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NEW INDIAN ANTIQUARY

Within the last decade in India and abroad the number of scholars actively engaged in research in the different branches of Indology has grown so rapidly that a monthly journal devoted to the publication of the results of their research appears to be a great necessity now. With the cessation of the Indian Antiquary five years ago such work could be published only in the Quarterlies and other Periodicals. In spite of the numerous Quarterlies that are now trying to publish important research data pertaining to the entire field of Indology, every active researcher feels at times discouraged when the results of his painstaking research have to wait for months together before they become available in printed form to fellow-researchers in the field. We have no doubt, therefore, that there is still ample scope for the publication of a new journal appearing month after month to supplement and co-ordinate the useful work done by the Quarterlies in their own way. It is to fill in this gap and to provide a medium of expression for Research Scholars, be they in India, Asia, Europe or America, that the New Indian Antiquary comes into being.

The main feature of the New Indian Antiquary will be the presentation to the Scholarly World every month of scientifically written research articles dealing with all branches of Indology and Oriental Learning in fine artistic printing. It will embody all that is best in the existing Oriental Journals of the World and be indispensable for all serious research work in every department of Oriental Learning.

The New Indian Antiquary accepts for publication scientifically written research articles and critical reviews of books from Oriental Scholars in all parts of the world. All scholars, irrespective of nationality, are cordially invited to co-operate with the Editors in making the New Indian Antiquary an exhaustive and up-to-date record of research in Indology. The contributions may, if necessary, be accompanied by plates and diagrams; they should be normally written in English. In exceptional cases, however, contributions written in French or German will be accepted provided they are accompanied by short summaries of important results in English.

The Editors and Publishers are fully aware of the heavy responsibilities connected with a journal of this type, but they have willingly undertaken to shoulder them with the confidence that an enterprise designed to render disinterested service to the devotees of Learning is bound to succeed with the willing and active collaboration of the Scholars themselves.
Our first thanks are due to the Publishers who have shown courage and foresight in undertaking this new publication at a great sacrifice; nothing but a genuine desire to help scholarship has prompted them to shoulder this heavy responsibility. It is, therefore, the business of every scholar interested in Oriental Research to help them in all possible ways so as to ensure a steady and prosperous career for this new Journal on Indology.

The response to our Appeal has been very encouraging and we sincerely thank all those scholars who have readily contributed papers for inclusion in the *New Indian Antiquary*. The success of the Journal depends upon the active co-operation of scholars and we assure all of them of our readiness to collaborate for a common cause. Now that the *New Indian Antiquary* has commenced its career we hope that Indology will once more occupy an honoured place in the field of Oriental Learning.

Owing to the large number of papers received it has not been possible for us to include them all in this inaugural number. We crave the indulgence of the scholarly contributors in this matter; exigencies of time and space have determined the order of their appearance.

A word is necessary to explain the title of this journal. We all stand on the shoulders of our ancestors and in spite of our modern outlook and methodology the respect for these ancestors has a steadying influence on all our aspirations and achievements. We have, therefore, thought it advisable to name our new monthly journal by the title "*New Indian Antiquary*" in commemoration of the distinguished services of that journal to the cause of Oriental Research for over half a century.

P. K. Gode

S. M. Katre
THE BUDDHIST TANTRIC LITERATURE (SANSKRIT)
OF BENGAL

By S. K. DE

By far the most extensive literature which Bengal produced in the whole course of its literary history, and which has also an importance and interest of its own, concerns itself with the large number of Buddhist writers, whose works, however, are mostly lost in Sanskrit but are preserved in Tibetan translation in the *Bstan-hgyur*.

They flourished in Bengal under the Buddhist Pāla kings in the 10th and 11th centuries, or perhaps a little earlier. The works belong to the different Yānas which developed out of the Mahāyāna, and are loosely called Buddhist Tantra (*Rgyud*), as opposed to the Buddhist Sūtra (*Mdo*), inasmuch as they teach esoteric doctrines, rites and practices in a highly obscure, and perhaps symbolic, language. That Bengal had been pre-eminently a land of Buddhism even before the 7th century is known to us from the testimony of the Chinese pilgrims, who refer to the existence of Buddhist monasteries as centres of later Buddhist culture; but neither Yuan Chhwang nor Yi-tsing makes any reference to Buddhist Tantric.

1. Our account is chiefly based on P. Cordier, *Catalogue du Fonds Tibétain de la Bibliothèque Nationale* (*Bstan-hgyur I-LXX*), Part 2, *Rgyud Section*, Paris 1908. It is not clear if the originals were all written in Sanskrit; some of them were obviously in the Vernacular, and some are described obscurely as written in the Indian Language. The locality of the author and the place of translation are not always given. A good index (barring a few slips) of this volume of the Catalogue is given in H. P. Shastri, *Baudhka-Gān O Dohā* (Calcutta 1916), Appendix.—We have also made use of the works of Tāranātha (1608 A.D.) and Sumpā Mkhan-po (1747 A.D.) cited below. Other authorities are given below.—In matters of Tibetan sources we have received cordial assistance from Dr. Prabodh Chandra Bagchi.

2. See L. de la Vallée Poussin, Tantrism (Buddhist) in *Hasting's Encyclopaedia of Religion and Ethics*, xii, p. 195-96.

3. The Tantra itself was probably of foreign origin (H. P. Shastri, *Nepal Catalogue II*, Preface, p. xviii; P. C. Bagchi in *IHQ*, 1931, pp. 11); and it appears to have found a luxuriant soil in the northern, southern and eastern frontiers of India, the Madhyadeśa having been the seat of orthodox Brahmanical culture from a very early period.
ism, which could not have developed so early. Tāranātha tells us that during the reign of the Pāla kings there were many masters of magic, Mantra-Vajrācāryas, who being possessed of various Siddhis, performed miraculous feats; and his testimony of the prevalence of Buddhist Tantric culture is borne out by the hundreds of works produced on this subject, not a small part of which presumably belongs to Bengal. It was during this time that the monasteries of Nālanda, Vikramaśīla, Jagaddala, Somapuri and Pāṇḍubhūmi were renowned seats of Buddhist learning, with which the composition or translation of many of these Tantric works are associated. The second of the Vihāras named above, which is said to have been situated on the banks of the Ganges, most probably had its location, like that of Nālanda, in Magadha; but the other Vihāras, no less distinguished, were probably situated in some parts of Bengal, although their exact situation is a matter for speculation.

Many of these Vajrayānist writers and thaumaturgic Siddhācāryas of mediæval cults, whether directly Buddhist or indirectly of Buddhistic origin, belonged undoubtedly to the east and most probably to Bengal in these centuries. Some of them travelled beyond Bengal and were so transformed into deified or legendary figures that all trace of their place of origin and activity was obliterated. Although the descriptions are often insufficient or obscure, the Tibetan sources sometimes definitely mention the locality of some of these works and authors; and of them alone we can be reasonably certain that they belonged to Bengal. The question of chronology and provenance is further complicated by a curious conflict and confusion of traditions, both Indian and Tibetan. The chronology can in most cases be settled only roughly or relatively; and with regard to the problem of authorship or the

1. The high antiquity claimed for the Buddhist Tantra by Benoytosh Bhattacharya in his various writings can hardly be substantiated. No serious student of early Buddhism will agree that the Buddha gave instructions on Mudrā and Manjūśīla and incorporated Tantric practices into his system of religion. The Tantric works are found in late Tibetan translations which assign some of them definitely to the Pāla period; this is confirmed by the two chroniclers of Tibetan tradition, Tāranātha and Sumpā Mkhan-po; and no such work was translated into Chinese at an early period (see M. Winternitz in IHQ, 1933, pp. 8f, and Prabodh Chandra Bagchi in IHQ, 1930, pp. 576-77).

2. Tāranātha’s Geschichte des Buddhismus in Indien, aus dem Tibetischen übersetzt von A. Schiefner, St. Petersburg 1869, p. 201. — Tāranātha’s other work (trs. A. Grünwedel, Petrograd 1914) is cited below as Edelsteinmine.

3. Cordier, op. cit., ii, p. 29. The site of this Vihāra has been a matter of much speculation; see Cunningham in RAS, viii, p. 75 (identified with Silao; six miles north of Rājgir); JASB, 1909, pp. 7-12 (identified with Pāṭharghāṭa in the Colgong range, about 30 miles from Bhagalpur). We have evidence that it was patronised by the Pāla kings. On Somapuri, built by Devapāla, see Tāranātha, Geschichte, p. 209f.

4. A systematic chronology has been attempted by B. Bhattacharya in JBORS, 1928, pp. 341f, in Tattva-saṃgraha, pp. xvii and in Sādhanamālā, ii, p. xlii; but the available evidence is slender, and there is no agreement of the traditions concerning spiritual succession of these teachers, or their relationship to one another.
identity of particular authors still greater uncertainty prevails. As most of these cults overlap in point of time as well as in respect of doctrine and practice, there has been a tendency towards an appropriation, and sometimes a mutual assimilation, of teachers and their teaching through a curious syncretism of beliefs characteristic of mediæval popular faiths. Into these difficult problems our limited scope precludes us from entering in detail, but in the midst of such uncertainty and meagreness of decisive material it is necessary to present the question with a proper regard to the available data and avoid hasty conclusions and allegations on insufficient basis. In any case, the account we are presenting in the following pages should be taken as nothing more than tentative and necessarily imperfect.

For, apart from these handicaps, the available material is unfortunately too scanty for a full and systematic account of this literature. A glance at the catalogue of the Rgyud contained in Bstan-hgyur will show not only the variety but also the very large number of texts that were composed; but as they are preserved in Tibetan, they have been, so far, little studied, while even the very few which are available in Sanskrit have not all been published. Our knowledge of Vajra-yāna, as of other later Yānas, with which these works are concerned, is extremely limited. To realise and restore these works from Tibetan, therefore, had been found neither an easy nor always a safe task. They were meant, again, for a limited sectarian purpose and possess

1. This is true not only between the Mahāyāna and Vajra-yāna (or Mantra-yāna) but also between Vajra-yāna and Sahaja-siddhi. As Mantra-yāna and Vajrayāna grew out of Mahāyāna, the line of demarcation between a Mahāyānist and a Vajrayānist work is not fixed; for the former often contains Tantric ideas and practices of Vajrayāna, while the latter includes topics essentially Mahāyānist. Thus, Sāntideva's Śikṣā-samuccaya, an undoubtedly Mahāyānist work, contains unreserved praise of the use of the dhāraṇis (see ed. BENDALL, p. 140) and traces of other Tantric ideas (see WINTERNITZ, op. cit., ii, pp. 380, 387f). The Tibetan canon, no doubt distinguishes the Sūtra (Mdo) and the Tantra (Rgyud) and classify texts under these heads; but the Mdo and Rgyud very often overlap. At the same time, it is generally certain that works properly Tantric are hardly to be found outside Rgyud. We have in our account here proceeded on this assumption, especially with reference to the question of identity of the authors. On Sahaja-siddhi and Nātha cult see below.

2. An account of the different Buddhist Tantras is scattered throughout in the two works of Tāranātha. For modern exposition, see H. P. SHASTRI, Introd. to his ed. of Advaya-vajra-saṅgraha, GOS, x, Baroda 1927; B. BHATTACHARYA, Introd. to his editions of Sādhana-mālā, vol. ii, GOS xii, Baroda 1928 and of Guhya-sema, GOS liii, Baroda 1931, also his Two Vajrayāna Works, GOS xiv, Baroda 1929; his Origin and Development of Vajra-yāna in IHQ, 1927, pp. 733-46 and Glimpses of Vajra-yāna in Proc. Third Oriental Conf., p. 133f; M. SHAHIDULLAH, Les Chants mystique, Paris 1928, pp. 10f; for a more critical interpretation see WINTERNITZ, Hist. of Indian Lit. (Revised English trs.), ii, pp. 375-401; L. DE LA VALLÉE POUSSEIN, Tantrism (Buddhist) in ERE, xii, p. 193f (where some of the terms Sādhana, Vajra etc. are discussed), also his other works cited therein; P. C. BAGCHI in IHQ, 1930, pp. 567f and in his ed. of Koula-jñāna-nirñya, Calcutta 1934, pp. 33-59.
little that is of general or literary interest. Apart from their technical or esoteric
terminology, they are often written with an entire disregard for grammatical or
elegant expression. They never pretend to be academic, but declare\(^1\) that
their object is to be accessible without much grammatical or literary prepara-
tion. Most of these works consist either of Stotras of varying lengths to
Tārā, Avalokiteśvara, Mañjuśrī and other personages of later Buddhist pan-
theon, or of theurgic texts, called Sādhanas and Vidhis, of esoteric devotion,
doctrine and practice. Some of them are also texts of magical ritual or com-
pletely dedicated to magic, even to black magic. Nevertheless, with their
characteristic deities, Stotras and Saṃgītis, their Mantra, Mudrā and Maṇḍala,
and their Dhāraṇi, Yoga and Samādhi, they present a phase of Buddhist
Tantra, closely allied to the Brahmanical, which possesses considerable inter-
est and importance in the history of mediaeval religious cults. As such, they
have not yet received as much recognition as they fully deserve in the history,
at least, of the mediaeval culture of Bengal.

It is necessary to point out in this connexion that our extremely inade-
quate knowledge of the Buddhist Tantra should not give us freedom in elucidat-
ing its doctrines or pronouncing hasty judgments on its spirit and out-
look. Rajendra Lal Mitra\(^2\) in the last century spoke of the Buddhist Tantra
as reeking of “pestilent dogmas and practices”; and the opinion has ever
since been repeated in various forms.\(^3\) It is not our intention to enter into
the question here, but it must be said that, whatever may have been the
state of affairs in later times and in certain writers of the left-hand school,
there is nothing to support the view that the Vajra-yaṇa doctrines in their
origin encouraged sexual rites and obscenities.\(^4\) Magic, mysticism and theurgy

1. An interesting passage, quoted by H. P. Shastri (Descriptive Cat. of ASB
Mss. i, no. 67) from the Vimala-prabhā commentary on the Kālacakra-yaṇa, tells
us that Buddhist writers deliberately laid aside all rules and conventions of
Sanskrit grammar and prosody and wrote only with a view to the sense; and this
is certainly true in the case of most of these Tantric writings in Sanskrit. The
authors seem to take a pride in writing ungrammatical Sanskrit and ridicule those
who are fastidious about grammatical accuracy.


3. Haraprasad Shastri for instance, declares (Descriptive Cat. of ASB Mss
vol. i, preface) that the Tantra works discard asceticism and\(^b\) teach enjoyment of
the senses; Benoytosh Bhattacharya (Sādhana-mālā, ii, p. xxii, and also in other
writings) uses stronger language and stigmatises them as specimens of “the worst
immorality and sin”; while Moriz Winternitz (IHQ, 1933, pp. 3-4; more guard-
edly in Hist. of Ind. Lit., ii, pp. 398-99) is frankly puzzled at what appears to him
to be an “unsavoury mixture of mysticism, occult pseudo-science, magic and erotics”
couched in “strange and often filthy language”. While conceding that Buddhist
Tantrism is more than a pagan system of rites and sorcery, even a discerning and
well-informed critic like L. de la Vallée Poussin would attribute to it “disgusting
practices, both obscene and criminal”. Grünwedel’s attitude that the Buddhist
Tantra is all necromancy is similarly one-sided.

One requires scarcely to be reminded that Yuan Chwang (Watters, Yuan Chwang,
were undoubtedly at their basis, but it should be recognised that all Tantric works of the higher class, whether Buddhistic or Brahmanical, present their mystical doctrines in an equally mystical language, of which a literal understanding would be unwarranted and misleading. They speak of unknown methods and ideas of spiritual experience and employ esoteric expressions to signify unknown realities. The symbolical language is sometimes called Saṃdhābhāṣā, which being intentional (ābhiprāyika), is intended to convey something different from what is actually expressed. There is also an apparent sex-symbolism here, as in other mediæval religious systems, which expresses fervent spiritual longings or strange theological fancies in the intimate language and imagery of earthly passion. This mode of thought and expression, no doubt, borders dangerously upon sense-devotion and sexual emotionalism, but it is only an aspect of that erotic mysticism which is often inseparable from mediæval beliefs, and need not be taken as implying sexual licence.

A consideration of all this, however, belongs to the sphere of religious history and falls outside our province. On the other hand, some of these Buddhist writers were also regular logicians and philosophers, whose works deserve notice in the general literary history of Mahāyāna Buddhism. As very few of these writings, however, are preserved independently in Sanskrit and possess little literary interest, it will not be necessary for us to enter into details. We shall give here a general survey of the more important writers who in all probability belonged to Bengal and contributed materially in Sanskrit to the growth of the Buddhist literature both in its general and esoteric aspects.

As our concern here is with Buddhist Tantric literature, we need only refer to Candragomin the grammarian, who in all probability belonged to Bengal. But the Tibetan tradition does not distinguish him definitely from the Tantric Candragomin who is credited with thirty-six miscellaneous texts in the Bṣṭan-hgyur. They include not only mystic Stotras in praise of Tārā, Mañjuśrī and other personalites of later Buddhist hagiology, but also works on Tantric Abhīcāra (such as Abhīcāra-karman, Cāmi-dhvaṃśopāya, Bhaya-trāṇopāya, Vighna-nirūṣaka-pramathanopāya), as well as a few magical tracts apparently of a medical character (such as Ṣvāraṇaśa-viḍhī, Kuṣṭha-cikitsopāya)! The logician Candragomin, whose Nyāya-sidhyāloka also exists in Tibetan, is probably a different person.

ii, p. 165) refers to the high tone and austere lives of the Nālandā monks, which account is confirmed also by Yi-tsing who spent ten years at Nālandā. Moreover, the older traditions of Tantra literature in general hardly permit us to attribute obscenities to its practices.

1. V. BHATTACHARYA in IHQ, 1928, pp. 287f; P. C. BACCHI in IHQ, 1930, pp. 389ff for a whole chapter on Saṃdhā-bhāṣā in Hvaḍra-tantra; also M. SHAHIDULLAH, op. cit., pp. 9-10; P. C. BACCHI in IHQ, 1931, ff. 9f. EDGERTON (JAOS, 1937, pp. 185f) is of opinion that the Buddhist Sanskrit word Saṃdhā or Saṃdhi means “complete, comprehensive (and so) fundamental, essential meaning.”
The next important personage is the Mahāyānist scholar Śīlabhadra, the friend and teacher of Yuan Chwang, who mentions him¹ as one of the great monks who rendered good service to Buddhism by their lucid commentaries. Originally a Brahmin, he belonged to the royal family of Samataṭa and became a pupil of Dharmapāla at Nālanda, of which he subsequently became the head. None of his works, except Ārya-buddha-bhūmi-vyākhyāna preserved in Tibetan², has survived.

