाजी गायकवा
5  द सुभेदार समशेह बहादुर
6  याणी तलाव करखिल...
7  भीवाजींपंत ह...  
8  ...जाला
9  कविता...संवत.
10  ...९. माष खर...

PÄTDI

No. 173]

v. s. 1801  [25-3-1745.

This inscription is engraved on a stone slab fixed in a wall of the devadi at the inner door of the Darbargadh at Pätđi. The inscribed portion measures 26½" by 10".

It records that during the time of the emperor MUHAMMAD SHAH (of Delhi) Desai Udakaranā of Viramgaon caused the fort of Viramgaon to be built and his son BHAVASIMHA caused the fort of Pätđi to be built. The cost of this was Rs. 40361. Names of several officers of Bhaivasimhī employed at Pätđi are given. The date, third day of the bright half of Caitra of v.s. 1801 probably refers to the time when the Pätđi fort was completed and when the inscription was set up.

This Desai Bhaivasinghji fought bravely against the Marathas in defence of the Viramgaon fort. (See History of Gujarat, p. 323).
No. 174] [12-12-1748.

This inscription is found in a well called ‘Dholia vāv’ in the Darbargadh at Mahuvā. It is much worn out. It measures 14” by 15”.

It seems to record that during the time of VAKHATSIMHJI, evidently the ruler of Bhavnagar, some men belonging to the Khatri community caused a well to be dug up and made a gift of 60 bighas of land on the fourth day of the bright half of Pauṣa in v.s. 1805.

This inscription was once published in the Pkt and Skt inscriptions of Kathiawad p. 167.

1 ......... नाराय...
2 
3 पाणिरादा ! ... कराबी
4 राय श्रीवस्त्तरसी ... विजय[ रा ]
5 ज्ये .... खोरगढ़चे परागी ? तथा
6 क्रमी माहवी ... सेट मेता दे
7 वरी तथा मित ... गाढाई सैंगीडी
8 पोले कुनूं संचाल्यो ... घरति विचा ६०
9 .... गाव रामदास तलहीवास रामा
10 .... संवद १८०५ अर्स छुद ४

(To be Concluded.)
INDO-EUROPEAN GM·SKÓ OR GM·SKHÓ?

By

SIDDHESHWARA VARMA, Jammu.

C. R. SANKARAN’s very learned article on “GM·skó versus GM·skhó” in the January number (pp. 632 ff.) of Vol. I of this journal has deeply interested me. In this article he advances a new theory that in Greek forms like [skhídē], [skhízō], when, normally, “the accent preceded the cluster of the dental sibilant and the voiceless guttural stop phonemes, the voiceless guttural became non-aspirate; otherwise aspirate in Greek” (pp. 634, 636). But before this theory can be accepted, there are a few additional points which must be taken into account.

(1) As examples of Greek aspiration, SANKARAN gives forms of only one Greek stem, namely [skhíd-] and a theory based on only one stem has little chance to be established. In fact Greek has only this stem or the phonetically allied stem [sk(h)ēi-] in [skháō] to offer [vide BOISACQ, Dict. Ety. de la La Grecque (1923), p. 932] as a clear example of aspiration after [s].

(2) But even this aspiration in the single stem [skhíd-] or [skhēi-] may be an illusion, or just a sporadic phenomenon, for side by side with the aspirate forms of this stem, we have also the NON-ASPIRATE forms, Cf. Gr. [skídnēmi] side by side with [skhízō], (cf. BOISACQ Ib. p. 932) [skidarón], [skindalmós] side by side with [skhindalmós] (WALDE-POKorny’S Lexicon, II, p. 544).

(3) The inference from SANKARAN’S statement that “we find the accent immediately after the voiceless guttural aspirate stop phoneme,” (p. 634) is that if the accent does not follow the consonant-group immediately, the stop is a non-aspirate. But this inference is disappointed by the following examples, in which the aspiration is maintained, although the accent does not immediately follow:

[skhistós], [skhindalmós], [skhasmós], [skhosterion],
[skhostēria] (Vide WALDE-POKORNY, II, 544, BOISACQ, p. 932)

4. WALDE-POKORNY (I, 137) give another example of aspiration in Gr. [érkhomai], Skr. [ṛchhati], and if this etymology is accepted, we would expect [*érkomai] by SANKARAN’S theory, for the accent immediately precedes the consonant group. WALDE-POKORNY, however, connect the stem, not with [skh-] but with [sko-], [ér-śko].

(5) On p. 635, footnote 5, SANKARAN notes [skór] as an exception, but there are a few more exceptions, such as the following, collected from WALDE-POKORNY:
Greek [skúlos] Sanskrit [chavi-] [ská̄] [chá̄yá]

(6) Greek [skedánnu]i] "I break into pieces" mentioned on p. 634, has no bearing on the main issue, for, according to WALDE-POKORNY (II, p. 558), it is connected with Skr. [skhadate] "he splits," and so has the Indo-European stem [sqhed-] or [sqed], not [s̥khed-].

In my opinion, the very occurrence of an Indo-European [s̥kh] or even [kh] is extremely doubtful. The first article attempting to establish an Indo-European [kh] was by BARTHOLOMAE, who, in KZ 27, pp. 366 ff gave examples like [cháyati], [pucham], [cháyá], the [ch] of which is now traced to a composite sound [sk], without any aspirate element, cf. WALDE-POKORNY on these words. The occurrence of [kh] has been once mentioned by BRUGMANN (Grundriss I, 548), but the only sure example he gives thereof contains a composite sound, viz. gr. [skhízō] and he has not further mentioned [kh], even in the Indo-Iranian section, while HIRT has cut the Gordian knot by eliminating [kh] altogether, for he does not mention it at all in his Idg. Gramm. I, 245 (1927). He mentions only [kh], nor does he mention [s̥kh]: he gives only [s̥kh]. In fact the motive to keep a [kh] seems to have been a feeling to complete a series, though no positive element was available to do so. No single sound in any Indo-European language is available, which may be traced to [kh].

Skr. [ch], as has been established by WACKERNAGEL and others (cf. WACKERNAGEL, Ai. Gramm. I, 156) is a composite sound, being a product of internal Sandhi. But to trace [ch] to an Intermediate group of spirants [s̥], [s̥h] (WACKERNAGEL I b., 157) is a phonetic impossibility. [Ch] has been considered to be an affricate, but there is no conclusive evidence that it was so. Ancient Indian Grammarians never mention that it was an affricate, they always treated it as a plosive [sparśa-]. That it was possibly a plosive is further supported by some of the modern Indo-Aryan dialects, in which it is a plosive, cf. my "phonetics of lahnda" JASB, 1936, Vol. II, No. 2, pp. 72, 75. Now when once a group of complete spirants like [s̥s̥] has been established in a language, it is not possible for it to develop into a sound with considerable occlusion like [ch], which was possibly, or very nearly plosive. In my view, Skr. [ch] preserves the traces of a very ancient Proto-Indo-Iranian stage in which [sk] had not yet become [s̥s̥]. SANKARAN'S hypothesis (p. 633) is therefore certainly a definite improvement, as he deduces from [grpskho] a series of forms, in which the occlusive element has been maintained, viz. [s̥kh] > [s̥k'x'] > [s̥t's̥]: only his adherence to aspiration in [kh] has no convincing evidence, as has been shown above. When there was already in Indo-European a spirant with a palatalized plosive in [sk], the ground was possibly enough for the occurrence of [ch]: the supposition of an additional aspirate [h] is an unnecessary and unproved encumbrance.
I would therefore prefer [ṛṣkō] to [ṛṣkẖō] as the origin of Skr. [gāccha-].

A few minor points in SANKARAN's article deserve some consideration:

(1) On p. 632 he says, in Sanskrit "[g] and [gh] came to be represented by [j] and [h] remaining thus in an intermediate stage of development," the other Satem languages further changing the intermediate sounds to sibilants. Now this is true of [j], but not of [h], for [h] cannot precede a sibilant in the development of a language: rather the reverse is the case. We know, for instance, that even in Sanskrit [s] has become Visarga, a sound akin to [h], while in many modern Indo-Aryan languages [s] has become [h]. The fact, therefore, seems to be that Sanskrit further developed the sibilants into [h].

(2) On p. 633, footnote 4, there occurs the following quotation from POULTNEY:—"Sanskrit [chinatti], Lat. [scindo]......give good evidence for the existence in I. E. of a nasalized root-form [sqind-]". A little inaccuracy has here crept in. It is not Skr. [chinatti], but [chindanti] which is an evidence for an I. E. nasalized root, for forms like [chinatti], as BRUGMANN (Gundriss II, 3, 276 ff.), (MU, III, 150, 153, 154) has pointed out, are pure Indo-Iranian innovations: the exact correspondent of Lat. [jungit] is not [yunákti] but [yunájate]. The fact that in Sanskrit forms like (bhuṇjāti) [rundhāti], exist side by side with [bhunākti], [ruṇāddhi] indicates the preservation of the inherited forms with an infixed nasal side with the analogical forms like [chinatti].
NOTES OF THE MONTH.

The royal court was the patron of learning in ancient India. Its place has now been taken up by the learned bodies, which stand for promotion of learning in modern times. These bodies, however, are in many cases too poor to help materially all the learned men of the land who have completely dedicated their lives to the advancement of knowledge but they appreciate occasionally at least the work of some select scholars who have already put their stamp on the subjects they have made their own and who have thus made themselves famous throughout the world by their life-long intellectual effort guided by the inner vision only. In accordance with this practice of honouring learned men the Bombay Branch of the Royal Asiatic Society presented last month medals of honour to Diwan Bahadur Dr. S. K. Aiyangar, M.A., Ph.D., and Mr. R. P. Masani, M.A., the present Vice-Chancellor of the Bombay University. The tribute paid to these two scholars by His Excellency the Governor of Bombay on the above occasion is well worth putting on permanent record as it voices the genuine feelings of admiration we entertain for the services of these scholars in the cause of knowledge.

"Diwan Bahadur Dr. Aiyangar's contributions to a knowledge of the history and traditions of this vast sub-continent," said His Excellency "will be guide and an inspiration to all future explorers in these fields of difficult and laborious study. It is in every way fitting that one who has made by his teachings and writings, such a great contribution to history in South India should be honoured by this Society."

"Mr. R. P. Masani has a special place of his own in the life of Bombay and India. He is indeed one of the 'wise men' whom Plato would have loved to appoint as a ruler of his perfect Republic, for he has combined high intellectual effort in the sphere of pure knowledge with practical ability in the world of everyday affairs, a versatility which is given to very few indeed. We are indeed lucky to have him today as Vice-Chancellor of the Bombay University." The history of Indian literature bears ample testimony to the fact that Indian Scholars of old, Jaina, Buddhist or Brahmanical, unmindful of the political conflicts of their days, kept on the torch of learning ever burning through centuries of unsettled conditions of life due to political turmoil and occasional vandalism caused by foreign invasions. We of modern times maintain the same tradition in minding our own business and by honouring our learned men at a time when the greatest of the modern wars is now raging in Europe. There is undying optimism in the human breast even in the pursuit of the mundane things. Things of the mind are not of clay and that touch of the Immortal which has enlivened our ancient glorious history and civilization will safely guide us through the present gloom, if we but stick fast to our aims and ideals in the pursuit of knowledge, pure and simple. As Kālidāsa said:

"हेम्न: संवेद्यन्ते क्षणी विद्यु: श्वामिकापि वा"

Verily the test of gold lies in the fire!
EIGHTEENTH-CENTURY MALAYĀLAM PROSE WRITTEN BY CHRISTIANS*

By
L. V. RAMASWAMI AIYAR, Ernakulam.

CONSONANTS

1. Old -cc-, denoting a stage anterior to -ss-, is retained in the following:—
   Kuricce < ultimately Kurai-y-a-c-ceydo; vūcca, the past relative participle of vāy-kk—.
   In modern kurēśa or kurēśa, the stop element in the long affricate has completely dropped out.
   The other form vāśa (< vācca) is not heard in the Cochin State today.

2. t and d become changed to -s- in vulgar corruptions like the following:—
   kausukham < kautuka-; [Skt.] the influence of sukham [Skt.] has also perhaps been operative.
   sōppa 'garden' < tōppa.
   dēvasa < dēvata [Skt.]
   varasānt 'uninvited guest' < varattan.
   dīnasa-pptta < dīnata [from Skt. dina]
   agimōssiyam, a corruption of aikamatya [Skt]
   auyaadica, 'having allowed' < auyavadica [from Skt. anuvad-]
   carasi-kk- 'to be careful,' "corrupted" from śraddhi-kk- adapted from Skt. śraddhā
   sarggam, a "sanskritization" of the native word tarkam 'quarrel,' under the influence of Skt. sarga

3. Colloquial forms like the following show the assimilative change of the alveolar nasal n to other nasals:—
   tinga-y-illa [< tinnuma-y-illa]
   mumbā [< mumbā]
   imbām [imbam]
   timma [timma]
   kāmmān [kānmān]

4. veṃmadam [< veṃmādam], kālam [kānmān] show l < n

5. n is substituted (by analogy) for n (arising from the meeting of l and m), in peniaynumār, kānumānnār.

6. Skt. b- appears as v- in forms like vēndicca (Skt. bandh-), vālyam (Skt. bālya), etc.

7. solppaḥ (Skt. svalpa) in collocations like solppaḥ polūdo has final n < m; cf. vulgar colloquial samayān for samayam.

* Continued from p. 337 of Vol. III.
8. Forms like pörāliga (<pörāyga), varāliga, mēṭāliga are met with; these are heard occasionally today.

9. ellēppōlum or ellēppālum does not have the y of modern ellēyppōlum.

10. saṇḍhiya (for Skt. sandhyā) and pralagam (for Skt. pralaya) have -g- in the stead of -y-. Instances like colloquial caṇḍriya beside caṇḍrika, iṣṭiya beside iṣṭika, etc. may have led to the feeling that the velar plosive was original in popular colloquial saṇḍhiya (from sandhiya) and pralayam. Such a process of wrong back-formation has operated in tiriya (tirīya < tiriya) and oliya (oliya < oliya), both of which are modern.

11. Kār-kk- for (kā-kk-) and kaṇar-kk- (for kaṇa-kk- formed from Skt. ghana) have an intrusive r. These are colloquial. Literary Mal. has kōlar-kk-, kōṛ-kk-, pījar-kk-, in all of which r is an intrusive. Tam. colloquials have kār-kk-, kōr-kk-.

12. The change of the post-dental r to the palato-cerebral r is met with in forms like pālīkkār̥ar which shows the dissimilative change of old r to r.

13. Skt. s is adapted as l in ilal, anvali-kk-, purulān, etc.

14. Kūdal 'hesitation' [ < kūsāl < kūsāl] shows the change of s > d.

SANDHI.

1. The colloquial practice of using the front on-slide after consonants preceding, even where there is no breath-pause, is represented in some of these texts, as in avar yeṅgilum, etc.

2. The Mal. fondness for the front glide y which from an earlier period began to replace in many contexts the back glide y (which was originally normal in these contexts) is reflected in instances like vahhū-y-eñhma, etc.

3. Rules regarding doubling of stops are here not consistently or "correctly" observed.

FOREIGN NAMES.

There are a number of names of European places, towns, countries, subjects of study and religious functionaries, which are sought to be spelt in Vartṭamagappustagam according to the pronunciation current at the time in the Mediterranean countries (particularly Italy and Portugal). The spellings used in Varttt. are transliterated here.—The interpretation of the phonetic facts has to be made separately with reference to the actual sound-values of the European names.

allemāñño 'Germany'
äśya 'Asia'
grammatica 'grammar'
ittālā 'Italy'
įnglēsa 'English'
ispāñño 'Spain'
īndia 'India'
evāṅgeliōn
evurōppa ‘Europe’
kardināl ‘cardinal’
k kappa dē bōpo esperānza ‘Cape of Good Hope’
kumbasāram ‘Confession’ from Portuguese ‘confessare’
konāf ‘Consul’
kvārehtēna ‘Quarantine’.
lisbōa ‘Lisbon’.
trōpōs
dōje ‘Dogé’
pātriākaṃnār ‘Patriarchs’.
pilosūpia ‘Philosophy’.
pyirēnza ‘Florence’.
plenipoteponsario ‘Plenipotentiary’.
prāsan ‘Frenchman’.
prattugāl ‘Portugal’.
propagandā phīde ‘Propaganda fide’.
Bolōнная ‘Bologne’.
mupsīnīnōr ‘Monsignor’.
miserakkordia ‘Misericordia’.
lāsaretta ‘Lazarette’.
Vīskōntti ‘Visconti’.
vīskōnttessa ‘Viscontessa’.
vattikāgā ‘Vatican’.
siyeppa ‘Sienna’.
siṃnōra ‘Signora’.
sekretāri ‘Secretary’.
rettōrikā ‘Rhetoric’.
rōma ‘Rome’.

VI MORPHOLOGY

1. The third case postposition konōs is used in contexts where to-day the postposition āl would be preferred.

2. The Skt. prati when used as a postposition in this dialect has not only the meanings ‘concerning’ ‘towards’, but also the force of ‘for the sake of’, as in avar prati, daivatte prati, etc.

3. -ēl, as in marattēl, kavyēl, appears fairly often; this type is still heard in parts of Travancore.

4. edō for singulars and plurals, masculines and feminines, as commonly in the older stages.

5. The frequency with which the terminative expletive ē is used in instances like irikkayilē, adigālē, etc., is a noteworthy old feature.

6. Among pronouns, the following are noteworthy :—iṇikkā a colloquial form < eṇikkā.

nōm [for nām] owing to the influence of the bilabial nōm and nōm are heard to-day.
tandle tandle ʻof eachʼ, modern avayavande; taṇñal taṇñalude ʻof each groupʼ, modern avavavude; ā dēham ʻthat personageʼ [modern addēham the honorific third person singular pronoun].

7. Among feminine forms, one may note the old aḍiyyāṭī, pāḍalāṭi, agadiyyāṭī.

8. Rational plurals like dōṣāṭṭalar, kūli-y-āḷar, punya-v-āḷar; pāḷikkārar, pāḷikkāgar and kartanaṇāḷ are other old plurals.

9. Though the personal endings of finite tense-forms had disappeared already in Mal., certain traditional forms continued to be used in formal prayers and utterances. Since the history of the Malayāḷi Christians goes back to a period when these personal endings were still current, there is nothing surprising in the fact that such endings were retained in their prayers and formal ceremonies. The prayers cited in SV contain many types of personal endings.

10. Past stems like viṃh. (for vin-) and (conversely) ūni (for ūn̄-i-) are peculiar.

11. The "indeterminate" tense with ū is represented in more contexts than those in which they are used to-day:—vaṣṭavamāyiṛippu; avide paṛkka hallū.

12. Okka which originally was a pure infinitive began to be declined (like a noun) in the New Mal. period. Okkakkum, okkayude, okke are all met with here.

13. The collocations formed of the relative participles and āṟa express 'manner'; future relative participles followed by āṟa (as in ceyyum-āṟa) express 'effect' also; past relative participles followed by ūṟē denote 'time'—Older kāṃtā-undo, vicāṛipparaundo.

14. The combinations of present relative participles and appōḷ, like ceyyühnappōḷ are rare to-day.

15. Kolgā, celgā, elunēkkā are imperatives with final long ā.

16. Venduvado or vendvado for modern vēṇḍado.

17. Verbal nouns with -ga, -kka are used with the "seventh case" ending -il, as in (pasaṇṇott) iṅka-y-il-ē; this is uncommon to-day in Cochin colloquials.

18. Among negative tense-forms the following may be noted:—

(i) Beside the negative finite type of ceyyāṇī, the type of pōgāṭtu, illāṭtu so common in 18th century Mal. literary texts, is also used.

(ii) tāmāsirāḍē, bōdhirāḍē, vicāṛirāḍē, sammadirāḍē which show an r instead of the glide-developed y. This r is met with in the negative participles of disyllabic verb-bases which have i for their past stems.

(iii) Negative "purpose"-participles with ᾱyaṇ occur fairly frequently in the texts under reference:—udappiṇḍe avagāsam koḍukkāyāṇ; veliccam-ākkāyāṇ; āgāyāṇ; pūgāyāṇ, vighnam varuṭṭāyāṇ; etc.
(iv) *nilôdê, perattâdiyâdê* as negative imperatives (met with dialectally even to-day).

(v) *pûgikkollâyê* is another old form with *ollâ.*

**VIII Vocabulary**

*Native elements.*

The words that I have discussed below are (a) those which are not in common currency to-day, except (if it so happens) in regional or communal colloquials; and (b) those which show structural or semasiological peculiarities.

These words include (i) old words forming part of the native heritage, (ii) words and forms specially adapted for expressing purely Christian religious ideas, and (iii) peculiar pseudo-Sanskritic formations derived from native words.

Many of the words discussed below are, it is true, met with in non-Christian texts and documents also; but the question how far some of these words enjoyed a special popularity in the language of the Christians (in respect of structure, meaning, connotation or associations) is a matter deserving of a more intensive investigation than I have been able to make in the course of these pages. I have, however, indicated in connection with a few words that they may have had a ‘communal’ popularity on account of social, cultural or historical considerations.

Wherever a word in the following lists is listed in VD (as cited by Gundert), or in Bailey, I have indicated the fact within square brackets. Though presumably the materials gathered by the compilers of VD (in the 17th and 18th centuries) and by Bailey (at the very beginning of the 19th century) were chiefly drawn from the language of the Christian communities of North Travancore and South Cochin, it must be understood that the mere fact that a word is listed by VD and Bailey does not necessarily mean that it was ‘communal’ or that it enjoyed a special popularity among the Christians. This question, as I have pointed out more than once in the course of these pages, is a complicated one, and further materials (not available now) alone will satisfactorily solve the problem.

The words discussed below are all taken from Vartt., SV or BG. Many of the words are common to all the three. There are, however, a few which are exclusive to one text or the other; and these have been marked off as such by me.

*ađutta* ‘suitable, fitting’ and *ađatta* ‘unworthy, unsuitable,’ as in the following, are not common to-day; *tanîkk-ađutta yogyânilâ* or *makkaîkk-ađutta āsarna*; and *varggattin-ađatta kîtyânîlî,* etc.

*aṭtal* ‘sorrow’.

*amaḷi* ‘tumult’ [VD]


*ayarpaṭ* ‘estrangement’ ‘discord’ [VD]. Cf. Tam. *ayar-kk-* ‘to forget.’
aritam 'revengefulness' [SV defines it thus as 'revengefulness']—In literary Mal., it means 'anger'. 'Black pepper' is the meaning in Tam.
arasar-irikkak-sthānam 'seat of kings' 'capital of a country'.
alārinna 'having become fatigued, on account of a long march' [Vartt.] appears to be a blend of alārinna and ayarhinna. Perhaps there is also the influence of ular- 'to be hot, dry.'
axappo 'qualm' 'aversion' [VD]; the verb arai-kk- 'to feel aversion' also exists in Mal.

Tam. arai- does not have this meaning; perhaps Tam. arai-po- 'to become bewildered or nonplussed' may ultimately be related to the Mal. form.

The form arappo is used in expressions like arappo kett- 'without any qualm or aversion.'

alivā 'repentance' [VD], as in manassinde alivā in SV. Cf. 'loosening of the mind', 'distress', a meaning that is associated with the word in classical literary texts. 'Distress' is a meaning shown by Tamil also.

ixummal 'gnashing' in pal-l-ixummal 'gnashing of the teeth'—VD has ixambal.

udappo 'offence' [VD].—Cf. Tam. udai-kk- 'to kick', 'to strike.'

uyir-kk- 'to be resurrected', uyirppu 'resurrection' [Bailey], uyirvar 'those alive.'—Cf. Tam. uyir- 'to be animated to life.' uyir-kk- and uyirppu (as in mariccavaruṇe uyirppu) convey the Christian idea of 'resurrection.'

uvavi [also upavi] [VD] incorrectly perhaps owing to a dissipilative change 'love.' VD has a new upavi-kk- 'to love' based on upavi.

uvavi is based on the old base uva-kk- 'to feel glad.' Tam. has uvavi 'great pleasure' 'religious ardour.'

uvavi is a classical word met with in Rāmacaritam; but upavi and upavi-kk- appear to have been specially popular in Christian literature.

ūni hiriṇi-kk- 'to consider carefully or intently.'

ūni < ūhni < ūndi, the conjunctive participle of the verb ūnd- 'to be fixed, steadfast,' etc.

The peculiarity here is the somewhat rare change of ḷh to Ṽ (through an intermediate stage of Ṽ simplified from ḷh after a preceding long syllable). The cerebralisation (raising of the tongue-tip on the mouth roof) arises from the influence of the back vowel preceding.

There are some rare analogies in Mal. < < Ṽn < Ṽn < Ṽṅdun [present tense of ḷ- 'to become.] varunu [the colloquial variant of the present tense finite varuṇi] < varuṇu < varuṇī.

ūlam 'turn' [VD and Bailey], as in pala ūlavan 'many times.'—Cf. Tam. ūlī 'turn' 'time.'—SV has the pseudo-Sanskritic form uṣam.—Cf. the from ḷṣau used in BG for kilavan.
erivu 'religious zeal' [VD].—Cf. Tam. erivu 'burning' 'agitation' 'wrath,' which meanings exist for the Mal. word also even to-day.—The meaning may have been specially adapted in the religious vocabulary of Christians:
elläppolūm 'always' appears in this dialect often without the intrusive-y- of modern elläyppolūm.

eḷāvar-am 'all people' is a "corruption" with "wrong" singular masculine ending—as occurring in BG.—The "correct" form is ēḷāvar-am.

eḷima 'humility' [VD and Bailey]—A common word in the 18th and 19th century Kérala Christian vocabulary.

ēg 'to rebuke' [VD and Bailey]. In classical Mal ēg generally means 'to direct, command,' 'to order a boon to be conferred.'—This classical ēg-corresponds to Tam. ēv-.

ērakkurava [VD and Bailey], ērakkurayam 'assault' 'indignities,' 'illtreatment—The first word is a noun, while the second is a noun formed from the old infinitive ēra-k-kuraya.—ērakkurava occurs in old granthavarsis [Cf. Cochin Arch. Report for 1103 M.E.].

Tam. ērakkuraya-p-pēś-means 'to vilify or abuse.' ēttam and kai-y-ēttam 'assault' derive their meaning from ēr- 'to attack', whereas ērakkurava derives its meaning from 'what is more or less than propriety.'

oppār 'comparison' 'parable'.

orumbādō, orumbādō 'concord' [Bailey]. Cf. Tam. oruppādu 'unanimity' 'concord', Tam. orum-paď-and Tam. oru-maňa-p-paď-
kārēr-and kēr 'to climb, ascend' are both met with in this dialect.—The former base appears to have disappeared in Mal. colloquials by about the 19th century. [see my EMM, p. 42].

kalalappādo 'election,' 'nomination' [VD]. Cf. Tam. kalal- 'to become loose, free, marked off as a separate unit.'

Bailey's kalalappādo means 'groin.'

kōr-kk- 'to guard, watch, etc.' [Varitt. and BG].—The intrusive -r- in this word is not met with in other Mal. colloquials.—Kańar-kk—[BG] is another base which has an intrusive r not heard in other colloquials.


The r is inserted in these forms as an intrusive, on account of the analogy of forms like kuļr-, kuļr-kk-.

kili-kk- 'to cover or traverse a distance of [Varitt].

kurai-kk- 'to cut short' is used literally in kuzeccu kohna ; cf. hilattill kurayādē in Uttarāram. gadyam.

kūḍal 'hesitation' < kūṣal [the usual modern Mal. form] < kūṣal [cf. Tam. kūṣal, kūccal].

kūṭt-arruto 'definitely.'—Cf. aruttu para- 'to speak decisively,' arutta paliṣa 'fixed interest,' vila-y-aru-kk- 'to fix the price.' VD has arūlta vākko 'conditional promise.'

Bailey equates kūṭtaruppō to 'want of friendship' 'arrogance, haughtiness,' in which aru-kk- appears to have the meaning 'to sever.'
kai-y-ālī. ‘to rule’ [VD], and kai-y-āli-kk. ‘to entrust, hand over charge to’ [VD and Bailey].

kurala ‘backbiting; calumny’.—Eluttacan has kuralakkaraṇ.—Cf. Tam. kuralai.
caval ‘to be soiled’. [VD and Bailey]—Cf. Tam. caval ‘to become crumpled.’—Tam.—Mal. cavaṭṭ-, caviṭṭ- ‘to trample on, to tread on’ are causatives of caval-.—caval-

cittālāma ‘services performed by personal attendant’ [VD].—Cf. Tam. cittāl. cey ‘to do’ appears very often as cai- in SV and BG.—This cai or cey- is common in old mss. and inscriptions.

cemmōrtta [VD and Bailey], cemmōrtta, cemmūrttam [this last in Vartt. only] ‘blessing, benediction.’ VD has also cemmōr- (<cemmuvar. ‘to become prosperous’) and cemmōrt-(<cemmuvarutt- to make prosperous ‘to bless.’)

cemmuvār-occurs in Kṛṣṇagātha and other old classical texts. The structural contraction and the particular meaning ‘benediction’ for the derivative cemmōrtta are due probably to the incorporation of the form in the religious terminology of the Christians.

The u of cemmōrtta is due to the bilabial following; and cemmūrttam is a corrupt variant.
tagarppa ‘demolition, destruction,’ as in manassinde tagarppa ‘contrition of the mind,’ used in religious phraseology.
tanma ‘lowness, vileness.’—This is the sense in which the word is sometimes used in classical texts like Kṛṣṇagātha. Cf. tan-ped- of this 15th century text.
tanuppa ‘comfort’ is another meaning, as in rakṣayum tanuppum [SV].
tanyā ‘wicked,’ as in tanyā hṛdayam ‘wicked heart,’ shows in its formation the influence of tan above and of Skt. dāṇḍa—tanyā does not occur in any classical texts, so far as I know.
tatra-p-ped- ‘to be in a hurry’ ‘to hustle’ [VD].—Cf. Tam. tattaram ‘flurry.’
tala-p-ped- ‘to be the first’ ‘to commence.’—Cf. Tam. talappad-
tigai ‘to be fulfilled’ ‘to be completed’ is used in phrases like pustaganīla tigayuvāḥ which is the literal translation of “in order that the scriptures might be fulfilled.”
lirva and lirrma ‘final settlement.’ In Vartt., lirrma-y-attā means ‘definitely.
lir. ‘to become aware of (fault), to be mended or reformed,’ as in pilaccā-
dimēl lirī.
tudarmānānāt ‘continuations.’—The -ānam- here is due to analogy of forms like tīr-mānam.
tudassam ‘beginning’ [VD and Bailey] (for tudakkam, tođakkam) owes its -ss- to the analogy of tādassam perhaps.
turasse ‘opening’ [Bailey] is another form with -ss- introduced on account of the analogy of words like balasse.
telīṇa 'having become glad.'

ḥada rá 'formerly, for the previous time.' This is used in classical Mal. and in some modern regional colloquials.—ḥadaṇā 'for the first time,' heard in the northern parts of Cochin State, is derived through haplogogy, from ḫaḍhaṇa.

ḥandi 'gratitude.'—The "correct" Mal. form is ḥanhi [< older handi ]; but the influence of Skt. nandi 'joy' has led to the spelling ḥandi in the "learned" Mal. of some people. In literary Tamil and in older Mal. the form has both the meanings 'goodness' and 'gratitude.'

ḥarunānā 'insolent language' 'abuse' [VD]. The form is connected with ḥarukk 'to mash, cut into pieces'.—I have not come across ḥarunāṇi elsewhere.

ḥarappa, ḥirappa [BAILEY] 'reconciliation, levelling of differences' 'peace' —Eluttaccañ has ḥirappu ārāi-.

ḥīgalam 'pride, haughtiness' [VD and Bailey]; this is perhaps a popular back-formation from īlām, like tegal 'scorpion' [BG] from āl.

ḥombaram 'pain' 'distress' [BAILEY].—Cf. Tam. hombalam and North Mal. hombalam.

paṭṭānā, paṭṭāṇā [BAILEY], paṭṭānā [BG] 'truth'. The "correct" form is paṭṭānā [cf. Tam. paṭṭāngu-].

paṭṭāṇā with final a instead of u appears to be a colloquial variant. Bailey has paṭṭāṇā-y-uḍe as the "sixth case" form of paṭṭāṇā.

paṭṭānīna occurring in BG is a "corruption", with an intrusive l.

paḍava 'boat'.

paṁmaṭṭa 'deceit' [BAILEY].

porul paḍavārtta, (porul)paḍārtha, piḍārtha [this last in BG].—In Vartt., the word has the meaning 'religious discourse' in contexts like the following: upavi mēl ulla porulpadārta;

porulpadārta parāṇādinḍu ṣēsam; i ṣagariyil ulla porulpadārta-k kāranḍeyum.

The same meaning exists for the expression in SV:—ōttum porulpadavārttayum, and tavāl tavālaṇḍe pēccil paḍārta parayugayum.

piḍārtha (which is apparently a corruption appearing in BG) means 'speech' 'expression' in hinuṇuṇu piḍārtha hinuṇe ariyikkunnu.

paḍavārtta occurs in the old commentary on Līl in piḷ pōle paḍavārttayum where paḍavārtta may mean 'speech' or 'expression'.

GUNDERT cites VD as explaining it as 'disputing'. This appears to me to be unsatisfactory.—In the Christian texts under reference, the expression appears not only as paḍārta but also as porul paḍavārtta. Can it be that the expression was phrasal to start with, and that from the collocation porul paḍa vārtta parayuga 'to hold a discourse in such a way as to make the meaning clear' the expression porul paḍavārtta was isolated?

paṇava 'bird' [BAILEY] 'bird in general'.—
pešar ‘rain’.—Cf. Tam. puyal ‘storm’, colloquial, pešal ‘beating rain’.—Cf. pišir ‘rain-drops’.

puravar ‘outsiders’.—This form occurs in Uttara-rāmāyaṇam gadyam.

puṇṇāram or pounāram ‘false praise, flattery’ [VD and BAILEY], as in puṇṇāram-āya vanaçānial.

peratţa ‘adultery’, as in the sixth commandment peratţ-adiyādde ‘non-moechaberis.’—Neither the literary dialect nor the colloquials that I know of have this meaning for peratţa.

pūg- ‘to enter’ (a Mal. base formed from older pug-) often interchanged with pōg- ‘to go.’

pāidalēti ‘young woman or girl.’—Note the association of -āṭti with pāidal, in order to indicate the feminine gender.

perppō ‘copy.’ [VD and BAILEY]—pagaṛppo is a comparatively late form.

porūdi ‘forgiveness, pardon’, [BAILEY] as in dūṣattinde porūdi ‘forgiveness of sins’.

poruppānam ‘Arrangements for lodging’, as in tinnūnum poruppānum poru-kk. has the meaning ‘to abide’, ‘to stay’ in Mal.

pōrum ‘enough’ [BAILEY], beside madi.

pōriga in madi pōriga ‘sufficiency’ ‘ability.’—BAILEY has pōrima with the same meaning.

marudali-kk. ‘to oppose’ ‘to contradict’, from mazu-tala, ‘opposition’.—Cf. maʁu-kk. ‘to oppose.’

mīnd-āṭrānī ‘to be silenced.’—VD has mīndu-mūz-, and BAILEY has mīnd-āṭtām mūt- with the same meanings.

munḍugār literally ‘those who wear the loin-cloth’ is used for native Christians as distinguished from kuppāya-k-kār ‘those who wear coats’ i.e. Eurasian Christians (who are called caṭṭakkār to-day).

munḍu munragal ‘miscellaneous sāmāns’.—The generalisation of meaning is evident in contexts like poṇnum velliyum kondulla munḍumurigal.

mēsakk-iri-kk-mēska-kalī-kk., literally ‘to dine at table’ means ‘to take food’ in contexts like pul pūrattu mēsakk-iruttuvān. mēska-kalī-kk. or mēsakk-iri-kk. is generally used today only in connection with the dinner or meals of Europeans.

mēni ‘rank’ ‘honour’, as in mēni-ksayam [SV]. VD has mēni-y-ariyunhavaṉ ‘courteous man’.

maiyaḷ ‘twilight’ ‘dusk’ [VD and BAILEY].—Cf. Tam. mai- ‘to be dim’.

mōnu ‘to bark or howl, like a dog’ [VD], as in mōnuvaṉ pōguhha īṇaya. —Cf. molaini-, mulaini-.

mruivāli-kk. ‘to become benumbed’ [BG] is a corruption of viraiṇali-kk. In corrupt colloquials, v changes to m; cf. mikk- for vikk-, amasaram [BG] for avasaram.

vaga- ‘to arrange,’ as in vagaṇṇuṇḍākkiya pustagom. VD vagaccal is equated to ‘composition of work, fiction’; and BAILEY has ‘to compose a work’.
vadugar 'bondsmen or slaves' [VD and BAILEY].—These were generally Pulayas. Though slavery has disappeared, Pulaya servants (and families, sometimes) remain attached to Christian families permanently even to-day in Kërala.

varattar 'uninvited guests' [VD and BAILEY], from varattt 'coming, arrival'—BG has varasan (with s<t<t). 

valarni-kk- 'to rear up' is based upon the colloquial valarmma (= literary valarcc). 

valaiini-kk- 'to hatch a plot' [Vartt.]

vacc 'some', 'any' is the past relative participle of vay-kk-. The meaning has undergone considerable generalisation.—BAILEY has vashadum 'anything'.

viccugar, literally 'throwers (of nets)' 'fishermen'—VD has vccalkkarany.

vindu viluvay 'in order to redeem or recover.' vily- is a Late Mal. base corresponding to Early Mal. and Tam. mil.

villaccan 'pater familias'.

venduvado, vendvado 'what is required'.—Modern vendado.

vendadhinam 'objectionable, malicious words.'—A corruption of vendadanyam under the influence of forms like Skt. paradhinam. One hears in the corrupt colloquials Acchadhinam for Skt. atchadana. 

BAILEY has vendasanyam which is also a "corruption" with s<t (through the fricative stage).

velusam in velusamayi ppara.' to speak openly'.—Cf. valusam and palusam.

vellongudi (vellam kudi), literally 'drinking of water', is used for 'food taken during a journey' and for 'food' in general. BAILEY gives the meaning 'provisions for a journey'.

velmadam 'terrace', for vemmadam.

sargam 'quarrel' for tarkkam, is one of those numerous pseudo-Sanskritic forms that abound in this dialect.

soppo 'garden' 'a tope' [VD] shows s for the initial t- of toppo.
INSCRIPTIONS OF KATHIAWAD*

By

D. B. DISKALKAR, Poona.

LĀTHI

v. s. 1808 [6-8-1752.

This inscription is found in the temple of Bhīdbhanjana Mahādeva at Lāthi. The length and breadth of the inscribed portion is 6”.

It records that Sanghavi Hemarāja and Viṇhal, sons of Kalyāṇji, belonging to the Vaṇik Kapol community caused the temple of Bhīdbhanjan Mahādeva to be built in Lāthi during the time of GOHEL ŚRISĪMHJī, on Thursday, the eighth day of the bright half of Śrāvana in v.s. 1808.

This inscription was once published in the Pkt. and Skt. Inscriptions of Kathiawad, p. 168.

Text

1 श्रीमन्तेपाय नमः। श्री सारदेशे नमः। श्रीरण्णवर्नी
2 सत् हे॥ श्रीजयो मंगलाचरणं श्रीभैरवकृत्
3 १८०८ वर्षे मासवतमासे भारभारामासे
4 खकल्लपके तवी अहिमी बार शुद्ध जोग अंध
5 एवं चंचंगसंजी तदा देववल भीदमंजन शेषमु
6 नुमाल। आदिरीलीमहे गोहेल श्री
7 संधवजी देवराजमान राज करे हे श्रीभैरवकृत्यो
8 लगनाली गोव्र मंडळ संवेदी श्री ५ कर्यावाणी
9 केशव तदा मायी बाई उमचकुचमधुबाईज
10 मल्ल पुव संवेदी हेमराज तथा संवेदी बीठि
11 जी पुव पीतामर॥ श्रीमीदिमंजनसंवेदिन्दुः देववल
12 वणदारों जे बैसारण जे शे होय हे सर्व तुलसीपने हे श्रीकुमाण

DHRANGDHRA

No. 176] v. s. 1815 [9-5-1759.

This inscription is engraved on a stone slab fixed in the southern wall near the image of Ganapati, in the Mani-Nāgēśvara temple at Dhrangdhra.

It records that Avāradāsa and his sons began building the temple, (of Mahādeva) on Thursday, the 9th of the bright half of Śrāvana of v.s. 1809 = 6-8-1753) when AHMED SHAH was the emperor (of Delhi) and Mahārāṇa RAISIMHJī was the ruler of Zākāvād. The construction of the

* Concluded from p. 382 of Vol. III.
temple was completed on Wednesday, the 13th of the bright half of Vaisākha
of v.s. 1815 in the time of Rāja GAJASIMHJI (of Zālāvad) and his son
JASVANTSIMHJI. The cost of the building was Rs. 7101. Āvardās spent
91 kalasis of corn in charity and promised to grant 10 kalasis every year
for the maintenance of the temple.

Text

1 श्रीहिरसिनारायण || श्रीगणेशय नमः श्रीवर्मणी नामेपर || श्रीअंबारी || हमन
2 || संवत १८०९ ना वर्षे सावण शुद ९ देने वार.
3 मंदिर हीपरसादपंचतीर्थावी आराम मांडी हे.
4 वादसाह हीहैरसकाहा बोजे राजा श्रीभारा.
5 लावाइना देरपाठी महाराण धी रावेसवाचनी.
6 ना राजमां हीडांगडरामधे वास धी आवराव.
7 मुख्यी भाराया बाई दत्ताया मुत दानसंप सुत.
8 कहाहाई तथा नवज्ञोप सुत बनेलेप सुता धायाद.
9 राम तथा जन जामाहाई तथा बालोपाळ हीपरसाद.
10 काटूळे हे तेनी बेसराण होळा ६१०९ ) अंके हे को.
11 तेलापाइने अनेकी बेसराण बघी हे तेनी पुराणाहूँ.
12 संवत १८१५ ना बेसराण शुद १२ हुँरे सपर चढाव चे ता.
13 र राजा हीसवाचनी कुजारी जसवांतसंगव धी.
14 ट पाटोपरे हे श्रीधरसाते वास आवरावे दाना.
15 कलमी ९.१ एकाणु धरमबाते करा हे वरस १ कलमी १०.
16 ने आसरे मंत घरे हे हीपरसाड अपावे तार सुची आ.
17 वे रक्षा कारवता हीस्वरे हे परसाडाते सेवक राखव नाहा.
18 ना मुत अवजी तथा माई माधवी भी
19 बेराणा नारीमत सलात सामरी जीवणी.

LĀTHI

No. 177] v. s. 1820[27-11-1763

This inscription is engraved on the pedestal of the image of Gaṇapatī in the temple of Bhidbhavan Mahadeva at Lāthi. The inscribed portion measures 10" by 3".

It records that Sanghavi Kalyāṇa Keśava caused the image of Gaṇapatī to be set up on Sunday, the seventh of the dark half of Kārtika in v. S. 1820 in Lāthi (in the time) of Gohel LĀKHĀJI.

The inscription was once published in the Prakrit and Sanskrit Inscriptions of Kathiawad, p. 169.

Text

1 श्रीगणेशय नमः || संवत १८२० वर्षे कारतक वद ७ देने रजीवानारे धी.
2 गणपतिवं सर्व पदुं हे श्रीमारीमधे गोहल लापाजी.
3 शंची कलाण केलस सुत पीतामर गणपति नमः.
HALVAD

No. 178] v.s. 1822 [3-10-1765.

The inscription is copied from one of the many pālias standing in a deći near the temple of Bhavāni Mata in Rājehara in Halvad.

It records that Mahārāṇā Gajasirihji, son of Raisimji was slain in a fight with the cavalry of Vāghaḍa on Thursday, the fourth of the dark half of Aso in v.s. 1822.* Haṭhi Sanga, son of Gajaṅja Kesarji was also slain with him.

Text

सबत १८२२ वर्षे आसो बद ४ व
र गद मारण श्रीरामसंघजी
छूट महरण श्रीगजसंघजी वा
र चहतन काम आबा छ चुडं बांड
ना सायकमाहा थच ते कम आबा
छ गजना केसरज सत गजणी
आ हटींगजी कम आबा छ.

VALĀ

No. 179] v.s. 1828 [4-5-1772.

This inscription is engraved on a white marble slab in the possession of the Thakur Saheb of Valā. The inscribed portion measures 12" by 8".

It records that Bhäuseri Prāmji made repairs to the well, in which the inscription was first fixed, on the second day of the bright half of Vaiśākha in v.s. 1828, during the time of BHĀVASĪMHJI. The well was formerly built by Vāṇa Shri Shurāji.

The inscription was once published in the Prakrit and Sanskrit Inscriptions of Kathiawad, p. 170.

Text

1 सबत १८२८ वर्षे बशाखा छुट २ दने वा
2 ला श्रीधरजीए बंधावी छे ते बाब अंधा
3 रोमा भारोजी फारमजीए बंधावी छे
4 नारो श्रीधरजे के राज्यवी राखलौ बी
5 शाभाई मावरींजीं छे धीरसु

LIMBDI

No. 180] v.s. 1830 [16-5-1774.

This inscription is found engraved on a marble slab fixed in the wall of the deći of 28 pillars on the bank of a tank at Limbdī. It measures 13" by 6".

* The v.s. seems to the Aṣāḍḥādi.
1. The mango grove in the vicinity of a village is called अंधरी.
2. i.e. the passage of the well is to the east.
It records that Mahārājādhirāja Adāji and Kumāras Verāji and Amara-
simhāji who belonged to the Zālā family, which is one of the 36 royal
families and is of the Mārkaṇḍeya gotra were killed in a battle. In their
honour a deri was built at the cost of Rs. 2,321. The building of the
deri took 2 years and 4 months, and was completed on Monday, the sixth
of the bright half of Vaiśākha in V. S. 1830.

Text

1 भी || स्थिति श्रीमन्तुपुरिकारसमयायति संवत १८४० वर्ष श्रीमन्तूप
2 शालिनाराहुका शाके १९६९ प्रवर्तताने वैशाखमासे छुट्टकरे धे सोमवा
3 सरे पुर्णमश्रेणे बृंदािमधी ज्योगे कक्षिकुक्षयोकारिष पद्मशिराज
4 कुक्षिके मारक्केनायकसिंहासनमस्तिपालन झाला श्रीमा
5 हराजखिराज अवाजी पंचवर्ष तथा कुब्र श्रीविराजी श्राब्धापाते पंचवर्ष
6 तथा कुब्र श्रीभामसेंगजी श्राब्धापाते पंचवर्ष प्राप्तिः तथा हिताग्ये
7 वजीकरितिरिति सर्वसतो भ्राक्षात संपूर्णांमनए प्रसाद बैंथे
8 २ मास ४ पूर्ण धर्यो इश्त्ययरं सहित २३२९ बेत्रीयसे एकासिस
9 पर्चा के प्रसादानी राखे बेठी झाला श्री अदाराजी
10 करणो

WADHWAN

No. 181]

v. s. 1833   [30-12-1776.

This inscription is found in the deri of Candrasirihji at Wadhwan. The inscribed portion measures 10½" by 12".

It records that Mahārānā Prithvirājji caused a deri to be made in honour of Mahārānā Candrasimhāji on Monday, the 5th of the dark half of Māgashirsha in v.s. 1833. Prithvirajji's mother was the daughter of Jayasimhāji of the Vāghelā family, and was named Kuśala Kuvarbā.

Text

1 संवत १८४३ ना वर्ष शाके १९६८ प्रवर्तताना
2 ने वि पुड़ाने में गते मातीमासः मा
3 हराजखिराज कुब्रके तिथि ५ वार चंद्र महरा
4 गाःचंद्रसिंहजिनी प्रसाद वाजेला श्रीहेंसिन
5 जी० तथौ सुता बाई श्रींकाल कुब्र सुत
6 महराना श्रीविराजाजिज्ञास प्रसाद के
7 रावते ० श्रीसम ||

GHELA SOMANATHA

No. 182]

v. s. 1850   [3-2-1794.

This inscription is found engraved on a slab which is fixed near the
door of the temple of Nilakaṁtha Mahādeva adjoinging the temple of Soma-
natha, called Ghelā Somanatha, on the bank of the river Ghelā, at a dist-
ance of eleven miles to the north-east of Jasdan, and a mile from the village named Piplia.

It records that Thākor Śrī Vakhtsirñhji, evidently the Maharaja of Bhavnagar, had come to worship Somanatha with his Diwan and Kāmdārs and about 1000 cavalry, on Monday, the fourth of the bright half of Māhā in v.s. 1850.

The visit of Vakhatsirñhji to the place might have taken place on his way back from Jasdan where he had gone to humble Vājsur Khācar, the powerful Kathi ruler of Jasdan.

An earlier inscription of v.s. 1798 fixed in the wall near this inscription shows that the temple evidently of Nilakantha Mahadeva was built (repaired?) at a cost of Rs. 7625, by Davagar.

Outside the courtyard of the Somanatha temple is a pāliā of Jamni, wife of Jasa who became Sati in v.s. 1675

**BEYT**

No. 183]  

v. s. 1855  

[31-3-1799.

This inscription is inscribed on one of the six pāliās, all of the same date, standing in an enclosure in front of the new Sankha Narayana temple in Beyt. It records the death of Bhanji Pujaji in the fight with the English, on Sunday, the 11th of the dark half of Phālguna in v.s. 1858. The other five pāliās record the death of other soldiers in the same fight.

This fight must have taken place between the people of the Vāḍel Rāṇā of Aramḍā and Beyt and the English who had attacked the island in A.D. 1799. In the light of these inscriptions the date of the first connection of the British with the island given as 1804 A.D. in the Kathiawad Gazetteer (p. 594), requires to be corrected. It took sixteen years to completely subjugate the island in 1816 by the combined forces of the British and the Gaikwad. By the treaty of 18th November, 1817 the island passed under the sovereignty of the Gaikwad of Baroda.

**LIMBDI**

No. 184]  

v. s. 1860  

[14-1-1804

This inscription is engraved on a marble stone slab fixed in a wall of the deri of 28 pillars on the bank of the tank at Limbdi. The inscribed portion measures 6½" by 7½".

It records that Mahārāṇā Harisīrhjī caused the deri of Harbanjī to be made on Saturday the second of the bright half of Māgha in v.s. 1860 at a cost of Rs. 725.

**Text**

1 स्वतरू. १८६० ना मात्र छावि २ याने  
2 उ माहरांणा अहरम्भमजी  
3 नि देरी करीयी के ६० ७२५ नचा
4 वत यहा के मास० ६ वे पूरी थ 
5 ई छे महाराणा श्रीहिरसंग्रजीवे 
6 वणावी छ ला० तकितादा. [श्री ]

TARANETAR
No. 185] 
[9-5-1811

This inscription is found in the temple of Mahādeva at Taranetar.
It records that Vithal Bābāji in the service of the Gaikwād caused a
temple of Trinetra i.e. Mahādeva to be built in v.s. 1867 or Šaka 1733.
This Vithal Bābāji was the famous general of the Gaikwād, who con-
quered Kathiawad, and established the power of the Marathas there.

Text

1 श्रीगणेशाय नामः।।
2 श्रीमिहिरसंग्रजाय: परिमि
3 तेजादेवसमनावाढुस्मावे
4 गृहलस्वस्थिततिमयनश
5 सादामानिमय्य।। श्रीमहायक
6 बाडसेवकाशिरोरलस्य श्रीवाचि
7 न: सेवालस्यधिक्षेत्रनयः
8 श्रीविहिरस्य। मुः।। १ ॥ विच्रमा
9 नृसमे सीम्येलयने माति माचवे
10 कृष्णे पुरौप्रतिश्री: प्रतिश्रीविचि
11 रणभूत। ॥ २ ॥ श्रीरस्तु रवेष्मन्तः।।
12 शके १७३२ एवन्त १५६६
13 श्रीचरणे केसब आनंदराव श्रवण....

JĀDEŚVARA
No. 186] 
[13-3-1813

This inscription is engraved on a black stone slab fixed in a niche near
the image of Ganpati in the famous Jādesvara Mahādeva temple at a
distance of 6 miles from Vānkāner. The inscribed portion measures 14" by 11".
Though the man who composed the inscription seems to be learned the en-
graver has done his work most carelessly. The mistakes are not corrected.
The inscription mentions that the temple of Jādesvara Mahādeva was
built by Vīthalrao Bābāji, the general of the Gaikwād, who conquered Sau-
rastra, on Saturday the 12th of the bright half of Phālguna, in v.s. 1869 or
Śaka 1734.

Text

1 ॥ श्री सायसदशिवाय ॥
2 श्रीमहायकवाहसंवस्रुद्वतातिशालिनी
3 बानामाहित विद्हशतनयतः: स्वायत्ततः-
4 राजः।। अबलेक्सः कुमुंदेस्वरायो विद्वा
5 मात सिते माल्ये पुष्पावें शानिवा
6 सरे हरितियो जायसाध्य व्यातात
7 ॥ १ ॥ यहुहार्यसरोवर मया गंगारालोरी
8 रित्वः।। मात्रपूर्वपर्कते माते सेवकु
9 जाटेवरः।। ॥ २ ॥ जयं मुक्तितिर्म राहुः का
10 रण नेति तावः।। जगान्नादियानुत
11 लालुदलिम जाटेवरः।। ॥ ३ ॥ सं १८८९ वा
12 के १७३० फाल्नु मृत्यु १२ शतो पुष्पाहक्षे
13 आधुनिको बालुककणे सूक्ष्मायत्तव इस
14 घटी १५ पद ३१ समय प्रासाद प्रतिष्ठा इत्यादः।।

AMRELI
No. 187]  
[v. S. 1873  
[28-4-1817

This inscription is engraved on a stone slab built up in the wall of the famous Nāgēśvara Mahādeva temple in Amreli. Unlike most of the inscriptions of the modern period this inscription is composed in good simple Sanskrit.

The object of the inscription is to record the building of the Nāganātha temple in Amaravalli by Vīthalrao Vevāji of the Prabhu community who was the minister of the king of Vatapura and who conquered Saurāstra. The work was completed on Monday, the 12th day of the bright half of Vaiśākha in v.s. 1873 (Saka 1739). The inscription was composed by Jagannatha, a Brāhmin of the community.

Text

1 ॥ भीमकुमाराकमः।। सैगराणे। पुष्पामुर्गी जयति ज्ञायणा
2 छोंडः।। भूमिकुमारा सा पुराणवाणवाही विलक्षा सततं जग्न नामे
3 भरोसाः।। पूर्वे यो। पावनसमिवुपवरणावछिन्नः।। सम्यकः
4 हरिद्वारः।। पुष्करनिर्जनितमहिम विकलयासनः।। ॥ १ ॥ देवा
5 ज्ञित्याजुनवाहः।। प्रभुदत्तिको विकुटकल्याण सुपुर्दानी मातो
6 ड़वालेक्षितपुरुसप्रभावदर्शनः प्रतापः।। तेन भीमागमः
7 यो न्यायवरदमल राजयुगः तु मध्ये पदावरणे नन्दनामां
8 निजाधिकल्यानदुलस्यतुकः।। ॥ २ ॥ प्राच्यो भीमवि
9 हरिद्वारावलमुदिते चंद्रप्रकाश च श्रीनेत्री
10 जत्रादायकम्बुमुग्धमा कार्यायामासं श्रीमतः।। प्रासा
11 द रैवतां।। प्रतिष्ठामसरस्यं तंत्रं विकृतम्य प्राच्यो
12 यो जोपनलुपाचितवन्तसमी श्रीचायामास श्रीमतः।।
13 ॥३॥ वयं नंदार्गामासुतिकरणितेहि विप्रवहितः
14 चंद्र स्याते शाके च मापे मकरमोहिरे दुःखसम्भवः एव
15 चेव।। कृप्ये कुमुंदेश्वी परिश्चेत्तमिवाकौः।।
16 देवयोगीने प्रार्थना नागनाथाय विकृतिरचना
17 काहियोंविधेयम ॥ ४ ॥ वर्षे बन्धिनागसुतकरण
18 मित्र माधवे णुकळपडे हङ्गाच्या सोमवारंजवभमग
19 शृणुने बाळवे दृष्टिवादी ॥ पालित्या नंदिनाथो क
20 मणिगणपयोमाहे श्रीसहिष्ठा प्रायादस्य प्रति
21 झा श्राकलकलशी कारिता बिधेयम ॥ ५ ॥
22 संवत १८७३ वर्षे शाखे १७९९ वैशाख हङ्गाद ॥
23 श्री सोमवारे बिंदू देवाजीने नामेषनो राजासा
24 द संपूर्ण करावयो छे ॥ कवि जगनाथ प्रभो राजाण
25 शिल्पी सुमयाम सोमपरा

SIHORE

No. 188] v.s. 1887 [20-10-1831

This inscription is engraved on a stone slab fixed in the wall of a small deri in the north-western part of the famous Brahma Kund which is in the southern part of the town Sihore in the Bhavnagar State. The inscribed portion measures 8" by 4".

It records that Sāmī Purushottama Sarasvati caused a temple of Brahmā to be built on the bank of the Brahma Kund on Thursday, the seventh of the dark half of Aśvin in v.s. 1887.

It is to be noted that the image of Brahmā is now missing. This Brahma kunda is said to have been originally built by the Caulukya sovereign Siddharāja Jayasimha.

Text

1 स्वति श्री संवत् १८८३ ना शाख १७९३ प्रवर्ति
2 माने आध्यात्मासे कण्यपडे तिथि ३ स
3 समी गुह्रावरे ॥ व्याही धोपरीपसम
4 सरस्वत्ती अस्राकुंडवर देह चणा
5 शीतो श्रीज्ञानी मुरलीनी वापना करी
6 छे ॥ श्रीरुठ ॥ दुःष्ट मेवु ॥ कवयायममखु ॥

MADHAVAPUR

No. 189] v.s. 1896 [11-5-1840

This inscription is found in the famous Mādhavrai’s temple at Mādhavapur, now in the Porbandar State.

It records that the temple of Mādhavarāi was repaired by Rūpālibā, mother of Mahārājā Vikramātīj of the Jethvā family, on Monday, the 10th of the bright half of Vaiśākhā in v.s. 1896. The same queen repaired the Kedāreshvara temple in Porbandar as an inscription of v.s. 1894 in the temple to that effect states.
This inscription is found fixed in the northern dam of the Chandrāsar lake to the west of the town Rājasāthāpur in the Dhrangadhra state. It measures 1’10” in length and 10” in breadth and being quite modern is in an excellent state of preservation.

It records that in the Jhalla family, which is one of 36 Kṣatriya families, was born a king named Candrasinjhaji who was eleventh in descent from Mānasinjhī, son of Raymallsja, who was the son of Amarasinjhī. This Candrasinjhaji had caused to be dug a lake, called Candāsar lake, where an inscription dated Monday, the 5th of the bright half of Phālguna of v.s. 1624 was fixed. The lake had been very much out of repairs. Mahārāṇā Raymallsja, therefore, ordered his Vazir Jādeja Sāngāji to dam it as strongly as before. Accordingly he repaired the tank on Thursday the third of the bright half of Vaiśakha in v.s. 1911 (Saka 1777).

Text

1 ॥ श्रीमान अग्रेश नः ॥ श्रीमानवरायो जयति ॥ स्वरूप ।
2 ॥ श्रीमनुप्रवीकामाकामसमयस्व ्ति वर १७५९ ना ॥
3 दसके १७६२ ना वैशाखामासे श्रुक्षणे दसमया १० ॥
4 तीनी सीमावरुणे उत्तरा फाल्गुनिनिर्धारे हेरियणे ॥
5 गे ग्रिरको मेजुरसिद्धीते दुर्गे रॉम उत्तत्त्वे ॥
6 वसंततिती तुल्यतीसीते देवपुरी वेन पांचोण ॥
7 श्रुक्षणे अन्त प्राप्ते श्रीमानवपुरमासे घरमेत्र धे ॥
8 दमने महाराजाः श्रीविक्रमात्जी तत्क युक्तः ॥
9 पालिवाले श्रीमानवराजीदु जीवनंदर हदु ते नो ॥
10 तरम कीर्तु छे ॥ कलो विक्रमासे तलाट पोरे ॥
11 भा देवा वसरामे एकु छे ॥ ली अयाज हर्जीवन स ॥
12 बहुं श्राण अविद्वसतः जोकी ईसामली ॥
SHIMROLI

No. 191] v.s. 1912 [8-2-1856

The subjoined inscription is engraved on a white stone slab fixed in a well near the temple of Shamnath Mahadeva at Shimroli, which is at a distance of 7 miles from Kesod on the Kesod-Mangrol road. The inscribed portion measures 1'7/8" by 11'.

It records that at Shimroli there was a very old well called Khodiyal tāv which was dug deeper and granted in girās, in the time of Nabab Bahādur-kañji and his Diwan Amardji, in v.s. 1831. It was again repaired by Mukhtarām, son of Jayaśankar in v.s. 1912 at the cost of 3216 koris.

Text

1. ॥ श्रीगणेशय नमः ॥ श्रीमा
2. ता खोदियाल साहाय के ॥ शंक
3. त १८२१ नी सालमा नवाब श्री
4. ॥ बाहादुरखानजीनी नव
5. [वी जाना मोजे शीमरोली मोटीमा
6. बाब खोदियाल असल पुरा
7. तनी हरी तेमा पाणीने मेन
8. त करी [आवा साथो। काका
9. तथा काला राजस्ता ? ] ते उप
10. ॥ गामा गरात मेता श्रीकाम
11. रजी दीवाला[न*]नी बारमा आपु छे
12. ते बाब पाणी सं १९१२ ना
13. महाना छायु ॥ दीमे च मगे
SEKHAPAT
No. 192] v.s. 1914 [20-1-1858

This inscribed slab is fixed in the wall of a deri in the eastern part of the village Sekhpát.

The inscription records that Vibhā, son of Rāymal repaired the temple of Asāpuri Mātā, on the 5th day of the bright half of Māgha in v.s. 1914.

Text

1 II Brāhมāshāpurajī sāhāya II dīha II satarēsē s
2 talatatō II āyamāna uḷantō II tathā tērasēr
3 bāsēr bhū II rānakārī bhāṣa II 1 II ṭhār
4 sāsāsī bhīkūsō II unādūkē bhēmēn II bhēma
5 ē tāpagāhā II rāṇ paṭh tērāsaṅg II 2 II aśō
6 gānūsē cūdār aṭhak II māhāmāsaḥdhūmasat
7 r II rāmanamastūlaśīsērṣu II bhīsē jīrṇāyāča
8 r II 2 II tāsē aḷaḥ nīvīnāpurī II paṭṭh phāraṇa
9 tāṣail II bhīmē dūlaṃvērīṇāhī II ke kavitā
10 vajamāla II 4 II pavīt 1914 nā māhā suḍ 15 II

BEYT
No. 193] v.s. 1935 [13-8-1879

This inscription is engraved on a stone slab fixed in the wall of the Sankha Nārāyaṇa temple situated in the central portion of the island Beyt Sankhadhāra near Dwarka at a distance of half a mile to the east of the main temple of Raṇchodrāū. The tradition goes that the image of Sankha Nārāyaṇa in this temple was set up by one Śiva Sangaṇa in v.s. 1607.

The inscription mentions that in v.s. 1774 Mahārāv Prāgji repaired the temple and an inscribed slab was fixed to that effect. It was afterwards repaired in v.s. 1854. The inscription put to that effect was worn out. The temple was again repaired in v.s. 1902 and the inscription which was put at the time is preserved near the present inscription. Lastly, on Wednesday, the twelfth of the dark half of Śrāvaṇa in v.s. 1935, the temple was rebuilt by order of Nānibā Zāli, mother of Mahārāv Khangārjī.
11 भी शैक्षिकारणिजी सत्य के सन्तु, 1374 नी शास्त्रों कच्चे दे शांतिप
2 ति महाराजां भी प्राप्तजीनेच्या था भूती मंदिरच्या नजु नाहे कर तेंशी शिखालेख नि
3 ज मंदिरही नामानांची ते पड्या से 1892 नी शास्त्र मंदिरस साम करावे
4 ते ते तेंशी शिखालेख आ बोहे फायम ते पड्या से 1925 ना अभावण नी
5 द 12 विषेश शास्त्रानाच्या भिक्षा महाराजां भी शिखालेखांच्या बांधवर्गांच्या मातृभी
6 बांधवर्गांच्या शी नामे शालीच्या भाष्यानं मंदिरसु काम तथा मंदिरनं सा
7 भी भीतनामानीच्या दरवाजी के ते उपर मला बेनीसो बांधवी केर्ये काम से
8 पूर्ण कराव्या के 11 गादिस्य बड्डचाथिरि शी, (लिखित वि......वासी......)

**List of inscriptions**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INSCRIPTION</th>
<th>OF SAÑVAT</th>
<th>INSCRIPTION</th>
<th>OF SAÑVAT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Dudāpā</td>
<td>Vikrama 1258</td>
<td>39 Dhāmlej</td>
<td>Vikrama 1437</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Vīśavādā</td>
<td>1262</td>
<td>40 Mahuvā ? Sudā Vāy</td>
<td>1262</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Ājaka</td>
<td>1262</td>
<td>41 Bhavnagar Museum</td>
<td>Date missing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Mahuvā</td>
<td>1272</td>
<td>42 Baḍulā</td>
<td>Vikrama 1440</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Ghelānā</td>
<td>Valabhi 911</td>
<td>43 Rāṇāvālo</td>
<td>14[4]0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Mīyānī</td>
<td>Vikrama 1290</td>
<td>44 Somanātha Pātaṇa</td>
<td>1442</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Jāsān</td>
<td>1292</td>
<td>45 Phulkā</td>
<td>1443</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Waḍhwān</td>
<td>1301</td>
<td>46 Mesavānā</td>
<td>1444</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Verāval</td>
<td>Valabhi 927</td>
<td>47 Khorāsā</td>
<td>1445</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Girnār</td>
<td>Vikrama 1305</td>
<td>48 Dhandhuras</td>
<td>1445</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Ghumli</td>
<td>1318</td>
<td>49 Āvānā</td>
<td>1447</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Girnār</td>
<td>1319</td>
<td>50 Phulkā</td>
<td>1448</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 Lāthodrā</td>
<td>1322</td>
<td>51 Bagasrā</td>
<td>1448</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 Forebandar</td>
<td>1334</td>
<td>52 Corwād</td>
<td>1450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 Kansārī</td>
<td>1347</td>
<td>53 Gorerā</td>
<td>1450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 Waḍhwān</td>
<td>1350</td>
<td>54 Māṅgrol</td>
<td>Date missing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 Somanātha Pātaṇa</td>
<td>1355</td>
<td>55 Māṅgrol</td>
<td>Vikrama 1452</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 Girnār</td>
<td></td>
<td>56 Parālā</td>
<td>1453</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 Somanātha Pātaṇa</td>
<td></td>
<td>57 Somanātha Pātaṇa</td>
<td>1454</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 Somanātha Pātaṇa</td>
<td></td>
<td>58 Kankāsā</td>
<td>1455</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 Somanātha Pātaṇa</td>
<td></td>
<td>59 Paṭṇā</td>
<td>1456</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22 Somanātha Pātaṇa</td>
<td></td>
<td>60 Bhūvāṭimā</td>
<td>1457</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23 Sūṭrāpādā</td>
<td>1357</td>
<td>61 Jamlā</td>
<td>1461</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24 Satrunjaya Hill (Pālitāpā)</td>
<td>1371</td>
<td>62 Somanātha Pātaṇa</td>
<td>1462</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 Māṅgrol</td>
<td>1375</td>
<td>63 Verāval</td>
<td>1464</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 Rāval</td>
<td>1375</td>
<td>64 Vantali</td>
<td>1469</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27 Hātasni</td>
<td>13[1]816</td>
<td>65 Mesavānā</td>
<td>1470</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28 Div</td>
<td>1393</td>
<td>66 Vāghelānā</td>
<td>1471</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29 Adpokar</td>
<td>Date missing</td>
<td>67 Vantali</td>
<td>1472</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 Girnār</td>
<td></td>
<td>68 Junagadh</td>
<td>1473</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 Amreli</td>
<td></td>
<td>69 Corwād</td>
<td>1485</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32 Māṅgrol</td>
<td>Vikrama 1402</td>
<td>70 Mesavānā</td>
<td>1488</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33 Kherāli</td>
<td></td>
<td>71 Mesavānā</td>
<td>149[1]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34 Somanātha Pātaṇa</td>
<td>1423</td>
<td>72 Lokhvā</td>
<td>1499</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35 Somanātha Pātaṇa</td>
<td>1432</td>
<td>73 Mūl-Mādhopur Date not given</td>
<td>1499</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36 Thān</td>
<td>1432</td>
<td>74 Śimara</td>
<td>Date missing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37 Nāgicānā</td>
<td>1434</td>
<td>75 Mahuvā</td>
<td>Vikrama 1500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38 Osā</td>
<td>1435</td>
<td>76 Junagadh (Uparkot)</td>
<td>1507</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37 Girnār</td>
<td></td>
<td>77 Girnār</td>
<td>Date missing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INSCRIPTION</td>
<td>OF SAṆṇAVT</td>
<td>INSCRIPTION</td>
<td>OF SAṆṇAVT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78 Jegaṃḍa</td>
<td>Vikrama 1514</td>
<td>136 Rājasithāpur</td>
<td>Vikrama 1701</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79 Jegaṃḍa</td>
<td>1518</td>
<td>137 Beyt</td>
<td>1702?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80 Ginnār</td>
<td>1519</td>
<td>138 Khārvā</td>
<td>1716</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81 Jegaṃḍa</td>
<td>1524</td>
<td>139 Sekhāpaṭ</td>
<td>1719</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82 Khāṃbhāḍ</td>
<td>1531</td>
<td>140 Beyt</td>
<td>1720</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83 Kutilyāṇa</td>
<td>1531</td>
<td>141 Anindarā</td>
<td>1723</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84 Candrāsara</td>
<td>1534</td>
<td>142 Halvād</td>
<td>1722</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85 Gosā</td>
<td>1536</td>
<td>143 Muli</td>
<td>1735</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86 Rāmpara</td>
<td>1538</td>
<td>144 Beyt</td>
<td>1738</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87 Khodu</td>
<td>1544</td>
<td>145 Gadhākā</td>
<td>1740</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88 Bāḍi</td>
<td>1572</td>
<td>146 Māḷia (Miyanā)</td>
<td>1740</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>89 Kūvā</td>
<td>1572</td>
<td>147 Mavinā</td>
<td>1746</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90 Sarā</td>
<td>1579</td>
<td>148 Bāḍi</td>
<td>1748</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91 Urā</td>
<td>1582</td>
<td>149 Jhīnjhuvāḍā</td>
<td>1751</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>92 Dhṛēsāryavel</td>
<td>1582</td>
<td>150 Halvād</td>
<td>1749</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>93 Halvād</td>
<td>1583</td>
<td>151 Kambhāḷāḷa</td>
<td>1749</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>94 Veḷvādvar</td>
<td>1584</td>
<td>152 Gopanāṭha</td>
<td>1750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95 Satrunjaya Hill</td>
<td>(Pāḷitāṇa)</td>
<td>153 Kambhāḷāḷa</td>
<td>1751</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>96 Hāṃpar</td>
<td>1587</td>
<td>154 Thāṅ</td>
<td>1752</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97 Nāgicānā</td>
<td>1588</td>
<td>155 Rāvav</td>
<td>1753</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>98 Padā</td>
<td>1590</td>
<td>156 Gundi</td>
<td>1754</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99 Bagasārā</td>
<td>1594</td>
<td>157 Berāḷa</td>
<td>1756</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100 Kodidārā</td>
<td>1604</td>
<td>158 Thāṅ</td>
<td>1757</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101 Wadhwan</td>
<td>1609</td>
<td>159 Dihor</td>
<td>1758</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>102 Daulasara</td>
<td>1613</td>
<td>160 Nāgicānā</td>
<td>1758</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>103 Gogha</td>
<td>1614</td>
<td>161 Bhāvnagar</td>
<td>1768</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>104 Māṅkhetrā</td>
<td>1639</td>
<td>162 Bhāṇavāḍ</td>
<td>1771</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>105 Dhrol</td>
<td>1647</td>
<td>163 Thāṅ</td>
<td>1776</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>106 Satrunjaya</td>
<td>1650</td>
<td>164 Halvād</td>
<td>1779</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>107 Unā</td>
<td>1650</td>
<td>165 Sīyāṇi</td>
<td>1781</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>108 Satrunjaya</td>
<td>1652</td>
<td>166 Bhāḍrod</td>
<td>1792</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>109 Hāṃpar</td>
<td>1652</td>
<td>167 Limbdi</td>
<td>1793</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>110 Dhṛēngdhṛā</td>
<td>1656</td>
<td>168 Lōlyānā</td>
<td>1794</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>111 Kondha</td>
<td>1657</td>
<td>169 Limbdi</td>
<td>1794</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>112 Jāmmagar</td>
<td>1663</td>
<td>170 Morvi</td>
<td>1797</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>113 Gāḷā</td>
<td>1666</td>
<td>171 Wadhwn</td>
<td>1797</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>114 Dādar</td>
<td>1668</td>
<td>172 Beyt</td>
<td>1797</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>115 Gogha</td>
<td>1669</td>
<td>173 Pāṭadi</td>
<td>Date missing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>116 Vartej</td>
<td>1672</td>
<td>174 Mahuvā</td>
<td>Vikrama 1801</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>117 Satrunjaya</td>
<td>1674</td>
<td>175 Lāṭhi</td>
<td>1805</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>118 Satrunjaya</td>
<td>1675</td>
<td>176 Dhṛēngdhṛā</td>
<td>1809</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>119 Māṭhak</td>
<td>1675</td>
<td>177 Lāṭhi</td>
<td>1815</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>120 Vāṅkāner</td>
<td>1677</td>
<td>178 Hāḷvād</td>
<td>1820</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>121 Kāḷāvaḍ</td>
<td>1679</td>
<td>179 Vala</td>
<td>1822</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>122 Kuā</td>
<td>1682</td>
<td>180 Limbdi</td>
<td>1828</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>123 Satrunjaya</td>
<td>1682</td>
<td>181 Wadhwan</td>
<td>1830</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>124 Halvād</td>
<td>1683</td>
<td>182 Ghelā Somanāṭha</td>
<td>1835</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>125 Mūḷi</td>
<td>1683</td>
<td>183 Beyt</td>
<td>1850</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>126 Gadhākā</td>
<td>1685</td>
<td>184 Limbdi</td>
<td>1855</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>127 Māṅgrol</td>
<td>1687</td>
<td>185 Tarnetar</td>
<td>1860</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>128 Kuā</td>
<td>1687</td>
<td>186 Jāḍēṣvara</td>
<td>1867</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>129 Dahisārā</td>
<td>1687</td>
<td>187 Amrelī</td>
<td>1869</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>130 Bīḷpāra</td>
<td>1688</td>
<td>188 Sihore</td>
<td>1873</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>131 Dhuā</td>
<td>1688</td>
<td>189 Māḍhavpur</td>
<td>1888</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>132 Halvād</td>
<td>1688</td>
<td>190 Candrāsara</td>
<td>1896</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>133 Jhīnjhuvāḍā</td>
<td>1690</td>
<td>191 Simrolī</td>
<td>1911</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>134 Jāmnagar</td>
<td>1692</td>
<td>192 Sekhāpaṭ</td>
<td>1912</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>135 Wadhwan</td>
<td>1699</td>
<td>193 Beyt</td>
<td>1914</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
MISCELLANEA

FEMALE EDUCATION AS EVIDENCED IN BUDDHIST LITERATURE.