Of Śāntideva the problem of identity and provenance³ is more difficult. The Tantric Śāntideva to whom three Vajra-yāna texts are assigned in the Bstan-hgyur,⁴ is probably not identical with the well known Mahāyānist Śāntideva who was the author of Sīkṣā-samuccaya⁵ and Bodhicaryāvatāra.⁶ This earlier Mahāyānist teacher, Śāntideva, who probably belonged to the 7th century, came, according to Tāranātha,⁷ from the royal family of Saurāstra, was for a time a minister of king Pañcasimha and became a pupil of Jayadeva, the successor of Dharmapāla at Nālanda. The Tantric Śāntideva, on the other hand, belonged, according to the Bstan-hgyur,⁸ to Zahor, the identity of which place is obscure but which is sometimes located in Bengal.⁹

2. CORDIER, op. cit., iii, p. 365.
5. ed. C. BENDALL, Bibl. Buddhica, St. Petersburg 1902, and translated by BENDALL and W. H. D. ROUSE, London 1922. According to BENDALL, the work was translated into Tibetan between 816 and 838 A.D., but was probably written as early as the middle of the 7th century.
6. ed. I. P. MINAYEFF in Zapiski, iv, 1889 and JBTS, 1894. Prajñākaramati’s commentary (with the text), ed. LA VALLÉE POUSIN, Bibl. Ind., 1901-14. The text is translated by POUSIN, PARIS 1907, and in an abridged form by L. D. BARNETT, London 1909 (Wisdom of the East). A Sūtra-samuccaya is also ascribed to Śāntideva by Tāranātha (pp. 162f.); on this work see WINTERNITZ, Hist. of Ind. Lit. ii, Calcutta 1933, p. 366, note, and reference therein cited.
7. Geschichte, p. 162f. Sumpā Mkhon-po (p. xcix, 103) agrees with this account and states that Śāntideva was known in his boyhood as Śānti-varman, son of Kalyāṇa-varman, and that he became a minister of Pañcasimha, king of Magadhā. The fragment of a biography mentioned by SHASTRI (Descriptive Cat. of ASB Mss, i. p. 52, no. 9990/52; for a summary see IA, 1913, pp. 49-52, Baudhā-gān, pp. 9-11 and JBORS, 1919, pp. 501-05; the Ms dated c. 14th century) is apparently the work of a late Tantric writer and is of doubtful value; it mentions Mahājum-
varman as Śāntideva’s father.
8. CORDIER, loc. cit.
9. This place Zahor is conjectured in turns to be Lahore in the Punjab and Jessore in South Bengal (Sarat Chandra Das and WADDEL) and Sabhar in East Bengal (H. P. SHASTRI). The suggestion (IHQ, 1935, pp. 143-44) that Zahor was in Rādha is pure imagination. A. H. FRANCKE (Indian Tibet, ii, pp. 65, 89-90) would with great probability identify it with Mandi in North-western India (see BAGCHI in IHQ, 1930, pp. 581-82).
According to another tradition, Śāntideva had another name Bhusu (called also Rātu), but tradition is uncertain as to which Śāntideva is meant. It arises probably from a confusion with Bhusu, who is known as a Buddhist Tantric writer of Dohās in the vernacular, following the Bàṅgāli sub-sector of the Sahaja-siddhi, and who could not be, if he is a disciple of Dipāṃkara Śrījñāna, earlier than the 11th century. He may or may not be identical with Śānti-pā or Śānti-pāda, to whom also some vernacular Dohās are ascribed and who is described as a disciple of both Kṛṣṇācārya and Jālanādhara.

Evidence is equally inconclusive with regard to the identity and place of origin of Śānti- (or Śānta-) rāksīta, who is placed by the Tibetan tradition in the 8th century. According to Sumpā Mkhan-po he belonged to the royal family of Zahor, which, as we have noted, some scholars are inclined to locate, without much justification, in Bengal; but Bstan-hgyur, which gives three Tantric works under the name Sāntirāksīta is silent about his place of origin.

1. Sumpā Mkhan-po Yešes Dpal Hbyor, Dpags-bsam-ljon-bsun, ed. Sarat Chandra Das, with an Analytical Index in English, in 2 pts. Calcutta 1908, pt. i, pp. cxvii, 126. The tradition is given also in Shastri's fragmentary biography mentioned above. But Tāranātha (Geschichte, p. 249) believes that Bhūṣnikā (sic), whom he does not identify with Śāntideva, was a contemporary of Dipāṃkara Śrījñāna and therefore a much later teacher.

2. The eight Dohās assigned to Bhusu in the Caryācārya-viniścaya (included in H. P. Shastri's Baudhāga) are nos. 6, 21, 23, 27, 30, 41, 43 and 49. To him probably also belongs the Vajra-yāna work called Caturāddhavāna (H. P. Shastri, Descriptive Catalogue, i, p. 82; Ms dated in 1295 A.D.), which deals with some of the occupation of Tantric Buddhists and contains some vernacular Dohās.—On the language of the 47 Caryāpadas of the 22 authors included in the Caryācārya, see S. K. Chatterji, Origin and Development of the Bengali Language, Calcutta 1926, pp. 112f.; M. Shahidullah, op. cit., pp. 33f.

3. H. P Shastri, Baudhāga, introd. p. 12; this reference is said to indicate his Bengal origin. The Dohās also appear to be written in proto-Bengali. According to Grünwedel, Gesicht de Mahāsiddhas, p. 184), Bhusu belonged to the Kṣatriya caste, flourished in Nālanda in the time of Devapāla, and was known by the name of Śāntideva.


5. The Dohās in Caryācārya are: nos. 15 and 26.

6. To Śānti-pāda, who is also called Ratnakara-śānti, is ascribed Sukhandhaka-dvaya-parityāga-dīṣṭi in Bstan-hgyur (Cordier, ii, p. 235). A Sanskrit Dwibhūja-heruka-sādhana of his is published in Sādhana-mālā, ii, pp. 474-76. Tāranātha (Edelsteinmine pp. 105-06) describes Ratnakara-śānti or Śānti as a Brahman of Magadha who became an Ācārya of Vikramāśīla and preached for seven years in Śimhala. See Grünwedel, op. cit., pp. 156-58. To Ratnakara-śānti eighteen Tantric works are ascribed in Bstan-hgyur. A Chando-ratnakara by Ratnakara-śānti is noticed in JASB 1908, p. 595, as existing in the Tibetan version. (Sansk. text with Tibetan version, ed. Georg Huth, Berlin, 1890, Roman transl.).

7. op. cit., pp. xxix, 49, Sarat Chandra Das is here (see p. ci) uncertain about the location of Zahor, but in JBTS, i, 1893, p. 1f, he believes that Sāntarakṣita was a native of Gauḍa, which opinion has been repeated by Benoytosh Bhattacharya and others.

8. viz. Aṣṭa-tathāgata-stotra, Vajradhara-saṃgīta-bhagavat-stotra-ṭīkā and Hevajrodhava-kurukkulyāyāga Pāṇca-mahopadesa at Cordier, ii, pp. 11, 12, 93. He is also known as Ācārya Bodhisattva, to whom also four works, mostly on Saptatathāgata, are ascribed in Cordier, pp. 298, 368, 369.
origin. The Tibetan tradition, however, appears to centre round the Mahā-
yānist logician and scholar Śāntarakṣita; but he does not appear to be de-
initely distinguished from the Vajrayānist Tantric author, Śāntirakṣita, who
is connected with Padmasambhava of Uṣṇīṣa as his brother-in-law and
collaborator but who may or may not be the same person. The logician
Śāntarakṣita was a high priest and teacher at Nālanda and followed the Sva-
tantra Mādhya-māyika school. From this standpoint he reviewed with great
acuteness and scholarship the earlier philosophical systems, both Buddhist
and non-Buddhist, in his Tattva-saṅgahāra, which exists both in Sanskrit
and Tibetan, and on which his pupil Kamalaśīla wrote a commentary. He
also wrote Vāda-nīyā-vṛtti-vipaścitārtha and Madhyamakālaṃkāra-kārikā,
(the latter with his own commentary), which are available only in the
Tibetan version. His reputation must have travelled beyond the limits of
India, and he is said to have visited Tibet at the invitation of king Khri-
sron-ide-bstan and assisted him in building the first regular Buddhist monas-
tery of Bsām-ye on the model of the Odantapuri Vihāra of Magadha. He
is said to have worked for thirteen years in Tibet, and, along with Padmasa-
bhava and his own disciple Kamalaśīla, laid the foundation of Buddhism
in that country.

With regard to Jeta, the next important writer, the Tibetan tradition appears to distinguish a senior and junior sage of that name. The senior

1. WADDLE, Lamaism, London 1895, p. 379f. The name of the place Uṣṇī-
ṣa is also given in the forms Oṣṇīṣa, Oṣṇīṣa, Oḍyāṇa, and sometimes
as Oṛgyān or Oṛgyāṇa; but it has not yet been definitely located. B. BHATTACHARYA,
following H. P. SHAstry, would identify it with Orissa and draw far-reaching con-
clusions about Buddhist Tantric centres in Orissa. But this is only a conjecture;
and Orissa is often mentioned as Oḍiviṣa in the Tibetan works. In JBORS, 1928, p. 34,
however, B. BHATTACHARYA believes that the place was in Assam! There is great
probability in the identification proposed by Sylvain Lévi (JAS, 1915, p. 105f; see F.
W. THOMAS in JRAI, 1906, p. 461 note) with the Swat valley in North-western
India, the people of which, even in Yuan Chwang's time (WATTERS, i, p. 225), made
"the acquaintance of magical formulas their occupation." See the question dis-

2. ed. (in part) GOS, no. xxx-xxxi, Baroda 1926, (author called Śāntarakṣita)
with Kamalaśīla's commentary. Cf. M. WINTERNITZ in Indologia Pragensia i, 1929,
pp. 73f. A Vajrayāna work, Tattva-siddhi, is also mentioned by B. BHATTACHARYA,
but this may be by the other Śāntarakṣita or Śāntarakṣita.

3. There is no definite evidence that Kamalaśīla belonged to Bengal; but he
is said to have been a contemporary of Lui-pa.


5. Taranatha, Geschichte, pp. 204-5, 213. See WINTERNITZ, Hist. of Indian
Lit., ii, p. 375.

6. Sarat Chandra Das (JBTB, i, pp. 1-31) gives an account of Śāntarakṣita's
activities in Tibet. He is said to have visited Tibet in 743 A.D., erected the
monastery of Bsām-ye in 749 and died in 762 A.D. This has been accepted by
B. BHATTACHARYA (introd. to Tattva-saṅgahāra, p. xiv.) and Phanindranath Bose
(Indian Teachers of Buddhist Universities, Madras 1923, p. 124).

7. Taranatha, Geschichte, p. 230-33; Sumpa Mkhpan-po, op. cit., pp. xcvi,xxi,
or Mahā-Jetāri belonged to Varendra where his father Garbhapāda lived at the court of king Sanātana. He is said to have received from Mahāpāla the diploma of the Pañcīta of Vikramaśīla Vīhāra, and instructed Dīpamkara Śrījñāna in the Buddhist lore. The younger Jetāri was a Buddhist Tantric sage of Bengal, who initiated Bodhibhāgya and gave him the name Lāvanyavajra. It is possible that the three learned works on Buddhist logic, preserved in Tibetan, belonged to the senior Jetāri, while the junior Jetāri was responsible for eleven Vajrayānist Sādhanas also preserved in Tibetan.

Dīpamkara Śrījñāna, the alleged pupil of Jetāri, appears to have been a very industrious and prolific writer, to whom the Bstan-hgyur assigns about one hundred and sixty-eight works, of which a large number consists of translations. They are mostly Vajrayānist Sādhanas (Rgyud), but Sūtra (Mdo) works, also listed in the Bstan-hgyur under his name, presumably deal with the general doctrines of the Mahāyāna. H. P. Shastri is probably right in distinguishing two Dīpamkaras, but there might have been more Dīpamkaras than two. Of these, Dīpamkara Śrījñāna, who is also designated by the Tibetan title of Atiśa, belonged, according to the Tibetan tradition, to Bengal. Sumpā Mkhan-po informs us that Dīpamkara was a high

1. See Tāranātha, Geschichte, loc. cit. Sumpā Mkhan-po, however, believes that Jetāri was born of a Yogini whom Sanātana kept for Tantric practices.
5. The Rgyud section, according to M. Shahidullah's calculation, contains 95, Rgyud-hgrel 36 and Mdo-hgrel 36. Shastri's index of Cordier's summary of Rgyud-hgrel I-LXX gives over 100 tantric works, of which about 40 are translations.
6. On the characteristics of the Sādhana and of Vajrayāna literature in general see L. de la Vallée Poussin in ERE, loc. cit.; Winteritz, History, ii, pp. 387-92. Most of the published Sādhanas, as in B. Bhattacharya, Sādhana-mālā, 2 vols., GOS nos. xxvi, xli (1925, 1928); and elsewhere, are very short, but some are fairly long; they are generally written in indifferent Sanskrit prose, with verse Mantras, some being entirely in verse. On Dhāranis see the Winteritz, op. cit., pp. 380f. The Saṃgītis introduce the Buddha in an assembly of the faithful.
8. Besides Dīpamkara Śrījñāna, the Bstan-hgyur has preserved numerous works under the names Dīpamkara, Dīpamkara-candra, Dīpamkara-bhadra, and Dīpamkara-rakṣīta, who were probably not all identical. Dīpamkara-bhadra is mentioned also by Tāranātha (Geschichte, pp. 257, 264; Edelsteinmīne p. 95) as belonging to Western India. To Dīpamkara Śrījñāna Atiśa is also ascribed a Caryāgīti (Cordier, op. cit., p. 46).
10. op. cit., pp. xlii, 118; also pp. xxxvi, 95; Tāranātha, Geschichte, p. 243. Dīpamkara Śrījñāna also appears to have been connected with Somapuri Vīhāra, where he translated Madhyamaka-ratna-pradīpa of Bhāva-viveka (Cordier, iii, p. 299).
priest both at Vikramaśīla and Odantapuri, and that he was known also by the honorific epithet of Jovo (= Prabhu). He visited Tibet, lived, travelled, and worked there for some time, and the large bulk of his original and translated writings testify to the assistance he rendered not only in propagating Tantric Buddhism but also in rendering Indian works accessible in Tibetan.

Jñānaśrī-mitra, described as a central pillar of the Vikramaśīla Vihāra at the time of Canaka of Magadha, was born in Gauḍa. He first joined the Śrāvaka school, but afterwards became a Mahāyānist and came to Vikramaśīla about the time when Dipaṃkara Śrījñāna left for Tibet. He wrote a work on Buddhist logic, called Kārya-kāraṇa-bhāva-siddhi, which exists in Tibetan, and must have attained considerable reputation to be mentioned by Mādhava in the 14th century in his Sarva-dārśana-saṃgraha. He should be distinguished from Jñānaśrī, of whom ten Vajrayāna works exist in Tibetan.

Of the minor Buddhist writers, mostly Tantric, who in all probability flourished in Bengal during these centuries, it is not necessary to give a detailed account here; for their writings appear to be of the same character and possess no distinctive interest. Among these may be mentioned Abhayākara-gupta, who has more than twenty Vajrayānist works preserved in Tibetan, but four of these are also available in Sanskrit. He is described

1. Sarat Chandra Das in JBTS, i, pp. 46-53 supplies further information. Dipaṃkara Śrījñāna, according to him, was born in 980 A.D. He was the son of Kalyānaśrī and Prabhāvatī, and belonged to the royal family of Gauḍa at Vikramaśīlipura, east of Vajrāśana or Bodhi-Gaya (east of Magadha, according to H. P. Shastri in JBORS, 1919, p. 182). He went to Tibet from Vikramaśīla Vihāra by invitation in 1038, and worked there till his death at the age of 73 in 1053 A.D. (See JASB, 1889, p. 41, where Sumpā Mkhon-po’s chronological table gives 1053 A.D. as the date of Atiśa’s death at the age of 73.)—He must have travelled and preached widely in Tibet where traces of his activity are still to be seen all over Western Tibet (A. H. Francke, Indian Tibet, pt. i, pp. 50-52).


4. To Jñānaśrīmitra only one Tantric work, named Mūla-tantra-saṃgraha-hṛdayābhidhānottara-tantra-mūla-vṛtti, which appears to be a translation, is assigned in Cordier, ii, p. 30.

5. These are: Kāla-cakravatāra (Shastri, Descriptive Cat. of ASB Mss, i, p. 161; Ms dated 1125 A.D.), Paddhati commentary on Buddha-kapāla-tantra (ibid, pp. 163-64; Ms. finished at Vikramaśīla in the 25th year of Rāmapāla’s reign),  Vajrāvali-nāma-mandalopāyika (ibid, pp. 153-61 and Ucchusma-jambhala-sādhana (Shastri, Nepal Catalogue, II, p. 205; no. 152, in the Sādhana-saṃucchaya). Sumpā Mkhon-po, op. cit., pp. cxxxvii, 63, 112, 120, 121; Tāranātha, Geschichten, pp. 250f., Edelsteinmine, pp. 109f. Tāranātha believes that Abhayākara’s father was a Kṣatriya and his mother a Brāhmaṇī. He was well versed in the Hindu Sāstras and the Tantras of the Tīrthikas before he was converted, but studied Buddhist Tantra in Bengal later on. S. C. Das in JASB, 1882, pp. 16-18 gives a slightly different account from Tibetan sources. He states that Abhayākara was born in the middle of the 9th century in eastern India near Gauḍa, went to
as a Buddhist monk of “Baṅgala” born in a Kṣatriya family at Jharikhānda in Orissa; he flourished in the reign of Rāmapāla as Ācārya of Vajrāsana and Nālanda, becoming a high priest of Vikramaśīla, according to Sumpā Mkhan-po, at the time of Yakṣapāla’s dethronement by his minister Lavasena. Divākara-candra, described as belonging to Bengal in the Bstan-hgyur² which includes one Heruka-sādhana and two translations of his, was according to Sumpā Mkhan-po, a disciple of Maitri-pā lived in the reign of Nayapāla, but was driven away from Vikramaśīla by Dipanḍkara. Kumāra-candra, described³ as “an Avadhūta of the Vikramapuri Vihāra of Bengal in Eastern Magadha” is responsible for three Tantric Pañjikās (commentaries) preserved in Tibetan; while Kumāra-vajra, also described as belonging to Bengal, was mostly a translator, who has only one independent work on the Heruka-sādhana. Dānaśīla, similarly described as belonging to “Bhagala” in Eastern India⁴ and to the Jagaddala Vihāra in the east, is mentioned as a translator by Sampā Mkhan-po.⁵ He has about sixty Tantric translations in Tibetan to his credit, but there is also a brief Pustaka-pāthopāya⁶ translated by himself into Tibetan, on the mode of beginning the reading of a book. Putali (or Puttali), mentioned⁷ as a Buddhist Tantric sage of Bengal, wrote a Vajrayānist work on Bodhicittas; but Nāgabodhi (or

Magadha, became a priest of king Rāmapāla, and by his learning and other accomplishments came to preside over the Vikramaśīla Vihāra. He died before Rāmapāla abdicated in favour of his son Yakṣapāla, and was succeeded by Ratnākara-sānti at Vikramaśīla.—In two of his works noticed in Cordier (ii, pp. 71, 255) he is described as an inhabitant of Magadha. See IC, iii, pp. 369-72.

1. He appears to be different from Abhaya-paṇḍita to whom about 108 Tantric works are assigned in the Bstan-hgyur.


3. op. cit., pp. xlvii, 119, where the name is given as Devākara-candra. See Tāranātha, Geschicchte, p. 244.

4. A Pāka-viḍhi by Paṇḍita-sri-Divākara-candra is noticed in Shastri, Nepal Cat. II, pp. 43-44; cf. P. C. Bagchi, Dohi-kośa, p. 8 (colophon), where the Ms is dated in 1101 A.D. He is probably identical with Devākara-candra, also chiefly a translator (5 works in Tibetan), or Divākara (two translated works, Cordier, ii, p. 181), both of whom are described as Indian paṭhīyāyas (Cordier, pp. 176, 181, 217, 277); but he may be different from Divākara-vajra (4 works, Cordier pp. 47, 48 328, 329) who is described as a Mahābrāhmaṇa.

5. Cordier, op. cit., p. 160. For the works see pp. 73, 169.


7. Ibid, p. 188, also p. 63. Has Bhagala any connexion with modern Bhagalpur? Or is it another form of Bangala or Bhaṅgala by which Tāranātha and Sumpā Mkhan-po mean Bengal? Tāranātha (Geschichte, pp. 204, 226) believes that Dānaśīla was a Kashmirian, and lived in the time of Mahipāla of Bengal.


11. Sumpā Mkhan-po, op. cit., pp. lxiii, 130. He is regarded as one of the 84 Mahāśiddhas, who was a Śūdra of “Bhaṅgala” (Grünwedel, op. cit., p. 216).