In every respect, the period of Buddhism is marked with allround development. Buddhistic philosophy and theology had something quite conspicuous and specific in it that gave impetus and encouragement to education. It furnished a dynamic force which is so essential for any civilization if it wants to establish supremacy and gain ground.

We are dumbfounded while reading the accounts of Universities like those of Vikramaśīla, Ajanṭa, Sāranaṭha, Nālandā and the last but not the least Taxillā,1 which poured out a colossal force of Buddhistic culture and civilization. These Universities were so generously conducted that not only Indians but the peoples of Asia and Europe also received instruction on all the branches of literature, art and science, namely, philosophy, politics, painting, rhetoric, medicine, astrology, archery, architecture, and also alchemy.

Besides Taxillā and Nālandā, Chinese travellers in their travel accounts have mentioned quite a number of minor institutions which shaped and circulated Aryan Culture and civilization, far and wide. These were exclusively financed by the rich and the reigning princes of India. The most noteworthy feature quite characteristic of India's catholicity was that they imparted tuition free of charge to all and alike without observing distinction in caste, colour, and creed.

Prasenajit, the king of Kosala, and Jivaka2 received instruction sitting together. A prince and a pauper were treated alike. It is written in one of the Jātakagranthas named Mahāsūtasaṃa that hundreds of princes were instructed in the uses of weapons and missiles on the lines of strict equality. All these accounts and the historical records lead us to the conclusion that there were very big Universities in Buddhistic times, which provided ample scope for education to males; but they are comparatively and teasingly silent as regards female education. To get an adequate idea on the point we will have to fall back upon the Buddhist Canon and the works allied to it because we are not at all prepared to believe that the nuns who wandered in the nook and corner of the country, leaving aside Lakṣmī and luxury to scatter the seeds of Buddhism, with a fanatic's zeal, were almost illiterate.

On the contrary, the splendid missionary work which they have so ably put forth is itself a good and reliable commentary on the broad outlook, clear vision, practical wisdom, unfailing foresight, intellectual width and what not. These and a train of merits did neither come to them as mere windfalls, nor were they Nature's bounties conferred so lavishly and thoughtlessly on them; but they were the outcome of the closest application and the unflinching devotion to the Goddess of Learning. Let us see in the following paragraphs what light we get and gather in this connection from the Buddhist Literature. It cannot of course, be definitely asserted whether they received education after the fashion of the present day girls

1. In the North and North-West of India there were great centres of learning such as the Universities of Nālandā and Taxillā where for hundreds of years not only all branches of secular knowledge, especially, medicine, but also the philosophical and theological literature of Buddhism, were cultivated with great zeal. Chinese pilgrims like Heuen Tsang learned Sanskrit at Nālandā and translated Buddhist texts into Chinese. See Phaṇḍrā Nath Bose: Indian Teachers of Buddhist Universities.
2. Jivaka was the son of a courtezan, named Sālavati. Mahāvagga VIII, 1.
going to the educational institutions or by of private tuition. This much can be
culled that they got first-rate training, both academic and spiritual.

It is now an admitted fact that the Slokas of the work styled Therigāthā were
composed by learned nuns of those times. Religious sermons of Sukkā and philo-
sophic discussions of Dharmadinnā and Kesemš entitle us to hypothesize that they
were given a technical training regarding those subjects. We come across a refer-
ence of a learned lady named Sukkā in Saññyuttaniikāya. She was a nun and had
delivered an illuminating lecture in a great assemblage at Rājagaha. This lecture of
Sukkā was so impressive that a certain man of Yaśa caste wandered in every
street and proclaimed to the effect that every one should go and hear her nectarine
words. A nun named Kesemš was very famous for reciting Vinayagranthas. She
had crammed the Vinayagranthas and her melodious recital of those granthas was
simply engaging.

It was considered a privilege to hear her singing. Her erudition also is
brought out in high relief by the dialogue about the theory of rebirth between
her and the king Prasenajit who was so convinced by her brief, bold and cogent
arguments that there was not a single vestige of doubt left in his mind when he
departed. Another brilliant star in the person of Kuntalakesā shines resplendent
in the whole galaxy. In Logic, she was discomfited only by one Sāriputta and none
else. She ruled supreme in the intellectual world of those days. We get an account
in Vimānaavatthu of one of the learned nuns named Latā who had mastered the
art of magic. She had a wonderful command on Vinayaśīktaka, which she taught
according to Dipavaniśa not only to nuns in Anurādhāpura but to monks also.
Estimate of her scholarship will remain incomplete if we neglect to take into
consideration the fact that she had a chance to bring out masterly editions of
some of the Piṭakagranthas. Uttarā had undertaken to teach seven works bearing
upon Vinaya, Sutta, and Abhidhamma in the University of Anurādhāpura. Añjali
had gone to Anurādhāpura taking sixteen thousand monks with her, to teach especially
the Tripitakas. Is it not a privilege to lord over monks as large in number as
sixteen thousands? And is it not a glorious achievement for a man (what to talk
of a woman) to be appointed as the senior professor in a University like that of
Anurādhāpura, Nālandā and Taxilā, which is decidedly ten times bigger than any
of the present day Universities of the world. It was considered a red letter day
in the History of India on which Sir Radhakrishnan’s appointment as Spalding
Professor of Eastern Philosophy in the Oxford University was announced. It was
considered the highest pinnacle for which an Indian can aspire in an academic line.
What to talk of those times, then, in which even the ladies ruled the academic
world? It means there is a long history of female education which has, still got
to be constructed out of the fragments lying hither and thither in Vedī, Buddhistic
and Jainistic literatures. This proves that female education was not only in vogue
in those days but was appreciated and encouraged. It is also true that it was
imparted on a more solid and sound basis because it could produce scholars of
intrinsic worth and deep study. It is also manifest from the foregoing pages that
female education was of a diverse character including instructions on magic, sculpt-
ture etc. Latā mastered the art of magic and Nanduttarā and Vidyā were adepts
in the art of sculpture. This is also evident that it was considered more a duty
rather than a matter of pride to educate the females because we have seen above
that it was open to all. Besides those mentioned above, there is quite a good
number of other ladies also no less superior. Their worthy names are Kālī, Channā,
Sayallā, Ulī, Revati, Sivalī, Mahāruhā, Culabhagā, Dhannā, Sonā, Mahātissā, Cula-
sumanā, Mahāsumanā and Hemā. It will be a long list of the female professors

3. Therigāthā forms part of the Khuddaka Nikāyā which is again included
in Suttaśīktaka.

who actually worked in the University of Anurādhāpura⑤ which also like Nālandā fulfilled the dictum of Carlyle that a true University is a collection of books as well as that of Newman that it is a school of Universal learning the alma mater of a host of distinguished logicians, grammarians and philosophers. I leave it to the scholars to find out whether there were separate institutions for female education or there was a system of co-education or they were privately tutored.

Andheri.

A. S. GOFANI

JAGADDEVA PRATIHĀRA, A FORGOTTEN HERO

Everyone knows the great difference in the character of the earlier and latter periods of the reign of Bhima II, the last Chaulukyan ruler of Gujarat. In the earlier portion, he defeated and drove back the Muslim invader Muhammad Ghori, measured swords with Pythvīrāja Cāhamāna, then regarded as the strongest ruler of Northern India, and successfully invaded the Paramāra kingdom of Malwa. In the latter portion, he was not only defeated by the Muslims, but also kept away from his ancestral throne for a short period, and even when restored was a mere puppet in the hands of the faction headed by Viradhavala and his ministers. He was a young boy when he ascended the throne. Had he been overpowered by someone at the time, or failed in administering well his kingdom, it would have been regarded as the natural consequence of his inexperience and childhood. But his failure in all directions when he had grown up to manhood and was expected to show even greater heroism and administrative ability than formerly, requires some explanation; and for this one would look in vain to the Jaina chroniclers of Gujarat, who, loud in the praises of Vastupāla and Tejapāla and their patrons, have omitted the name of Jagaddeva Pratihāra, the heroic general and prime minister of Bhima II, to whom really belongs the credit of the early successes of this king’s reign, merely because he happened to be a non-Jaina and a worshipper of Siva and Viṣṇu. The purpose of this short paper is to rescue from unmerited oblivion this very hero of the history of Gujarat.

The Kirtikaumudi of Someśvara, though in the main a panegyric of Vastupāla, the powerful Jaina minister of the Viradhavala, gives in a single but pertinent verse what Gujarat owed to this great Pratihāra. It represents the guarding deity of Paṭṭana appearing to Lavaṇaprāśāda and bewailing the absence of Jagaddeva in the words, ‘In the absence of Jagaddeva, I have been reduced to this plightby my own people as if they were my enemies. As long as that Pratihāra was alive, the enemies, being afraid, never entered the city of Gujarars.‘ From the Kirtikaumudi we also learn that another general, responsible for the defence of the kingdom, and most probably one of his colleagues or subordinates was one Pratīpamalla Rāstrakūṭa.

An earlier and better notice, showing him not only as the guardian of the kingdom, but also of the child-king Bhimā II is to be found in the Verāval inscription, which states explicitly that on the death of Mūlarāja II, the administration of the kingdom was carried on by the ‘famous Jagaddeva Pratihāra’ who ‘brought up with care the young Bhīmadeva II along with his companions.’ It was at this time of his regency that Muhammad Ghori invaded Gujarat, and sustained a severe defeat. The inscription calls Jagaddeva, the ‘Sun to the lotus in the form of the queen of

5. See BURLINGAME’S Buddhist Parables.
6. बिना जगददेशभमिमार्त्या नीलता निजलैं परिपरिवाहम्।
   वर्ण सिंहये मेघिनिष्ठ श्विकृतिनित्व: प्रविष्टे पुरे गृह्यरणाम्। II. 19.
7. अंगधिन इति प्रतिपत:। यो वाल्पति: सहितं प्रयस्तवःभैरभैरवेभु:।
   समवैकृष्ण।। Line 32. ........प्रताहारभिरोपण:। ॥ ॥ Line 35.
Prthvirāja. This refers, most probably, to his fight against Prthvirāja III of Ajmer. According to the Kharaṭaragaccha Paṭṭāvalī of Jinaṇḍa, a contemporary work of great historical value, this war came to an end before v.s. 1244, and the night-attack by the Jāṅgaleśa, mentioned in the Pāṛthuvaṇīya of Prahlādana was most probably one of its many incidents, about which we should have learnt something more from the Verāval inscription had it, unfortunately, not been so very fragmentary.

The Paṭṭāvalī just referred to supplies some important and additional details. It mentions him as the chief minister of Bhimadeva II. When the pilgrims from Saḍḍalakṣa visited the holy places in Gujerat, they did so with his permission. It was he who concluded a treaty of peace with Prthvirāja of Ajmer, and it was an army under him which was invading Malwa in v.s. 1244. That he was a man of his word is shown by his refusal to grant Abayāda, a daṇḍanāyaka, the permission that he sought for to mulct the pilgrims from Saḍḍalakṣa with a view to provide provisions for Jagaddeva’s cavalry then operating in Malwa.

The colophon of the Sāntināṭhacarita of Māṇikyacandra mentions Jagaddeva Pratihāra along with Kumārapāla, but here again the portion dealing with him is unfortunately obliterated.

Jagaddeva Pratihāra was most probably a Vaiṣṇava. But he built also a temple of Siva. The colophon of the Sāntināṭhacarita, just referred to seems to indicate that he could grant favour to Jainas also. If we succeed in getting further materials about him, these will be presented to the readers in some subsequent number of this very journal.

Dasharatha Sharma

SIGNED ARROWS: A NOTE

In an interesting and illuminating article entitled “Signed Arrows” contributed to Professor K. V. Rangaswami Aiyanger Commemoration Volume (pp. 155-158), Mr. C. Sivaramamurti draws attention to the ancient custom of marking the arrows with the name of the archer, and cites instances in support from Vālmiki, Kālidāsa, Māgaha, Bhaṭṭa Nārāyaṇa and Kṣemendr. The accompanying illustrations of actual specimens from the Madras Museum bearing the name of Sarabhoji of Tanjore supply corroboration for the literary evidence.

In this connection, I wish to point out that Bhāsa, whom I place in the Mauryan epoch, furnishes us with one of the earliest references to the custom mentioned above. In the Paṇcarattra, arrows inscribed with the name of Arjuna are referred to. In the Abhiṣeka, we come across arrows bearing the name of Rāma. These instances from Bhāsa go to show the continuity in the ancient tradition. As I hold Bhāsa and Kautilya to be contemporaries, I tried to find confirmation of the tradition recorded by Bhāsa in the Arthaśāstra, but did not come across any reference of inscribing the arrows in Kautilya’s work.

A. D. Pusalker

9. 'Mājha maha kathā somant kṛṣṇīrājane sāndhi: kṛṣṇīrājan', Jagaddeva’s letter to Abhayada.
11. See verses 32 and 33.
REVIEWS

Tūzak-i-Wālajāhī of Burhān Ibn Ḥasān, Translated into English by S. Muhammad Husayn Nainar, M.A., LL.B., Ph.D., Head of the Department of Arabic, Persian, and Urdu, University of Madras, 1939, Pp. 292; Size:—6½" × 9½"; Price: Rs. 5 or 8s. 6d.

The volume under review is No. 4 of the Madras University Islamic Series which is being published under the direction of the General Editor Dr. S. M. H. Nainar. The first volume of these sources of the Nawwâbs of the Carnatic was published about six years ago. The present volume carries on the history of the Nawwâbs of the Carnatic from the battle of Ambur to the fall of Pondicherry (A.D. 1749-1761). This period saw the gradual rise of the supremacy of the East India Company on the Coromandel Coast. The volume contains detailed references pertaining to the "indebtedness of the English to the rulers of the Wālajāhī dynasty in the Carnatic".

The sources of the History of the Nawwâbs of the Carnatic are Persian MSS., of which Burhān's Tūzak-i-Wālajāhī translated into English by Dr. Nainar is an important one. This chronicle comes to an end with the present volume.

The history of India of the 18th century presents many difficulties to the historian, not on account of paucity of materials, but on account of their abundance. To synthesize all these materials by a detailed comparison of all available sources for all important political events is no easy task. But by translating the old accounts of historical events into one language like the English language we provide a medium now accessible to every educated Indian and thereby provide an instrument of historical investigation which exercises a healthy check on one-sided statements made by contemporary writers, who were sometimes blinded by prejudice or patriotism of the narrow type which disabled them from hearing and recording the other side of the occurrences dealt with by them. The fault lay not always with these writers but at times with the peculiar circumstances under which they recorded their impressions, that were not always based on accurate data or reliable documents. All the same we must thank these contemporary and subsequent chroniclers for what they have done for Indian history because in the absence of these chronicles there would have been a complete void of historical knowledge of the different periods which bristled with epoch-making political and social changes in Indian history.

In the present volume Dr. Nainar has not given us the mere translation of the original chronicle but has supplemented it with occasional informative foot-notes regarding the persons and events mentioned in the chronicle. These footnotes serve as a historical corrective to the author's statements, which are at times likely to be exaggerated. They also link up the narrative to other contemporary sources bearing on the narrative and hence lead to a proper understanding of the history enshrined in the text of the narrative.

The glossary of Persian terms with their explanation in English as also the two Appendices given at the end of the volume will be found useful to the close students of the history of the period. As the Bhārata Itihāsa Samshodana Mandal, Poona, has been publishing summaries of Persian sources of the Maratha History and as the chronicle before us is one such source we trust that some day they will give us a scholarly summary in Marathi of the present chronicle translated by Dr. Nainar for the benefit of the Marathi knowing public interested in the Persian sources. The present translation has paved the way for such undertaking and we have no doubt that Dr. Nainar would willingly help any brother-
scholar in the Mahārāṣṭraj who takes the trouble of mastering the present sources in the original and presenting a critical summary of them in Marathi divested of all hyperboles and other superfluous matter which sometimes characterize the Persian sources.

P. K. Gode

Citracampū by Mahamahopādhyāya Bāṇeśvara Vidyālaṅkāra Bhaṭṭācārya, with a Foreword by M. M. Gopinātha Kāvirāja; Edited by Pandit Ramcharan Chakravarti, Headmaster, Jay Narayan High School, Benares, 1940; Pp. 40+4+90. Price: Rs. 2-0-0; Size: —5 1/2"×8 1/4".

Though Bāṇeśvara Vidyālaṅkāra is famous as a poet and jurist of the transitional Bengal of the 18th century in his own province his works have not attracted much attention of outside scholars. The present Campū from his pen is edited by Pandit Chakravarti with scrupulous care with an exhaustive Introduction of 40 pages dealing with (1) the Poet and his Works, (2) the Quasi-historical and Quasi-geographical nature of the poem, (3) the description of the rare India Office MS. of the work on which the present edition is based, (4) the date of Composition of the work (about 1744), (5) an Analysis of the poem and (6) a Short Sanskrit Introduction. This Introduction gives us a correct literary and historical background of this interesting poem, which aims at describing the gradual ascent of the soul from earth-bound consciousness into the summits of Divine Life and consciousness" as Principal Gopināth Kāvirāja puts it in his interesting Foreword (p. 4).

Bāṇeśvara came of the well-known Sobhākara family of Guptapalli or Guptipāra in the district of Hooghly in Bengal. This family produced many Sanskrit scholars. He was born about A.D. 1672 according to the Editor (p. 8). He was patronized by Maharāja Kṛṣṇacandra of Nadia (A.D. 1710-1782). He left Nadia after some time and later sought the favour of Nawab Aliveri Khān of Murshidabad. From Murshidabad he went to Maharāja Citrasena of Burdwan after whom the Campū takes its name "Citracampū". He lived with Citrasena till A.D. 1744 and during his stay at Citrasena's court he produced his works (1) Citracampū and (2) Candrabhīṣekam. Citrasena died in A.D. 1744 and Bāṇeśvara again went back to Maharāja Kṛṣṇacandra of Nadia. He later lived under the patronage of Maharāja Navakṛṣṇa Deva of Sobhābazar, Calcutta. Navakṛṣṇa had the greatest regard for Bāṇeśvara, for whom a house was constructed by him on the Upper Chitpur Road near Sobhābazar. The house no longer stands but the poet's descendants are still living near the old site. In 1755 Bāṇeśvara went on a pilgrimage to Benares and composed his Kāśīsatakam.

Warren Hastings asked Bāṇeśvara to compile a code of Hindu Law. This book was written in Sanskrit under the name of Vīvādānavaśetu in collaboration with many other scholars, among whom we find one Sitārāma Bhaṭṭa who was possibly a Maratha Brahmin according to the Editor. This book was then translated into Persian, from which it was again translated into English under the title "A Code of Gentoo Laws" and was printed in England in 1776. Bāṇeśvara composed a mahākāvyya called Rahasyāmytam and many other khaṇḍakāvyas.

On p. 12 we get a reference in this Campū to the Maratha raid on Bengal ("सहस्राण नमूनेःः—गौड जनपदः जनपदः समूत्तमः—महाकाव्यकेतः: इव समृत्तश्""). The poet also records the date of this raid viz. śaka 1664 when the sun was in the first rāśi. This date appears to be correct as we know from history that Bhashkar Ram Kolhatkor, the general of Raghūji Bhosala was in Bengal in April 1742 (Vide

The world of Tamil scholars should be indebted to Rao Sahib S. Vaiyapuri Pillai for editing this important metrical lexicon in Tamil. This work is next in importance only to Divākaram, the oldest of Tamil nighantus. It belongs to about the middle of the 15th cent., A.D. It was sufficiently popular in about 1575 A.D. The usefulness of this work is pointed out by the editor (Foreword, pp. vii-viii.). It will be of a great use to a student of synchronic linguistics of the Tamil of the 15th and 16th centuries.

The editor seeks (p. x) to establish the name Kayātaram as more correct than Kayākarar (for contra, see Rao Sahib M. Raghava Aiyangar, Sen Tamil. Vol. V. p. 121). Kayātaram is the first metrical lexicon in Tamil in which the last word of each stanza in every section is so arranged as to be structurally similar to the first word of the following stanza. This device facilitates the committing to memory of the entire work. (p. xiv).

This printed edition of Kayātaram has doubtless thrown light on certain scribal errors which crept in the printed edition of Divākaram. For instance, in the latter, one of the names of Buddha is printed as pāriyāna; but this is obviously meaningless. The correct form ‘pāramitaiyavan’ given in Kayātaram removes the the error (pp. vii-viii and xv Kayātaram. St. 14. p. 3). Kayātaram helps us also to correctly determine the meaning of certain words. For instance, in the printed edition of Divākaram we have “pāmmaiyum Kauñiyum arutiavappamey” ‘pāmmai and Kauñi are names of women-ascetics.’ Clearly, the meaning of Kauñi should have been more restricted as it referred only to ‘ascetic women of arhat order’ (cf. Silappadigaram. U. V. Swaminathiyar’s ed. Madras, 1927. pp. 263, 265, 266, 357, 391, 401). This is emphasised by stanza 118 of Kayātaram also ‘Kauñiyum pāmmaiyum arukata tavap pey’ (p. 18) this showing that what has been printed in the Divākaram text was due to a scribal error (p. xv).

Divākaram which belongs to the 8th century A.D. was published by Vidvān Tāntavaraiya Mudaliar in 1835. His edition is untrustworthy as there are interpolated in it many of Tāntavaraiya Mudaliar’s own sūtras. But Kayātaram follows the original Divākaram (cf. Pongiya mānana porul terindu—Keyātaran Čeytamaítāng. St., 285. p. 45. Here mānul undoubtedly refers to Divākaram, p. xvi. Again stanza 220. p. 33 paḻaiyir kaiyirig ciḻi Vēnḻor Yōvum pongivatu Vākaiyam pōtēriyampey which is certainly after Divākaram ‘nallicai yampurc celucen-tamil, Vallin Kaliyir paḻaiyir Kōtaiyil.

Vellināravikai Vērippai which is however not found in the printed edition of Divākaram. p. xvi. Therefore, it is possible with the help of the text of Kayā-
taram, to eschew the interpolated stanzas in the text of Divākaram (not only in the printed edition but in several manuscripts as well) and determine the original text which will in its turn serve as an effective tool for a student of synchronic linguistics who studies the Tamil of the 8th cent. The alveolar phoneme \( \text{r} \) perhaps ceased to be distinct one in Tamil during the 12th cent., when ottakūṭṭar flourished (See S. Krishnaswami Aiyangār, Ancient India, p. 153) for in his Tokkayāgapparṇi (U. V. Swaminatha Aiyar’s ed., Madras, 1930, 35. Urai, p. 16) it is treated merely as a phonemic variant of \( \text{r} \) (substituted for Sanskrit \( \text{r} \) for instance in Skt. mīṭa = mirula for mira of another Tamil dialect; amirutta of one dialect for amīrla of another.)

Similar is the practice in Kayāṭaram (for instance Kāḍarpo kāḍarpo st., 21 p. 4. pp. xvi-xvii). In his time, possibly in some dialect the alvelor \( \text{r} \) replaced \( t \) or \( d \) also in some words (see for instance pagam, st., 2, 7 and 225, for Skt. padma, pp. 33 and 35 and xvii) and \( p \) in some others (copoṇam for copoṇan Skt. svapna st., 347, p. 55). In Kayāṭaram we come across some interesting modifications of the various forms of certain words. For instance, in st., 124 (p. 19) we meet with the word makunāṇ instead of the usual form makiloh. In this connection, it is interesting to remember that this word appears as makināṇ in IRAYANAR KALIYya I, p. 18 and makināṇ (Silappadīgāram under 6, 37 in a quotation occurring in urai p. 192 of U. V. Swaminatha Aiyar’s ed.,) ‘husband’. Another such word is aminai which appears as ayumai in st., 334 (p. 53). The same form occurs in patrappatu, urai (p. 132 of U. V. Swaminatha Aiyar’s ed., 1920 Madras), and in aikkuṟu iṟu uṇai also (cf. U. S. Swaminath Aiyar’s ed., 1920. pp. 65, 67, 134. Introduction, p. 6). The importance of a study of these words in modern linguistics, can never be exaggerated.

The etymology of K uṇa (st. 113, p. 17) as given by Kayāṭara is kulam-kareṇ got from the equation kula + inu = kufina is evidently due to some scribal error just like the erroneous irāmiṣṭurakkovi (st. 402, p. 64) for irāmiṣṭurakkovi. The meaning of certain words like kulitta (st. 207, p. 31), tuvarē (st. 444, p. 70) and tuyrili (st. 517, p. 79) are not clear. The editor could not properly reconstruct stts., 468, 477, and 496 (see pages 73, 74 and 76). Many lines are perhaps irretrievably lost in stanzas 479, 494, 503 and 519 (pp. 74, 76, 77, 79 and xvii). How certain Sanskrit words changed their forms when they were borrowed into Tamil is yet another interesting problem we meet with in Kayāṭaram (cf. Skt. Sarma becomes saruna in Tamil. Pari (pādāl 21, 3. p. 155. U. V. Swaminath Aiyar’s ed., 1935 also ibid. p. x.). What a difficult task the learned editor set himself to, would be evident to any one who tries to reconstruct the original of stanza 517 from the hopelessly corrupt readings in the manuscripts used by the editor (p. xvii).

The first ten sections of Kayāṭaram deal with synonyms and the last one with homonyms (p. vii). The book is neatly got up with few mistakes and the Madras University, particularly the Tamil department, deserves our warm congratulations for bringing out this important work. Indeed, Rao Sahib S. Vaiyapuri Pillai has placed all the lovers of Tamil language under great obligations.

Poona.

C. R. SANKARAN.
THE EPOCH OF THE GUPTA ERA

By

K. G. SANKAR, Calcutta.

The epoch (320 A.C.) of the Gupta Era, as determined by Dr. Fleet, is considered to be, with that of Candragupta Maurya (c. 320 B.C.), one of the sheet-anchors of Hindu chronology. In recent years some attempts have been made to challenge its accuracy, but they have not met with general acceptance. This is due in part to the inadequate presentation of the points in favour of an earlier date. But the chief reason is certainly the general disinclination to unsettle accepted dates, in the absence of compelling evidence. The epoch of 320 A.C. seems to work fairly well and to fit in with ascertained facts of Hindu history, and if now and then some fact is discovered, which is inconsistent with that epoch, it is sought to be explained away or simply ignored. But when a fly, with the whole world to choose from, persists in sitting on my nose, it is not wisdom to ignore it. I therefore determined to face all facts which refused to be charmed away and tried to discover an epoch, which would be in harmony with all of them. The result is given below.

I tried first to find out how the epoch of 320 A.C. came to be so generally accepted, and even by those who had before persistently advocated an earlier date. I was surprised to find that almost the sole evidence on which the epoch was settled was Dr. Fleet’s discovery of the Mandasor inscription of Mālva years 493 and 529, (Gupta Inscriptions, No. 18), which mentions a Kumāragupta. It was supposed that only one Kumāragupta could possibly have been ruling in Mālva year 493 = 436 A.C. This evidence therefore, seemed conclusive for dating the Gupta epoch in 320 A.C. Since then, however, another Kumāragupta has been found to have been ruling in year 154 (Annual Report of the Archaeological Survey of India, 1914-15, p. 124); and the natural interpretation of the Mandasor inscription is to take Kumāragupta as the Sūzerain of Viśavarman, father of Bandhuvārman, who was ruling in year 493 = 436 A.C. Dr. Fleet was aware of another Kumāragupta, son of Narasimhagupta Bāḷāditya, but as Bāḷāditya was identified with the Bāḷāditya who, according to Hieun-Tsang, took Mihirakula captive, and as Yaśodharman, of Mālva year 589 = 532 A.C. claims to have subdued Mihirakula, Dr. Fleet thought it impossible that Bāḷāditya’s son could have been ruling nearly a century before Yaśodharman. But in my paper on the Hun Invasion of Hindusthān (under publication in New Indian Antiquary), I have proved that the Bāḷāditya, who defeated Mihirakula, was not Narasimhagupta, but a much earlier king of Magadha, and there is no reason to suppose that Kumāragupta, son of Narasimhagupta, was different from Kumāragupta of year 154, who ruled between Skandagupta and Budhagupta. Now, there-
fore, we have to consider the possibility of Kumāragupta II being the Kumāragupta of the Mandasor inscription, and the epoch of 320 A.C. is thus no longer the sheet-anchor it was supposed to be. It must here be pointed out that so far no other proof has been adduced for this epoch, except the evidence of Alberūnī (1030 A.C.).

In his *India* (tr. Sachau, v. 2, pp. 5-7), Alberūnī identifies the Gupta era with the Valabhī era, placing its epoch 241 years after the Saka era, in 320 A.C.; and adds that it was called Valabhī era from Vallabha, King of Valabhī, that the Guptas were wicked, powerful people, and, when they ceased to exist, this date was used as the epoch of an era, and that it seems that Vallabha was the last of them. Dr. Fleet accepted Alberūnī’s epoch for the Gupta era, but argued that the era used by the Guptas themselves could not have begun from their destruction. Others, notably Cunningham, relied on Alberūnī’s statement that the Valabhī era dates from the destruction of the Guptas and argued that the era used by the Guptas themselves must be different and earlier than the Valabhī era. Both forgot that Alberūnī was only recording local traditions, and that he probably misunderstood what he heard. Of the Saka era, he likewise wrote that it dates from their destruction by Vikramāditya. But this statement has been proved to be wrong by the earliest inscription dating in that era by name, the Bādāmī inscription of Cālukya Kṛśṭivarman, which definitely refers to the years as those of the anointment of the Saka King (*Indian Antiquary*, Vol. 3, p. 305). It is equally certain that the Guptas could not have dated their inscriptions in an era dating from their destruction; and Alberūnī’s statements cannot be accepted without corroboration. Alberūnī’s epoch of 320 A.C. for the Valabhī era is, however, confirmed by the Verāval inscription of Arjunadeva, dated in Valabhī year 945, Vikrama year 1320, and Hijra year 662 (*Indian Antiquary*, Vol. 11, p. 242). Vikrama year 1320 = 1264 A.C., and the epoch of the Valabhī era must therefore be 1264—944 = 320 A.C. This epoch for the Valabhī era is further confirmed by the Unā plates of Mahendrāyudha (890-907 A.C.) (*Epigraphia Indica*, Vol. 9, No. 1), dated in Valabhī year 574, and by the Verāval inscriptions of Valabhī year 850, (*Bhāvnagar Inscriptions*, p. 186), which mentions Cālukya Kumārapāla (1143-1173). Regarding the origin of the Valabhī era, Candraprabhasūri in his *Prabhāvakocarita* (1277 A.C.) gives a hint (p. 74, st. 81-82) that in year 845 after Vira-nirvāṇa = 319 A.C., Valabhī was destroyed by Turushkas. It is probable that Valabhī was rebuilt soon after in 320 A.C. and that the Valabhī era dates from that event. Alberūnī also refers to this tradition, when he says that Vallabha and his city Valabhī were destroyed in a night-attack by the lord of Almansūra (tr. Vol. 1, pp. 192-193). We may therefore, conclude that the Valabhī era dates from its rebuilding in 320 A.C., and not from the destruction of the Guptas.

But there is no reason to think that the Gupta and the Valabhī eras are identical, and it is not clear why the Guptas should date their inscriptions in a local Valabhī era. Modern scholars, therefore, prefer to believe that the
Gupta era dates from their coming to power and that, because it was continued by the Maitrakas of Valabhi, it later on came to be known also as the Valabhi era. This theory involves two assumptions that the Gupta and Valabhi eras are identical, and that the Guptas started the era, which was continued by the Maitrakas of Valabhi. The proper procedure would be to ascertain when the Guptas and the Maitrakas flourished, and whether they used the same or different eras, and then to try to fix the epochs of the eras as exactly as the available data would permit.

The Guptas are not known to have ruled in Central Hindusthān also.
The Eraṇ inscription of the brothers Mātrivishṇu and Dhanyavishṇu (Gupta Inscriptions, No. 19) refers to Budhagupta as the ruling king in Gupta year 165. Of these, Mātrivishṇu had ceased to live, when Dhanyavishṇu refers to Toramāṇa as the ruling king in his first year (Eraṇ inscription, Gupta Inscriptions, No. 36). Toramāṇa’s first year must therefore be dated after Gupta year 165, and he is known to have ruled for at least 52 years, as one of his coins is dated in that year (Cunningham: Coins of Medieval India, p. 20). After Toramāṇa, his son Mihiirakula is known to have ruled for at least 15 years (Gupta Inscriptions, No. 37), before he was conquered by Yaśodharman Vishṇuvarndhana (ibid, No. 33). Yaśodharman’s conquest of Mihiirakula cannot be dated before 532 a.C. as it is not mentioned among Yaśodharman’s achievements in the Mandasor inscription of Mālva year 589 = 532 a.C. (ibid., No. 35). On the other hand, when Hiu-en-Tsang visited Mālva in 642 a.C., he heard that Śīlāditya of Mālva had been ruling for 50 years, some 60 years before (Si-ya-ki, tr. Vol. 2, p. 261). Śīlāditya must therefore have ruled from 532 to 582 a.C., and his predecessor Yaśodharman cannot be dated after 532 a.C. Thus Yaśodharman’s conquest of Mihiirakula cannot be dated either before or after 532 a.C. It must, therefore, be dated in that same year; and since Toramāṇa and Mihiirakula had already ruled for at least 52 and 15 years respectively, the early Guptas had ceased to rule in Central Hindusthān before 532—(52 + 15) = 465 a.C. But in year 191, Bhānugupta is mentioned as the ruling king in another Eraṇ inscription (Gupta Inscriptions, No. 20). The epoch of the Gupta era cannot therefore be dated after 465—191 = 274 a.C.; and, if the reference in that inscription to Bhānugupta’s waging a mighty battle indicates the war that ended in transferring Central Hindusthān to Toramāṇa, the Gupta epoch may be dated in c. 274 a.C. This inference is confirmed by the fact that the interval between year 165, when both Mātrivishṇu and Dhanyavishṇu were alive, and Toramāṇa’s first year, when only Dhanyavishṇu had survived, cannot be more than a single generation, that is, not much beyond year 191, when Bhānugupta was still ruler of Central Hindusthān.

The date here arrived at for Toramāṇa (c. 465-517 a.C.) and Mihiirakula (c. 517-532 a.C.) are confirmed by Jain legends of Kalkirāja. Jinasena, in his Harivamsā, composed in Śaka 705 = 783 a.C. (Ch. 66, st. 52) says that the Guptas ruled for 231 years, that thereafter Kalkirāja ruled for 42 years, and that he was succeeded by Ajitanjaya at Indrapura (ch. 60, st. 491-492). From Jinasena’s chronology, it would appear that the Guptas ruled from 200 to 431 a.C., and Kalkirāja from 431 to 473 a.C. But Guṇabhadra, in his Uttarapurāṇa of Śaka 820=898 a.C. (Ch. 77, st. 35), says that in year 1000 after Vīra-nirvāṇa (= 473 a.C.), a Māgha year, Kalkirāja was born in Pāṭaliputra as son of Śīṣupāla, that he ruled for 40 years and lived altogether for 70 years, and that his son was Ajitanjaya (ch. 76, st. 397-401 and 428). This implies that Kalkirāja ruled from 503 to 543 a.C. Thus Guṇabhadra’s date for Kalkirāja is 70 years later than that of Jinasena; and 473 a.C. was in fact not a Māgha year. The nearest Māgha year was 474-75 a.C.
But both agree that Kalkirāja was son of Śisupāla, succeeded the Guptas and ruled for 40 or 42 years, and was succeeded by Ajitanjaya. Kalkirāja seems to be identical with Toramāṇa, who succeeded the Guptas in Central Hindustān, and had a reign of 52 years; and his true date (c. 465-517 a.c.) lies between the dates given by Jinasena (431-473 a.c.) and Guprabhadra (503-543 a.c.). The statement that he was son of Śisupāla of Pātaliputra seems to be confirmed by the Pahalapur inscription (Gupta Inscriptions, No. 57), which mentions a Pārthiva Śisupāla as commander. Toramāṇa seems to have inherited the post and used it to revolt against Bhānugupta, becoming ultimately independent in Central Hindustān.

The epoch of the Gupta era has been shown to be not later than c. 274 a.c. The earlier limit may now be fixed. The interval between Budhagupta and Yaśodharman cannot be more than 3 or 4 generations, as Dhanyavishṇu was a contemporary, first of Budhagupta and then of Toramāṇa, and Yaśodharman was a contemporary of Toramāṇa’s son Mihirakula. Budhagupta’s year 165 cannot therefore date more than about a 100 years before Yaśodharman’s Mālva year 589 = 532 a.c. The earlier limit for the Gupta epoch seems therefore to be c. (532-100) - 165 = c. 267 a.c.

Sylvain Lévi has proved from Chinese sources (Journal Asiatique, 1900, pp. 316, 401) that Śrī Meghavarṇa of Ceylon sought permission of Samudragupta to build a vihāra for Ceylon pilgrims at Buddha-Gaya; and Samudragupta too refers to relations with Simha-la (Gupta Inscriptions, No. 1). Samudragupta was therefore a contemporary of Śrī Meghavarṇa. Both Rājāvaliya and Pūjāvaliya place Śrī Meghavarṇa’s accession 845 years after Buddha-nirvāṇa in 845-543 = 302 a.c. The Mathurā inscription of Candragupta II, dated in year 61, cannot therefore be placed before 302 a.c., when his father Samudragupta’s contemporary Śrī Meghavarṇa came to the throne, and the Gupta epoch cannot thus be dated before 302-61 = 241 a.c. Some identify Śrī Meghavarṇa with Goṭhakābhaya (252-265 a.c.); but Goṭhakābhaya had only a title Meghavarṇābhaya, and was never known as Śrī Meghavarṇa.

Fan-Chan, again, of Funan (Cambodia) is said to have sent an embassy to Mu-lun (Muruṇḍa), king of Hindustān, whose capital (Pātaliputra) was 7000 li up the Ganges from its mouth, in 240-245 a.c. (Indian Historical Quarterly, Vol. 1, p. 612). Since thus in 240-245 a.c. a Muruṇḍa was king of Pātaliputra, the early Guptas and the Gupta epoch must be dated after 240-245 a.c.

Another datum for the earlier limit of the Gupta epoch is found in the Mandasor inscription of years 493 and 529 (Gupta Inscriptions, No. 18). It says that when Kumāragupta was ruling the earth, Viśvarman was protector (goptā) of Mālva, and that when his son Bandhuvarman was ruler of Daśapura (Mandasor), the sun-temple there was built in Mālva year 493 = 436 a.c. Thus before 436 a.c., Viśvarman had become a Gupta feudatory. But in Mālva year 461 = 404 a.c., his father Naravarman had been independent (Epigraphia Indica, Vol. 12, No. 35), and Viśvarman
too was still independent in Mālva year 480 = 423 A.C. (Gupta Inscriptions, No. 17). Viśavarman, therefore, had become a Gupta feudatory between 423 and 436 A. C. and Skandagupta was probably the Gupta, who conquered Western Mālva. Viśavarman's contemporary Kumāragupta must thus be dated 423-436 A.C. Among the early Guptas, there were two Kumāraguptas. The first was ruling from year 96 to year 130, and the second was ruling in year 154 and was succeeded by Budhagupta in year 157 (Annual Report of the Archaeological Survey of India, 1914-15, p. 125). Budhagupta's year 157 cannot hence be later than 423 A.C., when Mālva had not yet come under Gupta suzerainty. The Gupta epoch cannot therefore date before 423-157 = 266 A.C. Thus the earlier and the later limits of the Gupta epoch have been found to be 266 and 274 A.C. and the Gupta epoch may therefore be dated in c. 270 A.C.

The Maitraka era may now be considered. Their inscriptions range only from year 183 to year 447. They cannot therefore have founded an era of their own. But as they ruled over Surāshtra, which was formerly under the Guptas down to at least Gupta year 138 (Gupta Inscriptions, No. 14) and as the first two Maitrakas Bhasārka and Dharasena I are styled Senāpati, it is probable that the Maitrakas were originally gupta generals in Surāshtra, who later became independent, but continued the Gupta era in their own inscriptions. On the other hand, it is equally probable that they used the local Valabhī era. But it will be shown presently that the astronomical data of their inscriptions do not fit in with the Valabhī era of 320 A.C.; and, if they are supposed to have used this era, their rule should have extended to at least 320 + 447 = 767 A.C. But Surāshtra came under the Arabs of Sindh shortly after 712 A.C.; and it is not probable that the Maitrakas could have continued to rule 767-712 = 55 years later. It is therefore more likely that the epoch of their era is not much later than c. 712-447 = c. 265 A.C. This epoch closely agrees with the Gupta epoch (c. 270 A.C.) already arrived at. We may therefore conclude that the Maitraka inscriptions too are dated in the Gupta era.

In 642 A.C. Hiuen-Tsang found a Dhruvapaṭu ruling at Valabhī (Si-yu-ki, tr. Vol. 2, p. 267), who was nephew of Śilāditya of Mālva and son-in-law of Śilāditya of Kanauj. But no Valabhī king is so far known to have had the title Dhruvapaṭu, and no chronological inference can be drawn from his identity.

Another Valabhī king is mentioned in Dhananjaya's Satrunjaya-mahātmya, composed in Vikramāditya's 1477, when Śilāditya was king of Valabhī. This statement is discredited on the ground that in Vikrama 477 = 420 A.C. there could have been no Śilāditya of Valabhī. But the date is not given in the Vikrama era, but 'from Vikrama'; and the Śaka era is sometimes believed to commemorate Vikrama's destruction of the Sakas. Alberini says (tr. Sachau, Vol. 2, pp. 5-7) that Vikrama killed a Śaka at Karūr and that the date became famous and was used as an epoch by astronomers; and the Vikrama and the Śaka eras were often confounded with each other, the Śaka
era being even referred to as the era of 'Vikramânsa-šakarâja.' Supposing Dhananjaya's 'Vikramāt 477' refers to šaka 477 = 555 A.C. and his Śilāditya to be Maitraka Śilāditya I who issued grants from year 286 to year 292 and succeeded Dharasena II, whose latest date is 270, Maitraka year 270 cannot date after 555 A.C. and the Maitraka epoch must date before 285 A.C.

We have thus arrived at c. 270 A.C. as the true epoch of the Gupta era. Let us see how it fits in with the astronomical data given in Gupta and Maitraka inscriptions. There are 16 such inscriptions and I have made careful and exhaustive calculations to find suitable epochs between 240 and 340 A.C. I could find only one suitable epoch (273 A.C.) in this century. 273 A.C. must therefore be the true epoch of the Gupta era. The data are given below with references and equivalents, if available, for the epochs of 273 A.C. and 320 A.C.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>E. I. v. 21, No. 1</td>
<td>Year 61 (Candragupta II), adhika month (Unnamed)</td>
<td>334 A.C., adhika Āśādha</td>
<td>380 A.C. adhika Śrāvana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>G. I. No. 21</td>
<td>Gupta year 156 (Hastin), Vaiśākha year</td>
<td>429-30 A.C.</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>G. I. No. 22</td>
<td>Gupta year 163 (Hastin), Āśvina year</td>
<td>434-35 A.C.</td>
<td>482-83 A.C.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>G. I. No. 19</td>
<td>Year 165 (Budhagupta), Āśādhaśukla 12, Thursday</td>
<td>1st July 437 A.C.</td>
<td>21st June 484 A.C.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>G. I. No. 23</td>
<td>Gupta year 191 (Hastin), Cātra year</td>
<td>464-65 A.C.</td>
<td>511-12 A.C.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>E. I. v. 19, No. 21</td>
<td>Year 191 (Śarvanātha), Adhika Āśādha</td>
<td>464 A.C.</td>
<td>510 A.C.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>E. I. v. 21, No. 20</td>
<td>Gupta year 198 (Hastin), Āśvina year</td>
<td>470-71 A.C.</td>
<td>517-18 A.C.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>E. I. v. 8, No. 28</td>
<td>Gupta year 199 (Sankshobha), Mārgaśira year</td>
<td>472-73 A.C.</td>
<td>519-20 A.C.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>G. I. No. 25</td>
<td>Gupta year 209 (Sankshobha), Āśvina year</td>
<td>482-83 A.C.</td>
<td>529-30 A.C.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>E. I. v. 21, No. 30</td>
<td>Year 254 (Dharasena II) Vaiśākha Amāvāsyā, solar eclipse</td>
<td>28th March 526 A.C.</td>
<td>19th March 573 A.C.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>E. I. v. 6, No. 14</td>
<td>Gupta year 300 (Śaśānka), solar eclipse</td>
<td>23rd September 572 A.C.</td>
<td>21st March 619 A.C. or 10th March 620 A.C.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nos.</td>
<td>References</td>
<td>Astronomical Data</td>
<td>Epoch 273 A.C.</td>
<td>Epoch 320 A.C.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>I. A. v. 15, p. 340</td>
<td>Year 330 (Dharasena IV), Adhika Mārga-śīra</td>
<td>602 A.C.</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>J. B. R. A. S. (N. S.), v. 1, pp. 38-40</td>
<td>Year 343 (Silāditya III), Adhika Ashādha</td>
<td>616 A.C.</td>
<td>662 A.C.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>E. I. v. 22, No. 19</td>
<td>Year 357 (Silāditya III), Adhika Pausha</td>
<td>629 A.C.</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>I. A. v. 2, p. 258</td>
<td>Gupta year 585 (Jāika), solar eclipse</td>
<td>27th May 857 A.C.</td>
<td>10th November 904 A.C. or 7th May 905 A.C.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From the above it is seen that, while the epoch of 273 A.C. satisfies the data of all the 16 inscriptions, the epoch of 320 A.C. satisfies those of only 12 inscriptions. The data are of four kinds. Inscriptions 1, 7 and 13-15 give adhika months. Inscriptions 2, 4, 6 and 8-10 give Jupiter's years. Inscriptions 3 and 5 give tithi and nakshatra or week-day. Inscriptions 11, 12 and 16 give solar eclipses. The adhika months are evidently mean adhika months, as otherwise there could be no adhika Mārgaśīra or Pausha; and mean intercalations continued in use, till Śrīpati (1039 A.C.), in his Siddhānta-śekhara protested against their continued use. Jupiter's years are of two kinds, the heliacal-rising system, and the mean-sign system. The former requires actual observation or calculation of apparent motions of Jupiter, while the latter system is based only on mean motions of Jupiter; and observation was not common among early Hindu astronomers. For several centuries after even the Gupta period, they preferred mean motions of Jupiter and other planets. For the Gupta period, we have therefore to take the Jupiter's years as those only of the mean-sign system. The tithis likewise of Gupta inscriptions must be mean tithis and the nakshatras of the equal-space system, mentioned in Vedāṅga-Jyotiṣa. The lunar months must then have been pūrṇimānta, as Caitra Śukla 13 is equated with Caitra 27 in the year 209 inscription of Sankshobha and Māgha Krishna 3 is equated with Māgha 3 in the year 191 inscription of Hastin, and because, with an amānta month, it is impossible for the nakshatra to have been Māla on Vaishākha Krishna 7, as stated in the year 157 inscription of Budhagupta. Lastly, solar eclipses were considered auspicious occasions for making gifts and hence were often mentioned in inscriptions, though invisible.

These inscriptions may now be discussed in detail, to see how their data fit in with the two epochs of 273 A.C. and 320 A.C.

1. In Gupta year 61, there was an unnamed adhika month; and there were a mean adhika Ashādha in 334 A.C. and a mean adhika Śrāvaṇa in 380 A.C.;
2. Gupta year 156 was a Vaisākha year. This datum is satisfied only by the epoch of 273 A.C., as 429-30 A.C. was a mean-sign Vaisākha year, while neither 475-76 A.C. (Phālguna year) nor 476-77 A.C. (Caitra year) was a mean-sign Vaisākha year.

3. In Gupta year 157, Mūla was the nakshatra on Vaisākha Kṛishṇa 7 day. This datum too is satisfied only by the epoch of 273 A.C., as on 12th March 529 A.C., pūrṇimānta mean Vaisākha Kṛishṇa 7 began 4 hours 5 minutes after sunrise, when the moon’s longitude was 246°, and the nakshatra was therefore Mūla. But neither on 1st April 476 A.C. nor on 21st March 477 A.C., when Vaisākha Kṛishṇa 7 began 23 hours 17 minutes and 8 hours 10 minutes respectively after sunrise, was the nakshatra Mūla, for the moon’s longitude on those days was 226° 30’ and 255° 7’ respectively, and the nakshatra can have been only Pūrya Ashādha, not Mūla.

4. Gupta year 163 was an Āsvina year. The date in the inscription is clearly given as 163. But on the mean-sign system, it is impossible for year 163 to have been an Āsvina year, when year 156 was a Vaisākha year. Dr. Fleet has therefore admitted that ‘tri’ in the inscription might have been wrongly engraved for ‘dvi’. Accepting this emendation, both epochs satisfy the given data, for 434-35 A.C. and 482-83 A.C. were both Āsvina years.

5. In Gupta year 165, the day of Āśādha Sukla 12 was a Thursday; and both 1st July 437 A.C., when Āśādha Sukla 12 ended 5 hours 2 minutes after sunrise, and 21st June 484 A.C., when Āśādha Sukla 12 ended 11 hours 46 minutes after sunrise, were Thursdays.

6. Gupta year 191 was a Caitra year, and both 464-65 A.C. and 511-12 A.C. were Caitra years.

7. In year 191 of Šārvanātha, there was an adhika Āśādha. Ucchakalpa Šravanātha does not indeed specifically date his inscription in the Gupta era, but his inscriptions range from year 179 to year 214, and he issued a joint inscription (Gupta Inscriptions, No. 24) with Parivrājaka Hastin, whose inscriptions range from year 156 to year 198 of the Gupta era. Šārvanātha’s inscriptions also must therefore be dated in the same era. Accepting his year 191 to be a Gupta year, there were an adhika Srāvana in both 464 A.C. and 510 A.C., which, according to Brahmagupta’s rule that the second month is the adhika month, would be named Āśādha. But in both years the adhika months were true and not mean adhika months and the Ucchakalpas must have preferred true months. If this supposition is not accepted, both epochs fail to satisfy the given datum.

8. Gupta year 198 was an Āsvina year, and both 470-71 A.C. and 517-18 A.C. were Āsvina years.

9. Gupta year 199 was a Mārgaśīra year; and both 472-73 A.C and 519-20 A.C. were Mārgaśīra years. With both epochs, we must assume that year 198 was current and year 199 expired; and for all these inscriptions, we get satisfactory results only by assuming some to be current and others expired years. Even to-day when we ask of men their ages, some give expired
and others current years, and the same must have been the case in old times also;

10. Gupta year 209 was an Āśvina year; and both 482-83 A.C. and 529-30 A.C. were Āśvina years;

11. In Maitraka year 254, there was a solar eclipse on Vaiśāka amāvāsyā; and there were solar eclipses on Vaiśākha amāvāsyā of both 28th March 526 A.C. and 19th March 573 A.C. The solar eclipse on 28th March 526 A.C. was probably not visible in India; but, as pointed out already, it is not necessary that solar eclipses cited in inscriptions should be visible; and, as the sun’s distance from the node on 28th March 526 A.C. was 179° 33’, solar eclipse was certain on that day. The opinion of Prof. Jacobi (Epigraphia Indica, Vol. I, p. 423), the greatest modern authority on Hindu astronomy, may be cited here:—“The eclipses mentioned in inscriptions are not always actually observed eclipses, but calculated ones. My reasons for this opinion are the following: Firstly, eclipses are auspicious moments, when donations, such as are usually recorded in inscriptions, are particularly meritorious. They were therefore probably selected for such occasions, and must accordingly have been calculated beforehand. No doubt they were entered in panchāngs or almanacs in former times, as they are now. Secondly, even larger eclipses of the sun, up to seven digits, pass unobserved by common people, and smaller ones are only visible under favourable circumstances. Thirdly, the Hindus place implicit trust in their Śāstras, and would not think it necessary to test their calculations by actual observation. The writers of inscriptions would therefore mention an eclipse, if they found one predicted in their almanacs”;

12. There was a solar eclipse in Gupta year 300; and there were solar eclipses on both 23rd September 572 A.C., and 21st March 619 A.C.;

13. In Maitraka year 330, there was an adhika Mārgaśira. This datum is satisfied only by the epoch of 273 A.C., as there was an adhika Mārgaśira in 602 A.C., while there was no mean or true adhika Mārgaśira in 649 A.C. or 650 A.C.;

14. In Maitraka year 343, there was an adhika Āśāḍha; and there were an adhika Āśāḍha in 616 A.C., and an adhika Śrāvaṇa in 662 A.C., which, by Brahmagupta’s rule, would be called Āśāḍha;

15. In Maitraka year 537, there was an adhika Pausha. This datum is satisfied only by the epoch of 273 A.C., as there was an adhika Pausha in 629 A.C., while there was no adhika Pausha in 676 A.C. or 677 A.C.;

16. In Gupta year 585, there was a solar eclipse; and there were solar eclipses on 27th May 857 A.C. (not visible in India) as also on 10th November 904 A.C. and 7th May 905 A.C.
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Indo-Aryan elements.

The adaptations from IA, discussed below, are words that have structural or semantic peculiarities or those that are out of vogue to-day. Some of the words are curious hypersanskritizations which may have been artificial creations of shallow people with pretensions to Sanskrit scholarship. Some of these adaptations may have enjoyed currency not only in the speech of the Christians but also in the language of non-Christian communities. Here again, the extent to which some of these words may have been specially popular among Christians has to be clarified by further research.1

ayusaram and ayusaraṇa are both met with.—Cf. adaptations ayusarāṇai and ayusaraṇam occurring in Tamil.

apūra-p-ped- has developed the meaning 'to marvel at' in some contexts in this dialect.

arani-kk- 'to be separated by a schism, perversely' appears to be the meaning in contexts like paṭṭānṇaiyil hinnhum aranippirppān or aranikkappetta idāttūṭukāraṇ.

arani 'stronghold' 'fortress' appears to have been derived from Skt. šaraṇam.

BG has karunikkappetta, with an intrusive h.

asakya-p-ped- 'to be astonished'.

aṣṭahāsam [BG] for aṭṭahāsam 'loud laughter'.—The word is used in BG also for 'speaking aloud, or 'crying aloud,'

Cf., for the intrusion of foreign sounds in 'vulgar' speech, rāstrī for rātri.

avakāṣam has the meaning 'opportunity, occasion' in these texts. The meanings 'title' 'claim', 'right' do not appear.

astamaṇam 'sunset', for astamaṇam.

āsta, āsthā, āyistam have all the meaning 'prepared' or 'made ready.' I think that the original word from which these forms were derived was Skt. āyatā and that this has been confused with Skt. āsthā structurally. VD. has āsthham-ākk- 'to get ready.'

* Concluded from p. 397 of Vol. III.

1. In transliterating the adaptations just as they are used in Mal., I have used Dravidian symbols wherever IA sounds are replaced by Dravidian ones. I have also symbolically distinguished ī and ṯ in these adaptations from IA.
āśraya, āśarna are "transmutations" of Skt. āśrayaṇa, 'dependence, obedience'.

िसा, इल [from Skt. īsā] have in Mal. the meanings 'slightest doubt,' 'slightest displeasure or unwillingness.'

ugramam 'vehement' 'fierce' for ugram.—The hypersanskritization is due to the influence of forms like uttalam.

uttari-kk- 'to reply' [VD] from uttara 'reply' which meaning this form has developed in some South Dravidian languages.

ejastra [only in Vartt.,] a very remarkable blend-formation. Here three different adaptations of Skt. words converge: yaśasso, śeśasso, and ahtasta.

kānman-mār 'chiefs' 'lords'.—kānymāl (corresponding to modern kaimmal or kammal) is from kānymiyal<karmigal. The original meanings are 'workers'.—For the replacement of l before m by n, cf. peninaymār, rāyākKaymār, etc.

kārṣam or karīṣam is used in Vartt. with the meanings 'cruel' 'unsympathetic'. VD has kārṣī-kk- 'to be unfeeling, impetuous'.

karttavyam 'leader', as in jātikku karttavyam [Vartt].

karkkisagn-mār [Vartt.] 'very avaricious persons, hard to deal with'.—The Mal. form karkkasa-kkār is equated to 'avaricious persons' by VD.—Karkkisagn is a curious instance of forcible alteration (by those who were ignorant of Skt.).

kāvyār 'Hindus' 'heathens', a form perhaps adapted from kāvyam 'Hindu literary work.' The word appears to be an ancient one in the vocabulary of Christians. Dr. P. J. Thomas suggests that the word may have been derived from Arabic Kāfīr 'infidel' 'heathen'.

kausukham [Vartt.] 'show, spectacle' shows the influence of sukham on the structure of the word kautukam.

klesām has developed the meaning 'effort involving distress'.

guna-v-adhikāraṃ shows a glide produced by Dravidic sandhi rules.

camayam [VD and BAILEY] 'ceremonial dress.'—this meaning is met with in classical literary texts [cf. Uttarārām, gadyam]. Tam. camayam does not have this meaning.

caradam 'parsimony' [VD].—BAILEY gives the meanings 'carefulness' 'laying up in store'.—The word occurs in the 14th century Uppuṇilī saṁdeśam with the meaning 'carefulness'. It occurs with this meaning in other classical texts also.—I am told that in North Malabar to-day the word is used for 'carefulness'.

The pejorative meaning 'parsimony', given to it in these Christian texts, is a noteworthy semantic development.

BG has śaradikkhuḥu and śaras-kk- 'to be careful about'. These forms may all be ultimately connected with Skt. śraddhā.
cidam, as in cidavum padavum, means 'propriety' 'agreeableness'. The Tam. Lexicon gives the meanings, and suggests for the word a connection with Skt. cit.

curudi 'report' 'rumour' is adopted from Skt. śruti.—The Mal. evaluation of r (in śr) as ṛ is normal, but the anaptyctic vowel is not heard today.

jaymāndaram appears in all the three texts with the meanings 'noble manners' 'virtues' [VD].—This word occurs very frequently in Christian religious writings. Colloquially, one hears it often even today both among Christians and among others, with this and other derivative meanings.

BAILEY gives the meanings 'kindness' 'generosity', 'gratitude' besides the meaning 'another birth'. SV which is a religious work gives a full-dress explanation of buddhi jaymāndaram 'the foresight which enables one to avoid falling into deception, and the virtue which prevents one from deceiving others'.

Today, I have heard some Christians use jaymāndra-k-kēdo with the meaning 'original sin'.

tuppāyi 'interpreter' 'East Indian or Eurasian' [BAILEY 'interpreter'] is from dvibhāsī.

diśtādi 'need'.—The word tiśtādi 'need' occurs in old texts like Kṛṣṇagatha. [BAILEY tiśtādi]. Is diśtādi a Sanskritization of tiśtādi (which itself may have been a tadbhava form)?

duṣi, as in duṣi-padam, duṣi-vākka means 'abuse'—duṣi-kk. [from Skt. duṣ]- and duṣi-kk- 'to abuse, speak ill of' are common in Mal.

dēvasa (for dēvata<Skt. dēvatā) 'evil spirit, demon', appears frequently in BG in the phrase dēvasa gōṣṭhikkāraṇa 'a man possessed with the devil'. Bailey has dēvatā gōṣṭhi 'possession by an evil spirit'.

daivānīta 'devotion' [VD]

hanibham 'coin' from Skt. nāṇakam.—For the bh, cf. vālibham [corresponding to Skt. bāya]

nimisāda [SV and Vartt.] has the meaning 'facility', 'ease'. VD has nimisātavam 'facility'.

niccal 'always' 'daily' [VD].—niccal and niccam [BAILEY] are adapted from MIA forms.

nidānam 'carefulness' 'rectitude' [VD].—Though spelt with -t, -d-, and -dh-, the meanings in Mal. are all connected with Skt. nidāna.

nirūvaya 'consideration' [VD].—Cf. Tam. nirūvaya. The modern form is nirūpanam.

nisrtti 'termination, end,' as in aḷikkku nisrtti.

hirmmānam 'disgraceful, insolent,' as in hirmmānavum duṣṭadāyum is only a popular variant of Skt. nir-mōnam, confused with Skt. nirnāṇa and also Skt. nirvāṇa.—VD has hirmmānam.
parahasyam 'what is published', 'open fact' is a form (corresponding to modern parasyam), appearing in all these texts, as the opposite of rahasyam 'secret'.—Is parahasyam < para-rahasyam?

parāhāṇam 'difficult' [BAILEY].

palusam, as in palusam-āya vacanaṁ [Vartt.], may have been a variant of balassa formed from balasam [VD] [Skt. balasthaḥ].
pala is from bhāṣā.

pramādham has the meanings 'danger' 'misfortune' in SV:—marikkān
pramādam-āyi; maranapramādatto.

GUNDERT cites VD as equating pramāddakkhaṇa to 'don't despair.'

BAILEY gives the meaning 'misfortune' among others.

bhaktima (for bhakti 'piety') shows a -ma perhaps under the influence of native forms like nāg-ma and of Skt. forms like bhaktimān.

bhāṣītām 'ridicule' 'scorning' [VD].—The Ṛṇādādiris use it even today. Kṛṣṇagātha has bhāṣī-kk- 'to talk prattlingly.'

bhūṣ- 'to decorate oneself with ceremonial dress' is not common to-day.—

Tam. has bhūṣi-kk-.

māryādī 'custom.' Today maryāda means 'civility,' 'conventional propriety.'

mārggakārār 'converts to Christianity' 'Latin Christians' converted within recent centuries, as distinguished from the Syrian Christians of Malabar.'

mśkaraṭtvam 'power' a common word in these texts. mśkaram in Tam. means 'obstinacy'.

yāvaṇa, yāpaṇa 'maintenance' 'victuals' 'meal' [VD and BAILEY], are occasionally heard even today. Yāvi-kk- 'to subsist on' occurs in very old west coast inscriptions.

rājidam (for rājyam) 'kingdom' 'royal authority'.

vasanār 'capacities' [BAILEY].

varggam 'case', 'dispute'.

vasaḥta 'small-pox' owes its meaning, according to GUNDERT, to the belief that spring winds cause the disease. BAILEY gives the meanings 'dysentery, diarrhoea'.

vahiya 'not possible', the older form of modern vayyā.

vālibhakkārār 'young men'.—vālibha is an adaptation ultimately traceable to OIA bālyā.

vāṣṭa-p-peṭṭa (for vāṣṭava-p-peṭṭa); cf. vāṣṭapeṭṭavaḥ hīyā [PALph].

vidayam and vidhayam for vidheyaṁ 'to be made ready, brought under control'. [VD].

vilasaṇ 'man in the enjoyment of luxuries', from vilas- [Skt. vi-las-].

viravadham [Vartt.] for vīrōdham, as if it had some connection with vadhām.

vivāda [Vartt.] for vivādam (Skt. vivādaḥ) 'dispute.'
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venjanūḍigal ‘household accompaniments’ [VD], from Skt. vyāñjanam.

velēsidam [BG] beḷēsidam [BG], melēsidam [BG] for meḷēcchitaṃ [Skt. mleçchita].—The change of l to ñ in the Mal. adaptation of the Skt. group ml is normal. The anaptyctic vowel in the initial syllable and the change of m to b and v are colloquial corruptions.

vēsta (for vyavastha from Skt. vyavasthā) means ‘certainty’, ‘ascertainment’ [VD and BAILEY].

vyāpti ‘trick’, ‘dissimulation’.

srāṇa-p-ped—’to confide in, trust, hope’ [VD].

śarasi-kk- a “corruption” of śraddhi-kk- occurs in BG.

śōbha-kēda (‘insult’ ‘disgrace’ < the literal meaning ‘loss of brightness’; the verb base śōbha kedu-kk- is represented in Uttarārāmaṇḍaṇaṃ gadyam. sandhīga [Varś.] for sandhyā [Skt. sandhīya] is a wrong reconstruction with -g- of a popular form like sandhiya, the g being introduced as a result of the analogy of alternative forms like caḥdrīga and caḥdriya.

samukṣattam for samakṣam (Skt. samakṣam) is due to the wrong incorporation of the sixth case -att- appearing in the constantly used inflexional form samakṣ-attā. savutṭam and savuttam appearing in BG in vāli savutṭam-aṅkkuvāṅ is a mutation of sauṣṭhavam ‘beauty’ ‘elegance’.

samvadicca ‘having acquiesced, agreed’ is often used in the stead of samma-dicca (from Skt. sammatiḥ). VD gives the meaning (to converse’. sādhanāṃ ‘document’ is common in granthavaris.

cāmarthyam ‘wealth’ as in vidugaludē sāmarthyavum [Varśt.], is rarely used to-day with this meaning. Skt. has ‘wealth’ as one of the significations of the word.

sotvam is a ‘mistake’ in BG for svastham ‘at ease’, ‘healthy’, ‘happy’. sudē ‘by oneself’ [svadē < svadovē < Skt. svatāh + Drav. ē].
sūksam ‘carefulness’ for sūkṣman [Skt. sūkṣma ‘minute’].

sauyram [BG] for svāram (from Skt. svāra ‘free’). The structure sauyram may have been due to the influence of the adaptation sakaryam which appears “corrupted” sometimes as sauryam.

svarumicca, sorumicca [frequently in Varśt.] are “corrupted” forms of the verb svarūpi-kk-(adapted from Skt. svarūpa), under the influence of native orumi-kk.-

VIII SYNTAX

As is only to be expected, SV (composed as it has been by a European missionary) evidences the influence of foreign syntax to a considerably greater extent than Vartt. which is the work of an Indian priest who inveighs against the tyranny of the western missionaries. The BG, said to have been translated literally from the Syriac Bible, contains very curious constructions which (I am told) are influenced by Syriac syntax. The syntax of BG in some
places strikes the reader as exceedingly bizarre and unnatural; and I feel that many of these artificialities may have been due to the interference of a non-Malayali or an extremely "denationalised" Malayali who wanted to twist and bend Mal. constructions to suit the needs of foreign syntax. I have not, therefore, discussed here the syntax of BG, generally speaking.

The style of Vartt. is full of raciness and native vigour, particularly in the descriptions of European scenes and in the indictment of the western missionaries. Here and there one comes across native proverbs rich in mother-wit and wisdom:—

mōṁnūvāḥ nińna ṭeṁṇa vēnu eṁnu ṭattuḷa colluṭpole.
āḷreppōguhhadine-k-kāyil tāṅre-p-pōguḥhadu hallā.
andī kalāṁna anvāṇade kuṭṭe.
kaṅḍankāl eṁnu collī kaludakkālummaḷ pīṭiccu eṅnadu pole.
oṁhugil pāṭhiċcirikāṁam alleṅgil kuḍiccirikāṁam eṁnu malaṅgare pāzayukha bhāṣṭam pole.
tāṅ kaṅda kaḍavil kāryaṁ keṭṭuvaṁ saṁnadi varigayilleṁnuḷa bhayam.

The peculiarities of the syntax of these texts may be considered under two headings:—A. Native features that have become out of vogue to-day.

B. Features which directly reveal or indirectly betray the influence of foreign syntax.

A

1. The use of the postposition kōṇḍa to denote a "second case" force, as in niṁnale-k-kōṇḍa vēṅḍa-vacanaiṅal paṇaṁna or in maṭṭ-ārāṇe-k-kōṇḍum polisatyam ceyyarudū.

2. The use of Skt. prati in contexts like the following:—(i) kāryaṁ prati ṛlocico.
   (ii) dāvatte prati; ēlāvaruḍēyum rākṣaye prati mariccē
   (iii) prati prati avaruḍe viiṭil cehno
   (iv) paṅkṣaprati-y-āyī.

3. The use of pronouns as expletives in contexts like the following is common in BG. The practice is carried to a fantastic extent in BG; yet, fundamentally the use of such pronouns is not foreign to the genius of Dravidian. A few instances from BG are the following:—

accan-avaṁ;
lōgaril kalakkam-ad-āgāyvāṁ;
aṅdi-y-ad-āyappōl.
kōli-y-adu kuvi.
SV has bhāryāval.

Instances of this use of pronouns exist in classical literary texts, as in the following:—
gurubhūtanmār ṣawar taṁmaḷuḍe;
ucca-y-ad-āgumbōl;
galam-adil mula karëtti varikum; vambamariil munban-ad-ägum umbar kuy, etc.

The history of this practice goes back to the parent stage, since Tolkëppiyam, colladigaram, envisages this peculiarity for Old Tam. In the history of Mal., however, the purely expletive character of the pronoun became so definitely marked that the non-rational singular (a)d known occasionally with rational nouns.

4. The final -(a) d in the following illustrations from SV may be regarded as a transitional tense-expletive; such constructions are unusual to-day. Participial nouns in origin, the forms with -(a)d become finite here:

śuddhamāna mārpāpa paliyude talavān āguhnāda [modern āguhnū, or (if āguhnāda is retained as a participial noun), mārpāpa an-āguhnade]. i kārayānñalāl miskhāde marayam palarkkum dusphalam-āyi pōguhnāda.

āñhu hamaskariippān ellāyilum ālla samayam āguhnāda.

5. Collocations like ceyyuhnappōl (present relative participle followed by appōl), ceydārē (past relative participle followed by ārē denoting ‘time’); ceyyum-āra, kāmnāra, marippāra (future relative participles followed by āra) have already been noted.

6. —ām pakkam following a “neuter” participial, as in the following:—
arinādīg-ām-pakkam;
āguhnadhīg-ām-pakkam.

7. The use of nyāyam in constructions like ēñhu colli nyāyam appears in SV frequently, to indicate a clear truth.

8. arigayum-ām, (as in orttukanāl i paramārtham ariyugayum-ām), kolgayum-ām are old constructions not common to-day.

B

1. The government of cases in contexts like the following is due to foreign influence:—
i avasthamēl paṣaṇṇu;
cākkō-k-katta gurude mel samandam vilugayum ceydu [the use of the post-position mel is foreign to Mal.]
bāyāyilihīnu pirakkappe lotadēnekkōda [the use of the “fifth case” is peculiar].
dōsattige dvēsippān venduñna veliv [the use of the “second case” in this particular context, i.e. dōsattige followed by dvēsi-kk- is unusual].

2. Literal translations, like the following, of foreign (European) constructions:—
pahdōs pitāttige nālugalil ‘in the days of Pontius Pilate’;
timmmaku ēñnu pōguhnā āmmuđe duśīlavyum ‘our evil nature which tends towards sin’.

pižagalude porudi ‘forgiveness of sins’. 
hrdaya kallam 'the wickedness of the heart'.
puli-yâna 'false oath'.
maricavarude uyirppa 'the resurrection of the dead'.
puvavâlamkâruđe pugalccakkum tanyavarude nāmattinum 'for the praise of those who have done good, and for the shame of the wicked.'
kudâśayude maddhyattâl dōṣaâñâl pôkki-k-kolvâng 'for warding off evil through the sacrament.'
kattolikkappalliyilhinhu pugatt-irikkumhavarikku 'those who remain outside the Catholic fold.'
pañvâdu kûdâ lând kudicca halla valartippinuđe 'of the good training that one has imbibed with the mother’s milk'.
ñâinâle parikṣayil pûgikkallâyê 'lead us not into temptation'.
ñâinâluđe ahhainhê appam înhu ñâinâlukku tariga 'give us to-day our daily bread'.
pulikkku sâksi hillođe 'do not bear false witness'.
samudrattinupugattu malsyam ehnapòle 'like fish out of water (the sea)'.
ceâhâde hrdayattâdu kûdîya kuñâdindê kuppâyam 'the clothing of a lamb with the heart of a wolf'.
udappindê avagâšam koḍukkâyvâng 'in order not to give room for offence'.
bâvâ-y-ilhinhu pizakkappettadindê-k-kondo 'since he is born of the Father'.
câvudõsâm 'mortal sin'.
pramânâm tigaya-p-peđûhînu 'the scripture is fulfilled'.
pravrttiyâlê tigappaŋ 'in order to fulfil through deeds'.
bhayanikaramdâya kaṇakkâ tamburândê tirumunuđugê elppikkendivarrow would have to give a terrible account before the sacred presence of the lord'.
hannûđe mûrgattinde kâdalîya elimayum padavum kûdappîzâpinggâlê uâla upavîyum 'the qualities of humility, moderation and love of fellow-beings, which form the essence of our faith.'
MISCELLANY

THE HĀRĀHĀ INSCRIPTION AND THE GUPTA ERA

In a note entitled 'The Hārāhā Inscription of Maukhari Mahārājādhirāja Isānavarman' contributed to the *Indian Culture* for July 1938, I tried to prove from the evidence of that inscription that Dr. Fleet's epoch of the Gupta era is in error by at least a hundred years. In the January issue (1939) of the same journal Mr. Jagannath in a note entitled 'The Bearing of the Hārāhā Inscription on the Epoch of the Gupta Era,' added arguments to show that my objections do not in any way upset the epoch of the Gupta era as determined by Dr. Fleet.

I am really sorry to find the types of arguments advanced by Mr. Jagannath to disprove my findings. His arguments are the following:

Mr. Jagannath admits that Rājādhirāja Yasodharman was reigning in Mālava year 589 and that Sūryavarman was born about Vikrama year 590. But he denies the fact that Isānavarman had achieved his glorious conquests and became a Mahārājādhirāja before that date, inasmuch as he says, there is nothing in the inscription to prove that. He then assumes that Isānavarman's victorious career may be supposed to have begun ten years after the birth of Sūryavarman i.e., about Vikrama year 600 = A.D. 542 before which date Isānavarman could not have become a Mahārājādhirāja. As Rājādhirāja Yasodharman's known date, Mālava year 589, supposed to be equivalent to A.D. 532 on Fleet's epoch, is some 10 years prior to A.D. 542 when according to Mr. Jagannath Isānavarman became a Mahārājādhirāja, there is ample room for the 'meteoor like' Yasodharman to disappear by A.D. 542. Thus the contemporaneity of the two great rulers on Fleet's epoch as shown by me, in the opinion of Mr. Jagannath, is not proved.

I would request Mr. Jagannath to study the Hārāhā inscription carefully, especially verse 13 which runs thus:

कितनाग्रिहिति सहस्रायणादेशाक्षरः
व्याप्तमुनि, नियुक्तात्तिष्ठित्वा चतुर्गुणान्, भ्रात्रस्त्रायेण शालिकान्
इत्या चायतिमोहिन् अमरकुमारो तौराङ्ग नायितबं जलाः
अध्यासिद्ध नवस्यातिश्रोतरः संहासनं देष जितेत

'who, being victorious and having princes bending at his feet occupied the throne after conquering the lord of the Andhras, who had thousands of threefold rutting elephants, after vanquishing in battle the Śūlikas, who had an army of a large number of galloping horses, and after causing the Gauḍas, living on the seashore, in future to remain in their proper realm'. So that any careful reader of this inscription will come to the same conclusions as arrived at by the late N. G. Majumdar (I. A., 1927, p. 127), that the defeat of the Andhra King, the Śūlikas and the Gauḍas happened during the reign of Iśvaravarman and thus the glorious campaign of conquests of this king's son Iśānavarman preceded his sitting on his father's throne.' This will be evident from a study of the fragmentary Jaunpur inscription of Iśvaravarman where the defeat of the Andhra king is mentioned. The mention of the Raivatakam mountain in Surāṣṭra in this fragmentary inscription seems to be in connection with the defeat of the Śūlikas or the Cāñkyas as stated in the Hārāhā inscription. 'In any case the three victories of the Maukhari ruler made it easier for him to assume lord paramountcy i.e., the title Mahārājādhirāja.' From verse 16 of the
Hārāhā inscription Mr. JAGANNATH will kindly see that while Iśānavarman was ruling the earth a son was born to him who was named Śūryavarman:

बरिमन्द्रा स्वयं त्रि तिलां ब्रह्मविपति ।

So that Mr. JAGANNATH’s remark ‘There is nothing in the inscription to indicate that Iśānavarman had achieved these conquests before the birth of Śūryavarman, or 21 years before 611 V.S.’ is really deplorable. If now Mr. JAGANNATH admits that V.S. 611 is the date of the Hārāhā inscription and Śūryavarman was born about V.S. 590, he has no other option but to admit that Mahārāja Yāsodharmaraja Iśānavarman was ruling at least from Vikrama year 589 assumed to be identical with Mālava year 589 when Rājādhirāja Yāsodharmaraja was ruling and consequently also to admit the lordship of Mahārājādhirāja Iśānavarman over Rājādhirāja Yāsodharmaraja. Thus the contemporaneity of the two follows and the meteoric origin and career of Yāsodharmaraja on Fleet’s epoch, as stated by Mr. JAGANNATH cannot save the situation. Even assuming with Mr. JAGANNATH for argument’s sake, that Yāsodharmaraja ruled till A.D. 542 after which Iśānavarman became a Mahārāja Yāsodharmaraja, we find that at this time the Imperial Gupta Monarch Mahārāja Yāsodharmaraja, Kumāra Gupta of Sam. 224 = A.D. 542 on Fleet’s epoch was ruling. Does not the contemporaneity of two Mahārāja Yāsodharmarajas and Rājādhirāja Yāsodharmaraja show as clearly as possible the utter incorrectness of Fleet’s epoch of the Gupta era?

Moreover, savants will kindly see that the real meaning of (verse 21 of the inscription) Ekaśāra-tīrīketuṁ saṅguśa sātika vidviṣi | sātikaśa śīrādām patau bhavah Śrī-śānnavarman || is that the dilapidated temple of Śiva was repaired by Śūryavarman when six hundred years is already superfluous by eleven i.e., in Sarivāt (600-11, or) 589, while the illustrious Iśānavarman who had crushed his enemies, was the lord of the earth. ‘In the Annual Report of the Lucknow Museum (for the year ending 31st March, 1915, p. 3, footnote) it was suggested that ‘Taking atriṣṭa (see the verse quoted above) in the sense of superfuous, the other possible meaning will be 589’ ‘(the late N. G. MAJUMDAR, ‘A Hārāhā stone inscription’, I. A. 1917, p. 125 ff.) i.e., V.S. 589 = A.D. 532 = Saka 454. That this is the really correct meaning will be evident from the silver coins bearing the names of Iśānavarman, dated 54 and 55, and of his son Sarvavarman, dated 58. These dates are evidently in the Saka era with omitted hundreds and equivalent to Saka (4) 54, (4) 55 and (4) 58 = A.D. 532, 533 and 536 = V.S. 589, 590 and 593 respectively. The first date Saka (4) 54 is exactly the year (V. S. 589) of the Hārāhā inscription. The year 52 of Toramāna’s coins was supposed by Fleet to denote years of Toramāna’s reign. Gen. CUNNINGHAM suggested that the date is Saka with omitted hundreds i.e. 52 = 452. The late Prof. RAPSON remarked on the former suggestion. ‘This explanation is rendered less probable by the fact that the Maukhari Iśānavarman and Sarvavarman and also Bhimasaṇa apparently date in years of the same era.’ (Indian Coins, p. 29.) In fact as already shown by me (in my paper on the Gupta era), the date 52 of Toramāna, = Saka 52 = A.D. 130 = (Gupta) Vikrama Sam. 188 = Kṛṭa or Mālava year 588, only one year previous to Mālava year 589 when Yāsodharmaraja defeated Toramāna’s son Mihirakula. Thus it is evident that Mahārāja Yāsodharmaraja Iśānavarman was ruling at least from about 20 years previous to V. S. 589 and was ruling till about V. S. 592 (= Saka 457), after which Mahārājādhirāja Sarvavarman was ruling.

Again, the Chinese historians mention an emperor of India, called Yueg-nai, king of Kiapili who sent ambassadors to China in A.D. 428. This name has rightly been identified by Capt. WILFORD (Asiatic Researches, Vol. IX, pp. 42-44 and 110-11) with Yajñavarman. This was evidently the great king Yajñavarman about whom we learn from his grandson Anantavarman’s cave inscriptions found near Gaya (seems to me to be ‘Kiapili’ or Gayapuri) written in Gupta script. That the date of Maukhari Yajñavarman was about A.D. 400 will be evident from the following: ‘But
the letters of the inscriptions of Anantavarman are older in form than those of the Harāhā inscription. The tripartite Ya which is a characteristic of the Kushan and the early Gupta alphabets, is used promiscuously along with its later developed forms, in the Harāhā inscription. But in the inscriptions of Anantavarman only the tripartite form of Ya is to be met with. This is a clear indication that they are of considerable earlier date.' (N. G. Majumdar, 'A Harāhā stone Inscription', I. A., 1917, p. 125 ff.). On Fleet’s epoch, the Gupta Emperor Kumāragupta I was ruling India in A.D. 428 (=Sam. 108) and there was no room for any other Emperor Yueg-nai (Yajna) to send ambassadors to China during Kumāra I’s rule, thus showing that kings other than the Imperial Gupta’s were ruling in Magadha about A.D. 428. The late Jayaswal also in his History of India (p. 115) comes to the conclusion from the drama ‘Kaumudi-Mahotsava’ that the Varmans (Sundaravarman, Kalyānavarman etc.) (evidently the Maukhari Varmans) were ruling in Magadha about the fourth century A.D.

As for the Menālgadh inscription of the Chahamāna Prithvirāja (II) of v. s. 1226, Mr. Jagannath will kindly see that there the year is stated as ‘Mālavēga-gata-vatsara.’ Everyone knows that Vikramāditya was lord of Mālava (Ujjaini-puravārahāsvara) as well as of Magadha (‘Pātalipuravārahāsvara’). The composer of the inscription wanted to date the same in the era of king Vikramāditya who was lord of Mālava. This has nothing to do with the reckoning ‘traditionally handed down by the Mālava tribe’ (Mālavānām gaṇ-ānāme) or ‘from the date of the establishment of the Republic in Mālava’ (Mālavānām gaṇa-sthātya). We should remember that the Mālava or Kṛta era fell into disuse several centuries before Vikrama year 1226 = A.D. 1169.

Mr. Jagannath accuses me by saying ‘It is uncritical to say definitely that Mahārājādhirāja Kumāragupta, son of Narasimhagupta, has to be placed in c. A.D. 532 and thus Fleet’s theory creates a conflict’, and states that Mahārājādhirāja Kumāragupta, son of Narasimhagupta, ruled in A.D. 472. If this date for the above Kumāragupta be accepted then on Fleet’s epoch he must be assumed to be ruling in Vikrama (equivalent on Fleet’s epoch to Mālava) year 530. We know that in Mālava year 524 Govindagupta, son of Candragupta II was governor of Vaiśāli (not to speak of Mālava year 529 when his brother Kumāragupta I, was ruling). Thus Mr. Jagannath and his authorities Mr. Pannalal, R. D. Banerjee, Dts. V. Smith, H. C. Roy Chowdhury and R. C. Majumdar cannot but admit that the interval between the known dates of Govindagupta and his great grandson Kumāragupta is one of six years only (or, one year only between Kumāragupta I and his great grandson)! For, from the Bhitari seal we know that Govindagupta’s brother Kumāragupta I’s son was Budhagupta wrongly read as Puragupta (Vide also S. K. Saraswati, ‘A Gold coin of Budhagupta’, I.C. Vol. I, pp. 691-92), whose son was Narasimhagupta and the latter’s son was Kumāragupta, thus exactly verifying Yuan Chwang’s statement that Sakrāditya’s (Kumāragupta I’s) son was Budhagupta (Sam. 165, 175) who seized the throne (evidently from Skandagupta, his half-brother). From Yuan Chwang’s Records and his Life we know that Budhagupta was succeeded by ‘Ta-ta-ka-to-ku-to’ rendered as Ta-tha-ga-ta-gupta. The Chinese word seems to be a copyist’s error for the real modern name ‘Gha-to-tka-ca-gu-ptha’; (Kie-ta = Kaccha, the modern Cutch). From the evidence of the gold coin bearing the name ‘Ghaṭo’ Mr. Allen correctly states that this king Ghaṭo-tka-ca-gu-ptha ‘must be contemporary with those (kings) known from the Bhitari seal’ (i.e., Budha, Narasimha and Kumāra). Again, Yuan Chwang says that after Gha-to-tka-ca-gu-ptha Bālāditya (Narasimhagupta) succeeded to the throne whose son was Fa-she-lo (?) or, Ku-mo-lo (?) . The transliteration of this is also given as ‘Chin-kang’, taken for ‘Vajra-pāṇi (hasta)’ but should in my opinion be rendered as ‘Sakti-hasta’ which is a synonym of ‘Kumāra’ (or, ‘Kārtikeya’) thus exactly verifying the statement in the Bhitari seal that Narasimhagupta’s son was Kumāra-
gupta." Thus Kumāragupta of Sam. 154 = A.D. 472 (= Vikrama or Mālava year 530) on Fleet's epoch, cannot be the son of Narasimhagupta. Narasimhagupta's son Kumāragupta is evidently Kumāragupta of Sam. 224 (= A.D. 542 on Fleet's epoch = Vikrama Sam. 600). And as Fleet's adherents assume Vikrama and Mālava years to be identical, Mr. Jagannath will kindly see that Narasimhagupta may safely be placed in Mālava year 589, contemporaneous with Yaśodharman and therefore of Mihirakula. So that, the tale told by Yuan Chwang is not in the least pseudo-historical as supposed by Mr. Jagannath and his authority the late Vincent Smith.

As the Later Guptas followed the Imperial Guptan monarchs, does not this show that Kṛṣṇagupta, the first Later Guptan ruler ruling about A.D. 432 and Mahārājādireśa Kumāragupta of the Imperial Guptan line ruling in Sam. 224 = A.D. 542 on Fleet's epoch (not taking account of at least three other Guptan monarchs who must have followed him, namely Viṣṇu Guptana Candrāditya, Candragupta III Dvādaśāditya and Prakāśāditya, carrying the Imperial Guptan rule beyond A.D. 600 on Fleet's epoch, i.e., shortly before Yuan Chwang's visit), the same is in error by at least a hundred years as shown by me.

I request Mr. Jagannath will kindly ponder over these in the interests of truth and express his frank opinion on the correctness or otherwise of Fleet's epoch.

Daulatpur.

Dhirendra Nath Mookerjee

---

CORRIGENDA


P. 580, l. 24, for actor read : altar.
P. 580, l. 24, for adopted read : dompted.
P. 580, Note 2, line 2, for 57 read : 75.
P. 584, l. 27, for nowhere read : nowhere.
P. 585, l. 12, for on read : an.
P. 587, l. 7 read : in die Luft hinein.
P. 587, l. 13, read : zu werden was er ist.
P. 587, l. 14, read : was er nur zu sein scheint.
P. 589, l. 6, for destruction read : distinction.
P. 589, l. 32, for observation of read : observation to.
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P. 1, l. 5, for isl read : ist.
P. 3, l. 9, for casually read : causally.
P. 3, l. 16, read : pneuma.
P. 3, Note 5, l. 3, read : here with that intended by the
P. 5, Note 10, l. 3, for qu'on read : qu'on.
P. 9, Note 19, l. 27, for thoubaka read : Itivuttaka.
P. 10, Note 22 continued, l. 5, for a, read : as.
P. 11, l. 9, for infinite read : infinity.
P. 11, Note 26, line 5, for wide read : wife.
P. 11, line 26, for mind read : mind is.
P. 12, Note 28, l. 6, for atta read : attā.
P. 13, l. 21, read : Swarzenski.
P. 14, l. 1, read "May it be known to.
P. 13, for sin entbilde sin read : sich entbilde sin.
P. 13, Note 29 continued, l. 5, for padbājaka read : pabbājaka.
REVIEWS


Mahamahopādhyāya Rai Bahadur Pandit Gauri Shankar Hirachand OJHA has undertaken to write an exhaustive history of that old, picturesque and chivalrous country, known as Rajputana since at least the Mahābhārata, but has as yet only succeeded in publishing a little less than a dozen volumes covering only the histories of a few big states such as Oodeypur, Jodhpur, Bikaner and a few others. As was to be expected from the pen of such an eminent scholar it is a painstaking, laborious and lengthy undertaking and requires time to complete it. Being entirely based on authentic tradition, paper documents and stone inscriptions, its accuracy cannot be questioned.

But to the general public the only source for knowing the history of this beautiful country with inspiring and admirable episodes and thrilling adventures, was the Annals of Rajputana by Col. Tod. But being in English and besides being only a collection of stories, tested by personal travels and observations, it could neither satisfy the scholars nor could the general public derive an accurate knowledge from it.

Mr. Jagadish Chandra GAHLOT, the author of the work under review has undertaken to write in a lucid manner an authentic and scholarly history of the several big and small states in Rajputana. The present is the first volume and others will follow. It is fully illustrated with portraits and pictures of incidents. Out of over seven hundred pages of this volume no less than 126 pages are devoted to a general description of the country which is so very helpful in understanding the position of the states as well as habits, customs, families and foreign relations, common to all the states. It then gives a detailed, yet succinct history of half a dozen states beginning with that of Mewad the capital of which is Oodeypur. The narrative does not confine itself to the political history of a state but describes its finances, social structure, customs, feudatories and other subordinates, trade and commerce and so on.

Such is then this unique history. The talented and the first Indian Director-General of Archaeology, Rao Bahadur K. N. DIKSHIT, has contributed an appreciative Foreword to this volume, which renders other praise unnecessary. As observed by him "I commend this book to the notice of the public who will find that Mr. GAHLOT's well documented book fulfils a long-felt want of a reliable work on the states of Rajputana."

M. V. KIRE.

Sources of Karnāṭaka History, Vol. I, edited by S. Śrīkāṇṭha Śāstri, M.A., published by the University of Mysore in the Mysore University Historical Series, Demy pp. 48 + 238, Mysore 1940, Price Rs. 3/-.

It is a praiseworthy effort on the part of the University of Mysore that it has inaugurated a Historical Series in which the Sources of Karnāṭaka History, Vol. I, is edited by Prof. S. Śrīkāṇṭha Śāstri. A good many records, both epigraphic and literary, bearing on the various aspects of the history of Deccan in general and
Karṇāṭaka in particular have been brought to light and used in various contexts in the last fifty years or so. The bulk of such records is daily increasing, and some of them are not easily accessible; so the workers in the field of Karṇāṭaka history would really welcome with great pleasure such volumes for ready reference.

In this volume the editor has given 133 passages, long and short, both from epigraphic and literary sources. They are in Sanskrit, Kannada, Tamil, Telugu and Prākrit; and some extracts, bearing on the Karṇāṭaka history, are given in their English garb from Greek and Chinese sources. In most cases the extracts are accompanied by a short summary of facts and some explanatory remarks in English. The Introduction in English gives in a nut-shell the salient facts about Karṇāṭaka, its geography, political history, literature and fine arts, and religious, social, economic and cultural aspects. It is followed by useful genealogical tables of different dynasties. The specialist may differ here and there from some of the remarks of the editor, but the limited space prohibits their discussion in details. To note just a few instances, the remarks on Prabhācandra (p. 66) may be rewritten in the light of the latest researches (Anekānta Vol. I, pp. 130 etc.; Nyāyakṣemudacandro, Intro., Bombay 1938). As to Śākaṭāyana (p. 69), he belonged to the Yāpaniya Saṅgha (Journal of the Univ. of Bombay, Vol. I, part vi). Asaga’s date (p. 70) may be understood as Vikrama era which solves the difficulty felt by the editor (The Karnatak Historical Quarterly Vol. II, part i). Jīnendrakalyāṇabhyyudaya is not the work of Hastimala (p. 237) but of Ayyāpārya.

We sincerely wish and feel sure that many more volumes would be published like this to bring within easy reach the rich sources of Karṇāṭaka history. On the one hand these sources indicate what facts we already know and on the other what links are still needed to have a connected account and a complete sketch. We would like to give a few suggestions which the editors may kindly consider in shaping the subsequent volumes:

(i) There should be a map of Karṇāṭaka in every volume showing the then boundaries of Karṇāṭaka and marking the ancient places with their modern names wherever possible. (ii) In the case of many important literary passages the requisite references are not noted. It is quite necessary that Mss. or printed editions should be mentioned with due descriptions. (iii) It is not unlikely that the editor might handle, in course of his collection, certain critical discussions on these passages in different contexts. It would be quite welcome, if references to such discussions are also noted. (iv) Time has arrived that we should look at the history of Karṇāṭaka from an all-India point of view; and I feel that the editor means this when he gives the summaries of some of the passages in English. It is necessary therefore that the original passages may be presented either in Roman or in Devānāgari characters, so that the originals also may be handled by those who do not know some of the south Indian scripts. Some of the Kannada passages, which have predominant percentage of Sanskrit words, can be easily followed by scholars in the North, if they are presented in Devānāgari characters with a couple of special types. (v) From the present collection it is abundantly clear that the Jaina works contain a lot of historical material in their introductions and praśastis. We wish that these sources in Prākrit, Sanskrit, Tamil, Kannada and Telugu might be tapped more exhaustively; and the data available would shed abundant light on the chronology of Indian history and literature. This would help us to get cleared a few of our hazy notions about the dates of some of the Tamil works of antiquity. (vi) The Sanskrit passages should be presented more accurately especially with regard to spacing etc. (vii) Lastly there should be an exhaustive Index of all the proper names. Perhaps the editor means to add it in the last volume.

It is Mysore that has given the world of scholars the grand volumes of Epigraphia Carnatica, and there could not have been a better body than the University of Mysore to publish the sources of Karṇāṭaka history. This handy volume is a pre-
cious possession for the student of Karnataka history. We sincerely thank Prof. S. Srikantha Sastri for his patient labour on the first volume and eagerly await the publication of subsequent volumes.

Kolhapur.

A. N. Upadhye

_Upanisad-Vākyamahākoṣa_ (or a concordance to 223 Upanisads) Vol. I (श to न) by Gajanan Shambhu Sadhale Shastri. Published by the "Gujarati" Printing Press, Fort, Bombay, 1940; Pp. 351; Price Rs. 7. Size: --7½" × 11".

It is now 50 years since Col. Jacob published his _Upanisad-Vākyamahākoṣa_ or a Concordance to 45 Upanisads in 1891. There is no Sanskrit Scholar in the world who has not utilised this valuable life-boat while navigating on the high seas of Sanskrit literature during the last half a century. Now that this reference book is gone out of print there is a crying demand for a reprint of it from Sanskrit Scholars all over the world. We are, therefore, glad to find in the volume before us a similar concordance to five times the number of _Upanisads_ used by Col. Jacob for his work. The present elaborate Concordance by Shastri Sadhale is projected in 2 Vols. of which Vol. I has just appeared and the work of bringing out Vol. II is in progress. The work of compiling such monumental work single-handed speaks volumes for the patience and learning of Shastri Sadhale, who is already running his 72nd year and we hope he would be encouraged by Sanskrit Scholars and learned bodies all over the world to complete Vol. II of this Concordance before long. There is no greater satisfaction to a scholar than that afforded by the completion of his life's work designed and carried out for the benefit of comrades in the field in a spirit of service and devotion to duty, which is characteristic of Indian Shastris but which is now getting rare.

'God helps those who help themselves' and the labour of Shastri Sadhale on this _Mahākoṣa_ has not been spent in vain. The new Ruler of Baroda, His Highness Maharaja Pratapsinh Gaekwar has already donated Rs. 3,000 towards the cost of publishing this work. This is a magnanimous gift and it is but in the fitness of things that the work is dedicated to the Maharaja. It gives us great pleasure to find Maharaja Pratapsinha following the best traditions of his grandfather His Highness Maharaja Sayaji Rao Gaekwar who had a soft corner for learned men and learning of any nation in the world and much more for Indian Scholars and learned bodies. It is also gratifying to note that the University of Bombay has donated Rs. 1,000 for the present work and thus evinced its appreciation for the work of Shastri Sadhale.

The wisdom of the _Upanisads_ has saturated the entire field of Sanskrit learning and scholars carrying on historical research find it a baffling problem to trace quotations from the _Upanisads_ to their sources. The philosophers of old had no sense of time and space as they were "dīk-kāla-anavacchinnā" but the history of literature is based on _time_ and _space_. There has sprung into being a host of _Upanisads_ from the earliest times to the present day and consequently the task of determining even their relative chronology has become extremely difficult. It would be a red-letter day in the history of Critical Sanskrit Scholarship when the history of every Upanishadic quotation is proved and recorded with textual variations in an Encyclopaedia of Quotations. For such a history the present _Mahākoṣa_ should prove extremely useful. Then again scholars who want to edit many Vedānta texts are unable to trace some of the Upanishadic quotations to their sources which are not available in a published form. For this purpose Shastri Sadhale has utilised many Upanishads which are at present available only in a Manuscript form.

To burden a scholar in his 72nd year with suggestions regarding the improvement of his work may be considered sacrilegious. However, in the interest of a wider
use of his valuable work of a life-time we feel it our duty to record one suggestion for his consideration viz. the preparation of an Index to the leading words in the Quotations recorded in the Mahābodhi, in the absence of which we find it difficult to make full use of the wealth of material garnered in these Volumes. In the Dictionaries of Quotations from English and other literatures we always find an Index of leading words appended to each Dictionary. Even in the Hobson-Jobson by Yule and Burnell we find an exhaustive Index of 335 pp. in a volume of 1021 pp. Such an Index is a necessary adjunct to a monumental work and should not be avoided if the work is to be used for frequent reference by every Sanskrit Scholar. With this suggestion we take leave of Shastri Sāhale’s labour of love put in neat printing by the Gujarati Printing Press of Bombay, to whom we offer our best thanks for the successful production of the present volume.

P. K. GODE.

Some Sayings of the Buddha (according to the Pāli Canon) Translated by F. L. Woodward, with an Introduction by Sir Francis Younghusband; Oxford University Press, London, 1939, Pp. xxvi+356; (World’s Classics No. 483) Price:—2/6 net; Size:—3½”×6¼”.

Some Sayings of the Buddha was first published in 1925. It was later published for the first time in the celebrated World’s Classics in 1939. Buddhism arose as a vigorous re-action to Brahmanical Sacerdotalism. The oral tradition of Lord Buddha’s teaching was handed down by his disciples and spread like wild fire in India and also in outside countries. It left an abiding impression on Indian life and thought. Buddha occupies a place for himself as a Hindu reformer and founder of a new religion.

This pocket edition of Buddha’s Sayings before us now published in the World’s Classics Series will help many a searcher after Truth who gets bewildered by diverse ways of thought and action and much more by the stupendous mass of literature on Buddhist religion and philosophy which enshrines the simple teaching of Lord Buddha. Buddha’s teaching arose out of his experience of life and though it looks simple it is “exceedingly difficult to carry out” as Sir Francis Younghusband puts it in his excellent Introduction to the volume before us. All best thought is immortal and it exercises a vivifying influence on all introspective souls. The present volume contains the quintessence of Buddha’s teaching arranged in 18 chapters and makes delightful reading, divested as it is of all technicalities and presented to the common run of educated minds in the pristine purity of Buddhist tradition as preserved in the Pāli Canonical literature. In short it is a pocket-size Buddhist Bible which reminds us of Dwight Goddard’s Buddhist Bible. May Buddha’s message be carried to every mind in a reflective mood in all corners of the world through the efforts of Mr. Woodward and the Publishers of World’s Classics!

Poona.

P. K. GODE
CORRESPONDENCE

To

THE EDITOR, NEW INDIAN ANTIQUARY,
POONA 4.

Sir,

On page 381 of your January issue, an inscription from Beyt has been reproduced. Mr. DISKALKAR, the editor of this Inscription, in his introductory note writes, "A question arises here as to how could Damaji, son of Pilaji, who ruled from v.s. 1788 to 1824 have built a tank in Beyt which was conquered by the Gaikwads in v.s. 1873 (1817 A.D.)"?

The following letter from the Gaikwad ruler to his Kathiawad Subha corroborates the genuineness of the inscription.

यादी राजकी निर्माण देवाजी सुमा प्रांत बाठवाड यांचे नाहीं पत्र की श्रीभक्तीकेस बेट शंकाशारीरी तीर्थंकरस्वामी यांनी तलवार बांधिया आहे. त्याची पाल शंभर गज पदली. ती नवी जाली पाहते मनोनु तुपी पत्री किंवा त्यास :-करिव अमरोळीचे इमारतचंचॅक व सदरहू तलवाचे कामास दोन हजर ६. पावे होऱ खरा कहूऱ तयार करणे...म्हा अवी अहाऱ मया तेन व आतल, छ २० माहे राखर.


The date of this letter corresponds to 12th April 1814, three years earlier than the date of the conquest of Beyt by the Gaikwads assumed by Mr. DISKALKAR.

The letter quoted above clearly shows that the Gaikwads were in power over Kathiawad before 1815 A.D.

Yours truly,

C. V. JOSHI

State Record Office,
Baroda, 19th February 1941.
NOTES OF THE MONTH

The Report of the Bhāratiya Vidyā Bhavan for 1940 just published shows commendable progress in the different spheres of academic activities in which this Research Institute has been engaged since its very inception two years ago. The Bhavan has at present Departments for research and instruction in (1) Sanskrit and Comparative Philology, (2) Prākrit Languages and Hindi, (3) Gujarāti, (4) Bhāgavata Dharma, (5) Jaina Studies, and (6) Indian History. The Professors in charge of these Departments, besides doing research work themselves, train postgraduate research students for the M.A. and Ph. D. degrees of the Bombay University. Besides these activities the Bhavan conducts a Sanskrit Pāṭhahālā, where students are trained for the several Sanskrit examinations in Sāhitya, Vyākaraṇa etc. conducted by Govt. Sanskrit College, Benares and the Bengal Govt. Sanskrit Association, Calcutta. To create popular interest in their work the Bhavan has been conducting a Department for instruction in Jyotis and an Extension Lecture Series. Of more abiding interest to outside scholars are the Publications of the Bhavan, which comprise a research journal called the Bhāratiya Vidyā, now running its Second Volume, and several other publications including critical editions of texts and other original works now projected by the Bhavan. We feel confident that the progress shown by the Bhavan so far will gather momentum as years pass by and that this research institute under the able guidance of Shri K. M. Munshi and his learned collaborators like Muni Jinavijayaji, Dr. Patel and others will take its rightful place among premier research bodies of India at no distant date. India is now bristling with energetic young Indologists and the responsibility of directing their individual research effort to national enterprises in the academic sphere must be shouldered by learned bodies like the Bhavan. We therefore look forward with great interest to the preparation of the National History of India under the guidance of Shri Munshi contemplated by the Bhavan as stated in the Report under notice. It is high time for Indian scholars to apply themselves to the task before them with the tools kept at their disposal by research bodies like the Bhavan, the Bhandarkar Institute, the B. B. R. A. Society, the Deccan College Research Institute, to mention only a few from the Bombay Presidency. The days of Prize essays in research matters are now gone and the cause of research can only advance if the research worker sets himself to his task in a purely disinterested manner.

The Report of the Archaeological Department of the Gwalior State for the year 1938-39 contains among other interesting notes a note on the exploration work of the Department (pp. 13-20) which would be read with interest by every lover of Indian Archaeology. The State of Gwalior, we are happy to note, sanctioned during the year of the Report the necessary funds for trial excavations on some sites selected by the Department viz. (1) the site of ancient Ujjayini popularly known as Garh, (2) the Vaisya Tekri and (3) Kumbhar Tekri. Ujjayini was once the centre of ancient Indian culture, though now a desolate waste and we are, therefore, curious to learn more about its culture from archaeological excavation to enable us to see how far the literary traditions about this culture are justified in the light of archaeological evidence. As a result of the excavation work carried out by the Department numerous interesting objects have been unearthed (pp. 73-78).
These objects of course belong to the different levels of the excavations and hence tell their own tale. We may mention a few of these finds such as bricks; pieces of pottery; coloured stone beads; bangles of lac, shell, copper and glass; coloured China ware; coins, square and round; punch-marked copper coins; funeral urns; earthen cups and beads; ear-rings of shell and copper; axes and spear heads; Avanti copper coin; Andhra copper coin; terra cota toys; earthen vessels; a stone paça linga; stone relic caskets; ivory caskets; conch ear-rings; Indo-Sassanian punch-marked cast; ivory objects (dice, toy dagger, casket); clay seals; earthen bangles; human skeletons; painted teeth of a skeleton; tooth of a camel; enamelled painted tiles; pottery lamps; carved brick; carved shell bangles etc. The correct valuation of these rich finds and their bearing on the history of Ujjaini will be given by the Department after the excavations are completed but the Govt. of Gwalior will be fully justified in spending more money on the excavations and conducting them under the able and experienced guidance of Mr. M. B. Garde, the present Director of Archaeology, who has done well in availing himself of the advice of Rao Bahadur K. N. Dikshit, the Director-General of Archeology in India in the selection of sites for excavation and the occasional inspection of the excavation work carried out on these sites. The Report under notice is richly illustrated with not less than 32 plates containing photographs of excavated objects as also of the copies of wall paintings from Bagh Caves in the Archaeological Museum at Gwalior and hence deserves perusal by all lovers of Indian antiquities.

On the 8th of March 1941 Indology lost one of its greatest sons, full of years and honours, in the personality of Sir George Abraham Grierson, the foremost authority on Oriental Languages, whose devoted labour for over sixty years bears witness to his versatile intellect and critical acumen in the study of Indian and Central Asian tongues. It was only in 1936 that a Volume of Indian and Iranian Studies was presented to him on his 85th birthday by fellow-workers all over the world and we all mourn his loss to-day, though we are proud of his monumental achievements in the form of the ponderous volumes of the Linguistic Survey of India, his innumerable papers on linguistics and his many grammars of known and unknown languages. Sir George belonged to the older generations of the Indian Civil Service, which he joined in his 23rd year and adorned by his ever increasing literary output culminating in the completion of his twenty volumes of the Linguistic Survey of India in his 77th year. It is difficult for us to do justice to his linguistic genius, his exemplary life and scholarly ardour in this short tribute to his memory. We hope to record at no distant date for the benefit of our readers a literary biography of this great linguist and a great man, whose service to the cause of Indian philology will continue to inspire Indian Scholars in the study of their neglected vernaculars in the generations to come. Sir George has firmly laid the foundations of such study and it behoves us now to erect a monument on them worthy of these foundations and worthy of the master-builder whose boundless energy and undimmed vision has already triumphed our all the basic difficulties in this field.

The Vedas are the substratum of Hindu religion and culture. Leaving aside the average Hindu belief of old that they are divine in origin it is now granted by all educated Indians that they are the oldest records of the Aryan race and as such extremely valuable for a proper understanding of the Hindu culture and thought that has evolved during the last three thousand years. Barring the study of the Vedas by a few specialists, the average Hindu is absolutely ignorant of the nature
and contents of the Vedas. This state of things is anything but satisfactory and reflects no credit on us, the modern descendants of the ancient Aryans. The reasons which have led to this situation are mainly (1) the absence of cheap and accurately printed editions of the Vedas and (2) absence of ceaseless effort to take them to the homes of persons who are interested in them and who can afford to spend a little on this national heritage of theirs.

In view of this neglect of the Vedas by the average Hindu the efforts of Pandit S. D. Satavalekar and his collaborators of the Svādhyāya Maṇḍal, Aundh (Dist. Satara, Bombay Province), to publish cheap and accurate editions of the Vedas and allied literature are most praiseworthy. He has succeeded in publishing so far the following texts: (1) Rgveda-Samhitā (Rs. 5); (2) Sukla-Yajurveda-Vājasaneyi Samhitā (Rs. 2); (3) Sāmaveda-Samhitā (Rs. 3); (4) Atharvaveda-Samhitā (Rs. 3); (5) Kānya-Samhitā (Rs. 3). Those who have seen these nice editions of the Vedas can easily vouch for the painstaking editing of these texts and the amazingly cheap prices at which they are placed on the market by the assiduous Pandit whose zest and tenacity in collecting funds for this labour of love has already evoked admiration from scholars and laymen in all parts of India. He hopes to bring out shortly a few more volumes such as (1) Maitreyani-Samhitā, (2) Kaṭhaka-Samhitā, (3) Taïttriya-Samhitā, (4) Sāmāgāna (Kaṭhumī and Rāgāyaṇi), (5) Paippalāda-Samhitā, (6) Jaiminiya-Samhitā of the Sāmaveda, (7) Sāmāgāna (Jaiminiya) and (8) Kaṭiṣṭha-Samhitā. Such literary projects involve considerable time and expense and require financial support from everyone in an unstinted manner so that Pandit Satavalekar's efforts to popularise Aryan culture and thought should be crowned with success. Every library in India worth the name, if not every Hindu of average means, should possess a complete set of these Vedas. If we keep copies in our libraries of the Bible and the Quran with a view to understand the religious background of the Christian and the Muslim thought, there is greater reason for keeping a set of the Vedas among our literary possessions, as possession, though it means nine points in law, means ten points for people of studious minds.
attention to the building of the theatre, to musical accompaniment, to action and to the delivery of the speech. Otherwise he could have stopped with Rasa, Kāvyabandha and the Daśarūpaka chapters. When Abhinava says that it is from Drama that complete Rasa-realisation is got, he means the enacted drama; for he speaks here of the make-up, the intonation (Kāku) in the delivery of the speech etc. But the Sanskrit critics are not so uncritical like some European critics as to say that the dramatist is nothing; that the dramatist’s glory is in finding out his actor to interpret his play and that acting, the stage paraphernalia, theatre architecture etc., are more important than dramatic poetry or literature.

The question has been long discussed in the West. Fortunately we have a fine article by J. E. Spingarn on this very subject, giving us definite details on this very question, the title of the essay however being “Dramatic Criticism.” First of all, it should be remembered that our Aristotle, namely, Bharata, dealt with drama not only as the art of the genius called poet but also as the art, in part, of the producer and actors. Bharata speaks of the appropriateness of dress; the Nepathyā-rasa is one kind of Rasa, says Mātragupta;1 but Bharata views that question as settled that drama is first the art created by the poet-dramatist and then the art presented by the actors. A serious controversy as seen in the West whether it is not the art only of the actor, whether it is not more an art of the actor than of the poet-dramatist or whether it is, as held by the other extremists, purely an art of the poet-dramatist, never faced the Sanskrit writers. Bharata’s followers and commentators answered the question most sanely. Before coming to this answer, as seen in the works of Abhinava and Bhoja, we shall survey the views of the European critics.

Aristotle himself was responsible for starting the discussion. For he held the view that Tragedies might be acted and effectively too, but acting, dress etc., have really nothing to do with the greatness of the tragedy. Of Āhārya-abhinaya, dress and scenery, he said: “This has an emotional attraction of its own, but of all the parts it is the least artistic and connected least with the art of poetry. For the power of tragedy, we may be sure, is felt even apart from representation and actors. Besides, the production of spectacular effects depends more on the art of the stage mechanist than on that of the poet.” In chapter xiv he said that a great drama need not be acted at all and can affect us even as it is read. Surely it is only inferior drama that needs light effects and spectacular scenery. Aristotle said: “For the plot ought to be so constructed that even without the aid of the eye, he who hears the tale will thrill with horror and melt with pity at what takes place.” Again in chapter xxvi, he said that tragedy like Epic Poetry produced its true effect even without action; it revealed its power by mere reading.

1. Quoted by Rāghava Bhaṭṭa in his commentary on the Sākuntala.—See p. 113, Vol. XI, JOR, Madras, my article on Number of Rasas.
One Lodovico Castelvetro, an Italian scholar who translated Aristotle with a critical commentary in A.D. 1570, disagreed with Aristotle. He said:

(i) It is not true that tragedy produces equal effect when read as well as when acted.

(ii) When acted, learned and ignorant alike follow it, whereas only the learned can follow and appreciate it by merely reading it.

(iii) Drama is for the stage, to be acted, and this fact shall form the basis of any dramatic theory.

This at least, Castelvetro said that when a dramatist wrote a drama he had to keep in view that it was to be acted before an audience. He granted that the culture could feel its power by mere reading but he opined that acting the drama is the general rule, for all the world is not cultured. Another writer named Didetort went further and said in his work called "Entretiens" that the essential part of the play was not created by the poet at all but was created by the actor. Still further went the playwright, Grillparzer who attacked the "read drama", with relentless contempt for all fine writing, poetry, soliloquy etc., which, according to him, did not contribute to action. He considered that there can be no distinction between the theatrical and the dramatic. Then there was the age of "theatricalism rampant" beginning in France in the middle of the nineteenth century. Spinagran characterises this stage of dramatic criticism as "dramatic materialism".

As against this opinion, coming down to modern times from Castelvetro, there was a persistent view, promulgated by Aristotle himself, as pointed out above, which did not condemn stage, action, producer and actor but gave them their proper place, which was however only next to that of the poet-dramatist who created the Drama. And this view agrees perfectly with that of Bharata and Abhinava and other Sanskrit writers. Bharata, by his encyclopaedic treatment of 'Drama' as well as of 'Theatre', took into consideration both the poet and the actor. Abhinava, his greatest exponent, says that Drama is the greatest form of literary art, for, from Drama alone is complete Rasa-realisation possible. Only when actors take parts and speak with appropriate dress, accent etc., do all emotional conditions get fully presented i.e., in Abhinava's language, the Sama prādhānya, equal importance, of Vibhāvas (excitants and object of emotion) Anubhāvas (ensuants) and Saṅcārins (crossing feelings) is had only in the enacted drama. The fullest Rasāsvāda—Rasa-āsvāda-utkarṣa—is thus got first in the enacted drama. There is some truth in Castelvetro's contention that Drama needs to be enacted if one means to give its joy to the uncultured as well as the cultured. The cultured can, he ac-

1. Bhoja also is not an extremist. Though he considers the text of the Drama, the Kāvya, which is the work of the poet's genuis, as greater than actors and acting, we know from reliable authorities like Sāradātanaya, Sāṅgadeva, Pārvadeva and other Nātya and Saṅgita writers that Bhoja wrote another work dealing with action and music and other subjects of Nātya Sāstra.
cepts, relish a play by merely reading it whereas to the uncultured, presentation of play on the stage by the actors alone carries understanding. Somewhat similar is the position taken by Abhinavagupta. It all depends upon the nature of the audience. Everybody is infected with the emotions when a play is acted but he who can relish it by reading alone must be highly cultured. Says Abhinava that the more a man is Sahādaya, the more he is attuned to aesthetic impression from literature by constant literary habit, the more mirror-like his heart is as a consequence of constant study of property, the more easily is this Rasa roused. Such a Sahādaya can enjoy drama even by reading it. Even when stray verses are read he quickly understands the setting etc., his mind fills up the missing emotional conditions, and he enjoys it completely; whereas for another of a less cultured and less attuned heart, a lot of prefatory explanation is necessary to make the stray verse relishable. Similarly a drama also, if it has to be understood by less cultured souls by mere reading, has to be explained.

“किन्तु समाधान एव स्मारनस्थोक्यः। तच्च प्रबन्ध एव भवति, वस्तुवत्तो दशशाक्ष्य एव। यदाहै वामनः। सन्देशं दशशाक्ष्यं तेषाः। तद्विनिवासं। चिन्तनपदिवेशसाक्षात्। (I–III ३०–३२)। तद्भवारणं तु प्रवचनं भाषाभिषुप्रकृतिचितार्थित्यादित्वादि, तद्यथायवेन सुचिके। तथा च तत्र सहद्या:। पुर्वार्पिषितं परिकटद्य इत्यद्यात वन्यवसे। इत्यादि बहुतं विद्वंस्य विद्वंस्य तेन ये कायासमालयस्यस्यादित्वाविषुब्धात। [क्षति] सहद्या:। तेनार्थित विद्वंस्य विद्वंस्य तेनार्थित इत्यदि परिकाट्तु स्यात्। आदि साधकारक्यं कायार्थं। स्वविषु। अत एव तेनार्थित अत एव प्रतिवेद्याय प्रतिवेद्याय प्रतिवेद्याय प्रतिवेद्याय।”


Even in the case of the Sahādayas, there are times when their hearts are turbid and minds distracted—Kaluśa vikṣipta. So much so that not only do the dramas not infect them when read but they do not, even when enacted. Therefore it is that the Sanskrit critics first posit that to appreciate poetry and drama one has to be first of all a Sahādaya; and not all are Sahādayas; secondly even Sahādayas are not influenced by drama when they are distracted. Abhinava says that it is to remove such distractions, to increase receptiveness and even to make an Ahrdaya into a Sahādaya that the preliminaries, music and other operatic elements, and the peculiar atmosphere of the decorated theatre are intended. “Nija sukhami vivaśibhāva” is a vighna or obstacle to Rasa-realisation and it has to be removed by music etc.

“निनिःसुवादिविश्वासूतथ को वस्तवनारै संबंधित किरिमचार्यविदित तद्भवप्रकटायस्यादि अत्रिप्रति। साक्षात्महस्तिय सकलमोक्षतास्याहमिदित्वादि। आत्मविद्विषयाँ स्वविषु विद्वंस्य विद्वंस्य विद्वंस्य विद्वंस्य विद्वंस्य विद्वंस्य। उपरजनं समाधितम, तेन अहर्दीपाति सहदीपिताय सहदीपिताय सहदीपिताय सहदीपिताय।”


1. The Sahādaya, Abhinava defines, as one whose heart has been made transparent (receptive) like mirror by constant ‘chewing’ of poetry and who is therefore able to become immediately the emotion that is portrayed.

“थेता भजनायुक्तसाधारं बिशिष्ठस्य वर्गीयात्रां श्रुति विद्वंस्य श्रुति विद्वंस्य श्रुति विद्वंस्य श्रुति विद्वंस्य।”

Locana on Dhva. A. p. 11.
Therefore greater is the appeal of drama; greater in degree in the heart of a Sahādaya; and greater in respect of the numbers of people to whom appeal is made. For the uncultured as well as the cultured (as well as the cultivated who are not receptive in mind by their individual cares) are able to enjoy the drama when it is enacted.

"—इति न्यायेन सुतरं निरंलोकरणम्। अहिद्यानां च तत्वेऽन्मेल्याणावि।"


It is on this score that drama is the best form of literary composition.

The drama is called Drṣya, that which is seen, only so long as it is acted. But when it is not acted and is capable of being enjoyed by mere reading, it is simply Kāvyā. Bharata uses the word Kāvyā often to mean the text of the drama. The name Nāṭya refers to the Kāvyā in a certain dramatic form, dialogues, division into acts etc. and when it is enacted. The vocabulary of the Sanskrit critic has significantly no word for dramatist as distinguished from poet. To him everything is Kāvyā, drama as well as epic poem. Drama versus Poetry is a problem as absent in Sanskrit Alamkāra Śāstra as Prose versus Verse. All these are Kāvyā. What is it in essence? It is expression ensouled by Rasa—वस्तु सात्तनको काल्यम् i.e., expression which rouses emotional sympathy in a responsive heart. It is the representation of moods and feelings and this is its eternal, unchanging, essential and fundamental character. It has various forms like epic poetry, drama and lyric. In the drama, poet's explanation, description and narration are omitted and their absence is made up by the addition of the art of acting. For, this, in essence, is the difference between poetry, epic or otherwise, and drama. The one describes the emotional condition; the other presents the same through the actors.

अनुभावविभावानां वर्णानां काल्यमुस्तायते।
तेष्वेव प्रयोगस्तु नाथ्यं गीतालिकीनितम्॥

Schlegel also said the same thing as regards drama and poetry. He considered drama as dialogue with conflict or change but without any explanation by the poet. This lack of explanation makes it necessary that dramatic dialogue to be understood must be aided by the introduction of men, women

1. Quoted in Mahimabhaṭṭa's V. V. p. 20.
   This is from the point of view of the primary end of Kāvyā or Nāṭya namely Ānanda. Even from the point of view of the secondary purpose namely the didactic, the Vyūtpatti in the form of Vidhi-Niśedha, there is no difference between Kāvyā and Nāṭya. There is, as Mahima says, only difference in 'means'—upāya. The drama is for educating the duller people whom Kāvyā fails to influence. For, as said above, the drama when enacted is understood by less cultured people also. Further music, action etc., make drama a more charming medium of instruction, a sweeter pill to swallow.

"सामान्येन उभयामणि च तत् शास्त्रवदं विद्वितिविद्वियविद्विहत्तिफलम्।
केवलं भूयागाजनाभाज्यावाणोतितमोक्षम्
काल्यनांवासारसोद्यमं उपायमात्रेन
उपक्रमात्रेन न फलमेव। इति।"

p. 20 Vyakti Viveka, I.

2. Vide SPINGARN'S essay on Dramatic Criticism.
and scenery; otherwise an interpreter has to explain the sequences. Bhaṭṭa Tauta points out that Rasa is realised when the emotional conditions of Vibhāvas etc., are powerfully realised; they can be realised in that manner surely in a drama which depicts to the eye all those conditions rousing the Rasa. Drama gives a Pratyakṣa-sāksātkāra which is not available from poetry but a powerful poet’s expression makes his descriptive and narrative poetry have such life as will equal the life which drama enacted before the eye has. Thus there is little essential difference between Kāvyā and Nāṭya.

"प्रोक्तलयनापने काय्ये नास्त्वादसम्भवः।
वर्णोत्कृतामयोगप्रायोगिक्या सम्प्रभापितः।

उत्साहकारानाथः प्रक्ष्यक्षरसुता॥"


Therefore to the cultured soul of the Sahṛdaya, there is no difference between un-acted drama and poem. When a drama is not acted but yet can be relished as keenly, by mere reading, it is only Kāvyā and it is supremely the art of the poet’s genius only. It gets its vitality by the genius of the dramatist. A great drama needs no actor, no theatre. Its greatness can be felt by mere reading in a corner of a room. As Aristotle says: “Tragedy like Epic Poetry produces its true effect even without action; it reveals its power by mere reading.” Dryden tells us that it is his ambition to be read which he considers as surely ‘the more lasting and nobler design’. A great French scholar, Dacier (end of the seventeenth century) admits that while stage decoration etc., add to the beauty of the play, they make the piece in itself neither better nor worse. In the middle of the next century Voltaire says (in the Notes to the Tragedy of Olympie): “What has the stage decoration to do with the merit of the poem? If the success depends on what strikes the eyes we might as well have moving pictures.” At the end of the same century, Pye, in his commentary on the Poetics, says that good tragedies affect us as forcibly even while read in a room. Their effect is independent of the stage effect. Lessing, the German writer, in his work on Dramaturgy, expresses himself similarly that “there is no real relation between elaborate scenery or splendid theatrical edifices and great drama itself.” Too much emphasis on the stage craft and scenic extravaganza is ‘theatricalism rampant’; this has nothing to do with drama. What have these to do with real dramatic worth when critics are of opinion that even such an important accessory as the art of acting itself has little to do with the greatness of the drama whose beauty can be realised even by reading? He is really a great poet who creates dramas whose influence is had even when he is read. LAMB even says that a great play cannot be properly acted. “A masterpiece is rarely as well represented as it is written; mediocrity always fares better with the actors.” Therefore by Anvaya and Vyatireka, it can be maintained that first and last, a great drama is the creation of the genius of the poet-dramatist. Really great dramas need no acting, and acting, however great, cannot make insipid plays great. According to Bhaṭṭa Tauta, the greater the poet’s power
of description, the lesser grows the need for presentation by actors. For Rasa-
realisation is had when we see things powerfully living before our eye, physical
or mental. And this can be accomplished either by acting and production
or by the inherent dramatic power of the piece. If it is not there already
as a result of the Praudhi of a poet’s genius, no amount of Prayoga by
actors can create that Pratyakṣāyamānatva. Therefore all Nāṭya is Kāvya,
the art of the poet, and not of the actors. So it is that Bhoja says that more
than actors and acting, he esteems poets and poetry or drama.

"अतोप्रिनेनायग्यं: कवीनव बहुभायमेहः;
अभिमन्येयमयं काव्यंभवति।"
CHAPTER VIII

SĀHITYA

‘शाहित्यम् सहिती काव्यम्’

Bhāmaha I. 16.

I. Introduction.

II. Beginnings: Early history of the concept; Bhāmaha, Mukula, Pratihārendurāja, Rājaśekhara and Kṣemendra.

III. Bhoja’s conception of Sāhitya.—Sr. Pra. & S. K. Ā.

IV. Sāradātanaṇa follows Bhoja.

V. The Sāhityamāṁśā; its interpretation of Sāhitya following Bhoja, in a way; five stages of Sāhitya.

VI. Kuntaka’s definition of Sāhitya.

VII. Bhoja’s and Kuntaka’s conception of Sāhitya: comparison and contrast; Bhoja’s Sabdārthaguna-‘Sammitatva’ compared to Kuntaka’s Sāhitya.

VIII. Conclusion: Meynel, Vidyādhaṇa, NilaKaṇṭha dīkṣita, Parāsarabhaṭṭa and Kālidāsa on this Sāhitya.

The concept of Sāhitya had a grammatical origin. It became a poetic concept even as early as Rājaśekhara; as far as we can see at present, the Kāvyamāṁśā is the earliest work to mention the name Sāhitya and Sāhitya vidyā as meaning Poetry and Poetics. Even after him, grammatical associations were clinging to the term up to Bhoja’s time. Kuntaka, about the time of Bhoja himself, was responsible for divesting Sāhitya of dry grammatical associations and for defining it as a great quality of the relation between Sabda and Artha in Poetry. Sometime afterwards was written by Ruuyaka or Maṅkhuka a work called Sāhitya-māṁśā, which was the first work on Poetics to have the name Sāhitya. Afterwards Sāhitya became more common and we have the notable example of the Sāhitya-darpaya of Viśvānātha.¹

Sāhitya is derived from the word ‘Sahita’, “united together”. सहित्ययो-भाव: साहित्यम्. All literature is made of the material of word and sense united together and so also is Poetry. The earliest definitions of Poetry are material, giving us the substance of which Poetry is made, namely, Sabda and Artha. Bhāmaha says:

शाहित्यम् सहिती काव्यम् K. A. I. 16.

This is the starting point and no one can ignore this essential element, so long as Poetry is a kind of expression, expressed through the medium of language. So Rudraṭa follows with his indication of the nature of Kāvyā—

¹. Vide my article on Kriyā Kalpa, with a Note on the Evolution of the Names of the Alamkāra Śāstra in the JOR., Madras. Vol. VIII, part. 2.
and many later writers like Mammaṭa and Vidyānātha define Poetry through Sabda and Artha. Even after the establishment of the Aman of Poetry, Sabda and Artha were taken as the body of Poetry. The two are inseparable and always go together, the one meaning the other. No literature, no talking even, is possible without the two. But there seems to have been in the early period of Poetics a view on this grammatico-poetic question that of the two elements of Sabda and Artha, the former is more essential and important. It is perhaps to answer this view that Māgha says in his poem, the Sīṣupālavadha, that a discerning man will pay equal regard to Fate and Self-exertion, and a poet will, to both Sabda and Artha.

Māgha here emphasises that Sabda and Artha are of equal importance. It is to this same controversy that Bhāmaha refers in chapter I and replies like Māgha.

It is immediately after this that Bhāmaha says that both Sabda and Artha, united together, form Kāvyā. Sabāyā samoṁita kāryāya. It is meaningless to emphasise either Sabda only or Artha only, to call the one as Abhyantara and the other as Bāhya. Quoting the above-given verses of Bhāmaha and knowing full well the complete significance of the immediately following observatīon of Bhāmaha sabāyā samoṁita kāryāya, Kuntaka thus concludes: ten sabāyā drī samādītā kāryamānī kṣyataµ. V. J. I. p. 10. Earlier also Kuntaka says:

"..." V. J. I. p. 7 De's Edn.

In another way, the very late writer Jagannātha emphasises Sabda to start with, though he includes Artha also in his definition of Poetry. He defines Poetry as Sabda that gives such an idea, Artha, as is productive of non-worldly aesthetic bliss when contemplated upon. "..." Jagannātha further justifies himself that Sabda it is that is called Kāvyā and not Artha also, because we say in the world ‘The Kāvyā has been read but its Artha has not been understood’. But this is not a strong argument for, in the ordinary speech in the world one adopts a fictitious analysis of a single whole into its parts. The proper attitude however is what Kuntaka has stated, namely, that both Sabda and Artha together constitute Poetry.

1. See also Namisādhu on Rudraṭa, II, i.
The emphasis on Šabdā by a school which considered Artha as Bāhyā was perhaps strongly influenced by the grammatical Šabdā Brahman philosophy of the Vākyapadiya which holds Artha as a Vivarta of Šabdā. Bhoja is a great follower of Bhartṛhari and his V.P. which is quoted numberless times in the opening chapters of the Śṛ. Pra. Bhoja takes trouble to explain that the acceptance of Dhvani does not bring any difficulty regarding the basic tenet that all Artha is the Vivarta of Šabdā. He explains Dhvani also as a Šabdā Vivarta. (Vide infra, section on Bhoja and Dhvani.) As against this view of Šabdā prādhānya, it can be said that the Etymologists or Nairuktas considered the Idea or Artha as chief and Šabdā, secondary in importance. Durgācārya on Yāska says:

अच्छो हि प्राधानम्, तद्युगः शब्दः: | p. 3, Venkatesvara Steam Press Edn.

It is as a reply to this controversy that Bhāmaha says, शब्दश्च सहितोऽकव्यम् that both Šabdā and Artha together constitute Poetry. This is the first significance of Sāhitya.

The old writers did not go further than defining Poetry as made up of Šabdā and Artha, words and ideas. Anything said or written is of this nature and this does not define Poetry or, on the face of it, give us an idea of the nature of the charm in Poetry. The old writers described Poetry as linguistic composition (Šabdā and Artha), divided it into Prose and Verse, Sanskrit and Prākṛt, Read and Acted, and so on. But at the same time they realised that Šabdā and Artha in Poetry had a special beauty not found elsewhere; that, to put it briefly, the Šabdā and Artha in Poetry had some speciality, Viśėşa. It is a question of deciding this Viśėşa that is the problem of Poetics. Some approached the problem from the outer expression, the garb called Šabdā and Artha; some plumbed the content within; while others emphasised that, whether it be a Viśėşa of the Šabdārtha or of the content within, everywhere in Poetry, in the Šabdārtha śarīra as well as the Ātman of Rasa and Dhvani, it is the poet’s peculiar way, the work of his genius, Kavi Vyāpāra, that is the Viśėşa. A fine sum up of the poetic theories from this point of view is thus made by Samudrabanda on the Alainkāra Sarvasa.

"इह विद्येऽऽवधार्थी कव्यम्। तत्तुस्व वैशिष्ट्यं धम्मुपेन, व्यापारमुपेन, व्यह्ममुपेन वेति 

वर्णः। आधेस्यवल्लक्ष्यातो मुण्डलो वेति त्रिविधयः। द्वितीयोपि मृणित्विचित्वेयं भोगह्मुपेन वेति 

त्रिविधयः। इति चबसु पक्षेऽऽधः उद्वूक्तार्थमस्यहः, द्वितीयो आत्मानेन, तुत्तीयो ववकोन्त 

जातिनकारणे, चतुर्थो भावनायकेन, प्रममे आन्तवशेषेन।" Triv. edn. p. 4.

1. Both Kuntaka and Bhaṭṭa Nāyaka emphasise Kavivyāpāra but there seems to be an apparent difference. The former’s Kavivyāpāra leans towards the old writers’ view and approaches from the expression-side arriving at Bhaṇjiti-vāicitrya. But Bhaṭṭa Nāyaka’s Kavivyāpāra is related by him to the Rasa, to the content-school. But as explained in my paper on writers quoted in the Abhinavabhārati (JOR., Madras, Vol. VI, pp. 212-214), Nāyaka also had much inspiration from Bhāmaha and the old school. As the Locana says, the Bhogakṛtva is preceded by
It is the analysis of this Viśēṣa that engages our attention and it is the main theme in the history of Sanskrit Poetics. That it is some beauty is accepted by all. Replying to Bhāṭṭa Nāyaka, Abhinava says that it is acceptable to him to say that the ‘Soul’ of Poetry is the realisation of beauty.

“यथोक्ते—‘वाच्यप्रतितिस्तादि काव्यस्य आयमा स्वात्त्’ इति, तद्विषुकमेव एव। नामित खलब्रविवाद इति।”

Sābdā and Artha that are ‘beautiful’, Ramaṇjīya, are Kāvya. Within this Ramaṇjīyaka come Alāṁkāra, Guṇa (Riti included in it), Rasa, Dhvani and Aucitya. These form the speciality of poetic speech, of the relation between Sābdā and Artha in Poetry. In ordinary speech, Sābdā and Artha are united, Sāhitau. Without this Sāhiṭya, no linguistic expression is possible. Then what is the meaning of Sāhiṭya with reference to Poetry? The Sāhiṭya meant is one of a special kind, an unusually beautiful relation between Sābdā and Artha in Poetry.

“नम् व काव्यचरणकस्तन्वयस्त्विषमानलावष एषयों न कथविषयिः साहित्यविषयः सत्यभेदाय भिन्नभेदाय साहित्यभेदाय ।” Kuntaka V. J. p. 10.

Poetry is speech par excellence; and Sāhiṭya, relation par excellence. Thus to begin with, the word Sāhiṭya meant only the mere union of Sābdā, the expresser, and Artha, the expressed—Vācyā vācaka sambandha. This means correctness and purity of grammar on the one hand and logical sensibility on the other. Taking Sābdā and Artha united as Kāvya, the early writers examined the varieties of Sābdā, different languages, different kinds of words as Noun, Verb, Preposition etc., and sentences made up of words (पदसमूह-लक्षणाकृत) and of types of compositions made up of Vākyas, like the Sargabhāṣa, Nāṭaka etc. This analysis pertains to Sābdā and is had in the first chapters of the works of Bhāmaha and Dāṇḍin. But there is no trace of any analysis of the Artha in Poetry in the texts of these two writers. The first writer who began to talk of more varieties of Artha than one, in Poetry, is Udbhāṣa according to the evidence of the Dhvanyāloka and the Locana. Analysis of Artha in Poetry begins here. In his Bhāmaha

Bhāvakatvā which Abhinava says, as far as Kāvya is concerned, is due to certain elements of beauty in expression, Sābdārtha, namely, Guṇas and Alāṁkāras.

अन्ये तु काव्यप्रतितिपुन्थितस्तादि काव्यपरिवारमात्माभिमानिश्च सिद्धिविचयस्य काव्यस्य कथयते । Locana p. 70.

It is to this view of Bhāṭṭa Nāyaka that Abhinava refers in his Abhi. Bhā. p. 292, Gaek. Edn. I.

If it is so, Nāyaka’s view is not far distant from that of Kuntaka and of the old schools which defined the Viśēṣa as a ‘Dharma’. The difference between the three schools as analysed by Samudrabandha is that while the first sticks to the expression, the third to the expressed, the second comprehending both the expression and the expressed, emphasises the peculiar poetic activity of the poet’s genius which shapes everything.

2. Vide my paper Kriyā Kalpa and the Evolution of the Other Names of the Alāṁkāra Sāstra, above referred to; the section on Saundarya and Čārūtva.
SÁHITYA

vivaraṇa, while commenting upon Bhāmaha, I. 9. śabdavádabhipartha: Udbhāta tries to interpret the two words Sabda and Abhidhāna as distinct and points out that in Poetry, besides the primary sense of the words, there is a second sense which is the secondary meaning.

“—तथापि गुणवत्ता कालेपुरूः र्वजहार्यं द्विभक्ताः भविष्मां भावा कृष्णाति (अः न) लक्ष्यति इति परिकल्प्यैवमुक्तम्—।” Dhva. A. p. 10.

‘द्विभक्तिः। माहोद्ववामनाः। माहोद्ववी ‘शवद्वद्वन्दीसविभवेत्।’ इत्यविभाषे शवद्वाद।

मैद्वे याहार्यः माहोद्ववे च वामाः ‘शवद्ववामनामविहवायामाः। मुहयो गुणवत्ताः।’ इति,

बामोद्ववी ‘सा साहित्यम् लक्षणा काकौक्षे’ इति।” Locana, p. 10.

Udbhāta thus mentioned the Amukhya or Gauṣa Artha and Vāmana definitely speaks of Lākṣaṇā which gives the secondary meaning as underlying the beauty in certain expressions. Soon critical circles discovered the third and greatest variety of Artha, the suggested idea—अच्छन्न or चन्द्रमाण्डित्व अर्. Taking Sabda and Artha together, i.e., the two in Sāhitya, and leaving aside the grammatical aspects of their mutual relation, it was found out that in Poetry the relation between the two consisted of some beauty analysable into Alarnkāra, Guna etc. In such a manner, in course of time, Sāhitya which at first meant only the inevitable grammatical and logical relations between Sabda and Artha in any kind of linguistic expression came to mean those things which form the distinguishing characteristics of Poetry as different from the other utterances. Soon Sāhitya came to be used as a synonym of Poetry.

We do not know when and how exactly the world Sāhitya came into existence and came to be used in the sense of Poetry. We have an old verse which uses the name Sāhitya for Poetry:

साहित्यसहाग्नि कल्लिनि: साक्षात् पुष्कविष्णुहिनि:।

but its date is not decided. In Bhāmaha we have only the qualifying adjective 'Sahitau' from which Sāhitya is derived. साहित्योपपाव: साहित्यम्। Mukula uses the word. (Pp. 21-22)

पद्धार्थमां तदन्तत्त्वतिरभितम्।

यो योजयति साहित्ये तस्य वाणी प्रसीति॥

Commenting on this, he himself mentions Sāhitya twice as a Sāstra (Poetics) along with Mīmarisā, Vyākaraṇa and Tarka. Mukula's pupil and commentator on Udbhāta, Prāthāreṇḍūraṇa, while describing his Guru in the closing verse of his commentary on the K.A.S.S. mentions the word in the sense of Poetics. साहित्यों अभियुक्ते:। In Rājaśekhara's K.M. we find Sāhitya-vidyā meaning Poetics as one of the Vidyās. पत्नी साहित्यविद् इति यावधीवः।

स হি চলस्त्रुयनाम पिवान निष्णवः। He explains Sāhitya derivatively as the Vidyā of Sabda and Artha placed together in the proper manner.

“शवद्वन्दीसविभवेत् सहभविन बिवा साहित्यविवा।” K. M. p. 5.
In section 3, describing the legend of Kāvya Puruṣa and his descent into the world, Rājaśekhara mentions Sāhitya-vidyā as the spouse of Kāvya Puruṣa.

"—तदेतस्य (काव्यपुरुषस्य) वजस्वरं कामिपि हि यथं सुजामीति विचिनतयंति साहित्य-विद्याकथुसुपूर्णस्य, आदिशिवान्—एव ते यथा धर्मेनि: पुर: प्रतिचर्ते, लद्वृत्तेन, एवं नव-तैयः न।"

From the first quotation it appears that by Rājaśekhara's time it is definitely settled down in books that Sāhitya is synonymous with Poetry or Poetics. Abhinava's pupil, poet and critical writer, Kṣemendra, uses Sāhitya twice as meaning Poetics, the subject which he studied under Abhinava.

धूलाभिनयगुणायतं साहित्यं बोधवारिः।
आचार्यशेखरस्यं विद्याचिनत्िकारणं। Bṛhatkathāmañjarī p. 260.

It is only when we come to the eleventh century that we see the concept of Sāhitya entering into its 'Bhāgya dasā'. It begins to loom larger and gets two exponents for itself, one in Malwa and another in Kashmir, Bhoja and Kuntaka, two of the names among first rank Ālambikārikas who must be specially noticed in a history of Sāhitya. It is striking that both Bhoja and Kuntaka start with Bhāmaha's definition—शबदाभिर साहित्यं काल्यम्. Before we compare and contrast the two expositions of Sāhitya by Bhoja and Kuntaka, we shall see what Bhoja means by that term.

We have already said that Poetry being speech supreme, Sāhitya is, between the two parts of language—Sabda and Artha—relation supreme. Thus, Sāhitya first means all linguistic expression and the general and inevitable grammatical and logical relations between word and sense; and then it means Poetry and the poetic relations between the two. Bhoja means by Sāhitya both kinds of relation and he not only deals with Poetry but with language also. At the lower levels, lies language with its general Sāhitya: higher up the language has risen above itself and has bloomed into Poetry and here, the Sāhitya is poetic relation between word and sense. Bhoja defines Kāvya as the Sāhitya or unity of word and sense.

“तत् (काल्यः) पुर: शब्दाभिर: साहित्यायमानजाताः। तथा—‘शब्दाभिर साहित्यं काल्यम्’ इति। It is to a treatment of this Sāhitya of Sabda and Artha that the Śr. Pra. is devoted. Bhoja calls his work itself Sāhitya Prakāśa in chapter xi.

यस्मदशेष्यविशालानानाश्वविभुताय: प्रकाशन्ते।
संहित्य, स साहित्यप्रकाशा एतददा भवति।

Chap. xi, p. 430. Śr. Pra., Vol. II.

The scheme of the whole work is contained in the definition, "शब्दार्थात्वादसा शास्त्रात्तात्त्वात् काव्यम्" and under the edifice of the Śr. Pra. lies the foundation and system called Sāhitya. This has been already pointed out by me in
a previous section. Sāhitya is thus defined by Bhoja: It is the relation between Sabda and Artha and is of twelve kinds. Eight of these twelve Sāhityas can be called general and the last four are special and can be classed as the poetic Sāhityas.

"किं साहित्यम्? य: शब्दार्थोऽसंबन्धः। स च द्वादशा: अभिधा, विवेकः, तात्त्विकः, प्रविक्रमः, व्यपेक्षा, सामर्थ्यम्, अन्तर्यामः, एकार्थमिहास: दोषवहानी, गुणोपादानम्, अखलकार्योऽसमावेशः।"

Again, at the beginning of chapter vii which begins the treatment of Sāhitya, Bhoja repeats these twelve-fold relations between Sabda and Artha as constituting Sāhitya.

"तत्र अभिधा-विवेक-तात्त्विक-प्रविक्रम-व्यपेक्षा-सामर्थ्य-अन्तर्याम-एकार्थिनिहास-दोषवहान-गुणोपादान-अखलकार्योऽसमावेशः। शब्दार्थोऽसंबन्धः। साहित्यमुपयोजिततः।"


Even the earlier work of Bhoja, the S.K.A., contains indications of this conception of Sāhitya of Bhoja. The first verse of the work चालनिकाः: पदे वाक्यम् etc. covers part of contents of chapters i-vi of the Sr. Pra. and the second verse of the S.K.A. gives the last four-fold poetic Sāhitya, दोषवहान, गुणदान, अखलकार्योऽसमावेश and रसाविषयोऽसमावेश; commenting on the above-said first verse of the S. K. A., Ratneśvara who is acquainted well with Sr. Pra. says:

"तत्र शब्दार्थसंबन्धः—साहित्यस्तवकऽप्राच्छिन्दयः। शाब्दिव्यां च शब्दार्थोऽसंबन्धः। साहित्यम् च शब्दार्थोऽसंबन्धः। शब्द च एव क इवये च चालनिकाः। चालनिकाः। अखलकार्यस्तु संबन्धः। चालनिकाः। अखलकार्यस्तु संबन्धः। अखलकार्यस्तु संबन्धः। अखलकार्योऽसमावेशः। स चालनिकाः।"

Ratneśvara on S.K.A. I, 1.

"निर्देशं गुणवकार्यम् अखलकारिंगार्यतः। रसान्वितं कविः: कुर्विर तीतिः प्रीतिः च विन्दितः।"

S.K.A. I, 2.

There is the well-known eternal, external grammatical relation between Sabda and Artha but these are subjects pertaining to grammar. As far as Poetry is concerned, the relation is of a superior kind, Viśiṣṭam Sāhityam as Kuntaka says, or Sarvasvāvyāmanāh sambandhāh as Ratneśvara says. Sāhitya is thus really the poetic relation only; or rather it is necessary to investigate the poetic Sāhitya only, leaving aside the well-known external Sāhitya. But, with a suggestion of the historical origin of the concept of Sāhitya in grammar, and, as in most places, writing here also under the great influence of the Śāstra of grammar, Bhoja takes at first Sāhitya as merely relation between Sabda and Artha and includes under it two sets of relations, grammatical and poetical. Among the eight grammatical relations, four are classed together
as Kevala-sābda-sambandha-śaktis and the other four as Sāpekṣa-sābda-sambandha-śaktis. The following table gives these classifications at a glance.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>12 kinds</th>
<th></th>
<th>12 kinds</th>
<th></th>
<th>12 kinds</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>काव्यम्</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>शब्द:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>अर्थ:</td>
<td></td>
<td>तथ्यो:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(8 kinds)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(12 kinds)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(12 kinds)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grammatical.</td>
<td>4 kinds.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Poetical</td>
<td>4 kinds.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sabda-sambandha-śaktis.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4 के व्याकरणाभ्यासः
4 सापेक्षाभ्यासः
1. अभिव्यक्ति
2. विविधता
3. तत्त्वाभ्यासः
4. प्राविभागः
5. व्यपेक्षा
6. सामसंगमः
7. अन्वयः
8. एकायनाभ्यासः
9. दोषादनम्
10. गुणादनम्
11. अद्वित्यार्थार्थः
12. रस-अभिव्यक्तिः

The first eight are called Sabda-sambandha-śaktis. Abhidhā is comprised of the three Vyrtis, Mukhyā, Gauṇī and Lakṣaṇā. Vivakṣā is comprised of three kinds—Kākāvādi-vyaṅgyā, Prakārapādi-vyaṅgyā and Abhinayādi-vyaṅgyā. In Tātparya is included the Pratīyāmaṇa and Dhvani. (See below, section on Bhoja and Dvāri). These eight Sabda-sambandhas are treated of in chapters vii and viii. Poetic Sāhitya begins in chapter ix.

We remarked above how it is worth while in a work on Poetics to investigate into this Poetic Sāhitya only, leaving out the Vācyā-vācaka-sambandha as very well known. Ratneswara also opines so. But Bhoja has taken the grammatical relation also as Sāhitya. As if this is not enough, he confuses us more by contradicting himself at the opening of chapter ix by restricting the name Sāhitya to the first eight grammatical and logical relations. He separates the last four, does not call them Sāhitya and introduces them newly as factors which secure goodness of expression—Samyak praprayoga or Prayoga-arhatā.


This contradicts the statement that all the twelve relations form Sāhitya. There is yet another contradiction which appears at the very beginning of the Sr. Pra where Bhoja defines Poetry as the Sāhitya between Sabda and Artha.
This would mean that Sāhitya is neither the sum-total of all the twelve relations, grammatical and poetical, nor the sum-total of the first eight only but that it is only the four-fold poetic relation of Doṣa-hāna, Guṇāḍāna, Alarikāra-yoga, and Rasa-aviyoga,—a view that will correspond to that of Kuntaka and Ratnesvara. The second view of Sāhitya that it is the sum-total of the eight Sabda-sambandha-saktis is the view of the work called Sāhityamimāṃsā which we shall notice presently.