Nāgabuddhi?), who is said\(^1\) to have been born “in Sīhṣera in Baṅgala” and who served (the later) Nāgārjuna as a disciple when he was working alchemy in Puṇḍravardhana, left thirteen Tantric works now preserved in *Bstan-hgyur*. It is not clear if Taṅkidāsa (or Daṅgadāsa)\(^2\) was a native of Bengal, but he is described as a Vṛddha-kāyastha and contemporary of Dharmapāla of Bengal; he wrote at the Paṇḍubhumī Vihāra a commentary called *Suviśade-sampaṭa* on the *Hevajra-tantra*. But Prajñāvarman, who is credited with two commentaries and two translations of Tantric texts, is distinctly assigned to Bengal.\(^3\) There are, however, some Buddhist Tantric writers who worked in Vihāras situated in eastern India; but there is no direct evidence that they were natives of Bengal. They are: Bodhibhadra of the Somapuri Vihāra\(^4\); Moksākaragupta, Vibhūticandra, and Subhākara\(^5\) of the Jagaddala Vihāra. Of these Moksākaragupta wrote a work on Logic called *Tarka-bhāṣā*,\(^6\) and may be identical with the commentator of the same name on the *Dohā-kōsa* in the vernacular.\(^7\) Vibhūticandra has a total of 23 Tantric works,\(^8\) of which 17 are translations, including translations of two works of Lui-pā. Similarly, Vanaratna, who is mostly a translator, is vaguely described in the *Bstan-hgyur*\(^9\) as belonging to Eastern India; but Sumpā Mkhan-po\(^10\) informs us that he visited Tibet from the monasteries of Koki land.\(^11\) Of some writers, again, we can infer their place of origin only indirectly from their works. Thus Kambala or Kambalāṃbara-pāda, to whom eight works chiefly on Heruka- (or Cakrasambara-) Sādhana are credited in

---

4. Ibid., pp. 98, 250; two works. He may be the same as Bodhibhadra of Vikramāśīla mentioned by Tāranātha (*Geschichte*, p. 259f).
11. For Buddhist Tantra in the eastern Koki land, see Tāranātha, *Geschichte*, p. 262.
Tibetan, wrote also a collection of Dohās, called *Kambala-Gitikā*, apparently in proto-Bengali, and one such Dohā (no. 8) occurs also in the *Caryācaryā*.

To this class belong several writers, but about some of them we have more definite information. These are Kukkuri-pāda, Śavari-pāda, Lui-pāda, Kṛṣṇa-pāda and others; but since these writers, to whom Vajrayānist works are credited in the *Bstan-hgyur*, are also counted among the 84 Siddhas and connected with popular Tantric cults, especially the Mahāmāya, the Yoginī-kaula and the Nātha cult, all of which possibly developed further out of Vajra-yāna and Mantra-yāna, it would be better to take them up separately.

With these so-called Siddhācāryas we enter upon a somewhat new phase of Bengal Tantrism, although most of these thauematurgists present a medley of doctrines, which had probably not yet crystallised themselves into well defined or sharply distinguished cults. The Vajra-yāna and Mantra-yāna, as offshoots of Mahāyāna, were never at any stage separated by any clear line of demarcation. The same remarks would apply to the various closely allied, perhaps concurrently existing, and presumably popular, cults which became associated with the names of the Siddhācāryas and the Nātha-gurus, and which (whatever might have been their origin) show a clear admixture of Buddhist ideas and claim as their teachers recognised expounders of Vajra-

1. See H. P. Shastri, *Buddha-gān*, introd., p. 27. (Only one of his Padas occurs in *Caryācaryā* (no. 8). On the legends of Kambala, who is counted as one of the 84 Siddhas, see GRÜNWEDEL, *op. cit.*, pp. 175-76. For his Vajra-yāna works see CORDIER, *op. cit.*, pp. 27, 36, 41, 81, 235, 287. He is described as the Guru of Prajñā-raķṣita (CORDIER, p. 41), who also wrote a number of works on Heruka or Cakr-sambhara Sādhana.

2. ed. H. P. Shastri in his *Buddha-gān*. Tāranātha (*Geschichte*, pp. 188, 191f, 275, 324, *Edelsteinmine*, p. 53f) connects Kambala with Uḍḍīyāna and associates him with Lalitavārja and Indrabhūti in the exposition of Hevajra-tantra. Sumpā Mkhan-po (*op. cit.*, pp. x, 90, 94), on the other hand, believes that Kambala was a contemporary of Āryadeva.

3. On the distinction, which however is not sharp, between Mantra-yāna and Vajra-yāna see WINTERNITZ *Hist. of Ind. Lit.*, ii, pp. 387-88.

4. With our present available materials the exact relationship of these various cults cannot be determined; but there can be no doubt that, whether Buddhistic or Brahmanical, they were intimately related, and their teachers figure indiscriminately in more cults than one.—In addition to the authorities cited above, all the Tibetan legends about the Mahāsiddhas or Siddhācāryas will be found in *Geschichte der vierachtzig Zauberer* (Mahāsiddhas), aus dem Tibetischen übersetzt von A. GRÜNWEDEL, in *Buessler Archiv*, Band v (Leipzig und Berlin 1916), pp. 137-228 (here cited as GRÜNWEDEL), and also Tāranātha’s *Edelsteinmine* aus dem Tibetischen übersetzt von A. GRÜNWEDEL, Petrograd 1914 (Bibliotheca Buddhica xviii).

5. The persuasions or sub-sects of Avadhūtī, Cāndālī, Dōmbī, Dākīnī etc. are strictly Buddhistic. They are sometimes included in the broad scope of Vajra-yāna or Mantra-yāna, but they are collectively known to Tāranātha as Sahaja-siddhi. The Nāthism is more complex, but Buddhistic affinity cannot be denied. Tāranātha calls the system of Matsyendra-nātha Upadeśa-yoga. There can be no doubt that all these systems emphasise some form of Yoga-practice; but it would be incorrect to say that they consisted of pure and simple necromancy, for the object was not Siddhis but Siddhi. The term Sahaja-yāna is used by some modern writers, but
yāna and Mantra-yāna. We have in consequence a curious confusion in the various traditions between the early teachers of the different but closely related cults. We have for instance, the traditions of more than one Šavara, Lui-pā, Saraha and Kṛṣṇa, just in the same way as we have traditions of more than one Sāntideva, Santiraksīta and Dīpankara; while Lui-pā has been equated with Mīna-nātha or Matsyendra-nātha, who is one of the acknowledged founders of both Yogini-kaula and Nāthism. The difficulty is here perhaps greater than that of distinguishing between Mahāyāna and Vajra-yāna writers where they might have been confused by similarity of names, and where the one system having developed out of the other, it was not inherently impossible for a Mahāyānist to be a Vajra-yānist. But in this case, as also sometimes in the other, it is not always possible to assume two or more sets of teachers having a common name or a common belief. Behind this confusion, therefore, one should presume a syncretic tendency, not unusual in the history of religious cults, to assimilate and identify the teachers of the different groups. This tendency must have been facilitated by the fact that these cults, collectively called Sahaja-siddhi, were not in their origin probably sharply differentiated, having developed under the same conditions and possibly out of the same source or sources. In the case of Nāthism especially, which was perhaps more popular than academic, this tendency of assimilating the recognised teachers of Buddhist Tantrism is not unintelligible. Whether the Nāthism in its origin was a form of Tantric Buddhism which transformed itself into Tantric Śaivism or whether the process was otherwise, need not be discussed here; but it is clear that it assimilated rites and tenets from various sources, its curious legends belonging to no regular order.\footnote{1} In the same way it appropriated, or rather assimilated its own Gurus to Vajrayānist teachers of repute, on the one hand, and to Śiva and his disciples, on the other.

One of the characteristics of Sahaja-siddhi is that it repudiates Mantra, Maṇḍala and other external means and modes of Vajra-yāna and Mantra-yāna, puts emphasis on Yogic practices and cultivation of mental powers, and, accepting their terminology, places different interpretations on such fundamental concepts as Vajra, Mudrā etc. The lands where this phase of Tantrism was the most wide-spread, and perhaps where it originated, were Bengal and Assam. Most of the teachers, therefore, belong to these countries, from which their teachings must have spread in divergent forms to Nepal and Tibet; but the traditions concerning them became overlaid, obscure and confusing, and their works present a medley of Buddhism and Hinduism. The religious aspect of the question is not our concern here, but we shall give a brief survey of the important works and authors connected with these cults.

---

it is hardly employed in the older works as the designation of a recognised Yāna. The later Sahajiyā cult of Bengal was undoubtedly connected with Sahaja-siddhi and the Nātha-yogi cult.

Kukkuri-pāṇa (or “pa), one of the eighty-four Siddhas, is mentioned by Tibetan tradition¹ as a Brahman of Bengal² who introduced Mantra-yāna (Heruka-sādhana) and other Tantras from the land of Dākinī. This somewhat obscure account probably refers specially to the introduction of the cult of Mahāmāyā, with which his name is traditionally associated, and which, judging from the titles of the works,³ appears to form the theme of at least three out of his six Tantric compositions in the Bstan-hgyur. He is also credited with two vernacular Dohās in the Caryācarya⁴ (nos. 2, 20).⁴ Another early Siddhācārya is Śavari-pāṇa, of whom it is recorded by Sumpā Mkhān-po⁵—that he was a huntsman of the hills of “Baṅgala”, who, with his two wives, Lokī and Guṇi, was converted by Nāgārjuna during the latter’s residence in that country. The Tibetan sources,⁶ again, place him as a contemporary of Lui-pāṇa, making him⁷ even a preceptor of Lui-pāṇa in Tantrism. Two vernacular Dohās of Śavari are also found in the Caryācarya⁸ (nos. 28, 50). It is probable, therefore, that he was connected with the new cults, although thirteen Vajrayānīst works are assigned to him in the Bstan-hgyur.⁹ He appears to be the same as Śavariśvara or Śavaraśvara,⁹ some of whose works in the Bstan-

1. Sumpā Mkhān-po, op. cit., pp. vi, 113, 135, 145. Tāranātha (Edelsteinmine, pp. 104f) adds that he taught the Tantras to Padma-vajra, from whom they were handed down in succession to Tilli, Nāro and Sānti! The strange name Kukkuri-pāṇa is explained by “Sumpā by the legend that Kukkuri-pāṇa united in Yoga in the Lumbini grove with a woman who was formerly a bitch. The same work (pp. vi, 108, 145) speaks of a Kukurādāsa (= Kukurājā?), also called Kukurācārya, as a Buddhist Tantric sage, adept in Yoga and a great preacher, who was a lover of dogs.

2. Tāranātha, Geschichte, p. 275. According to GRÜNWEDEL, op. cit., p. 176 Kukkuri was a Brahman of the eastern land of Kapilaśakru.

3. One of these, Mahāmāyā-sādhana-pāṭika is available in Sanskrit in Sādhana-mālā, ii, pp. 466-68 (no. 240).

4. He is probably identical, as CORDIER suggests (p. 109, 110), with Kukurājā or Kuku-rajā, of whom eight Tantric texts on various deities (Vajrasattva, Vairocana, Heruka etc.) are given in the Bstan-hgyur. This perhaps confirms Sumpā Mkhān-po’s statement that he introduced various kinds of Tantra. See Tāranātha, Geschichte, pp. 188-89.

5. op. cit., pp. cxxi, 90. Elsewhere (pp. cxxi, 124) it is said that Śavari belonged to the hill tribe called Śavara. In Tāranātha the name is given as Savari. The legends of Savari, who is counted as one of the 84 Siddhas, are given in GRÜNWEDEL, op. cit., pp. 149-50.

6. See P. C. BAGCHI, introd. to Kaula-jñāna⁹, p. 27.

7. Sumpā Mkhān-po, op. cit., pp. 124, 135; Tāranātha, Edelsteinmine, pp. 20, 23. The relationship of the earlier Siddhas to one another in spiritual lineage is differently given in different traditional accounts. Their chronology, therefore, depending on their mutual relationship, is equally uncertain. On the question of the confusion of Savari, Mahāśavara and Saraha, see below under Saraha.

8. CORDIER, op. cit., pp. 57, 58, 128, 198, 235, 296, 335, 326. Some are available in Sanskrit also, e.g., in Sādhana-mālā, ii. pp. 384-88 (Siddha-śavara), 456 (ibid).

9. CORDIER, op. cit., pp. 21, 55, 56, 224, 248. But he is probably different from Mahāśavara, by which name Saraha (Rāhulabhadra) is also known (CORDIER, pp. 221, 248, also p. 39). See below.
hgyur are concerned with Vajra-yogini Sādhana, which king Indrabhūti of Odyañ and his sister Laksīrṇkara made popular.¹

But the most important name of this group is perhaps that of Lui-pā. He is credited with five Vajrayānist works in the Bstan-hgyur,² of which one, called Abhisamaya-vibhaṅga, is said to have been revealed by him directly to Dipamkara Śrījñāna in order that (according to the colophon to the text)³ the latter might help its Tibetan translation. He was, therefore, in all probability an older contemporary of Dipamkara and belonged to the beginning of the 10th century.⁴ Two of his vernacular Dohās are given in the Cāryācaryā⁵ (nos. 1, 29), but H. P. Shastri⁶ speaks of an entire collection called Luipāda-Gitikā. It is through these vernacular Dohās that he probably became one of the earliest founders of the Tantric religion found in the Dohā-kośas. The Tibetan tradition mentions him as the Ādi-siddha, thus making him occupy the same position as the Indian tradition would ascribe to Mina-nātha or Matsyendra-nātha. It has been pointed out that the Tibetan translation of the name Lui-pā means Matsyodara or Matsyāntrāda⁷; and Sūmā Mkhān-po⁸ makes him, as the Indian tradition makes Matsyendra-nātha, a sage of the fisherman

---

1. Advaya-vajra, who belonged to Savara-sampradāya (Cordier, p. 45) has a very large number of works assigned to him in the Bstan-hgyur, but some of his works are also available in Sanskrit. Twenty-two small Vajrayānist tracts of his are edited by H. P. Shastri in the Advayavajra-samgraha. Also in Sādhana-mālā, i, p. 47; ii, pp. 424-490. His other name or title, Avadhūtā-pāda or Avadhūti-pāda probably indicates his connexion with the Avadhūti sect of Sahaja-siddha, and this appears to be supported by his commentaries on the Dohā-kośa (ed. P. C. Bagchi, Journal of the Dept. of Letters, Cal. Univ. (JLCU), 1935). Excepting his connexion with the Savara-sampradāya, there is no direct evidence that he belonged to Bengal. One Advaya-vajra, however, without the title Avadhūta, but called a Brahman, appears to have come from Bengal! (Cordier, p. 250).


3. M. Shahidullah, op. cit., p. 19, would explain the colophon differently, while H. P. Shastri thinks that Dipamkara helped Lui-pā in writing this work. But see P. C. Bagchi, Kaula-jñāna⁹, introd., p. 28.

4. M. Shahidullah (op. cit., p. 21 f), following Sylvain Lévi and Tāranātha, would place him much earlier in the 7th century. From Marāṭhi sources Matsyendra-nātha's date would be the end of the 12th century (see S. K. Chatterji, op. cit., p. 122; D. R. Bhandarkar in IC, i, pp. 723-24). But see Bagchi, loc. cit., for a criticism of these views. The approximate dates assigned by B. A. Sakepole to Ādi-nātha, Gorakṣa-nātha and others from South Indian tradition (Poona Orientalis, vol. i, No. 4, pp. 16-22) do not conflict with our tentative chronology.

5. His Tattva-svabhāva-dohākośa-gitikā-dṛṣṭi (Cordier, i, p. 230) is the same as Dohā no. 29; see IHQ, 1927, p. 676f.


8. op. cit., pp. 124, 135.
caste. The Tibetan sources, again, place Lui-Pāda in Bengal, while all the Indian legends of Matsyendra-nātha are connected with the sea-board of eastern India. The published Sanskrit texts of the school claim Matsyendra-nātha as the founder of the Yogini-kaula system, while Tāranātha (Geschichte, p. 257f) believes that Lui-pā introduced the Yogini cult. On these, among other grounds Lui-pā has been equated with Matsyendra-nātha, the legendary fisherman of Candradvīpa, who is the starting point of a new system of Tantric thought and practice, connected with the Yogini-kaula, Ḥaṭha-yoga and Nātha cult of East Bengal and Kāmarūpa. Even if the identification is not accepted, it will certainly strengthen the suggestion made above of the tendency towards syncretic assimilation of the teachers of the various cults.

The homage paid by the Kashmirian Abhinavagupta in his Tantrāloka would place Matsyendra-nātha earlier than the beginning of the 11th century; and if he is identical with Lui-pāda his probable date would be the beginning of the 10th century. As the reputed founder of the new school of Sahaja-siddhi, he is connected with a series of teachers, whose writings are preserved mostly in the Apabhramśa and the vernacular, and who, as such, properly fall outside our province. But in its earlier stages the Sahaja-siddhi represented by these teachers start apparently as a deviation from the Vajra-yāna and Mantrayāna; while in these cults are to be found the source of the Nātha cult, which calls itself Śaivite but which shows greater affinity with the Buddhist than with the Brahmanical Tantra. All the reputed Siddhäcāryas are, therefore, found credited with Vajrayānist works in the Bstan-hgyur. The only exception is perhaps Matsyendra-nātha, if he is not the same person as Lui-pāda; but we have a work on the Bodhicitta by Maṇi-pāda, who is described as an ancestor of Matsyendra-nātha. The cult must have been introduced early into Tibet and Nepal, where Matsyendra-nātha came to be identified with Avalokiteśvara.

1. That most of the teachers of these cults belonged to lower-castes (probably an indication of their Buddhist origin) is suggested by the names as well as the legends. Cf. the names Jālamḍhara (fisherman), Tānti-pā (weaver), Hāḍ-pā (sweeper), Tili-pā or Teli-pā (oilman), etc.

2. Cordier, op. cit., p. 33. But Sumpā Mkhān-po makes him (p. cxli) an employee of the king of Udḍiyāna; while Tāranātha (Edelsteinmine p. 20) makes him a scribe of Sāmantaśūba, king of Udyaṇa in the West. See on this point, P. C. Bagchi, IHQ, 1930, p. 583. H. P. Shastri (JBORS, 1919, p. 509) informs us that Lui-pā is even now worshipped in Rādha and Mymensing. Wassiljev (note to Tāranātha, Geschichte, p. 319) states that Lui-pā was born in Ujjayini, while according to GRUNWEDEL, loc. cit., he lived under Indrapāla at Sāliputra in Magadhā. In Tāranātha’s opinion Lui-pā was a contemporary of Asaṅga.

3. The equation was first suggested by GRUNWEDEL (loc. cit.); Cordier (p. 33) would not accept the identification. See also Lévi, Le Népal (Paris 1905), i, p. 353, note 4. Tāranātha (Edelsteinmine, p. 120 f) distinguishes Lui-pā from Mīna, but he also distinguishes between Mīna and Macchindra.

4. ed. Kashmir Sanskrit Texts, Allahabad 1918, i, 7 (vol. i, p. 25). In spite of conflict in the legendary accounts the names Mīna-nātha and Matsyendra-nātha belong probably to the same person.

5. Cordier, op. cit., p. 237; the work is named Bāhyāntara-bodhicitta-bandhopadeśa.
while in India his apotheosis occurred by his assimilation to Śiva. There are some works, however, which profess to have been revealed (avatārita) by Matsyendra-nātha. Five of these texts written in Sanskrit have been published from old Nepali manuscripts; and if the manuscript of the principal longest text, entitled Kaula-ñāna-nīrṇaya, belongs to the 11th century (as its editor maintains), it must be taken as the earliest known work of the school. According to this work, Matsyendra-nātha belonged to the Siddha or Siddhāṁṛta sect, primarily connected with the Yogini-kaula, the chief seat of which was Kāmarūpa. Although the word Kula in Brahmānical Tantra is often synonymous with Śakti, it is undoubtedly related here to the five Kulas of the Buddhist Tantra, representing the five Dhyāni-Buddhas; while the word Sahaja is equated with Vajra as a state to be attained by a method of Yoga called Vajra-yoga. There is thus a very considerable admixture of Buddhist Tantric ideas and practices with those of the Brahmānical Tantra.