Bhoja wrote without a systematically thought-out unitary idea of Poetry. He borrowed from all, accepted all and somehow accommodated every writer from Bhāmaha to Anandavardhana and the Daśarūpakāra in his big berth of Sr. Pra. Bhoja accepted Alarikāra as expounded by Bhāmaha and Daṇḍin. Following the former, he took his stand on his definition of Poetry, “Sabdarthau sahitau kāvyam.” Following the latter, he completely incorporated the Kavyādarṣa into his own work. He followed Vāmana on Guṇas and their relations to Alarikāras. As a matter of fact, the chapter heads, Doṣa-hāna and Guṇāḍāna, are taken from Vāmanā’s Sūtra, त्रैयोग्याभिकर्षणांनार्यां गुणाकार सम्बन्धम् I, 1.3. He follows Bhāmaha in another respect also, i.e., in considering all Alarikāras to be of the form of Vakrokti. (See below section on Alarikāra and on Vakrokti.)

“अरिन्द सति सबबल्भकारणायो वकोल्लभिभाषावाच्य: भवनि ।
तु दुःस्म—
वकल्पमेव काय्यानां परा भूति भामह:।

Following both Bhāmaha and Daṇḍin, Bhoja considers Rasas and Guṇas also as Alarikāras.

“एवमस्थापिते गुणसतदाभानामाबायांमालायार्याकारसाहस: सम्बन्धि।”

(See also Pp. 612-3 S.K.A. See also below sections on Guṇa, Alarikāra, and Rasa). Bhoja then follows Vāmana and says that, of the two, Guṇa and Alarikāra, the former is more important. He quotes the two verses of Vāmana on this point.

“तत्र न गुणोदानालाल्यार्यायोगः: गुणोपादान गरीवः। अति: तदेव प्रथमसूचयं। यदह—
यदि भवति बुद्धिज्ञुन गुणम्।” etc. etc., (Vāmana) | Sr. Pra. Vol. II, p. 211.


As a follower of the Rasa-school also, he considers that the last aspect of Sāhitya called Rasa-aviyoga or non-divorce from Rasa is the most important. It is the greatest factor of beauty in Kāvyam and the three preceding it, only serve it.

“नीतिन्द्रयु गुणवत्ताकल्यात्तस्य काय्यार्यारस्य कामिनीरास्त्रयेव शोभाविविष्यतौ रसार्थियों एव प्रकृत उपयोगी।” Sr. Pra. Vol. II, p. 352.
In the S.K.A., among the three Uktis which comprehend the whole field of Poetry, namely, Svabhāvokti, Vakraokti and Rasokti, he assigns the greatest place to Rasokti.

बकोकित्व रसोकित्व स्वभावोकित्व बाह्यमयम्।
सवास्मु प्राहिगी तास्मु रसोकी प्रतिहारते॥—S.K.A. V, 8.

He also adopts as much as possible verses of Ananda, which subject I have separately examined in a further section on Bhoja and Ananda. This, in brief, is the plan by which Bhoja improvises a system called Sāhitya, in which is envisaged his conception of Poetry as speech made more attractive by four factors, namely, absence of grammatical, logical and literary flaws (Doṣahāna), securing of stylistic qualities of ślesa etc., which are of prime importance and which must necessarily be present (Gunaḍāna), adornment with Alankāras which is optional and is intended for further beautification (Alankāra-yoga), and above all, seeing that no part of Poetry is devoid of Rasa (Rasa-avyoga). This is his definition of Poetry also:

विद्रोष्ण गुणवत्काल्यम् अल्पकरसंरलक्ष्यतम्।
रसानवते कौशः कौशिकी श्रीति व बिन्दुति॥—S.K.A I, 2.

‘एतेऽन कायवस्मयमपि काठक्षितम्।’—Ratneśvara on the above.

Thus, if it can be granted that there is some thought-system of Poetics in Bhoja’s Śr. Pra., it must be this system of Sāhitya.

Sāradātānaya, in his Bhāvaprakāśa (chapter vi, p. 145, Gaek. Edn.) follows Bhoja’s conception of Sāhitya. He gives the twelve-fold Sāhitya in a clear, classified and succinct manner. The three-fold classification of the twelve relations indicated by us above is also made by him. The verses in the Bhā. Pra. on pp. 145-152 form a good metrical summary of chapters vii-ix of Bhoja’s Śr. Pra.

वाक्यावलिन् (रसस्य) च वाक्यासंवयवादवगम्यते।
संवादो द्वारसिविन्न स्मः: वाक्यायेऽविन्ने॥
द्वारशास्त्र सम्बन्धः शास्त्रवेदमथं स्वाहित्यम्।
स्वर्णकृत्यं स च चुम्हितभविभ्यं च नुमिथभः॥
शृतिविवक्ष तत्त्वंप्रज्ञाविभानिस्योऽदिते।
ततो व्यपेक्षात्मात्मोऽत्यायेकार्थाभावम्॥
वीरभद्रं गुणदारं तत्त्वदेहकार्ययोगिता।
रसाविशेषं धृतेऽन संभवं कृत्यं।॥—p. 145.

See also Mr. K. S. Ramaswamy Sastri’s Introduction to the Gaek. Edn. of this Bhā Pra. pp. 42-43. Following the phraseology of the (anti-Dhvani) Tātparyavādins headed by the Daśarūpakakāra, Sāradātānaya calls here Rasa the Vākyārtha, towards the comprehension of which the Padārthas named Bhāvās help. The Vibhāvas etc., are ‘Vākyārthapara’, i.e., Rasapara. Their Tātparya is Rasa, the Vākyārtha. Bhoja follows Dhvani as well as Tātparya, reconciling the two somehow and uses the phraseology of Padārtha-vākyārtha for Bhāvās and Rasas.
Sāradātānaya, who follows Bhoja, says that this Vākyārtha of Rasa is got at by the Sambandha between Sabda and Artha.

This Sambandha helping the manifestation of the Vākyārtha of Rasa is the twelve-fold Sāhitya of Bhoja, out of all of which Bhoja himself says that the last, namely, Rasa-aviyoga is the most important. Bhoja says that it is for securing Rasaas that such Guṇas as Kānti, the absence of such flaws as Grāmyatā, the adding of such Alarikāras as Kaisāki vṛtti and Vaidarbhi riti etc., are resorted to by poets.

Thus according to Bhoja, the Vaiśīṣṭya of Sabda and Artha (in Samudrabandha’s terminology), which is responsible for making ordinary Sabdārtha into Kāvyā (Viśīṣṭau sabdārthau kāvyam), is Sāhitya. If the Alarikāra-school and the Guṇa-riti school define the peculiarity (Viśeṣa) about Poetry by ’Dharma’, if Kuntaka’s Vakrokti defines it as a Kavi-vyāpāra, if Ananda’s system defines it by the suggested Rasa, Bhoja, whose position contradicts that of none, arranges all the views suitably and says that the Viśeṣa is Sāhitya which comprehends all these—Alarikāra, Guṇa-riti, Dhvani and Rasa. Kāvyā is Sabda and Artha with a special kind of beauty, Śobhā, i.e., the Vaiśīṣṭya or Viśeṣa of Samudrabandha. The Kāvyā-sārira is the point from which Bhoja studies Kāvyā. Kāvyā is understood as ’Sabdārtha’, shirō nārayamatasya padavali of Daṇḍin is accepted. The Śobhā of the Sarira of Sabdārtha is due, in Bhoja’s opinion, to the absence of flaws, the presence of excellences, the addition of ornaments, and the non-divorce from emotion. Of these, the first is the negative element of Śobhā in the form of absence of flaws. Regarding the other three, Bhoja completely follows Daṇḍin, his greatest Guru, quotes his text kāvyāśekaranaḥ smaṇatdārthkaraṇaḥ and says that whatever is responsible for the charm in the Sabdārtha of Kāvyā is Alarikāra, be it Guṇa, Alarikāra (figure) or Rasa. Rasa may be the most important; Guṇa may be more important than Alarikāra which is the least important of the three but functionally, all the three are identical in that they contribute to the charm of the expression, in being Kāvyā-śobhākara-dharma. Thus, in another way, we arrive at this conclusion that, in Samudrabandha’s phraseology, Bhoja is one who would put the speciality of Kāvyā as a ’Dharma’, as Alarikāra. Bhoja goes with the ancient Bhāmaha and Daṇḍin and is of opinion that even as the Rasa,
the way of saying things in Kāvya through suggestion (he accepts Dhvani as functioning supremely in Poetry—व्यक्ति काव्य) beautifies only expression. Therefore, to sum up, Bhoja considers the speciality about Poetry as a शोभा, which is due to Sāhitya; this Sāhitya is Alanākāra, analysable into Rasa, Gunja and Alanākāra. This is a solution which is really an arrangement or an adjustment of the various items, a synthetic or eclectic theory.

Bahurūpamīśra is a very late commentator on the Daśarūpakaka and his work deserves notice here as one of those which follow Bhoja’s theory of Sāhitya. Bahurūpamīśra drew upon Sāradātanaya and he had direct access to Bhoja’s Śr. Pra. also. In his commentary on the D. R., the MS. of which is available in the Madras Govt. Oriental MSS. Library, he quotes Bhoja and his Śr. Pra. often. In the commentary on the fourth chapter of the D.R. dealing with Rasa, he gives us the concept of Sāhitya as expounded by Bhoja and as reproduced by Sāradātanaya in his Bhā Pra. He says:

नन्तु रसस्य स्थायिनो वा काल्पनिक कः संबन्धः। वै वाक्यार्थः स्थायः। उच्चयते: साहित्यम्। XXX व्रतादस्योऽविभाज्यः हि समाचारस्थिरः साहि साहित्यसुविभाज्यः। चतुर्भिन्वितार्थः संबन्धः। त्रिनिष्ठाः प्राप्तिः। स तु कृतिविविक्तात्तत्त्वशैवविभागम् (स्थायिता) सामान्यतया कार्यावली व: (व्यक्तिक विन्यासाद्वादि अवलोकनं) रसायनम् इति।—p. 73, Mad. MS. R. 4188.

Bahurūpā explains each with definition and illustration and most of the illustrative verses are those found in the Śr. Pra. This portion of his work is a clear summary of Bhoja’s vast treatment of Sāhitya in nine chapters. Both Sāradātanaya and Bahurūpā made a slight emendation and gave Bhoja’s first item called Abhidhā as Vyṛtti. As we shall notice presently, the Sāhitya-mimāṃsā also adopts the name Vyṛtti and thereby, confusion is removed; for Abhidhā, which Bhoja gives as a general name for the three Vyṛtis of Mukhyā, Gauṇī and Lakṣanā, is generally used only to denote the first, namely Mukhyā.

The Sāhitya-mimāṃsā on Sāhitya:

There is a MS. of a work called Sahitya-mimāṃsā (henceforth written as S.M.) in the Tanjore Library, a copy of which has been secured for the Madras MSS. Library. The work is short and incomplete, in Kārikās and Vyṛtti. A copy of the work is available in the Curator’s Library at Trivandrum and the work has now been edited in the most careless manner as no. 114 of the Trivandrum Sanskrit Series. The following account of Sāhitya according to the S.M. is based in the Tanjore MS. and its Madras copy.

The work S.M. may strike one, as it has struck the Editor of this work in the T.S.S., as the same mentioned in the Alankāra-sarasvatya and the commentary on the Vyakti viveka. We know of a S.M. by Viriṇca misra, fifth ancestor of Lolla Lakshmīdhara (end of the 15th and the first half of the 16th cent.), mentioned in the long colophon at the end of Lakshmīdhara’s

1. See JOR, Madras, VIII, pp. 321-334, my article on Bahurūpamīśra’s Daśarūpakavīkhyā.
Saundaryalahari vyākhyā, Mysore Edn.) A S. M. is quoted by Rājacūḍāmani in his Kavya-darpana. This MS. of S.M. does not bear the name of either Ruṣyaka or Maṅkhuka. What is plain is that the work is later than Bhoja, Kuntaka and Kṣemendra. The work as its name shows, discusses regularly, for the first time in the history of Sanskrit Poetics, as far as we know now, the subject under the name Sāhitya. The work states its scheme thus: it treats of Sāhitya and Pariśkāra; i.e., of the (four and four) eight relations of Vṛtti, Vivakṣa, Tātparya, Pravīhbāga; and Vyapēkṣa, Sāmarthya, Anvaya and Ekārthibhāva; and then the Pariśkāra, consisting of the last four items of Bhoja, namely, Doṣahāna, Guṇādāna, Alarīṅkāra-yoga and Rasa-aviyoga. Next the work speaks of different kinds of poets and different kinds of Rasikas but our interest at present is in the discussion on the term Sāhitya. The author of the work is not only well acquainted with Bhoja’s Śr. Pra. and Bhoja’s method of treating Poetics, but reproduces also long passages from the Śr. Pra. The S.M. accepts Bhoja’s conception of Sāhitya as the sum-total of the general relations between Śabda and Artha from Vṛtti to Ekārthibhāva coming under two heads of four,—four Kevala and four Sapeaker Śabda-sambandha-saktis. There is, however, this definite difference that this S.M. makes. It restricts the name Sāhitya to the first eight items of Bhoja and calls the rest, Doṣahāna etc., by a new name Sāhitya Pariśkāra or Sab-dārtha Pariśkāra or Prasādhana (polish or refinement).

The work says:

Sāhityāṃ सपरिपत्ते कक्षिन वर्तात्विनिमयम् ।
भावनम् रक्षिते नोके मुखान्तस्य सूत्रेऽवृत्त्वि ॥
हस्तादिद्रुत्साह साहित्योऽकविः। साहित्यसंबंधात् तत्त्वम् (तत्त्वरि )कृत्तिः ।
शाक्तिधारयोऽपिताभविनिमयः। कविविश्वास्य प्रसाधनः ॥

* * *

अधीं श्रुताश्वस्त्र साहित्यार्थार्थ परिनविनिमयः ॥


The ‘Vṛttyādi Aṣṭa’ consisting of the four Kevala and the four Sāpeaker Śabda saktis constitute Sāhitya in the opinion of this S.M. It again says so:

एवं समधिर्ग्रमः (श्र) नां Sāhityamiti निर्णयः। —p. 5. T.S.S. Edn., (p. 11)

The MS. briefly explains these eight, following Bhoja, but with some slight difference. Dhvani is not mentioned under Tātparya as is done by Bhoja and the work follows the Daśarūpaka and holds Rasa as the Vākyārtha and the Tātparya.

वाक्यार्थ गर्भः: शब्दः स बालायत्र इति स्वतः ।
एवं रसस्य प्रस्तुति परश्चर्च साहित्यायतः ॥ —p. 3. (T.S.S. Edn. p.7).

It is on the basis of this Tātparya and Vākyārtha view of Rasa that we have to doubt strongly that this S.M. is different from that believed to be

1. The work reproduces from all these three authors. If only this fact had been realised by the editor, the work would have been edited better.
written by Ruyyaka or Maṅkhuka, both of whom are staunch Kashmirian followers of Ānanda's theory of Dhvani.

To return to this S.M.'s view of Sāhitya, it is after word and meaning are united through these eight relations, that the poet handles them and now begins the fact of Poetry by virtue of the poet refining this 'Word-Idea', Sabdārtha, having Sāhitya.

This Parīśkāra or refinement is all the activity of the poet. It is of four kinds: Doṣahāna, Guṇa-Ādāna, Alamkāra yoga and Rasa-aviyoga. This, the work says, comes in due course.

Therefore, Sāhitya according to this work is not the art of Poetry but only language and linguistic expression; it is not the poetic qualities that characterise Poetry and its words and ideas but is only the inevitable general relations, syntactic etc., between word and meaning.

The Vṛtti more clearly says that Sāhitya means only the eight relations of Vṛtti etc., and that Doṣahāna etc., are excluded. We have here the concept of Sāhitya again sinking back into its original grammatical meaning. The text of the Vṛtti runs thus:

"Brātiṣṭhātād: sāhātyānārthe dūpahānugamālīkharasambvānasthā vahāvāve vahētvukmuah."

This however is not Bhoja's view. As Ratnēśvara explains the second verse of the S.K.Ā., and as Kuntaka would take it, Sāhitya is really Poetry and the poetic relation between Sabda and Artha, the Parīśkāra as this S.M. calls it. This consists of the four qualities, Doṣahāna etc., which alone Bhoja deals with in his smaller and earlier work, the S.K.Ā. In the Śr. Pra. however, which is a larger work with a greater scope, grammatical relations in

addition to the poetic, are included and thus Sāhitya is made to mean not only the four-fold poetic relation but also the eight-fold grammatical relation. It was also pointed out above that in an opening passage at the beginning of chapter i of the Śr. Pra., Bhoja describes Kāvya as the Sāhitya between Sabda and Artha and not exactly all kinds of expression in language. In that case, Bhoja would seem to agree with Ratnesvara and hold only Doṣahāna etc., as Sāhitya. Again it was pointed out before that the third view, now found to be held by the S. M. that the ‘Vṛttyādi Aṣṭa’ alone form Sāhitya and that Doṣahāna etc., represent a separate department, is also warranted by one sentence of Bhoja at the beginning of chapter ix.

“तत्र अभिवावकाव्यादिम्: निहिलित शब्दावधयो: साहित्ये, बावक्यस्य प्रायोगयोग्यता प्रायोगानहं- 
ता उ निधीयते। यदाह—‘एक्षालयः: सम्प्रभुत्वम्: स्वमें वेयौः कामवृत्त महति।’ दुःखतुः: सुनार- 
मीयक संपत्तवे। सम्प्रभुत्वमवास्य तात्रोपसते यदा दौष्ट्यहाम्। शृणुपराधम्। अवदक्षारोम्। 
रसाविवेर्म निःक:’” —Śr. Pra. Ch. 9, Mad. MS. Vol. II, p. 144.

It is from this passage that the S.M. must have taken its inspiration. The phrases of Bhoja, Prayoga-yogatā, Prayoga-arhatā and Samyak-prayoga which are to be secured by the four means of Doṣahāna etc., exactly correspond to the S.M.’s Pariśkāra or refinement of the language that has already come into being with the eight-fold Sāhitya.

The S.M. then reviews another view of Sāhitya.

शब्दावधयो: सहस्थवात साहित्यमपरे जयु: ।
श्रीयो (नवयो:) परमरस्तवाये: (धर्मो) दुर्फ्यो: काव्यसंज्ञितम् ॥
साहित्याम्बयो: श्रीभावाविद्या प्रति काव्यसी ।
अनुवादकालिकाध्यायेण हृदर्द्धस्वतिः: ॥


This represents the view of Kuntaka, the author of the Vakroktijīvita. The S.M. clubs together the Kārikas of the V.J. with the Saṅgraha and the Antara Ślokas in the Vṛtti of the V.J. The work quotes the two sets of Antara Ślokas of Kuntaka found on pp. 28-29 of the V.J. Of these two only the first set of three verses on p. 28 are on Sāhitya and the other set of four verses on p. 29 are on Vakrokti. But the S.M. puts the two sets together and takes the description of Vakrokti also as one of Sāhitya. It concludes its review with the remark that this view does not differ from that first described, i.e., the slightly modified view of Bhoja.

“एतत्तमतमपि ग्राहोऽपि मतसम्मालनातुते ।
अभेदं: स्वयम् तत्र किन्नू साहित्यान्तरयो:।
एतत्तमतमपि अस्तस्मात्मेव आप्रति: इदमतत्ममपि [S] परिकारं (रो:) साहित्याम्बये: (स्यामिति) तेनां महम् । बयू हि शब्दावधयो: समसिद्धाग्राहो: मिनमात्रस्युरे स्वम्य साहित्यम्। ततु 
शाल्कायानाविश्वायारणम्। अन्यद्व यत् परिकारविचित्रं ततु काव्यमिति मन्यामहेऽ ।’

(T.S.S. Edn. p. 15.)
The difference also has been stated by the work. According to Kuntaka Sāhitya is Kāvyya, the embellished or refined Śabdārtha, the Pariśkāra only. But the S.M. says that Sāhitya is not Poetry; it is a grammatical fact, common to all utterances, of Poetry, of Śastra and of Ākhyāna; it is the grammatical relations, Vṛtti etc., which all linguistic expression inevitably means. What brings in Poetry after the coming into existence of language and Sāhitya is Pariśkāra. This view of the S.M. is a degradation of the idea of Sāhitya and a sinking back of the concept to its original meaning. With Kuntaka’s view agrees Bhoja’s view implicitly expressed in the S.KĀ., i., 2., and expounded by Ratnesvara. It is only in the Śr. Pra. that the concept of Sāhitya is expanded to embrace also the grammatical and the logical relations between word and idea. This itself seems to be a degradation of the poetic concept of Sāhitya but the S.M. has dragged it down further by separating the grammatical and the poetical relations, by conferring the name Sāhitya on the former only and by creating the new name of Pariśkāra for the latter.

The reason why Bhoja considered Sāhitya as literature in general besides Poetry and as the general and the inevitable relations also, besides the four poetic relations, is Bhoja’s great love for the Vyākaraṇa Śastra which is in evidence all through this big work of Śr. Pra. It is no surprise that in many places in Bhoja, there is more grammar than real Poetics. The fact can be realised by a comparative study of the conception of Sāhitya according to Bhoja and Kuntaka and the difference can be seen to be immense. Even while beginning the poetic part of Sāhitya in chapter ix, Bhoja does not say ‘beautiful expression’ but only ‘good and correct expression’—Samyak prayoga, Prayoga yogyata, Prayoga arhatat. And here, Bhoja quotes the text which refers to the Apūrva resulting from the grammatically pure expression, a text quoted in the Vyākaraṇa Śastra—एकः शब्दः सम्प्रस्तुः प्रतिकः: etc. This makes all the difference; it shows how again and again it is grammar that is Bhoja’s fascination. In this connection even the author of the S.M. is more imaginative and poetic. To give Vedic prāmāṇya for Poetry, he quotes the beautiful text भ्रमया लक्ष्मीनिधित्वाभिबाचि which Bhavabhūti has adopted into a verse of his in his Uttarārāmacarita. (IV. 18) The S.M. says:

‘तदैव काय्यार्थभावनाय रेण [स्य] निरतिश्यामनमव्यास्य कविवचनाय भ्रमया लक्ष्म्या निधानस्य न अवणात कविकाव्यस्य: महतः, रसिकम्य न प्रयोजनं शृंगितसद्भेवेति सर्व समस्तसम।’ —pp. 49 and 50, Mad. MS. (T.S.S. Edn., p. 161).

Thus to sum up:

(1) Sāhitya rose as a grammatical concept denoting the eternal and well-known united character of Śabda and Artha, comprehending the general Sambandhas of Vṛtti etc., between the two.
(2) As far as Poetry is concerned it seems to have emphasised on Bhā-
maha’s observation शब्दार्थ साहित्य काव्यम् that neither Sabda alone nor Artha alone is Poetry but both together are Poetry. There is no question of su-
periority, as between the two. Māgha and Kuntaka are clear on this point.

(3) The third stage is represented by Bhoja’s view according to which
the grammatical or ordinary Sāhitya between Sabda and Artha has expanded
to embrace the poetic qualities in the relation of the two in Poetry. Bhoja
fully expounds this view, taking Sāhitya to mean ordinary expression as well
as poetic expression, ordinary Sabdārtha sambandha as well as the peculiar
poetic Sabdārtha sambandha.

(4) Kuntaka can be said to represent the fourth stage. Even very
much earlier than Bhoja, the name Sāhitya had come to mean Poetry and
Poetics, e.g., in Rājaśekhara’s K.M. Kuntaka recognises that Sāhitya surely
means, primarily, only the ordinary relation of Sabda and Artha as Vācaka
and Vācya but he says that the word in Poetics is restricted to the poetic re-
lation, Viśīṣṭa Sāhitya, which is the same Vācya Vācaka sambandha made
finer. Sāhitya is considered at this stage as above Pada-vākyya-pramāṇa and
only as a poetic concept. This view of Kuntaka we shall presently examine
in detail.

(5) The next stage it is that the anonymous S.M. represents. It is the
direct opposite of Kuntaka’s view and between its view and that of Kuntaka
stands that of Bhoja embracing both. The S.M.’s Sāhitya is a return to that
of stage No. 1, where it is a purely grammatical concept meaning the šabda
śaktis etc. Poetry and poetic relations between Sabda and Artha fall out of
its scope and come under the separate head named Pariśkāra.

Kuntaka on Sāhitya:

The eleventh century was a favourable time for the concept of Sāhitya.
Ideas are in the air and at a certain time they seem to descend on our earth
and reveal themselves for the good of humanity through certain chosen
persons. It happens often that laws and discoveries in all departments of
knowledge have their destined time when they come to light and more than
one ‘Seer’ sees those truths. So it is that many discoveries, though going in
the name of one noteworthy personality, are really found out to have been
at the same time or a little earlier or later revealed to certain others also. The
same is the case with Ideas. When Bhoja was defining the concept of Sāhitya,
Kuntaka was doing the same thing in Kashmir. Kuntaka is a great
name in Sanskrit Poetics. Besides his new doctrine of Vakrokti, there are
many other points on which his genius made special and valuable contribu-
tion. One such point is Sāhitya.

Like Bhoja, Kuntaka is a follower of the ancients whom he re-inter-
prets. Like Bhoja, Kuntaka starts with Bhāmaha’s definition of Poetry—
Sabdārthau sāhitau kāvyam—and accepts it by adding it to his own Vak-
rokti. He says that both word and sense together, having Sāhitya, are Kāvyā, when set in Vakrokti.

शब्दार्थीं सहिती बक्कबिब्यापरशालिनि।
कन्ये व्यवस्थिताय करायं तत्तत्वादादकारणि॥ V. J., p. 7.

Thus, language or word and sense become Poetry by virtue of what we might call a Guṇa called Sāhitya and an Alamkāra called Vakrokti, both the words Guṇa and Alamkāra being used here in a large sense. This Sāhitya is the prime requisite. It is only Kuntaka who has given us a full and significant exposition of the concept of Sāhitya. He himself says that though people have been using the word Sāhitya for a long time, no writer ever systematically thought out its full significance and expounded it in any treatise. Kuntaka rightly takes credit for having done this work.

“यदवद्वा साहित्यं नाम, तदेदतावलित निरसीमिति समायचनि साहित्यार्धमर्मेन प्रसिद्धम्।
न पुणर्तस्य विकन्द्रकौशलाल्पसंदर्भस्य अद्वापित कविनिधि विपविद्र, अयस्मय परमार्थ श्रेयं
मनाहुमांगमर्मः विवाचूपप्रस्तावीः। तदयु सर्गविवर्णाविन्दमकरनदिवनिहदद्वशुद्धराणि सत्कार-
विवर्णसामन्तरामौद्विहर्तलेन परस्परंदेवताः सहवधर्मप्रचरणोपयोजताः हीतात्॥"

Sāhitya literally means the relation between word and sense. ‘सहितवयो-
मूलः साहित्यम्।’ Kuntaka, p. 27. ‘सहितवयो सहितमात्र सहितन्याम अवस्थितिः,’ Ibid., p. 10.

This relation is eternal and there is no language without it, i.e., without the word and sense being united together as the expressing and the expressed (Vācaka and Vācya). This Vācyavācaka sambandha comprehends the consideration of the structure and varieties of the Vācaka, the Pada, of the syntactic import of a succession of words in a Vācya and of the logicality of the idea, i.e., Pada, Vākya and Pramāṇa. These are present in all kinds of expression and form the original meaning of Sāhitya.

शब्दार्थीं सहितावलित प्रत्याय स्कृतः सदा।
सहितावलित तवेव किमपूर्णं विश्विते॥

This original Sāhitya which is जिसमेंजोगजियारंसंगीत्य becomes Sāhitya of a superior kind by the operation of the poet’s genius or Kavi-vyāpāra. It is this superior Sāhitya that is discussed in Poetics. It is the magical quality pertaining to the words and ideas coming from a poet which makes ordinary utterance with Pada, Vākya and Pramāṇa into Poetry. It is not present in either Śāstra or the ordinary utterances of the world but is seen in Poetry only. It is Pada-vākya-pramāṇa-atirikta. It is not the Śāmāṇya but is the Viśistā Sāhitya.

“नमु न वाचवाचकसंबंधस्य विचारानत्वः, अतयोः न कथविद्वित साहित्यविरहः, सत्यमेतः
किन्तु विशेषभेजनि साहित्यमिल्ललम्।” V. J. p. 10.

Kuntaka defines this Sāhitya as the quality of Śabda and Artha vying with each other in the suggestion of Rasa, or, to put it generally in enhancing the beauty of Poetry. He gives this Sāhitya as applying to all the ele-
ments in Poetry; it is something like Aucitya. First of all kinds of Sāhitya comes the Sāhitya of Sabda and Artha, their mutual commensurateness.

There must be beautiful expression as well as beautiful idea. The question of whether form or content is important in Poetry does not arise. Mere idea or emotion is the subject of psychology. As long as Poetry is expression, the form is unquestionably important. It has to contain also an Artha that is equally charming. This is the first kind of Sāhitya of Kuntaka. He takes Sabda as a whole meaning expression and Artha as a whole meaning the sense. He examines some verses and points out the presence or absence of this commensurateness between the expression and the expressed. Inadequate expression and expression devoid of idea are both bad. Beautiful expression without beautiful idea and a beautiful idea not couched in an equally beautiful expression are both bad. The fault on the one side affects the other also.

Idea insufficiently expressed is 'dead' and expression without idea or expressing something other than the intended idea is 'disease'—Mṛtakalpa and Vyādhibhūta. Thus, the first Sāhitya is the complete harmony and commensurateness between expression and expressed, form and content.

The second Sāhitya is that between one word and another in the expression and between one idea and another in the expressed.

The first Sāhitya takes Sabda and Artha as a whole meaning expression and expressed while the second Sāhitya emphasises that in the expression itself the several units, namely the Padas, must have mutual Sāhitya and that similarly, the various Artha-units, in the expressed. This Sāhitya is defined at length in Kārikas 16-17 and the Vyṛtti thereon.

The first and the second Sāhitya are always together.
Word and sense must be so set that neither of them is dull; they are to be of the same power; they are to be so set that they mutually vie in enhancing the beauty of the poem. The expression and the expressed are to be neither more nor less than the other but must be most precise and equally powerful. In the matter of promoting the Rasa and the Camatkāra of the Sahārya each should emulate the other. This is the first Śāhitya. Similarly one word should vie with another and one idea with another. This is what Kuntaka means by defining Śāhitya as Parāspara-sparāhā of Sabda and Artha. He compares the sympathetic co-operation between the two to the understanding between two friends—सुझुहदविव सङ्गती।

Similarly, Kuntaka speaks of this Śāhitya with reference to other elements in expression like Marga or Riti, Vyrtti, Guṇa, Alarikāra and Vakratā in general. Every part or aspect of expression has to vie with the other towards enhancing the beauty of the poem.

तत्र वाचनम् वाचकान्तेन वाच्यम् वाच्यान्तरणं साहित्यभिप्रेतम्, वाच्यम् काव्य-सङ्कः परस्पर-सङ्कः परस्परवादित्वतः प्रतिविषयकथाम्।"  

V. J. p. 27.
Thus Kuntaka’s conception of Sāhitya in general is that the expression (Vācaka śabda) and the expressed (Vācyā artha), as also the several units in either part of Poetry, must be set in a glorious race, competing with each other in making the poem beautiful. This notion of Sāhitya has to base itself on the beauty of the poem or the relish of the Sahṝdaya as the test, according to Kuntaka. In this respect the concept means the appropriateness and power of the Vācyavācaka in suggesting the Rasa. For, Rasa, Kuntaka accepts as supreme. Therefore, this conception of Sāhitya generally likens it to the other concept of Aucitya which also figures very much in Kuntaka. Criticising the introduction of Sabdālankāras with special effort, Kuntaka says that this would result in the loss of Aucitya and through that would mean an over-emphasis on Sabda-saundarya and a loss of Sāhitya.

“स्म्यसाहित्यसंस्कृतविभागः। वाच्चवाचकायेः। परस्परविचित्रशाहित्यनिर्मिति।” V. J. II. p. 84.

Kuntaka has thus brilliantly expounded the concept of Sāhitya as a great principle in Poetry, as the greatest perfection in expression a poet should attain, namely, the harmony between the expression and the expressed. When Rājasēkhara slightly explained Sāhitya as the proper equipoise between Sabda and Artha—“दद्यपन्धृतत्त्वाभवेन बिष्मा साहिहित्यिणा”—p. 5, we must understand him as having had in his mind ideas similar to what Kuntaka has expressed. The word Sāhitya is derived from Sahita, united. Another explanation can be given bringing out this same significance, namely, the equipoise between Sabda and Artha, the harmony of Kuntaka. The word Sahita contains the affix ‘Sa’ standing to denote ‘Samam’ (समम्) ‘equally’ —and the main word is the past passive participle of ‘Dhā’, to put, place or set. Thus ‘Sahita’ means equipoised word and idea.¹

A comparison of Kuntaka’s exposition of Sāhitya with that of Bhoja reveals interesting points. Firstly, Bhoja and Kuntaka start with the same definition of Bhāmaha शाहित्यविभागः वेक्कल्। The difference is, Kuntaka emphasises by Sāhitya, a quality of Sabda and Artha resembling Aucitya. Besides that, Kuntaka mentions Rasa, Dhvani, Mārga, and above all Vakrokti. That is, Kuntaka adds to Bhāmaha’s definition of Poetry (that Sabda and Artha united, are Kāvyā), the Vakrokti in which the Sabda and Artha having Sāhitya, must be set. वक्रकल्पविभागवर्तकतिः। सन्ये व्यस्तितिः। V. J. I. 7.

Thus, though all the varieties of Vakrokti also as forming aspects of expression have to observe Sāhitya, they are not included in Sāhitya. Therefore

1. The author of the Sanskrit introduction to the Nirmaya Sāgar Edn. of the Sāhitya Darpaṇa suggests another derivation for the word Sāhitya. He says that the ‘Sahabhāva’ means that Poetry has in it all the eighteen Vidyāsthamā. And he quotes the verse of Bharata and Bhāmaha containing that idea—Na sa śabdō na tad vācyam etc.
there are two ideas, Sāhitya and Vakrokti, in Kuntaka’s definition of Poetry. Bhoja’s conception of Sāhitya differs in being very wide. It means Poetry as a whole in Bhoja, whereas it is a supreme quality of Poetry that has to be present along with Vakrokti according to Kuntaka. Bhoja’s Sāhitya means all the manifold activities of the poet’s genius, namely elimination of flaws, style and its qualities, figures and diction, and finally making every point of expression the embodiment of Rasa. That is, Bhoja’s Sāhitya comprehends not only the whole of Kuntaka’s Vakrokti also, but every other thing in Poetry. Beyond Sabda and Artha, the only other fact in Poetry is Sāhitya and under it comes everything else. In another way also Bhoja’s Sāhitya is very much wider than that of Kuntaka. For, Sāhitya means all literature and all kinds of Sabdārtha-sambandhas to Bhoja, while to Kuntaka, it means Poetry and a poetic relation only, though he also recognises that ordinarily Sāhitya refers to the Sambandha between Sabda and Artha in general as Vācaka and Vācya. Only, Kuntaka leaves out the consideration of language itself and its inevitable Sabdārtha-sambandhas related to Pada, Vākya and Pramāṇa, and treats only of the poetic Sambandha above all these. Just as Poetry is finer speech, Sāhitya is the finer Sambandha between Sabda and Artha. Rājaśekhara calls Sāhitya or Poetry as the finest essence of all the four Vidyās—Sa hī चतुर्मणिसाधनिविवेयां निवेयम्: (p. 4) even as Wordsworth says that Poetry is the breath and finer spirit of all knowledge. We can say with reference to Sāhitya here, making a slight change, that Poetry is the breath and finer spirit of language.

It is not the concept of Sāhitya in Bhoja that has any exact correspondence to Kuntaka’s Sāhitya. It is interesting to note that almost the same idea contained in Kuntaka’s Sāhitya, is found in Bhoja’s Guṇa called Sammitatva. याबद्धसिद्धम्: च समितितलम्: ! S. K. A I. 74.

It is the avoidance of verbiage or ‘over-expression’; it is the use of words enough for the idea on hand. Bhoja further explains this Sabda-sammitatva as the quality of Sabda and Artha being as if held in a balance.

अन्तः अधेष्ठय पदानं च तुवाकियतवत् तुव्यत्वेन समितितलम्: ! S. K. Æ. p. 58.

This is what Kuntaka means by his Sāhitya which he describes as Anyān- anatiriktatva of word and idea being neither more nor less than each other. Sammita means well-adjusted or harmonised utterance. The above-given definition is of the sabda guṇa, Sammitatva, and Bhoja has the same Guṇa for Artha also. The difference between the two is that in the former the poet weights the adequacy of expression from the point of view of Artha and in the latter, vice versa.

शादात्मः ग्रतः सतः समितितलं त्रुव्यते : ! S. K. A. I. 86.

Ratnesvara comments on this:

‘अन्तः अधेष्ठय तुवाकियतवत्, प्रतितिनिवेशः समितितलमिति : अर्थमृदिभिः शब्दतुलनं कायमाव- ब्रिज शल्यः, शादस्यविशिष्ठ त्यछतुलनम्यावादः ’ ! S. K. Æ. p. 71.
All qualities of precision, powerfulness, clarity, and such others are comprehended in this weighing of word with idea. Its breach brings in a train of flaws—verbiage or Vṛthā pallava, Apuṣṭārtha, Neyārtha, the Avakara of Mahima Bhaṭṭa and so on. When we have too much of words we have Avakara, Pādapūrana, Aprayojaka, etc. When we have inadequate expression we have the Doṣa, Neyārtha, by which Prasāda and Arthavyakti are lost. This is perhaps the greatest quality of poetic expression, the peak of perfection of poetic art as Kuntaka says—

> कवित्वमेवौप्रधानमानामः।

This quality is variously called, descriptively and metaphorically. Kuntaka calls it Sāhitya, Anyūna-anatiriktatva or Paraspara-spardhā between Sabda and Artha. The Sabda and Artha having this quality are compared by him to two friends united in some glorious task. Parāśara Bhaṭṭa calls them ‘brothers’ with the best Sauhhrātra feeling. Bhoja calls the same as Sabdārtha-sammitatva and gives the imagery of the poet weighing Sabda and Artha in the scales of a balance. A greater comparison comes from Kālidāsa himself, who gives the simile of the ideal prime divine couple Pārvati and Paramēśvara, the prototype of Man and Woman, in Raghuvanṣa, I. 1. The Sāhitya or Samparka between Sabda (Vāk) and Artha is compared by Kālidāsa to that between Pārvatī and Paramēśvara or to the ideal Sāhitya laid down by the Smṛtis between wife and husband. There is no question of inferiority or superiority between the two. Their marriage is sacred and they enter the holy union for the service performed together to Dharma to which they are both and equally subordinate. Rasa or ‘beauty’ of Kāvyā can be likened to that Dharma and Sabda and Artha to the married couple. It is not likely that the great poet wrote the above verse merely to mean by Vāg-artha samparka the well-known and eternal Sabdārtha sambandha. He might have meant it also; but he powerfully suggests here the Viśiṣṭa Sāhitya or the Viśiṣṭa sambandha. Similarly there is no ‘Sarasya’ or credit to the great poet to say that by ‘Vāgartha pratipatti,’ Kālidāsa prayed for the attainment of proficiency in lexicography, in words and meanings. The compound is often explained by Mm. Professor Kuppuswami Sastri as meaning the same as Kuntaka’s Sāhitya or Spardhā between Vāk and Artha or the understanding between the two.

> बागवयोऽप्रज्ञाविवादः।

It is for this great quality of Poetry that Kālidāsa prays for. He describes it with the simile of the prime divine couple, Ardhanārīśvara, as Sabda and Artha fused together or wedded in perfect sympathy and harmony. It is this same Sāhitya that Wilfred MEYNELL speaks of in the same conjugal metaphor, in his biographical note attached to a selection of the poems of Francis THOMPSON. He says (of the particular poem, “Sister Songs”): “Sister Songs is a poem to be read aloud; for sound and sense herein celebrate their divine nuptials.” The same is conveyed by Kālidāsa’s comparison of Poetry to Ardhanārīśvara. Vidyādhara describes the Šabda and Artha in Poetry in the same metaphor:

> बन्धुमालयांसूकः—

>्श्रेष्ठालंकाराभिषेकः—

> Ekāvali.
The goddess Pārvatī is Vāk or Sabda; god Paramesvara is Artha;¹ their union as Ardhanārīśvara signifies the greatest ideal of Poetry variously emphasised as Sāhitya, Sammitatva etc., by the above-noticed writers, and by Nilakantha Dikṣita, by the following verse:

सत्यं वपूः शन्त्रमयं पुरारे-
रचालकं दृश्यमापमन्नित्।
अहं जगमहतदेश्यरे तद्,
अहैऽन्त्र क्राभ्यं कश्मलपुण्यः॥

Sivalilārṇava i. 15.

and which Kālidāsa kept before him when he wrote his immortal poetry.

वाग्यभाविका संपृक्तः
वाग्यभावप्रतित्वये।
जगत: पितारी बन्दे
पर्येन्दीप्रस्थिर॥²

---

1. "अर्थः शंखुः चित्रा बाणोऽदति विज्ञपुराणम्" quoted by Viśveśvara in the Kavin-

2. Kālidāsa is charmed with this idea. He says in his Kumāra sambhava, VI. 79. तमयमिव मारत्या मुत्या योक्तुमहैवि, and Mm. Prof. S. Kuppuswamy Sastri loves to dwell on this passage and to speak of the birth of रस-विकट as a result of the union of शन्त्र-पावली and अर्थ-परस्मयं. Since Rasa is अर्थावत् the poem, K.S., stops with the marriage of शन्त्र and अर्थ, leaving रस-विकट's birth as a matter of course to be suggested.
CHAPTER IX

UKTI

‘उक्तिविशेषः काव्यम्’

Rājaśekhara, Karpūramañjari, Prologue.

Very intimately related to Bhoja’s Alarnkāra-synthesis is another synthesis of Bhoja which can be called the Ukti-synthesis. Besides the systems of Sāhitya and Alarnkāra, there is also a system of Ukti in Bhoja’s Sr. Pra. The history of this concept of Ukti is a very interesting study.

Ukti can be translated as poetic expression or poetic speech as distinguished from expression or speech, either of the ordinary work-a-day life or of the scientific laboratory, the scholastic class room and the philosophical text book. As we say in the Doṣa-prakaraṇa that poetic words are to be neither Grāmya or Loka-mātra-prayuktā, ordinary, vulgar, colourless words of our daily routine life, nor Apratīta or Śāstra-mātra-prayuktā, technical and pedantic, so also we can say of poetic expression as a whole that it is in that place which is too sanctified for either the Grāmya and the Pāmara or the pure pandit and pedant. It is the very essence of speech, language beautified, a high-power communication. That poetic expression possesses this peculiar beauty or power not found in ordinary talk or writing, scientific treatises or mere historical documents can be seen by every person. That this beauty and power pertain to the method of expression can also be seen easily; for, poetic expression or the poetic form depends upon how a thing is said and not upon what is said. The emphasis on what is said is in ordinary talk where we are careless regarding the manner of saying, as also in mere narration of story or history, and in mere recording of scientific or philosophical truths. The same is the case with Law also where again the emphasis is not on how beautifully the thing is expressed. In the history of Sanskrit Poetics it was given to the great critic, Bhaṭṭa Nāyaka to enquire into this subject and formulate the following as the difference between Poetry on the one hand and Śāstra and Ākhyāna (Veda and Narration) on the other.

शाब्द्यप्राचारायणमाधिमयः तत्र शाब्दः पद्धविरुङ्खः।
अथेव तत्त्वेऽव युक्ते तु वदन्व्यासान्मेतयोः।
हयथेषुण्डे व्याप्यप्राचारायणवे काव्यामीग्नेत्॥

Bhaṭṭa Nāyaka.

1. I have discussed this aspect of the question in relation to what the Western writers like ABERCROMBIE have to say on the difference between poetic and other expression in a separate paper on a comparative study of the Sanskrit Alarnkāra Śāstra and Western Literary Criticism. Here I deal only with the ideals of the Sanskrit writers on this subject.
The Veda is śabda pradhāna; the Purāṇa, Artha pradhāna; Kāvyya or poetry makes both Śabda and Artha apradhāna, unimportant, and makes Vyāpāra, the most important. The Vyāpāra of Bhaṭṭa Nāyaka is the poet’s peculiarly beautiful expression, embellished with Guṇa and Alamkāra, capable of becoming universalised and producing delight to the reader, i.e., Abhidhā, Bhāvakatva and Bhojakatva.

“भावकऽमपं समुचितगुणाल्पकान्तरामहास्तमभिरेव वितव वस्यं।”

_Locana_, p. 70.

This beauty of form or the peculiar grace in poetic expression can be called the characteristic poetic Abhidhā vyāpāra, using Abhidhā here in a wide sense. While commenting on the section on the Lakṣaṇas in Bharata, Abhinavagupta quotes in his _Abhī_. Bhā. the above-quoted lines of Bhaṭṭa Nāyaka and equates the idea contained therein with Bhāmaha’s conception of Vakrokti. Abhinava also quotes here Bhāmaha—_Sāśā sārvaiva vakroktīḥ_ etc. Bhaṭṭa Nāyaka distinguished Poetry from Veda whose words cannot be changed at all; and from Akhyāna, story or semi-historic narration in which the story or the events (Artha) alone count. But in Poetry one looks to the beautiful way in which a story is told and the words are used. The ‘beautiful way of expression’ is the thing. As mere expression it has to interest us. In all other expressions related to our daily life, scientific literature etc., we are interested more in the Artha. The Artha is the ‘Tattva’ in those cases; in poetry, the manner in which the poet has said those things is the ‘Tattva’. It is only an inelegant way of saying this that is contained in the following given as Udbhaṭa’s observation in the _Kāvyamimāṁsā_ of Rājaśekhara:

“अन्तू नाम निजसीता अर्धास्तयः। किन्नु द्रिस्य एवासः, विचारितथुसः, अविचारितरमणोयथः। तथोऽ पूर्ववाचितानि शामाणि, तदुपरं काव्यानि’ इत्यौऽदत्तः।”

_K. M._, p. 44.

The Vastu svarūpa is comparatively less important than the Bhaṅgi Bhāṇīti, the beautiful manner of poetic expression. Says Rājaśekhara’s wife, Avantisundari:

“बस्तकम्भावोदञ्च कविततन्त्रः सुगृहाङ्गावक्षवेशं काव्येः।
स्थायविवाहस्तम्भशुमिद्रं निर्मलेऽशोभकर्माः प्रकृतम्।”

and “‘विद्यर्मणिज्ञिज्ञिनिभो बस्तुनि रूपं न वियततस्माभवम्’ इति अबन्तिमहर्द्यः।”

_K. M._, p. 46.

The same idea is stressed by poet Nilakaṃṭha Dīkṣita in a verse in the first canto of his _Sivalīlārvavā mahākāvyā_:

बाणाव महाराजः वाणामालाबामः शामेव चार्यां वाणः वर्मुक्तिर्मामः।
तैरेव विद्याशिवोपस्यचेतः संमोहयन्ते काव्यो जनानि।”

_I. 13._

1. Is this from Bhāmaha Vivarṇa, on Bhāmaha, V, 33: ‘तत्र तोऽकाष्ठं काव्यामात्मा: तत्ववर्द्धिनः।’?
This Vinyāsa viśeṣa is the secret of Bhaṭṭa Nāyaka's Vyāpāra. It is what Bhāmaha calls Vakra-ukti and Rājaśekhara, Ukti.

To Rājaśekhara, I think, must go the credit of making important the word Ukti. We find in the list of Alamkāras given by Bhāmaha, Sāmāsa-Ukti, Atiśaya-Ukti, Svabhāva-Ukti, Viṣeṣa-Ukti and Saha-Ukti; and above all Vakra-Ukti. In all these we find the Viṣeṣya as Ukti qualified by different attributes. Here it is that the conception of Ukti was born. Ukti as such came to mean poetic utterance and soon there was felt to be no need to qualify Ukti by the attribute of Vakra to mean poetic expression as a whole. Rājaśekhara, while describing the Kāvyā Puruṣa, says that his speech is rich in Ukti: 

उक्तिकर्ता ते विषेशः। क. म. प. 6. All Alamkāras are Vakrokti to Bhāmaha but poetic expression itself is denoted by Ukti. What we have now as the Kāvyā-mimāṃsā is only the first chapter thereof named Kavirahasya. According to Rājaśekhara himself, his next chapter dealt with Ukti. उक्तिकर्ता उक्तिमयः। It is a pity that we have lost the bulk of Rājaśekhara's treatise. It must be in that chapter on Ukti that Rājaśekhara classified the various Uktis into which poetic expression could be brought. Classifying poets, he says on p. 27 (1. 5) that there is a class of poets called Ukti-Kavis and on p. 28 he illustrates his Ukti-Kavi thus:

उक्ति कर्ता—

'उदरमिद्रमन्यं मानिन्द्रायास्थवयं
स्तनललंगिरिणो दोषेतात्स्वेसीमः।
स्फुरित च वदनेऽत् हकुरणालीनिनेयः
तद्ध्व शुद्धिः कल्पनः केत्यो गौरवस्य॥'

This is an intensely animated description full of specially graceful expressions teeming with the Samādhī guṇa. This is Ukti in a restricted sense. Another instance of Ukti in a restricted sense is found in what Rājaśekhara calls Sāstra-Ukti—वेदन्य आदिनिर्मिति: (p. 3) regarding the verse द्रा सुप्तम् मयुः इत्या. In another context also Ukti in a restricted sense is mentioned by Rājaśekhara.

"वा शब्दयमानम्, अरेराध्यम्, अन्त्वक्तरतन्म, उक्तिमार्गम्, अन्वदिप तथाविषमविद्यं प्रतिभास्यन्ति, सा प्रतिभा।" p. 11, K. M.

From this restricted sense, the larger concept of Ukti developed even as the concept of Vakrokti. Ukti in a general sense emphasising the beauty peculiar to Poetry as distinguished from other writings is found used by Rājaśekhara himself in a verse in the Prologue to his Karpūramaṇjari.

अथविशेषः त एव शब्दस्त स्थ परिसमन्तोधि।
उक्तिविशेषः काव्यम् भाषा यथा भवेत ता भवतु॥

Neither is the idea (Artha) the point, nor the mere word (Śabda) but the manner of expressing that idea in words, Ukti-viśeṣa, is the thing which makes for Poetry. This verse and that of Nilakaṇṭha Dīkṣita quoted above correspond exactly. Abhinavagupta, while elucidating Bharata's concept of Laksana in his Abhi. Bhā. equates Bhāmaha's Vakrokti with Bhaṭṭa Nāyaka's Vyāpāra
and these with the concepts of Bandha, Gumpha, Bhanjiti, and lastly Lakṣaṇa. (See p. 65, Vol. VI, J.O.R. Madras, my article on Lakṣaṇa). To these concepts meaning the peculiar poet’s expression, the concept of Ukti gets equated.

The word Ukti occurs in Bhoja both as a Guṇa and as an Alanikāra. The Guṇa of Ukti has two varieties, one of the Sabda, the other of the Artha. The Sabdagaṇa Ukti is defined by Bhoja as a graceful turn of expression—Viśiṣṭa bhanjiti.

विशिष्टा भनितिया् स्वाद उक्ति तो कबयि बिहुँ। S. K. A. I. p. 60.

In his Vṛtti and comments on the verse illustrating this Sabda-Ukti Bhoja uses the phrase Ukti Bhaṅgi. One asks another about somebody’s welfare and instead of saying straight whether she is well or ill, the other person says ‘she lives’, and the whole verse delicately portrays the lady’s pitiable plight. That mode of expression powerfully suggests her suffering, describing her as simply living, Jīvita-mātra-śeṣā. This is the excellence of expression, Ukti guṇa, and it is a mode of expression as a whole, a mode that is characteristic of poetry as such. Not altogether different from this Sabda guṇa of Ukti is Bhoja’s Artha guṇa of that same name. The beauty is achieved more by words, comparatively speaking, in the Sabda guṇa whereas, in the Artha guṇa of Ukti, the idea is given in subtle turns and shades and is expressed or suggested by peculiarly graceful elaborations.

उक्तिनाम यदि स्वाधीन्य भय मूर्द्धिमिश्रिते।

अत्र अर्थात् स्नानकन्यकारारथसमय महया भणमुक्ति। S. K. A. I. p. 73.

Between Viśiṣṭa Bhanjiti or Ukti Bhaṅgi and Bhaṅgyā bhanjana, there is no fundamental difference. These two classes of Ukti are not mere Guṇas appearing in a part of a specific piece of poetry but constitute the distinguishing mark of poetic expression itself.

Besides these two kinds of Ukti of Sabda and of Artha, which is a Guṇa, Bhoja recognises a Sabda-Alarikāra called Ukti. It is defined in S.K.A. II, 42 (p. 146) and is held as the several kinds of expression named by Bhoja in the following manner:—Vidhi-Ukti, Nisedha-Ukti, Adhikāra-Ukti, Vikalpa-Ukti, Niyama-Ukti and Parisaṅkhya-Ukti. Under his Sabda-Alarikāra called Chāyā also Bhoja gives a set of Uktis: Loka-Ukti, Cheka-Ukti, Arbhaka-Ukti, Unmatta-Ukti, Poṭā-Ukti and Matta-Ukti. Keśava, in I. 2 of his Alanikāra-śekhara, makes Bhoja’s Chāyā his Ukti, and classifies this Ukti into the Uktis of Loka, Cheka, Arbhaka and Unmatta. This Ukti which Keśava derives from both the Sabdālārīkāras of Bhoja, Ukti and Chāyā, is constituted by Keśava as one of three ‘Bahiraṅgas’, external parts, of poetic expression. He says at the end of I. 2 that of this and of how these are to be related to Rasa, he has spoken at length in his other Alanikāra treatise named Alanikāra-sarvasava which unfortunately is not available to us now. Perhaps it is Rājaśekhara who described Ukti as a ‘Bahiraṅga’ along with Riti and Keśava might have followed him. It has been pointed out in the notes to the Gaek. Edn. of the K. M. of Rājaśekhara that a quotation from
the lost Alarīkāra section of the K. M. is quoted in this Keśava's work, A. Sekhara. I have spoken of this elsewhere, in the section on Alarikāra, in this thesis.

The meaning of the term Ukti in both the śabdālāmkāras of Chāyā and Ukti is very narrow; but both the Šabda and the Artha Guṇas of Ukti, though Bhoja restricts their meaning by some sort of definition, show how the term means the poetic mode of expression in general, Viśiṣṭa Bhāṇḍita and Bhāngyā Abhidhāna. Ratnaśvara's comments make this clear. Under the śabdāṇuṣa Ukti, he says:

"लोकोत्तर: सन्ति हि भाणितप्रकारः (,) लोकप्रियता: (साधा)। यथा, सुप्रसीति प्रश्ने यथे देवकुरे केत्यादि। अध्यात्मितिध्वितिकषमेऽऽ तु या कावितू कविपतिभया भाणितराह्यते, सा मववति लोकोत्तरः। तथा च भाणितवाच्यता चमकातिलयद् शुगलयम्। अतः एव लघु ध्वाह। कविसाख्यानानेऽव तात्त्विकपरिचयेऽसंवद्वेत्।" p. 60.

Under the Arthāgūṇa Ukti, he says:

"सन्तःकोरीवः स्वायः; तस्य साहाय्यकपदण्डनुस्तितमपि अवर्तनदभिः: प्रतिपदन-माध्यय:।" ।

Expressing in a manner uncommon in ordinary talk, expressing not straightforwardly and baldly but imaginatively, giving a turn to the expression, giving the idea a hiding and revelation through deft suggestion—these constitute Ukti and thus it is clear that the Ukti Guṇa of Bhoja rises above itself and means poetic expression in general.

Bhoja does mean that Ukti refers comprehensively to poetic utterance. He agrees with Rājaśekhara who says 'Ukti višeṣāḥ kāvyam' and restates Bhaṭṭa Nāyaka that while Śāstra is Sabda Pradhāna and Itihāsa, Artha Pradhāna, Kāvyam is Ukti Pradhāna. This, Bhoja clearly says in his description of his śabdālāmkāra called Adhyeya, where Bhoja distinguishes Kāvyam, Śāstra and Itihāsa. He says (S. K. A. p. 260):

"तद्विषयः उक्तिप्राध्ययत् कर्त्तिकमितुद्वेत्।। "शब्दस्य प्राध्ययमिति शासनादः, शक्तिमदम्।। अतोत्तत्त्वप्राध्ययाद् इतिहासः।।"

In the same context Bhoja says more briefly in the Śr. Pra. (Vol. II, p. 285):

"तेन उक्तिप्राध्य शास्त्रम्।। "—शब्दप्राध्य शास्त्रम्।। "अर्थप्राध्य इतिहासः।।"

Earlier also while dealing with Vivavākṣa, Bhoja says in the Śr. Pra.

"तत्र शब्दप्राध्यानमपारं, मनो शारणं च । + + अर्थप्राध्यानमार्: स्वितिरितिहासः।। उभयं प्राध्य राहेष्येस च।।"

remarks which closely correspond to what Bhaṭṭa Nāyaka has said.

In another place, in chapter xi of the Śr. Pra., Bhoja synthesises the whole realm of poetic expression in the concept of Ukti, in an attempt which achieves at the same time another synthesis in Alarikāra. In a separate paper on Svabhāvokti (Indian Culture, V, pp. 147-165) and in the section on the Svabhāvokti according to Bhoja in this thesis also, I have gone into the ques-
tion in great detail and here I briefly cover the ground. Bhāmaha had an Alaṅkāra-synthesis namely Vakrokti. Poetry had something strangely beautiful and it was diagnosed as Vakrokti. Within this Vakrokti Bhāmaha had figures like Upamā and Rūpaka, Rasas, and Natural Description : Alaṅkāra, Rasavad Alaṅkāra and Svabhāvokti. I am of opinion that Bhāmaha did recognise Svabhāvokti as an Alaṅkāra; but he differed from Daṇḍin in this point: Even though a given instance of natural description is devoid of that amount of Alaṅkāra as is seen in other turns of ideas and expression found in other Alaṅkāras, it is all the same Alaṅkāra since even this natural description has a special charm born of the poet’s genius and, in an unmistakable degree differs from ordinary bald non-literary utterance. Rasas are considered Alaṅkāras because they also go to beautify expression only. This is the stage in Bhāmaha. Daṇḍin represents the next. Daṇḍin realises that Svabhāvokti cannot be strictly included in Vakrokti; for, in it, Vakratva or ‘out-of-the-way-ness’ is least. So he divides Kāvya-Ukti into the two Uktis of Svabhāva-Ukti and Vakra-Ukti.

भिन्न द्विष्य स्वभावोक्ति: बकोङ्कोकेति वाह्मयम्।
He however retains expressions dominated by Rasa—Rasavad Vacaḥ—under expressions beautified by Alaṅkāra, the Rasavad Alaṅkāra. He follows Bhāmaha but amplifies by treating of all the eight Rasas in Rasavad Alaṅkāra. Daṇḍin however is aware of a strange superiority in expressions dominated by Bhāvas and Rasas; he sees that the three cases of Preyas, Rasavat and Úrjasvi Alaṅkāras are superior Alaṅkāras as compared to other Vakroktis. Hence he says—युक्तोक्तम् च ततौ अयम्।—II. 275.

Bhoja takes the suggestion contained here in Daṇḍin’s remark युक्तोक्तम् च ततौ अयम्। and makes a logical analysis of poetic expression into three departments, Natural Description of objects, Figurative Description and Delination of Emotion: Svabhāva-Ukti, Vakra-Ukti and Rasa-Ukti. All these three are kinds of Ukti and Bhoja means by Ukti ‘poetic expression’ which he calls by the name Alaṅkāra also. For, to Bhoja, Guṇas and Rasas also are Alaṅkāras; thus Ukti means Alaṅkāra, the beautiful poetic expression as a whole.

Kāvya = Ukti = Alaṅkāra

Vakrokti
(Svabhāva, Vakra, and Rasa Uktis)

Svabhāvokti.
(Vakra and Rasa Uktis).


Bhāmaha.

Daṇḍin.
Says Bhoja in Chapter XI of his Śr. Pra.:

"त्रिविषयः खल्लकुक्कण्या; बकोकिः स्वभाविकः; रसोपकिरिति । तत्र उपमानाद्विकाराप्राथाने बकोकिः; सोदिंगुणाप्राथाये स्वभाविकः; विभावनाबव्यविचारियंगानातु रसालिष्टाती रसोपकिरिति।"

In Chapter V of his S. K. A. also, Bhoja says:

बकोकिः रसोपकिः स्वभाविकः बाह्यमयम।
सर्वानु महाप्रियानं तातुर सर्वोपकिः प्रतिज्ञानं।

—V. 8.

It was noted above how it was Ukti or Bhāgī Bhāṣīṭi that distinguished poetic utterance from other utterances. The equation of Ukti with such concepts as Vakrokti, Alarikāra and Nāyaka’s Vyāpāra was also made. The observation of Rājaśekhara, ‘Ukti viṣeṣaḥ kāvyam’ was taken as defining Poetry on the basis of this conception of Ukti. It was interpreted as the peculiar poetic manner of expression and as the most important factor and mark in Poetry as compared to the elements of Śabda and Artha, both of which are subordinate to it. It was shown how this definition was similar to Nāyaka’s definition based on Vyāpāra pradhānya.

The observation of Bhāṭṭa Nāyaka is re-stated by Mahima Bhāṭṭa with a change. Mahima Bhāṭṭa holds that Poetry is utterance in which neither Śabda alone nor Artha alone is important but both together. He says that Kāvya is Udbhaya-pradhāna instead of saying like Nāyaka that Kāvya is Vyāpāra-pradhāna and Udbhaya-apradhāna. He says:

“त्रिविषयः हि शाक्राम्; शास्त्रप्राधानम्; अर्थप्राधानम्; उम्मयप्राधानं चेति। तत् शास्त्रप्राधानं वेदादिः
अर्थप्राधानं अर्थप्राधानां अर्थप्राधानां अर्थप्राधानां
मनन्दिपपयसिप्रयासवत्वंविवादात्। अर्थप्राधानानां
शास्त्रप्राधानां शास्त्रप्राधानां शास्त्रप्राधानां
उम्मयप्राधानं संग्नन्दिविकार्यम्; तस्य रसास्मकात्; रसास्य च उम्मयानिष्ठेन
परिप्रेक्षितात्। काव्यसारपो शालग्यो प्रतिपादित्तथेष।”

V. V. III, p. 122. T. S. S. See also I. p. 20.

Bhoja must be said to follow Mahima Bhāṭṭa’s modified statement of Bhāṭṭa Nāyaka’s distinction between Kāvya on the one hand and Śāstra and Akhyāna on the other. For, as has been noted above in the text quoted from chapter VII of the Śr. Pra. Bhoja also does not say that in Poetry both Śabda and Artha are subordinated (made Apradhāna or Guṇa) to something else but says that in Poetry both are Pradhāna.

“तत् शास्त्रप्राधानं पौर्णेष्यं त्रित्रित्र अर्थप्राधानमार्यं।”


The charm of a poet’s verses is lost when their words are changed and ideas modified. Thus it is that Poetry is Udbhaya-pradhāna. This is called by another as maturity of expression—Kāvya Pāka—when the poet has written such lines that even a slight change spoils the effect. Says Rājaśekhara:

पदनिवेशशिशुक्कम्रता पाकः इत्याचारिः। तदाहूः—
‘आधापोदरणे ताबद्र याब्दोऽधायते मनः।
पदानं स्थापिते स्वच्छम् हतं सिद्धा सरस्तात।’
In this Kāvya Pāka which means the 'unchangeability' of the words in Kāvya, is emphasised the same idea as is contained in Mahima Bhaṭṭa's and Bhoja's remark that Poetry is Udbhaya-pradhāna.

This maturity of Ukti or poetic expression—Kāvya Pāka or Ukti Pāka—is given by Bhoja as a Guṇa called Praudghi of Śabda and Artha immediately after the Guṇa, Ukti.

That we are justified in finding such an Ukti-synthesis or a system of thought called Ukti in Bhoja can be granted when one sees what Bahrurūpa-miśra, a latter-day commentator on the Daśarūpaka, who reproduces many ideas from Bhoja's Śr. Pra., has to say. Bahrurūpa chooses the word 'Sūkti' instead of 'Ukti' and shows Bhoja's three-fold classification of it and relates to this viewpoint, as we have ourselves done above, the Abhidhā-śuddhānya of Poetry of Nāyaka and the Vakrokti-idea of Poetry of Bhāmaha. It is a pity that the text of Bahrurūpa's Daśarūpaka vyākhyā in two volumes in the Madras Govt. Oriental MSS. Library comes to an abrupt end here. Bahrurūpa says:

\[ "\text{कृत्युः शोभाःकर्त्तव्याविदेशत् सर्वदशयोरस्थ्यकारिबं मन्यन्ते। तत्तमः सिद्धविषयः स्वरुपः | बहुकोल्पः रसाकरितः} \]
\[ तत्र गुणार्थाये गुणा गस्तिकारितः। उपबोधकायलवृत्तारथावास्ये बहुकोल्पः। विभवानाभव्यव्यवहिभीवाकर्तियाध्यास्यात् रसाकरितः। \]
\[ अतः शास्त्री अर्थप्रतिभादं भूषितः यत् कविन्ना उपायी ( यते, तत्सपि, अहंकारः। ) \]
\[ आत एत स्त्रायायेन अभिव्यक्त्यापाजः ( काल्यं प्रधानमिनित्याकार�। ) \]

(\text{शंक}) प्रधानमाध्यमकं तत्र शाः प्रधानसिद्धिहुः। \]
\[ अर्थं तत्त्वं के तु वदनविकायामेते। \]
\[ द्वीपोषणः ( व्यापारारअालेः ) कार्यमेव तत्तु।। \]

भाषेवप्रि— 'सॉभय सॉबेव ( व्यक्तिक्रमश्चेव ) विभिन्नस्ते।' ........................


APPENDIX

1. The Agni Purāṇa, in 337/2-3, states Bhaṭṭa Nāyaka's remark on the difference between Kāvya, and Śastra and Itihāsā thus:

\[ \text{शास्त्रं शास्त्रप्राचायमतत्त्वमितिहासियं ( इतिहासियं ) नित्या।} \]
\[ \text{अभिव्यक्तिः: प्रधानान्तरः काल्यं तात्पर्यं विभिन्नते।।} \]

2. Commenting on Daṇḍin II, 13, that in Śastras it is all one statement of things as they are—Svabhāva ākhyāna—and that in Poetry also there are a few cases of this Svabhāva ākhyāna—

\[ शास्त्रसिद्धिवास्य सामाज्यं काल्यक्रमेतदीस्तितम। \]
The *Hṛdayaṁgamā* points out that śāstras are Tattva Pradhāna or concerned with truthful statement of facts and things as they are; but Poetry is *Varnanā Pradhāna*; Poetry emphasises the mode of giving the thing, ‘description’ or ‘expression’ as such.

“शायत्रु धमोपतमांश्यायु अनुतवनामावात् अस्तेव स्मणवाल्दर्कारस्य सामग्रायं चंपति-भवति। काययु बर्णनाग्राहान्याहान्य असत्यवचनं कल्पितमिच अस्ति॥”

K. A., p. 64, Mad. Edn.

(3) Vidyādhara thus explains Bhaṭṭa Nāyaka’s remark in his *Ekāvalī*.

शब्दप्राधान्यं वेदायत्यं प्रसुस्मितमतमचयं।
ईपत्याण्यणापाध्य प्रत्ययास्यं देशानात॥

इतिहासिकं शायत्रं मित्रस्मितमतमचयं।
अस्यार्थवादहपपाल्यं कृत्यतेऽध्यायनं॥

व्यापिप्राधानं कायं तु कान्तास्मितमततिम।
शब्दाधृतं मुम्मतं नीलवा व्यक्तिप्रवचनं यत॥

I. 4-6.

As a follower of Ānanda and Abhinavagupta, Vidyādhara has interpreted the Vyāpāra as Dhvani, following Abhinavagupta’s observation to that effect in the *Locana*.

“तेन यदाह भक्तावक: ‘शब्दप्राधान्यं + काव्यभचन्त।’ इति तदपास्तम। व्यापारेण हि यदि व्यापितमार्न्यानस्तभावः, तद्व अपूर्वसुचकं।”

*Locana*, p. 27.
CHAPTER X

BHOJA AND VAKROKTI

'ककोकिरेख काव्यानां परा भूषेति भामह:।'

Bhoja : Śr Pr. Ch. XI.

The history of the concept of Vakrokti must be older than Bhāmaha and Dāṇḍin, for, we find it used with settled connotation in the works of both writers. It is needless to point out here the very well-known passages on Vakrokti in Bhāmaha. To him, Vakrokti means Alāṅkāra.

वानां ककार्यशब्दोक्तिरहस्यार्थ कल्पने। V. 66.

युक्ति वक्ष्यामालवत्या सर्वमेवातिदित्यसे। I. 30.

In his description of the Atiśayokti Alāṅkāra (II, 85) he has used the word Vakrokti as a synonym of Alāṅkāra. Therefore according to Bhāmaha, the whole realm of poetic expression is permeated with Vakrokti, striking, deviating expression. In II, 86-87, Bhāmaha refutes Hetu, Sūksma and Lēśa, that they do not deserve to be called Alāṅkāra because, in them, the expression as a whole has no Vakrokti in it.

समुद्रायमित्वान्त्य वक्कोक्ष्यान्तिभासानत। II, 86.

This Vakrokti is the one requisite and it distinguishes poetic expression as such. In its absence, Bhāmaha says, we have no Kāvyā, but only insipid narration, speech or mere news called Vārtā.

ग्यासत्मकौं भावानु: वाक्ति वासाय पश्चिम।

इत्यव्याधि किं काव्य ?—पारंपरिण प्रचत्ते। II, 87.

Therefore the distinction in Bhāmaha is between ordinary and poetic expression, Vārtā and Vakrokti. This point as well as another that Bhāmaha does accept Svabhāvokti as an Alāṅkāra has been elaborately explained by me in my paper on Svabhāvokti (Indian Culture, V, pp. 147-165). None can deny that 'natural description' or Svabhāvokti is a striking and powerful portraiture, and as such, differs from mere report of news or ordinary dull speech. Mammaṭa points out that it is this amount of strikingness and effect in Svabhāvokti that we take as Vaiśātrya and count it as an Alāṅkāra. Even the opponent of Svabhāvokti as an Alāṅkāra, Kuntaka, who refuses to consider it as an Alāṅkāra on the plea that Vastu svabhāva is not Alāṅkāra but is Alāṅkārya,—even he accepts that instances of graceful and effective pen-pictures of Nature, men, and things as they are found, constitute Vastu Vakratā (III Unmeṣa). It is by virtue of this element of Vakratā in it that Bhāmaha also considers it as one of the Alāṅkāras coming under Vakrokti. It is not unreasonable to hold Svabhāvokti also as an Alāṅkāra and Vakrokti,
when one can accept delineation of Rasa as a Vakrokti-variety called Rasavat. Bhāmaha, thus, has one universe of Vakrokti, falling into three departments, the description of things as they are (अर्थस्य तदस्य, स्वभावपरिचयः) more definitely deviating striking expression deserving the name Vakrokti to the greatest degree, Rūpaka, etc., and thirdly, delineation of Rasa, Rasavad Alanikāra.

In Daṇḍin, there appears a clearer analysis. Svabhāvokti no doubt involves strikingness, but strikingness is least in it. It is almost the starting point for further Alanikāra or Vakrokti. So it is that Daṇḍin separates it and calls it the first Alanikāra, Ādyā Alanikātyā. He classifies poetic expression into Vakrokti and Svabhāvokti; description of things as they are and figurative description. The cases of Rasa-delineation, Daṇḍin still keeps like Bhāmaha within Vakrokti.

The third stage is reached in Bhoja who makes a further analysis of poetic expression. Elsewhere, in the sections on Ukti, Alanikāra and Svabhāvokti, I have spoken of this subject. Bhoja takes the suggestion directly from Daṇḍin and by Bhoja’s time, Rasa has become sufficiently important. Though he described the three Alanikāras of Preyas, Rasavat and Urjasvi as Vakrokti, Daṇḍin, realised that they, as related to Bhāvas and Rasas, are of a special nature and of greater appeal. Hence it is that he said of them that they were superior गुणोक्तिः च तत् च्रयस्. Bhoja includes Preyas and Urjasvi under Rasavat. He constitutes a class called Rasavad Alanikāra which is the delineation of Rasas and Bhāvas; and he separates it from other kinds of Vakrokti. This is a better treatment; for, delineation of Rasa has greater affinities with Svabhāvokti than with Vakrokti. As Jayaratha on Ruuyaka and Ruuyaka himself also point out, the Sahṛdaya has a Sarīvāda in Poetry and it is of two kinds: Citta Sarīvāda and Vastu Sarīvāda. The former refers to delineation of Rasa and Bhāva, and the latter, to descriptions of Artha or objects. Both are natural non-figurative descriptions and are Rasavad-Alanikāra and Svabhāvokti. Though Bhoja, following Bhāmaha, Daṇḍin and Vāmana would call the whole realm of poetic expression Alanikāra, he would restrict the name Vakrokti to figures beginning with Upāmā. Improving upon both Bhāmaha and Daṇḍin, he would separate and exclude the Rasas from it. Thus he says in his S. K. A. Chapter V:

ककोक्तिश्च स्वभाविकाः स्वभावविद्वादभास्यम्।

Sl. 8.

In Chapter XI of the Śr. Pra. he says that an instance like ‘धृस्त्ययमयोः’ is no Alanikāra, because, the necessary Vakratā or poetic beauty is not seen in it. He speaks here of Vakratā or Vakrokti as Alanikāra-sāmānya-lakṣaṇa, Kāvyā śobhā as such.

“न चैतत्ववच्च ‘धृस्त्ययमयोः’ इत्यात्त्वायोग्यतरस्वस्थः: प्रसेवत। यथापि धृस्त्य उत्त्यास्य

सापसमस्मयांस्वः, तथापि

‘काव्यशोभाकरणं धर्मान् अन्तर्गतार्थविश्वसने’
Thus Bhoja uses Alamkāra in the sense in which Vāmanā used it in his Sūtra I. i. 2. शैलालक्षण: meaning poetic beauty in general. In this same sense Bhoja uses the concept of Vakrokti also and in this respect he follows Bhāmaha. Therefore in Bhoja we find Vakrokti used in two senses, the major and the minor, the former meaning poetic expression in general and the latter, only the figures of Upamā, Rūpaka etc. In its second sense we have to trace its history as indicated above through Daṇḍin who first restricted Vakrokti to Rasas and figures like Upamā. Finally, Bhoja restricted it to the figures Upamā etc.

It is not enough if one finds in an expression the presence of the technical features of a particular Alamkāra. Besides conformity to the definition, the expression has to exhibit the primary requisite of an all-pervading beauty which alone makes the expression deserve the name of

1. On p. 23 of his *Theories of Rasa and Dvani*, Dr. A. SANKARAN takes this verse as a quotation from Daṇḍin. The first line mentioning the name of Bhāmaha is absent in the printed texts of the Kāvyādāsra. Dr. SANKARAN feels some gap in Daṇḍin's text as it is in II. 362, which gap he says this line in Bhoja's quotation fills up.

The text as printed does not seem to have any gap; secondly, if this half verse is added to the text of Daṇḍin, the 362nd verse at the end of this chapter will have to be ended like an epic Anuṣṭubhb with three feet; or, the line भिषं द्रिष्या स्वभाविक: वक्रोक्तिः वादनयमः must stand single. Thirdly, Vakrokti is certainly old enough for use in Daṇḍin as in the line भिषं द्रिष्या etc.; but, when one sees the history and the rise and the time of the currency of various words in the Alamkāra Sāstra, one can see that the concept under the briefer name 'Vakratā' or 'Vakravta' is very much later than even Ananda. My feeling is that, if this is a quotation by Bhoja, it is from some later writer who adapted and incorporated into his text parts of the texts of older writers, making the necessary changes. If one goes through the Śr. Pra. one comes across numerous instances of Bhoja giving verses of old writers with the necessary changes; he quotes Vāmanā's Anuṣṭubhb on the Vaidarbhī Riti changing the first line. The Doṣa and Guna sections are full of such reproductions with necessary changes from Bhāmaha, Daṇḍin and Vāmana. Therefore it is extremely likely that this verse वक्रालक्षण: etc. is Bhoja's own. One need not be troubled by the introductory words 'तत्तुकम्' which may suggest that the verse is a quotation from another author. We have instances of Bhoja quoting himself with the words 'तत्तुकम्'.
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Alāṅkāra; for Alāṅkāra is a thing of beauty. Bhoja considers this beauty as Vakratva, Vakrokti and Šobhā and gives a very significant interpretation to Daṇḍin’s definition of Alāṅkāra:

\[
\text{काव्यशोभामकरणं दम्मो अलंकरणं प्रचक्षते।}
\]

Herein lies the defence of the Alāṅkāra school. I have spoken of this in my paper on Kriyā Kalpa and Other Names of the Alāṅkāra Sāstra, published in the JOR, Madras. (Vol. VIII. pp. 130-132). Taking the idea of Cāruṭva or beauty as essential from the text of Ānanda, Abhinava elaborates the idea with illustrations in his Locana on the third Uddyota of the Dhvanīyālōka in the following manner:

\[
\text{“तथाजातीयायामर्थसिद्धिततवासिष्टसऽमस्याः। सुदक्षिणा इति यत् किल एवं तद्विमुयस्य कुम्बू, न तत् कायभ्रमणियम्। उपमा हि “यथा गौि: तथा गवय।’ इति। (कुकं हि) ‘गौिहाहिकः’ इति।} \text{केष्य: “निश्चिपने (S धि’ इति) तत्वार्थसकः। \times \times \times \text{ एवमस्यत। न मैवमादिक} \text{काययोगीति।”}
\]


Appayya Diksita emphasises similarly that expressions derive their life as Alāṅkāras by being graceful—Hṛdyā. Otherwise they are not Alāṅkāras.

\[
\text{“स्वीकारः ह्यत्हारः कविसमप्रसिद्धिपुरोचन हुयत्वाय काव्यशोभामकरण एव अलंकारता महते। अतः “गौिहसही गवय” इति नोपमा। ‘गौिहाहिकः’ इति न कुम्बू।’}
\]

Citramimāṁsā. p. 6.

This has been pointed out by Dr. S. K. Dé also in the Introduction to his edition of the Vakrokti Jivita. pp. xlvi-lvii. The truth has been realised by Bhoja and by Abhinava as the texts above quoted clearly show. Hence it cannot be contended by Dr. Dé that Sanskrit Poetics and the study of the theory of poetic figure owe this idea and its importance to Kuntaka. (p. xlvii V. J. Introduction) But it can be accepted that new importance and new enthusiasm for Vakrokti in the post-Ānanda period are due mainly to Kuntaka and his V. J. Bhoja takes up the Vakrokti from Bhāmaha and Daṇḍin, independent of any other writer and without any knowledge of Kuntaka. Bhoja and Kuntaka were writing at the same time and it happens in the history and destinies of ideas and subjects, that, at different places, different scholars happen to work at the same time. The current of Vakrokti coming down from the hill of Bhāmaha had two courses. There is one culmination in Bhoja and another in Kuntaka. Regarding Kuntaka and how he developed the doctrine of Vakrokti or Vakratā as the life of Poetry, there is little need to devote any part of this study.

Though Bhoja definitely put down Vakrokti as a general name for all figures beginning with Upamā, he retained the substance of Bhāmaha’s conception of poetic expression as Alāṅkāra to which also Bhoja applied the name Vakrokti. To avoid confusion Bhoja restricts the word Vakrokti to the minor sense of figures Upamā etc., and generally applies the name Alāṅkāra to the larger concept. The use of the word Vakrokti in the larger sense is only rare in Bhoja. Elsewhere however Bhoja uses the concept
and name Vakratā in the larger sense of poetic expression as such, forming
the very distinguishing mark of Poetry. It seems that Bhoja turns back
to concur verbally also with Bhāmaha. It is surprising how Bhoja’s stand-
point agrees so remarkably with that of Kuntaka. We shall now examine
this aspect of the question.

It is in connection with Dhvani, and this again is strange and suggest-
ive, that Bhoja talks of Vakratā. Bhoja holds Dhvani as a variety of
Tātparya and also as the poetic counterpart of the prosaic factor of Tāt-
parya. The intention of the speaker in ordinary affairs and expressions is
called Tātparya whereas the same, as far as Kāvyā is concerned, is called
Dhvani. He says ‘तत्त्वयेष्वव वचनः व्याख्यात वाक्योऽयम्’ and a perusal of the section
on Bhoja and Dhvani will elucidate the point. Bhoja asks himself:
wherefore this classification of expression into two kinds, Laukika and
Śāstriya on the one hand and poetic on the other? He speaks of Vacas,
on ordinary expression, and as against it, of Kāvyā. He does not say that
Dhvani marks off the Kāvyā; for, he considers Dhvani as part of Tātparya
and as obtainable in ordinary expression also, Dhvani being only another
name for Tātparya. Then, what is it that Bhoja finds out as the element
which distinguishes the poetic and the non-poetic expression? He says
that beauty or poetic charm called Vakratā distinguishes the two. In the
ordinary speech there is a blunt straightforwardness in expression and there
is no regard for beautifully saying things. The manner of saying things in
a beautiful and embellished way is discounted and is considered as an
extravagance. When, of course, one praises or abuses, he heightens or low-
ers and resorts to his powers of praising or damning by the power of his
expression. Literary expression now results.

"—तत्त्वयेष्वव वचनः व्याख्यात वाक्योऽयम्
तत्त्वयेष्वव वचनः व्याख्यात वाक्योऽयम्
"

* * *

कः पुनः काव्यवचनोऽव्याख्यातान्तरंयोऽविशेषः । उच्चयते—
यद्वकः वचः शब्दे लोके च वच एव लोके
वचे यद्वकः वचार्थिते तत्त्व काव्यवचनोऽविशेषः.


Again, at the end of his treatment of Dhvani, Bhoja says:

"कः पुनः काव्यवचनोऽव्याख्यातान्तरंयोऽविशेषः । नेतृत्वः पुरस्तातः—
यद्वकः वचः शब्दे लोके च वच एव लोके
वचे यद्वकः वचार्थिते तत्त्व काव्यवचनोऽविशेषः.

Sr. Pra. Vol. II. p. 42. chap VII.

This is almost a definition of Kāvyā in terms of Vakratā or Vakrokti and
in this respect, Bhoja would use Vakrokti or rather the name Vakratva in
the sense of Bhāmaha’s Vakrokti, comprehending all the three Uktis of
Śvabhāva, minor Vakra, and Rasa. Thus Bhoja has a major and a minor
Vakrokti and corresponding to the two, a major and a minor Alanțkāra. The conception of two Alanțkāras, the major one meaning Saundarya or poetic beauty, and the latter minor Alanțkāra meaning only figures like Upamā, corresponds to Vāmana’s view. In Bhoja’s opinion Dhvani as such does not distinguish Poetry so much as this primary Vakratā without which Kāvya will only be mere Vacas, and as noted earlier, even Alanțkāras cease to have any right to deserve that name. Therefore even Dhvani will cease to be poetic when it is not the case of an expression which is essentially beautiful. This insistence on an essential and primary beauty lying at the very basis of poetic expression is accepted by Abhinava also. This has been pointed out by me in the paper on Kriyā Kalpa. With regard to Dhvani, Abhinava says that even Dhvani has to be beautiful.

“This Guṇālārkāra-aucitya-saundarya of the Śabdārtha or the Śarīra of Poetry is held by others as comprehended in the composite concept of Vakratā, Vakrokti or Alanțkāra. This is a strong point for the Vakrokti and the Tātparya schools of thought and a somewhat weak point for the Dhvaniavadins. Take for instance the implication or the suggestion of a prohibition from an expressed injunction—Nīsedha from Vidhi—as in the well known Gāthā, Bham Gham etc. The Dhvani-theorist who refutes the Lakṣanāvādin stresses this as the chief point everywhere that Dhvani cannot be Lakṣanā, since in the latter, the primary sense is incompatible whereas in Dhvani, the primary meaning also is acceptable and as such forms part of the intention of the speaker. If the cleverness of the lady of the Gāthā speaking to the pious man is the point in the verse, if her clever speech is of importance as much as her final intention of preventing him from frequenting the banks of the Godāvari, if much, if not all, of the poetic beauty of this Gāthā is due only to the way in which the clever lady told the prohibition in the form of an injunction, if the primary sense also matters, the ground is let to the Vakrokti-vādin who considers the out-of-the-way, strange and beautiful expression, Vakra-Ukti, as such, as the life of Poetry; and Dhvani as one of the many elements helping this Vakratā or resulting from this Vakratā. Śrī Harṣa, the poet, makes this “reconciliation”, if it can be called so, between Vakrokti and Dhvani, in his own characteristic way of introducing Sastric ideas into his poem:

निषेधेयो विक्षरित तदश्रव
तवेन युक्ता खडु वाचि बक्तातः
विभाज्मयं यथय सिद्ध ध्वनिनिर्वि
विदश्चनारीवदं तदाकरः II

N. C. IX. 50.
As one of those following the ancients and as one who emphasises the expression-aspect or the form in the terms Alamkāra and Vakratā, Bhoja considers Dhvani also as an embellisher of expression; as the Guṇa called Gāmbhīrya. (Hence Dhvani is an Alamkāra; for, Bhoja holds all the Guṇas as Alamkāras.) And Rasas also are taken as Alamkāra by Bhoja. Thus, Rasa, Dhvani, and everything go to make the beauty called Vakratā that is Poetry. So Bhoja will accept Dhvani and will consider it as holding a supreme position in Poetry, व्यवस्थिति काव्ये, but he will at the same time emphasise Vakratā.

**BHOJA AND KUNTAKA**

There are many similarities between Bhoja and Kuntaka. First of all there is agreement to a notable degree regarding the concept of Vakrokti or Vakratā considered as the life of Poetry or the very distinguishing mark of Kāvya. In Bhoja, however, there is but a verse on this Vakratā; Kuntaka works out the idea into a whole work. Kuntaka defines Poetry as Šabdā and Artha in unison and set in Vakrokti.

शब्दात्मां वायव्यपाराशास्तिरिनि।
बन्धे व्यवस्थिति काव्ये तद्विद्वादास्कायिनि॥

I. 7. V. I.

2. Bhoja will not deny that his Vakratā which distinguishes Kāvya from Vacas, is synonymous with Alamkāra. He classifies this Vakratā or Alamkāra into Guṇas (Svabhāvokti), Arthālārṇkāras (Vakrokti in a restricted sense), and Rasas (Rasokti). Kuntaka is a similar reviver of the old Alamkāra. His Vakrokti which is of six kinds is equated by him with Alamkāra. He says that there are only two factors in Poetry, Alamkārya and Alamkāra; the latter is Vakrokti.

काव्यसाधारणमलक्ष्यः: कोन्यपूर्वोऽविद्यते।
उभावलक्ष्याः तत्त्वोऽपि तु कालस्वरूपे॥

I. 2. V. J.

वर्णविद्विषेकृतं वैद्यत्वमक्ष्यी भर्षितत्वस्तिनि॥

I. 10. V. J.

To Kuntaka also, therefore, Dhvani which comes under certain aspects of his Vakratā, is Alamkāra. Kuntaka says actually that Guṇas also are Alamkāras.

"अलामकाः मलक्ष्यमाणाः: शब्दात्माः शास्त्रात् मलक्ष्यमाणाः।
साधनां तत्त्वस्तिनि भर्षितत्वस्तिनि।"—V. J. p. 3.

Though Kuntaka expressly refutes at length the older view that Rasas are Alamkāras and accepts mostly the new ideas on Rasa, as on Dhvani, he treats of Rasa as if it is also part of Vakratā, the poet’s peculiar mode of expression, as part of his Vastu vakratā. III, 7, pp. 150-3. On the surface one must say that Kuntaka differs from Bhoja, for, while Bhoja follows Bhāmaha’s and Daṇḍin’s view of Rasa as Rasavad Alamkāra, Kuntaka criticises Bhāmaha on this point. III, 10, pp. 156-166. He holds Rasas as Alamkāryas. But Bhoja and Kuntaka agree in the main that Poetry is
distinguished by Vakratā; that Vakrokti or Vakratā means Alamkāra in general and that Guṇas and Dhvani also form part of it. If one can grant that anything coming under Poetry is directly or ultimately a manifestation of the poet’s Vakra vyāpa or Vakratā according to Kuntaka, and if all Vakratā is, as Kuntaka himself says, Alamkāra in a general sense of the term, he can see that Bhoja and Kuntaka completely agree with each other. Bhoja brings under Śabdālāmikāra the proper choice of the form of composition, of appropriate language, of appropriate medium of verse or prose, the adopting of the proper Vyrtti and Riti etc. Most of these are generally comprehended in one or the other of the sub-varieties of the six kinds of Kuntaka’s Vakratā. Any element of poetry, Riti, Dhvani, Śabdālāmikāra or Guṇa, Kuntaka must deal under some kind of his Vakratā.

3. Another point of striking similarity between Kuntaka and Bhoja is that they both recognise the factor called Alamkāra of “Prabandha”. Bhoja, it will be explained at length in the Alamkāra section, considers that Guṇas and Alamkāras are of two kinds, those of Vākya and those of Prabandha. He gives a set of Guṇas and Alamkāras for the work as a whole. This corresponds to some aspects of Kuntaka’s Prakaraṇa vakratā and Prabandha vakratā. Thus the second aspect of Prakaraṇa vakratā given by Kuntaka corresponds to what Bhoja describes as Prabandha doṣa hāna, avoiding the Anaucityas in the source by new imaginative creations and deviations from the original. Śr. Pra. chapter xi.

Then Kuntaka gives प्रक्रियानमसुप्राशühruprayaḥकाव्यम as a Prakaraṇa vakratā pp. 225-6. Bhoja similarly speaks of Suśiṣṭa sandhitva (सुशिष्टसन्धित्वम्) which is explained with reference to Mahākāvyas as the unity and the mutual help between the various cantos and subject-divisions forming part of the one unity—Ekavākyatā and Prabandha-upakāritva. P. 431, chapter xi, Vol. II., Śr. Pra.

Kuntaka explains his Vakratā with reference to Kāvyas also in IV. 9. (P. 231).

“काव्याचिन्तयायं तदुक्ति मनोयन प्रववते।
यदहि सर्गविभागः सौन्दर्याय निवाचते।”

“—यदहि सर्गविभागः सौन्दर्याय निवाचते। वजलकृत्याविद्भक्तं महाकाव्यप्रचयः उपशोभामः-निषयतः निवेदते।”

Bhoja considers these as Artha-alamkāras of Prabandha.

“नगराधसैलीनसारणवादिविद्यमनम, नानुराष्ट्रीयकालमवयचन्द्रदाविद्यमनम, नायक-नालिकामुदाहरानवाहिनिविद्यमनम, मन्त्रप्रत्ययाष्ट्रादममन्त्रविद्यमनम, वरचिवारजलकृत्यानन्दपालमात्मात्मात्मासतादविद्यमनमसताद।” P. 431. Vol. II. Śr. Pra.
The next Vakratā of Prakaraṇa in Kuntaka is about Rasa, the Āṅga, chief and accessory. IV. 10. pp. 232-3. Bhoja considers this as an Artha guṇa of the Prabandha and calls it “Rasa bhāva niran-taratvam.” He explains this as richness in emotions. The one main interest of a single Rasa is like eating one kind of dish continuously; it produces Vairasya; therefore there are to be many subsidiary emotional interests.

“रसभावस्ततरसमिलनेन रसप्रमोदेनापि तत्कारणभूतानां भावानां परिमोहण् ॥
× × × × ×
मोक्षस्वेत्वेकरस्तय प्रसन्नस्यापि वैरस्यमयकरोति ॥” p. 432. Vol. II.

Another Vakratā of Prakaraṇa is explained by Kuntaka as the introduction of episodes.

प्रशान्तलतिनिलघ्रेण रस्वन्तरबिचित्रता ॥
यथोक्तत्ति सोहेज्य सापरसपस पक्ता ॥ Pp. 233-4. V. J.

This is taken up by Bhoja under two heads: पताकाप्रकाशिकल्यनम् and कवान्तरापुष्पानम्, two Udbhayālāmikāras of Prabandha. (p. 443. Vol. II. Sr. Pra).

Another feature of beauty in a work is the introduction of a drama within a drama. Says Kuntaka:

कविता कविळणायात: स्मूर्ति प्रकाशान्तम् ॥
सर्वप्रबङ्गवस्तैलक्षणं पुण्यति वक्तात ॥ p. 235. V. J.

Bhoja counts the same feature as one of the items of his Udbhayālāmikāra of Prabandha—गमित्वविषयानम् (p. 422. Vol. II. Sr. Pra.). Both Kuntaka and Bhoja cite the same instance of the drama within the third act of the Bāla-rāmāyaṇa called Sitā svayamvarā, अश्वेता: अत्यन्तर्कः: etc. (III. 12).

The last Prakaraṇa vakratā prakāra spoken of by Kuntaka (p. 236) is the well-knit expression of the plot in a drama or in a story, through the successive stages of the development of the purpose in the Sandhis.

Bhoja has, corresponding to Kuntaka’s phrase ‘संविधानकल्पनः’ the phrase ‘सम्बुधा संविधानसमुद्रानम्’ (p. 411. Vol. II. Sr. Pra.) and corresponding to this Prakaraṇa vakratā, Bhoja has the Udbhayālāmikāra वैष्णवतन्त्रकारकाद्योपकल्पम्” (p. 431.) The Sabda guṇa of Prabhandha called Suśīlṣṭa sandhitva also refers to this (P. 431).

The last kind of Prabandha vakratā in the text of the V. J. (as now available in Dr. De’s Edn.) refers to the Vyutpatti derived by a spectator or a reader, the spiritual, ethical, or the social end.

नृत्यमयविषयकल्पनयं विषयस्वस्ति वक्ता ॥ V. J. p. 245.
This Bhoja calls as the Mahāvākyārtha which helps man's attainment of the four aims of virtue, desire, material prosperity, and spiritual salvation. Bhoja holds this Mahāvākyārtha as a transformation, Vipariṇāma, of the Sabda Brahman.

“वल्लु तद्गृहार्णातिद्रोहणत्वमार्थाः सिद्धत्वमार्थाः परि महाब्रवधाः: अर्थसूची विपरीततमार्थानन्दिनित्वमार्थाः अर्थवर्धन वायायाः। अर्थवर्धनाः परि जन्तुप्रभावति। जन्तुप्रभावते परि योगिणीपरिकष्टे।” (Vākyapadīya).

P. 143. Chap. VIII. Vol. II. Śr. Pra.

Of this Mahāvākyārtha, Bhoja speaks at greater length in chapter vi (Vol. I, p. 407 onwards):

“सब्र हो वायाः विषिष्टयौरेष परमस्वयः। × × किं विष वहायाविरिप रामायणातिद्रोहणमेव अभ्यास्ते। रामायणम पितुराणाणां पालवत्: बननिविष्टिनिपिनिपिनेन ह्यवेदयत:। रामणस्य पदराम अभिविष्टत:। भैलेवविनिविष्टिनिपिनेन तथविषविष्टती। तस्मात पितुराणाणां पालवेत। पदरामानाम नादस्यन्तरेव। रामविश्वेता, न: र: रामविश्वेता, श्रात्म।”

He speaks of this twice again in his two Prabandha-features—

‘चतुर्विंशतिरत्माः’ and ‘विषिष्टसंयुक्तपदक्रमम्’ p. 430. Vol. II.

a Prabandha guṇa and a Prabandha alāṁkāra.

“चतुर्विंशतिरत्माः तत्ततद् बनुविष्टिनीपिकस्य:। त: त: किंपरमस्त:। समस्ता बाणकः कथमाप्यविष्टर:। रामायणेऽपिनेन भाष्यस्य।” p. 431.

“विषिष्टसंयुक्तपदक्रमेऽलु गुणवत: नायकः उक्तक्रियाः। कालसंयुक्तपदक्रमेऽलु गुणवत्।” p. 432.

4. Another important concept on which Kuntaka made a valuable contribution is Sāhitya. It is again remarkable how, almost at the same time, the same concept possessed another writer and clamoured for definition. Bhoja and Kuntaka are the two most important names in the history of Sāhitya, which have been dealt with in the section on Sāhitya. Here it is necessary to point out only a few facts of similarity regarding that concept between Bhoja and Kuntaka. Both start with Bhāmaha's definition—शब्दविषयं सतित्वं कालम्। Secondly, Bhoja analyses this Sāhitya between Sabda and Artha into twelve relations, eight of which are grammatical and the last four of which refer to poetical relations. If we leave aside the first eight and take into consideration the last fourfold literary Sāhitya in the shape of avoiding of flaw, taking of Guṇas, adding of ornaments, and securing the eternal presence of Rasa, we can see that Bhoja will not refute us if we equate his Sāhitya with Alāṁkāra. For, to Bhoja, Guṇas, figures and Rasas are all Alāṁkāra. Similar is the case with Kuntaka's Sāhitya. Though Kuntaka describes Sāhitya in
his own way, it can be contended that his Sāhitya also is a kind of Vakratā; and Vakratā, we have already pointed out, is Alamkāra. In Poetry, Kuntaka says, there are, to begin with, three factors—Sabdārtha, Sāhitya and Vakratā. Sāhitya can be merged in Vakratā and finally only two categories remain, Kāvyā which is Alamkāra and Alamkāra which is Vakratā. In I. 17, which defines Sāhitya, Kuntaka gives it as कायमित्र: and in the Vṛtti as सा कायमित्र: वाक्यक्षायतन्त्व: साहित्याच्यवदेशात: सब्जित: ” p. 27.

Thus there are many points of similarity between Bhoja and Kuntaka, two great writers of the post-Ānanda period, who accepted Dvānani and Rasa, with all their supremacy, but took up the old concept of Alamkāra and Vakrokti and elaborated systems out of them. But there is a good deal of difference also between the two writers. In the concluding part of chapter vi while dealing with Vākyārtha, and in the middle of chapter xi while beginning the treatment of Prabandhas, Bhoja considers the significance of the names of works like Jñānakara, Kumāra-sambhava, etc. In the former context at least, there is some amount of literary treatment of these names as giving to us the idea of the poem, the Vākyārtha. But in the latter context i.e., in chapter xi, Bhoja goes into these names as a grammarian enquiring what Samāsa is involved in them. Compared with these two treatments of names of works, Kuntaka’s Prabandhavakratā referring to the significant and beautiful titling of a composition, exhibits greater literary value.

आतो वस्तुः पौडार्यं काब्यं कामित्रं बक्तातम्।
प्रयासंक्षिप्तायान्तरात्मन्त्री वृत् कथि: ॥ V. J. IV. 24.

See also Vṛtti on p. 243. V. J.

In the same manner Kuntaka’s treatment of Sāhitya is very much superior to that of Bhoja. Kuntaka relegates the question of Pada, Vākyā, Artha, Tātparya etc., to an alien sphere and considers in his work Sāhitya from a purely poetic standpoint. Again, Bhoja has devoted chapters to a consideration of Sabda and Artha and his treatment of these two is purely grammatical. Compared to it Kuntaka’s treatment of Sabda and Artha in the definition—Sabdārthau sahitau kāvyam—contains very beautiful ideas of great literary value, V. J. I. 8-9, Pp. 14-22, Sabdārtha pāramārthya.

To return to Bhoja and Vakrokti: the only Sūtra-like verse of Bhoja on Vakrokti as a ‘definition’ of Poetry is the above-referred to verse

यद्वस्तं वचः साध्रे लोके च वच एव तत् ।
वर्णं यद्वस्तवादातं तस्य कामित्रिः स्मृति: ॥

What exactly Bhoja comprehended under the ‘etc.’ in the word ‘Arthavādādau’ is not known. Arthavāda, Bhoja defines elsewhere in the midst of the several Vākyadharmas, as praise or abuse and turning the idea to suit
either. Anyway, an Arthavāda is an exaggeration this way or that, an Atiśayokti.1

"स्तुतिनिन्दितविषयोपरिवर्तवादः। ततथा—मनोज्वोशः, किष्कपपिनी तुषणित। यथा च
स्तुती—
क्वावीं मानसं नामि तस्तित प्रतिभामित।
यथा हंसव्यासीच्छ मुवनां चलदुर्देशः॥

यथा वा निन्दायाम्—
वेषाः प्रणविध: कीडा नये मम्मच्छिद्यो मिरः।
परापवादः कर्तव्यं ते मृत्योरिष मृत्यः:॥


This kind of approach to Poetry seems to correspond to what Rājaśekhara records as Yāyāvariya’s opinion that in Poetry things are not what they are, but what they are to the mind of the poet or of the poet’s characters—Pratibhāsa nibandhanam (pp. 44-45 K.M.) and as the opinion of his own wife, Avantisundari, who says, “there is no constant nature of things, so far as Poetry is concerned; for, the poet’s artistic mind and the poet’s turns of expressions conceive of things in all sorts of ways.” The scientific nature of a thing which is the fact does not matter for the poet; he makes things good or bad by his conception and expression; he praises the moon and calls it the ‘nectar-rayed’; and if he has to say against it, he calls it ‘doṣā-kara.’

"विदमभणितविषयोपरिवर्तवादं वस्तुनिः स्तुतं न निनयत्विषभाम्। इति अवनन्दरी। तदात्—
वस्तुनिन्दितवात्रष्ट्र कन्येपतं: गुणायुक्तविनिवेशन कायम्।
स्तुतिविषयविषयवाच्यं निन्दस्तु दोषोपास्माह दृष्टं॥” P. 46. K.M.

This can also be compared to what Yāyāvariya says on p. 25 that in Poetry there is no question of things being true or untrue, Satya and Asatya. It is all one Arthavāda.

"नात्रयं नाम कृतं कायम् यस्तु नन्दायांवर्तवादः।
स न परं कृतिकमणि प्रभुती च शाश्वेच च लोके च॥

This verse throws some light on Bhoja’s brief utterance on Vakratā, Kāvyā and Arthavāda. Even in Veda, Śāstra and Loka, cases of Arthavāda are cases of Poetry. By the etc.—Ādi—in the statement ‘Vakram yad arthavādādau’, Professor S. Kuppuswami Sastri suggests that Bhoja may mean Mantra, the Stotras and descriptive Rks, since they form Poetry. But the word Ādi seems to me unnecessary and Arthavāda, by itself, seems to give some kind of definition of Poetry. In Arthavāda, we cast away the face-sense; and so also in Poetry. We take the intention or the real sense which is either Stuti (Praise) or Nindā (Condemnation). In Poetry also, there are

only two facts—heightening of objects and lowering them, Utkarṣa and Apakarṣa, according to the context or the theme, Artha and Rasa. Says Mahima Bhaṭṭa also:

विना उद्धोपर्यन्त्यां स्वदर्शयूर्ति न जातुचित्।
तद्विनिमित कार्यादेशाराम पर्युपासते॥

V. V. p. 53. T. S. S.

Ratnēśvara, commentator on Bhoja’s S. K. Ā., as has been already proved, is acquainted with Bhoja’s Sr. Pra. well. He explains somewhat Bhoja’s notion of Vakratā. He quotes this Anuṣṭubh kārikā of Bhoja on Vakratā, namely, Yad avakram etc., in his commentary on the S. K. Ā. Bhoja has a ‘flaw’ among his Doṣas called Arītimat which is the reverse of the nine Guṇas, śleṣa, etc. One kind of this Arītimat is the reverse of the Guṇa ofAUDārya—Audārya viparyaya—which Bhoja describes as Analāṁkāra.

“वेस्तु रूेटनिबिधानान्ध वैद्यवैर्य विपर्ययः।
वाक्यं तदनन्नकारमलक्ष्यकार्यविबिधी नितुः॥

Vṛtti:
तददस्युपापायाऽद्यतुष्टिविदेशधर्मसूचियाविदेशधर्मोसोध्यमादिविपर्ययः:—।


Here, in the word Analāṁkāra, the name Alamāṅkāra is used to mean the common, minimum, or prime requisite of beauty necessary for making any utterance poetic. Bhoja uses the word in the very general sense in which he uses it when he classifies it into Svabhāvokta, Vakrokti and Rasokti. A similar instance of Bhoja’s use of the word Alamāṅkāra in this wider sense is Bhoja’s Vākyārtha Doṣa called Niralaṁkāra. Under this Doṣa also, Bhoja emphasises the same point. Any expression to be poetic must have ‘Alamāṅkāra’; otherwise it is bald. Ratnēśvara, while commenting on the Audārya viparyaya, explains this point. He says that without Vakratā there is no possibility of Poetry. Thus run his comments:

“अस्तु रूेटेरिति। काव्यरूपतायोजकं स्ताद्यपोः वक्तता उदारता। न हि वक्तता-
मन्तरेण काव्यपदविभाषित। तदाह—
‘गुण ( ० ) वक्तं वचः। शाखे लोके न वच एवं चतुः।
वक्तं वदतुसुपापेऽत्र काव्यित्वमित्रतिः॥’

Sr. Pra.

तदेवतदलकारादिविदेशधर्मसूचियाविदेशधर्ममेतेहै। (शाल्यायनोः) अवकर्मेन स्फूटकर्त।”

P. 30. S. K. Ā.

Ratnēśvara has here quoted the verse of Bhoja on Vakratva, ‘Yad avakram etc.’, given by him twice in his Sr. Pra. The context in which Ratnēśvara quotes it and the purpose for which he quotes it make the meaning of the verse pretty plain. Ratnēśvara says that Alamāṅkāra signifies the prime essential element of beauty and is synomous with Vakratva which is the condition that makes for Poetry—Kāvyā rūpātā prayojaka; and it is to supplement this that Ratnēśvara quotes the Kārikā of Bhoja on Vakratā from his Sr. Pra.
The Kārikā as quoted by Ratnēśvara, reads in the first line यत् वक्रम् for यद्वक्रमम् and is a clear mistake. In the last quarter there is an insignificant change: तत् तत्त for तत्स्य and भुजित् for स्मरित्. But a really noteworthy change is in the third quarter which substitutes the word ‘Anurāgādau’ for ‘Artha-vādādau’. Perhaps both mean the same thing. Anurāga means love and consequently praise and by ‘Adi’ is meant Dveṣa or dislike and consequently abuse. Thus ‘Anurāgādau’ also we may take as meaning Stuti and Nindā.¹

Under the Vākyārthata doṣa called Niralaṁkāra, Ratnēśvara explains Bhoja in the following manner: Without Vakratā, there can be no Alamkāra, hence no Kāvyā. Such Vakratā is the product of the poet’s genius and is delectable to the Sahṛdayas. Even Svabhāvokti has got this Vakratā; hence it is that Svabhāvokti also is an Alamkāra. But there are bald utterances like ‘गोरुपत्य कहींकहीं’ which do not come under Svabhāvokti or Jāti, being devoid of Vakratā or Alamkāra. Such cases of ‘baldness’ form the Doṣa called Niralaṁkāra.

"वक्रतायथरेकेत्तल्लकर्मयामायमेव न स्वादिति निरत्त्वामायमयुक्तम्। × × ×
ततो जारीवट्टवेषन वक्रतायथरेकेत्तल्लकर्मयामायमेव न स्वादिति निरत्त्वामायमयुक्तम्। × × ×
कथे तैह वक्रतायथरेकेत्तल्लकर्मयामायमेव न स्वादिति निरत्त्वामायमयुक्तम्। × × ×
कथे तैहे शब्दाल्पमे अभावम: इति शब्दाल्पमः। हेतु तु न तथा। किन्तु उक्तमे वक्रतायथां न वक्रमम्
इति वाक्यायं त्व।" P. 38. S. K. A Vya.

The previous instance of Audārya viparyaya or Analaṁkāra emphasises śabda vakratā as essential and this Vākyārthata doṣa of Niralaṁkāra, Artha vakratā.

Earlier also, while commenting on the opening part of the flaw Arītimat, Ratnēśvara has some introductory remarks where he points out that the nine Guṇas, Śleṣa etc., secure the requisite Vakratā without which an expression cannot be called Poetry.

"एतद् (त्वेपाधिनवर्गण) योगात वक्रस्पन्ताम् आतावच्यवपदेशं वमते।" P. 24.

Both Bhoja and Ratnēśvara follow Vāmana on the difference between Guṇas and Alamkāras. In the larger sense of the term Alamkāra as Saundarya or Kāvyā-sobhākara-dharma, Guṇa also is Alamkāra. But Guṇa is a necessity, Nitya; and Alamkāra or figure like Uपamā is only optional, Anitya. In the absence of the former, there is no Kāvyā; the latter is only to add additional grace. Thus the basic beauty or Vakratā is due to the Guṇas. This Vakratā increases by addition of Alamkāras like Uपamā. Hence it is, by the way, the reason why Vakrokti and Alamkāra though they mean Guṇa also, mean, par excellence, figures like Uपamā which add the more easily perceptible Vakratva.

¹. There is also the third state of Mādhyaasthya which means neither Praise nor Abuse. See Pālīyaśkriti’s view on p. 46 Rājaśekhara’s K. M.
Under the śabda guṇa Samādhi, Ratneesvara explains Vakratā as underlying Samādhi.

“सम्पगावनां आरोपण समाधि: | सम्पगक्ष्यां च बकङ्क; लोकानितिवस्य—|"  P. 54.

Under the Artha-guṇa, Śleṣa, Ratneesvara takes Vāmanā’s Kauṭilya as Vakratā.

“—तत्तैव कौटिल्यं लोकानितिवस्यं बक्रता। अवक्रोऽयोः श्वायत्योऽऽवक्रमात्रुत्तर।”  P. 63.

The second sentence is a paraphrase of Bhoja’s dictum that Kāvyā and Vacas are Vakra and Avakra.

Again under the Guṇa, Samatā of Artha, Ratneesvara remarks that Vakratā is absolutely essential.

“बक्रता चाय विशेषणमूलकतिः। अन्यथा मुख्य नवज्ञयत्व: को विषेषः स्वातः।” P. 64.

On the Vaiśeṣika guṇa of Analamkāra, he says:

“अष्टगोऽन्न वक्रोभवेन तत्तस्वरूपः।”  P. 109.

Under the Vaiśeṣika Guṇa, Niralamkāra, Ratneesvara straightly puts Vakratva as Alarīṅkāra.

“—वक्रत्वे च अलाङ्कार इति। × × सामान्येन बक्रता प्रकाशत एव।”  P. 109.

The Vakrokti-alāṅkāra.

Side by side with this larger concept of Vakrokti, which meant poetic speech and Alāṅkāra in general, there must have been a kind of poetic figure of this name involving clever dialogue turning on ordinary and word-split (Bhaṅga-śleṣa) puns. We do not meet with Vakrokti as a special figure in Bhāmaha and Daṇḍin, both of whom use the word as a common name for Alāṅkāra in general. But, when Daṇḍin says that in Vakrokti in general, Śleṣa adds charm, he seems to minimise the scope of Vakrokti; for it is not all kinds of Vakrokti that involve Śleṣa. But much cannot be made out of this remark of Daṇḍin, who simply says that Śleṣa is an element which can beautify many other Alāṅkāras. In theoretical writings, it is only when we come to Rudraṭa that we find the first writer who gives the smaller Vakrokti. Rudraṭa never speaks of Vakrokti as a name of Alāṅkāra in general. He gives a śabdālāṅkāra called Vakrokti, which is a dialogue involving intonation cleverly employed to change the meaning and another variety of the same which employs word-split pun. (II. 14-17). The variety employing Kāku soon ceased to be considered as an instance of Vakrokti and Rājaśekhara criticises it in his Kāvyā-mimāṁsā. In Ananda’s time, we have poet Ratnākara writing his minor poem Vakrokti-pancāśikā, which contains Vakrokti involving Bhaṅga-śleṣa, one of the two varieties of Rudraṭa. Mammata accepted Rudraṭa completely and gives both the Bhaṅga-śleṣa and Kāku Vakrokti in the śabdālāṅkāra section. Hemacandra, following Rājaśekhara, refuses to accept Kāku as a variety of Vakrokti; as follower of Ananda, he places Kāku
under Guṇībhūta-vyaṅgya and accepts only Bhaṅgasleṣa-vakrokti as a Šabdālāṁkāra. Mammaṭa has added Abhaṅgasleṣa also to what Rudraṭa gave and, on this point, Hemacandra follows Mammaṭa. Ruuyaka accepts (p. 175) Mammaṭa’s position and gives both Śleṣa and Kāku Vakroktis, though he takes them over to the Arthałāṁkāra section. Ruuyaka decides the future for this Vakrokti; Vidyānātha follows him (p. 296, Bāla, Edn.) and so also Appayya Dīkṣīta. Viśvanātha however chooses to follow Mammaṭa completely in retaining Vakrokti as a Šabdālāṁkāra.

Thus, after the time of Rudraṭa, the word Vakrokti was signifying both the particular poetic figure of Šabda or of Artha, and the general concept of Arthałāṁkāra as such. It is likely that, as a name for that kind of dialogue in which one outwits another by word-split puns, the history of the word goes far back into those days of Poetics of which we have no work left to us. It is very intelligible how this kind of speech came to be called Vakra-ukti, crooked speech. How by Bhāmaha’s time the name Vakrokti came to mean Alāṁkāra in general, so much, that we do not see any trace of the particular figure going by that name, is not known. But it cannot be settled whether Šabdālāṁkāra Bhaṅga-ślēṣa Vakrokti expanded into the larger Vakrokti or the larger Vakrokti of Bhāmaha and Daṇḍin sank to the level of the mere Šabdālāṁkāra of that name in Rudraṭa. In the Dvanyāloka of Ananda, Vakrokti as meaning the larger common name of Alāṁkāra, is met with in Ud. II. Ruuyaka says that the word means both:

“बकोक्षीत्वत् अल्पकारसमान्यबन्धनोपि इह्ः अल्पकारविशेषः संप्रितः।” P. 177.

and Vidyānātha also says regarding the Vakrokti-arthałāṁkāra:

‘उपैतुके कथविसम्बन्धयः एवविभक्तुक्यामावात् स्वल्पकाररूपमिथावत्।’ P. 296.

In Bhoja, we meet with this smaller Vakrokti meaning a particular poetic figure also, alongside of the larger concept of that name. Bhoja, in common with Mammaṭa, follows Rudraṭa in accepting Rudraṭa’s Vakrokti as given by him as a Šabdālāṁkāra. But Bhoja makes it a sub-variety of a new class of Šabdālāṁkāra constituted by himself. All instances of Vakrokti, as seen in Alāṁkāra texts and in such examples of it as the Vakrokti-paṅcāśikā are dialogues and this element of dialogue is taken and made a major type of Šabdālāṁkāra called Vākovākyya by Bhoja.

उपैतुकसुपपर्य वाक्यं वाकोवाक्यं विद्युधेषोऽऽत् ॥ II. 143. p. 252 S. K. Ā.

One of the six varieties of this dialogue and repartee called Vākovākyya is Vakrokti. Bhoja accepts only the Śleṣa variety of Vakrokti of Rudraṭa. The Kāku variety he has separated; Kāku by itself is brought under another Šabdālāṁkāra called Paṭhiti by Bhoja, which is more intelligible. (P. 164, S. K. Ā.) Śleṣa-vakrokti is divided by Bhoja into two kinds—Nirvyūḍha and Anirvyūḍha. The former is sustained Vakrokti running to the end of the verse; the latter is not so sustained. Bhoja cites Rudraṭa’s illustration for Śleṣa-vakrokti for his Nirvyūḍha variety. S. K. Ā., P. 253.
Thus in Bhoja’s work Vakrokti means:—

(1) Alāṅkāra, Vakratā, the characteristic poetic expression in general; the very definition of Kāvya.

(2) One variety of no. 1. That is, the Alāṅkāras beginning with Upamā. The two other varieties are Svabhāvokti and Rasokti. These three comprehend the whole realm of poetic expression.

and (3) One of the varieties of the Śabdālāṅkāra called Vākovākya.

**Vakrokti and the Lakṣanā vyrtti**

In the history of Vakrokti, Vāmana holds a striking position, standing somewhat aloof with a singular opinion. Vāmana is the first writer in whose work we meet with the term Vakrokti with the restricted sense, as the name of a particular figure of Artha. Vāmana holds a position altogether different from that of Rudraṭa who, though he also gives Vakrokti only as the name of a particular figure, gives it as a Śabdālāṅkāra. Vāmana gives it as Arthālāṅkāra, involving similarity, Upamā; an Arthālāṅkāra which is the same as Daṇḍin’s Samādhī-guṇa, being based on the transference of attributes of one to another on the basis of similarity. सद्र्ष्य वक्रोक्ति: । IV. iii. 8. Vāmana definitely says that it is only Lakṣanā based on Sādṛṣṭa, similarity, that is Vakrokti and not those Lakṣanās based on Śāmīpya etc.

“बहुलिः हि निवन्यनाति लक्षण्याम॥ तत्र समाधिसक्तम् वक्रोक्तिः।। x x असाद्र्ष्यधिवन्या तु लक्षणा न वक्रोक्ति:।” Pp. 130-1. K. A. Sū. and VĪ.

But writers who want to bring all cases of beautiful poetic expression under Vakrokti will have to say naturally that not only Sādṛṣṭa lakṣanā but other cases of lakṣanā also form Vakrokti. If even non-lakṣanā expressions, Abhidhāmūla dhvani for instance, have also to be brought under some kind of Vakrokti, it goes without saying that non-sādṛṣṭa-lakṣanās also are Vakrokti.

In Bhoja’s Śr. Pra., there is a significant verse quoted by Bhoja on Lakṣanā in the beginning of chapter VII, which treats of Abhidhā, Lakṣanā and Gauṇī vyrtis. While defining Lakṣanā, Bhoja says

तदुकमः—

ʿअभिधिमाचिनामूवित्ततिक्षणघत्ते।
शैष्य विद्रशकोक्तिनां दृश्यितिरिपते॥’


For those writers who recognise beyond Abhidhā only one Vyṛtti, namely, Lakṣanā and bring under it all the ideas appearing in the train of Abhidhā, and for those writers who hold all aspects of strikingness in poetic expression as Vakrokti, this verse in Bhoja is fully acceptable. It gives Lakṣanā as the very life of the poet’s Vakrokti. Bhoja simply gives the verse and makes no comment; he does not utilise it or expand it elsewhere in his work.
As in the case of his other verse on Vakrokti, *Yad avakram*, etc., he leaves us with a meagre Anuṣṭubh. What kind of Lakṣaṇa, whether it is that based on Śādrśya only or all kinds of Lakṣaṇa is meant in this verse, is not easy to decide. Perhaps Bhoja means by this Vakrokti, here, not Vāmana’s Vakrokti based on Śādrśya lakṣaṇa but the larger concept of Vakrokti which occurs so much in his work; and perhaps Bhoja says here that of all kinds of Vakrokti, i.e., Alamkāra in general, Lakṣaṇa is generally a life-giving element, even as Daṇḍin said that Śīsla generally adds beauty to all kinds of Vakrokti. At the end of his definition and illustration of all the sub-varieties of the two kinds of Lakṣaṇa, named Lakṣaṇa and Lakṣīta lakṣaṇa, Bhoja says that all kinds of Lakṣaṇa are found amply in poets’ expressions. Bhoja gives many fine verses in illustration (Vol. II, pp. 14-18), many of which are found given in the *Dhvanyāloka* as illustrations for Lakṣaṇāmūla-dhveni. Surely, of all these, Śādrśya lakṣaṇa is the greatest but we can take that, in the above-given verse, Bhoja does not mean a re-statement of Vāmana’s Vakrokti based on Śādrśya lakṣaṇa, but seems to mean that Lakṣaṇaś is of all kinds are found to lie at the root of all kinds of Vakrokti as a secund principle.¹

Under his Śabdālarṇkāra called Ṣayyā, Bhoja gives a variety called ‘miscellaneous’—Prakṛṇa Ghaṭaṇā, S. K. Ā. pp. 159-164. Bhoja here speaks of the presence in poets’ expressions of the Śabda vr̥tti of Mukhyā, Gauṇi and Lakṣaṇa. While commenting on this, Ratneśvara quotes (p. 162) the above-discussed verse on Lakṣaṇa and Vakrokti. And he also seems to con-

---

1. The above-discussed Anuṣṭubh in Bhoja on Lakṣaṇa and Vakrokti is introduced by Bhoja with the words तदुःक्षम्. We do not know who its author is. Most likely Bhoja himself is its author. The first line ‘अभिषेयाविविधामूर्तितितिश्लेषणोऽभ्ये’ is not Bhoja’s. It is Kumārilā’s definition of Lakṣaṇa. On p. 242, Vol. II, in a discussion on Gauṇa vr̥tti and Upacāra, Bhoja quotes it, as also the definition of Gauṇi vr̥tti with the mention of the name of their author, Bhaṭṭa, i.e., Kumārilā. It is likely, Bhoja took the first line defining Lakṣaṇa from Kumārilā and added to it the second line giving Lakṣaṇa as the Life of Vakrokti. We need not doubt Bhoja’s authorship of the second line and of the idea of Lakṣaṇa as the Life of Vakrokti, just because of the words तदुःक्षम् introducing the verse. Elsewhere Bhoja quotes his own verses with these words तदुःक्षम्. It must be noted that accidentally we meet with in this verse the combination of the words Vakrokti jivitam, which gives the name of Kuntaka’s work!

Sāradātanaṇaya who summarises Bhoja’s text on Sāhitya, has this verse on Lakṣaṇa and Vakrokti in his Bhā. Pra. on page 145.

अभिषेयाविविधामूर्तितितिश्लेषणोऽभ्ये । सैया विद्याविवकोन्तीश्वरबिन्दुः श्रुतिरिथते ॥
कोशार्थम् मध्य इत्यदाहि सा श्लेषणमयंते । व्ययमार्गावसंग्रहसरस्वति गौणात् ॥

Sāradātanaṇaya illustrates the Lakṣaṇa here by the expression “कोशार्थम् मध्यः” and this shows that Bhoja means in that verse all kinds of Lakṣaṇa. Bahrūpamīśra, who borrows largely from the Śr. Pra. and the Bhā. Pra., reproduces the above from Sāradātanaṇaya. (p. 74, Mad. Ms. R. 4188.) He also quotes the verse of Bhoja on Lakṣaṇa as the life of Vidagdha-Vakrokti.
sider the Lakṣaṇā meant here as the Jīvita of Vakrokti, as not merely the one based on Sādṛṣya but Lakṣaṇā of all kinds.

"—वक्रकोक्षण । तदुपकृत—
‘अभिविन्यादिनमुद्गतीतिर्लिङ्गोन्यन्ति।
सैया विद्यवक्रकोक्षजीवितं कृद्विनिबन्धनं॥’

सा शिवशा-शुद्धा, लक्षितलक्षण च।”

Ratneśvara summarises here a part of the Śr. Pra. text on Lakṣaṇā (from Vol. II.), giving the same illustrations as given by Bhoja.

That the Lakṣaṇā in this verse described as the life of Vakrokti means all kinds of Lakṣaṇā and that Vakrokti consequently does not mean what it meant to Vāmana but means various kinds of poetic expression, is also proved by Ratneśvara’s comments on Bhoja’s Vaiśeṣika guṇa of the Paruṣa doṣa. S. K. A. I. 145, p. 114. Bhoja says that Paruṣa doṣa becomes a Guṇa in Vīruddha-lakṣaṇā. Commenting on this, Ratneśvara quotes the above-discussed verse of Bhoja on Lakṣaṇā and Vakrokti (in a corrupt form), S. K. A. p. 114.
CHAPTER XI

BHOJA AND SVABHĀVOKTI*

Bhoja’s treatment of Svabhāvokti has something new to give us. Firstly, on the nature of this Āraṇkāra, some valuable information is gained even from his S. K. Ā. Secondly, an original view and a new definition of Svabhāvokti, and a systematic working out of Dāṇḍin’s view of Svabhāva and Vakra Uktis are available in Bhoj’s Śr. Pra.

Bhoja describes Svabhāvokti thus in his S. K. Ā.

नानावक्स्याय जायन्ते यानि हृपाणि बस्तुन: ।
हृपायमपस्येव निमित्तस्वायावलि जाति प्रवक्ते ॥
अर्थनीयकर्यं नेद्रियतः प्रज्ञपयेते ।
जायमानाणि(मिः)यं वक्ति हृपं सा सार्वकालिकम् ॥ III. 4-5.

(The text of S. K. Ā., N. S. Edn., reads here wrongly जायमानाणियम् वक्ति हृपम् but जायमानाणियम् वक्ति हृपम् is preserved in a quotation of this verse by Bhaṭṭa Gopāla in his commentary on the Kāvyā Prakāsha. T. S. S., p. 187, part II). In the first verse, Bhoja defines his first Arthālāṅkāra called Jāti. Jāti is another name for Svabhāvokti. ‘Jāti’ might originally have referred to “Class attribute” which figures in a Svabhāvokti. The name Svabhāva-Ukti or Svabhāva-Ākhyāna emphasises the essential nature of the figure called ‘Natural Description’. Bhoja’s definition gives a new interpretation to the name ‘Jāti’. Bhoja says that ‘Jāti’ means the exact opposite of the logical concept of class-attributes! It means those aspects of things that result from particular conditions, but aspects related to the essential nature of the things. There are two ideas in this definition of Svabhāvokti of Bhoja: one, attributes which are due to the changes consequent on particular moods or conditions—नानावक्स्याय जायन्ते यानि हृपाणि—and two, these attributes must be of the very nature of the thing—हृपायमपस्येव निमित्तस्वायावलि। We shall first examine the second condition, namely, that the attributes shall be such as are born of the very nature of the things. It rules out all cases of conceits and superimposed ideas—Āropita. This is the most essential condition; for it is the chief and direct meaning of the word ‘Svabhāva’ in Svabhāvokti. The action or qualities described must pertain to them as theirs. Mammaṭa emphasises this by the word ‘Sva’ in his definition—

स्माहोतितत्त्वादिन्हादेव: स्वखरायमयवर्गांम्। स्मायोतितक्रिययायां:। हृपं, वर्णं, संस्कारां च।”

Attribution or superimposition—असभ्ये समध्योति: and आरोप:, which

* Vide also the sections in this Thesis on Ukti, Āraṇkāra and Vakrokti, and my paper on Svabhāvokti in the Indian Culture, Vol. V, pp. 147-165.
result in Atisayokti and Rūpaka, are prohibited. Commenting on the above-
given definition of Mammaṭa, Vidyācakravartin says:

"स्वाध्य निवाहयोऽनांगोपितलम् अतः स्वभावोत्तिन्ति अनवचैता।"

p. 336. T. S. S.

If something is added by way of comparison or contrast, we have no Sva-
abhāvokti but we land on some Alaṅkāra based on Aupamya or Virodha. Externally ideas, our ideas of an object, or reflections on seeing an object,—
these again are out of the scope of Svabhāvokti. Ratnēśvara clearly explains this as the import of the words स्वेम्यः स्वेम्यो नित्येम्यः in Bhoja’s definition. Giving an instance of a poet’s reflection, he says:

"स्वाध्यायापि जातिं स्थानं अत आह—स्वेम्यः स्वेम्यं विल। स्वभावभूतानि इत्यः।"

p. 266.

Thus the main characteristic of the ‘Natural Description’ is that it is purely a Svabhāva varṇanā, that the ‘Rūpa’ described in it shall be ‘Svīya’ and ‘Naisargika’.

In the first qualification, Bhoja makes out some new significance for the
word ‘Jāyante’ from which ‘Jāti’ is derived. His new meaning of Jāti
here restricts the scope of Svabhāvokti. Bhoja emphasises the word ‘Jā-
yante’—‘produced in certain circumstances’. As for instance, a horse may
be described as sleeping in standing posture in accordance with its nature. The pcase, the attitude etc., in the state of its sleep constitute the ‘Jāta-
rūpa’ of the Avasthā of sleep.

Why is it that Bhoja stresses this point that the attributes described in Svabhāvokti shall be those which characterise a mood or state of a thing? His source and greatest Ācārya, Daṇḍin, has nothing like this in his work; Daṇḍin simply says “नानावस्थस्य पुनः तथावस्थसम् गमन” —apearances of things as they exist in their various states and actions. And things can never be separately noticed, apart from their states and actions. It is not possible to find a moment when a thing will not be in some Avasthā and if we must really make any distinction of the nature of things into that which is permanent and basic and that which pertains to the moments, we can justify that distinction as of only relative truth.

Bhoja brings in his new emphasis on ‘Jāyante’ because he has to accom-
modate in his system Vāmana’s Arthavyakti Guṇa, side by side with the Svabhāvokti Alaṅkāra. This is not the first or only case where, Bhoja fol-
lowing everybody and borrowing from everywhere, with a hundred hands, has
to artificially scheme out certain ways of adjusting all that he has gathered. The second verse in the definition of Svabhāvokti quoted above explains Bhoja more clearly. In it, Bhoja points out that Svabhāvokti Alaṅkāra is different from the Guṇa called Arthavyakti. It is necessary here to note what Bhoja means by Arthavyakti, what that Guṇa means really, apart from Bhoja’s idea of it, how it is related to Svabhāvokti in particular and poetic expression in general, and such other matters.
In Daṇḍin, Arthavyakti is a Guṇa related to the other Guṇa of Prasāda. It has nothing in its nature which overlaps with that of the Alarikāra Svabhāvokti. Vāmana’s Sabda Guṇa of this name is identical with Daṇḍin’s Arthavyakti and so also is Bhoja’s. But Vāmana has an Artha guṇa also of this name and that also Bhoja borrows. Vāmana defines his Artha guṇa Arthavyakti thus:

\[ वस्तुः-स्वभावक्ष्यक्तम् अर्थ्यक्षतः ॥ III. 2. 13. \]

Bhoja gives the first verse given by Vāmana for illustration for his Arthavyakti guṇa of Artha and adds this definition of his own:

"अर्थ्यक्षतः: स्वभावक्ष्यक्तम् अर्थ्यक्षत्ते।"

"अन्तः कृत्तेव स्वभावक्ष्य साक्षात्तिथि भूयमात्सचेत्ते यत् स्वभावक्ष्यक्तमसावर्ण्यक्षतः।""

S. K. A. I. p. 65. This 'vivid portrayal of an object's appearance'—स्वभावश्क्षाक्षक्षतः is what constitutes the essential mark of Svabhāvokti. This phrase, 'साक्षात्तिथि' stands for Vāmana’s 'सूक्त्वत्' and is borrowed by Bhoja from Daṇḍin’s definition of Svabhāvokti Alarikāra:

नानावस्थे पदार्थानः क्योः साक्षात्तिथि मित्रान्ति।

The idea that a 'Natural Description' is poetic or constitutes Alarikāra only when it is powerful, effective, and vivid is emphasised by every writer. Bāṇa says 'जातििरमयः'. A description of the nature of an object must not be bald and stale. Bhāmaha includes Svabhāvokti also in Vakrokti because of this very strikingness; and natural description devoid of this vivid portrayal is dismissed by him as Vārtā having no Vakrokti or strikingness in it.

भोजव्यक्तमेण। भलोनु: यानि वासात्त पक्षिणः।

इत्येवादार्तकम् विनात्तिथि। II. 87. K. A.

Close upon denying Alarikāratā to Hetu, Sūkṣma, and Leśa, Bhāmaha gives the above-given instance and says: Is this Kāvya? It is but ordinary speech, or mere news. Daṇḍin emphasised that Svabhāvokti must have life and must give us a vivid picture which will conjure up the object before our mind’s eye. He stressed the idea in the single word 'साक्षात्'—हं साक्षात् विकृत्वत्—on which Tarunāvīcāspati says: साक्षात् विकृत्वति प्रत्यक्षमिव दर्शवति। Rudraṭā qualifies the general class of Vāstava Alarikāras to which Jāti belongs by the attribute ‘Puṣṭārtha’. This emphasises the need for the Jāti to be vivid.

1. The Hṛdayaṁgα interprets 'Sākṣāt' as 'Avyājena' and it is significant in another way. It emphasises the other essential nature of Svabhāvokti that it must be the natural appearance and not the attributed, super-imposed, or conceived form of a thing. This is the idea emphasised by Bhoja in the words—स्वेश्यो: स्वायममण्ड: and by Mammaṭa, by the word 'Sva' in the definition स्वायम्, अस्वायम्, अन्तःवायम्, and अन्तःवायम्, and Mundaka, and by Bhoja in the words 'तत्त्वज्ञनम्, अनवयः जातिः।'
It is this quality that is born of Arthavyakti. Arthavyakti, though it pertains to all descriptions of the poet in general,¹ is pre-eminently the life of Svabhāvokti. Svabhāvokti without Arthavyakti, without ‘Vastu-svabhāva-sphuṭatva’ in Vāmana’s words, is insipid Vārtā, is Grāmya, is Apuṣṭa. Thus there is little contradiction between the Guṇa of Arthavyakti and the Alarṅkāra of Svabhāvokti.

To Vāmana, the recognition of Arthavyakti Guṇa removes the need for Svabhāvokti Alarṅkāra. So it is that while refuting Vāmana’s Artha Guṇa of Arthavyakti, Hemacandra says that it is nothing but Svabhāvokti Alarṅkāra “अष्ट च जातिनमयमालब्धकार: इति।” p. 199. Bhaṭṭa Gopāla also says:


In either case, whether Bhoja follows Vāmana closely and casts off Svabhāvokti having accepted the Arthaguna of Arthavyakti, or accepting both, understands that the two do not collide but that one is the Guṇa of the other which is an Alarṅkāra—in either case, Bhoja will have no occasion to give a distinction between Arthavyakti and Svabhāvokti. Feeling that there will be no need for Svabhāvokti when Arthavyakti has been recognised, Bhoja hastens to point out that the two differ. Arthavyakti refers to cases of portrayal of the essential, never-changing, and permanent nature of a thing; but Svabhāvokti describes only such temporary nature as is born of a particular mood or state—नानाकस्यतु जायन्ते यानि ह्याणि।

अष्टवेयक्तिः भेदविभयत गृहिषयते।

जायमानमू इत्य बलि तुप्लश्च हस्यकलिक्कू।

Svabhāvokti is जायमानमहयवग्न while Arthavyakti is सार्वकलिकहस्यवग्न. This is unnecessary narrowing down of the scope of both Svabhāvokti and Arthavyakti. The former refers to description of the inherent permanent nature as well as the effects of particular states and the latter refers to the clear, vivid, and powerful portrayal of the same picture. Bhoja’s position regarding these two resembles that of writers who dragged down the large concept of Bhāvika of Bhāmaha and Daṇḍin, a Prabandha Guṇa, made it a mere Vākyālārṅkāra and then felt that it collided with Svabhāvokti and consequently distinguished with great ingenuity Bhāvika and Svabhāvokti. (See Ruyyaka and Viśvanātha)²

Bhoja’s separation of the scope of Arthavyakti and Svabhāvokti is thus stated by his commentator, Ratneśvara.

“वस्तुस्यस्यहयक्ष्यां (यो) व्यक्ति: अष्टवेयक्तिः उक्ताः। तत्र सार्वकलिकं रूपं उपजनापायान्तालस्यापं ह्यवर्यः। अष्ट तु (वायस्यहयक्ष्या) जायमानं आयातकलिकं समवधानप्रबं व्यञ्चितां ह्यर्यः।” p. 266.

1. See Mammaṭa, _K. Pra._ T. S. S. II. Pp. 186-187, where this Artha guṇa Arthavyakti of Vāmana is included by Mammaṭa in Svabhāvokti.

So also Hemacandra; see K. A. com. p. 199.

2. I have gone into this subject in detail in my paper on Bhāvika published in the _IHQ._
The Agni Purāṇa also helps us to understand what Bhoja's differentiation between Svabhāvokti and Arthavyakti means, it being one of the works which borrow from Bhoja. In chapter 344 it gives Svabhāvokti as Svarūpa Alamkāra.

स्वरूपमय साहयस्यसत्तातिशास्यावपि etc.

It defines this Svarūpa or Svabhāvokti or Jāti thus:

स्वभाव एवं भावानाम् रहस्यमभिमीयते।
निजम् आगानिक् वैतिह द्विविधं तदुदाहतम्॥
सांसिद्धिकं निजं वैभिज्ञानिकम् आगानिकं तथा। 344|3-4.

Bhoja is clearly followed here and the nature of things is classified into eternal and temporary. Though the A. Purāṇa borrows this classification of the nature of things into 'Jāyamāna' and 'Sārvakālika' Svarūpa, the Purāṇa does not say that the description of the former only is Svabhāvokti or Svarūpālamkāra. The Purāṇa evidently proposes to treat descriptions of both as Svarūpālamkāra. Only, the Purāṇa shows two kinds of Svarūpa, even as Daṇḍin showed in Svabhāvākhyāna, varieties like Jāti, Kriyā, etc., and others, varieties like Īmbha, Tiryak, etc.

The Śr. Pra. on Svabhāvokti

On Guṇa and Alamkāra, the Śr. Pra. reproduces the S. K.A. and therefore all that has been said above stands as Bhoja's view in the Śr. Pr. also. Besides these ideas just now examined, Bhoja has something more to say in his Śr. Pra. on the general nature of Svabhāvokti.

It has already been pointed out in the sections on Ukti etc., how Bhoja following up Bhāmaha and Daṇḍin, classified Kāvya-vacana or Ukti or Alamkāra into three departments,—Svabhāvokti, Vakrokti and Rasokti. If Upamā, Rūpaka and such figures predominate, it is Vakrokti. Where Rasa is delineated through the description of the Vibhāvas etc., i.e., where expression is dominated by Rasa, there we have Rasokti. The third is Svabhāvokti, natural description of things. In the realm of ideas or Artha, there are only two classes, namely, the mere nature of things—Vastu svabhāva—and Emotions. In the description of these two, we have Vastu sarīvāda and Citta sarīvāda respectively, and the corresponding cases of expression are called Svabhāvokti and Rasa-delineation or Rasa-Ukti, according to Bhoja. These two are bare descriptions, Vastu svabhāva or Rasa svabhāva being the object of description. When both of these are figuratively described, we have the third kind of Ukti,—Vakrokti.

This is intelligible but Bhoja has sought to confuse us suddenly by a flash of originality here. Something struck him, as it often happens, and he caught a new equation. "Alamkāra, Upamā, etc., is Vakrokti; Rasa is Rasokti; . . . ." he pondered over and said, "Guṇa remains; Guṇa is Svabhāvokti!" We cannot understand this equation if we take into consideration particular Guṇas and the nature of the Svabhāvokti Alamkāra. Firstly,
Svabhāvokti or Jāti is an Alarikāra, the first among Arthālakārās. By saying that Vakrokti is Alarikāra-pradhāna, does Bhoja mean to include Jāti or Svabhāvokti in that Vakrokti? If so, why does he say that Vakrokti is Ukti dominated by Alarikāras beginning with Upamā? Are we then to throw Svabhāvokti out of the fold of Alarikāra? Why should he say that Svabhāvokti is ‘Gunā pradhāna’? Bhoja’s Guṇas are not all of a homogeneous nature. Gāmbhirya Guṇa is a case of Dhvani; Kānti which is ‘Diptā rasatva’ is given as a Guṇa but a verse dominated by Kānti will be a case of Bhoja’s Rasokti. This Guṇa-Svabhāvokti equation of Bhoja not found in his S. K. A. in any plain manner and found plainly stated in his Śr. Pra. is not easy to be understood.

Bhoja can be understood in a way if we approach this classification of his from the point of view of his conception of the nature of Guṇas and Alarikāras in general. Bhoja follows Vāmana in his conception of Guṇa and its difference from Alarikāra. The former is eternally related to Poetry, Nitya, Samavāya sambaddha; and the latter is only optional, Anitya, Sāriyoga sambaddha. The former is absolutely necessary and there can be no Poetry without them; even in the absence of the latter, the presence of the former makes for Poetry. Guṇas are also Ṣobhākara dharmas but they refer to Svabhāvika Ṣobhā whereas Alarikāras are only Kṛtrima Ṣobhā. Therefore, in a piece of Poetry where there is no Upamā etc., there is the beauty resulting from the Guṇas. Svabhāvokti or Jāti is a case devoid of all figures coming under Vakrokti; then it must have the Guṇas in abundance. Thus it seems that Bhoja thought that Svabhāvokti is Ukti dominated by Guṇas. So it is that he said:

“श्रीवि: खल्लवक्कारवगः, वक्रोक्तः, स्वभावोक्तः, स्वोच्चिरितः। तत्र उपमाखल्लकार-प्राचायेव वक्रोक्तः, सोज्य गुणप्रभावेय स्वभावोक्तः, सिमाक्कुलभल्लविभिरिष्योगादि रसनिष्ठतः स्वोच्चिरित: इति।” Śr. Pra. Mad. Ms. Vol. II, chap. XI, p. 372.

APPENDIX

Hamsamīṭhū’s Hamsa-vilāsa (GOS, LXXXI), ch. 43, p. 241, restricts the scope of Svabhāvokti to ‘Nica-Vasti’, i.e., lower class of beings, animals, trees etc.

नीचादिवस्तूर्णा याधात्प्रेयनस्वहस्तकथनं जाति:।
CHAPTER XII

BHOJA, DHVANI AND ĀNANDAVARDHANA

"तत्पर्यायेऽवत्तिः विद्विवाख्यते कह्ये "
Bhoja : Śr. Pra. ch. 1.

The beginnings of Dhvani; the suggested idea and the 'Gauṇa' idea in Bhāmaha, Daṇḍin, Udhaṭa and Vāmana.

The anti-Dhvani viewpoints; the three main Dhvani pratipakṣas mentioned by Ananda and the twelve mentioned in two Kārikās quoted by Jayaratha. Examination of the twelve anti-Dhvani standpoints with Ananda's reply to some of them like the Bhāktavāda and the Anumānāvāda.

Elaborate exposition of the Tātparyavāda; Ananda's discussion in Uddyota III; the reply of Dhanika.

Bhoja's position, a compromise between Tātparya and Dhvani. Bhoja and Ānandavardhana; Bhoja's indebtedness to Ananda; texts borrowed by Bhoja from the Dhvanyāloka.

Bhoja and Dhvani; criticism of Dr. S. K. De's view of Bhoja's attitude towards Dhvani. Traces of Dhvani in the S. K. A. among the Guṇas and Alamkāras.

Exposition of the text of the Śr. Pra. on Tātparya and Dhvani; three kinds of Tātparya in Bhoja, Abhidhiyāmāna, Pratīyāmāna and Dhvanirūpa; critical examination of the division of the Suggested by Bhoja into the Pratīyāmāna and Dhvani; Hemacandra's indebtedness to Bhoja's text on this subject. Critical examination of Bhoja's view of Dhvani as Tātparya and as part of Tātparya; Vidyānātha, Kumārasvāmin, Sāradātanaya and Ānanda on it.


Sāradātanaya's acceptance and succinct exposition of Bhoja's view of Dhvani. Bahūrūpamīśra following Bhoja and Sāradātanaya.

Two texts of Bhoja on Rasa as Vākyārtha and Bhāvas as Padārthas.

APPENDIX I. Vākyaśeṣa, Srutārtha-patti and Dhvani; Bhoja's text on Vākyaśeṣa.

II. Vivakṣā and Dhvani.

III. Sanskrit Texts:

(i) Śr. Pra. on Dhvani. Ch. 7.
(ii) Dhvanyāloka on Tātparya and Dhvani. Ud. 3.
(iii) The Daśarūpāvaloka on Dhvani and Tātparya.

The origin of the idea of suggestion or Dhvani is to be found in those Alamkāras in Bhāmaha and other early writers in which there is an implied sense also imbedded. In II. 34, Bhāmaha speaks of Guṇaśāmya pratiti, which is a case of implied or suggested similarity, Gāmyāmāna aupamya. In II.
79. he defines Samāsokti as suggesting an idea by describing a similar one: वर्णोऽसे गम्यतेऽयोऽयः। Bhāmaha states plainly that an idea, totally different, though similar (Tatsamāna viśeṣaṇa) is suggested by saying something. Similarly, in the Pāryāyokta defined and illustrated in III. 8-9, Bhāmaha speaks of instances of utterances which are specifically meant to give a different meaning. The ‘Abhidhiḥāna’ has a meaning which is not the idea sought to be conveyed. यद्यन्त्र प्रकारण अभिव्यक्ते। In his Apahnuti in III. 21, Bhāmaha says that the idea of similarity is implied, “Antargatopamā.”

Similar traces of the ‘suggested idea’ can be found in Daṇḍin’s work. Daṇḍin’s Guṇa called Udāra, in its first variety, is the suggestion of a quality by a suggestive description.

उन्नयनान् गुणः कृति शमिलस्ये प्रतीते। I. 76. इति स्वागत वाक्ये शमिलस्ये साधु कृत्ये। I. 78.

While defining the Udātta Alāṁkāra also, Daṇḍin says in II. 303: पुर्वान्तरायमहात्म्याचार्यव्रद्धेऽग्रीवः। सुविशेषार्थिति व्यक्तमुदयत्वमयः। II. 303.

The implied idea, Pratiyamāna, is also met with in the Alāṁkāra chapter. It is seen in many varieties of Upamā, II. 14, 16; Sāmyapratīti in 46 (Prativastāpamā), Pratiyamāna sādṛṣya in Vyātireka in II. 189 & 195, also in 205 (Samāsokti) where Daṇḍin says there is the suggestion of another idea, Sūcana (213), and Prakārāntara ākhyāna in Pāryāyokta (295).

When we come to the Pāryāyokta in Udṛṣṭa we find a clear mention of a significative capacity called Avagama which means Suggestion, a capacity different from and coming after the well-known Abhidhiḥā of the words and the Tātparya of the sentence as a whole.

पर्यायोऽसे यद्यन्त्र प्रकारणार्थिचरणे। वाच्यवाचकवृत्तिः सुवेनाविभाजनम्।

Similar traces of Dhvani can be found in Rudraṭa’s Bhāvālaṁkāra (vii. 38-40.) where Rudraṭa points out the presence of Avagamana of another idea, and in his Parikara, Samāsokti and Anyokti.

Both Ananda and Abhinava clearly state that Udṛṣṭa showed (in his Bhāmakavivarana) cases of Alāṁkāra dhvani, one Alāṁkāra suggesting another. He might not have called those cases Dhvani or Alāṁkāradhvani. Says Ananda:

अन्यत्र वाच्यवाचक प्रतीति यथा रूपकारितः; सोद्भवं प्रतीतिमान्तः बाहुल्येन प्रदर्शित:। तत्ततादि: भावोद्भवादिम्। p. 108.

The Locana says:

तत्ततः।—राच्यवाचकविशेषविशेषं अन्योदायकविशेषं: भावोद्भवादिम: उच्चम:। इत्यविश्वासय अवलंबे तत्ततादिः। केवले ते अवलंबक्षणात्वः। वाच्यवाचकाः। विशेषविशेषवाल्येन अहुरितं भाव:।। p. 108.
When the theory of Dhvani was formulated by the neo-critics headed by Ānanda, there was all-round opposition and one of the many counter-theories put forward against the necessity for Dhvani is the theory of ‘Alarikāra antarbhāva’, the viewpoint of those who accepted the existence of a suggested element but held it, whether it be a case of Dhvani of Vastu, Alarikāra or Rasa, as included in Alarikāras, ordinary Alarikāras or Rasavadalarikāras. This viewpoint is held by Pratihārendurāja also, who expounds it at the end of his commentary on Udbhata’s Kāvyālāṅkāra-sāra-saṅgrahā.

Vastudhvani is shown to be Paryāyoktālāmkāra; in such cases as the Padadhvani in the verse rāmāḥśrīṃ सवे सहे Pratihārendurāja posits Paryāyoktālāmkāra, by accepting a class of Paryāyokta pertaining to a single word in addition to the generally accepted Paryāyokta in a Vākya.

Besides the realisation of a suggested element in the above given cases of Alarikāra, early writers vaguely touched certain other kinds of Dhvani also. Ānandaavardhana says in stating the Pūrvaṇa that those predecessors who recognised certain cases in poetry where a secondary significance of words beyond the primary one added charm, touched the fringes of Dhvani.

“—तथापि गुणविभ्यं काल्येतु व्यवहारं दर्शयता चविभाषणं मनाकः स्पृष्टः—” I. p. 10.