The next great Siddha of the school is Gorakṣa-nātha, who is given in most of the accounts as a disciple of Matsyendra-nātha. The legends, which must have originated in Bengal and spread in divergent forms to Nepal, Tibet, Hindustan, the Punjab, Gujarat and Mahārāṣṭra, connect him and other Nātha-gurus with the Gopīcānd legend, with the Yogī sect of the Punjab and the Nātha-yogis of Bengal. Perhaps he did not, as some of the legends suggest, strictly conform to the traditions of the Mantra-yāna, and it is no wonder that in Nepal and Tibet he is considered to be a renegade, whose Yogīs passed from Buddhism to Saivism simply to please their heretic rulers and gain political favour. Of Gorakṣa-nātha no work has been found, unless he is

1. For a résumé of the legends of Matsyendra-nātha see P. C. Bagchi in IHQ, 1930, pp. 178-81, and in the work cited below. The Yogini-kaula cult must have been closely connected with Haṭha-yoga; for some of the Āsanas and Mudrās in Haṭha-yoga are expressly named after Matsyendra-nātha, and its tradition claims him as the first teacher of Haṭha-yoga after Adi-nātha (i.e. Śiva). In the Tantra-sāra of Kṛṣṇānanda (15th century), Maṇa-nātha or Matsyendra-nātha is connected with the worship of Tārā.


3. For an able treatment of the legend in its various forms, see Gopal Haldar in the work already cited. On Gorakṣa-nātha as a defied protector of cattle see JLCU, xiv, p. 16f.

4. S. Lévi, Le Népal, i, p. 355f; Tāranātha, Geschichte, p. 255. H. P. Shastri, Bauddha-gān, p. 16. Gorakṣa has been identified with (Note to Tāranātha, p. 323), Anāngavajra, but this may be an instance of the attempt to assimilate him to the well known Vajrayānist writer Anāṅgavajra, who was a disciple of Padmavajra and preceptor of Indrabhūti of Udḍīyāna. This Gorakṣa may be the Gorakṣa mentioned in the Bstan-hgyur.

5. A Sanskrit Jñāna-kārikā, in three Paṭalas, said to have been revealed by Gorakṣa-nātha (?), is mentioned by Shastri in Nepal Catalogue I, pp. 79-90; this has been included by P. C. Bagchi in the work cited above, where the name of the teacher occurs (p. 122) as Mahā-macchindra-pāda and not as Gorakṣa-nātha. A Sanskrit Gorakṣa-samkhīta of late quasi-Hindu origin is supposed to embody his teachings. Also a Gorakṣa-siddhānta, ed. Gopinath Kaviraj (Pt. I), Sarasvati Bh. Texts, Benares 1925—a work probably of the same school. The vernacular produc-
identical with the Gorakṣa of the *Bstan-khyur*, who is responsible for one Buddhist Tantric work. If his alleged disciple Jālamḍhari- (or Jālamḍhara-) pāda, who figures in the legends as the Guru of Gopičāṇḍ, is the same person as Mahācārya Mahāpaṇḍita Jālamḍhara, Ācārya Jālamḍhari or Siddhācārya Jālamḍhari-pāda of the *Bstan-khyur*, then he might be taken as the author of four Vajra-yāna works, including a commentary, called *Suddhi-vajra-pradīpa*, on *Hevajra-sādhana*, the original being assigned to Saroruha-vajra.

To the other Siddhācāryas of the Sahaja-siddhi, some of whom are also Gurus of the Nātha cult, numerous Buddhist Tantric works are assigned in the *Bstan-khyur*. Both Indian and Tibetan traditions make Virūpa a disciple of Jālamḍhari; but the latter tradition also appears to mention more than one Buddhist Tantric sage of that name, of whom a junior and a senior Virūpa are distinguished. One of these Virūpas was born in the east at “Tripura” (Tipperah?) during the reign of Devapāla. The distinction, however, is not clear in the *Bstan-khyur*, but it ascribes twelve Vajra-yāna works to Ācārya or Mahācārya Virūpa, and two collections of apparently vernacular Dohās and Padas (Virūpa-padasacaturāśiti and Dohā-kośa) to Mahāyogin or Yogisvara Virūya.

1. Called Vāyu-tattva-bhāvanopadeśa (CORDIER, op. cit., p. 237). To his alleged disciple Caurāṅgin also is ascribed a work of the same name.

2. Jālamḍhari or Jālamḍhara is sometimes mentioned as a disciple of Indrabhūti of Udḍiyāna, while some popular legends identify him with Hādi-pā of the Gopičāṇḍ story. According to GRÜNWEDEL, op. cit., p. 189, Jālamḍhari was a Brahman of Thaṭa land, while Tāranātha (Geschichte, p. 195) makes him a contemporary and preceptor of Kṛṣṇācārya, and connects him (Edelsteinmine, p. 62f) with the Gopičāṇḍ legend of Bengal. His real name according to Tāranātha and Sumpā Mkhanpo, was Śiddha Bālapāda, but he was called the sage of Jālamḍhara, a place between Nepal and Kashmir, where he lived for sometime. The Nagarā Thaṭa was in Śindhu, where Jālamḍhara was born in a family of Śūdra merchants. He visited Udṛyāna, Nepal, Āvanti and Cātigrāma in Bengal, in which last place Gopičāṇḍ, son of Vimalacandra, was the king. See JASB, 1898, p. 22.


4. CORDIER, op. cit., pp. 78, 75.


6. Ibid, pp. lxxii, 102, 104, 109, 112. Tāranātha (Geschichte, p. 162f) makes the senior Virūpa a disciple of Jayadeva Paṇḍita (successor of Dharma-pāla) and fellow-student of Sāntideva at Nālanda. He mentions the junior Virūpa (p. 205) as a Siddhācārya. Virūpa is connected with various forms of Vajra-yāna Śādhana and mentioned as the preceptor of the Śiddha Dombi-Heruka. Elsewhere Tāranātha (Edelsteinmine, p. 31) believes that Virūpa appeared thrice in this world. According to CORDIER (ii, p. 30) and GRÜNWEDEL (op. cit., pp. 147-48), Dombi-Heruka was a Kṣatriya king of Magadh and exponent of Hevajra-siddhi (8 works in Bstan-khyur). See Tāranātha Edelsteinmine, pp. 34-35.

7. Sumpā Mkhanpo, loc. cit, GRÜNWEDEL, op. cit., p. 145.

8. CORDIER, op. cit., p. 233, H. P. SHASTRI (Bauddha-gān, introd., p. 28) adds two others, viz., Virūpa-Gitikā and Virūpa-Vajra-gitikā. But are these Pada-collections or Samāgītis? One Dohā of Virūpa occurs in the Caryācārya8 (no. 3). For his Vajra-yāna works see CORDIER, ii, pp. 57, 125, 176, 177, 182, 223, 224, 230.

tions of the Gorakṣa school are of very late origin, and it would not be critical to assign any of them directly to the teacher.
Tilo-pā or Tailika-pāda, another Siddhācārya, is made by Tibetan sources a contemporary of Mahāpāla of Bengal; and one of these traditions makes him a Brahman of Tsātigāon (Chittagong?), who was converted under the name of Prajñābhadra. Besides four Vajra-yāna works, a Dohā-kośa of his is preserved in Tibetan. Tilo-pā’s disciple Nāro-pā or Nāḍo-pā is also assimilated to well known Buddhist Varjra-yāna teachers. He is said to have succeeded Jetārī as the north-door Pandit of Vikramaśila as an adept in the Buddhist Agama, and left the monastery in the charge of Dīpankara in his seventieth year to become the high priest of Vajrāsana (Bodhi-Gaya). One account makes him son of king Śākya Subhaśānti-varman of the east (Prācyā), while another believes that he was the son of a Kashmirian Brahman, and became a Brahmanical Tirthika Paṇḍita and then a Buddhist Siddha under the religious name of Jñānasiddhi or Yaśobhadra. As he appears to be identical with Nāḍa, described in the Bstan-hgyur as Śrī-mahāmudrācārya, and with Nāḍa-pāda, described in the same work as Mahācārya, Mahāpāṇḍita and Mahāyogin, he should be credited with five Vajra-yāna Sādhanas, of some of which concern Heruka and Hevajra, as well as two Vajra-gītis and a Paṇḍita on Vajrapada-sāra-saṃgraha, which last work, it may be noted, was undertaken at the request of Vinayāsri-mitra, a Bhikṣu of Kanakastūpa Mahāvihāra of Paṭṭikera in Kashmir.

1. The name is given in various forms: Tili, Tili-pā, Tili-pa, Tilla-pa, Tila-pā, Til-lo-pā, Tailo-pā, Telo-pā, Tell-pā, Teli-yogi. It is explained by Sumpā Mkhan-po, fancifully, by the legend of his having joined in Yoga with Yogini, who used to subsist in her early life by pounding sesame (tila)! Did he belong to the Teli caste?


3. Cordier, op. cit., p. 43, assigns a Sahaja work alternately to Tailika-pāda aias Prajñābhadra. It is possible that all these teachers had a popular name, as well as a Buddhist devotional name. There is another Siddhācārya Tailika-pāda (Cordier, p. 79) who hailed from Oḍyāna. According to Grünwedel, op. cit., p. 170, Tilo-pā lived in Viṣṇunagara and attained Mahāmudrā-siddhi.


5. Sumpā Mkhan-po, op. cit., pp. lv, 18, 45, 115, 117 (called Nāro-pā). On pp. lxvii, 118 the name of the place where Nāro-pā practised Tantra is given as Phullahari to the west of Magadha. According to Grünwedel, op. cit., p. 168, Nāro was by caste a wine-seller, and lived in Sālaputra in East India. Tāranātha (Geschichte, pp. 239f, 244f, 249, 328; Edelsteinmire, p. 74f) believes that he was a Kashmirian Brahman, and agrees with Sumpā Mkhan-po in his account of this sage.

6. Cordier, pp. 16, 68, 70, 87, 92, 97, 125, 130, 132, 238. G. Tucci (JRAI, 1935, p. 677) speaks of a work of Nāro-pā which he discovered in Nepal; it is a Sanskrit text, entitled Sekoddesa-tikā, on initiation according to Kālacakra. In Grünwedel, op. cit., p. 168, Nāro, Nāro-pā, Nāḍa-pāda and Nāro-pā appear to be the same person, who was also known as Jñānasidhir or Yaśobhadra.


8. Cordier, op. cit., p. 68. This might refer to the Nāḍa-pāda of Kashmirian origin.
Another important Siddhācārya is Kṛṣṇa or Kṛṣṇa-pāda, known also in the Prakrit form of the name as Kaṇha or Kaṁhu-pā. There must have been, as H. P. SHASTRI rightly conjectures, several Kṛṣṇas or Kaṇhas. The Bstan-hgyur mentions a senior Kṛṣṇa,\(^1\) a Brahman Kṛṣṇa from Oḍyāna who was a translator,\(^2\) as well as a Kṛṣṇācārya or Kṛṣṇa-pādācārya and a Kṛṣṇa-vajra.\(^3\) One Indian Kṛṣṇa, again, wrote at Somapūrī Vihāra\(^4\) which was probably situated in Bengal. It is difficult to say which of these authors\(^5\) should be connected with Kṛṣṇācārya or Kaṇha-pā of the Sahaja-siddhi and the Nātha cult, who is regarded as a disciple of Jālamdhari-pā. According to Tāranātha, Kṛṣṇācārya, disciple of Jālamdhara, belonged to Pādyanagara or Vidyānagara in the Southern country of Kaṇa; but another Tibetan account\(^6\) informs us that his birth-place, as well as place of conversion, was Somapūrī. Eleven vernacular Dohās are given in the Cāryācārya\(^7\) under the names Kāṇhu, Kṛṣṇācārya-pāda, Kṛṣṇa-pāda and Kṛṣṇa-vajra,\(^8\) as well as cited under one or other of these names in its Sanskrit commentary. A Dohākośa in Apabhraṃśa by Kṛṣṇācārya also exists in the original and has been published.\(^9\)

1. CORDIER, p. 159, called Mahāmahopādhyāya ; the junior Kṛṣṇa is mentioned at p. 82.
2. Ibid, p. 82. Sumpā Mkhan-po (pp. v, 110) mentions Kaṇha as a Buddhist Tantric sage who was born in a Brahman family in Orissa (Oḍyān ?) and was initiated by Jālamdhara ; see also pp. lvii, 135, where the name is given as Kaṇha or Kaṁhāyā.
3. CORDIER, op. cit., p. 227, where he is called a Mahāyogin and a Dohā-kośa is assigned to him. He may be the same as our author. Also see pp. 94, 101. Altogether three works are mentioned under his name by CORDIER.
4. Ibid., p. 166.
5. To them altogether 69 Buddhist Tantric works are ascribed in Bstan-hgyur. Under the name Kṛṣṇa with the alias Kaṇhapāda we have 16 works. Some of these have been preserved also in Sanskrit in Nepal, e.g. Vasanta-tilaka (CORDIER, p. 38; Kṛṣṇa) = the same in SHASTRI’S Nepal Catalogue II, p. 199 (incomplete), Kurukullā-sādhana (CORDIER, p. 94; Kṛṣṇa-Vajra) = the same in Sādhana-samuccaya (Nepal Catalogue II, p. 201) = the same Sādhana-mālā, pp. 372-78, Yoga-raṭāmālā Panjikā on Hevajra (CORDIER, p. 67; Kṛṣṇa or Kaṇhapāda) = the same in Nepal Catalogue II, p. 44; SHASTRI, Descriptive Cat. i, p. 114.
6. Edelsteinmine, p. 69. M. SHAHIDULLAH takes it to be Orissa. Tāranātha in his Geschichte distinguishes between a senior (pp. 195, 197) and junior (pp. 211, 234, 244, 258, 275) Kṛṣṇācārya. The junior, in his opinion, was responsible for Tantra works on Sambara, Hevajra and Yamāntaka; he belonged to the Brahman caste and was also a writer of Dohās.
8. Kāṇhu, nos. 7, 9, 40, 42, 45; Kṛṣṇācārya-pāda, no. 11, 36; Kṛṣṇapāda, Nos. 12, 13 (? ) 19; Kṛṣṇa-vajra no. 18. In no. 36 Jālamdhari is mentioned with respect as a master. S. K. CHATTERJI (op. cit., pp. 120-22) identifies Kṛṣṇācārya with Kāṇhu-pāda.
The problem of the identity of Saraha or Saraha-pāda, the next important teacher, whose other name is given as Rāhulabhadra, is equally difficult. Sumpā Mkhā-n-po\(^1\) describes him as a ‘Brahman Buddhist sage,’ born of a Brahman and a Dākini in the city of Rājña in the eastern country. He was well versed in both Brahmanical and Buddhistic learning and flourished in the reign of Candana-pāla. He is said to have converted Ratnapāla and his ministers and Brahmanas, and to have become the high priest of Nālandā. He learnt the Mantra-yāna from Chove Sukalpa of Ōdiviśa (Orissa), but afterwards visited Mahārāṣṭra where he united in Yoga with a Yojini who approached him in the guise of an archer’s daughter. After having performed the Mahāmudrā with her he became a Siddha and went by the name of Saraha. It is also recorded that he used to sing Dohās of Tantric Buddhism as a means of conversion. In the *Bstan-hgyur* there are about twenty-five Tantric works assigned to him,\(^2\) including more than half a dozen concerned with Dohākośa-giti and Caryā-giti.\(^3\) An Apabhramśa *Dohā-kośa* (with a Sanskrit commentary\(^4\)), connected with his name, has been published; and four of his Dohās occur in *Caryācarya*\(^5\) (nos. 22, 32, 38, 39) where he is called Saraha-pāda. Cordier is probably right\(^6\) in his suggestion that there were several Sarahas, who are described in the *Bstan-hgyur* variously as Mahābrāhmaṇa, Mahācārya, Mahāyogin or Yogīśvara, as belonging to Oḍḍiyāna,\(^7\) and also as Mahāśāvara\(^8\) and once as a descendant of Kṛṣṇa\(^9\) but it is difficult to distinguish them. Tāranātha, however, distinguishes two Sarahas, one of whom, the junior, was otherwise called Sabari,\(^10\) while the other was named Rāhula-

---

the Cambridge University Library Ms of the *Hevajra-paṇḍikā* by Paṇḍitācārya Śrī-kṛṣṇa-pāda is dated in the 39th year of Govinda-pāla (=c. 1199 A.D.), presuming our author’s identity with this Kṛṣṇa-pāda.

1. *op. cit.*, pp. xxvii, 84, 85, also pp. xxxiii, 84; GRÜNWEDEL, *op. cit.*, pp. 150-51.

2. One Vajrayānist Sanskrit text of Saraha-pāda’s is given in Sādhana-mālā, i, p. 79. Another in Sādhana-samuccaya, 176.


5. Then commentator Advaya-vajra calls his author Saroja-vajra, Saroruha and Saroruha-vajra. This Advaya-vajra is probably a later writer, different from the Vajrayānist author of the same name, who is also called Avadhūtā-pāda. He belonged to Sarideśa in Bengal (CORDIER, pp. 232-250).—Saroruha is distinguished from Saraha by Tāranātha in both his works.


7. *Ibid.*, p. 375. Tāranātha (*Edelsteinmine*, p. 10) believes that Rāhulabhadra, with whom he identifies the younger Saraha, was born in Oḍdiviśa. He makes Lui-pā a disciple of this sage.


bhadra. It is likely that the Siddhācārya Saraha, to whom the Dohās can be legitimately ascribed, was a different person from Saraha-Rāhulabhadra, the Vajrayānist author of the Sādhanas, and that both are to be distinguished from Sarorua-vajra, also called Padma-vajra, who is known in the history of Buddhist Tantrism as one of the pioneers of Hevajra-tantra and as the Guru and Paramaguru respectively of Anahgavajra and Indrabhūti of Odḍiyāna.

Of those minor personalities of this group, who probably belonged to the east, only a brief mention may be made here. It is not clear, if all of them belonged to Bengal. Garbhari-pāda or Garbha-pāda, popularly called Gābhur Siddha, wrote a work on Hevajra and a Vajra-yāna commentary; Kila-pāda described as a descendant of Lui-pāda, is credited with a Dohā-caryāgiti-kārakṛṣṭi; Amitābha commented upon the Dohā-kosā of Kṛṣṇa-vajra; Karmāri, Karmāra or Kamari, a descendant of Virūpa, was the author of one Vajra-yāna work; Viṇāpāda, also a descendant of Virūpa, but described as a Kṣatriya prince of Ghahura who was fond of the Viṇā, wrote three works on Vajradākini and Tantric initiation, as well as one Dohā (no. 17) given in the Caryācaryā; Kańkaṇa, a descendant of Kambara-pā, composed one Dohā to be found in the Caryācaryā (no. 44) and a Caryā-dohā-kosā-giti-kā; Dārika or Dāri-pāda, also a Mahāśiddha, variously described as a disciple of Lui-pā and Nārō-pā, was responsible for twelve Vajra-yāna works in the Bstan-hgyur and one Dohā in the Caryācaryā (no. 34); and Dharmapāda (also called Gunḍari-pāda), a descendant of Kṛṣṇa, has three Vajra-yāna works in the Bstan-hgyur and two Dohās in the Caryācaryā (Nos. 4, 41). None of their works, except the Apabhramśa Dohās mentioned, is available in print; they exist only in Tibetan.