Abhinava comments upon this in the following manner:

“मामहोरं शवद्मनोभिधामस्य शवद् मेद्व्यासक्तः मामहोरं शवद्मनोभिधामस्य शवद् भवैं शवद्मनोभिधामस्य शवद् मेद्व्यासक्तः मामहोरं शवद्मनोभिधामस्य शवद् भवैं शवद्मनोभिधामस्य शवद् मेद्व्यासक्तः मामहोरं शवद्मनोभिधामस्य शवद् भवैं शवद्मनोभिधामस्य शवद् मेद्व्यासक्तः मामहोरं शवद्मनोभिधामस्य शवद् भवैं शवद्मनोभिधामस्य शवद् मेद्व्यासक्तः मामहोरं शवद्मनोभिधामस्य शवद् भवैं

While commenting upon Bhāmaha I. 9, where some subjects accessory to poetics are mentioned two of which are Śabda and Abhidhāna, Udbhata pointed out that the first word Śabda referred to words themselves and the latter, Abhidhāna referred to the two-fold significative capacity of words, the primary and the secondary. The presence of the latter in Alarikāras, Udbhata must have shown in the course of his commentary on Bhāmaha but we are not fortunate enough to know it owing to the loss of Udbhata’s Bhāmahavivaraṇa. But in his Kāvyālāṅkāra-sāra-saṅgrahā, a text pretty closely following Bhāmaha, Udbhata says there is Guṇavṛtti in Rūpaka. The charm in Rūpaka is said to consist in the prominence of this secondary significance.

The Guṇavṛtti is very much earlier than Udbhata in philosophical literature. In poetics, we meet with it even in Daṇḍin’s Samādhiṇa which is identical
with Vāmana’s Vakrōkti Alāṅkāra, both of which result from the secondary significance based on similarity, Sādṛṣyālakṣanā.

This Samādhi of Daṇḍin and the Vakrōkti of Vāmana are the Sūkṣmālāṅkāra of the Aupamya class of Rudraṭa (VII. 98.). In the Alāṅkāra section also, Daṇḍin speaks of Gaṇavṛtti in connection with varieties of Hetvalāṅkāra. II. 254.

This suggested idea was slowly gaining importance. We see Ananda informing us in the opening verse that, though (as Abhinava points out) none ever put it in the form of a work, the theory of Dhvani was old and was being held by scholars for sometime before him, द्वै: समानान्तपूजः। When Ananda was trying to give shape to the concept, and establish the theory in a systematic form, contemporaries like poet Manoratha (p. 9) ridiculed him. To them, there must be something definite in terms of Alāṅkāra, Vyutpanna śabda i.e., Saussabda, and Vakrōkti. Ananda had to meet all objections and in his Dhvanyāloka he has given and refuted the following Anti-Dhvani theories:

In the opening Kārikā itself Ananda says that Dhvani has three Pratipakṣas: (1) Certain scholars denied it altogether; (2) certain others considered it as Bhakti or Laksanā, the secondary significance; (3) a third set considered it incomprehensible and indescribable. Of these three, the second and the third recognised the idea of Dhvani; the former included it in Bhakti while the latter, granting the maximum to the Dhvani-theorists, admitted the impossibility of its inclusion in Bhakti, but said that it is something which a few Sahādayas only see and that it is beyond the capacity of words to define it and put it into a system of thought. These form the three primary anti-Dhvani standpoints. Abhinava puts them succinctly thus: Conventionally sets of ideas are associated with words; whatever is thus associated and is got at by this conventional association is Abhidhā, the denotation of the word; beyond this there is no special capacity of words called Vyañjana. If the ideas got are to be analysed into those that form the ideas primarily associated through convention and those coming in their train, then the second class of meaning can be classed as the ‘secondary meaning’, all coming under Laksanā or Bhakti. If it is held that the suggested idea is not included in Bhakti, then surely it is not to be called by a new name like Dhvani but has to be pronounced indescribable. The first is negation, Abhāvavāda; the second is inclusion in Bhakti, Laksanāntarbhāva vāda; and the third is Anirvacaniyātā vāda.

“(१) तत्र समयप्रक्षेप शन्दोपर्यतिपादत् हि तत्त्वा वाच्यविकिर्ष्टं नातित्वमेव। (२) सदवि वा वदविभाविष्टं वाच्यविकाः-अर्थवृक्कृष्ट्वाद स्वच्छम्। (३) तदनादशिसमपि वा न बुधे शब्दवर्णे, कुमारीषिव भर्गूपसमानदुःख।” Locana. p. 4.
Ānanda takes up the first view-point and analyses it into three arguments (pp. 4-9). Poetry is different from other utterance in that its Šabda and Artha are beautiful in some way. The causes of that beauty have been found out to be Anuprāsa etc., and Upamā etc., Alamkāras of Šabda and Artha, Guṇas of Šabda and Artha on which are based the Vṛttis of both Šabda and Artha as well as the Ritis. Therefore there can be nothing new like Dhvani beyond Alamkāras, Guṇas, Ritis and Vṛttis. Secondly, these exhaust the elements of charm in poetic expression and if there is said to be something which a clique like that of the Dhvani-theorists urge as a feature of poetic charm, the only reply is that this strange thing not coming under any known category, is plainly not a feature of poetic charm at all. Thirdly, even granting that there is something like Dhvani and that it is an element of poetry, it can be shown that it is only a new name for one or the other of the numerous varieties of figures etc., accepted by the ancients or is included in one or the other of the varieties of the same which are infinitely possible. Thus even in this first viewpoint there is a gradual passing from the Abbāva to the Antarbhāva vāda. Thus on the whole there are three Abbāya vādas, one Bhāktā vāda and one Anirvacaniya vāda, giving a total number of five anti-Dhvani theories. Abhinava also explains these clearly on pp. 4-5 (Locana).

All these are generally answered by Ānanda in the first chapter itself. Between Pp. 35 and 45, Ānanda refutes the Alamkāra vāda. Taking the cases of Alamkāras like Samāsokti, Āksepa etc., he says that though there is a suggested element in these cases, it is only the expressed sense of the figures that is the principal idea and that the suggested in those cases is only accessory or subordinate. Dhvani is a case of the suggested dominating over the rest. The general argument is also urged that Alamkāra means “means of decoration”; Dhvani is what is decorated and it cannot therefore be called Alamkāra. The last section of the first Uddyota is devoted by Ānanda to refute the second objection of Bhāktavāda. Dhvani is not identical with Bhakti; there are cases of Bhakti without Dhvani and cases of Dhvani without Bhakti. At best, Bhakti of a certain kind is productive of one kind of Dhvani. This discussion on Bhakti and Dhvani is again taken up in the third Uddyota between pp. 195 and 197 after disposing of the Tātparya Vāda.

Jayaratha, in his commentary on the Alamkāra-sarvasva quotes two Kārikās from some unknown writer which give the anti-Dhvani theories as twelve in number.

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{तात्पर्यस्तहिति} & \text{ लक्षणानुगमिताः द्विधा} \1
\text{अर्थपरिलीक्षिणेऽविचारस्वभवतः} & II \\
\text{रसस्य कार्यते भोगः व्यापारान्तरगतम} & II \\
\text{द्राक्षेनेत्र ज्ञनेन्द्रस्य स्थितम् विप्रतिक्षयत्} & II \quad \text{N. S. Edn. p. 9.}
\end{align*}
\]

The twelve theories are not easy to be identified. They may be stated thus: (1) Tātparya—Mimāṃsakas. (2) Abhidhā—very old Mimāṃsakas. (3) and
(4) Two kinds of Lakṣaṇā—the two kinds of Lakṣaṇā are Ajahatsvārtha and Jahatsvārtha; the latter is also called Lakṣita lakṣaṇā or Lakṣaṇā lakṣaṇā. (5 and 6) Two kinds of Anumāna. The two kinds are not known. (7) Arthāpatti—the Anumāna pakṣa slightly bettered. (8) Tantra—clever expression containing double significance as in the case of Śleṣālāmkāra. (9) Samāsokti and other Alaṁkāras—this is the old Alaṁkāras held as covering all cases of Dhvani, the viewpoint refuted by Ānanda in Uddyota I. (10) Rasakāryatā—is the view of the old Rasa writers like Daṇḍīni and Lollaṭa (the Cirantanas) as shown by Abhinava in his Abhinavabhāratī. They are Utpattivādins regarding Rasa. This is an anti-theory of Rasa-dhvani only. (11) Bhoga—this also refers to Rasadhvani. It is Bhaṭṭa Nāyaka’s theory of Rasa and it can be taken as referring to Bhaṭṭā Nāyaka’s Bhaṭvānā also. (12) The last Pakṣa is given as यापरात्तरवाचनम्. I ventured the guess that this may refer to Kuntaka’s Vakrokti but Professor Mm. S. Kuppuswamy SASTRI considers Vakrokti as included in the Alaṁkāra Pakṣa. The Vakroktījīvita further accepts Dhvani, though not as the Ātman of poetry. So, according to Prof. SASTRI, the last refers to the Anirvacaniya vāda, the third of the three main anti-theories mentioned by Ānanda. This view accepts that Dhvani is not included in any other Vyāpāra, that it is different from them, but leaves Dhvani there saying that it is not possible to define it.

Of these, we shall consider the Tātparyavāda at length later, for, it forms the main subject of this section. It is the view of some very old writers that words have nothing but one very powerful Abhidhāa stretching over the whole length of the expressed, including all the subtle implications of the words. They cited the analogy of the arrow shot forth forcibly which went piercing many things. This is stated and refuted by Abhinava on p. 18 (Locana). An analysis of all the ideas conveyed by an expression shows that there is more than one kind or class of idea conveyed. The whole set of ideas is not of one homogenous nature and necessitates the postulation of a power of significance, additional to the mere Abhidhāa. Further, the suggested ideas are not like the ideas got at through Abhidhāa and conventionally associated and fixed to the words through Samaya.

“योद्धि अन्विताभिमानवादी ‘यत्स: शव: स शवस्य: ’ इति हदये नस्लोता सयस्यभाषा-
गारमेव दीवार्योगिन्नित्यत, तथ यद्य दीवार्योगिन्निस्य, तदकोष्टस्यतितुष्ट: ? निर्माणित्यत| अधो अनेकोगेन तत्तदयसहारसमेतदार, अस्ततीतिय एव युक्त।। सजातीयः च काँवे विरम्यभाषाः-
शत्रुःभेद्विप्रभावावरंगेन्निक्रियतेऽनुस्विषिदः। अस्ततीतियः न अस्मात्त्य एव।। अधो योतावे चतुर्बक्षानु-
विचित्रोपः स एव हरित्व वाक्येन अभिभावात्तिति एवं दीवार्योगिन्निस्य विविक्षितम्।। तत्सह तत्संकिते-
तास्तावादात् कविः सक्षात् प्रतिपत्ति:।।”

Pp. 18-19 Locana.

This long-long Abhidhāavyāpāra as comprehending the entire meaning is the view of the Prabhākara mimāṃsakas. Abhinava says on p. 188 of his Locana “प्रामाणिकरक्तोपधी द्रोष्टीयां व्यापारः—” This is the second anti-dhvani theory of Abhidhāa.
Under the two Lakṣaṇāpakṣas comes the Bhākta vāda refuted by Ānanda in his work at the end of chapter I and in chapter III. After refuting the possibility of holding Dhvani as Lakṣaṇā, Abhinava says that some writer escaped the difficulties by creating a new name for Dhvani, ‘Lakṣīta lakṣaṇā’, a variety of Lakṣaṇā. He says, ‘बश्यं ‘गह्यंं ‘घोप.’ हत्यारी’” p. 118.

The reply to this viewpoint is that in any kind of Lakṣaṇā, there is the incompatibility or unintelligibility of the primary meaning. In Dhvani, the primary sense is not cast off. The case of a Lakṣīta lakṣaṇā may be one kind of Dhvani, the Lakṣaṇā-mūla-dhvani but Dhvani is of other kinds also. Thus, the two kinds of Lakṣaṇā mentioned as two anti-theories of Dhvani in the Kārikā quoted by Jayaratha may be Lakṣaṇā and lakṣīta lakṣaṇā, Ajahat-svārthā and Jahatsvārthā.

Mukulabhaṭṭa, in his Abhidhāvṛtti-mārtkā, defines Lakṣaṇā in such a way as to avoid the element of incompatibility of the primary sense, Mukhyārtha badha. He calls the Mukhyāsakti only as the Vyāpāra of Śabdā par excellence. Compared to it, Lakṣaṇā is the Vyāpāra more of Artha than of Śadba, it is Abhidheya-sāmarthya-ākṣipta.

He brings many instances of Dhvani under Lakṣaṇā; in the instance ‘रामोऽसिम सह गह्यंं’ he says (p. 11) that the suggested ideas are all conveyed by Lakṣaṇā, “लक्षिता.” He cites the verse दृश्यं ‘मदनेषु:’ etc. and says that Vipralambhaśṛṅgāra is conveyed in this verse through Lakṣaṇā.

This way of definition of Lakṣaṇā and illustration of that Vṛtti has been criticised by Mammaṭa in his Sabdavyāpāra vicāra and the necessity to accept Dhvani for explaining the Prayojanāṁśa in Lakṣaṇā has been explained by him. Surely Lakṣaṇā-mūla-dhvani must have everything to do with Lakṣaṇā; but this cannot mean that Dhvani is Lakṣaṇā; for there is Dhvani elsewhere, based on Abhidhā also. Above all, there is Dhvani based on no kind of Sabdavyāpāra, neither on Abhidhā nor on Lakṣaṇā. That is, there is Dhvani of Rasa from the sweet sounds of music; again,
there is Dhvani from non-Sabda element like Ceṣṭā. Says Ananda in *Uddyota* III. pp. 193-4:

"व्याकरणं हि कविद्व वाचकारणं व्यवस्थितं, यथा विविषितान्तपरवाणे च चानी। कथितं गुणस्वयं भाषणं, यथा अविविषितान्तपरवाणे च चानी। तत्तुद्दाह्यप्रतिपादनात्मकं च चानी: प्रयोगं हि प्रभेदं उपरवहः। तत्तुद्दाह्यप्रतिपादनं व्याकरणं न शक्ते वक्तृतं: यस्मात् न तत् वाचकत्वं दशक्तेन यथा अविविषितान्तपरवाणे अन्यं वाचकारणं व्यवस्थात्। न च उक्त्यवस्थात् अन्यं वाचकारणं व्यवस्थात् न मभवितं: यावद् वाचकत्वार्थादिप्रतिपादिन्त्वते, तथा हि गीताः सर्वभावीनां मधिमेऽव्यक्तित्वमं रसादिविवेयं: न च तेहाय वाचकत्वम्, तः शब्दव्यापारं च कथितं व्यक्तित्वम् दृष्टान्ताद्वादित्वंवाचकत्वश्चारात्मकं अस्वयं वक्तृतं।"

See also *Kavyaprakāśa* V. p. 269. T.S.S. Vol. I.

Anumiti is the view upheld by the Naiyāyikas. Ananda refutes this Lingalingi-paśa as the last counterview in the third *Uddyota*, after pointing out that the Vyākaraṇa-adherent is no enemy to Dhvani. In the post-Ananda period, and just after Abhinava, Mahima Bhaṭṭa wrote his *Vyakti-viveka* to show inclusion of all kinds of Dhvani in Anumāna or inference. Jayanta Bhaṭṭa, in his *Nyāyamaṇḍari*, casts bitter remarks on Ananda and considers the poets and literary critics as unfit to discuss such serious problems as Sabdavyāpāra and Pramāṇa. He refutes the Arthāpatti of the Mimāṃsakas as included in Anumāna and along with it, he includes Dhvani also in Anumāna. Pp. 48-49. Vizianagaram Edn. The chief reply to the Naiyayika critics of Dhvani is that there cannot be established any logical invariable concommittance between the Vācyā and the Vyaṅga which concomittance is the basis of all inference.

"न तु व्याक्तित्वम् अस्वयं व्यापारितं शक्तं वक्तृतं। न हि वाचकत्वव्रत्योऽहं: प्रतिविर्भवित्वं कथितं प्रमाणमिति।"

Mammaṭa's *Sabḍavyāpāravācīrā.*

Arthāpatti. The writer who considered it possible to explain away Dhvani as Arthāpatti is not known.

Now we shall proceed to consider the greatest anti-Dhvani theory, viz., the Tātparya pakṣa which says that the Tātparya or meaning of a sentence comprehends the suggested also and therefore there is no need for a separate Śaktī called Dhvani. Mimāṃsakas must be considered as the upholders of this view. Older Mimāṃsakas held Abhidhā as giving only Padārthas and the Vākyārtha was given according to them by another Śaktī called Tātparya. The definite sentence-meaning got out of the indefinite word-meanings is through a peculiar Śaktī of the words formed into a sound sentence called Tātparya. (p. 13, *Locana*) In this Tātparya, Dhvani is sought to be included. It is argued against Ananda by his critics who advocate Tātparya that at best a meaning other than and different from the expressed, Vācyāḥ atirikta, only can be established. It does not follow that this different meaning is only suggested, Vyaṅga. Where this idea other than the one that is expressed is primary, Pradhāna, it is as good as expressed. So, it is to be called also the expressed sense, the expression being intended to mean that. In that case,
the first realised primary expressed sense is to be explained as a means to the realisation of the latterly realised Tātparya. Just as word-senses are the means of knowing the sentence-sense, so also the first expressed sense is the means to the further Tātparya.

Ānanda replies to this argument thus: Where an expression gives its first and primary meaning and is said to have another meaning also, there are two meanings for the word or sentence. Are the two distinct and different or identical? They cannot be identical for their nature and the means of their respective realisation clearly differ. When the first meaning is the meaning of the words themselves, the second cannot be described so. The former proceeds directly from the Sabda; the latter is got at by the suggestive power of the first expressed meaning. If the two were identical, there will be no talk of two meanings.

Further, the former is denotative power of the expressed words having definite sense-associations. The latter is Avagama or suggestion and it totally differs from the former; for, it pertains even to non-expressing sound (Avācaka) like music, which suggests emotions. Similarly, an action or Cēṣṭā is suggestive and has this power of conveying meaning called suggestion. When these two differ in this manner, it is not proper to call Avagamanāsakti, Vācaka sakti. Surely it is a Sabdavyāpāra, a significative power of the words but it differs in this respect from Vācakatva or primary Abhidhā. Abhidhā pertains only to Sabdas; Vyañjanā and Vyañjakaṭva pertain not only to Sabda but to Artha also. When its process is known to be plainly different and it is also known that the sense derived therefrom also differs, it is not proper to call it by the same name Vācakatva. It cannot be contended that a sentence can have only one sense-unit and that according to Dhvani, this law of Ekavākyatva is contradicted. For, the two meanings are explained by the Dhvani theory as being related as chief and accessory. The suggested is the chief meaning and the expressed, its accessory. The two senses are not of equal importance and as such do not go against the principle of Vākyā-aikārthya.

It is only in that case where the suggested is the dominating idea that the Tātparyavādin holds that it naturally comes under the intention of the speaker and as such is nothing but Tātparya. Where the suggested is not dominant, there he does not hold the Sabdas to be Tatpara, wholly intent on that, but holds that they are intent only on the Vācyā or primary meaning. Therefore, even where the Vyaṅgya is Apradhāna, it is not included in Tātparya. The text of Ananda’s Dhvanyāloka bearing on this discussion is given at the end of the section.

We can take up the view of Dhanañjaya and Dhanika, advocates of Tātparya against Dhvani, as a typical reply to Ānanda. The text of the Daśarūpaka and the Avaloka on it pertaining to this subject is given at the end. Dhanika summarises the case for Dhvani first: The suggested cannot be the Vākyārtha; i.e., Tātparya cannot be the Śakti. For the suggested belongs to the third stage. In such a case as "Bhrama Dāhmika etc.," the first
stage is the Padārthas, the meanings of the words, the Abhidhā. The next is the meaning of the sentence, its Tātparya, in the form of an injunction, Vidhi, as in “Bhrama dhārmika”. The suggested appears in the third stage and is of a different nature being a prohibition, Niṣedha. And this is due to the Sakti called Vyañjanā.

But all cases of Tātparya are not cases of the second stage; there are instances of expressions like “Viṣam bhūṅkṣva” addressed by a father to his son, which mean the exact opposite. The expressed appears to be an injunction (Vidhi), “eat poison”. But the father intends to say to his son who proposes to eat in a particular person’s house, “do not eat in his house; better eat poison than eat in his house”. In this utterance, “eat poison”, there are three stages, the second and the third, Vidhi and Niṣedha, appearing in the second and the third respectively. Even the third stage is here only Vākyārtha and Tātparya. Therefore the Vyāpti or the law that the third-stage-sense is Vyaṅgya does not hold good. The reply to this is that a father’s injunction to his son to eat poison is on the face of it absurd; so the sentence obviously means something else. Hence the real meaning, the prohibition of eating, explained as the third stage, is also only the second stage. The rule that Vyaṅgya comes after the second stage therefore stands. In cases of realisation of Rasa, in the second stage, only the Vibhāvas etc. are known; it is in the third stage that Rasa is realised. In fine, it is proper to hold Tātparya in those cases where there is no completeness of sense or exhaustion of the expressed sense and the words tend to mean something else and stop only with that. But in cases where the words stop with conveying what they mean by Abhidhā and there is no incompleteness or unintelligibility in the expressed sense and yet from that first meaning arises another meaning, the case is one of Dhvani.

It can be seen in the above discussion that the chief point is this: The Tātparyavadin presses that Tātparya is not exhaust with the first expressed sense, Aviśrānta. But the Dhvanivadin contends that it is Viśrānta with the expressed sense and that what appears afterwards is got at through suggestion. It can also be seen in the discussion in Uddyota III of the Dvanyāloka that both recognise that there are two meanings and the difference is that while the Tātparyavadhin holds both as Tātparya, the first as the means of the second, Upāyamātra, the Dhvanivadin separates the second as the Vyaṅgya and instead of calling the first Upāya for the further meaning, he says it is Gaṇa and the Vyaṅgya is Pradhāna or Mukhya. The

1. In the Locana, taking cases of Lakṣaṇa also into account, Abhinava describes Dhvani, not as of the third stage, Trītya-kakṣā-vaśaya, but as appearing in the fourth stage, Caturtha-kakṣa-vaśaya: Abhidhā, Lakṣaṇa, Tātparya and Dhvani.
chief argument of the Tātparyavādin is that there is no such limitation of Tātparya to the expressed sense as held by the Dhvani-theorists. Tātparya extends over the whole range of the speaker’s intention and covers all implications coming up in the train of the expressed sense.

एतावतेष विभानि: तात्पर्यवानि प्रकृताम् ।
वाक्यवान्यप्रसारावतां तात्पर्यं न तुत्तरताम् ॥

(Dhanika, Avaloka on the Daśarūpaka, p. 121) quoted from his own Kāvyā-nīrṇaya).

In the given instance of “Bhrama Dhārmika”, surely the prohibition of the mendicant from going to the banks of the Godāvari is part of, nay the chief, intention of the speaker and is therefore included in Tātparya. There is no need for creating a new faculty for words called DHVANI. तात्पर्यात्म निर्विकाल व्याकरणस्य, न चलनि:। As against the powerful argument that the intention of the speaker is the indication of the extent of the Tātparya of his utterance, and therefore, the implied and suggested train of ideas are also Tātparya, the Dhvani-advocates say that the Tātparya of a Vākya like Abhidhā of a Pada, is very limited in scope and can give only the bare meanings of all the words put together in grammatical order; that the ideas suggested are not invariably associated through Samaya, that Dhvani or suggestion exists in Avācaka-sounds like music and in gesture which is not any Ṣabda, and that above all, Dhvani must be accepted for cases of the realisation of Rasas which can be found out in experience as incapable of realisation by mere Abhidhā, mention of their name. If Dhvani is not accepted, and Tātparya alone is held, it follows for the Tātparyavādin that Rasa is realised by Abhidhā and Tātparya also. That is, they will have to say that Svāsadbopādāna of Rasa is not only not a flaw but is the fact in some cases. This Dhanika accepts. He says that we speak in two ways and our sentence sometimes contains expression of the verb and sometimes not. We say “drive the cow” and the act of driving is mentioned herein; we also say sometimes “door! door!”, meaning “shut the door". The idea of shutting the door is in our minds and one who runs to shut the door realises that “shutting-action” in our mind from context etc. The case of Rasa-realisation is similar to this. In most cases utterances in poetry would seem to belong to the latter class where the verb is not seen and is understood from context. In poetic utterances, Vibhāvas etc. are described; and we at once get at the permanent mood of Rati etc., invariably associated with those particular Vibhāvas etc. described. The invariable association between some Vibhāvas etc. and some permanent mood is a thing of the world and experience. Other cases there are where the Sthāyin, like the expressed verb, is seen mentioned by the poet and we easily get at it.

All sentences गम्यवत्, द्वरेः, द्वगम् etc. terminate in some action; the poetic ends in the Kriyā called the Svādodbhūti, the manifestation of relish which is the Sthāyin that has been nourished to that extent. Towards this end of relish is all poetry addressed. Thus definite Vibhāvas etc. described in a piece of poetic utterance form the word-units, the Padārthas which give what they
mean viz., the sentence-unit, the Vākyārtha, the Sthāyin. This Sthāyin known by the Bhāvaka, the tasteful spectator or reader, revolves in his heart and attains relishable state. This is ābhidhānīki-ratyādi-pratīti; if this does not sufficiently clear the issue, Dhanika says that the understanding of the Sthāyins from the Vibhāvas etc. may be held to be got through Lākṣāṇa, Lākṣāṇika-ratyādipratīti. This may resemble Kumārila's position which holds Vākyārtha as Lakṣya.

Dhanika further relates his position to that of Bhaṭṭa Nāyaka who advocated a new relation between Kāvyā and Rasa. Strictly speaking, against the Vyaṅga-vyaṅjaka sambandha between Rasa and Kāvyā of the Dhvani theorist, the Tatparyavādīn must say that the relation of the two is Vācyā-vācaka or as Dhanika adds in the end Lakṣya-lakṣaka; but the case being one of poetry and there being a need to give a new kind of less prosaic process, the Vācyā-vācaka sambandha itself is called Bhāvya-bhāvaka sambandha. Poetic expression has a power called Bhāvanā and this is sanctioned, says Dhanika, by the Bhāvanā-vādins, viz., Bhaṭṭa Nāyaka, and is granted also by Bharata's description of Bhāvas:

‘भावयन्ति रसान् यस्मातुः तस्माद् भावः.’

The most serious flaw in this theory is its view that Rasa is realised also by express mention of its name. This was the ancient belief and we find Udībhata saying in his definition of Rasavadalāṃkāra that Rasa has as its seat (Āspada) Svāsābda, i.e., its own name, its Sthāyin, its Saṅcārin, its Vibhāvas and their Abhinaya (fourth Varga, 3.). Ānanda has criticised it in the first Uddyota and Abhinava also, both in the Locana and the Abhinava-bhārati. In later times, as stated by Mammatā in a regular form, the chief of the Rasadosas is mention of the name of the Rasa, Svāsabdā-vācyatva of Rasa. Even Vyabhicārinś are allowed Svāsabdbhāvidhāna only occasionally. It is plain that the Rasas cannot be realised in a verse enumerating the nine Rasas one after another. The text of the Nātyaśāstra cannot rouse the emotions which Nātya arouses.

Bhaṭṭa Nāyaka was a great adherent of Rasa and though an adversary of the Dhvani-theorist, we must gather from Abhinava's words that he did not hold Rasa as Svāsabda vācya anywhere. Says Abhinava:

“—रसस्य च शास्त्रवाच्यवें तेनापि नीपतानिमित्त व्यश्चयकमेव। p. 19.

There is also this additional argument adduced by Ānanda to show that there is something called Dhvani. If Rasa and the suggested Vastu and Alāṃkāra are not accepted as 'Dhvanyamāna' they must be vācya; if they are vācya, anybody knowing the meanings of words must realise them; but the fact is that only a few Sahṛdayas realise them. This is a sure proof of something existing beyond the mere Vācya-vācaka.

It has been pointed out by Ānanda that though the suggested is the primary thing, the expressed forms the means thereof. Between them, it is a question of the former being primary and the latter accessory. When the former
is realised, the latter does not disappear. With the cognition of the latter, the former also arises immediately and during the continuance of the former, the latter does not cease to exist. The Tātparyavādin maintains that Vācya vācaka, the Vibhāvas etc., is Padārtha and the Tātparya of these Padārthas is Rasa which is described as Vākyārtha. If this means generally that the Padārthas are the means, Upāya, of the Vākyārtha, Ananda accepts this analogy. He says in Uddyota I.

यथा पदार्थाद्वैरण वाक्यार्थः संपन्निहैः ।
वाण्यार्थाद्वैतिकता तद्वर्त श्रद्धितपर्व वस्तुनि ॥

This does not mean that Ananda subscribes to the view expounded later by Dhanika that Rasa is Vākyārtha, attained through Tātparya. Ananda hastens to explain himself in the Tātparya-discussion in Uddyota III on the subject of this analogy.

न च पदार्थाद्वैरणायथायथाय वाण्यार्थाद्वैतिकताः। यथा पदार्थाद्वैरणायथायथाय वाण्यार्थाद्वैतिकताः। बन्धणस्यस्यायथाय नानुगमायथाय।
वाण्यार्थाद्वैरणायथाय नानुगमायथाय ॥

This, Abhinava says, is said by Ananda to refute the Tātparyavāda which holds the Padārtha-vākyartha-nyāya between Kāvyya and Rasa. Regarding the relation between Padārthas and Vākyārtha, there are two main views: The grammarians hold that the Padārtha-jñāna is unreal. This certainly cannot answer for the relation between Vibhāvas etc., and Rasa or between the expressed and the suggested; for, it cannot be said that the expressed is unreal. The Bhāṭṭa māmārta-sākṣas hold that the Padārthas are not unreal and they must then accept that Padārthas are ‘Upādāna-kāraṇa’, material cause, for Vākyārtha. When a pot is made and seen, its component parts, the sherds which made it, are not separately cognisable. Similar is the case with the Padārthas. When one insists on seeing the parts in the whole, the sense of the whole is lost. Therefore, even this relation of Upādāna-kāraṇa does not hold good in the case of Vācyya and Vyāngya. When the Vyāngya is seen, the Vācyya does not disappear. Therefore, the analogy of a light manifesting to our eyes the hidden objects has to be chosen. This is Prakāśa-nyāya or Ghaṭa-pradīpa-nyāya. When the pot in the dark room is manifested to our eyes by the lamp, and when we are seeing the pot, the lamplight does not disappear but continues to shine. It manifests itself and manifests another. See Locana pp. 189-190.

एवं पदार्थाद्वैरणायथाय तत्त्वज्ञानिकस्य विराज्ञान अभिमुकः प्रकाशयति साधिक तत्त्वप्राप्तिः सहस्रानां योजकसाह ॥ Locana. p. 190.
In *Uddyota* I also, under the tenth Kārikā mentioning the Padārthavākyārtha-nyāya as a general analogy for the idea of means and end, Abhinava remarks:

> न तु वाच्यसत्वाय अनवभासः। अत एव तुतीयायोगे घटमनीयाधृतम्बलद्रव्यम्। क्षेत्रार्थाद् वस्त्रक्षेत्रार्थाणि संबंधते। इति विद्वानः। तेन सह अस्य महत्वस्य न विरोधः। Locana, p. 32.

Dhanika refutes this analogy of the pot and the light, Ghaṭapradīpa-nyāya. He holds Rasas as incapable of being described as Vyaṅgya. ‘Vyaṅgya, Vyaṅjakaka and Vyāṅjana’ are concepts related to that mode of our knowing things in which one object, entirely different and come into existence through its own causes, manifests another independent thing which has come into being through its own causes. Thus the Vyaṅjaka-vyaṅgya nyāya is used regarding a lamp and its light manifesting a pot; the two things are independent, in origin and nature. The former manifests the latter. But in the case of Vibhāvas etc., which are described by the Dhvanivādin as Vyaṅjakaka, there is nothing similar to this state of affairs which can justify the use of the concept of Vyaṅjaka and Vyaṅgya. The Vibhāvas etc. themselves are the conditions that bring Rasa into being. They are so closely related to each other; they are not utterly unrelated and independent of each other like the lamp and the pot. Surely, the pot is not brought into being by the light; the pot is made of or produced by the sherds made of mud. Therefore, the case of manifestation through Vyāṅjanā regarding Rasas on the analogy of the lamp and the pot is absurd in so far as the so-called suggesting elements and the suggested in Kavya are so much inter-related and the former itself brings the latter into being. Says Dhanika:

> "एवं त न सति स्मार्थिनः व्यायामसम्बन्धतः। अन्वेष्यते लघुसातांक बलु अन्येनापि(भि)-
> व्यायते, प्रदीपिनेष्य घटादि। न तु तद्वर्तिनें अभिव्यक्तस्कृतविभवति: आपावक्तवाभवः।"

**D. R. A., p. 122.**

The above-given survey covers the whole ground of the discussion on Tātparya and Dhvani. After the time of Ananda, the pre-Abhinava-gupta commentator and Abhinava’s kinsman-predecessor, the author of the *Candrikā* on the *Dhvanyālūka*, inclined towards the Tātparya-vādins and held, on the basis of all the suggested ideas being part of the poet’s intention, that Dhvani was Tātparya. There are two passages in Abhinava’s *Locana* giving clue to this.

(1) p. 20.

> बलुः च अनिवर्तमानोपितः तात्पर्याशिरितेऽविश्वाभिश्रुतवेंद्रव वा ध्वनि मन्नतं, स नास्त्यां
> हृदयाभावविति।

(2) p. 26.

> बल्वत्वापि तात्पर्याशिरितेऽविश्वाभिश्रुतवेंद्रव वा ध्वनि मन्नतं, स न वस्तुतत्वविदी।

The latter instance is not very clear but the former plainly says that the author of that view is a commentator on Dhvani, i.e., the *Dhvanyālūka*. What exactly Bhaṭṭa Nāyaka said regarding Tātparya as against Dhvani, we are not able to know. From what we see from the *Avaloka* on the *Daśarūpaka* which
follows the view of Bhāvya-bhāvaka sambandha, we must conclude that Bhāvakatva is only a poetic or a new name based on Bharata’s own etymology of the name Bhāva for Tātparya. It is the counterpart of Tātparya of the ordinary utterance in the field of poetic expression. But in criticising Bhaṭṭa Nāyaka, Abhinava seems to say that Bhaṭṭa Nāyaka accepted Rasadhvani and did not hold Rasa to be Vācya.

रसायनस्य तेनविवादत्वानुसारः। p. 15.
रसाह्य च शत्त्राचार्यवर्ते तेनापि नौपनतमिति व्यञ्जनस्वेतं। p. 19.
This, however, is not clear. No doubt, as a staunch advocate of Rasa, Bhaṭṭa Nāyaka emphasised Rasa as Jīvita, the life of poetic expression, as Abhinava remarks on p. 12 of his Lokaṇa.

“अथं च जाये रसायनम सात्वत-जीवितमूलिति भवसोप प्रद विवर्णात्रिः।”

And for this Abhinava quotes the following text from Bhaṭṭa Nāyaka as authority:

कायाये रसायन समेत न वेदिता न नियोगमाकः।

This, Bhaṭṭa Nāyaka evidently said to distinguish poetry from epics from which one takes lessons (Bodha) and from Veda and Sāstra from which one takes injunctions regarding right and wrong conduct. But in Kāvyā, one simply enjoys. This verse has to be related to the other oft-quoted lines of Bhaṭṭa Nāyaka ‘शत्त्राचार्यायामात्रियते’ etc., which distinguish in a similar manner poetry from Itihāsa or Ākhyaṇa and Sāstra. On Dhvani, Bhaṭṭa Nāyaka has this definite statement quoted by Abhinava, but which is, it seems to me, rather misinterpreted to twit him:

व्यञ्जना मामार्थो योक्ति व्यपायो व्यञ्जनात्मकः।
तस्य बिद्धेपि मेवेदे, स्मात कायाङ्ख्ये, न हरिता॥

This is granted by Bhaṭṭa Nāyaka in the end, according to the well-known “Tusyatu durjana nyāya.” Let there be a separate and distinct Vyāpāra called Dhvani; it is at best an accessory element in poetry, Kāvyā-arśa or Kāvyā-aṅga but not Kāvyā-rūpi or Kāvyā-ātman as described by Ananda. The Kāvyā-rūpi or Kāvyā-ātman is surely Rasa but not Rasadhvani as Abhinava would put it wrongly as Nāyaka’s position. To be correct, Nāyaka’s Kāvyā-ātman is Rasacarvanā or Rasabhoga got at, not through Dhvani to demolish which he wrote his treatise, but through Bhāvakatva and Bhojakta. Bhaṭṭa Nāyaka’s attitude towards Dhvani at this stage when he accepts it as one of the elements of poetry is similar to that of Kuntaka who also accepts it as an element in poetry though not as something all in all. To Kuntaka, Dhvani comes under some variety of Vakratā. Says Ruuyaka that Bhaṭṭa Nāyaka accepted Vañjanā vyāpāra as an element in Prauḍhokti, as part of poetic power or Kavivyāpāra.

भट्टाकृष्णेन तु व्यञ्जनायामात्राय प्रशोऽक्ष्यायामात्राय प्रक्ष्यायामात्राय कायाङ्ख्यायामात्राय कुब्रता etc. p. 9.

In the text ‘भवतोगिपि शक्ताराधिकारो मतः’ Bhaṭṭa Nāyaka clearly states that Rasa is got at not by Dhvani but by Bhāvanā.
BHOJA

The position of Bhoja is one of compromise. He follows both Ananda and the Tātparyavādins. Bhoja is less of a critical and consistent analytical writer and is always for broad synthesis and ignoring of differences, a peculiarly fortunate position which enables him to follow everybody, to follow both parties at the same time. Bhoja is very well acquainted with the Dhvanyāloka of Ananda and there is no trace in his works of his acquaintance with either work of Abhinava. Evidences of Bhoja's acquaintance with Anandavardhana's work are available even in the S.K.A. On p. 628, Chapter V of the S.K.A. Bhoja quotes four Kārikās from Uddyota II of the Dhvanyāloka. He says that in certain cases of Guṇas which are inherently fused with Rasas, there is no place for Sarinaka or mixture of Guṇa and Rasa. Here Ananda's Dhvanyāloka II, Kārikās viii—xi on the three Guṇas, Mādhurya, Ojas and Prasāda (pp. 79-82) are quoted and effectively utilised by Bhoja. This point is further explained in the Guṇa section. Similarly on the subject of Rasa and Alamkāra, Bhoja utilises three verses of Ananda from Uddyota II, the first Parikara śloka on p. 87, Kārikā xvii on p. 85 and the Parikara śloka on p. 221 in the third Uddyota with change of the last foot.

"समवेति हि वस्तुनि", "स्थाक्षिपतया" and "समवादादि—"

How Bhoja utilises these verses of Ananda is explained in the Alamkāra section. These two sets of citations or rather 'unacknowledged appropriations' from Ananda occur also in the same places in the Śr. Pra. Chapter XI. Vol. II. pp. 398 & 404-5. In the Śr. Pra., in the latter case pertaining to Alamkāra, Bhoja quotes another Parikara śloka from the third Uddyota of Ananda's Dhvanyāloka namely, "ध्वनियो यथा कवि: काव्ये etc., (p. 222, Dhvanyāloka). In the S. K. A. this verse is cited and made part of his Kārikās by Bhoja at the very outset in Chapter V. (S. K. A. p. 474, Śl. 3.) Of course, Bhoja pushes into this verse his own interpretation of Śrīgāra as Ahamkāra.

If we leave these two or three instances of citation of a few verses of Ananda, the only other topic on which Bhoja draws upon Ananda, and that to a very large extent, is Dhvani. We shall now go into the question of Bhoja's attitude towards Dhvani. Dr. S. K. De says in Vol. II. of his Sanskrit Poetics (p. 229) : "It will be convenient in this connection to take up the school of opinion represented by the writer on Poetics in the Agnipurāṇa and by Bhoja, which stands in many respects apart from the Kasmirian school of Anandavardhana and which appears to have been entirely untouched by the implications of the Dhvani theory." On p. 261 of the same volume, he says : "The prominence given to Rasa and the absence of the Dhvani theory in Bhoja, therefore, need not surprise us." We again find on the same page : "He (Bhoja) even appropriates Kārikās from the Dhvanyāloka, although he does not accept its theory." On the next page (262) Dr. De says : "His (Bhoja's) huge compilation ...... represents apparently one of the several forms of arranging the teachings (with
the exception of ignoring the Dhvani theory)..........." These remarks are of course based upon what one can know from Bhoja's S. K. A. One cannot write like this after seeing Bhoja's Sr. Pra. But even in the S. K. A the concept of Dhvani is not entirely absent. Bhoja accepts Dhvani in the S. K. A. as well as in the Sr. Pra. But he follows Bhāmaha, Daṇḍin and Vāmanā in bringing down every item under Alāṅkārā or Guṇa; under Alāṅkārā ultimately, for Guṇa also is Alāṅkārā. Thus Rāsas are called both the Artha Guṇa Kānti (as described by Vāmanā) and as Rasavad alāṅkārā or Alāṅkārā of the category named Rasokti. In a similar manner, Dhvani is called by Bhoja the Sabda-guṇa Gāmbhīrya.

S. K. A. I. 73. p. 55

Just as Rasa is held as Rasavad alāṅkārā because Rasa also is a beautifying factor of expression, so also Dhvani is held by Bhoja as the Guṇa embellishing expression. A Vācyopakāraka may be a Guṇa or an Alāṅkārā; if Rasa was an Alāṅkārā to Bhāmaha and Daṇḍin, it was a Guṇa for Vāmanā. In a similar manner, Dhvani was a Guṇa to Bhoja. Stopping with this only, we can say that Bhoja's position towards Dhvani is a kind of Antarbhāva-vāda, an Antarbhāva in Guṇa and through it in Alāṅkārā.

वर्स्त्र गुणात्मकार्यतिरिक्ते तत्तत्तत्त्वायम् न भवति। (X X X नासवहेतुष्ठ च्यनि:। तत्र तदद्दुषः

तिरिक्तः:) " Locana p. 5.

This apart, we can see traces of Dhvani in other places in the S. K. A. of Bhoja. In the Guṇa section itself we find Dhvani in other Guṇas besides Gāmbhīrya. Bhoja's Artha-guṇa Gati is a case of Dhvani.

गबिक्षा स्वाद्य्यान्माद: गोदार्थांश्रयान्तरयुँ।

Ratneśvara says on this: तेन सहदयहर्षवर्णार्थैः अथात् कांस्यतालमुलस्वान्त्यायेन

tattvamabhāyantarambhāyante sa gatiṁś Sansarāye।

Ratneśvara says on I. 121

वनन्यांश्रीरामेखला गुणवतत्।

We meet with Dhvani in Bhoja's Sābdālāṅkārās also. Dhvani or the getting of some meaning for which there is no word in the expression, presupposes suppression. The idea of suppression or hiding of the idea is used as a concept called Sarīrvṛti which goes to produce many Alāṅkārās. Thus, Bhoja uses Sarīrvṛti in his Sābdālāṅkārās, Mudrā, Ukti and Bhānīti. (pp. 146 150-1, & 154) All these cases involve Dhvani. Commenting on Bhoja's Sābdālāṅkārā called Kalpaṇā bhānīti, Ratneśvara says:

नेत्रं भविति: विचिनिष्ठेश्वरस्त्र निमेषस्तक्करशा विचिनिष्ठा भवतीश्वस्त्रः विस्तरः।

Bhoja himself says this in his comments on the illustrative verse.

"—कल्याणामिति: विचिनिष्ठेश्वरस्त्र निमेषस्तविचिनिष्ठा।"

We meet with the suggested idea in Bhoja's Arthālāṅkārā section also. Bhoja's Arthālāṅkārā called Sūkṣma is a case of pure Rasadhvani from Anubhāva. This Sūkṣma Bhāmaha refuses to accept as any Alāṅkārā (II. 86), whereas Daṇḍin calls it, with a vengeance, Uttamabhūṣaṇa, a great
Alamkāra. Bhoja takes it with some change from Daṇḍin. Sūkṣma is the conveying of a subtle meaning or idea through the expression of attendant signs. "इति द्वितीयमिथियमिन्धियमानमूलम् यथा—"तां प्रत्येकांकमनोययोऽदानम् प्रमाणां" इति। अन्तः स्वेच्छायान्तः तस्मात् राख्यतः प्रति प्रासना संस्कारम् संन्यासः निर्देशनकर्मः आन्तरिकयतः अवस्थाने: अभिविषयमाण: सूब्रमेदः।" p. 285 S. K. A.

Bhoja recognises another kind of two classes of Sūkṣma, the expressed and the suggested, Abhidhīyamāṇa and Pratiyamāṇa.

बायो: प्रत्यायमाण्य सूब्रोध्य द्विविधे मता:। III. 22.

The description of an Anubhāva and a Sāttvikabhāva and the suggestion of Rasa through them is called Abhidhīyamāṇa Sūkṣma; the Pratiyamāṇa Sūkṣma is case of Radadhvani through a Vyabhicārin being described.

"इति द्वितीयमिथियमिन्धियमानमूलम् यथा—"तां प्रत्येकांकमनोययोऽदानम् प्रमाणां" इति। अन्तः स्वेच्छायान्तः तस्मात् राख्यतः प्रति प्रासना संस्कारम् संन्यासः निर्देशनकर्मः आन्तरिकयतः अवस्थाने: अभिविषयमाण: सूब्रमेदः।"

Commenting on this illustration (p. 286 S. K. A.) Bhoja explains the latter case. In the third instance of Pratiyamāṇa-sūkṣma, we have Īrṣyāvipralambha dhvani (p. 287). Bhoja does not seem to hold seriously that Rasa is anything but Pratiyamāṇa; he seems to hold it as Abhidhīyamāṇa also. If he recognises an Abhidhīyamāṇa variety of Sūkṣma also, it is because he finds the Svasaβda of the emotion in the two illustrative verses:

"तां प्रत्येकांकमनोययोऽदानम् हन्ति सा दृष्टि सयमित्रमिलागवन्य:"

Therefore it is that Bhoja says:

"मनोरसस्य अभिविषयमानस्य नोऽर इति निर्देशन व्ययायवन्य:।"

2. Anyonyālālīkāra (III. Pp. 294-5) is described by Bhoja as having three varieties, Vācyā, Pratiyamāṇa and Ubhayā. In the illustration for the Pratiyamāṇa anyonya, the well known Gāthā of a traveller drinking water with fingers widely opened and the girl pouring him water slower and slower, and thinner and thinner, Bhoja says that their mutual (Anyonya) love (Anurāga) is suggested (Pratiyamāṇa).

3. A case of Alalikāra-dhvani is found in the Arthālālīkāra section. P. 305. S. K. A. Bhoja speaks under Vyatireka, of Pratiyamāṇa Sādrśya.

4. Finally, in his comments on Sambhāvālālīkāra, Bhoja refutes the older conception of Sambhava which clearly shows Bhoja’s disapproval of the Anumāṇa theory of Rasa-realisation. This is not exactly a point showing Bhoja’s acceptance of Radadhvani but is given here as a point that is
bound to be of interest in connection with the question of Dhvani and Rasadhvani. Bhoja says on p. 294 III. S. K. Ā.

अतः यथा खावती हस्ति नियमः, शते परिसम्भवं इति नियमः, नेवं ग्रहस्मे अल्पकालाकल्पनम्, अनानन्दम् अत्यं; समुनो वा प्रश्यावेदि; बुद्धिदृढ़त्वाभासः वा नवसत्संवत्तनानि; समावयन्ते व प्रभूतकारणः (वा) लोकातिशेखर विशिष्ठवेद एव सम्भवः।" He says that the Sambhava of Droṇa in Khāri, of 50 in 100 is nothing but Anumāna, सोऽञ्जमानानं न मिति ते. S. K. Ā. III. 26. He does not accept that between Rasa, here Vipralambha, and its Vyabhicārins and Anubhāvas there is any Nyaya or Vyāpti. There is only probability. This is the chief argument of the Dhvani-theorists against the Anumāna or the Liṅgaliṅgi-bhāva vāda. Says Vidyānātha (p. 41, Bālamamoramā Edn. Pratāparudrīya):

"न च अवर्धकसृष्टि व्यवहरे अनुमानवाक्षरा। व्यवस्थापकारकः अन्विताभावाभावात् । नमस्त्राक्षरादिकसृष्टि अथेकारणकल्पत्र।"

5. Upamā is given as Abhidhīyamāna and Pratīyamāna.

The above points related to Dhvani in the Alāṁkāra section in the S. K. Ā. are found repeated, though without the comments, in the Śr. Pra. also. Besides, in the 22nd chapter of the Śr. Pra. (Vol. III. pp. 368-9) Bhoja classifies Anurāga into 24 varieties, two of which form a distinction into Abhidhīyamāna and Pratīyamāna.

These odd contacts with Dhvani apart, Bhoja completely accepts Dhvani as the greatest Vyāpāra ruling in the realm of poetry and embodies much of Ānanda’s text in his own treatment of Dhvani in the Śr. Pra., as we shall see presently.

We meet with Dhvani for the first time at the end of chapter VI in the Śr. Pra. Bhoja has explained ‘Artha’ as ‘superimposition’ (Adhyāsa) or ‘transfiguration’ (Vivarta) of the Śabda Brahman due to Avidyopādhi. This, it is pointed out, may apply to the meaning which is primarily associated with Śabda, viz., the Abhidhīyamāna Artha; and Bhoja adds, there is another kind of Artha also called the Pratīyamāna. How is it related to the Śabda Brahman? Is it also explainable by Adhyāsa and Vivarta?

Bhoja accepts the existence of the ‘implied’, the Pratīyamāna Artha. He quotes Ānandavardhana’s verse on it प्रतीयमानं पुनर्भवेत् etc. (Dhvanyāloka I. 4.) It is also accepted here by Bhoja that the Pratīyamāna appears after the appearance of the Vākyaartha.. वाक्यार्थभावावलोकितकल्पवेदे: This Pratīyamāna is another ‘state’, Avasthāntara, of Śabda, a Vipariṇāma of the Śabda Brahman. This theory of Vipariṇāma or transformation is adopted by Bhoja, and Adhyāsa and Vivarta are cast off. Vipariṇāma, he says, explains both the Abhidhīyamāna and the Pratīyamāna. The Pratīyamāna is, as much as the Abhidhīyamāna, a Vyāpāra of the Śabda and this, Bhoja says, is a subject which he will speak of at length in a further section.

Further, Bhoja briefly indicates here the nature of this variety of Artha called Pratīyamāna. He gives an illustrative verse प्रासाधिषेष कस्मात् etc.
(quoted in the Dhvanyāloka on p. 109) and explains the full purport of this eulogy on a king. The actual meanings of the words form the expressed sense, the Abhidhiyamāna; the conceiving of the king as an Avatāra of Viṣṇu is implied in the verse and this is Pratīyamāna; there is a further meaning also suggested, that this king-Avatāra of Viṣṇu is superior to the other Avatāras; this forms the final Tātparyya and it is called Dhvani in the realm of poetry.

As promised at the end of Chapter VI, Bhoja takes up Dhvani in Chapter VII. It has been explained in the section on Sāhitya that Bhoja has schemed out a system of poetics under the concept Sāhitya which consists of three departments of relations between Śabda and Artha. The first two departments cover grammatical relations, Vṛtti, Vivakṣā, Tātparyya and Pravibhāga; Vyapakṣa, Sāmarthya, Anvaya, and Ekārthibhāva. Vṛtti covers Abhidhā, Lakṣaṇā and Gauṇī; and other significative capacities known to us as Tātparyya and Vyāhārāṇā, we find constituted into a separate category, the third in the first set called Tātparyya. Strictly speaking Vṛtti and Tātparyya should not have been given as two separate classes; all śaktis, Abhidhā, Lakṣaṇā, Gauṇī, Tātparyya and Dhvani, must have been considered together. Bhoja, however, treats of Tātparyya and Dhvani separately, because Abhidhā, Lakṣaṇā and Gauṇī are taken as Padaśaktis and under Tātparyya, Bhoja investigates the Vākyārtha.

Bhoja’s acquaintance with the Dhvanyāloka is amply proved in this section of his work. Earlier, we saw, Bhoja quoted Ānanda I. 4. प्रतीयमान पुनर्मदेव etc., and accepted the suggested idea also and explained it as appearing after the Vākyārtha. In this section on Tātparyya and Dhvani proper, Bhoja, as can be seen by a perusal of the text appended herewith, borrows freely from Ānanda. Ānanda I. 13., the definition of Dhvani, the varieties of Pratīyamānārtha which Ānanda shows as samples in the beginning to prove the existence of a sense separate and different from the expressed one (pp. 16-23 Dhva. A.), some of the verses given by Ānanda here as illustrations and a few other ideas found in the Dhva. A. are found here in Bhoja’s text on Dhvani. Though Dhvani is accepted by Bhoja, Ānanda is not completely followed by him; Bhoja borrows, adjusts and adapts Ānanda’s Dhvani. He reconciles Ānanda to the Tātparyavādin, makes the equation that Tātparyya is identical with Dhvani.

Whatever sense is intended to be conveyed by words form their purport, Tātparyya. This purport or Tātparyya is of wide extent and of more than one kind. It may be expressed, ‘implied’ or ‘suggested’,—Abhidhiyamāna, Pratīyamāna and Dhvanirūpa. The expressed or Abhidhiyamāna sense is the Vākyārtha, the meaning of a sentence got at by Ākāṅka, Sannidhi etc., after the separate words have delivered their individual meanings through one or the other or one or more of the three Śabda śaktis or significative capacities of words called Abhidhā, Lakṣaṇā and Gauṇī. In the sentence—गौ: गाढ्यति—, “the cow goes” is the Abhidhiyamāna vākyārtha.
There are cases of other kinds of sentences which, when the expressed sense alone is taken into consideration, mean nothing or tend to mean more. The expressed sense is in one case displaced by an implied sense and in the other, supplemented by a further and implied sense. The conditions which manifest or aid the manifestation of this additional sense, both in cases of incompatibility of the expressed and compatibility of the expressed, are such as the meaning, the context, propriety etc. If a father says to his son who is about to go to an enemy’s house for dinner, “Well, eat poison”, the mere expression itself or its expressed sense which is an injunction (Vidhi) to eat poison obviously means little and naturally drives us to explore the context and set our mind at rest by finding out the meaning that the father’s real intention is not that his son should die by eating poison but that he should realise that it is better to eat poison and die than dine at such a person’s house, that, in short, the son should not go to dine there. This is a case of the primary sense being incompatible and hence calling forth some other implied meaning. Similarly, a primary compatible meaning may be attended by the rise of another wave of meaning. Both the cases are called Pratiyamāna.

If, after the appearance of the expressed sense, either Sabda or Artha, completely subordinating itself gives rise to another sense, it is said that, in those cases, Sabda and Artha suggest another sense. If an Artha or one sense itself suggests another, the suggesting Artha is subordinate and the suggested Artha shines forth as the chief idea. This is not universal; for this rise of a suggested sense can be likened to two phenomena, —resonance, Anunāda and echo, Pratidhvani; it is only such metals as bronze which, when struck, give rise to ripples of resonance and it is only a few spots like caves where one’s voice is echoed. This Dhvani or the suggested idea appears after the rise of not only the expressed sense but also of the implied or Pratiyamāna sense. As for instance, when it is said, “She winks” —निमित्तप्रभा —one gets the primary meaning first that she winks; the twinkling of the eye is the Abhidhiyamāna sense. We also come to know from the winking of eyes that the woman is not a celestial damsel who has no closing of the eye, but only a mortal being. This first extra-meaning is Pratiyamāna. There is yet further significance possible in the small expression. The winking raises the vision of a pair of exquisitely sparkling eyes whose beauty excites emotion. This last sense, namely, the beauty of her eyes is said to be the suggested sense, Dhvani.

The expressed sense, on analysis, shows itself to be one of the four kinds, an injunction, a prohibition, a case of both or a case of neither.

The Pratiyamāna is entirely different from the expressed. It is of various kinds. If the expressed is an injunction, it may be that the Pratiyamāna is a prohibition. That is, though to all appearance an expression may contain in its words only an injunction, its real purport may be its opposite, prohibition. Bhoja points out, illustrates and explains some varieties.
They are:

1. 2: Prohibition from Injunction and vice versa.

2. Prohibition: विधिं निषेधः and निषेधः विधि:

3. A further Injunction from an Injunction: विधिं विधयतारम्

4. " Prohibition " a Prohibition: निषेधः निषेधान्तरम्

5. Another Injunction from both Injunction and Prohibition:

6. " Prohibition " " " " " विधिनिषेधोन्निषेधान्तरम्

7. An Injunction from a case of neither Injunction nor Prohibition:

8. A Prohibition from a case of neither Injunction nor Prohibition:

9. Neither Injunction nor Prohibition from an Injunction: विधावनमयम्

10. " " " Prohibition: निषेधान्तरम्

11. Neither Injunction nor Prohibition from a case of both Injunction and Prohibition: विधिनिषेधे अनुभयम्


This forms an amplification of what is found in the Dhvanyāloka I. pp. 16-23. Ananda has only indicated the nature of the suggested sense as being totally different from the expressed by a few examples: विधिं निषेधः, निषेधः विधिं विधावनमयम्, निषेधान्तरम् and one case of general difference, बाच्याद्विधिनिषेधान्तरम्: and he concludes अन्ये चैव विधिये: अन्तर: बाच्याद्विधिनिषेधान्तरम्: प्रतीयामानं: संभवति। तेनां दिशमान्तरतु प्रश्लोकः। p. 23. These are taken by Bhoja as also most of the illustrative Gāthās given here by Ananda, and similar varieties are elaborated. A few of the other illustrative Gāthās in Bhoja are also taken from other sections of the Dhvanyāloka itself, Uddyotas II and III.

Dhvani, Bhoja has said, is what appears after the Abhidhiyamāna and the Pratiyamāna. It is not clearly understandable why Bhoja separated the Pratiyamāna and the Dhvanyamāna. In Ananda, there is no such difference. Pratīti, Avagama, Dhvani, all mean the same thing in the Dhvanyāloka. When everyone was denying the very existence of Dhvani, Ananda tried to prove its existence step by step. He first started by stating that Artha in Kāvyā which Sahādayas relish is of two kinds, the expressed and the implied or suggested, Vācya and Pratiyamāna (I. 2). Just as the various limbs of the beautiful woman or the body of that woman itself is one thing and besides that there is something hanging over her called Lāvanya, so also there is in poetry something which is totally different from the expressed and the obvious,
the Vācyā. This is borne out by experience. This something in poetry is also experienced as being separate and altogether different from the Vācyā, the expressed. If in a set of instances it can be shown to exist in this manner, separately and different from the expressed, the first stage is crossed and the opponents must accept that a separate non-expressed sense is a fact. For this purpose, Ananda avoids the name of Dhvani which he wants to give to that suggested sense and the process of its realisation, and generally introduces his critics and readers to the other unexpressed sense. He accordingly gives five instances of such unexpressed sense, regarding Vastu (Vastudhvani). This Bhoja seems to take by itself and as separate from Dhvani, which according to him is the third kind of Tātparya, appearing after and through the second, named the Pratiyamāna. The Pratiyamāna is defined by him as the extra-meaning immediate to the Abhidhīyamāna. Proper emphasis on the condition “उपसङ्गोत् स्ववायमिः एवदे चन्द्रिति” in a case of Dhvani from Śabda or Artha or both is not laid by Bhoja and there is, as a matter of fact, no critical and deep or intense study and exposition of Dhvani in Bhoja’s work. After the release of the mere expressed Vākyārtha from a Vākya, the sense, in many cases, goes on revealing more and more. The first revealed ideas which are not directly expressed by so many words in the sentence is the Pratiyamāna; the next or subsequent or final revelations constitute Dhvani. If we examine Bhoja’s explanations of his own illustrations of the several varieties of Dhvani, we shall see that, in each and every case, Dhvani passes through Pratīti or the Pratiyamāna Artha, and the suggested, Dhwanyamāna, always arises at the back of or through the Pratiyamāna. “एवत् प्रायमायमोऽदे चन्द्रिति” is the phraseology in all cases. We can say that the two do not differ except in the fact that the Pratiyamāna is the first risen Dhvani and Dhvani itself is subsequent Dhvani. Almost all the Gāthās given as illustrations for the varieties of the Pratiyamāna are taken up in the Dhvani section and the suggested idea or Dhvani is pointed out in all of them. As regards these, Bhoja says that the Dhvani is the suggestion of how clever the lover or the lady or her friend is, how much one loves the lady and so on. In the verse विश्वारिणि कः नः नाम etc., all non-expressed implied ideas are called Pratiyamāna and as for the suggestion or Dhvani, Bhoja says it is the love of the man for the lady described in that verse. In the Gāthās भम नृत्यम् etc., Bhoja assigns all implied ideas, Arthas or Vastus to the class of Pratiyamāna and gives the Vaidagdhyā of the Nāyikā or her Ceṭī as the suggested, Dhvani.

नमस्या वैद्यवर्णम् चन्द्रिति। श्वास्त्रकोषोऽपि चन्द्रिति। नाभिकोषोऽपि चन्द्रिति। नाभिकोषोऽपि चन्द्रिति। नाभिकोषोऽपि चन्द्रिति। नाभिकोषोऽपि चन्द्रिति। नाभिकोषोऽपि चन्द्रिति। नाभिकोषोऽपि चन्द्रिति। नाभिकोषोऽपि चन्द्रिति। नाभिकोषोऽपि चन्द्रिति। नाभिकोषोऽपि चन्द्रिति। नाभिकोषोऽपि चन्द्रिति। नाभिकोषोऽपि चन्द्रिति। नाभिकोषोऽपि चन्द्रिति। नाभिकोषोऽपि चन्द्रिति। नाभिकोषोऽपि चन्द्रिति। नाभिकोषोऽपि चन्द्रिति। नाभिकोषोऽपि चन्द्रिति। नाभिकोषोऽपि चन्द्रिति। नाभिकोषोऽपि चन्द्रिति। नाभिकोषोऽपि चन्द्रिति। नाभिकोषोऽपि चन्द्रिति। नाभिकोषोऽपि चन्द्रिति। नाभिकोषोऽपि चन्द्रिति। नाभिकोषोऽपि चन्द्रिति। नाभिकोषोऽपि चन्द्रिति। नाभिकोषोऽपि चन्द्रिति। नाभिकोषोऽपि चन्द्रिति। नाभिकोषोऽपि चन्द्रिति। नाभिकोषोऽपि चन्द्रिति। नाभिको�
however come more and more under the category of Vastudhvani. If however Bhoja had really pursued such distinction or made some such clear classification that Vastu-Alanikāra Dhvanis form the Pratīyamāna and that Rasabhāva dhvani is the Paramatātāparya and Dhvani, it would have been interesting. Or, if he had emphasised ‘Upasarjanīkritasvārthathva’ in the definition of Dhvani, he could have separated the Pratīyamāna as Guṇībhūtavyaṅga or cases of Alanikaras where Dhvani is not pronounced. As different from this, he could have given Dhvani as cases where it dominates over the subordinated Vācya. He must then have defined and illustrated both differently. As it is, we must say that Bhoja has not made out any point to distinguish the Pratīyamāna and Dhvani. A distinction into Vastu-Alanikāra dhvanis and Rasādīdhvani, Bhoja did not hit upon at all; he found the Paramatātāparya to be of the form of Vastu also and so he vaguely left the question, leaving it to us to define his position systematically. Hemacandra who reproduces the text of the Śr. Pra. on the varieties of the Pratīyamāna considers the whole text as referring to what Ānanda distinguishes as Vastudhvani. See Hemacandra, Kāvyānusāsana pp. 26-34.

At best, we can say from Bhoja’s text only this much that the Pratīyamāna is ‘Avāntara-gamyamāna artha’ or ‘Abhidhiyamāna-avyavahita-dhvani’ and Dhvani is ‘Paramatātāparya’.

For all practical purposes, we must ignore this vague distinction into Pratīyamāna and Dhvani. Tātparya must be described as having only two kinds, the expressed and the non-expressed or the extra-sense that is implied or suggested. It would have been enough if Bhoja had given Tātparya as being two-fold, Abhidhiyamāna and Pratīyamāna otherwise called Dhvanyamāna. While explaining the relation of the non-expressed, Anabhidhiyamāna or Abhidhiyamāna-atirikta, with the Śabda Brahman as one of Viparītāmaṇa, Bhoja mentions only the Pratīyamāna, though immediately, he cites a verse and points out in it a set of implied ideas, the former part of which he calls Pratīyamāna and the latter part Tātparya or Dhvani.

What is Bhoja’s Tātparya?

The Tātparya śakti refuted by Ānanda is the Mīmāṃsaka’s. Upholding it, Dhanika says that it is not necessary to recognise a new function called Dhvani. Bhoja follows in the gap between the two and greets both with both his hands. He accepts Ānanda’s Dhvani and his adversaries’ Tātparya. Tātparya is used by Bhoja in two meanings, one bigger and another a more restricted one. While he speaks of Tātparya as one of the four Kevala-śabda sambandha-śaktis (Vṛtti, Vivakṣa, Tātparya and Pravibhāga), he uses Tātparya in the larger sense. Under it comes the Abhidhiyamāna Vākyārththa which Ānanda urges must be the proper meaning of Tātparya. But Bhoja brings under it Ānanda’s Dhvani, as Dhanika and other earlier critics of Ānanda urged. The Abhidhiyamāna is not called exactly Tātparya. A special śakti like that is not called forth by Bhoja for the primary import of a sentence, as by the Mīmāṃsakas. The primary sense of a
sentence he says, is got at by Akāṅkṣā, Sannidhi, Yogyatā etc., when the words themselves deliver the meaning of each through Abhidhā, Laksāṇā or Gaunī Sakti. Or, as Kumārasvāmin puts it, the very sentence in proper grammatical build gives its Vākyārtha by its own inherent nature. “तत्त्वेऽसः समस्कर्ष्यो वाक्यार्थे: कच्चं प्रतीयतं इति चेकं, तत्त्वेऽकालमिचि बाक्यमभिषा, न पुनः: तात्त्वेऽणं सोमस्वस्वकोनम्यितं न बूः। अतं एवं ते स्वर्यं प्रकटाः सति वदनां पदावर्तनं वा समन्वयशक्ति: बाक्यम् तदह्याणां वाक्यार्थे।” Pp. 32-33. Pratāparudriya Vākyā. Bālamanoramā Edn. Therefore, regarding Abhidhiyāmāna, Bhoja must be said to follow the Tātparkas. Tātparya is the general name for his Abhidhiyāmāna as well as other kinds of non-expressed meanings. It is the name of the Abhidhiyāmāna as well as of the Pratiyāmāna and the Dhvanayāmāna Arthas. The two, the Pratiyāmāna and Dhvanirūpa, can however be clubbed together and Bhoja can, after ascribing the primary Vākyārtha to the power of the Vākyā itself (Vākyamahimā), reserve the name Tātparya to the suggested. As a matter of fact, in certain passages he has made such a reservation that Tātparya is Dhvani. In the oft-referred-to discussion of Dhvani at the end of chapter VI of the Śr. Pra., Bhoja gives the Abhidhiyāmāna-meanings of the verse and reserves the name Tātparya for the third sense, which he says is called Tātparya in the world of ordinary expression but goes by the name of Dhvani in the world of poetry.

(1)“—तात्त्वेऽच , वर्ष कालेयुच बनिते प्रसिद्धिः।”

(2) On p. 44 (Vol. II) Bhoja says: “अभिधीयामानम्, प्रतीयामानम्, तात्त्वेऽ (बनिते:) व—।”

Dhanika’s view and the view refuted by Ānanda is the extension of the Mīmāṃsaka Tātparya to cover Dhvani also. Bhoja cannot be said to reject this also. It is really a great task to find out whether Bhoja rejects any view. He goes on piecing together all views. Ānanda would agree with Bhoja if the latter could confine Tātparya to the Abhidhiyāmāna and leave the Pratiyāmāna and Dhvani as being above the Tātparya and as being Dhvani. Dhanika would agree with Bhoja if the latter calls Abhidhiyāmāna Vākyārtha the Tātparya and also the Pratiyāmāna and the Dhanayāmāna as Vākyārthas and Tātparya. Bhoja does so; all the amount of thought directly and indirectly expressed by a sentence is held as Tātparya by Bhoja, according to the Tātparyavādins; but here Bhoja votes for an analysis of the mass of ideas expressed directly and indirectly and labelling each variety. At this stage, he says that beyond the Vākyārtha got at by the power of the Vākyā itself through Akāṅkṣā etc., there is a class of ideas got at by suggestion; and Dhvani is here accepted. He even goes so far as to restrict the name Tātparya to the suggested, that is, to Dhvani, within which we can include his Pratiyāmāna also. Therefore, Bhoja’s position is a compromise and at a latter stage, it deserts Dhanika and others to follow Ānanda and makes Tātparya a name for Dhvani. A clearer position is held by Vidyānātha who says that there are only three capacities, Abhidhā, Laksāṇā and Dhvani; and Dhvani itself is Tātparya.
"तातप्येण प्रकाश व्यञ्जन एव, न पुनः प्रयमभूतः । अभिचारण्य सुविचार्यः निबन्ध प्रवर्त्यः ।"

Kumārasvāmin explains:

"नूि वदुथः तातप्येण जागति कवि विवेकभीक्षाकोः, इत्यादिशेष तस्ति तत्तैयेन सन्तभीय इत्यादि—तातप्येण इति। अत्र वक्तृत्वदसीनस्ववचारस्ति: बाक्यायगमय: बाक्यायं: रसालिपि: तत्कछदेनौन्त्येते ।
तत्स्मल प्राधः तत्स्मलः तदास्तः, ततृथस्य इत्यस्यः । तेषाः महाव: तात्यस्यः । नूि अभिविख्यताः पदार्थाः
अन्यान्यभाणिनाः वा पदार्थ विभिन्नरूपस्यायनाति: तातप्येण इति: तत्स्मलः श्रीसाहसी: । वर्णवाणिति ।
अतत्स्मलः देववत गामानमेत्याः देवदत्ततःकुफळिकणकणकरोक्मकान्यन्यन्य: विशिष्टार्य एव
व्यञ्जलविवर्त्यः तातप्यात्मकततात्त: तातप्येण इत्यत्त्येते: कविमन्य व्यञ्जनेतमाति: इति नेतृ, सत्यमः ।
न हि तात्यात्माः कविसंरसर्वाविभाविति:। काव्यशास्त्राधिकाराः प्रवृत्तिध्वनितद्विश्वषयस्वय
प्रवृत्तिनम् प्रोक्षणनातरस्तध: असेवताः। किन्तु तदर्थयात्मक तदांत्यां नामाचारांनातास्तदतिः
रसदार्थांगिरास्यं अतस्स एव तातप्येण:। तातप्यात्मककविसंरसर्वाविभाविति: नामाचारस्वयमिति। नामाचारस्वयमिति। × ×
एतो × व्यञ्जनेनेतदे नामाचारस्वयमिति। ×" P. 32.

Bālanamorāmā Edn.

तात्यात्मक व्यञ्जनापरवृत्तमेव तातप्य स्वाक्षरस्वेदित्वं नामाचारसिद्धम।
अत एवोंकेव भावभक्तेऽ—

dhvaṉyālokā. III. p. 199) Ibd. p. 33

Balamanorāmā Edn.

Vidyānātha and Kumārasvāmin clearly identify Tātparya and Dhvani. This Tātparya does not mean that of Mimāṃsakas but is only another name for Dhvani. A general sense of ‘Tatparatva’ i.e., Rasādiparatva is put on Tātparya by Kumārasvāmin and such a general usage of Tatparatva is met with in the Dhvanyāloka.

तातप्येन नामाचारः यत्र व्यञ्जन प्रति स्वच्छ स्वत:।
At the end of Uddyota I., Ananda says:

"—तात्यात्मक प्रकाशेण यत्र व्यञ्जनायां स चतुर्विति।"

and Abhinava explains this Tātparya as the final and chief purport:

तात्यात्मक विभावितायाः प्रयोगन्यन्तिते बावाः।

and more similar instances are available in the text of the Dhvanyāloka. Ananda will not have any objection to such an interpretation of Tātparya, enabling it to become a synonym of Dhvani. Kumārasvāmin quotes from the third Uddyota of Ananda the concluding part of Ananda’s arguments showing how the Mimāṃsakas also, if they want to explain the difference between Pauruṣeya and Apauruṣeya Śābda, must accept Dhvani or Vyañjana.

(P. 199.)
Both the sections on Dhvani in the 6th and 7th chapters of the Śr. Pra. close with the following verses:

तत्तपर्यं च चानि ध्वनिरेष्य काल्ये
धेमाध्यथमेव गुणानुभाद्वद्वभवः।

ल्लक्षणमेव पपुष्पी स्वदेस्यहस्ताया:
छुट्टारे एवं हुहे मानवोऽजायः॥

and

वद्विभिर्प्रायस्वेवं कुच्छाक्षाय प्रतीयते।
तत्त्वं अर्थविरंततं शब्दयम्: पुनर्वर्णिनः॥

सीभाष्यमिः तत्त्वमेह आन्तरो गुण हृयते।
वायस्वताया लाल्क्ष्यमित्व बायात्तत्वोऽवर्णिनः॥

अहुरिध्रुवाकल्यातु दूरेन दूरमुच्यते।
कथा नरसहाशाही महताक्षायः॥

Bhoja : Śr. Pra. Chapters VI and VII.

In ordinary speech and writing, the purport is called Tātparya; but the purport in poetic expression is called Dhvani. And what is the difference in the nature of the ordinary utterance and the poetic utterance, that purports of the two must be called by two different names, Tātparya and Dhvani? Ordinary talk and writing is “Avakra”, not beautiful; poetic expression “Vakra,” beautiful.

वद्वकं वचि शाबले तोके च वच एवं तत्।
वंकं वद्विवादादी तत्त्वा काय्यमिति स्वर्ति॥

Therefore, a more graceful name for Tātparya is Dhvani; this is the idea we get from the two verses of Bhoja. तत्त्वपर्यं च चानि etc. and वद्वकं etc. But suddenly he turns the statement the other way and says that the Abhiprāya, the entire intended idea, is a quality of Artha. That is, Tātparya is Artha dharma; Dhvani on the other hand is Śabda dharma. What does Bhoja mean by this? Does he mean that Dhvani is the name of the Vyāñjakaśabda and that Tātparya is the name of the Vyāñgyātha? That Dhvani is the Vyāñjanā śabdavyāpāra and Tātparya is its result? Or, does he mean that Śabda-dhvani is Dhvani and Arthadhvani is Tātparya? The last is clearly impossible; for, he speaks of Dhvani as pertaining to both Śabda and Artha. Again there is more poetry than any scientific analysis, when Bhoja says that Tātparya is internal, is the Saubhāgya of Vāk or speech, and Dhvani is external, the Lāvanya of Vāk. Another attempt, Bhoja makes to clarify the issue; he says in conclusion that you can call either by either name; they are identical; just as the months of Caitra and Vaiśākha, so called from an astronomical point of view, are called Madhu and Mādhava from another point of view, by two other names, so also the purport of an expression can be called Tātparya or Dhvani. To sum up:

1. Bhoja accepts Ananda’s Dhvani.
2. He first calls it a department of Tātparya, but finally says that the two are identical. In the latter stage, Tātparya does not include Abhidhīya-
māna vākyārtha but is a name of the Pratīyaṁāna and the Dhvanyāmāna
Arthas.

3. Bhoja makes an artificial division of the suggested element into Pratīyaṁāna and the Dhvanirūpa, which is unnecessary.

4. The distinction into Dhvani of Almaṅkāra, Vastu and Rasādī found in Ananda is absent in Bhoja.

5. “Upasarjanikṛtasvārhatva” is mentioned by Bhoja as part of the definition of Dhvani but its implications are not realised and worked out.
"Dhvani-kāvya where Dhvani is predominant, Guṇībhūtavyāṅga and Citra-
kāvya or Avyaṅga" is the other classification of Ananda, missed in Bhoja.

Analysis of the concept of Dhvani itself and the classification of Dhvani is not made by Bhoja to such an extent as is seen in Ananda. Later writers have worked out the possible varieties of Dhvani to 1326. (See Vidyānātha, p. 55. Bālamanorāmā Edn.) But the chief varieties indicated by Ananda are:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lakṣaṅāmūla</th>
<th>Abhidhāmūla</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Avivakṣitavācyāya</td>
<td>Vivakṣitānyaparavācyāya</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Arthāntarasaṅkrā-
mitavācyāya. Atyantatirakṛta-
vācyāya. Asamlakṣyakrama Samlakṣyakrama
( Rasādīdhvani ) ( alias Anunāda or Anuvāna or Anu-
raṇanadhvani )


Dhvani is first of all classifiable according as it is a case of suggestion from Sabda or Artha; for, one of the reasons, as Ananda says, why Dhvani is not Vācakatyāyāpāra is that Vācakatya is a pure Śabdavyāpāra while both Sabda and Artha display power of suggestion.

P. 191. III. Dheva. Ā.

It is from this point of view that Ananda classifies Samlakṣyakrama-vyaṅga which resembles resonance, Anusvāna or Anurāṇa or Anunāda, into Śabdā-
śaktimūla and Arthaśaktimūla.

Similarly, Avivakṣitavācyā or the Lakṣaṅāmūladhvani and the Vivakṣitānyapa-
paravācyā or the Abhidhāmūladhvani are explained by Abhinava from the point of Sabda and Artha. He says that in the former, there is more of Śabdadhvani; and the latter, more of Arthadhvani.
"अत एव अर्धांश्र प्राणायामश्च, धृत्रेण शन्ध्रः। शन्ध्रोद्ध (‘सुखण्णुष्मां’ स्वयार्द्री अविक्रियाः) प्राणायामश्च, अर्थस्वत तत्तत्त्वारिष्टया—।" P. 49. *Locana.*

In the Asamalakṣyakramavyānīya variety of Vivakṣitānayaaparavācyā, there is the least scope for Śabdadhvani.

Bhoja gives a simple classification of Dhvani. He has two kinds of classification. One is from the above-noted point of view of the suggesting element, the Vyañjaka śabda or the Vyañjaka artha. See Ratnesvara also on व्येनितम तु गाम्यत् in S. K. A. I. p. 55.

"व्यन्ते व्येनितयश्चापल्ये व्यापारे । स त्रिविधे—श्रवःन्ति, अर्थविनिष । × × ×
तत्त्वतः श्रवःन्ति व्यन्ते शन्ध्रविनि, अर्थान्तरं स अर्थविनि: इति वज्जनयः।"

The second classification is into Anunāda, a phrase occurring in Ānanda as Anusvāna (II. 21.) as a name of the Saṃalakṣyakrama-vivakṣitānayaaparavācyā; and Pratiśabdadhvani or echo. This second is a name created by Bhoja himself. Anunādadadhvani is explained as Abhidhiyamāna-pratīyamāna-anusuyāta, closely fused with the expressed and the implied senses or that case which looks like a continuation of the expressed sense, where the suggested does not stand separate. Pratidhvani is the suggestion of a different idea standing separate, like echo which is a duplicate of our voice. This variety of Pratiśabdadhvani where the suggested idea stands apart—Prthagbhūta—is Ānanda’s Avivakṣitānayaadhvani.

Tātparyā.


Of numerous kinds.

Śabdadhvani. Arthadhvani

Anunāda. Pratiśabda Anunāda Pratiśabda
dhvani. dhvani. dhvani dvani

For illustrations and explanations of these varieties, see extract from the *Sr. Pra.* at the end of this section.

Śāradātanaya summarizes Bhoja’s treatment of Sāhitya in his Bhāvaprayaśkāśa and tries to present Bhoja’s ideas on Dhvani in the light in which he understood them. Chapter VI. pp. 147 (line 17) to 150 (line 14). Tātparyā is defined by Śāradātanaya as—शयंश्राद्राय प्रति श्रेष्ठसमुचिनन्तय— and it is divided, as is done by Bhoja into three classes: “स च अभिवेंद्रः, प्राणायामः, चन्द्रयम: इति त्रिप्रथि।” It is at this stage of defining the Pratyāyya that Śāradātanaya makes a change. He finds it, as we also found, impossible to distinguish Bhoja’s Pratīti and Dhvani, Pratīyamāna and Dhvanyamāna. So he made the distinction that such meaning as is called forth to explain a statement whose obvious
expressed sense is clearly incompatible, Anupapanna, is called Pratiyamāna. The example is “Viṣam bhūṅkṣva.” This is partly faithful but not wholly, to Bhoja’s text.

Bhoja does not restrict Pratiyamānatātparya to cases of Anyathā-anuapa-patti of the Abhidhiyamāna. For, Bhoja expressly says:


though he illustrates only the latter with example “Viṣam bhūṅkṣva.” In other respects, Sāradātānaya faithfully summarises the whole text of Bhoja on Dhvani. At the end of this section, Sāradātānaya takes up the question of the difference between Dhvani and Tātparya. He quotes the Kārikās on Dhvani “अप्रिलितमविषयान्त” etc. quoted in the Avaloka on the Daśarūpaka and says that this view is wrong. Dhvani and Tātparya are not separate but are identical. Dhvani or the suggested idea is got at only through the Tātparya Śakti of a sentence. The suggested idea is also part of a speaker’s intention and everything coming within the speaker’s intention, is Tātparya. There is no rule which lays down that the speaker’s intention, beyond a certain stage, ceases to be Tātparya and needs a new name. Here Sāradātānaya quotes Dhanika’s Kārikā from his lost Kāvyanirṇaya which his Avaloka quotes:

एतत्रतेव विभानित: तात्त्विपिन्यति किं हृतम्।
यातकार्यप्रसरितान् तात्त्व्यं न मुख्यगतम्।

Sāradātānaya does not quote Bhoja’s verses on the difference between Tātparya and Dhvani which bring in the similes ‘Lāvanya’ and ‘Saubhāgya.’ Instead, Sāradātānaya gives a single analogy. He says that Dhvani is a class of Tātparya, an Avāntarabhedha, even as Brahmacārin is a kind of Brāhmaṇa, the first Āśrami Brāhmaṇa.

Bahrūpamiṣra, in his commentary on the Daśarūpaka (Mad. Ms. R. 4188 pp. 76-79), follows Sāradātānaya closely and puts in prose Sāradātānaya’s summary of Bhoja on Dhvani. He ends thus:

अति: तुतीयाभासानेन व्यविभाजिता तात्त्विपिन्य गम्यमानवताः रसांवकारवि: वाक्यशः। × × ×
एवं निष्कारसपि तात्त्व्यं वस्तुद्वारा वाक्यमभ्यं एवतिः।
Bhurūpamiśra follows also Sāradātānaya’s own modification of Bhoja’s Pratīyamāna. Sāradātānaya and, following him, Bhurūpā also, say that Tātparya pertains to the speech through the speaker, Vaktrdvārā vākyā-dharmaḥ, but Kumārasvāmin asserts that it pertains purely to the speaker and not to the speech.

उहेशो नाम वक्तुधमें; न मीमांसकानामिव वाक्यधमें इति। P. 33.

It is not clear what Bhoja’s ideas are on the description of Rasa as Vākyārtha; we do not find him discussing the subject in the section on Tātparya and Dhvani. But, while describing the varieties of composition, Dhyāna and Śravya Prabandhaś, he says that the Nāṭaka and the other nine Rūpakas as well as the Nāṭikā and the Saṭṭaka (on the whole twelve) form Vākyārthābhāhinaya; and the rest, twelve Uparūpakas, Śrīgadita etc., form Padārthābhāhinaya.

वाक्यार्थभिनयेः वर्णीतितत्त्वावस्थानिपन्न
उपपराप्रयोगरथिनिमयस्य व्याख्यानवत्व वच्चे॥ P. 422. Vol. II. Śr. Pra.

This by itself cannot lead us far. In this same chapter (XI) we find Bhoja saying regarding Rasa:

—न न हि विभवदृष्टात्, अपि ह भावसनलभसानामवन्दकारणामधिनिहितं
अध्ययनः।

नन्देशस्यापि अर्थस्यालाव अमीमासंवन्दकारणं प्राप्तिः? सत्येततः; किलु अन्यतरत्वं त
उपायमात्ता: तत्रैव न्यूनत्विनं; न वाक्यार्थप्रतीती पदार्थं: पूर्णं स्पूर्तिति।
P. 370. Vol. II.

Bhoja states here clearly that Vibhāvas etc., are similar to Padārthas in a Vākyārtha. Rasa, Bhāva and their Ābhāsa form Vākyārtha. While the Padārthas are described, they have no more purpose to serve than the manifestation of the Vākyārtha; the Vibhāvas etc., do not separately exist by themselves and are not ends in themselves; their ultimate aim is the manifestation of Rasa. This Padārtha-vākyārtha-nyāya between Vibhāvādi vācyā-vācaka and Dhvanyāmāna-rāsadā emphasises only the fact that Vibhāva etc., are Rasapara. The former are Upāyamātra, the means, for the latter. This will not go against Ānanda; for, though Padārthas are real, they are not separately realised when we realise the sentence-meaning; similarly, so quick is our perception of the Rasa from the Vibhāvas etc., that there seem to be no Vibhāvas etc. nor even a process of transition, Krama, from them to Rasa.

Says Ānanda:

स्वसामार्थ्यवेदनेष्व वाक्यार्थ प्रधययर्पिः
सत्या व्याकरणिलिङ्गस्य पदार्थवश न विमानवते॥
तद्वालेष्वतः गोद्वः वाच्यार्थपमुखामास्तं
कुली तत्त्वसंबद्धान्य बहुत्तीवाबान्ते॥ Dhva. A. I. 11-12.

Rasa is therefore Vākyārtha; and Vibhāva, Anubhāva and Vyabhicārin constitute Padārtha. The Vākyārtha, viz.—Rasa, must naturally be got at through Tātparya, otherwise called Dhvani and, as such, Bhoja contradicts
neither Ananda nor Dhanika. In Dhanika’s Aveloka we find a clear mention of Rasa being Vākyārtha, those that manifest it, Vibhāvas etc., being the Padārtha, and the Vākya being the Kāvyā.

“तत्र विभावतयः पदार्थायांक्षेपः, तत्स्मूङ्ग्रं रत्यतः: बाणायः; तदेव काय्यावलयं यदीशी
तत्विमी मद्वायावलयाः।” D. R. A. p. 120.

The dramatic and semi-dramatic compositions described by Bhoja as Vākyārthabhānaya and Padārthabhānaya are so designated perhaps after the manner of such a characterisation of those two by Dhanañjaya and Dhanika. Dhanan-
jaya says: “दशशैव रसाधयम्। अन्यद् भावाधयं नृत्यम। आर्थ ( सुतम् ) पदार्थाभिनयः।”
and Dhanika says: “—तथा बाणायाभिमिनण्यायांगणावहः, पदार्थाभिमिनण्यासकमयेदेव

The major Rūpakas depict Rasa which is like the full Vākyārtha; so they are called Vākyārthabhānaya. The Upārupakas depict only Bhāvas and are therefore called Padārthabhānaya.¹

APPENDIX I.

It was noticed above while surveying the position of Dhanāñjaya and Dhanika that the Aveloka compares the majority of cases of Kāvyā-vākya where the Sthāyin is not expressed to such elliptic sentences as “Dvāram dvāram” where the verb mentioning the action “Pidhehi” is absent but is understood from context etc. The understood action of ‘shutting’ in the one case and the understood Sthāyin in the other are both Vākyārtha. Thus they come within the scope of Tātparya. (See D. R. p. 120).

Bhoja discusses the two concepts of Adhyāhāra and Vākyāśeṣa related to the case of elliptic or incomplete sentences in Chapter IX of the Sr. Pra. (Vol. II. pp. 178-184). As an instance of Adhyāhāra, he cites the sentences in which the verbs giving the actions are not expressed, Asrūyāmañña kriyās, and sentences in which verbs alone are seen and subjects or objects are not found.

“‘द्वारे द्वारे’ इत्युज्ञे संदिच्यता अपाविष्टता बेत्यप्रायादिबोधे। तथा वर्ष्यद्वेदति इत्युज्ञे ‘वेष:,
मृषः’ इति”

Though this understood element is also part of the Vākyārtha, Bhoja says that the understood element is got at by the Pramāṇa of Srutārthāpatti. For, without that element, the sentence is deficient or unintelligible.

A similar case is Vākyāśeṣa. Bhoja explains it as distinct from Adhyāhāra. Both of them are cases of elliptic expressions, with something left to be understood. But in the former case, we fill up a word, Sabda; in the latter, an idea, Artha. The sentence is incomplete in the case of Adhyāhāra in respect of words or Sabdas themselves; but in Vākyāśeṣa the Vākya is complete so far as Sabdas go; only the sense is yet incomplete,—अर्थ: अपरिपूर्णः। Therefore, Bhoja says that Adhyāhāra is Sabdākāṅkṣā nivartaka and Vākyāśeṣa is Arthaṅkāṅsā nivartaka.

¹ More of this distinction is to be had in the section on Bhoja and Nātya Śāstra.
What is Vākyāśeṣa? It is Arthakalpanā, the putting forth of idea to explain an expression, in which that idea is understood but not exactly expressed. The sentence means it certainly but does not actually express it. As for instance, all sentences finally mean either an injunction (Vidhi) or a prohibition (Nisedha). Even in cases where we do not find express mention of either, we have to imagine and understand them. Thus, when one says on seeing a traveller “आर्थिकल्पना देव” he means to induce him to make a halt in his place, by praising that place as a fit abode, it being the habitation of noble men. Similarly, to request one to stay and dine, one says “मन्याहो बलते”. If one says “सानीर; पनथः” he means to say “don’t go that way.”

The Prabhākara māmāṁsakas do not accept this Śrutārthāpatti and they do not have Śabda-adhyāthāra at all. They accept that there are cases of Arthakalpanā but that Arthakalpanā is not through Adhyāthāra or Vākyāśeṣa, operating through Śrutārthāpatti. The whole idea understood in the case of an elliptic expression is expressed by the Abhidhāvyāpāra of the available expression itself. How can these words express also senses which they do not have and for which other words are needed? The Prabhākara say that the scope of the Abhidhā is extended far enough to embrace the understood sense also. The Abhidhā shoots like an arrow over a wide field. Bhoja replies that this view will not hold good. For the Abhidhāvyāpāra cannot mean no more than what the words put together mean exactly. Nor can this long-long Abhidhā be the Tātparya-śakti. Says Bhoja:

वषोऽयोक्तम्—कल्याणमस्य अपेक्षा अबिद्धते न भूततिः क्योऽमयां शब्दमीमांसिकोपरिव दैवतीयोऽया कः इति, तदन्त्रे न समस्यक्; तत्त्व तथाविचार्यविद्यासाधयत्नाः। स हि तम्मेऽपि प्रत्याशयनं अभिधायम्यः तत्त्वविचार्यमां वा! (न अभिधायम्यः), तत्त्वः पदविविलिपदानमानं एव उपविद्यन्तात्।

1. The Arthasastra of Kautilya gives Vākyāśeṣa as one of the Tantryuktis in the last chapter. It is illustrated by a case of Upamā in which the Upamā is missing, but the Upameya and the Samādharma—as in “Chinnapakṣa iva”—are present. The Upamā of ‘bird’ is understood and this is Vākyāśeṣa.

Vāmana gives the same idea of Vākyāśeṣa as the Arthasastra.
Now, we shall examine the definition of Vākyāsaṇa and its illustrations. Bhoja says that a Vākyya as such means Vidhi and Nīṣedha, and even where there is no express Vidhi or Nīṣedha, we must have it as understood. This holds good also for the Kāvyavākyya. For, beyond Rasa, and in respect of Vyutpatti, the purport of a Kāvyya is to induce us to a good action and to dissuade us from a bad action. A Rāmāyaṇa-kāvyya means:

रामबृत्तत्वम्, न रावणादिवः।

Says Bhoja on p. 143, Vol. II, on Vākyā-saṇa-ekārthi-bhāva:

"यथा तद्यथारामासिद्धिर्वा कार्यग्राहणाऽपि तत्त्वम् न राष्ट्रादिवः।

i.e., in the performance of a particular action, the Rāma, not the Rāavan, is implied.

Earlier also, Bhoja says, while dealing with Vākyārtha in Chapter VI, that Bhaṇāṇa, Vidhi and Pratibhā are Vākyārtha and that Vidhi in Kāvyās is the implied injunction to act like Rāma and not to act like Rāvana. Here Bhoja plainly says that this implied Vidhi-nīśedha is got at by Vākyāsaṇa.

this Vākyārtha or Vākyāsa of Vidhi-niṣedha is realised through Śrutārthapatti, he lets down Dhvani which he has elsewhere accepted. He joins the camp of those who, recognising Arthāpatti, have no need for Dhvani, those who hold the Arthāpattipakṣa in the two Kārikās on the anti-dhvani view-points quoted by Jayaratha.

The illustrations given by Bhoja for Vākyāsa form Arthavāda and clearly correspond to Kāvya vākyas. Their implied injunctions and prohibitions correspond to Kāvyavavyutpatti and have to be explained by Dhvani only.

Bhoja gives two illustrations for Vākyāsa from Kāvyas and gives us what ideas are left to be understood in those two cases. These remarks themselves prove Vākyāsa to be Dhvani.

---वाक्यशैषों भवति। यथा च---

लं जीवितं लभति मे हृदयं द्वितीयं
तं कौमुदी नधन्योरमृतं लभन्ते।
हस्यदिम: प्रयत्तितमृतम् मुर्गा
तामेव—शान्तमवव किमत: परेण।

यथा च—

पत्रेव स: महान: नलक्ष्मवर्णो
रम्भा स्तुता चन्द्रपतिरस सा ततः
यथार्थवचन हृदयां तदेति कथा
षेष्ठतत्तां यदि तत्त्वस्त एव यह:।

× × × ×

तथा हि—तामेव लं तथापि विषयादितिमभावमात्रामस्त विभवं च धर्मस्थां मस्तिष्कीर्तिः

कामयाणायामपि स्तुत्यां कामामपि यश्वर्णं तन्महापालकेः प्रकृत्यते, किमभ: पुनः

These are clearly cases of Dhvani, not of Dhvani dominant, but dominated by Alamkāra, Vācyā-anatisśāyi. That is, the former verse especially is Aśeṣa alamkāra of the first variety in Bhāmaha and Ruyyaka. The illustration in Bhāmaha is:

अहि लो यदि नेत्रेश्व अश्यम्भुस्तुका तत:।
हङ्कवलक्ष्तोत्सन्न भिनुपेन दीप्तिये ते। K. A. II. 69.

Ruuyaka illustrates with a verse of exactly the same nature as the first given by Bhoja:


Bhoja gives a similar verse in his Śabdālamkāra section as illustration for the Alamkāra called Samvrīttī mudrā.

संविषेढमन्थ्या यथा—

मविण्यं प्रविष्टस्य तथापार्या विभुः।

लघ्यं येनाथ योगेन तेन कि कौरवेन व:।
This is a case of purposeful suppression of a part of an expression and this "तेन की कौन से कीर्तित है" is of the same nature as the expressions "शान्तमिथु किमत: परेष" และ "न तद्वित क्रथू" in the two verses given by Bhoja as illustrations for Vākyāśeṣa. But these are not cases of dominating Dhvani but only cases having an element of Dhvani. Bhoja, however, does not want to call such cases of elliptic expressions where part of the expression is suppressed and the sentence is not complete as cases of Tātparya or Dhvani. They apply only to cases of full Vākyas, where a further meaning is implied. It is for cases of incomplete sentences that he postulates Vākyāśeṣa and Śrutārthāpatti.

Abhinava also says that cases of Śrutārthāpatti where the Abhidhā itself has not yet rested, and wants some more ideas to explain itself, are different from cases of Dhvani which operates on full Vākyas, after the primary Abhidhā is at rest having delivered its meaning.

Bhoja notices some cases of what are instances of Dhvani while dealing with various kinds of Vivakṣā in Chapter VII. (Vol. II, p. 27). Of these, the following deserve to be noticed here—

These are cases of Dhvani, where the exact opposite of what is intended to be conveyed is given as the expressed sense. These come under Bhoja’s Pratīyāmāna class. Bhoja ends the section with these general observations which would attribute Dhvani finally to the poet’s power, as Bhaṭṭanāyaka said when he made it a part of the Kavyāyāpāra. See Jayaratha, Alaih-kāravimārśini, p. 9. Bhoja says:

एवमिबिन्यमेऽविवव्या विवधते । तदेष लोककक्ताद्—
अन्तिमतपारे संसारे कविरै: प्रज्ञापति: ।
यथास्मै रोचते विवध तथेऽदेद परिवर्तेत्॥
अपि च—
िमित्ततेषां दीशा अन्तिमिष्ये यह तदां व परिहारः
जह संज्ञाय अ दीशा सुकृत्यैं इमानो परिहारो॥ (The Gauḍavahā, 66)
THE TEXT OF THE ŚRĪGĀRA PRĀKĀŚA
BEARING ON DHVANI
(Vol. II. Madras MS. Pp. 31-42).
(from Chapter VII)

"वर्गः शब्दः सं शब्दः इति तात्त्वयम्। तत्र वाक्य एकोपस्थता। पदमात्रेण अभिप्रायस्य प्रकाश्यते विहक्ष्यतात्। तत्र वाक्यः प्रतिरूपियं चेत सबूतं भवति अभिधीयमानम्, प्रतियमानम्, व्यन्तिवर्ते च।

यद् यत्, उपवासायेतु मुख्योऽण्डित्वमण्डित्वम्। शब्दशास्त्रम्: स्मरणमिच्छाय उपवासायपरेऽप आत्माकारायाः सभिष्ठमित्वमण्डित्वम्। वाक्यार्थमिच्छायांनिवयते तत् अभिन्नियमानं यथा सैमर्थ有力तः।

वाक्यार्थबिन्नताकलं वाक्यार्थ: उपवासाय: अनुपवासाय: अस्यथमिच्छायां नाशिकियांदसिद्धतातात् (त: ) यत् प्रतिशयति तत् प्रतियमानम्, यथा 'विवं मुक्त्व नाम चाचप्य युध्येन मुक्त्व।' समये के 'वरं विवं भक्ते न पुनः युध्येन मुक्त्व,' इति प्रतियते।

अर्थार्थोऽपि उपवासायाः सभिष्ठमित्वमण्डित्वमण्डित्वम् अनुपवासायाः प्रतिशयति विन्यास: 

(त: ) अभिन्नियमानं तत् व्यन्तिवर्ते। तत् न सैमर्थपतिः। तथा हि भिन्नतामिच्छायां कस्थितदेव भासायां: इति वाक्याय अनुपवासाय: अवव्याय: कस्थितदेव कस्थितदेव: प्रतिरूपियं यत् (त: ) कस्मिन्निविवद्वा वाक्याय प्रतियमानमनिविविष्यं चाचप्यमण्डित्वमानं ध्यातीति।

अतिदेवोऽपि अभिन्नियमानं च यथाविश्वासं च व्यन्तिवर्ते (तत: )

अथावे प्रयोगम्। तत्र अभिन्नियमानं चतुर्दशी विन्यासं, विन्यासपतिः, विन्यासपतिः, अश्चिन्तिनिवेष्यं च।

(उद्दाहरणानि)

× × × ×

प्रतियमानेऽपि पुनः अनुभवकहा। कलिदिरी निन्देः—भगव श्रीम्मोऽ इयायति (गाथा० II. 75)।

अत्र विन्यासं अभेति विचारके स्वरूपो तत्र निकुञ्जे सिद्धान्तातथा, तथा च द्योक्षे विन्यासं, तस्मात् तथाद्वा तमस्मिन विन्यासं निन्दते: प्रतियते।

कलिदिरीयेषु बिचारे—अतता पत्र: प्रणम्यं इयायति (गाथा० VII. 67)।

अत्र शास्त्रायाः मा नित्यासंति निन्देः अथावे, इति तदेव श्रुतियाः। इति धिन्तुपक्षः रांगी यथाः इह अग्निभयं इति विचार: प्रतियते।

कलिदिरी विचारां च यथा—

वहलतमा हस्फराई अन्य पद्योऽ पध्य धर्मण्।

ताः जेजाध्यस असेवण जद्य णं मे मुरितावणो (गाथा० IV. 35.)

[वहलतमा हस्फराई अन्य पद्योऽ पध्य धर्मण्।

तथा जेजाध्यस असेवण न यथा वध्येन सुषुप्यामै (गाथा० IV. 35.)

यथा (अनं यथा वध्येन सुषुप्यामै तथा ज्ञातावति विचारणारे रांगी: अस्त्याचारा, पति: प्राप्ती: एवं श्रुत्म्। अस्त्याचारा: नि हस्फराई अन्य पद्योऽ पध्य धर्मण्।]

1. The whole of this text giving the varieties of the Pratiyamāna is an elaboration of what Ananda has given on pp. 16-20 in ud. I. The whole text of Bhoja, with the illustrations and comments, is reproduced in his Kāvyānūśāsana by Hemacandra. See Kāvyānūśāsana. Pp. 26-34.
कविचित्रयेचे निर्देशान्तरं यथा—
आसाइंन अण्णाणं जालिं ताति एण बन्ध अ दिहि ॥ (तनुलं भुतमुहालिं )
उच्छसयु तुर्ह एहि रक्षककाय गोंधिस्वेतम् ॥ १
अन्य गुहाविभिन्ने हुङ्गुमवरणके निर्देशाय उपपत्तिवारण निर्देशान्तरं प्रतीयते ।

कविचिह्दे (ते ) चित्रितवेचे विविध्यं
मुद्देशिं हि सं पन्तिया जात हरसि सि अणिंकंया ॥ ( गंगासं गंगावाहों ) ॥
अतिरिहि कस्य स्थान कामो दूरे आहे एका ॥
[ मच्छा कं विविध्यं यदि हरसि विवसने वितमहात् ॥
आहियांमि कस्य अरण्ये कामो दूरे आहे एका ॥ ] २
अन्य विविधिनिर्देशान्तरं मनने अनेकाननी गामो, या इति विविधोपरेज्ञातखं निपी में
हर इति विनियमः प्रतीयते ।

कविचिन्दितिनिर्देशे निर्देशे यथा—
जीविताणा बलवती घनाणा ढुळवला मम ॥
मच्छ वा लिं वा काच तबलस्व तु निदिता॥ काण्डदेशं २—२३ ॥
अन्य मच्छ वा लिं वेशविविधिनिर्देशाय, जीविताणा बलवतो, घनाणा ढुळवला मेंढी वचनाणा
लया विनां हि जीवितं न वशोमि इति उपप्तेण गमनपनियेदः प्रतीयते ।

कविचिन्दितिनिर्देशधार्योऽः विविध्यं यथा—
सिंधुद्वारस्याश्चाशिया पायौ अणणेन बलसु पहें ॥
गाहपवहु ढुळवलातारां इस हसमामे ॥

[ निविदितादानीसिद्धकनिसिक अन्येन ब्रज पथा ॥
ग्रहपतिविवः ढुळववायुरा इस हसमामे ॥
अन्य अन्येन पथा ब्रज ( वेणे ) ति विविधिनिर्देशविनियामे है स्त्रकादानिम्नात्वततितकान पायभी(भ) हृ[ क ] है प्रामे भवतो ग्रहपतिविव इति विनियमरेण प्रतीयते ।

कविचवानि निर्देशायोऽः निर्देशान्तरं यथा—
उपेन सिंधु मा धून सेहालियां हळत्रसुहु ॥
एस अवसानिविसास संहुरेण सुहे बलसाहू ॥ ३
[ उपेन लिं सिंधु मा धूनी: षेषाविनिक हळत्रसुहु ॥
एस अवसानिविसास: संहुरेण धूनी बलसाहू: ॥]

1. Found in the Telugu Recension in Weber’s Edn. See S. K. A. p. 469, where also it is quoted. Its Chāyā is thus found there:
आसाइंन अण्णाणं जालिं ताति एण बन्ध अ दिहि ॥
उच्छसयु तुर्ह एहि रक्षककाय गोंधिस्वेतम् ॥


3. Vide p. 120. Dhvanyāloka. We find there विनियमरेण in the place 
अवसानिविसास of the Sr. Prā. in the third foot. The Gāthā is found in the Telugu 
Recension in Weber’s Edn. of the Gāthā Saptasati.
अनु पति कुलम् उपनिषि मा पुनिषि शेषः अभिविन्यासम् विविन्यासयोऽविविन्यास�
कांस्यचन्द्रानिवः, अविविच्छमनेव ध्यनं, अनुनादनहं प्रतीतयत इति अनुनादनिनः । तथा—
शास्त्रे बोधेन्नुभु कपालद्रम जातां पत्राधिदीयां विचिनि
कपी कपी गणः घराकृत पदवी नातिसिद्धार्थम् ।
विचे वचनति क्वयति क्षितिम् अयम्मिदिशिष्ठे विश्वास्ये
नामे रागिनु संस्तेतुपुष्टे जगमिवेंश्यति वामिनिः ॥

अथ गणः: कपालिलिपिम् अप्रतिद्वारां पदवी: पदष्टीति वक्ष्यार्थां उभियोः भविष्यमानः ।
पदवीस्त्थानं महायोः ( भो) । परिशिष्टे भगवती-सुनुभुस्वक्ष्यम् एवांकिनः: मेव ( समयं)
स्वानम् हि ( इति) वचनति । तथा विचे वचनतीत्याति पदवीं ( भो ) मुसुष्मेव (अनुनादश) पम्
विश्वास्ये इति अनुनादनिनः । एवम्—

अण्वन वच वालस नमनित फ़िङ्गोलिस भे एवं ।
र ( रे ) जायमुरुक्षणण ( भो ) तुहंपिण्डुहो ( तुहे तीखं विभ ण होत) ॥

[अन्य वच वालस मजानी कि प्रतीक्षेयइम् ।
भो जायमुरुक्षणो गुप्तमात तीथिमिह न भवित ॥ ]

अथ कि मां मजानी प्रतीक्ष्यति अन्य वच, नेते जायमुरुक्षणो तीथिमिहिभियोः भावः: जायमुरुक्षणो विभेदिति तेन मां न कामसे इत्युपाळमभारे प्रतिपादनं । अथ स्लेने विचा सुव्याहिता इथ्यं-पिते भविति ध्यनिति । तथा तथा अनुदारमाप्यानि ( भोभोङ्गुः ) मेव अनुनादनरथ्यं वचनात्युतानापद-चननि ।

एवं तथा विभेदिति इथिति वक्ष्यामाना यथा क्षितिम् तीथियं पम् विश्वास्ये इति उपेक्षमानाः: शास्तिविशिष्टवानाः राज्यम्यादिभिवादनां पण नयं यथा: बौद्धरथ्यं ध्यनिति । ताचाचायोः भाषणमात्यं अनुनादनरथ्यं वचनात्युतानापद-चननि । तथा— “महापुत्रहि कि व पंक्ति! इथिती अविभिनिरेणैः विधिः: प्रतीतिमात्यं। शुद्धाचायोः भाषणमात्यं अनुनादनरथ्यं ध्यनिति । तथा प्रतीतिमान्युतस्यसम्प्रमाणम् अनुनादसमहित (भे) उपस्थतमा इति अनुनादनिनः। अथि च दृश्यं पद्विक्षिप्तयुमा मा धुना सेविलिए कहार्यां हि वक्ष्यामाना यथा विभिनि वेक्ष्यामाना यथा: निषेधं वैतीचारं यथिति । स व राज्योः कृष्णापायवयाजतेजस् पश्चात्तमानुष्मानमात्यं: शास्तिविशिष्टवानाः तापन्ने तपन्ने सह भुजे चाँदकलजेहे क्षेत्रार्थित्रायसह सुराणीयामनोहर्वत्सद्वत्त्रलश्यिस्त: प्रतीतिमात्यं: चैवस्यस्यानेव शेषाचािक्षे शास्तिविशिष्टवानाः सह-लक्षकारुपान् च कांस्यनिर्विन्नेण अनुनादो यथि वितीपादयन् अनुनादनरथ्यं वद्धिमानसास्यां तीथिति ।

प्रतिद्वारवतिः:

वः: पुंजरभियोऽम्मानवयार्थात्, पृथ्वसम् इति गुहाविद्वत्िविसदस्यरस्मरातं प्रतिपादनं 
प्रतिज्ञातिः स प्रतिद्वारवतिः। यथा “लावणसिनुद्वर्चि हि के समथो” इति विद्वानोः
( भयोऽ नूनाम्-२०५ ) ( गांव हुआ) याः पूर्वाशिष्टवतिः प्रतिज्ञाय यथास्मात्, ते च व चिनि जनयतः उपस्थतमात्यं एवं लावणसिनुद्वर्चितिः पदवीं उत्तावदानाः यथा स्वप्नस्यार्थपरीक्षेत्तिमात्यं जानना ते च अवर्तनिर्भवनि जनयतं उपस्थव्यतः। तेनेव च बध्यानामानाममुक्तिमात्राशी: अभिधी-

1. For the correct word महापुत्रहि see Bhoja's Saiva Treatise, Tattva Prakāśa. V. 7 and 8.
2. See Dhvanityālaka. P. 156.
3. This is Ananda’s Avivakṣṣītavācyadhvani.
शब्दविनि :

एवं शब्दविनियिरिपि द्विवैव । तत्र अनुनदाहरो यथा—

भक्तियाहि दयानु मुक्कपुटटकोठकोठकोठीनां
वक्षीमाककुकामा इव कमलान्दाहतमुक्ति कैत ये ।
कारकारणस्तत्तज्ञानतयात्मसात्मारंभधकायः
कल्याणं व : किमातुः किभलकर्षयते कराभासकर्णः ( मद्युरः सूः ज. २ । )
अत्र भासकर्णः कल्याणं व : किमातुः हि वाक्यायः । कर्मकाण्डशक्तिस्वाभावतः कितलयः
हच्छयादिधमसत्त्वलिखितशयोगसमाहित्वोहसुः अनुगांजय जयामभवतः तेजोपवृत्तमुक्कसहृदयं च व्यथित ।
तदुभवमंकी तदसंस्तुतमेवेबहित्व भृत्तित्व हि अनुनदाहरि । एवम्—

gोमेष्टिस्वाभावि शिखरित्व च शिखरित्व तुतंतं पतनतः
प्रारम्भे बांसस्त्रा योगप्रति सबचहस्तिपवृषभ ।
निप्पोषांतिरहितः निपपुत्तन्मत्यांत्रिणां पानु तुम्मानः
रूमाणं सतातायथमभिमिव तद्विन्धो चत्वारिः । ( मद्युरः सूः श. ३ । )
अत्र पादशाक्ति भाभाभाय तत्स्मयिद्हूपजोगायम्
मात्र योगायम् किरिलिलिसकामालोहिनं तत्तवायी ।
अत्र च प्रतिशाटनियभया—

dत्तान्न्द्राः प्रणान्त्मानविशिष्टस्यैः वयोभि
पूर्वांशः विप्पकृति विद्विदिपि विसम्पर्विं संहारभाजः ।
सूर्याणांशः हिणेशुवन्धरभवमवयोद्वृत्ताराणीवो
गावो वः ववानानं परमपरिच्छां प्रतिमेवाद्यवन्तः ( मद्युरः सूः श. ६ । )

(This is found earlier, in chap. VI. and considers the nature of Dhvani from the point of view of Sphoṭa Philosophy.)

“ननु च अभिप्रययानस्तेन्त्र प्रतीयमानातिप वाक्यायांमेव विचित्रते। कथोच्छये—
प्रतीयमानम पुनर्स्वपदेत बस्यति वाणिज्य महाकवीनान्म।
यस्य, प्रसिद्धिवाकियातिरित्वा विद्यति लाभ्यमिकाद्रात्मसम्। (व्य. आ. १. ४.)
तत्स्य च वाक्ययोगायान्तरादशांभाषाःः अयासप्तस्विद्यन्तयेष्या वा कथ्यपञ्च उपस्कृतेष्याः।
उच्चते—विपरिरियामालेच्छवियति। वस्तुताःपि अवस्थान्तरगमनं विपरिति:। ततौ वशा रूद्रस्यो
पदाधिक्रमे, जीर्तिस्यो द्वयसिद्धिक्रमे, भौद्रयो बुधसिद्धिक्रमे विपरिति:ते तथेत शब्दश्रुपायापि अविरोंः।
ते तेन तेन अर्थसिद्धस्य तत्र तथा विपरिति:ते। तथाय—“संति ये पव। मातं पितं यानु: धार्मिकानास्य योगिणीमस्य अवकाश, सोपिपरमाणां पतिभि हिरणी: वालिसानि
तद्परन्ति।” अत्र च शास्त्राय: पुरुषदेवमारत्र वाक्याथ्येन अभिप्रययावताय: प्रतीयमानान्।
The Discussion on Tātparya and Dhlvani in the III uddyota of the Dhvanyāloka.⁴


"प्रागुक्षुपकृतिभि: बाच्छवितिरिक्षय बस्तु: सिद्ध: किता, स तवां व्य्वस्थतवेष मन्त्रान्तरः व्यप्तिः प्रस्तुत:। यद्य न प्राप्यमेन् ⁵अवस्थां तथा वाच्यातः; तत्वातीता व्यप्तिकुत्स:। तत्सर्वानां वाच्यकल्वन व्यप्तिः। किं तस्मां व्य्वस्थतरत्क्रपयतः। तस्मात् तत्सर्वाणि योवः स तवामुक्तस्वयम वाच्यः। य तत्ततां तत्त्वाति विषये वाच्यानुत्प्रत्यातिः; सा तत्त्वातितमृत्यवाच्यां वेदान्तक्रप्तति;।

1. Quoted on P. 109 by Ananda in his Dhvanyāloka.
2. भोजेन्द्र.
4. The text given above is as corrected by Professor Mm. S. Kuppuswami Sastri. The incorrect readings in the N. S. Edn. are given in the footnotes.
5. अवस्थां.
The Daśārūpaka and the Daśarupakāvaloka

on Dhuani and Tatparya. (Ch. IV. Pp. 119-121)

[The text as printed in the Nirmayasagar Edn. has numerous mistakes. A purified text, with the corrections made by Professor Mm. S. KUPPUŚWAMI SASTRI, is given here. The readings found in the printed text are given in the footnotes.]
The full stop here is wrong and the sentence ends only with the word 'त्रितीयकक्षा।'
अतिप्रसन्नति निरस्तः। इति च वाक्याविवरणे परिलिपितमिव विधानोपन्नेव समस्तवाक्यार्थानः साधनतपरिवर्त्यः प्रयासः। यद्वेचायं काव्यनिन्दः—

'तात्त्वय निरनिरिक्षम् व्यक्तिकल्पः, न प्राणः।'
किमुःक्र व्याधुताब्धःमयायुक्तोपन्नेव विशिष्टः॥
विप्र बखयः 'व्यक्ते वच्चवं चिन्तनः।'
प्रयुग्यते प्रायौगः ध्यानिः केन वापिने॥
'वाक्यविवाहानां वाक्यमोक्षःतांशः॥
तत्त्वस्वविबधानः। तस्मिन केन वापिने॥
परालैवन्व विवाहानांत्यायः सकः चिन्तः।
यावक्तायमसारिवः तात्त्वः न तूलक्षमः॥
संच धार्मिकं विधानः इति विशिष्टातस्याधमः।
निर्धारितं कथे वाक्यं मिमेषपुरुषविवि॥
प्रतिपादः विवाहतिरपेक्षापूर्णादि।
'प्रश्नः'विविष्टार्थः॥ अविवाहितः वा कथमः॥
'पैंहेयस्य वाक्यविवाहावरणः॥
वाक्यमं अतः काव्यस्य चिन्तः॥' इति।

अतः न सहस्रादानां काव्येन सह व्यक्तिमयवक्षमातः। किं तत्रः। भावावलक्षम्यः। कथे
हि भावः, भावावसदायः। ते हि स्वतःभवतः एव भावेकु विशिष्टविवाहाविद्या काव्येन
भावयते॥ न चावतः श्रद्धात्तेन भावावलक्ष्यमयवक्षमातः काव्यसेवयमपि तथा भावाविद्या
मिलति वाच्यम्। भावाकृतिरत्विद्या तथाविहृतः॥ किंव मा चावतः तथापि; अन्वयव्यविरूपेक्षा
भावसंख्येन तथाबक्ष्यातः।

तदुपः—(N.S. VII. 4)

'भावाविभिन्नसंख्यानां भावविनिर्लीतिति रसाविनिर्लीतः।
यथासामालापी: भावः: बिख्यग्या नामवयोक्तिः॥'

इति। कथे पुनरुपहितसंख्यानत्रं पदेतः। व्यक्तिमयाविवाहसारिवः सकः चे तथाविविशिष्टस्य
क्रृपुषातितुष्टः प्रायःविवाहाविधिसद्भवति, इत्याय विशिष्टार्थं सति राक्षसविनाभिमुक्तक्षिदार्शितादिप्रतिपक्षाध्यायः॥
अभिमेधाविनाभचनः। तथाविद्याविद्यात्यात्त्वः अर्थो वस्यः॥

1. पूर्वां बच० वरसुनागिदु। 2. प्रकाशते। 3. किं कृतम्। 4. आस्ये।
5. विविषांत्रमः। 6. विवशा पत्रस्त्रात्। 7. भवनः। 8. No full stop.
9. No stop. 10. अभिमेधाविनाभचनः.
CHAPTER XIII

BHOJA AND AUCITYA

This important concept of Aucitya, Bhoja does not deal with anywhere separately. As a chief topic in Poetics, it is not mentioned at all by Bhoja. But Bhoja is not absolutely silent on this concept. Aucitya occurs here and there, underlying many other ideas in Bhoja.

It has been pointed out in my article on Aucitya in the Journal of the Madras University, that, long before Poetics began to talk of Aucitya, its related Tantra of Vyākaraṇa was mentioning Aucitya as one of the conditions determining the definite import of a word of many meanings in a given context. Bhartrihari mentions Aucitya as one of the śabda-artha-pravībhājakaś in II. 316, in his Vākyapadīya. In this same connection, Bhoja also mentions Aucitya while treating of Vivakṣā in the seventh chapter of the Śr. Pra. (Vol. II. p. 30); and this same Aucitya as a determinant of the sense of a word occurs again in chapter xxv of the Śr. Pra. (Vol. IV. p. 463).

In chapter xi of the Śr. Pra., Bhoja calls his magnum opus, this Śr. Pra., by the name Sāhitya-Prakāśa and says that among other things, Aucitya is herein inculcated.

“एति तस्मां द्विग्रांप्रकाशे मुन्नक्षमेव अधेशक्षेधार्थशेषंपदुपनियदाम् अविवक्तकाल्क्यः। अविचित्यं-कल्याणारोपयायं च सहिष्णुतेऽद्यन्ते।”

Vol. II. Mad. Ms. p. 430.

This, however, has to be taken in a general sense that one of the fruits a reader of the Śr. Pra. will reap is acquisition of a sense of Aucitya. That, any work, especially Literature, Poetry and Literary Criticism, must inculcate.

In Poetics proper, Bhoja does speak of Aucitya more than once. He realises that it is a vast and elastic principle and that it pertains to every part of a work of art. There are the main and major Aucityas of Rasa and Itivṛtta as also the subsidiary and minor ones of Guṇas, Arāmkāras, Rīti, metre etc.

(1) We first sight Aucitya in Bhoja in his Doṣa prakaraṇa, in his Vākyadoṣa called ‘Apada’. ‘Apada’ is the use of inappropriate vocabulary. The appropriateness or otherwise is tested by a reference to the nature of the characters who speak. A Grāmya speaker must be made to talk as he does in life, using rustic or vulgar expressions, whereas a refined urban character must be made to use a refined language. This is an emphasis on one kind of Aucitya. See Doṣa-section for detailed treatment of ‘Apada’. See S. K. A. I. pp. 19-20.

Aristotle speaks of this Aucitya of Pada, the use of appropriate vocabulary, in his Rhetoric. He says; “If then one expresses himself in the language appropriate to the habit, he will produce the effect of being characteristic; for, a rustic and a man of education will express themselves neither in the same words, nor in the same manner.” (Vide my paper on Loka Dharmś, JOR., Madras, Vol. VIII. p. 71. Compare also Rājaśekhara, K. M. pp. 30-31).

(2) In the Vākyārthadaśa called Virasa, borrowed from Rudrata, Bhoja speaks of Aprastutarasā, which is a variety of Rasa-anaucitya. S.K.A. I. 50. p. 35. Ratnaśvara quotes here Ānanda’s verse on Aucitya and Anaucitya—“Anaucityād rte nānyad etc.” Ratnaśvara also points out that the following three Doṣas, Hīna, Adhika and Asadṛśa Upamās are all varieties of Anaucitya.

(3) The Doṣa called Viruddha, Loka-viruddha, Kāłaviruddha etc., (S.K.Ä. I. 54-57, pp. 38-42) is also based on Aucitya. It is only a more definite and particularised name for Anaucitya of various kinds in Vastu or Artha. While explaining in I. 56 ‘Anumāna virodha’, Bhoja mentions Aucitya and its breach—Aucitya-viruddha.


dand he illustrates Aucitya-viruddha thus:

\[
\text{वृत्ति-अौचित्य-प्रतिहारिकता यर्थां क्रमन।}
\text{अनुमानविरोधस्स कवितमुक्तिनिवादते॥ I. 56.}
\]

and he illustrates Aucitya-viruddha thus:

\[
\text{अौचित्यविरुध्द्वत्ता रथा—}
\text{\quad (छाया)}
\text{पङ्क्षमकोशीनाय पामसः पामरः प्रोच्चित।}
\text{अतिपुरुषकृमीभरे व्यदारितं वदनमु॥}
\]

\[
\text{अन्तः पामरथ पङ्क्षमकोशीनायन्य-अनौचित्यादृश्य अौचित्यविरुध्दमु।’’}
\text{S. K. Ä. I. p. 40.}
\]

“This case of Artha-anaucitya is plain; how can a Pāmara be described as dressed in a Nāgaraka’s dress of silk? (4) A similar instance of Artha-anaucitya is met with in Bhoja’s Śabda-guṇa, Bhāvika, where an elder, out of the overpowering feeling in him, goes to the extent of bowing at the feet of an younger. S. K. Ä. I. p. 58.

\[
\text{‘अन्तः हथवशाल, अनौचित्येनायि ‘वनदे-धव चरणपुक्तकरस्तम्’ इत्यादीनाम् उक्तवात्}
\text{भौक्तकलम्।’’}
\]
Here a case of Anaucitya becomes a Guṇa or Aucitya, according to the larger implications of the principle of Aucitya. The larger Aucitya herein involved, which makes Aucitya out of Anaucitya, is an instance of Rasāveśa and Rasa-aucitya.

(5) And the above-mentioned Aucitya which converts Doṣas into Guṇas is the very basis of the last section of the Guṇa-prakaraṇa of Bhoja, the Vaiśeṣika-guṇas or Doṣa-guṇas, Doṣas which turn into Guṇas under certain circumstances. (Vide my paper on Aucitya above referred to) S. K. Ā. pp. 74-120; See especially p. 118. Bhoja explicitly states the principle of Aucitya converting certain cases of Anaucitya into Aucitya.

"अन्तः ब्रीलाद्, ओऽयबिशधस्तिप्यतत्सम्योऽचित्वात् गुणलम्।"

_Aucitya in Bhoja’s _Alamkāra_ Section_

(6) (a) Above was noticed under the Pada-doṣa called Apada, a kind of Aucitya of language, the Aucitya of appropriate vocabulary. Bhoja opens his _Sabdālaṁkāras_ with an _Alamkāra_ called _Jāti_. What is _Jāti_? And how is it _Alamkāra_, and a _Sabda-alamkāra_? _Jāti_ is the various kinds of language, Sanskrit, the various _Prākṛts_ and Apabhramṣa. Though Language, by itself, is not an _Alamkāra_, the proper choice of the language suited to the theme etc., is an _Alamkāra_; for, this is a feature of beauty in _Kāvya_. This is Bhāṣā-Aucitya. Certain things are well said when expressed in Sanskrit; certain others in _Prākṛt_. Says Bhoja:

**S. K. Ā.** p. 122.

This intelligent choice and employment of language is an _Aucitya_ and is called by Bhoja as the _Sabdālaṁkāra_ named _Jāti_. The principle of Aucitya involved herein is pointed out by Bhoja:

**II. 6.** p. 121.

_and Ratneśvara explains it thus:

"नन्तः अवश्य शब्दन्तः संस्कृतवाच्यमेव भविष्यम्। तत्कोऽन्तः स्यात्, इत्यत आह्य-सेिति। ओऽय संस्कृतवाच्यमेव अवश्य इति ब संस्कृतवाच्यमेव तथाभावः: हति भावः।" p. 121.

Then, according to Ratneśvara’s _Avatārikās_ to the succeeding _Kārikās_ on _Jāti_, Bhoja indicates _Aucitī_ in general, _Visāya-aucitī_, _Vaktr-aucitī_, _Vācyāaucitī_, _Deśa-aucitī_ etc.

When, in a drama, the poet adopts the _Prākṛt_ for women and low characters, Bhoja would say, that in his scheme, it is a case of _Jāti_ _Sabdālaṁkāra_. It is _Vaktr-aucitya_. Bharata’s _Nāṭya Sāstra_ treats of this Bhāṣā-Aucitya in the chapter called _Bhāṣā-vidhāna_, XVIII. Bharata says regard-
ing Deśa-aucitya that a drama can be in many languages; for, in a drama, characters from various provinces and countries may be introduced.

अपवा छन्दतः काव्योः देशभाषाः प्रयोगमिति ।

नानादिशसमुप्ते हि काव्ये भवति नात्रे इति N.S. XVIII. 34.

(b) In chapter xi of his Śr. Pra. Bhoja again emphasises this Bhāṣā-Aucitya. There, he calls this an Udbhaya guṇa of a Prabandha as a whole, the Guṇa called 'Pātra-anurūpa-bhāṣatva' i.e., composed in language appropriate to the character.

"पात्रानुरूपभाषाइतन उत्तमपारिश्चलित महाते, उत्तमपारिष्ठान प्रकटके x x x etc. |" p. 432. Vol. II. Śr. Pra. Mad. MS.

(Vide Alamkāra and Guṇa sections).

(7) (a) Bhoja's second Sabdālakāra called Gati is nothing but the Aucitya of the medium of verse, prose or the mixed Campū style, and the Aucitya of the varieties of metres. To decide that a certain idea will be best expressed only in a verse-form and another only in a prose-form is itself an Alamkāra. This appropriateness of form is called Gatyaucitya. The chief controlling factor here, Bhoja himself says, is Artha-aucitya.

परं गर्भं च मित्रं च काव्यं यतः, सा गति: स्मृतः।

अर्थोचित्याविदितम: सापि बागवानकार इत्यते इति II. 18.

Again,

यथामति यथाश्चिति यथाचित्यं यथारचि।

कथे: पात्रस्य वैतत्त्वं: प्रयोगम उपयोगिते II. 21.

(b) Having chosen the verse-form, a poet picks out the proper metres to suit his ideas. This choice of metre is Vṛttā-aucitya. Bhoja says in chapter xi of the Śr. Pra. that 'metre according to ideas' is an Udbhaya-guṇa of a Prabandha as a whole.

"'अर्थानुसृतमाध्यस्य' इत्यनेन वहारे दुर्योजितादयः, वीरे, वस्ततितिलकादयः, करणे वैतालीयादयः, रैंटे समरादयः, सर्वेन शारुङ्किकिकिर्तनादय: निर्मलानीया: ईवपदशितस्व।" Vol. II. p. 432.

All these Bhoja does not fail to relate to Rasa and he realises that the final test of the appropriateness or Aucitya of a thing is Rasa, whether it be through Sabda or Artha. For, all Guṇas, Alamkāras and the avoidance of flaws (Doṣa-hāna) are for securing the eternal presence of Rasa, Rasa-avicaya.

Further, Bhoja also, like Mahima Bhaṭṭa (see section on Bhoja and Mahima Bhaṭṭa), holds all kinds of Doṣas as forms of Anaucitya. In chapter xi of the Śr. Pra. Bhoja says that Rasa-avicaya in a work as a whole is secured by avoiding flaws, and securing Guṇas and Alamkāras; and there are Doṣas, Guṇas and Alamkāras pertaining to Prabandha, even as to Vākya. Taking a drama, Bhoja illustrates the avoidance of flaw of Prabandha—Prabandha-doṣa-hāna. The story, in the source, may not, in every incident, be
consistent and exhibit an unity. The poet takes it up, eschews certain bits, and renovates the theme for his purpose. This eschewing and renovation in theme are, Bhoja says, Prabandha-doṣa-hāna or Anaucitya-parihāna. Anaucitya in the story is eliminated and Aucitya is secured.

“तत्र (प्रवन्धे) दोषधानम् अनौचित्यादिपरिहारेण । यथा मायाकृतकेशीदशरथायां रामः प्रवासितः, न मातापितुम्यां इति निर्दोषधारेः (बालरामायणे) etc., etc.”


(See the above-mentioned paper on Auctiya, sections on Bhoja and Mahima Bhatṭa. See also the section on Bhoja and Kuntaka and Vakrokti in this thesis). And in this connection Bhoja quotes Yaśovarman’s verse in the prelude to his now lost Rāmābhhyudaya:

“औौचित्यं कच्चसं प्रकटस्नूतगतं, सबं नत्र पात्रोभिताम्
CHAPTER XIV
RITI, VRITTI, AND PRAVRTTI.

Riti

Riti is dealt with by Bhoja three times, first in the Doṣa-section under the Aritimad-doṣa, then in the Alamkāra section as a Śabdālamkāra, and lastly in the Anubhāva section as one of the three Budhyārāmbha-anubhāvas. As in the case of Vṛtti, so also in the case of Riti; as a Śabdālamkāra, it is of six kinds, but as Anubhāva, it is only of four kinds. In the former case, the number six is purely a result of Bhoja’s sense of symmetry.

Bhoja uses all the three names, Riti, Panthā and Mārga, the latter two of which are synonymous. Bhoja derives the word Riti from the root Vṛti to go “रितः गतिः,” thus connecting it with the other names, Panthā and Mārga. To the three Ritis in Vāmana, Bhoja adds three more. Vāmana gives only the Vaidarbhi, the Pāncālī and the Gauḍīyā; Bhoja adds the Lāṭīyā which Rudraṇa was responsible for introducing, and then two more himself, namely, the Avantī and the Māgadhī. The Avantī and Māgadhī form Bhoja’s additions.

The three verses defining the Vaidarbhi, Gauḍī and Pāncālī (S. K. Ā. II. 29-31. p. 134) are reproduced by Bhoja from Vāmana. Bhoja borrows the Lāṭīyā Riti from Rudraṇa but abandons Rudraṇa’s definition of the Lāṭīyā. Rudraṇa defines the Lāṭīyā, as also the other Ritis, on the basis of the number of words compounded in a single instance. K. A. II. 5. But Bhoja arbitrarily says that a mixture of all Ritis is Lāṭīyā!

समस्तरीतिवृत्तिः (व्या) मिश्र वार्तिष्ठ रीतिवृत्तिः। S. K. Ā. p. 134. 
मिश्ररीतिवृत्तिया | Śr. Pra. Vol. II. p. 270.

The S. K. Ā. defines Avantikā Riti as one standing between Pāncālī and Vaidarbhi; with two to three or three to four words in a compound. But the same writer says in his Śr. Pra. that Avantikā is not any one kind of Riti exactly, but something approaching all Ritis! वैदमांदीनमथार्थिरप्रविष्टिका, Māgadhī is defined as Khaṇḍa Riti by both the S. K. Ā. and the Śr. Pra. i.e., beginning in one Riti and ending in another!

Such treatment of the subject of Riti has little reality and Bhoja here shows little grasp of either the historical aspect or the literary and artistic aspect of the subject and is of very little help to a student of the history and development of such an important concept as Style or Riti in Sanskrit Alamkāra Literature.

1. See also my paper on Riti in Mm. S. Kuppuswami Sastri Commemoration Volume, pp. 89-118.
While Bhoja is in a mood to follow Vāmana in his definitions of the Rittis, Vaidarbhi, Pañcāli and Gauḍīyā, in the S. K. Ā., he prefers to accept Rudraṭa’s definitions in the same context of Riti-sabdālārnikāras in the Śr. Pra. Rudraṭa defines the Riti on the basis of a single feature called Samāsa; he holds the Vaidarbhi as the name of an un-compounded collocation, and classifies the compounded collocation into the three other Rittis according to the number of words compounded. No doubt Vāmana does include Samāsa as a determining factor in the description of all the three Rittis; but none but Rudraṭa defines the Riti concept on the basis of Samāsa only. Vāmana defines the Vaidarbhi as having all the Guṇas fully, (Guṇa-sāmagrya); the preponderance of Madhurya and Saukumārya and absence of Ojas and Kānti is Pañcāli; the emphasis on Ojas and Kānti produces the Gauḍīyā. See Vāmana, K. A. Sū. and Vṛ. I. ii. pp. 17-21. Vānī Vilās Edn. and compare S. K. Ā. p. 134. In the Śr. Pra. however, Bhoja casts off Vāmana’s definitions and gives those of Rudraṭa as follows :


Here also it is only on Vaidarbhi, Pañcāli and Gauḍīyā that Bhoja agrees with Rudraṭa. The Lāṭiyā, he chooses to define according to his own sweet will and not as Rudraṭa defined it.

Riti, as expounded by Daṇḍin, Bhoja follows in the Doṣa-section while dealing with a Doṣa called Aritimad. S. K. Ā. pp. 24-30. More of this I have said in the sections on Doṣa and Guṇa. This is no strange phenomenon in Bhoja’s writings that, on the same subject, he follows different and differing writers at different places. On Riti, he follows Daṇḍin in the Doṣa-section; Vāmana to some extent in the Sabdālārnikāra section of the S. K. Ā.; and Rudraṭa in the same context in the Śr. Pra.; and lastly, he follows Rājaśekhara on the Rittis in the 17th chapter of the Śr. Pra. where again Bhoja speaks of the Rittis as Buddhārambhā-anubhāvas along with Vṛttis and Pravṛttis.1

In the 17th chapter the Rittis appear along with Vṛttis and Pravṛttis, as in Rājaśekhara. Rājaśekhara says at the very beginning of his work that he devotes a separate chapter to Riti in the statement “रितिनिषेधयथ सुरवर्णनाति:” and in the remarks “श्रवितमालाय यथावसरं कस्याम्:” p. 8. “रीतस्तु कित्वर्ताति: प्रसत्तान्।” p. 10. K.M. But this chapter on Riti is lost. Still we are given an idea of Rājaśekhara’s conception and definition of the Riti even in the available part, namely, the Kavi-rahasya section, sub-section 3 on Kāvyapuruṣa-uptatti. Rājaśekhara admits only the three Rittis of Vāmana and so has some difficulty in adjusting the three Rittis to the four Vṛttis and the four Pravṛttis. Bhoja

1. See my paper on Riti and Guṇa in the Agni Purāṇa in the IHQ, X, pp. 767-779.
removes the difficulty by accepting the fourth Riti of Lāṭiyā. Bhoja gives the following equations:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vṛtti</th>
<th>Pra-vṛtti</th>
<th>Riti</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bhāratī</td>
<td>Paurastyā</td>
<td>Pāñcāli</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ārabhaṭī</td>
<td>Udhra-māgadhī</td>
<td>Gauḍī</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaiśikī</td>
<td>Dākṣipātīyā</td>
<td>Vaidarbhi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sāttvati</td>
<td>Avantyā</td>
<td>Lāṭiyā</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


The Kāvyā-mimāṁsā gives the following scheme:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bhāratī</th>
<th>Udhra māgadhī</th>
<th>Gauḍīyā</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sāttvati</td>
<td>Pāñcāli or</td>
<td>Pāñcāli</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and</td>
<td>Pāñcāla madhyamā</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ārabhaṭī</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sāttvati</td>
<td>Avantī</td>
<td>No Riti</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaiśikī</td>
<td>Dākṣipātīyā</td>
<td>Vaidarbhi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaiśikī</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(K.M. Pp. 8-9).

The Kāvyā-puruṣa and the Sāhitya-vidyā-vadhū were perhaps struck dumb when they passed through Avantī and adjacent provinces! For, Rājaśekhara gives no Riti for that place.

It is not possible to go here deeply into the very origins of the concept of Riti and trace its history. That I have done in the separate paper on Riti already referred to, wherein I have also spoken of the place occupied by Rājaśekhara and Bhoja, with whom alone we are concerned here at present. The definitions of Ritis in Daṇḍin and Vāmana are on the basis of ideas called Guṇas. Rudraṭa restricts himself to Samāsa. And Bhāmaha brings into his discussion of the two Ritis other general ideas; finally, Bhāmaha throws away the Ritis. As distinguished from Bhāmaha and Rudraṭa on the one hand, and from Daṇḍin-Vāmana and the Guṇa tradition on the other, Rājaśekhara adopts for defining the Ritis characteristics and phraseology nowhere else met with, characteristics and phraseology which Bhoja borrows for the 17th chapter of his Śr. Pra. and from Bhoja, the Agni-purāṇa borrows. The following are Rājaśekhara’s definitions along with which I have also given those of Bhoja.

(1) "—समासबद्र, अनुप्रासबद्र, योगसुतप्रयर्थगमं अग्रद्, सा गौरीया रीतिः।", K.M. p. 8.

"गौरीदिवसं भवा गौरीया—सदितीर्थसमासम, परिस्फँतवननम, नातुपुरावर्तितम, पारान्तृप्रासबद्र, योगहस्तिप्रयर्थगमं वचः, सा गौरी॥" Śr. Pra. Vol. III. p. 213.
(2) "—स्थानान्यासवर, असमासम्, योगश्रितिम् च जग्य, सा बैद्धम् रीतिः।"
K.M. p. 9.

"पञ्चालाविद्यु (भवा पञ्चाली—यदनतिर्यंतसमासम्, (अनन्त) स्नेहवन्नम्, उप-(नार) श्रृंगित, पदान्यासप्रायमस्, योगहाडिम्, सा पञ्चाली।"

(1) "—स्थानान्यासवर, असमासम्, योगश्रितिम् च जग्य, सा बैद्धम् रीतिः।"
K.M. p. 9.

"विद्मावदित्वाद (भवा) बैद्धम्। यदि (२) समस्म, अन्तिरुक्मावज्ञद (व्यम्) अनु- (पचार स्नेहित), स्थानान्यासास्योगी, (योग) श्रृंगित, बच; सा बैद्धः।"

We shall consider the Lātiyā of Bhoja which is not found in Rājeśkhara separately afterwards. The following table shows the relation between the definitions of the two writers more clearly.

**Gauḍiyā:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>राजाशेखरा</th>
<th>समास</th>
<th>अनुप्रास</th>
<th>योगश्रितिपरम्परा</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>बोज्या</td>
<td>अन्तिरुक्मावज्ञदा</td>
<td>पदान्यासप्रायमस्</td>
<td>योगहाडिपरम्परा</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

And in addition to these three, we find Bhoja giving ‘Parishātha-bandha’ and a few Upacāra-vṛtti usages as characterising the Gauḍiyā. The source of Bhoja for these two additional features is not known. Regarding the three features taken from Rājaśekhara, Bhoja puts them more definitely; Samāsa is made Atidīrgha-samāsa; Anuprāśa, Pādānuprāśa; and the Yoga-vṛtti of Rājaśekhara, Bhoja makes Yoga-Rudhi.

**Pāncāli:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>राजाशेखरा</th>
<th>ईयदस्मास</th>
<th>ईयदन्यास</th>
<th>उपचार</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>बोज्या</td>
<td>अन्तिरुक्मावज्ञदा</td>
<td>पदान्यास</td>
<td>Same</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The additional features in Bhoja are ‘Anati-sphuṭa-bandha’ and ‘Yoga-Rudhi.’

**Vaidarbhi:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>राजाशेखरा</th>
<th>असमास</th>
<th>स्थानान्यास</th>
<th>योगश्रिति</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>बोज्या</td>
<td>Same</td>
<td>Same</td>
<td>Same</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The additional features in Bhoja are ‘Ati-sukumāra-bandha’ and ‘Anupacāra-vṛtti’.

This kind of treatment of the Ritis is not after the manner generally found in the writings of the Ālamkārikas but it is not altogether unrelated to the features of the Ritis as they are defined by Daṇḍin, Vāmana and Rudraṭa. Samāsa and Anuprāśa which play a great part in Rājaśekhara’s and Bhoja’s definitions form vital points in Daṇḍin, Vāmana and Rudraṭa. Upacāra also is mentioned by Daṇḍin as the Guṇa called Samādhī. But what is a bit striking as new is the terminology of Upacāra, Yoga, Rudhi and Bandha-sphuṭatva.
In similar terminology, Bhoja defines the Lātiyā also himself:

লাটিয়া ভোজ লাটিয়া; যদিরসমস্তস্ম, অনলিকুলমারবন্ধম, নানুপচারবদ, লাটিযালঃ

প্রাসবদ্ধোগহিমদ্বচন; সা লাটিয়া।” P. 215, Vol. III. Śr. Pra.

Sāradātānaya records this kind of definition of the Rītis in his Bhā. Pra., borrowing it from the 17th chapter of the Śr. Pra.; and from both Sāradātānaya and Bhoja, Bahurūpamīśra borrows it in his Daśarūpakavyākhyā. The Agni-purāṇa also borrows it from Bhoja. Of Rīti and Guṇa in the Agni-purāṇa, I have spoken in the article in the Indian Historical Quarterly already referred to.

1. Sāradātānaya, in chapter one of his Bhā. Pra. follows Bhoja’s treatment of Anubhāvas as found in the 17th chapter of the Śr. Pra. On pp. 11-12, Sāradātānaya follows Bhoja’s grouping together of Rīti, Vyṛtī and Pravṛttī as Buddhya-rāmbha-anubhāva.

Following Sāradātānaya Bahurūpamīśra says in his Daśarūpakavyākhyā:

Following Sāradātānaya Bahurūpamīśra says in his Daśarūpakavyākhyā:

Following Sāradātānaya Bahurūpamīśra says in his Daśarūpakavyākhyā:

Following Sāradātānaya Bahurūpamīśra says in his Daśarūpakavyākhyā:

Following Sāradātānaya Bahurūpamīśra says in his Daśarūpakavyākhyā:

Sāradātānaya beats Bhoja hollow by first adding two more ētis, Saurāṭri and Drāvidī, and by saying finally that ētis are as many as 105 or even as many as the men who speak.


But Śrīgabhūpala recognises only three ētis, Komalā, Kaṭhinā, and Miśrā, i.e., Vaidarbhī, Gauḍī and Pāṇcāli. On Vaidarbhī, Daṇḍin is followed; Gauḍī is distinguished by long compounds and aspirated words; Pāṇcāli is midway between the two. Following Sāradātānaya, Śrīgabhūpala also says at the end of the Rīti-section that there are innumerable ētis and that each
province has its own Riti. There are Andhrī, Lātī, Saurāṣṭrī and such other Miśra Ritis. For a description of these, Śiṅgabhūpāla refers us to the works of Bhoja and others.

Andhrī Lātī Śiṅgabhūpāla Miśra Riti

Mohanāśramañcaśtu tadākāśaśāriśatam

Śāradātanaya mentions such additional Ritis and remarks that Ritis are as many as the provinces. But Bhoja never does so, either in the Śr. Pra. or the S. K. A. Perhaps Śiṅgabhūpāla refers to the twelve Vṛttyanuprāsa varieties of Bhoja given in the Sabdālaṁkāra section, Andhrī, Kauṅkī, Kauṅkāṇī, etc.

The Agni-purāṇa also gives the three concepts of Riti, Vṛtti and Pra-vṛtti together as Buddhārambha-anubhāvas, in the section on Anubhāvas.

Aldābharabvanvāvatāṁ bhaṅgūdvāstraṁ

Mogābākubāruṇyapāṁ śrīvālaṣ́apāyaṁ

Ariyam eva viyugam ānuvāpaṁ āciśyati

339/44-5.

Then Mana-ārambha-anubhāvas of males and females and Vāgarāmbhas are given. And in the last two lines of the chapter, the three Buddhārambhas are introduced.

Sa bandhāraṁ āgniṁ

Tasya bheda: viyugte ķa śrīvālaṣ́apāyaṁ

339/54.

The next chapter, the 340th, called Riti-nirūpaṇa, speaks partly of Vṛtti also. The text as printed in the Ānandāśrama Edn. is corrupt and incomplete here. The chapter must be called ‘Riti-Vṛtti-Pravṛtti-Nirūpaṇa’ and must have dealt with all these three Buddhārambhas. For, with the next chapter we have Āṅgika-abhinaya or Sarīrāmbha-anubhāva beginning. As it is, the chapter (340) ends abruptly with the mention of the Āngas of the Ārabhaṭī Vṛtti; only the Ritis and two Vṛttis are available. Vide my paper on Riti and Guṇa in the Agni-purāṇa in the IHQ.

Another point to be noted in the Agnipurāṇa is that its definitions of the Ritis are taken from the Śr. Pra. (17th chapter). The four Ritis of this chapter of the Śr. Pra. are accepted and they are defined on the basis of the same features of Samāsa, Upacāra, Yoga, etc. Vide my article on Riti and Guṇa in the Agnipurāṇa above referred to.

The Vṛttis

Both from the point of view of history and that of dramatic art, I have critically examined and explained the concept of Vṛtti in a long paper entitled the Vṛttis published in the JOR Madras. In the third instalment of that paper, I noticed the peculiarities in Bhoja’s treatment of Vṛtti in the section called ‘Number of Vṛttis’. I shall briefly survey the same here.

Bhoja describes the Vṛttis as Anubhāvas born of the Buddhi—Buddhyārmbhānubhāvas—in chapter xxvii of the Śr. Pra. He defines Vṛtti as mode or manner of activity—Cesṭā-viśeṣa-vinyāsa-krama—and this agrees with Abhinava's definition of it as Vyāpāra and Ananda's as Vyavahāra. In chapter xxvii of the Śr. Pra., Bhoja describes only the four Vṛttis given by Bharata, and there is nothing special, no difference, to be noted in Bhoja's descriptions of each of these Vṛttis. There is some important difference in Bhoja's description of the Āṅgas of the Bhāratī vṛtti, which I have dealt with in a separate section below called Vṛtyāṅgas.

If Kaisikī means grace and delicateness, and Vṛtti means the temper and atmosphere of the situation, the Kaisikī vṛtti covers all such graceful activities and cannot be strictly called Anubhāva. Abhinava explains Arabhaṭī as Kāya-vṛtti, i.e., Cesṭā par excellence; Bhāratī as Vāg-vyāpāra; and Sāttvati as Mano-vyāpāra. Bhoja also says that the Vṛttis are 'Vānmanah-kāya-vyāpāra' (chap. xii.). If Bhāratī is Vāg-vyāpāra, it must be Vāgārmbha-anubhāva; if Arabhaṭī is Kāya-vyāpāra, it must be Śārīrārmbha-anubhāva; and Sāttvati alone can be Buddhyyārmbha-anubhāva, because it is said to be Mano-vyāpāra. What about Kaisikī then? It refers to no physiological or psychological department of our activity, of body, speech or mind. It refers to the graceful mode in all activities. How can this be called a Buddhyyārmbha-anubhāva? But such critical scrutiny, we cannot make even in Abhinava's text; how can Bhoja stand it?

As it is, Kaisikī is applied to a part of the physical activity of the limbs which exhibit grace and delicateness, śālakṣaṇatā and Saukumārya.

As in this chapter xxvi of the Śr. Pra., in chapter v of his S. K.Ā. (p. 643) also, Bhoja is satisfied with the old four Vṛttis but in chapter xii of the Śr. Pra. which corresponds to the above-noted part of the fifth chapter of the S. K.Ā., Bhoja gives the Vṛttis as five in number. In this chapter xii of the Śr. Pra. dealing with Prabandha-āṅgas, most things move in groups of 'Five' and can Vṛtti alone be, in this company, one short? So Bhoja adds the new fifth Vṛtti of his, the Vimiśrā-vṛtti, which is not a really new or additional Vṛtti but is only the jumble of all the other four. Bhoja describes this fifth additional Vṛtti thus on p. 459 in chap. xii of his Śr. Pra. (Vol. II).