1. Tāranātha, Geschichts, pp. 66, 73, 105. Rāhulabhadra is given as an alias of Saraha in Cordier, op. cit., p. 64 (Vajrayogini-sādhanas).
2. Cordier, op. cit., p. 255; he is probably the same as Garvari-pāda, p. 78.
3. One work each in Cordier.
4. Ibid., p. 234. Called also Kila-pā or Kirava. According to Grünwedel, op. cit., p. 208f, he belonged to the royal family of Grahara.
6. Ibid., p. 241, (Soma-sūrya-bandhanopāya). Grünwedel, op. cit., p. 188, informs us that Karmāra was a blacksmith of Sāliputra in Magadha, and was also known as Kamari.
8. SUMPĀ MKHAN-PO, pp. ccxviii, 125.
9. Cordier, op. cit., p. 231. On the legends of Kańkaṇa, who is counted as one of the Mahāśiddhas, see Grünwedel, op. cit., pp. 174-75.
11. Baudhā-gan, introd. p. 27. He is probably different from Dharmadāsa mentioned by SUMPĀ MKHAN-PO (op. cit., pp. xxxiv, 99), who was born in Bāṅgala and who became a disciple of Ārya Amazona and Vasumitra, travelling in many countries and erecting a temple to Mahājñuhaṣa.
12. Cordier, op. cit., p. 241. Also Taranātha, Geschichts, pp. 127, 177, 249, 278; Grünwedel, op. cit., p. 215. He is said to have belonged to Sāliputra in the time of Indrapāla. Dharmapa, according to Grünwedel, op. cit., p. 190, was a Brahman of Bodhinagara.
SOUTHERN INDIA, ARABIA AND AFRICA

By

K. A. NILKANTA SASTRI

The progress of modern research renders it more and more evident that in ancient times India was deriving the full advantage of her central position in Southern Asia, and that she maintained a more or less active contact with the prosperous and powerful nations that lay on either side of her. The linguistic studies of SCHMIDT, Sylvain LÉVI, PRZYLUSKI and others, pace the challenge of HAVESY, have brought out the pre-historic connections between Munda-speaking races of India and the Moi-Khmer and Indonesian groups. RONKEL has devoted a number of interesting memoirs to demonstrating the presence of strong South Indian influences in the languages of the Malay peninsula and Archipelago. And the conclusions of linguistics are being reinforced by pre-historic archaeology—witness Stein CALLENFELDS and Heine GELDERN, and by Ethnography—HORNELL, RIVET and others. The rôle of the different parts of India in the different stages of the historical period in contributing to development of culture in Farther India is being progressively unfolded by the combined efforts of the archaeologists working in the various parts of what was once ‘India beyond the Ganges’. In another direction much new light has been thrown on the connections between India and Central Asia on the one side, and Iran and Mesopotamia on the other, thanks to the several Central Asian expeditions and the labours of the Archæological Survey of India. The discoveries in Mesopotamia and Iran are of particular interest as likely to necessitate a radical revision of many current notions. The relations of India with the Roman Empire have been studied in considerable detail by CHARLESWORTH, WARMINGTON and the contributors to the Cambridge Ancient History. It is the aim of this paper to bring together the results so far attained on some of the most interesting aspects of the interrelations among the lands bordering on the Arabian Sea, and the Western half of the Indian Ocean, though we cannot, as will become clear presently, altogether keep the Eastern half out of our view.

First we may notice a recent and authoritative view of the probable racial relations between Southern India and South Arabia. "The enigma of modern Anthropology," says Sir Arthur KEITH in his remarkable Appendix (on The Racial Characters of Southern Arabs) to Bertram THOMAS' Arabia Felix, "is the Black Belt of mankind. It commences in Africa and peters out amongst the natives of the Melanesian islands of the Pacific." The Negro peoples at each extremity of this wide area could not have evolved independently of each other, and KEITH explains their present position by assuming a continuous belt of proto-Negroids which spread at one time across all the inter-
vening lands; from them arose in course of time the Hamitic peoples of Africa and their cousins, the Dravidian and brown-skinned peoples of India. He also draws attention to the pronounced Dravidian features among some of the South Arabian tribes, especially the children, which raise the question of their eastern connections and the nature of such connections. These tribes may have had an eastern origin, or they may constitute the remnants of a once common aboriginal population, traces of which have been obscured by later waves of migration; or, finally, the Dravidians of South India may contain elements representing an early trade migration from Persia or an adjacent country along the Persian Gulf to India. Trade relations between Mesopotamia and the North-west of India in the fourth millennium B.C. are known to have existed. Some of these might have been by sea, and might have extended to South India.

This suggestion of possible trade and culture connections between Mesopotamia and Southern India gains support from the striking parallels noticeable in the religious practices of early Mesopotamia and Southern India. The worship of the Mother-Goddess under the name ‘Lady of the Mountain’, and the annual celebration of her nuptials with the Moon-God of Ur1 closely resemble the Indian worship of Pārvatī in her various forms and the annual celebration of the Tirukkaliyāṇam (Divine marriage) in South Indian Śiva temples; in fact, the resemblance is so close, that, in spite of the absence of any direct proof of connection, it is difficult for us to believe that it is an accidental coincidence. Again, the nature of the worship offered in the temples of ancient Sumeria and the organisation of the temple itself have much in common with what can even now be seen in the great South Indian temples, exception being made of the changes that naturally flowed from the increasing aversion to meat-eating among the higher classes in India. “The essence of worship,” says Leonard Woolley,2 “was sacrifice, and by the ritual of sacrifice the cooked flesh of the animal was shared between the god, his priests and the worshipper; the kitchen was therefore not the least important part of the temple, and at all times of the day the fires would be burning and the priests would be overseeing the slaves who carried on the work of butchers, bakers, scullions and cooks.” It may be noted in this connection that the numerous mediaeval inscriptions of Southern India bear abundant testimony to the readiness of the people to enrol themselves as the slaves of a neighbouring temple and bind their descendants also to the same status. Again, what can be more accurate as a description of the spirit and form of worship in Indian temple of to-day, of the rājopacāra offered to the image of god, than this description by Woolley, of the worship in the Sumarian temple3: “Where the god was also the king, where church and state were so nearly synonymous,4 material efficiency was only too likely to get

3. Ibid.
4. ‘Kōyil’ in Tamil means both the temple and the royal palace.
the better of faith. Long life and well-being in this world was the reward men asked in return for formal service such as they might have rendered to a human overlord, and they regarded the wealth and prosperity of the Moon-god as a pledge for the welfare of the city." Hindu temples have often been taken to derive many of their features, structural and other, from Buddhist caityas and vihāras; but it seems quite possible that, on the other hand, the temple preceded the caitya and vihāra in India. Morphologically, the modern South Indian temple and its worship stand in much closer relation to early Sumerian temple and its worship than to the Buddhist institutions. And the attempt, often made, to trace the chief features of Hindu temple architecture to earlier Buddhist forms will strike the critical student as somewhat forced and unconvincing. The fact is that among the surviving monuments of India, the earliest ones happen to belong to Buddhism, and Hindu monuments come later in point of time. But this by no means warrants the assumption that the latter are derived from the former. The only logical conclusion would be that for some reason or other, the Indian Buddhists were the first to erect the more durable monuments of stone, and the Hindus followed suit. Let us not also forget this. Hinduism has had a much longer and more continuous history in India than Buddhism, and Hindu monuments have often suffered several renovations and reconstructions with the result that only relatively recent forms of these have survived. It seems very probable that the Hindu temple, like Hinduism itself, preceded Buddhism in India; and that even in those early days in South India it had features similar to those of Sumerian temples.

It is more difficult to speak with any confidence on the evidential value of the house shrine, and the common features exhibited by it in South India and Sumeria; for house chapels of one form or another are well nigh universal in their spread. But even here Woolley's observations on the Sumerian domestic chapel cannot fail to recall to the mind of a South Indian reader much that he finds in his own familiar surroundings to this day. Behind the guest chamber in every house there was a long narrow room, the chapel for the worship of household gods; it had only one floor, part open to the sky; near it was also the burial ground of the family, a foot or two below the brick pavement of the room.  

It is worth noting also that the Amazonite beads found in the ruins of Ur must have come from the Nilgiri hills of South India.  

The lines of evidence so far indicated date from a time so long anterior to the Hebrew kingdom of Solomon, that the evidence of South Indian connections with the West drawn from the references in his reign to Ophir and Tharshish, to ivory, apes and peacocks 3 is seen to be only a link in a more or less continuous chain of data suggesting such connections for long ages.

1. Ibid., pp. 211-16.  
2. Ibid. p. 121.  
3. I. Kings 10. 11, 12 and 22.
before and after. The recent attempts of philologists to discount the probative value of these references in I Kings thus loses much of its sting; and in any case the probability of very early maritime connections of Southern India with the West now rests on much broader grounds than the occurrence of a few words of doubtfully Tamil origin in one of the books of the Old Testament.

Another line of maritime contacts enjoyed by South India in very early times emerges from the study of the spread of cultural elements of Indonesian origin. There are many elements in the material culture of East Africa which can be accounted for only on the assumption of Indonesian contact. Much in the designs of canoes and huts prevalent in East Africa and Madagascar, and the use of the cocoanut scraper among the Swahili are instances in point. "To these have new to be added," says James Hornell; "instances from the geographical distribution of the flat bar zither, wind rattles, the bell-mouthed clarionet, fishing weirs, a string game or figure, and of certain kinds of coloured glass beads. It may also be that certain architectural features of the Rhodesian stone-built ruins of the Zimbabwe type are to be referred to the imitative skill of Bantu builders who had seen the religious (? Buddhist) buildings of Indonesian settlers at some port on the coast."

Hornell continues: "The evidence afforded by a close study of canoe and ship structure consists of: (a) the close resemblance which exists between the design of the outrigger canoes of the East African coast and those of Madagascar and North coast of Java; (b) the probability that the mtepe type of sailing coaster of the Swahili coast is a relic of an Indonesian type bereft of its outriggers; and (c) the exceptional design of certain large canoes used on Victoria Nyanza, which embodies features peculiar to the vessels of Java and Madura and has no parallel elsewhere in Africa."

The language of the Madagascar islanders belongs to the Malayo-Polynesian group, and has close affinity with Kawi or old Javanese; and the Eastern and Central tribes of Madagascar are of Mongolid extraction, though on the coast facing Africa they are definitely Negroid, and of Bantu origin; as the Bantu are never known to have been sailors, they were most probably brought over as prisoners or slaves from the opposite coast; at any rate their numbers were apparently sufficient to produce a mixture of Bantu words in archaic Malagasy, but not large enough for them to retain their own idiom. We have references to Zengi slaves from Africa introduced into China by the Sumatrans and Javanese from the eighth century A.D. onwards.

It is thus clear that Madagascar and East Africa fell under very marked Indonesian influences from the Malay Archipelago at one time. Regarding the route followed by these early population movements, Hornell rightly points out that with the kind of ships the Indonesians are known to have used, it would not have been possible for them to cut from Sumatra or Java across

1. JRAI, 1934, pp. 318-19.
the whole width of the Indian Ocean to Madagascar; with no compass and no polestar, the way would easily have been missed on any plan of direct ocean sailing. The route must have been mainly coastwise. The routes recorded by later Arab merchants and geographers also support this view. "All the probabilities point to the voyages of Indonesians from Sumatra and Java to Madagascar as having been performed in stages via South India and the Arabian coast in the earlier waves of migration, probably under the pilotage of Indian navigators. In later times, a direct course may have been shaped to Madagascar from the Indian coast during the period of the North-east monsoon."1

As evidence of Indonesian contacts with Southern India, HUTTON cites the use, among the Panaiyans of the Wynad, Coorg and the Malabar Ghats, of a typically Indonesian method of making fire, the employment in the Travancore hills of an Indonesian snare of the 'scissors' type, and an obsolete crescent shaped mother of pearl ornament formerly used by the Nāyāḍis and now preserved in a specimen in the Cochin Museum.2 Again, some of the Sumatran settlers seem to have settled in Sind from very early times, and become famous as mercenary soldiers of high quality, under the name of Sayābigas, a name which betrays their true origin from Sābag, Zābag or Jāvaka, as Sumatra was then called. They are found on the shores of the Persian Gulf before the rise of Islam, and it is possible that they owed their settlements on the Persian Gulf to the early Persian invasions of the Northwest of India. "The Sayābiga then," says FERRAND,3 "are the descendants of ancient Sumatran emigrants to India, then to Irāk and the Persian Gulf where there is evidence of their existence before Islam."

The presence of the boomerang in Gujerat is another piece of evidence confirming the line of movement suggested so far. And RIVET has argued that the distribution of the ornamental oculi in the prows of modern boats and of the boomerang may be taken to mark the route of the Indonesian migration. From India, he says, the boomerang seems to have reached Sumer, and thence by the nomads of the North Arab deserts to Mount Sinai, Egypt and Palestine. It appears in Egypt c 3500 B.C., and then spreads in Africa, where it gives rise to the throwing knife (werfmesser), and in prehistoric and protohistoric Europe.4

But it must be stated that the date of this Indonesian migration by way of India to Africa and Madagascar has been differently estimated by different writers. From the linguistic data drawn from the Malagasy language, FERRAND reaches the conclusion that the Sumatran colonisation of Madagascar took place during the period from the second to the fourth century A.D. or a little earlier. HORNELL is inclined to push the date a little further back. He5

1. JRAI. 1934, p. 315.
5. JRAI. loc. cit.
points out that the coconut is first mentioned in the *Mahāvamsa* in B.C. 118, its milk being used in the preparation of cement used in the building of the Ruanwelle dagoba at Anurādhapura, and must have come from Indonesia to Ceylon and South India about this time. The first colonisation of Madagascar, he concludes, may be put soon after, in the next succeeding century or two. Other writers are inclined to suggest still earlier dates, and the decision really turns on the question whether the migration to Madagascar is held to have taken place after the Hinduisation of Java and Sumatra or before it.

The evidence and the present state of opinion on the subject of this migration cannot be better summed up than by Krom, and no apology is needed for offering here a translation of a long extract from his *Hindoe-Indische Geschiedenis*. He says: "That from time immemorial there have been many more migratory movements that have taken place by land and sea across Southern Asia and the Archipelago than was believed at one time, and that their mutual relations are much more complicated than appeared at first sight, is rendered more and more probable with research in other fields becoming deeper and more many-sided. Attention deserves to be drawn to one remarkable fact. In a study of the boat designs of India and the neighbouring lands Hornell comes to the conclusion that the Archipelago was the home of a peculiar kind of boat which is provided with wings for the sake of stability. There are outrigger-canoes with one wing and those with two wings, and it is remarkable that the single outrigger canoe is found all over the West (West coast of Sumatra, etc.) and the East of the Archipelago, while in between these regions lies the area of the double outrigger canoe (which is also found in Madagascar). According to Hornell, the single wing model must have belonged to the original population, whom he calls Negritos or Proto-Polynesians; and the Indonesians coming from Indo-China must have spread themselves among them in a fan-shaped expansion, and by these the double-wing type must have been developed. But most interesting is what the author has noticed in South India where clear physical similarities to the people of the Archipelago occur among some castes. Among the Paravars, pearl-fishers of the Gulf of Manar from one old, the single outrigger canoe is in use (the oldest sources mention this), and these people must then be the remnants of a great Polynesian movement towards the West. Moreover the caste of Shanars exhibits particular agreement with the Indonesians from an anthropological viewpoint; they have no concern with sea-faring (and cannot therefore settle the problem with the double outrigger canoe) but with coconut cultivation which is not indigenous to India and must have been introduced there from the Archipelago by way of Ceylon: the Shanars must thus be the remnants of a second stream from East to West, later than the arrival of the Indonesians.

"These evidences may not be found very striking, but the view that

there lies behind them more than a bare possibility, is strengthened by the researches of Sylvain Lévi. They lead him to ask what the Austroasiatic culture, which has left behind traces among the Muñdas, could have contributed politically and socially to the later Indian culture. By the side of this we may doubtless place the question how far the ancestors of the Indonesians were involved in the evolution of what in historical times came to be known as the Hindu culture of India proper. There is every probability that when the Indians set forth to colonise the East, they did not strike a new path, but did the reverse of what in the remote past the sailors of another race from the East had done...

"We must consider one other question, regarding which opinion differs as to whether we have to deal with a fact of prehistory or whether it occurred after the Hindu colonisation. It relates to Madagascar. We have already mentioned the prevalence here of the double outrigger canoe, which might have been introduced by the Indonesians; that these came to Madagascar and that Malagasy is an Austronesian speech will not be questioned by anybody. But the question is, when the migration must have taken place, and as direct historical data regarding this are totally lacking in Madagascar also, we have to depend exclusively on the evidence of language. This contains a number of words of Sanskrit origin, and according as one lays stress on the fact of their presence or on the smallness of their number, one may infer that Madagascar was colonised by Hinduised or non-Hinduised Indonesians. The first opinion has found a convinced supporter in Ferrand, the second is that of Granddier. From any one who has not studied Malagasy, no verdict will be expected in this matter; but we would express our opinion that the words cited by Ferrand in comparison with the Sanskrit element in the Indonesian speeches of the Hinduised part of the Archipelago, make a somewhat poor impression, and it is not clear how the geographical situation of Madagascar to which this author appeals can be the cause of the Indonesian colonists allowing a much smaller supply of Sanskrit words to enter their speech than they themselves employed. It seems to us therefore much more probable that the speech brought to Madagascar was Indonesian without Sanskrit, such as we have to postulate for Java and Sumatra also before the arrival of the Hindus, and that in the Malagasy language which grew out of this imported speech, Sanskrit words were due to later intercourse which continued between the Archipelago and Madagascar after the Hindu colonisation of the former; and with this agrees the report of Edrisi that in his time (1154) both parties can understand each other's speech. The first voyages of the Indonesians towards the Far West, however, and the so-called

1. *Histoire physique, naturelle et politique de Madagascar*, IV (1908), pp. 10 and 75ff. Before the beginning of the Christian era, the Melanesians and others came from the East of the Archipelago, while the ruling class was derived from the historical Javanese immigration of the 16th century—Krom.

2. Strictly the reference is to the people of East Africa, but according to Ferrand the Malagasies are meant—Krom.
colonisation of the island must, in our opinion, have occurred before the arrival of the Hindus in the Archipelago, and are connected with the movements to India proper of which we have spoken above."

It is thus clear that according to Krom there was a marked wave of Indonesian migration across Southern India towards Madagascar in prehistorical times before the formation and spread of Indo-Aryan culture towards the East.¹

Before leaving this early Indonesian movement to the West, mention must be made of the interesting account of the foundation of Aden given by Ibn Al-Mujawir, an Arab writer of the early thirteenth century (1223 A.D.). He says:² "When the empire of the Pharoahs fell, this place (Aden) became deserted as a result of the decline of the (Egyptian) empire. The peninsula (of Aden) was inhabited by fishermen who fished in this place. They lived there for quite a long time, with the resources they found there, being provided by Allah with the material necessaries of life. (This lasted) till the arrival of the people of Al-Komr in boats with a great number of people (besides the sailors). They took possession of the peninsula (of Aden), expelled the fishermen on the peak of the Red Mountain, the Hukkat and the Djabal-al-Manzar. It is a mountain which commands the buildings of the port. The monuments raised by these people still exist, and their constructions are durable, being built of stone, and cement coming from the valleys and mountains of this country.

"The poet has said: I weep much, because their houses are empty now. The leader of their camels is gone. My heart is full of sadness. I stop where they lived dreaming and thinking of them and asking: 'O houses! have you any news of them? Answer me quick.' I was answered from their houses with lamentations and cries of—'I bewail the race, O careless one! The caravans are gone now. I have among them a mistress, perfect in every way. On her cheek and in her waist one saw the rose and the creeper.'

"(The people of Al Komr) left Al-Komr for reaching Aden, sailing in company and in a single monsoon. Ibn Al-Mujawir says that these people are dead, that their power has come to an end, and that the route which they

1. In his recent work Suvarṇadvīpa, p. 23, Prof. R. C. Majumdar expresses the view that it is more reasonable to explain the linguistic facts observed by Ferrand in Madagascar by supposing a common centre in India, from which the streams of colonisation proceeded towards the East as well as towards the West, than by supposing that Hindu colonists first settled in Malaysia and then turned back to colonise Madagascar. It will be seen, however, that Krom's view shows that the two alternatives given by Prof. Majumdar by no means exhaust the possibilities. In a region where speculation has admittedly to be based on very meagre data, there is necessarily room for much difference of opinion. Personally I feel that it is difficult to differ from or improve upon Krom's statement of the case. I may add that on the terms Malabar and Malaya, there is room for other views than those cited by Prof. Majumdar at pp. 19-22 of his excellent work mentioned above.

took is closed. At present there is no one who knows of the maritime voyages of this people, none who could tell how they lived and what they did.

"Section. Ibn Al-Mujawir says: From Aden to Mogadiso it takes one monsoon (to effect the voyage); from Mogadiso to Kilwa is a second monsoon, and from Kilwa to Al-Komr, a third. The people (of Al-Komr) have combined these three monsoons into a single one. A ship from Al-Komr reached Aden (directly) by this route in the year 626 (of the Hegira—1228-1229). They set sail at the time of departure from Al-Komr with Kilwa as their destination, but anchored on the contrary at Aden. The ships (of the people of Al-Komr) have outriggers, because the seas near Al-Komr are narrow, dangerous and shallow. When this people (of Al-Komr which had conquered Aden) lost its power and the Barabar came there, the latter attacked and chased them from Aden. They occupied the country and established themselves in the valley, at the spot where we now find mat huts."

FERRAND points out that in the first passage, Ibn Al-Mujawir refers, like his contemporary Ibn Sa’id, to the Western migration of the Indonesians, and that the second passage has reference to conditions of contemporary navigation between Madagascar and Aden. He also holds that Komr in the first passage refers to the original country from which the Malagasy people came, viz., Western Indonesia, and that the voyage said to have been effected in one monsoon must have comprised the last part of their journey, viz., that from South India to Aden. These old Indonesian voyages leading to the colonisation of Aden and of Madagascar FERRAND is inclined to place about the beginning of the Christian era, while KROM would put them much earlier as already stated. The mention of outrigger canoes in the second passage is also worthy of note.¹

The trade-relations between Southern India and the Roman empire have been very well studied by different authors, and there is no need to repeat here facts generally well known and established on authentic contemporary sources. There were two routes taken by the traffic between East and West: one, an older route from the head of the Persian Gulf along the Euphrates to the Syrian and Arabian coast; and a later, and in some respects more advantageous route, was that from the East coast of Egypt to the Nile. This latter commanded a stream better suited to navigation and involved a shorter land transport. "Not twenty ships in the year," observed a writer in the reign of Augustus, "ventured forth under the Ptolemies from the Arabian Gulf; now 120 merchantmen annually sail to India from the port of Myos Hormos alone."² Then came the discovery of Hippalus, "the pilot who by observing the location of the ports and the conditions of the sea, first discovered how to lay his course straight across the ocean."² Arabia also took part in this

2. MOMMSEN, *The Provinces of the Roman Empire*, ii, pp. 278-84.
trade, and 'in the houses of rank in India,' as Mommsen said1 'Arabian wine was drunk alongside the Falerian from Italy and the Laodicene from Syria; and the lances and shoe-makers' awls which the natives of the coast of Malabar purchased from the foreign traders were manufactured at Muzza.'

The rise of the kingdom of Aksum on the ruins of the kingdom of Meroë in the first half of the first century A.D. and the consequent increase in the importance of Adulis, the chief port of Aksum, appear to have opened the way for the penetration of South Indian influences in this part of the East African coast. Soon after Nero's time, Aksum was the neighbour of the Roman Empire in the south in North Africa, and had contact with Roman territory in Arabia across the straits. The relations between Aksum and the Roman Empire and the aim of Nero's policy in this direction have been the subject of an interesting discussion in recent years. It has been suggested that Nero aimed at safeguarding 'the commercial interests of the empire by securing the decaying Meroitic Kingdom against the encroachment of the expanding Aksumite kingdom of Abyssinia, which threatened to monopolize the African ivory trade,' and obstruct the direct trade route to India. Others have held that this theory will hardly bear close scrutiny.2 However that may be, we may be sure that the rise of Aksum and its chief port Adulis carried one stage further a process that had already been at work for a long time. From the earliest times Egyptians had traded with East Africa, and in Hellenistic and Ptolemaic times, they developed, as we have noted before, direct sea communications with India in competition with those of the Selucid land routes. "Under Augustus," says Mommsen, "the Egyptian commercial traffic increased not less with these African harbours than with India." And the Aksumite kingdom itself was subject to cultural influences from two sides: Hellenistic influences flowing from the north and easily traced in the coinage and epigraphy of the period and Indian Influences from across the sea. The latter have been studied specially by Enno Littmann in a paper, *Indien and Abessinien*, published in 1926 in the *Jacobi Commemoration Volume*.

Littman points out that the Portuguese found a colony of Indian merchants in Massua when they sought Abyssinian connections towards the close of the middle ages. And to-day there are many baniyas on the East African coast up to Madagascar, playing a prominent part in the trade of the ports of East Africa, and in Addis Abeba when any trade is possible there. And he argues that the high material culture of the kingdom of Aksum must have owed something in earlier times to the spiritual elements of Indian origin which then spread over the whole of the civilised world. It is possible that numeral signs were borrowed from India, and though little can now be traced directly to Indian influences in the realm of fairy tales, still it is not improbable that some narratives from Indian merchants started a more or less independent development along similar lines in Africa, or at least gave a fillip

to it. Indian influence, especially South Indian influence, can be traced more clearly, according to Littmann, in the rock-cut shrines of Lalibala and elsewhere.¹

Littmann discusses at some length the loan words of Indian origin found in the Abyssinian vocabulary, and distinguishes three classes among them. First, old Indian words borrowed directly by the Abyssinians; to this class belong 'sokar' (sugar) and 'nāga' (elephant). The word 'şarkara' travelled first by the land route across Persia and Asia Minor to Greece and Rome, and then again by the sea route to East Africa via Arabia. The Ethiopian Bible has the word sokar. The elephant was always indigenous in Abyssinia and had a native name. Halévy suggests that the native name, za.kon, applied to the untameable African elephant, while the Indian war-elephant came to be known as nāga in Abyssinia. But it may be doubted if elephants were ever exported by sea from India. Talking of the ivory trade, the Periplus² says distinctly: "Practically the whole number of elephants and rhinoceros that are killed live in the places inland (in Africa), although at rare intervals they are hunted on the sea coast even near Adulis." The Ptolemies hunted elephants for army use. Cosmas Indicopleustes has, however, preserved an inscription found by him at Adulis mentioning Indian elephants of the time of Ptolemy III (246-221 B.C.), but these are traceable ultimately to the herd of 500 elephants presented to Selucus by Candragupta Maurya.³ And in this respect, the statement Cosmas makes elsewhere of the Ethiopian use of elephants is not without interest. He says: "The Ethiopians do not understand the art of taming elephants; but should the king wish to have one or two for show, they capture them when young and subject them to training. Now the country abounds with them, and they have large tusks which are exported by sea from Ethiopia even into India and Persia and the Homeric country and the Roman dominion."⁴ Littmann concludes that the word nāga was probably borrowed from Indian merchants in Adulis of old and applied to tame court elephants.

The second class of Indian loan words in Ethiopian comprises words taken through Greek or Arabic translations. In this class we have the words for beryl (glass), musk, chess, pepper and some others. Lastly, the modern Indian borrowings mixed up in the popular speech of Abyssinia form a class by themselves, and Littmann gives a long list of these words like banian, Bengali, police, punkah, rupee and so on.

We may conclude with some observations on Adulis, the chief port of the Aksumite kingdom. This ancient name is preserved in that of the modern

---

1. cf. Fergusson, cited and commented on by Schoff in his edition of Periplus, pp. 64-5.
2. Section 4.
5. Periplus, p. 60.
village of Zula. "The present port is Massowa, centre of the Italian colony of Eretria, which lies near the mouth of the bay of Adulis." "Adulis was one of the colonies of Ptolemy Philadelphus (B.C. 285-246)," says Schoff, "and was always of commercial importance because it was the natural port for Abyssinia and the Sudan. It seems to have been built by Syrian Greeks." Adulis and the Aksumite kingdom are first mentioned by the author of the Periplus about 60 A.D. He calls Adulis 'a port established by law,' and says: "Opposite Mountain Island (on the mainland) twenty stadia from shore, lies Adulis, a fair sized village, from which there is a three days' journey to Coloe, an inland town and the first market for ivory. From that place to the city of the people called Aksumites there is a five days' journey more; to that place all the ivory is brought from the country beyond the Nile through the district called Cyeneum, and thence to Adulis." We get a detailed account of the exports and imports from this important harbour, among them. "There are imported into these places, undressed cloth made in Egypt for the Berbers; robes from Arsinoe; cloaks of poor quality dyed in colours; double-fringed linen mantles; many articles of flint glass, and others of murrhine, made in Diospolis; and brass, which is used for ornament and in cut pieces instead of coin; sheets of soft copper, used for cooking-utensils and cut up for bracelets and anklets for the women; iron, which is made into spears used against the elephants and other wild beasts, and in their wars. Besides these, small axes are imported, and adzes and swords; copper drinking-cups, round and large; a little coin for those coming to the market; wine of Laodicea and Italy, not much; olive oil, not much; for the king, gold and silver plate made after the fashion of country, and for clothing, military cloaks, and thin coats of skin, of no great value. Likewise from the district of Ariaca across this sea, there are imported Indian iron, and steel, and Indian cotton cloth; the broad cloth called monache and that called sagmatogene, and girdles, and coats of skin and mallow-coloured cloth, and a few muslins, and coloured lac. There are exported from these places ivory, and tortoise-shell and rhinoceros-horn." Then we have the account of Cosmas Indicopleustes, 'the principal character among the traders, as he is among the geographers or theorists of Justinian's Age.' Both Cosmas and Scholasticus apparently shipped at Adulis to sail East. Cosmas says: 'On the coast of Ethiopia, two miles off from the shore, is a town called Adule, which forms the port of the Axomites and is much frequented by traders who come from Alexandria and the Elanic Gulf.' He then proceeds to give an account of two Greek inscriptions on a marble chair which he copied in the reign of Justin at the request of Abbas, the Governor of Adulis; 'Elebsaan, who was the king of the Axomites, and was preparing to start on an expedition against the Homerites on the opposite side of the Gulf, wrote to the Governor directing him to take copies of the inscriptions' and send them

1. Periplus : Sec. 6.
to him, and the governor applied to Cosmas, who took two sets of the copies and retained one for himself. The inscriptions recited the conquests of Ptolemy Eurgetes (B.C. 247-223) and of a king of Abyssinia who came much later. He mentions also the direct sea trade between Adulis and Ceylon, and states that emeralds were taken to India by Ethiopian traders who got them from the Blemmyes in Ethiopia.

The site of ancient Adulis was discovered in 1906 after some trial excavations on the spot by Sundström of the Swedish mission in Abyssinia, regular excavation being prohibited by the Italian Government. The trial excavations brought to light the existence in former times of a considerable two-storeyed building, 'the Palace of Adulis,' besides some coins of gold and silver. Sundström also saw reason to believe that the ancient town was destroyed by fire. An Italian expedition under Paribenì conducted more systematic excavations a little later and in the course of these excavations a seal was found with a short inscription in four letters of unmistakably Indian Brāhmi script of the early centuries A.D. It is not possible to read the letters satisfactorily from the only reproduction of them I have seen. It is given by Littmann in his paper in the Jacobi Commemoration Volume (p. 410). It is evident we have the negative of the inscription before us, but the reproduction seems to be not mechanical, but based on a drawing, and only one letter can be read with any confidence at present.

1. McCrindle, pp. 54-6.
2. Ibid., p. 366.
4. Ibid., p. 174.
PARAMĀRTHASĀRĀ

By

S. S. SURYANARAYANA SASTRI

About the beginning of last year, my attention was directed to the Paramārthasāra in answering a query sent me by Mr. P. C. Divanji, as to the existence and authorship of an Advaita work of this name. After giving him the information asked for, I was interested in making a study and preparing an English translation of the work. At a later stage I realised that there were large similarities between this and Abhinavagupta's work of the same name, with which I had become familiar in the text and translation published by Dr. L. D. Barnett. Dr. Barnett refers to a book in Telugu script containing seventy-nine āryās, published in 1907 by Paṭṭīsapu Veṅkaṭeśvaruḍu, and holds that it is a work extracted largely from Abhinavagupta's with some additions and alterations calculated to give it a Vaishnava colour. On comparing it with Ādiśeṣa's work as published in the Trivandrum Sanskrit Series (No. 12) and Patañjali's Āryāpañcāśī (as published in the Pandit, volume V) I found that the three were substantially identical and that Veṅkaṭeśvaruḍu's seventy-nine āryās could be arrived at by leaving out the first nine in the Trivandrum edition and including one from the Pandit edition. Dr. Barnett's conclusion, if true, should therefore apply to Śeṣa's work of that name. Since my reading of that seemed to indicate its being a consistent whole and since in spite of the use of Viṣṇu's names there could be seen little or no sectarian bias, it seemed to me that the question of the dependence of either on the other merited further investigation. The examination would indicate that the Kashmir work rather than the other is derivative. The details of the analysis are given below.

1. K version which begins with the words "param parastham gahanād anādīm" requires explanation for "param" and "parastham gahanād"; the former is translated as "supreme" and interpreted as "superior to his 'Powers' (śakti)"; the latter is rendered as "exalted above the Abyss, i.e. higher in order of being than Māyā." This raises a question as to the status of

1. JRAS, 1910.

2. The Trivandrum edition will hereafter be referred to as T, the Pandit edition as P, and Abhinavagupta's work as K. Since completing this paper I have had an opportunity of comparing the text with an edition in Bengali script. It was published for the second time in Sākādā 1810. It begins with "avyaktād antam abhūt [v. x (T)] and contains 79 āryās in all, like the Telugu script edition, but, unlike the latter, uses the word "pancāśī" in the last verse

3. The ascription to Patañjali is probably correct so far as we can judge. There is no inconsistency with the alleged authorship of Ādiśeṣa since the former is reputed to be an arīsa of Ādiśeṣa. That the present work was long known as Patañjali's is borne out by a commentator on the Jivanmuktiviveka who refers to it as Patañjala-smṛti (See Anandavrama edition, p. 262).
Mayā; it is but a śakti of the Supreme, whether in Advaita or Pratyabhijñā Saivism, relative independence being granted only in pluralistic Saivism; this being the case “parastham gahanād” seems but to repeat what is said in “param”. The language of T is simpler and more straightforward: “param”, superior; to what? “parasyāḥ prakṛteḥ”, to primal nature which to the non-Vedāntic understanding is the root-cause of the world. It appears likely that Abhinavagupta made a change for the sake of distinctiveness and that the change was not very happy.

The use of “viśum” in T and “śambhum” in K is not very significant; many advaitins from Saṅkara to Madhusūdana have offered obeisance to Viṣṇu and referred to the Supreme under that name or one of its synonyms; Śiva has also been similarly referred to from Vācaspati to Appayya Dīkṣita. What is of importance is that while in T, “Viṣṇu” is practically colourless, “Śiva” in K is definitely the pati of Pratyabhijñā Saivism, “the universal subject of thought”, “whose essential nature is the rapture of supreme egoity (parāhantā-camatkārā).” Prima facie it is more likely that the theistically colourless was used as the basis for what has such colour, rather than vice versa. The commentator of T, it may be noted, explains “Viṣṇu” as “sadaṁandha-cid-ghana”, a homogeneous whole of reality, bliss and consciousness.

In any case the introductory verse need not engage us longer, since it is very doubtful if it is an integral part of the Āryāpāñcāśiti. It is not in āryā metre; its recognition leads to admitting more than eighty-five verses; and neither it nor its successor is found in the edition published in the Pāṇḍita. Possibly these two verses are the work of a later hand. But whoever did it in the case of T, introduced the word “Viṣṇu” in conformity with subsequent use of that name in the body of the text. If T (or its equivalent P) happens to be modelled on K, it is more difficult to account for differences in reckoning the number of verses in the former, the non-inclusion of the introductory verses in P and so on.

II. Verses 2 and 3 (K) clearly state that one who is the “ādhāra” was questioned by a disciple as to the Supreme Verity, that the “ādhāra” responded to the request in kārikās, and that Abhinavagupta relates the essence of these kārikās “śivasāsanadṛṣṭiyogena”; this last compound means, we suggest, “in conjunction with the knowledge of Śiva’s teaching (in the Āgamas)”, (not as DR. Barnett would have it “in mystic vision of Śiva’s law”). Thus, Abhinavagupta’s own words appear to indicate the syncretic character of his work.

And this appearance is confirmed by the words of Abhinavagupta’s commentator, Yoga Muni, who explains the ādhāra to be Śeṣa; Śeṣa is claimed to be the author of T; and the frequent use of “Viṣṇu” and its synonyms is intelligible in this case, for Śeṣa is the support of Viṣṇu, not merely of the world.

The language of v. 2 (K) implies a set of questions such as are found in vv. V-VII (T).
III. Where there is partial agreement between $K$ and $T$, the former often appears to develop an idea of the latter. For instance, in v. XVI ($T$), we are told "Just as a clear crystal takes on the colours of diverse coloured objects (in proximity) even so the pervasive (self) takes on the nature of the adjuncts produced by the gunas (prakṛti)." The commentator explains "nature of the adjuncts" as "the nature of beings divine, human, etc. (devatvamanusyatvādikam)". The corresponding line in v. 6 ($K$) reads: "sura-mānuṣa-pāśu-pādapa-rūpatvam tadvad īśopi". Supposing the latter to be the original no reason can be imagined for departing from it and adopting less clear language about upādhis brought about by gunas. Assuming Śeṣa to have been a staunch Vaiṣṇava the only word in $K$, he could have objected to, is "iśa" and this, in itself a colourless word, he does not fight shy of, as witness his mention of īśvara and paramēsvāri-bhāva (see vv. XXXIV, LXIV). Further, the repetition of the word "dhatte" in the second line of the verse in $T$ seems very natural and more consistent with the verse-form of a primary work, than the words of the second line in $K$. The same natural repetition is seen in v. XVII ($T$), where the first line is "gacchati gacchati salile" etc., and the second line "antahkaraṇe gacchati gacchaty ātmā'pi" etc. Here too, the second line of the corresponding verse, v. 7 ($K$), contains a more expanded but less poetically natural, though correct form: "tanukarāṇa-bhuvamavargre tathā 'yam ātmā maheśānaḥ." The same process of expansion followed by non-repetition or non-mention of the verb is found in v. 8 ($K$) which corresponds to v. XVIII ($T$), where the latter says "ātmā...
dsṛyatām eti", while $K$ suppresses the verb thus: "ātmā viṣayāśrayaṇena dhīmakure."

IV. Where there is incorporation of Scriptural passages, the $T$ version is more natural than that of $K$. Thus v. LIX ($T$) uses the words "ko mohah kaḥ śokah" following the text of Iṣa, 7, while $K$ (v. 52) inverts the order into "kaḥ śokah ko mohah". It is a justifiable conjecture that the original verse preserved the same order as the Śruti text. The same procedure is found in v. LXVIII ($T$), and the corresponding verse in $K$ (v. 58). The former refers to two texts—"ātmajñas tarati śucam" (Ch. VII, i, 3) and "vidvān na bibheti kutascaṇa" (Taṅt. II, 9)—, while the latter telescopes them into "ātmajño na kutascaṇa bibheti"; and the rest of the verse in $K$ is in the nature of an explanation, that he fears nothing since everything is his own true form and that there is no real destruction; this is less natural in a kārikā than the condensed statement of the $T$ version.

V. The process of telescoping will be seen at work in the case of the kārikās themselves, if we compare v. 51 ($K$) with vv. LVII, LVIII ($T$). The two verses of $T$ counsel the transcendence of Māyā and the contemplation of Brahman as the self, as the result of which contemplation, the āśiva will get to be of the same nature as Brahman, like water mixing with water, milk with milk and so on. The corresponding verse in $K$ speaks of the transcendence of Māyā and, immediately after that, merger in Brahman, like water in water, etc. The process of contemplation is neither foreign nor non-essential
to the Pratyabhijñā school. If in spite of its insistence on *ahanāgraḥopāsanā*, there is no mention of it here, it is likely to have been due to a process of telescoping, due to many causes, indolence, forgetfulness of the original, the desire to be distinctive and so on. It is not as though Abhinavagupta’s is the shorter work; so the desire for condensation cannot come in. Nor are intermediate steps or agencies always left out by him. When Śeṣa says release is the cutting of the knot of nescience (v. LXXIII), Abhinavagupta (v. 60) improves on it and speaks of release as the manifestation of one self through one’s own potencies, on the cutting of the knot of nescience (“*ajñānāgraṇthi-bhidā svāsaktibhir vyaktatā*”); this of course is quite in line with Pratyabhijñā teaching that bondage and release result through one’s own śaktis; all that has to be noted here is that Abhinavagupta does not always seek conciseness at the expense of doctrinal fullness or accuracy. Compare also v. 81 (K), where between cognition of the Absolutes and the sense of accomplishment (*kṛtyakṛtyatā*) Abhinavagupta introduces the manifestation of cognisernship (*upalabhḍhṛta-prakāśa*).