"वनारसवादितुपणासमताः
  मित्रज्ञमात्रयिय निम्य: प्रधनते।
  मरणेत् तं श्रीमुनानिन्द नीरसः
  साधारणीमर्मचतुःसूतिः॥

मुखाविदिविचय [च] भविष्यमणि (नाम) कोपनायकदीर्घां मनोवाक्याकंप्लितवन्यां:
पश्च ध्रुतीं भवन्ति—भारती, आरम्भी, कैशिकी, सात्वती, विमिश्रां चेति।" p. 459.

"सोऽन्यं पश्चक्राकोपि चेताविशेषविन्यासतः श्रीमिश्रवाक्यायते।" p. 459.

What is the scope of this Vṛtti, whether such a Vṛtti is necessary, what has Bharata's text to say on this matter, how śिङabhūpāla notes this Mīsrā-vṛtti of Bhoja and refutes it with the authority of Bharata's text—these ques-

Other writers besides Śīṅgabhūpāla have noticed this fifth Vṛtti of Bhoja. Earlier than Śīṅgabhūpāla, Śāradātana, who often shows his acquaintance with the Śr. Pra., says that there are others who do not accept the Artha-vṛtti of Udbhata and give in its place a fifth Vṛtti called Miśrā.

भारती तत्त्वी चतुजः कैशिकारभवती च।
वैद्वेद्या पद्ममध्यमग्रति च प्रतिभानाते॥
अघ्योऽऽस्वमभवालो (सम) श्रातं पद्ममी परे॥

The information in the first two lines is derived by Śāradātana from the Daśarūpaka. How the view of these two writers, namely, Dhanañjaya and Śāradātana, that Udbhata recognised a fifth Vṛtti called Artha-vṛtti is wrong and what exactly is the position taken up by Udbhata, I have elaborately shown in the section on Udbhata in my paper in the J.O.R., VI, on the writers quoted in the Abhinava-bhārati and in the paper on the Vṛttis mentioned above. In the third line quoted above, Śāradātana refers to Bhoja’s fifth Vṛtti called the Miśrā.

In the two published papers of mine above referred to, I had made a mistake which Mr. K. S. RAMASWAMY SASTRY of the Baroda Oriental Institute, editor of the Bhāva-prakāśa in the Gaekwad Series, was kind enough to correct. It was proved by me in the section on the writer named Śakalīgarbha in the article on Writers quoted in the Abhinava-bhārati, that this writer on dramaturgy held five Vṛtis, and added the fifth Vṛtti of his which he called Ātma-saṁvitī. The text of the Bhā, Pra. on the Vṛttis on p. 12 reads “विष्रंति पद्मी परे” and this view came just after the statement of Udbhata’s view and contradicting Udbhata’s view. In the Abhinava-bhārati, the view of Śakalīgarbha appears after that of Udbhata, contradicting Udbhata’s. So, at the suggestion of Professor Mr. S. KUPPUSWAMY SASTRIYAR, I took Śāradātana as referring to Śakalīgarbha’s view after that of Udbhata and the word ‘Viśrānti’ in the text was taken as a synonym meaning the same ‘Ātma-saṁvitī’ of Śakalīgarbha. Mr. K. S. RAMASWAMY SASTRY drew my attention to his Errata list at the end of his edition of the Bhā, Pra. where the correct text of the third line is given; Viśrānta must be read as ‘Miśrām tām.’ “मिश्रम ता पद्मी परे.” It is unfortunate that I should have missed the correct reading in the Errata and should have consequently seen in a plain reference to Bhoja’s view a reference to Śakalīgarbha’s view and should have corrected ‘Viśrānti’ in the text into ‘Viśrānti’, to enable me to equate it with Ātma-saṁvitī. It is all very smooth sailing now. It must be accepted that the Daśarūpaka and the Bhā, Pra. misunderstood Udbhata’s real view of Vṛttis and that there was a Śakalīgarbha, who held another view of five Vṛtis, but whom neither the D. R. nor the Bhā. Pra. refers to. It is clear that in the third line of the passage extracted above, Śāradātana refers to Bhoja’s fifth Vṛtti called Miśrā and this is perfectly natural, well acquainted as Śāradātana is, with Bhoja’s Śr. Prā.
Another writer of about the same time of Šāradātanaṇya who refers to this fifth Vṛtti of Bhoja, called the Miśā, is Prakāśavaraṣa, author of a work called Rasārṇava-alāṅkāra. (MS. in the Govt. Oriental MSS. Library, Madras). Prakāśavaraṣa is acquainted with the Śr. Pra. and he quotes the Upajāti verse of Bhoja on his new fifth Vṛtti—“वन्यार्चनव्रातिषुगणात्समस्या:” etc. from chapter xii of the Śr. Pra. But, instead of calling it by the same name by which it is called in the Śr. Pra., Miśā, occurring in the third line—

Prakāśavaraṣa calls it by the functional name occurring as Viśeṣaṇa in the last line, Saḍhāraṇa,—“साधरणमयेवचतुद्वस्यः.” Prakāśavaraṣa, however, makes a great mistake in attributing this verse to one Mahā Bhāmaha. (Vide my paper on Prakāśavaraṣa’s Rasārṇavālāṅkāra in the JOR, Madras; Vol. VIII. Part 3.)

The third kind of treatment of Vṛtti by Bhoja, which is however the first and earliest in order in his two works, is the treatment of Vṛtti as a Saḍbālaṅkāra along with Language, the Form of Verse or Prose or the Mixed Campū, Rīti etc. Vṛtti treated of in the Saḍbālaṅkāra section is not the Vṛtti described in the Rasa section as Anubhāva, with particular reference to Drama. Vṛtti is here applied to the title of the Drama as well as to the pure, read Kāvya. This aspect of Vṛtti also I have studied in the paper on Vṛttis above referred to in the section named ‘The History of Vṛtti in Kāvya’ at the end of the paper. (Pp. 104-112, JOR, Vol. VII).

When we speak of the written words, we are at once in the realm of one of the four Vṛttis namely, the Bhārati-Vṛtti. And if, within its realm, we want to distinguish the graceful and the forceful styles or modes, we must not have Kaśikeyā and Ārahaṭṭi Vṛttis but two Rītis like Vaidarbhī and Gauḍī. The whole set of Vṛttis brought from Nāṭya into Kāvya is incongruous. Ānanda says in Uddyota III that Vṛttis are two-fold—of Artha and Saḍba—the Artha-vṛttis being Kaśikeyā etc., of Bharata and the Saḍba-vṛttis being Upanāgarikā, Prarūṣa and Komāla. The latter are called by the other name of Rīti also and Mammaṭa equates the Saḍba-vṛttis with the Rītis. (K. Pra. IX). But Bhoja does not think of these difficulties and quietly makes up his needed number of 24 Saḍbālaṅkāras by things like Vṛtti. The following points are to be noted here:—

1. Bhoja increases the number of Vṛttis as Saḍbālaṅkāras to six, adding two of his usual jumbles—Madhyama-Kaśikeyā and Madhyama-Ārahaṭṭi. This really is fine scientific treatment! The same concept is once sixfold; at another place it is fivefold; and in a third place it is only fourfold! Why should there be this difference? Does Bhoja think that Vṛtti in these three places, Vṛtti as Saḍbālaṅkāra, as Anubhāva, and as a general Āṅga of the Prabandha, should differ? Vṛtti is primarily Anubhāva. All Āṅkāras are Anubhāva; they appear in the speech of the mood-filled character, in the Vācikābhīnaya, in the Vāgarambha-anubhāva; and they are intended to convey more quickly and more powerfully the mood. It is again as Anubhāva that Vṛtti becomes a Prabandha-āṅga. There is no need for Bhoja to treat of Vṛttis three times.
at three different places; and there is no justification for varying its number in each case on a diminishing scale from six to four.

2. If there must be a Kaiśikī which is not thoroughly Kaiśikī but is somewhat Kaiśikī—Madhyama Kaiśikī, and if there must be a Madhyama-Arabhaṭī also like this, why not a Madhyama-Bhārati and a Madhyama-Sāttvatī? The only reason for not having more is that all the Śabdālaṁkāras of Bhoja are subdivided symmetrically into SIX kinds only; and, therefore, Bhoja needed only two more and not four more Madhyama-Vṛtti.

3. All these Śabda-alāṁkāras called Vṛtti are defined as Ārtha-sandarbhas. This is a contradiction. How can Ārtha-vaiścītrya be productive of Śabda-alāṁkāra? It would have been something if Bhoja had made the Vṛttis, Ārtha-alāṁkāras. That is what Bhoja’s great Ācārya, Daṇḍin does. Daṇḍin counts the Vṛttis and their Āṅgas as Alāṁkāras, along with Sandhyāṅgas and Laksanāṅgas towards the end of chapter II of his Kāvyādāra and chapter II deals with Ārthālaṁkāras.

There is a lot of loose thinking and haphazard heaping of things in Bhoja’s work.

Another concept of Vṛtti

In the same Śabdālaṁkāra section Bhoja speaks of two other related concepts of Vṛtti coming under Anuprāsa. I have spoken of these also in the closing part of my paper on Vṛttis. (See Pp. 109-110, JOR, Vol. VII). Bhoja criticises the old Vṛttis of Udbhāṣa and others, Pāruṣā, Komaḷa and others (which Bhoja increases to twelve!) as unnecessary and as having been included in Āṅgas and Vṛttis. In their place Bhoja gives twelve other varieties of Anuprāsa called Vṛttis, named after twelve countries. S.K.A. Pp. 201-207. See my Vṛtti paper above referred to. See also the Alāṁkāra section in this thesis.

The Vṛttyāṅgas

Bhoja speaks of sixteen Vṛttyāṅgas, four for each of the four main Vṛttis, leaving out the Vimiśrā.

Of Vṛttyāṅgas in general, I have spoken in a special section in my paper on Vṛttis. (Pp. 44-45, JOR, Vol. VII). There is difference in Bhoja’s treatment of the Āṅgas of the Bhārati vṛtti. Bharata mentions four Āṅgas of the Bhārati vṛtti: Prarocana, Āmukha, Vithi and Prahasana. (XXII. 30-35, Kasi Edn). A critical examination of the Bhārati vṛtti and its two Āṅgas of Vithi and Prahasana especially, was made by me in the first part of the Vṛtti-paper. (Pp. 363-370. Vol. VI. JOR). Of the four Āṅgas of the Bhārati vṛtti given by Bharata, Bhoja takes only one, namely, Āmukha as constituting the whole Bhārati vṛtti and devides it into four Āṅgas, in the 12th chapter of the Śr. Pra. Bhoja differs even there also from Bharata. Bharata gives Āmukha as of five Āṅgas (XXII; 30-35)—Udghātyaka, Kathodghāta, Prayogāṭiśaya, Pravṛttaka and Avagālita. Bhoja omits the third and has no other reason for this omission except to make uniform enumeration of four Āṅgas for each of the four Vṛttis. This kind of equation of the
Bhāratī vṛtti with the Āmukha is not justifiable and contradicts Bhoja’s earlier definition of Bhāratī vṛtti as the name for all vocal activity in general. (Vāg vṛtti; p. 459 Vol. II. Śr. Pra.) The Daśarūpaka, like Bhoja, gives the same four Āṅgas of Bharata for the Bhāratī vṛtti but, for Āmukha, it adopts an independent attitude like the Śr. Pra. It gives only three Āṅgas for the Āmukha. Śīngabhūpāla follows the Daśrūpaka. The Āṅgas of the other Vṛttis are the same and are of the same number as given by Bharata. Pp. 478-480. Vol. II, Śr. Pra.

The fifth chapter of the S.K.Ā. has a different story to tell. Here also, there is no difference between Bhoja and Bharata on the other three Vṛttis and their Āṅgas. It is on the Āṅgas of the Bhāratī vṛtti here that Bhoja differs not only from Bharata but also from himself. On pp. 643-6 of S.K.Ā., chap. V., Bhoja gives four Āṅgas of Bhāratī following almost the text of Bharata: Prarocanā, Vithī, Prastāvanā (Āmukha of Bharata) and Prahasana. But Bhoja does not understand what Bharata means by regarding Vithī and Prahasana as two varieties of the Bhāratī vṛtti. The two refer to the two types of Rūpakas of the two names and not to parts of the Prologue. Later writers have made both the Vithī and Prahasana as part of the Prologue by restricting Bhāratī to Prastāvanā. All this is wrong and the true significance of this has been explained by me in the first part of my paper on the Vṛttis. What Bhoja has done is that he has further misunderstood by putting a completely mistaken meaning into Vithī. Vithī and Prahasana, Bharata and Dhanañjaya clearly say, are two types of Drama. Like many other writers, Bhoja also takes Prahasana as a small comic speech in the Prologue; but he is all alone when he takes the Vithī with thirteen well-known Āṅgas, as having five Āṅgas. And what are these Āṅgas? Here Bhoja makes a great mistake; he confuses between the Bharata’s Āmukha and the Vithī and attributes to the Vithī the five Āṅgas pertaining to Āmukha. In this particular place Bhoja seems to have understood neither Prastāvanā nor Vithī. He says:

“उद्धवकरीमाइगाजनं प्रवृत्ति: वृषभि; उद्धवकर:, कथोद्वादि:, प्रायोगितिसाय:, प्रवत्तक:, अवगतितमिति।”

Of the five Āṅgas given above, Udghātyaka and Avagalita are two Vithyāṅgas, also introduced in the Prastāvanā, and it is because these happen to be Vithyāṅgas also that the Daśarūpaka omits them and gives the remaining three as Āmukha-Āṅgas. These two have misled Bhoja to identify Āmukha and Vithī and give the other three, namely Kathodghāta, Prayogitiṣaya and Pravartaka, also as Vithyāṅgas. Greater confusion has not been made on any other subject of the Nātyaśāstra. The causes for such confusion regarding the Bhāratī vṛtti have been explained by me in the first part of the Vṛtti-paper.

Chapter seventeen of the Śr. Pra—the Anubhāva chapter—has a description of the Vṛttis and their given Āṅgas. The description of the Āṅgas of the Bhāratī here agrees more with that in the fifth chapter of the S. K. Ā. than with that in the same work in the 12th chapter. It is strange how, on the same topic, Bhoja has different views at different places. The
four Āṅgas of the Bhārati are given according to Bharata, Bhoja calling Āmukha by the name Prastāvanā—, Prarocanā, Prastāvanā, Vīthī and Prahasana. But when he comes to the Vīthī, he seems to have realised the mistake he had committed in the S. K. Ā. v. where he forgot that Vīthī was the Vīthi of thirteen Āṅgas. When, however, he sets about to correct, he makes a mess of the whole thing. He gives the Vīthī as that with the thirteen Āṅgas but the thirteen Āṅgas are said to be Udghātyaka, Avagalita, Kathodghāta, Prayogātiṣaya and Pravṛttaka, with an etc?

P. 216. Vol. III.

Of these, only the first two are Vīthyaṅgas; the other three are Āmukha-Āṅgas as given by Bharata. Firstly it is bad to combine the two together; secondly, it is not explainable how Bhoja made bold to say that these Āṅgas come to thirteen in number. The Vīthī, by itself, has thirteen Āṅgas and when the Kathodghāta, Prayogātiṣaya, and Pravṛttaka are added, the number of Āṅgas comes to sixteen. Lastly, it is cowardly for Bhoja to have begun to illustrate but to have left out illustrating all except the Udghātyaka. For a detailed illustration of the Āṅgas would prove the real total number of the Āṅgas to be sixteen and its contradiction with the accepted Vīthī of thirteen Āṅgas will become patent. Therefore Bhoja fights shy and ends thus:

“एवं कथोद्यावद्योपि दशमाश्चैव उदहायम्।” P. 216. Vol. III.

On the three other Vṛttis and their Āṅgas, chapter xvii of the Śr. Pra. also has nothing to differ from Bharata.

There is yet a fourth treatment of Vṛtti and the Vṛttyaṅgas in the Śr. Pra. and it is in the four chapters devoted to the four Purūṣārthas-Śṛṅgāras of Dharma, Artha, Kaṁma and Mokṣa. (Chapters xviii-xxi, Vol. III. Śr. Pra.). Bhoja lays out a scheme here that each of these four Śṛṅgāras is characterised by particular kinds of men, women, habits, dress, atmosphere and style of speech. That is, Bhoja gives each its appropriate Nāyaka, Nāyikā, Pravṛtti, Vṛtti and Riti. Of these also I have spoken in the Vṛtti-paper. (Pp. 51-52, JOR, Vol. VII). In explaining this scheme of the four Purūṣārthas = four Nāyakas = four Vṛttis etc., Bhoja resorts to a good deal of verbal ingenuity. It is all very clever but is most unreal. The section teems with apt examples for extreme far-fetchedness.

The Pravṛttis

The Pravṛttis and their relation to the Vṛttis, I have dealt with in a separate section in my Vṛtti-paper which has been mentioned here frequently (Pp. 49-51. JOR, Vol. VII). Bhoja treats of the Pravṛttis twice, once in chapter xii in the midst of topics of Dramaturgy and again in the midst of Anubhāvas which he deals with in chapter xvii. In the latter case Bhoja gives only four Pravṛttis because he wants their number to agree with that of the four Vṛttis and the four Ritis, all the three of which he clubs together and gives as Buddhīyāramba-anubhāvas. But in the 12th chapter most items are five in number and to be in harmony with them, he gives the
Pravṛttis also as five. But Pravṛttis are five here only in enumeration (Uddeśa) in Laksana and Udāharaṇa, however, Bhoja forgets that he has increased the number of Pravṛttis to five and consequently gives only the old four varieties of it.

"अब सन्तप्तम् पञ्चं (इतयः पञ्चं द्वृत्तम्) चन्द्रिविशिष्ट्वं प्रवृत्तम् (पञ्चित्तेव) इत्येका चतुष्पदीः।" p. 450. Śr. Pra. Vol. II, Chap. XII.

"वेयविविधात्मकं प्रवृत्तिः सापि चन्द्रिकोऽस्मिन् द्वृत्तम्, उद्धारादि, दक्षिणात्य, आचार्य सः।" p. 459. Vol. II. Śr. Pra. Ch. XII.

If we accept that Bhoja recognises only four Pravṛttis, we cannot get the mentioned number of 64 items; we get only 63. Bhoja could have easily invented the fifth Pravṛttī with a new geographical name and it is not known why Bhoja contradicts himself by first enumerating five Pravṛttis and then speaking of only four Pravṛttis.

The four Pravṛttis given by Bhoja are the same as found in Bharata, N.S. XIV. But Bhoja goes wrong in the naming of one of the Pravṛttis. Bhoja’s four Pravṛttis are Paurastya, Uḍhramāgadhī, Dāksinātya and Āvantī. Though he promises to describe them in detail latterly in chapter xii, Bhoja fails to do so in both the 12th and the 17th chapter. He does not take pains to give the countries coming under each of these four. Bharata does not have a Pravṛtti called Paurastya. His four Pravṛttis are Pāncalī, Uḍhramāgadhī, Dāksinātya and Āvantī. It is in the place of Bharata’s Pāncalī that Bhoja gives his Paurastya. Now Paurastya does not mean Pāncalī but means ‘the eastern’ and the ‘eastern’ Pravṛtti is the Uḍhramāgadhī. Bharata clearly enumerates the provinces coming under these four divisions. The Dāksinātya comprises all the southern countries in general; the Uḍhramāgadhī, all the eastern; the Āvantī, all the western and the Pāncalī, all the north-north-western. All the illustrations found in chapter 17 of the Śr. Pra. for these Pravṛttis are those given by Rājaśekhara in his Kāviya-mimāṃsā, I. 3. pp. 8-9. And in this source, of Bhoja, namely, Rājaśekhara, we do not find the Paurastya but see in its place the Pāncala-madhyamā (K.M. P. 8). ‘Pāncalā-madhyamā’ is another and more elaborate name of the same Pāncalī Pravṛtti; for, under it come the provinces of the Madhya-deśa also. Bharata’s text itself contains the other name of Pāncala-madhyamā in two Ślokas. Kāsi Edn. XIV. 48 & 49. Kāavya-mālā Edn. XIII 36 7 38. Therefore Bhoja follows neither the basic and remoter authority of Bharata nor the secondary and nearer authority of Rājaśekhara when he speaks of the Paurastya Pravṛtti. Less would have been the mistake if Bhoja had given instead of his Paurastya, the name Pāścātya meaning ‘the western’. Paurastya and Uḍhramāgadhī are identical. When Bhoja quotes Rājaśekhara’s verse describing the dress of the ladies of Mahodaya as illustration for his Paurastya-Pravṛtti, he does not seem to know what he is doing.

The concepts of Vṛtti, Pravṛtti and Riti are very intimately related. The one involves the other. But, for the sake of classification and analytical and theoretical study, Rājaśekhara says, it is laid down that physical action is
INDEX
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A
Abherājīji, 372, 374, 376.
Abhidhamma, 412.
Abhidhānacintāmāṇi, of Hemacandra, 87 n.
Abhinava, his Mahopadesh-virāṅkā, compared with Nirguna-māṇasa pūjā 32 ff.; his Paramārthasārasamīgraha, 32.
Abhīsekha of Bhāsa, 414.
Abul Fazal, 258.
Abu, Patel, 126.
Abu Zayd Hasan, 318.
Acara, 204.
Achāya, (?) 380.
Achāyana, succession list of Jain, 278.
Adevi (Aderājīji), caused a jēri to be built in Sīvājī, 377, killed, 401.
Adityasena, of Magadhā, 246, 247; flourished during the last days of Harsha, 247; 254, 421.
Adityavarman, a prince of Sumatra, 27; is identified with Avalokiteśvara, 27.
Advaitarātanakośa of Nrisihāśrama, 71.
Advaitarātanakośaprabhāsakā of Kṛṣṇānanda, 71.
Afzalkhan, his meeting with Sivājī as described in the Sivakāvyā, 88.
Aghā Mīrā, pupil of Bihāz, 258.
Ahikarade, wife of Rājaḍhara, 195; 276.
Ahmad Isfahani, 262.
Ahmad, Pātasahā, 202.
Ahmed Shah (of Delhi), 398.
Ahmedshah Abdali, 264.
Aṭṭin-i-Abbāri, 261.
Aitareya Aranyakā, 1 n., 2.
Aihole, inscription of, 248.
Ajājī, 205; son of Jām Satarāsāla, 205; killed, 206.
Ajamkhān, 205, viceroy of Gujrat, 205.
Ajantā, 411.
Ajitānya, 423.
Akbar, 203.
—258; invited Hiravijayasūri, to Delhi, 273.
Akherājīji, 280, his death, 347, 351, 370.
Akincūnā: Self-naughting, 1-16; outlines of the doctrine of 1-8; its Buddhist formulation, 8 ff.
Alādiyā, Miyā, 126.
Alankāramañjari, by Sudhindratirtha, 297.
Alankāraniksha by Sudhindratirtha, 297-298.
Alberuni, 244; identifies the Gupta era with the Valabhi era, 420; 424.
Aliyājī, 379, 380; murdered by Háloji, 380.
Almunsāra, 420.
Alukhān, 124.
Aman, 126.
Amarakośa, 87 n.
Amarana, 346.
Amarapura School or Burma Sāṅgha, 24.
Amarasimhājī, 284, 344; built a jēri in honour of Candrasenji, 288; his death, 379, 380; killed, 401 406.
Amarjī, 407.
Amalānanda, a. of Kalpataru, 71.
Ambadatta, 23.
Amerā wife of Vāktā, became a Sati, 201.
Amidā, 204.
Amreli, inscription of, 404.
Amrātdevi, wife of Varasimha, 276.
Anśuvarman, mentioned in the inscription of Sivadeva (1), 244, 245, 246, 250, 251, 252, 254.
Anuma, wife of Gopāla, 338.
Ananda, a Brahmachari, built a well at Gopanāthā, 353.
Anandabodha, 67.
Anandānabhava, a. of Nyāyaratnadiṣṭā, 65 n.
Anandavimalasūri, 278.
Ananyānabha, supposed to be the preceptor of Jānānagha, 70.
Aqindrā, inscription of, 347-348.
Añjali, taught Tripitakas, 412.
Ankor Thom, 313.
Anubhavānanda, 71.
Anurādhāpur, 412, 413.
Aparīkṣa, 36.
Appayya Dikṣita, refers to Tattva-suddhi in his Siddhāntādhyāsūmāṇīgraha, 62.
Aquinas, St. Thomas, 1, 3, 6 n 14, 8 n 18.
Arisinā Sāṅgama, 202.
Arjuna, of the Zāla family, 120.
Arjunadeva, 420.
Arjunasinhji, 380.
Arjunadas, 285.
Aryakāśīṣū, 380.
A., a Jain author, 37; a. of Kovidananda, 37; his works, 37; his date, 37.
Aṣaji, 348.
Asakaranji, 284; his death, 342.
Asoji, 348.
Asoka, 321.
Aśvalayana-Gṛhyasūtra, non-Rgvedic Mantras Rubricated in 49-61, 101-110; 144-155; 171-172, 211-222, 235-243; sources of the mantras in, 49 ff, edition of, 49 ff, is influenced by the Vedic texts, 51; interpretation of the mantras in, 52 ff.
Atavika, equivalent to Ālavaka, 35.
Atharva, 70, 71.
Augustin, J.; his De dubias animatis contra Manicheos, 5 n. 11.
Aurangzeb, 375.
Avardāśa, 398.
Avecrenel, his Fons Vīlē, 3 n. 5.

B

Babar, 258; picture of his durbar, 263-64.
Bab-eh-mandeh, straits of, 223.
Badi, inscriptions of, 126, 351; date, 122; description, 126; text, 125; a village in the Gogha district, 126.
Bagasir inscription of, 201; a village, 201.
Bahirad Khanji, Nawab, 407.
Bāhūdav, mentioned in the inscription of Velvādar, 196, 197, 200.
Bakhsh on Sivaji's life, list of, 93 n.
Bālakrīdā, a com. on Yājñavalkya Smṛti, by Visvarūpa, 69.
Balaputradeva of Sailendra Dynasty, 27.
Bāmanīyajī, death of, 346.
Bānabhaṭṭa, 69.
Bandhuvarman, 419.
Barbudur, 27.
Barada Gōla, a warrior, his death, 204.
Beherajī, his death, 378.
Berni, inscription of, 373.
Bernard, St. 5.
Berson, his visit to India, 223; arrived at Surat in A.D. 1655, 223; died in A.D. 1688, 223.
Betty Heimann, 4 n. 8.
Bhādri, 284.
Bhādrod, inscription of, 378.
Bhagatabai, her death, 283.
Bhagavatidāsa, 338.
Bhagvān built a temple, 375.
Bhagyavatsinhji, Thān, killed, 372.
Bhalāna, 373.
Bhanavāḍ, inscription of, 376.
Bhanji, 346, built a well at Anindara, 348.
Bhanji Pujaji, died in a fight with the English, 402.
Bhārmalji, 275, 340.
Bhariji Framji, made repairs to the well at Vāla, 400.
Bhāṣā, 414, contemporary of Kauṭilya, 414.
Bhāṣyadipikā of Jagannatha, 290; quotes and criticisms Tattvapraṇakāśikā of Raghuttamatintha, 290.
Bhāṭāra, 424.
Bhāṭa Nārāyaṇa, 414.
Bhavabhūti, his date, 68.
Bhāvaviveka, 68.
Bhāvānī, 348.
Bhāvānī, Sword of Shivaji, The Great, references to, 81 n.; journalistic description of, 82-83; reference in Chitrān Bakhar, 83-84; reference in Shivadīgitāvija, 84-85; the description of the sword, 85, believed to be preserved in the British Museum, 86; contribution to the problem of, 81-100; description of the, 81 ff; description of the, by Hari Kavi, 95; an earlier historical parallel to the story of, 98.
Bhāvavāsinī, 381.
Bhāvavāsinī, 400.
Bhāvānī, 380.
Bhādhāh damirāsaprakārama, 68 n.
Bhima, son of Lidāde, 120; 122, 195, 276.
Bhima, his death, 349.
Bhima II, his inscription formed at Gōla, 278.
Bhima II, 412; defeated Muhammad Ghori, 413.
Bhīmji Zalā, his death, 340.
Bhoja, 343.
Bhojadeva, of Kanauj, 254.
Bhojarajji, 340.
s—son of Candrasenji, his death, 283.
Bhojarajji, 349, 377.
Bhūchar Mori, battle of, 205.
Bhujaṅga, the Royal Officials of Hyam Wuruk, 27; were Brahmanical and Buddhistic, 27.
Bhūpati, 341.
Bhuvanevālā III (1552 A.D.), brought ruin upon Buddhist religion by Portuguese contact, 21.
Bibi Rani, queen of Muzfarshah II of Guzarat, 127.
Bihāzid, a famous painter of Herat, 258; a contemporary of Babar, 258.
Bileshvara, inscription of, 341.
Blake, 6.
Bodhagana, guru of Jñānagāna, 62; mentioned as the successors of Viṣvārupācārya in the Śrīvīṣyāppadhāna, 64 n.; followed by Jñānagāna, 66, 71.
Bothus, a. of Contra Evitchen, I n. 2; his De Consol, 3, 4.
Böhme, Jacob, I, 6 n 12.
Bhāmasidhāntaka. 245.
Bhāmasiddhi, 67 n; 69 n.
Chah Jehan = Shah Jahan, 223.
Chandragupta, a Sanskrit index to the, 232-234.
Chandrasa, inscription of, 406-407.
Chanhu Daro, 224.
Champa, 412.
Chas Phāya Chakkri, deposed Phāya Tāk Sin in 1782 A.D. and established a new dynasty in Siam, 22.
Che end Yeou King, 318.
Chintis Bakhar, 84 n; composed in A.D. 1811, 93.
Chintis, Malhar Ramrao, a. of the ‘Life of Shivāji The Great (in Marathi), 83; his reference to Bhavāni sword, 83.
Citrauguptabakhar, 83 n.
Citsukha, 67 n; 68.
Citsukhi, 68, 68 n.
Contra Evtychen, In 2.
Convito by Dante, 15.
Coomaraswamy, Anand, K. Akinçanā, Self-Naughting 1-16.
Cudamā Kings, genealogy of the, 117.
Culābhāga, 412.

D
Dadda I, 248.
Dādar, inscription of, 279.
Dahiserā, inscriptions of, 203, 340; a village, 203.
Dai, wife of Patā, 193.
Damāji Gaikwad, built a Siwa temple at Lollyārā, 379; founder of the Gaikwad family of Baroda, 379; 381.
Damodar Gora, built a dēri, 297.
Dandkhān, 351.
Devadās, 204.
Devakuvbarī, wife of Arjunasimhī, became a satī, 380.
Devanārāmiyī Tissa, 19.
Devapārā, 27.
Devapattāna, 119, 201.
Devji Jādejā, caused a temple to be built, 373.
Dhammaruci Ācārya, 19.
Dhammikika, King of Siam, 21.
Dhanji Pāt̄hak, stabbed himself to death, 349.
Dhanrā, 412.
Dhanavīsugī, 422.
Dharasar, Bīs, date of his death, 195.
Dharasr, I, 424.
Dharmadāsa, an ācārya, 278; caused a temple of Pārśvarāṣṭ to be built at Gālā, 278.
Dharmamūrtisūri, 343.
Dharapāla, guru of Nālandā, 27.
Dhokadvā, 200.
Dhrāngdhārā, 119; inscriptions of, 275, 398-399.
Dhrāśanavel, inscription of, 194-195; a village near Dvārakā, 194.
Dhruvadeva, 246; a Licchavi King of Nepal, 246; succeeded Sivadeva I, 251, 252, 253, 254.
Dhrol, inscription of, 204-205; 346.
Dhua, inscription of, 341-342; a village, 341.
Dhunaji, Raval, 281; killed in a fight with the Kathis in 1691 A.D., 281.
Dihor, founded by Hamir, 351; inscription of, 374-375.
Dipacandra, constructed the tank at Candrasar, 123.
Dipawarnisa, 18 n, 412.
Diksha-saṃkhyā śata-duśadā, 72 n.
Divanjali, P. C. Ancient Indian History and Research Work, 132-143; 161-170.
Duṭṭhaḥānāṇi, King, spread Buddhism in Burma in the 2nd cen. B.C. 19.
Dwarka, 345, 380.

E
Eckhart, 1, 4, 5, 5 n, 6, 7, 8 n, 13.
Escapism, defined, 2 n, 3.
Early Church Art in Northern Europe, 13 n.

F
Fan-Chan, sent an embassy to Mu-lun (Mrlenaja), 423.
Fa-Hien, gives account of the trace of Buddhism in Java (about 413 A.D.), 26.
Fried, 4 n, 8.
Fu-nan, 316, 318.
Fysee, A. A. A.—A Comprehensive Index to the Qur'an, 73.

G
Gadyavallari, Tantra by Nijamata-prakāśa, 64, 66.
Gajabrahma, son of Ranavira, 120.
Gajania Kesarāj, 400.
Gajasimha, of Zālāvad, 399; killed, 400.
Gajasimhajī, 348, 351, 374, 377.
Gal, 1, 2 n, 7.
Gālā, inscription of, 278-279; a village, 278.
Galapādar, a village, 277.
Ganapatinīga, cannot be identified with Ganēsvara, 35; supposed to be the a. of Bhāvaśatakā, 35.
Ganesa, an invocation to, in the inscription of Mānkhetrā, 204.
Ganēsvara, of the Uttara Kāśi Pillar inscription, 35; cannot be identified with Ganapati Nāga, 35; throws off the allegiance to Guptas, 36; was the friend of Sakra, 36.
Ganḍādāsa, 346.
Gangādevi, her description of the Pāndyan sword of Kumāra Kampāṇa, 98.
Garbhā, a fort, 249.
Gauḍāvalihā, 68 n.
Gheia Somanatha, inscription of, 401-402.
Ghogha, inscription of, 203; a port, 203.
Ghose, Jogendra Chandra, obituary notice of, 183-185.
Ghose, N. C., The Late Mr. Jogendra Chandra Ghose, 183-185.
Gilsol, his La Théologie Mystique de Saint Bernard, 5 n, 10.
Girnar, inscriptions of 116-119, 120-121; dates of the inscriptions, 116, 120; description of the inscriptions, 116-117, 120-121; Texts of the inscriptions, 117-119, 121.
Gitābhāṣyaprameyadīpiṇī, 292.
Gm-skō or Gm-skḥō? Indo-European, 383-385.
Gode, P. K.—Hari Kavi's contribution to the Problem of the Bhavānī sword of Shvajī the Great, 81-100;—when did Bernier arrive in India, 223.
Gogā, inscription of, 280.
Gopāla, a king of the Pāl dynasty, 252, 254; caused a temple of Maṇḍopārāya to be made, 338.
Gopālji, Zāli, his death, 286.
—340.
Gopālimbhji, 374.
Goparātha, inscription of, 353.
Gopani, A. S.—Female Education as evidenced in Buddhist Literature, 411-413.
Gosā, inscription of, 123-124; date, 123; description, 123; text, 124.
Govindanātha, a. of Sākaraścārya, 63, 65; mentions Suresvara, as the disciple of Sāncara, 65.
Govindji, 352, 374.
Gradual sayings, 9 n.
Grant Duff: His History of the Marathas, 81 n.
Guha, The Uttara Kāśi Pillar Inscription of 34-36;—the date of the inscription, 34; language, 34; metres, 35; text of the inscription, 35.
Gunaratna, a. of Saḍarśanasmuccayaṭṭika, 68.
Gundū, inscription of, 373; a village, 373.
Gupta Era, the epoch of the, 419-428; Hārāhā inscription and, 437-440.
Guruvaṇamahākāra, by Laksmana Sāstrī, 64.
Gylfiginning, 4 n.

H
Hādi, 124.
Hadjani Suraja, 201.
Hāloji, murdered Aliāji, 380.
Hāmapar, inscription of, 199; a village in the Rājastānpur Mahāl, 199.
Hamirji, 348, 374.
Harir, 280.
Harirji, 351, conquered Kukad, 351.
Hāmapar, inscription of, 274-275 a village, 274.
Haroma, its two meanings, 29 n.
Harabhanji, ruler of Limbdi, 379.
Haradatta, a. of Caturvedatātparya-saṅgraha, 71; his date, 72; his Pañcaratnamālā, 72.
Hārāhā, 247.
Harapali, built a temple in Khāmbad, 122.
Harappa, 224.
Harbanji, 402.
Haridālī, wife of Patā, 193.
Haridāsa, 280.
Harikrāvi, his contribution to the problem of the Bhavāṇi sword of Shivaji, the Great, 81-100; his works, 94 n; his description of the Bhavāṇi sword, 95.
Harisēna, 34.
Havisinharjai, 402.
Harjī, 280.
Hārsacarīta, 69.
Harsavardhana, of Kanauj, 244; supposed to have started an era from about 606 A.D., 244; never started an era, 244; 247, 248, 254.
Harshadeva of Kāmarūpa, 252, 254.
Harsha Era, Epoch of the, 243-253; used in Mathurā and Kanauj, 244; synchronic table of, with inscriptive dates, 254.
Harshahaputra, 421.
Harshavardhana Silāditya, 421.
Hāṣā, a merchant of Sambha-tirtha, 112.
Haṭhi Sanga, killed, 400.
Hazrat Suleman Khan, 202.
Hemā, 412.
Hemaljī, 378.
Hemārajā, Saṅghavī, 398.
Hermes, 7.
Hibā Mālī, 201.
Hieun-Tsang, 419.
Hien-Yun, 317.
Hinduism and Buddhism by Elliot, 17 n, 18 n, 21 n, 23 n, 24 n.
Hirā, 343.
Hirananda Sastri—Some rare portraits and Wasis, 257-265.
Hirvijayasūri, a Jain Ācārya, invited by Akbar to Delhi, 273; his demise, 273, 278.
History of Buddhism in Ceylon by De Silva, 18 n, 21 n.
Hiuen Tsang, date of his visit to Nepal, 245, 247, 248; visited Pulakesi's court, 248, 316, 317; visited Magadha in 637 A.C. 421, 424.
Huvin Lun, a Kopran pilgrim, 246.
Hyam Wuruk, 27.

I

 Ibn-Muqlah, 258.
 Ibn Wahab, an Arab merchant, 318.
 Indo-China, Buddhism in, 24-26; earliest trace of Buddhism in, I. is in the 2nd or 3rd cen. A.D. 24; Form of Buddhism in, 25.
 Indo-Persian or Mughal School of Painting 258 ff; started in the reign of Akbar, 258.
 Indraravan, King, 66.
 Indraravan II, founded the Monastery of Lokesvara in Indo-China, 25.
 Isāvanvarman, 247, 421.
 Isk Upamāsada, 4.
 Iṣṭasidhiḥivivara, of Jījanottama, 64.
 Ițhāsa Saṅgraha, 86 n.
 Itimad Khan Ahodi, 202.
 I-Tsang, 24, 25; visited Sumatra in the 7th cen., 26.

J

 Jādejī Sānγāji, Vaijī of Ranmalji, 406.
 Jādeśvara, inscription of, 403-404.
 Jāgaddeva Pratihārā, 413-414.
 Jāgamabhārati, 378.
 Jāgannātharathī, a. of Bhāṣyadīpikā, 290.
 Jagīsī, a village, 191.
 Jāhala, 343.
 Jaisinhar Siddharāja, 278; his inscription found at Gāšā, 278.
 Jāmanagar, inscriptions of, 277-278, 343-344.
 Jami, a celebrated poet of Persia, 261; portrait of, and 262.
 Jannī, wife of Jasa, became sati, 402.
 Janaji, 346.
 Jāngleśa, 414.
 Japan, received the doctrine of Buddha from China, 17; Buddhism in J. had always an intimate connection with social, political and military matters, 18.
 Japanese Buddhists, twelve sects of 18.
 Jāśā Ladaka, minister of Ajaji, 205; killed, 205.
 Jasa vaṃsiriha, son of Gajasimha, 399.
 Jasa vaṃsiriha, son of Satrūsalya, 277.
 Jasa vaṃsiriha, 352; killed, 377.
 Jasdan, 402.
 Jātakamālā, regards a Bodhisattva as dīkṣita, 13 n.
 Jayabhāta I, 248.
 ——III, 247; inscription of 247.
 Jayadeva, of Nepal, 248; Nepāla inscription of, 250, 252; II, 254.
 Jayantabhaṭṭa, 67.
 Jayārāma Kavi, his Rādhāmādhavgīlāsa, 83 n; a senior contemporary of Hari Kavi, 97.
Jayasāṅkara, 407.
Jayasiṁha, 117.
Jayasimha of Vāghelā family, 401.
Jedhe Kareena, Eng. Tr. of. 87 n.
Jedhe Sakāvali, 85, 87.
Jagdāva (inscription of), 119-120; description, 119-120, 121; dates, 119, 121; texts, 120, 121.
 Jehangir, 278.
Jesā, 351.
Jethi, killed in a battle, 376.
Jhinjuvādā, inscriptions of, 342, 343, 351-352.
Jivaka, studied with Prasena, 411; was a son of a Courtezan, 411 n.
Jivasambodhamāṇi, 319; its date of composition, 319; contains an account of Sāgara and his imperial attributes, 320.
Jivahā, wife of Karanji, 332.
Jivatāguptha, 421.
Jānagharana Pāñjarpāda, 62-72; was a disciple of Bhogāhamacārya, 62; a. of Tattvavedātātātparyasamgrahadipitā, 72.
Jiṣṇugupta, 246, 252, 253, 254.
Jitā, 195, 276.
Jitāde, wife of Jitā, 995.
Jitāmala, of Salki family, 199.
Jivanji, 351.
Jīvanottama, a. of Iṣṭasiddhihindara, 65.
Jodhā, 348.
John, 4, 4 n, 6, 11, 13 n, 14 n, 15.
Junagadh, inscription of, 113-116; date of the inscription, 113; description of the inscription, 113-114; text of the inscription, 114-116.
Jinapāla, a. of Kharalāgaccha Pattažavali, 414.
Jinasana, 422.

K
Kācā Parvata, of Bagasā, 201.
Kadamba, Rāma, Kṛṣṇa, a scribe who copied Kвидānanda, 37.
Kādembini, a com. on Kvidānanda, Ms of, 37; works cited in, 37.
Kālī, 375.
Kalambeke, Babāji Appāji, 381.
Kalīvād, inscription of, 285-286.
Kalīvād, 341.
Kāli, 412.
Kālidāsa, 414.
Kalkirīja, 422, 423.
Kālodaka, 318.
Kalpataru of Amālānanda, 71.
Kalāyān, 276.
Kalāyaṇade, wife of Rāmīga, 195; caused a well to be dug up in Halvad, 195.
Kalāyāna Keśava, Sāṅghavi, 399.
Kalāyānamalla, 284, 285.
Kalāyānji Visā, 280.
Kalāyānari, 203.
Kalāyānosāgaratā, 343.
Kalāyāna Seth, 375.
Kambhālica, inscription of, 371.
Kampārāyaśa of Gaṅgādevi, 98 n.
Kanakabai, 283.
Kāng T'ai, an ambassador, 316, 317, 318.
Kānoji, Gopal, his death, 373; a deri built in his honour, 373.
Karama, 346.
Karamāde, wife of Sādāsiva Thākur, 279.
Karaṇasiṁhāji, 372.
Karanji, 382.
Kārmāj, prime minster of Ratnasimha, 197.
Karmarkar, A. P. The Pañis in the Rgveda, 224.
Karnāji, Jām Śri, or Dahisara, 203.
Kasamkhā, Vazir, 280.
Kāśmirdev, 276.
Kassapa Thera, compilation of, sub-commentaries of Buddhist text took place under the guidance of, 20.
Kāyapassanāhita, 312 n.
Kathālakṣāna, 293.
Kathāsāri Sāgara, 319.
Kāthī Suma (?), his death, 341.
Kausiṣṭhī Upaniṣad, 9 n.
Kauṭiyā, 307, 414.
Kāvāji, 379, 380.
Ken Ārok, 27.
Kesod, 407.
Katre, Sadashiv, L.—Reference to Nasir Shah Khalji in a contemporary Ms. 191-192.
Kēśavācārya, 296.
Khāmāhā (inscription of), date, 122; description, 122; text 122.
Kambhāla, inscription of, 352.
Khangārji, Mahārao, 408.
Kharataragaccha Patīvali of Dinapāla, 414; records some information about Pratihāra Jagadadeva, 414.
Khare, G. H. Dr. Saletore and the authenticity of Mudhol Farāms, 186-190.
Khārvā, inscription of, 346.
Khengārji, 378; burned to death, 378.
Khetāji, 348.
Khodū—inscription of, 125; date, 125; description, 125; text 125.
Kīkī, daughter of Vyāsara, 193; married to Mītā, 193.
Kheva, Abdul Dādvud, a Painter, 258.
Kīrīkaumudī, of Somesvara, 413; a panegyric of Vāstupāla, 413; enuogises Pratihāra, 413.
Kīrtivarman, 420.
Kittisiri Rājasīha, 21.
Kodidara, inscription of, 201; a village, 201.
Kondha, inscription of, 275-277; a village, 275.
Korea, Buddhism first entered Japan through, 17; Buddhism entered K. in the 1st half of 4th c. A.D.; maintained friendly intercourse with T'ang Dynasty in China, 17; Merchants and Missionaries visited K. from India and Tibet, 17.
Kosambi, D. D.—A Note on Two Hoards of Punch-marked coins found at Taxila, 156-159.
Kovidhananda, with Kadambari of Asadhara, 37-39; description of the Ms. of, 37.
Krishnadisa, caused a temple of Laksmi-narayana to be built in Dhuṣa, 341.
Krishnapurta, 421.
Krishnanda, a. of Siddhanta-sidhanta-jana, 71; a. of Advaitaratnakosa-prakasa, 71.
Krishnapandita, the guru of Sambhaji, 96; identified with Kavi Kalasha or Kabaji, 96 n.
Kretanagara, 27.
Ksema, a nun, 412.
Ksemdra, 414.
Kusa, inscription of, 286, 340.
Kuki, wife of Hariddasa, 280.
Kulkarni, Bhagvant Dada, 381.
Kumarradevi, queen of Candragupta I, 249.
Kumargupta, 419, 420; fought with Isanavarman, 421, 424.
Kumargupta III, 247.
Kumara Kampa, son of Bukka I, 98; his expedition against the King of Turushkas at Madhura, 98.
Kumarrapala, 414.
Kumarrapala, 420;—his inscription forms at Galla, 278.
Kumarrila, 68.
Kumbha, 318.
Kumbharaja, 197.
Kuntalake, 412.
Kuntipura, identified with Kuttyiyana, 122.
Kureya, 72.
Kureyavijaya, is a refutation of Haradatta’s Poencaratnamalikā, 72.
Kutiyanga, inscription of, 122; date, 122; description, 122; text, 122.
Kutubuddin, Sultan, 119; invited to invade Naganagar, 346.
Kuva, 121, inscription of, 126-127; date, 126; description, 126-127; text, 127.
Kuvarba, Kuvala, 401.

L

Lachhu, mother of Bhānji, 348.
Ladvbai, a Brahman woman, became a sati, 352.

Lakaras, Purvacaarya Sarhjaas for, 39-40.
Lakhadhir, 124.
Lakh, 373.
Lakhaji, 285; 286; 340, 343; death of, 348; 372; ruled at Navanagar, 372, built the fort of Raval, 372; 373.
—Gohel, 399.
Lakhamani, 348.
Laksmansastrin, a. of Guruvamsa-mahakaviya, 64.
Laliade, wife of Nanamal, 195.
Lalima, wife of Pati, 193.
Lalitaditya, of Kashmir, defeated Yasovarman of Kanauj, 252; 254.
Lalitavistara, Characteristics of a mahā-purusa in, 313.
Lata, 412, taught Vinayapitaka to monks and nuns, 412.
Lāthi, inscriptions of, 398, 399.
Lavanyasamaya, composer of the Praṣasti in the inscription of Satrunjaya hill, 197.
Law, Bimal Churn, Expansion of Buddhism in India and Abroad, 17-28.
Lībaṭa Gōa, 345.
Lilāde, queen of Ranavira, 120, 195.
Limbidi, inscriptions of, 378, 379, 401, 402-403.
Loyalā, inscription of, 379.
Luke, 5, 6, 7.

M

MacIver, Mr. David, 6 n. 12.
Mādhavagupta, 246; contemporary of Harshavardhana, 247; 254.
Mādhavapura, inscription of, 405-406.
Mādhav Prājī, 408.
Madhumati, a town in Vālaka, 112.
Māgha, 414.
Mahabhiratra, 36.
Mahābodhi, 247.
Mahamalik Ayajavalli, 199.
Mahāmalik Pir Muhammad, 126.
Mahammad, Patashah, 123; identified with Sultan Mahmud Begada, 123; 124, 197, 201.
Mahāpanāsuti, 314, 315.
Mahāpurusa, Characteristics of a, 311.
Mahāruha, 412.
Mahātissā, 412.
Mahāvamsa, 18 n, 321.
Mahāvamsa commentary, 18 n.
Mahāśāman, 412.
Mahāvagga, 411 n.
Mahāvīra, 343.
Mahendrāyudha, 420.
Mihirakula, defeated by Bālāditya, 419.
Mohenjo Daro, 224.
Mahideva, 250, 254.
Mahipāla, son of Navaghana, 116.
Mahindr II, not mentioned in the inscription of Satrunjaya, 197.
Mahīm Bega, 123.
Mahopadesavimāśatika of Abhinava and Nirgupa mānasapūja, compared, 32 ff.
Mahuvā, inscriptions of, 111-113; 382.
Maitrāyaṇi Upanisad, 309.
Malīk Agadh, 202.
—Ain Ḥavālī, 202.
—Ajījahludīnī, 200.
—Asad, Sultan, 219.
—Mubārak, 119.
—Muhammad, 119.
—Nasrat Phal, 202.
Malkāpuram Inscription, (of Saka 1183), 36.
Māṇasimha, 195, 196, 199, 406
Māṇḍalika, King, son of Mahipāla of the Yādava dynasty, 114; 117, 121.
Mangrol, 2; inscription of, 339-340.
Mānji, 284, 287, 373.
Māṇikyacandra, a. of Sāntināthacarita, 414.
Māṇkā Meheta, 126.
Māṇkhetā, inscription of, 204; a village, 204.
Māṅsirīhī, father of Raisinīhī, 341.
Mantra, connotation of the term, 49.
Māṇpur, a village, 289.
Mark, 7.
Maṭā, son of Sevā, 193.
Maṭhak, inscription of, 283-284.
Māṭhaṇe, 4, 8.
Māṭrīkṣu, 422.
Māṭrīṣku, 422.
Māṭvāna, inscription of, 350-351.
Medapāta, 197.
Mēghā, 273.
Mēgharājī, 377.
Mēghavarṇa, 423.
Mēheramanā, 276.
Mēhetā Rangvāla, 202.
Melagadeva, 114, 116.
Mēhirakula, 247, 422.
Minālade, wife of Satruṣālīyā, 195, 296.
Mindon-Min, brought a triumph for the orthodox Buddhist Church in Burma, 24.
Mir Abdul Halim, 202.
Mir Hasbar, 202.
Mōdhera Hājīdī, caused a masjīd to be made at Sārā, 127.
Mōkōji, 341.
Mōkala, dug a well in Madumati, 112.
Mōkalasīnī, 117.
Mōngkūt, King of Siam, 23.
Mōng VI, 348.
Mookerjee, Dhlendra Nath.—The Epoch of the so-called Harsha Era, 244-254; the Harsha inscription and the Gupta Era, 437-440.
Morvi, inscription of, 379-380.
Mudhol Farmans, authenticity of, reply to Dr. Saletore, pp. 186-190.
Muhammad Ghori, defeated by Bhrma, 2, 413.
Muhammad Hussain, a Calligraphist of Akbar’s time, 258.
Muhammad Shāh, 264.
—381.
—Kajj, 280.
Mūnuṣa, 276.
Muktāpīda Lalitāditya of Kashmir, 67.
Mukutṣāṃ, 407.
Mūlāras, 413.
Mūli, inscriptions of, 338-339, 349, a state in Zālāvād, 338.
Munjāl, caused a well to be dug up in Gosā, 123.
Munţā, 343.
Muzafar, Bādāshāh, 126; identified with Muzafar II of Gujrat, 127, 197.

N
Nāga, 126.
Nāgarā Somanāthā, 193; composed the prasasti of the inscription of Ume, 193.
Nāgas, the worshippers of Nāga, 224.
Nagichharia, inscriptions of, 200, 375; a village, 200.
Nāiṣkarmyasiddhi, 65.
Nākubāi, wife of Jassawantāśīrīhāji, 277; made a grant of four parajos (?) of land, 277.
Nalanda, a Cola Prince, 27.
Nālāndā, 411, 412, 413.
Nāṁbā Zāli, 408.
Nanduttārā, 412.
Nārājī, 348, 373.
Narapāla, a merchant of Madhumati, 112; was a minister of King Rāma, 112; 343.
Narasimha Bharati, a pontiff of Śrīgeri Mutt, 62.
Narasimha Gupta, 419.
Narasinhabag Gupta Bālāditya, 247, 419.
Narasinhabhaka, prime minister of Bahadurshāh, 197.
Narasinhabhara, 193.
Narendradeva, 246; received a Chinese envoy in a.d. 646, 246; 250, 251, 253, 254.
Nārāyandīsā, 284, 285.
Nāsir Shah Khiljī, references to, in a contemporary Ms of Vīṣṇupurāṇa, 191.
Navaghaṃa, son of Manḍalika, 116.
Navānagar, 372.
Nāyājī, 376.
Nagapatam, a Buddhist temple constructed at, 27.
Nensi, 343.
Nepāla, eras in early, 250.
Nepāla Vanīśāvatī, 250.
Nicholas, of Cusa, his *De Docta Ignorantia* 3 n 4, n.
Nicholson, 8 n.
Nijamatprakāśa, a. of *Gadyavallari* 64 ;
identified with Prakāśānanda, 64 n.
Nirguṇamāna-pūja, of Saṅkararācārya,
compared with Mahopadeśa-viṁśatikā,
32 ff.; its various titles, 32.
Nilakantha Sastri, K. A.—Cakravartin
307-321.
Nināde, wife of Vāgha, 195.
Nirūsînārasa, a. of *Advaitaratnakōsa*,
71.
Nyāyamaṇjarī, 67 n.
*Nyāyaratnadīpavali* of Anandānubhava,
65 n.; identifies Suresvara and Viśavā-
rūpa, 65 n.
*Nyāyaratnasambhandhādīpikā* of Raghūt-
matārtha, 290-291.
*Nyāyavasudhātipani*, 295.
*Nyāyavivarana*, 290.
*Nyāyavivaranaṇaṭikā*, by Raghūttamatartha,
290.

P
Pada, inscription of, 200 ; a village, 200.
Pālha, 112.
Pali Literature in Burma, by Bode, 23 n.
Pāncaratnamālīka, of Haradatta, 72.
Pāncavarṭa, of Bhāsa, 414.
Pāṇḍurāṅga, 25.
Pāṇis, in the Ṛgveda, 224 ; identified
with the Nāga tribe, 224 ; inimical
towards Vedic Aryans, 224 ; referred
to only in the Vedic literature, 224 ;
termed as Rakṣasas in the Varāhā
purāṇa, 224 ; their location, 224 ;
worshippers of Abi-Vṛtra, 224.
Paradiso, 5.
Parākramavāhu, revived Buddhism in
Ceylon, 20 ; got prepared a Code for the
regulations of the Bhikhus, 20.
Paramārthasāra of Adīdeśa, 355-370.
Parbat Sutār, his death, 349.
Pārīṣa Phaṅka alias Pariṣa Ramji, 204.
Parāśarpasvatrakramākhyāna, by Jaya-
rāma Kavi, 86 n.; its date, 87 n.
*Pārthavijaya* by Prahlādana, 414.
Pārīīati, wife of Moṅgūji, 348.
Paśnāḍa, (inscription of), 119 ; description
of, 119 ; date, 119 ; text, 119.
Patā, 193, caused a well to be dug at
ūrā, 193.
Pāṭaliputra, 311 n.
Pāṭṭi, inscription of, 381-382.
Personality, what is 1-2.
Pielff, 5 n, 7, 8 n.
Phalii, 373.
Phāya Tāk Sin, deposed in 1782, 22.
Phulii, 371.
Phūli, 381.
Piplia, a village, 402.
Pithia Anāśa, his death, 200.
Pomasiha, 121.
Potbhai, wife of Asaṭī, 348.
Prabhākaraṇavardhana, 69.
Prājī, 275.

Prāgmalji, 350.
Prāgvyāta family, genealogy of, 204.
Prāhlādana, a. of *Pārthavijaya*, 414.
Praksānanda, a. of *Vedāntasidhānta-
muktāvalī, identified with Nījātma-
prakāśa, 64 n.
Prākṣātman, 69, 70, 71.
Pramāṇapaddhati of Jayatirtha, 290.
Pramāṇapaddhatiṣyākhyā, by Vedeśa
Bhikṣu, 293.
Prāṇavatibai, wife of Sartānji, became
a satī, 284.
Prapāṭha, 27.
Prasena, King of Kosala, received
instruction with Jivaka, 411 ; 412.
Pratāpamalla Rāstrakūta, 413.
Pratāpasthiṅhji, killed in a fight, 376.
Pratihāra Bhoja-deva, 245.
Pratīṃśāntakā, 13.
Pratyabhijñāh, and Advaita, 32-34.
Pratyagāpabhagavān, Commentator of
Citsukhi, 67 n.
Premji, 280.
Primalade, wife of Bhīma, 195, 276.
Prthvirāja, 414.
—Chāhārama, 413 ; neglected by
Jain Chronicles, 413 ; prime-minister
of Bhīma II, 413.
Prthvirajji, 284, 401.
Pulakesī II, 248, 254, 412.
Punch-marked coins, found at Taxila,
A note on the two hoards of, 156-159.
Punyaślokaṃjari, 65.
Puragoticus of Dante, 13 n.
Pūrṇavarman, 421.
Purusottama, a. of Sivakāvyka, born in
A.D. 1766, 87 n.; died in A.D. 1856, 87 n.
Purusottama Sarasvati, Śwāmi, caused
a temple of Brahmā to be built, 406.
Pusalkar, A. D. Signed Arrows, 414.

R
Radhākrishnan, E. P.—Jñānaghaṇa Puj-
apāḍa, 62-72.
Rādhāmādhavavūlāsa by Jayārāma Kavi,
83 n.; 96.
RagHAVAN, V. Pratyabhijñāh and Advaita,
32-34.
Rāghavedraswāmi, disciple of Sudhindra-
tirtha, 296.
Rāghavendrabhujya of Nārāyaṇa, 296.
Rāhābhji, his death, 339.
Raghuṇātha Nāyaka, patronised Sudhindra-
tirtha, 283.
Rāgūttama Tirtha, 289-92 ; an honoured
saṅhit of Madhva Calendar, 289 ; a
contemporary of Vijaśandra and Vādi-
rāja, 289 ; his works, 290-292.
Raisinmēh, 284, 287, 341.
Rājādhana, 284, 276.
Rājamalla, 197.
Rājas, 343.
Rājashihjā, his death, 346 ; 371, 372.
Rajasīthapur, inscription of, 344-345 ; a
town, 406.
Rājoji, 344.
Rāma, grandson of Narapāla, 112.
Sahasakaraṇa, 121.
Sakrādītya, identified with Kumāragupta, 36.
Saktisvāmin, 67.
Sākya Nāgasena, an ambassador in the Court of China in 484 A.D., 25.
Sālavatī, a courtesan and mother of Jīvaka, 411 n.
Salim Shah, 279, 339.
Samanta, a Buddhist, 25.
Samāra, 343.
Sambhuṭaracarita, by Hari Kavi, composed in A.D. 1685, 94; 95 n.; was composed by the order of Kṛṣṇa-panḍita, 96.
Samudra Gupta, 35, 249.
Sandhyākara Nandin, his Ramacarita, 35; mentions Koṭātavi, 35.
Saṅgāra, son of Mahāpālādeva, 116.
Saṅgrāmatīrasīhṛī, 197.
Saṅgrāmasihṛī, his death, 374; 376.
Saṅgārāmi, 347.
Saṅkara (of Śrīgeri Mutt), his predecessors, 63; date of his demise, 64, 66.
Saṅkarācārya, his Nirguṇamānasā-pūja, compared with Mahopadesviniśatātkā, 32 ff.
Saṅkarācāryacarita by Govindanātha, 63, 95.
Sānkarāna, C. R.—Tocharian and the invalidity of the Satem—centum Hypothesis forming a parallel to the Hitite and the Rathas-Patis hypothesis, 40-46.
Sānkṣepaśārisācara, of Sārvajñātman, 69.
Sāntināthacarita of Māṇikyacandra, mentions, Prathīṭha, 414.
Sānyuttanikāya, 412.
Sāpādalakṣaṇa, 414.
Saptarāma, of a Cakravartin, 310; mark the preeminence of the emperor, 311.
Saṅkara—inscription of, 127; date, 127; description, 127; text, 127.
Sārānātha, 411.
Sārāngde, Baghela, 195.
Sārāngaji, son of Kanoji, 112; 351.
Sārakara, a Śāmaner, 21.
Sārboji, of Tanjore, 414.
Sārvabhauma, 204.
Sārita, 412.
Sārīgadharapaddhati, 261.
Sārtanji, Rāṇa, 284; his death, 284.
Sārvajñaḥtman, a. of Sāṅkṣepaśāriśācara, 69.
Sāsaṇavamsa (ed. by Bode), 23 n.
Sāsānka, 421.
Sātājī, 375.
Sata, 381.
Satrāsālī, 374.
Satrāsālī, of Kuvā, 121.
Śatrūṇāyajaya, inscriptions of, 274, 281-283, 287.
Śatrūṇāyamāḥātmya of Dhanaṇjaya, 424, its date, 424.
Śatrūṇāyajaya, 195, 276, 279.
Śatrūṇāyajaya, 351.
Śayallā, 412.
Śekhapat, inscriptions of, 346-347, 408.
Śesamali, 372, 374, 376.
Śavā, son of Narasimhavara, 193.
Śakrer Furniture, 14 n.
Shah Shuja'ā, his portrait and its description, 264.
Shams-i-Tabrizi, 10 n.
Sharma, Dasaratha, Jagaddeva Prati-hāra, a forgotten Hero, 413-414.
Sherkhan, 200.
Shimara, inscription of, 111; description of the inscription of, 111; a village near Ajār, 111; date of the inscription of, 111.
Shimroli, inscription of, 407-408.
Shurājī, built a well, 400.
Shivarāji, Dosi, 126.
Siam, Buddhism of S. belongs to Thera-vāda school, 21; date when Buddhism entered in, 22; the form of Buddhism in, 22.
Siddhāntalesamangraha of Appayya Dik-sita, 62, 67.
Siddhāntasekhara of Śripati, 426.
Siddhāntassiddhānta of Kṛṣṇananda, 71.
Siddharāja Jayasimha, built the Brahmapurāṇa at Sihore, 405.
Signed arrows, 414.
Sīhala Saṅghe, introduced in Burma in 1181-1882, A.D.
Sihore, inscription of, 405.
Sikandar, a Mewad King, not mentioned in the Śatrūṇāyajaya-hill; inscription, 197.
Sirac, Dinesh Chandra Vāmdeva-Pad-ānudhyāta, 36-37.
Sīsūpāla, 423.
Śiva Bhārata, 86, 87, 89; date of, 92; 93.
Śiva Chhatrapati, by Dr. Surendranath Sen, 84 n, 85 n.
Śivadeva (1), 244, 251, 254.
Śivadeva (2), 246, 247, 250, 251, 254.
Śivadīgriyajya Bakker, 81 n; reference to Bhavāni Sword in, 84-85; 84 n, 85, 93.
Śīvakāvyā, by Purṣottama 87; its date, 87.
Śivasoma, predecessor of King Indrā-verman, studied the Śastras from Saṅkara, 66.
Śivālā, 412.
Śiyāni, inscription of, 377-378.
Skandagupta, 419, 424.
Slokavārttika, 68.
Smrticandrīkā, 36.
Somji, 280.
Someśvara, a. of Kirtikaumudi, 413.
Sonā, 412.
Sorath, 197.
Soul distinct from spirit, 5 n; used in many senses in European tradition, 5 n.
Souns, man has two, 5.
Śri-Bhānu, a Cāturmāṇa chief, 191.
Śri-Jogadeva, father of Śri-Bhānu, 191.
Śrīkaṇṭha Sāstri, S. The Uttara Kāśi Pillar Inscription of Guha, 34-36.
Śrī-Rāja-pura, 191.
Śrīśrinivāsa-Gohel, 398.
Śrīvidyāpaddhati, mentions Bodhagana as successor of Viśvarūpa-greya, 64 n.
Śrīgagiriruparampara, gives a list of pontiffs of the Śrīgeri mutt, 62; 64, 65.
Śambha-tirtha, 114.
Śubhodrāpaṇīyā by Śuddhānandatirtha, 298.
Śuddhānandatirtha, 296-298; disciple of Vijayadāsipātra, 296; his date, 296; his works, 297-298; honoured by Veṅkataraṇya of Vijayanagar, 296; patronised by Raghunāth Nāyaka of Tanjore, 296; his death, 296.
Sukkā, 412.
Sumantindra, successor of Śuddhānandatirtha, 297; wrote a com. on the Alankāramāṇijjā of Śuddhānanda, 297.
Śūṃma Theologica, 8 n ; 9 n.
Śundharā, 246.
Śūrdāśā Rāṇā, son of Devā, 125; his death, 125.
Śurāj, 286, 340.
Śurat, visited by Barnier, 223.
Śuresvara-greya, 65, Sāṅkara’s disciple, 65; identified with Viśvarūpa, 65.
Śūrjavarman I, 26.
Śūrsinīhi, his death, 351.
Śuryanarayana Sāstri, S. S.—Paramārthaśāra of Adīdeśa, 335-370.
Śuryavarman, 247.
Śutradhāṣṭra, 119.
Śvānadcīpe, by Mājumdar, 26 n.
Śwānacīpe, H. 13.

T

Tabāri, 1.
Tāttirīya Upaniṣad 4 n, 15.
Tajkhan, 126.
Taimūr Shāh, 264.
Talājā, 374.
Tamācī, 371, 372.
Tāo-Sivan, assistant of Huien-Tsang, 317.
Tamarat, inscription of, 403.
Tārik-i-Shivājī, 84 n.
Tarkatāṇḍavātikā by Śuddhānandatirtha, 297.
Tattvadvōta-paṇḍitā-tippāna by Vedēśa Bhikṣu, 292-293.
Tattvaprajākāśī, by Raghūttama, 290; quoted and criticised by Jaganmātha-tirtha, 290; quotes Nyāyavivarana, 290.
Tattvasanākhya-ṭippāna, 295.
Tattvasuddhi, referred to by Appayya Dīkṣita, 63; composed by Jñānagaha, 62; list of pontiffs of Śrīgeri in, 62-63; examination of the list, 64 ff; order of acāryas given in, 65; 67, 69; based on Almātattvā, 70; 71, 72.
Tattvavedoṭippāna, 295.

Tauler, 5.
Taxiā, 411, 412.
Tejāpāla, 413.
Tejāsi, 343.
Therigāthā, composed by nuns, 412.
The Rāja Garh Life, Eng. translation of, 83 n.
Tocharian, and satem-centum hypothesis, parallelism to 40-45; does not differentiate between the primitive Indo-European palatals and labio-velars, 42.
Toramāṇa, 422.
Tuvvusas, and Yadus, the first immigrants of India, 224.

U

Uāli, 412.
Udā, 343.
Udakaraṇa, 381.
Udāna, 14 n.
Udayadeva, of Nepal, mentioned by Huien Tsang, 246; succeeded Dhruva-deva, 251; 252, 253, 254.
Udayasimha, 276.
Uddhavadasā, 280.
Umbaibā, caused a temple of Mañjūdeva to be built at Hāmpar, 274.
Ummāla, 373.
Umveka, 68; is regarded to be the same as Bhavabhūti, 68; a disciple of Kumāranga, 68; discovery of his commentary on Slokavārtika, 68.
Unā, a town in Junāgad State, 193; inscriptions of, 193-194, 273-274; deities mentioned in the inscription of, 193.
Uttarā, 412.

V

Vācaspatīmisāra, 67.
Vāchāni Virji, slain, 350.
Vādel, Rāṇā of Aramāṃ, 402.
Vadrā, a village, 375.
Vāgha, 195, 276.
Vāghada, 400.
Vāghājī, 348.
Vāghellā Vākā, son of Hībā Mālā, 201; his death, 201.
Vāghji, Rāṇā, 124; identified with the Zāla ruler of Kuvā, 124; 373.
Vajarājī, 372, 374, 376.
Vakhatāṃsiṇī, 382.
Vakhatsimha, of Bhāvanagar, 402; visited the temple of Somarātha at Ghela Somanath, 402.
Vāja, son of Rāṇā Sāradāsa, 125.
Vajracchedika Śāstra, 8 n.
Vāsur Khaṭcar, ruler of Jasdan, 402.
Vāla, inscription of, 400.
Vallabhī destroyed by Turukās, 420.
Vālikā, 112.
Vālabbha, King of Vallabhī, 420.
Vālmikī, 414.
Vālvā, 196.
INDEX

Vāmadevapāññudhāyāta, 36-37.
Vāmasambhu, 36; identified with Vāma-
deva, 36; Prof. Mirashi's suggestion
examined, 36.
Vānkāner, inscription of, 284-285.
Vankaner, 350, 403.
Vansteenbergh, 3 n.
Varadarājaśārya, supposed to be a teacher
of Raghūtattamārtha, 289.
Vārāhapuruṣa, regards Panini as Rākṣasa,
224.
Varasinhadeva, 121, 276.
Varajang Patell, 126.
Varma, Siddheswar, Indo-European Gm-
śkô, or Gm-skô? 383-385.
Varêj, inscription of, 281.
Vasajī, 352; killed in a battle, 352.
Vāsanga, 200.
Vāsāni a brahmin, caused a temple to
be built, 285.
Vasantadeva, 250, 251, 254.
Vastupāla, 413.
Vatsādevi, 254.
Vattapārami, King, introduced important
changes in Buddhist religion in the
1st cen. B.C. 19.
Vavānja, 203.
Vāyupūraṇa, passage on Cakravartin in,
307-308; 309, 312.
Vedānga jyotisa, 426.
Vedāntasiddhāntamuktavali, by Prakārśa-
nanda, 64 n.
Vedēśa Bhīšu, 292-293; his works, 292-
93; a disciple of Raghūtattama and
Vedavyāsatthāra, 292.
Vejā, 280.
Vejānanda, 375.
Veilāvadar, inscription of, 196; a village
in Wadhwan state, 196.
Venāśī, wife of Sētha Vīṇā, 124; caused
a well to be made in Sūryapura, 124.
Vändidid, 31 n.
Venkatapatirāya, King of Vijayanagar,
296; honoured Sudhindratirtha, 296.
Verālī, killed, 401.
Vhālibai, became a satī, 283.
Vibha, 373.
Vibhājī, 285.
Vibhājī, son of Phulji, his death, 371.
Vidā, 412.
Vidīrānaya, 64; came to the pontif seat
of Śrīgeri in 1331 A.D. 64; supposed
to have succeeded his guru Vidyātirtha
in 1375 A.D. 64 n.; 65.
Vijā, 193.
Vijayā Rājasingha, Sri (1734 A.D.), 21.
Vijayasenāsīrī, 273, 278.
Vijayindra, 289.
Vijojī, 373.
Vikramāditya, 244, 420.
Vikramātīti, 123, 124.
Vikramājī, 250; II., 252.
Vikramasena, 246, 251.
Vikramasīla, 411.
Vikramasinh, 345.
Vikramātīti, of Jethva family, 405.
Vimānavatthu, 412.
Vimukṭatman, 67.
Vīṇā of Srīmāla family, 124; the account
of his family, 124.
Vīrāde, wife of Sārangade, 195.
Vīrādhavala, 413.
Vīramgonaon, 381.
Vīrji, Thakur, 280.
Vīsā, a King, 203; 349, 380.
Vīṣṇupūraṇa, 312.
Vīṣṇutattvamārṇṇayatikā, by Raghūttama-
ṭhāra, 290.
Vīṣṇuvardhana, 247.
Vīṣṇuji, 281.
Vīṣṇupārāyaṇa, succeeded by Bodha-
ghana, 64 n; successor of Śaṅkarācārya,
65; identified with Sūresvara, 65; 69;
his Bālakridi, 69.
Vīṣṇuvarman, 419, 423, 424.
Vīṣṇuvarāya, father of Laksmanā
Sāstrī, 64.
Vīṣṇuvaratīthā, 293-294; a. of a com.
on the Aitareya-Bhāṣya of Madhya,
293; identified with the 14th swami of
the Pejāvar Muṭṭ, 294; probably a
disciple of Vāḍirāj, 294; later than
Jayatirtha, 294.
Vīṭhāl Bābāji, 403; caused a temple of
Trinetra to be built, 403; a famous
general of Gaikwad, 403; built the
Nāgaraththa temple at Amreli, 404.
Vīṭhāl, Saṅghavī, 398.
Vīvarangodhāra by Raghūttamāṭhāra,
293.
Vīyās, 193.
Vīyāsāraṇya, 193.
Vīyāsāraṇya, Post, Commentators, 289-298.
Vīyāsā Smṛti, 36.

W
Wadhwan, inscription of, 202-203, 344,
347, 380.
William, of Thierry, his Golden Epistle,
5 n.

Y
Yādappaya, father of Yadupati Acārya,
295.
Yadupati Acārya, 294-296; his works
296-296; a pupil of Vedēśa Bhīšu,
294; his date, 295; his pupils, 295.
Yadus and Turvasus, the first immigrants
of India, 224.
Yajñānāravāna Dikṣita, a. of Prabhā-
mandala, a com. on Śastraṇāvāṇa, 71 n.
Yāqūt, 258.
Yasodharman, 419, 422.
Yasovarman, of Kanauj, sent an em-
bassy to China, 252; defeated by
Lāṅghāta of Kashmir, 252; 254.
Yasujī, wife of Phulji, 371.
Yuan Chwang, 251.

Z
Zālī family, description of the, 276.
Zalavad, 202.
Zāotar, the chief priest who recites
Gathās 29 n.
"A book that is shut is but a block"
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