Another instance of possible telescoping is provided by v. 50, the first line of which expresses the idea contained in the whole of v. LXII (T), while the second line goes on to say “I myself am the author of the various *Siddhāntas*, āgamas and *tarkas*.” The expression “*siddhāntāgama-tarka*” occurs in v. LXV (T), where it is said that the advaitin has no quarrel with the conflicting claims of various *siddhāntas* since they all refer in the last resort to that which is the self of all. The lifting of this expression from its context in *T* and its use in v. 50 (K) which is made to say that the self though not an agent is yet an agent in the production of the āgamas, etc., does violence to sequence as well as to sense. It calls aloud for explanation and the only explanation is the anxiety of Abhinavagupta to safeguard the inviolate authenticity of the revealed Śaiva canon.

VI. Occasionally we find in *K* moralising which is not quite consistent with the nature of *kārikās*. Thus, while v. LII (T) compares the pleasures and pains of the everfree soul to the bondage of the honest man caught in the company of thieves, v. 53 (K) says “Harmful verily is the defect of association, like the union with a thief of one who is no thief.” What is needed here is only the comparison (which is found in *T* too), not the moralising. Of a piece with this procedure is the expansion by *K* (v. 28) of the idea tersely or pointedly expressed in v. XXVIII (T). The latter wants to make out that the phenomenal is capable of practical efficiency and that it is due to nescience; the former elaborates the practical efficiency in the words “*trāsam kurute mṛtyuparyantam*, causes terror which may end in death” and proceeds to say that the great potency of delusion cannot verily be gauged. The latter part is pointless, especially in comparison with the second line of *T*, which says that the delusive presentation of duality is but nescience and not real; this indeed is what follows from the rope-snake analogy mentioned in the first line.
VII. In v. 30 (K) we have an instance of a variation from the T text, which is a clear case of going off the rails. The corresponding verse in T is v. XXIX; the previous verse states that the delusive presentation of duality is but nescience and not real; what is non-real is taken to be real, the non-self mistaken for the self; because of this delusion that the non-self (of duality) is the self, fools do not cognise the real self, which is all-pervasive and the self of all; this is what is stated in v. XXIX. But curiously enough we find that v. 30 (K) speaks not of “ātmā-bhrānti” in the “anātman” but of “anātmābhımānaḥ” in what is not other than “ātmān”. The process of superimposition is no doubt reciprocal; the self is taken to be the not-self, in the same way as the not-self is taken for the self. But there is no need for specially mentioning the former in this context. For the previous verse even in K, verse 29, speaks only of the delusive presentation of dharma, adharma, varṇa, āśrama, etc., that is to say, the not-self, in and as the self. The obverse presentation, though no doubt a fact, lacks any occasion for its mention; nor is the idea developed, as the very next verse, v. 31, goes back to the concept of self-hood in respect of the not-self “anātmanya apy ātmamānātavam”. It would appear that while freely developing the idea of reciprocal superimposition Abhinavagupta brought in casually the idea he expresses in v. 30 though it is not called for by the context. Such casual mention is inconsistent with his work being the original kārikā.

VIII. The references in K to Śiva and in T to Viṣṇu can be of little help in concluding the priority of either. It is worth noting, however, that while K consistently uses expressions like Sambhu (v. 1, 26), Maheśānaḥ (v. 7), Paramāśīva (v. 32), Bhagavān (v. 38), Śivamayatvam (v. 52) and Maheśvara (v. 81) and introduces characteristic doctrines like the thirty-six tattvas (v. 11) and the manifestation of the Supreme cognisership in release (v. 81), the text of T contains no characteristic Vaishava doctrines and though the names Viṣṇu, Vāsudeva and Hari are largely used, the word Īśvara (as already noted) is used at least twice. It has also to be remembered that “Viṣṇu” etymologically means the Pervasive one and that it is used in this sense by advaitins. Since advaitins admit a Saguna Brahman, only through the due recognition of whom release can be attained, since the name and form of this Brahman cannot but be relative to the status of the preceptor and seeker, and since the preceptor here is Ādiśeṣa, the mythological couch of Viṣṇu, it is quite natural that Śeṣa’s work should refer to the Supreme under one name or other of Viṣṇu without any question of religious bias. It is more likely that the Pratyabhijñā school, which is sectarian, borrowed from the non-sectarian text rather than that a non-sectarian non-dual text borrowed from the Pratyabhijñā and complicated its position by importing sectarian names and postulating an authorship to be consistent with the use of such names. The law of parsimony clearly favours the former possibility.

IX. Vidyāranyā who came within three centuries of Abhinavagupta is not likely to have erred in respect of the authorship of the Paramārthasāra. He quotes twice from this work in his Jivanmuktiveka (pp. 46, 70 of the
TPH edition); the first quotation is of v. 81 (T) and the second of v. 77 (T); in both cases he mentions the author by name as Śeṣa and on the former occasion with reverence as “Bhagavān Śeṣa”. It is possible to assume that the Advaita plagiarist had done his work prior to the time of Vidyārānyya and that the latter quoted from the plagiarism, not from the original. Such a contention presupposes Vidyārānyya’s ignorance of Abhinavagupta’s work or disingenuousness or both; not one of these alternatives commends itself. And it is not as though Vidyārānyya had to quote the work or establish its authenticity. There was no point in his quoting Śeṣa unless at least in his day the author and his work enjoyed unquestionable reputation such as is inconsistent with his having been a mere plagiarist. In the supposition that Abhinavagupta’s is the derivative work, there is no reflection on his integrity or worth; for he has made an honest if cryptic acknowledgment of his source, though present-day scholars have failed to note its significance.

X. The conclusion reached here has a significance not confined to the Paramārthasāra. It is possible that more than one Pratyabhijñā work has derived from Advaita sources. Where, in a work like the Daksināmārtīstotra, there are many points common to Advaita and Pratyabhijñā, it will be rash without further evidence to conclude the derivation of either from the other.1 The analogy of the mirrored city, for instance, is found both in that Stotra v. 1 and in the Paramārthasāra vv. 12, 13 (K). If, however, the whole of this work is based on and has drawn largely from an Advaita work of the same name, is it not likely that this analogy too is primarily the advaitin’s and constitutes part of what Pratyabhijñā took over from his system? The problems suggested in such comparisons are not susceptible of easy solution; nor should they be lightly brushed aside. There is an ever-recurring confusion, for instance, in the advaitin’s idea of release; while most schools hold that it is realisation of Brahman, some at least contend it is attainment of Isvara-bhāva. What was the position of the early advaitin? Did he favour the former view or the latter? Or did he waver between the two? Until questions like these can be satisfactorily answered it is not possible definitively to say which work or system was the borrower. And while not subscribing to the agnostic creed of perpetual ignorance we must yet confess that our ignorance of early Advaita is indeed very extensive. And our wisdom for the present will lie in the frank recognition that what are apparently clear indications are anything but clear and unambiguous.2

---

1. See an article by Rao Bahadur Amarnath Ray in JORM, VI, pp. 121-129.
2. Dr. K. C. Pandey in his study of Abhinavagupta (Chowkhambha, 1935) has come to the same conclusion as ourselves (pp. 57-59); his examination is necessarily briefer and his acquaintance with Śeṣa’s work does not seem to be perfect, since he speaks of it as a work giving “in brief the most essential principles of the Sāṅkhya philosophy” (p. 56); he draws attention to the fact that Abhinavagupta himself in the Bhagavadgītātitha Saṅgraha quotes from Śeṣa’s work (v. LXXXI) as if from Sruti; this throws further light on the antiquity of Śeṣa and the veneration commanded by him.
NOTES ON THE KĀTHA UPAŅIŚAD

By
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FIRST VALLĪ

Arhaṇā bṛhad devāsya anvṛtattvam ānāśubh, RV. X. 63. 4
Ka etam ādityam arhati samayāitum? JUB. I. 6. 1
Kas tam mad-ānyo devam ājnātum arhati? KU. II. 21.

Several crucial passages of KU. appear to have been radically misunderstood even by Śaṅkara, and a fortiori by modern translators. We must in the first place understand the situation. Death (mṛtyu, yama) is throughout the Brāhmaṇas and Upaniṣads, as also in RV. one of the highest names of God. Identified with the Sun, all that is under the Sun is in his power, and all beyond the Sun immortal; He is the Breath of life, at whose departure living beings die (SB. X. 5. 1. 4, 21—4 and 13, 14 etc.). Under the Sun he takes the form of “repeated death” (punar mṛtyu); beyond the Sun he rules in Paradise. Death does not die. It is only by a conquest of the one and union with the other of his aspects that an immortality can be attained,—the Comprehensor “defeats repeated death, death gets him not, Death becomes his Spiritual essence (ātmā), he becometh the One of the Devas” (BU. I. 2, 7), “he wins beyond the Sun” (CU. II. 10, 5). The solar Orb itself, the disk of the Sun, is the gateway of Death’s house, the mansion of Brahman, to which the Wayfarer seeks admission in our Upaniṣad and in so many of the related texts, e.g. Iśā 15-16. In our Upaniṣad Death himself is the Guru, and Naciketas the śravaka and śīśya. We proceed at once to a discussion of particular passages.

1.5. Bahūnām emi prathama ...emi madhyamaḥ, kim ...adya karisyati?
“As one of many I go first, and I go midway, and now what will He (Death) do with me?” “Now,” i.e. now that my time has come, now that I have really died and left the body behind me. Three visits to Death are likewise implied by the “three nights” of I. 9 (not necessarily consecutive “nights”); and these three correspond also to the three questions and three boons and three strides of the text. By bahūnām Naciketas recognizes the universality

1. See also my “A study of the Kātha Upaniṣad,” IHQ. XI, 1935, pp. 570-584. Frequent reference will be made to RAWSON, The Kātha Upaniṣad, Oxford, 1934. The following abbreviations are employed: RV., AV., TS., VS., MS., respectively the Rgveda, Atharva Veda, Taittiriya, Vājasaneyi and Maitrāyaṇi Sanhitā; SB., AB., JB. JUB. PB., TB., respectively the Śatapatha, Aitareya, Jaiminiya, Jaiminiya Upaniṣad, Peścaviṃśa and Taittiriya Brāhmaṇas; BU., CU., MU., Munḍ, Já., Trait. Up., KU. the Bṛhadāranyaka, Chāndogya, Maitri, Munḍaka, Iśāvasya, Taittiriya, and Kātha Upaniṣads; B.G., Bhagavad Gītā; Sn., Sutta Nipāta; A., D., S., the Āṅgut-tara, Dīgha, and Saṁyutta Nikāyas.
of his experience. His is not, indeed, a particular case: it is the rule that every man dies thrice and is thrice born.—first when he is begotten, second when he is initiated, and thirdly when he departs from this world (JUB. III. 9). Having now for the third time and "really" died, Naciketas stands upon the threshold of the new Life into which the sacrificer "is reborn of the Fire." This formulation of "three deaths" makes intelligible what would otherwise be difficult to understand, the words of the "Voice" in the TB. version, "Thou hast been told, 'Betake thee to Death's houses.'" Unto Death have I bound thee." Go thou to him when he is not at home." (pravasantam).

It is in fact only on the third morning that Death appears in person. One does not meet Him face to face until the body has really been consumed. But Death has other "houses" than that which lies beyond the golden disk, of which the dark night of the womb, often referred to as a "hell," is one, the "night" of initiation another, and "death's dark night" a third. Death "as he is yonder" (SB. X. 5. 2. 16-17) is not in the womb, nor does he show himself in person to the initiate, nor even at death; He is not "present" there, but only "re-presented" by the concept of "recurrent death" (punar mytyu) and this, we understand, is what is meant by the saying "Go when he is not at home." The Voice, in other words, advises Naciketas to prepare himself by an understanding of what is meant by a crossing over of the recurrent deaths that are appointed to every man here and now.

I. 8-9 (as represented in the TB. version): The matter of the food that Naciketas "eats" on the three nights may also be considered. The nourishments are respectively Death's "progeny" (prajām), "sacrificial animals" (paśūn), and his "duties" (sādhuṛtyān). These "foods" should correspond to the three means by which one "lords it over death" three times in the course of a normal life, as described in JUB. III. 9 f., "death" being the same thing as "hunger" (āsanāyā, privation). What are Death's "progeny"

1. We cannot see in what respect AA. II. 5 is, as Keith insists, "fundamentally distinct" from JUB. If in AA, it is three "births" only that are specifically mentioned, it must not be overlooked that any birth implies a previous death, and that in any case this is explicit in the case of the third birth, since it is when the man departs (parīti) as a kītakṛtyah, that is "dies", having fulfilled his tasks, that he "is born again" (punar jāyate) and becomes immortal (aṃtah bhavati). The texts are not identical, but nevertheless perfectly consistent.

Punar jāyate: "is regenerated," born again for the last time, never to be born again as a mortal individual, but only with and as the Spirit, aśarīrah śāriṣreṣu, cf. KU. VI. 4 sārīṣe lokeṣu śāriṣrātāya kalpate (sc. as a Kāmācaṁa). Punar jāyate: as in BU. III. 9. 28, jāta eva, na jāyate, ko tv evam janayet punah? "He is born indeed, (and yet) he is not born (having become the 'Unborn,' ajaḥ); for who is there now to beget him again?" (since he is no longer a member of any lineage, see JUB. III. 14. 1, and parallels, Hindu, Buddhist, and Christian).

2. Note the plural, "houses."

3. The "Voice" substitutes for the Father's dadāmi, ādām, which we take to be from dā, to bind or tie, as a sacrifice is "tied" to the post. The concluding words are spoken by the Voice, not quoted as the Father's.

4. "While the soul progresses, God remains unseen" (Eckhart).
or "children"? In SB. X. 5. 2. 16 he is "one as he is yonder, and many
as he is in his children"; and clearly, these "children" are the "breaths"
or "rays" or "feats" that reach the heart of every living thing, and with
respect to which it is said that when they are withdrawn, the creature dies;
just as the many rays of the Sun are its "sons" (JUB. II. 9. 10), the Sun
being the same as Death (JUB. III. 10. 10 and passim). The eating of Death's
"progeny" is then the same thing as "coming into being in accordance with
the breath; for it is inasmuch as the breath indwells the expended semen
that he comes into being" (sa tato 'nusambhavati prānān ca; yadā hy eva
retas sīktaṁ prāṇa āvīśaty attha tat sambhavati, JUB. III. 10. 5.) Thus he
overcomes the first death. Now as to the "sacrificial animals": "Verily
unborn is the man in so far as he does not sacrifice; it is through the sacrifice
that he is born" (JUB. III. 14. 8) with reference, of course to the sacrificial
initiation which involves a temporary or symbolic death, and a rebirth, as is
fully developed in the third book of the Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa. And thus by
this "birth from Agni," he overcomes this second and initiatory death (JUB.
III. 16. 6). Finally as to Death's sādhukṛtyāḥ: these "things to be done
right" are the "works to be done" by the new man born of the initiation.
what they do right, that rises up as their eating of food" (yat sādhu kuru-
vanti tad eśām annādyam utsidati, JUB. III. 14.6). It is by this "food"

1. "Under the theory of procession by powers, souls are described as rays"
(Plotinus, Enneads, VI. 4. 3).
2. "He who dwelleth in the semen is yet other than the semen...He is the
Spirit, the Inner, Controller, the Immortal" (ātmantaryāmyāmītaḥ, BU. III. 7. 23);
hence "Say not 'From semen' that a mortal once departed is born again, but from
what is alive (in the semen); just as a tree springs up from the seed, no sooner
deader than come into being again" (BU. III. 9. 28). This can only be fully under-
stood in the light of CU. VI. 11-12 where it is made clear that it is not the seed as
such that is alive, but that "undimensioned (animaṇam, see discussion of KU. 11.
20, below) that is not to be seen" within it, from which the great tree grows up. The
same is implied in AV. XI. 4. 14 "When thou, the Breath, givest life, then is he
born again"; cf. Kaus. Up. III. 3 "It is as the Breath (prāṇa) that the Prov-
dent Spirit (prajñātman) grasps and erects the flesh." And this is also precisely
the Christian doctrine, as enunciated by St. Thomas, Sum. Theol. III. 32. 1 "The
power of the soul, which is in the semen, through the Spirit enclosed therein, fashions
the body."

The comparison dhānāruha iva...pretya sambhavah of BU. III. 9. 28 is repeated
in KU. I. 9 sasyam ivājāyate punāḥ. The point of all these comparisons and
allusions is, that it is the Spirit, and not the individual so-and-so, that is perpetually
and instantly reborn, although not subjected to the vicissitudes of birth. It is only
the psycho-physical vehicles which are animated by the Spirit, and are in this sense
carnations of the Spirit, or more properly speaking manifestations of the Spirit, that
are themselves casually determined, and mortal. He only, therefore, who "knows
himself" as the Spirit, and not as the psycho-physical vehicle, is free and immortal:
and that "That art thou" follows immediately upon the passage briefly quoted above
from CU. VI. 12. 2. See further my "The coming to birth of the Spirit," to appear
shortly in Indian Culture.

3. For initiation (dikṣā) as a death and a rebirth see TS. V. 2.4 and VI. 1.3,
AB. I. 3 and VI. 31, JUB. III. 7-9, SB. III. 1.2 and III. 2.1, etc.
that the dead man is sustained and conveyed until he reaches the Sun and
stands face to face with Death. the Angel with the Flaming Sword, the Sun,
the Truth,—“his breath first ascends” ; it explains to the Devas, so much he
did right (iyad asya sādhū kṛtam), so much evil : then along with the smoke
(of the pyre) he ascends... He approaches him who glows yonder (JB. I. 18),
viz. “the Sun, Death” (JUB. III. 10. 10 and passim). In other words, it
is by the “duty done” or “what has been done right” (sādhukṛtam) that
the sacrificer is kept in being on the “night” of the third death, and until he
reaches the very gates of the solar Paradise wherein Death is always at home.
Past these gates there is no carrying over by means of any “food”, since
“the eating of food” implies in some sort of a formal embodiment ; what is
beyond the Sun, who is Death, is immortal (SB. II. 3. 3. 7) ; and no one be-
comes immortal with the body (SB. X. 4. 3. 9 ; JUB. III. 38. 10). It is by
knowledge alone, by such knowledge as Death himself imparts, that the final
passage is made ; which knowledge of the Brahman is the knowledge of one-
self as the Self, as the Spirit (ātman). This, as all our texts imply (JUB.
III. 14. 5, etc., with the closest possible parallels in the Hermetic, Christian,
and Islamic traditions), is a total severance of the Spirit from its psycho-
physical manifestation, a ceasing to know of oneself by any name or aspect
(nāma-rūpa), or as anyone or anywhere : for there can be no return to the
source except of like to like, and “That has not come from anywhere nor be-
come anyone” (KU. II. 18). The question “Who knows where he is?”
(KU. II. 25) will apply as much to the individual altogether liberated (ati-
mukta, etc.) from his individuality as to the Spirit itself, which is only omni-
present precisely because it is not “anywhere.” As the Buddhist texts so
often express it, “There beyond there is no further extension of thusness”
(nāparam itthatyāti, S. V. 222. etc. etc.).

The foregoing discussion of the problem of “foods,” “houses” and
“nights”, considered as one question, is strictly speaking pertinent only to the
TB. version of the story. In the Upaniṣad we are not told, but left to assume,
that Death has been “away”; we are only told in both versions that the
guest has “gone hungry.” And this is a matter of fact ; one does not “eat”
either in the womb, or on the eve of a sacrifice, or on one’s death bed. On
the “fast day” (upā-vasatha) preceding a sacrifice (see SB. I. 1. 1. 7-11),
in one way or another one “does not eat,” and “should sleep that night in
the house of the sacrificial fire or household fire (āhavaniyāgare vaitāṁ rātriṁ
sayita gārhapatyāgare vā) for he who enters upon the operation approaches
the Devas, and lies down amongst those very Devas whom he approaches.”
It is such a “night” as this, spent fasting in the “house of the Fire” that
is referred to by the second “night” that is to be spent at Death’s house.
The words of SB. I. 1. 1. 9. “Let him therefore eat what, when eaten,
counts as not eaten” is singularly suggestive of the situation represented in
the TB. version of our story where, although Naciketas “does not eat,” he

1. Cf. S. I. 119, where Māra seeks in vain for the departed arhat, Godhika.
is able to tell what it is that he "has eaten." In any case we have been able to trace a connection between the three kinds of "food" in the TB. version, and the "three deaths" that are implied by the "three nights" of both texts. In the same way in KU. I. 11 rātrīḥ āpyā, the reference is not to just any night, but to the Father's "rest" in the nights of time, in the sense of "rested on the seventh day." "Varuṇa is the night" (PB. XXV. 10. 10); "the night, the darkness, death" of AB. IV. 5; the "night" of JUB. III. 1. 9 muhyanti diśo na vai tā rātrim praṇāyante; i.e. the Brahman of MU. VI. 17 na hy ēṣya...diśāḥ kalpante. Thus in one sense or another all of the (four) "nights" of our text are "deaths" rather than "times," nor is there anything strange in this, in a tradition where seasons, months, fortinights and days and nights are so often states of being rather than times.

I. 10 and 11, tvat prarṣṭam and mat prarṣṭah "released by Thee" (Naciketas) and "released by Me" (Auddālaka Aruni, Gautama, father of Naciketas). These expressions can only be understood in the light of RV. X. 16. 4-5. "Bear him, O Agni (here the Devourer, Death), give him back again, unto the Patriarchs in the world of the Perfected; inducing Life, let the Residue ascend, let him be aggregated in his own form" (vaha enaṁ sukṛtāṁ loke, ava sṛja punar, agne, pīrībhyaḥ; āyur vaśāna upa vetu šeṣah, sam gacchatāṁ tanvā). No difficulty remains, if only we do not persuade

1. The story of Viśvāmitra and Indra in AA. II. 2. 3-4 is virtually identical with that of Naciketas and Death in KU. Indra speaks as the Sun; Viśvāmitra pays a trip visit to Indra's "dear home." On each occasion Viśvāmitra repeats a hymn, saying "This is food," meaning evidently, "This has been my sustenance." Indra grants a boon (not three: the whole story is condensed), Viśvāmitra choosing "to know thee, Indra." Indra describes himself as the Sun, the breath, and this breath is what really is his own sustenance, and Viśvāmitra's. The Comprehensor of this becomes immortal. The "What I am, he is; what he is, I am" of AA. corresponds to the answer of the postulant for passage through the Sun in JUB. III. 14-3-4. In SA. I. 6 the boons are three, but Viśvāmitra makes the same choice in each case, "to know thee, Indra."

2. See the discussion of KU. III. 1 tām pibantu sukṛtasya loke. Yama's Paradise in RV. X 16 is more fully described in X. 135. 1 f., where it is also perhaps "Order" that "Yama drinks of with the Devas" (devaiḥ sam pibate yamah).

3. Šeṣah : cf. KU. KV. IV. 3 and V 4 kim atra pariśisyate? with CU. VIII. 4-5 atiśisyate...ātman. We have shown elsewhere that it is by no means accidentally that Šeṣa and Ananta are designations both of the World Serpent and of the Brahman (see my "Angel and Titan" in JAOS. 55, 1935 and "Janaka and Yājñavalkya" in IHQ. XIII. 1937).

4. In X. 14. 8 hitvāvaraṇyam punar astam ehi, sam gacchasva tanvā suvarcā "Discarding wo-e-unspakeable, go home again, be aggregated in a form of light." Astam i here, as this expression is regularly used of the setting Sun, as "going home," i.e. to "Whence the Sun arises and unto which he goeth home" (yatās codeti sūryo' stam yatra ca gacchati, KU. IV. 9). This "Home", which is man's last end as it was his first beginning, is moreover one of the names of the Gale of the Spirit, "the one entire Godhood (Ṛṣu)...His very name is 'Home' (sa haiṣo) stam nāma). 'Home' they call the "Seizures' (gṛhaḥ) in the West" (JUB. III. 1. 1-3). Cf. modern "go to one's last home," "go West" to die. The "West" implies Varuṇa,
ourselves that the story of Naciketas is the relation of any “historical” event. What Naciketas asks is that he may be “let pass” by Death, may be “released” unto his father, to the Father whom Death has already and long since, i.e. at the close of a former Aeon, “let pass” and “released” unto his “rest,” a rest to be perfected by the son’s return and welcome. This is, in other words, and as the name Āruṇi suggests, not a “human” story, but an

who indeed is the Seizer of all things (SB. II. 3. 2.10 yathemā varuṇah praṇā ghyatu; similarly MS. I. 10, 12, TS. V. 2. 1. 3, AB. VII. 15 etc.). The Gale is Varuṇa’s ātmā te vātā…varuṇa, RV. VII. 87. 2) or what comes to the same thing, the breath of Vāc=Aditi (aham eva vāta pravāmi, RV. X. 125. 8). Hence in the Requiem RV. X. X. 16. 3 vātam ātmā…gacchatu, and the common expression vāyogataḥ = deceased. For Varuṇa as one to be both feared and loved see RV. VII. 86. This “Home” is the Father’s house, from which the Prodigal son departs with his portion, and to which he returns after eating of the husks; Death is the Keeper of the Gate.

Śaṅgamana, “Gatherer together, is one of the names of Yama, e.g., in RV. X. 14. 1. It is in this sense also that “to be unified” (eko bhū) and “to die” are regularly coincident expressions. In the same way ECKHART’S “separated and united beings,” viz., those who are alive to themselves on the one hand, and the “blessed dead, dead and buried in the Godhead” on the other. “How often would I have gathered thy children together…and ye would not;” (Math. XXIII. 37).

5. Cf. RV. X. 56. 1-2 saniveśane tanvās…parame janitre…diviva jyotish svam. Tanvā is “form” of such sort as is proper to the Ātman, cf. Kū. II. 23 vivyānute tanvān svām. Tanvā is as much as to say svarūpa, “in thine own proper, or intrinsic form,” i.e. in a body of light. With Kū. II. 23 cf. RV. X. 71. 4 (vād) tasmāi tanvān vi saṃre.

The assumption of this “form” is a “resurrection from ashes.” This is, in fact the Vedic doctrine of the “resurrection of the body,” more fully stated in JUB. III. 3. 5. “Now whoever is a Comprehensor of this Spiritual-essence of the Logos (uktahयātmānam, where uktah=śāman, identified with the Sun) comes into being in yonder world with limbs and body complete” (sāṅgas satanas sarvasaṃbhavati). This does not mean, of course, that the “form” or “body” of light, the “intrinsic form” (svarūpa), which is built up by the sacrificer while still in the body, is itself a physical form or body. On the contrary it is a “transformation” of the physical body, which no longer exists as a phenomenon (ṛūpa), but nevertheless subsists, with all that is proper to it, as an effect subsists in the cause to which it has been “reduced”, (i.e. “led back”), more eminently. The regeneration (last punah sambhava), in other words, is a rebirth of all that was real in that which died; all of which “real” is even here and now “light.”

We cannot now devote space to a comparison of the Indian and Christian doctrines of the resurrection of the body, except to remark that it is likewise Christian doctrine that all resurrection is from ashes, and that all the members of the body are resurrected; all, in fact, that really belongs to “human nature,” properly understood (see St. Thomas, Sum. Theol. Suppl. 78. 2 c, 80. 1 c, etc.).

1. RAWSON himself concludes that “probably the names, which are all patro- nymics, are not meant to be historical” (p. 65). And even if we choose to think of them as “historical” to the same extent that the sacrifice of Abraham can be thought of as historical, it remains that such sacrifices as those of Naciketas to Death, or dedications such as that of Rohita to Varuṇa, are “types” of the Eternal Sacrifice of the Universal Man, whom others sacrifice at the same time that he sacrifices himself. If we think of the “fathers” who appoint their sons to Death as “cruel,”
ever recurrent genealogia regni Dei, in which the Father is always coming forth in the Son, and the Son ever returning to the Father: which coming forth and sending forth of the Son is always a giving of the Son to a “recurring generation and death” in the sense of RV. X. 72. prajâyai mṛtyave tvat punah and KU. I. 4. mṛtyave. The “many” of KU. I. 5 is with reference to “many Agnis”: and that Naciketas, the Kumāra, is himself “an” Agni is further implied by the vaisvānara... atithih and the technical expression “give him his quietus” (śāntim kurvanti) of I. 7. Naciketas is at once the Sacrifice and Sacrificial priest; if he needs to be instructed in his office by Death, this corresponds to RV. X. 52. 1 where Agni likewise asks to be instructed in his duties. Our hero’s name is foreshadowed and perhaps intended in RV. X. 51. 4 etam arthan2 naciketāham agniḥ, “I Agni, have not recognized (na ciketa, Sāyaṇa ‘have not approved’) that task”, viz. that of the Priest (hotrā ahaṁ varuna bibhyat, ib.) and cosmic Charioteer (rathin, ib. 6); while it is Yama that “recognizes” Agni (tāṁ tvā yama aciket, ib. 3). In our text, indeed, the relation of Naciketas as “questioner” to Yama as Guru is precisely that of “one who does not know but seeks to know” (acikītvāṁ cikīṭuṣaḥ, AV. IX. 9. 7) to one who knows, and in this sense the name is fitting: cf. also in RV. X. 79. 4 “No knowledge of the God have I, a mortal” (nāhaṁ devasya martyas ciketa). Although not all of these are equivalent contexts, it cannot be questioned but that Naciketas is so called as being “One who does not know,” or “is unwilling.”

In RV. X. 135 we have again to do with a Kumāra, a “Boy” deceased, whose body has been consumed on the funeral pyre, and who now speaks with Death, and learns from him the meaning of death. The Kumāra says, “I have looked close on Him (Yama, Death) that careth for the Ancients (i.e. the foregone Patriarchs), on Him who goceth by the evil path, and after this (world) I long again”: Yama replying “Thou mountest (even now), my Child, a new and wheelless chariot, of which the single pole is pointed in all directions, which thyself has made by intellect (manasākṛtyoḥ), although as yet thou seest it not.” This “chariot” is not of course a “physical” vehicle, let us not forget that no man can beget a son who does not at the same time hand him, who is also himself, over to Death, or rather, to the triple death referred to above (triple, because in such society as this, initiation is the rule). In this respect, what is true of the Son of God is true of Everyman, and what is true of Everyman is true of the Son of God.

1. The applicability of RV. X. 52. 3. “Who is this Priest? Is he Yama’s?” to Naciketas may be remarked.
2. The bhūry... kartvam arthan of RV. I. 10. 2.
3. It would be impossible to discuss at adequate length here the “hesitations” of the Messiahs, Agni, Buddha, and Christ, though all are of the same sort.
4. “Evil” apparently only because the Kumāra is still acikītvāṁ, Naciketas, but in reality “the broad way that Yama first found out for us, nor shall this pasture even be taken from us” of RV. X. 14. 2. Compare Chuang Tzu, “How do I know that he who dreads to die is not as a child who has lost the way and cannot find his home?.”
but "wheless" and "universally oriented" by distinction from the physical body of local motion that has been left behind; in other words, the "chariot" is the same thing as the "form" of light, the tana = svaratapa of previously cited texts. Sayaña rightly identifies the Kumára of this Vedic requiem with the Naciketas of our Upaniṣad. The question is asked in the fourth verse, "Who was the father of the child?". In X. 51. 4, cited above, the Father is evidently Varuṇa: in SB. VI. 2. 1. 1. f. it is explicitly "Father Prajāpati" who searches for the Kumára, who evades him, entering into the sacrificial animals, man, horse, bull, ram, and goat: and When Prajāpati discovers these, he sacrifices them "for his own sake" (kāmāya); just as Auddālaka sacrifices animals and finally his own son.

Once this universality and essential timelessness of the story of Naciketas has been realised, the attitude of the "Father" becomes at once intelligible (or should at least be altogether comprehensible to a Christian, if not to a humanist). If the Father in the TB. version "regards" (paritya) the Son, as Sayaña adds "as if in anger" (kruddheva) or "speaks," as Śarṅkara comments in connection with KU. I. 5 "with angry intent" (krodhaśāt), this agrees with all that we know from the Rgveda of what seem to be the relations between the Father and the Son, the Father (or both Parents) being again and again referred to as "unfriendly" (amitra, asiva) in relation to the Son, whichever of the "twins" Indrāgni may be referred to in a given context. In innumerable texts, Agni is the "Friend" (mitra) and Varuṇa "Unfriend" (amitra) and no real distinction can be drawn between Varuṇa and Yama as "avengers" ("Vengeance is mine, I will repay, said the Lord"). That this is nevertheless not the final truth of the matter is poignantly expressed in RV. X. 124. 3 where Agni, abandoning the Titan Father, usually thought of as "unkind," confesses "I, myself 'unkind' am abandoning Him that is truly 'kind'". It is a matter of "approach"; the Father is no longer "deadly to be touched" by those who "approach him, making him their friend" (mitrakṛtye vopāsate AB. III. 4), for "as he is approached, such he becomes" (yathopāsate tad eva bhavati SB. X. 5. 2. 20, cf. RV. V. 44. 6). If the Titan Father is a

1. The "Titan Father" (asura-pitr) of RV. X. 124.3, whom Agni leaves when he proceeds from the non-sacrificial to the sacrificial function, from potentiality to act.

2. Hume's paraphrase of the Father's words by "Oh! go to Hades" is bad enough, but far more shocking Rawson's "His father, however, angered by the persistence of his 'priggish son, bursts forth with the equivalent of an angry Englishman's 'Go to hell'". With the "angry Englishman" we are only too familiar: his introduction here is a profanity.

3. Similarly in the case of such other solar heroes as Rohita (AB. VII. 15) appointed by their father's to be a sacrifice. Cf. the "evil done by Varuṇa to Prajāpati," SB. XI. 2. 6. 7.

4. RV. V. 44. 6 yādṛg eva dadṛṣe tadṛg ucyate corresponds to St. Thomas, Sum. Theol. I. 13. 1 and 3 Pronomina vero demonstrative dicuntur de Deo, secundum quod faciunt demonstrationem ad is quod intelligitur, with III. 35. 5 c. Unde nihil prohibit plures tales relationes eidem inesse... Omnis autem ratio quae ex tempore
"God of Wrath" to be avoided as such, what else but an At-one-ment is foretold in KU. I. 10 "Glad shall be thy Father Auddālaka Āruṇi as when of old he was released by me, sweetly shall he rest by night, his wrath dispelled (vita-manyuḥ) when he seeth thee from Death’s jaws freed" (mṛtyor mukhāt pramuktam)? Manyu we know well as the "Wrath" of God, from RV. X. 83, manifested as the "bolt" (vajra),—"A great terror! An upraised bolt! Which those who comprehend become immortal" in KU. 2. There are other scriptures in which the wrath of God must be appeased by the sacrifice of a lamb.

I. 16 and 11.3; śṛṇkā. This word, as everyone knows, does not occur elsewhere; but the rendering by "chain" or "garland" appears to be quite satisfactory. Some further discussion of the word may nevertheless prove helpful. Clues are provided by śṛka, arrow, and straja, garland, derivatives of strj, and its modification straj, in their senses of "loose" or "let fly", and "turn, twist, or weave" as a garland. What is common to śṛka and śṛṇkā depends on what is the most usual meaning of strj, viz. "to release"; the arrow being that which is released from the bow, and śṛṇkā being "product" in the sense that strṣṭi is the act of production. At the same time, although the forms are superficially unlike, straja is synonymous with śṛṇkā, and the semantics of both words can be easily understood in connection with the meanings of straj, to "twist" or "wind", and similar but less usual values in strj. Indian necklaces were and still are, in fact, often made of woven gold wire. Straja and śṛṇkā, accordingly, both imply a chain, which may be either a chain of gold or jewels, or a garland of flowers (cf. our "daisy-chain").

---

de Deo dicitur, non ponit in ipso Deo acterno aliquid secundum rem, sed secundum rationem.

1. Mṛtyor mukhāt pramuktam (cf. KU. III. 16) = mat-prasṣṭam in the previous verse: both signifying "freed," not to return to earth (a sorry reward), but to cross the solar threshold and pass through the golden gate to enter into the Paradise of Yama and of Varuṇa; the "jaws of Death" being an open door to Life for those who understand. Mors janua vitae. My rendering above dispenses with any necessity for emendation of the text.

The Father’s welcome of the Son may be imagined in the words of JUB. III. 14.5, “What thou art, I am, and what I am thou art, come in” with its exact equivalent in Rūmi, Mathnavī I. 3063, “Since thou art I, come in, O myself.”

2. RV. X. 83 identifies manyu with Varuṇa as well as with the vajra, etc. The same is implied in X. 73. 10 “He (Agni) came forth from the Wrath” (manyor iyāya); and by TS. V. I. 5. 9 and 6. 1 where “Agni when bound, as Varuṇa, attacks the sacrificer... he unloosens him... (and thus) distributes the wrath of Varuṇa that is in him. He pours water down; the waters are pacifications; verily by the waters appeased he calms his sharpness.” Compare the whole account of the origination of the "fire-flash" from the "darkness" in BĒHENM, Three Principles XIV. 69-75.

3. Observe that as "product" nothing is implied as to whether a material or a spiritual, "property" is intended. The "product" may be—either of phenomenal things, or an entertainment of ideas. Śṛṇkā, in other words, may stand either for an extrinsic or an intrinsic wealth."
We are now in a position to ask whether the *anekatūpā śrīkā* of KU.I.16 and *vittamayi śrīkā* of II.3 are really one and the same "chain." Let us consider the latter first. There can be no doubt what sort of chain it is that Naciketas refuses. It manifestly represents the "whatever desires in this mortal world are hard to come by" (I.3), which goods! Death offers to Naciketas, if only he will refrain from pressing his third boon.2 *Vittamayi* means made of, or of the nature of, wealth, property, goods, possessions: this is the meaning that is so well brought out in BU. 1.5.15, "The Spiritual-self (*ātma*) is the hub, goods (*vitta*) the felly (of the world wheel, or of any being).3 That is why, if anyone is afflicted by a total loss (of property), but himself still lives, they only say 'He has come off with the loss of a felly'". BU.I. 417 furthermore distinguishes a "human wealth" (*mānuśam vittam*, or v. 1. *mānasam vittam*) from a "divine wealth" (*daivam vittam*) of the Spiri-

---

1 Just as *artha*, "purpose" is also "object" both as first and final cause, desire and thing desired, so *kāma*, "desire" is also the "good" defined by Aristotle (Ethic I, cf. St. Thomas, *Sum. Theol.* I.5.1 c) as "Whatever men desire" *Kāmāh* can often be rendered better by "goods" than by "desires". A distinction has then to be made between particular and ultimate goods, or false and true desires, as in CU.VIII.3.1-2 and correspondingly St. Thomas, *Sum. Theol.* II.II.23.7 c and 45.1 ad 1, (distinction of *bonum verum* from *bonum falsum* as of satyāk kāmāh from satyāk kāmāh antyādīkānāh). In the last analysis, this is a distinction of all goods considered as particulars from the universal good in which all goods obtain and are obtained (*savyāpti*, Kauś. UP. III.3, etc.).

2 The "temptation" of Naciketas by Mṛtyu, Yama, in our text corresponds to the temptation of Māra in J.I.63 (offer of universal sovereignty) and J.I.78 (daughters of Māra), and to Matth.IV.8.9 "All these things will I give thee, if...." and to the temptation by the "Serpent" in Genesis. The Tempter (whether Love or Death, Satan or Serpent) is always one and the same Titan Father whom the proceeding Agni farewells in RV.X. 12.3-4, and the Tempted always the solar "Man". When the Sun of Men and Light of the World says "Get thee behind me, Satan", this "behind me" (mad-paścā) is a relegation of Varuṇa to his place in the West AB. V.2.3.1 "Yama holds the lordship of the whole extent of earth; he who without asking from Yama a place of it...." corresponds to Luke IV. 6 "for that is delivered unto me; and to whomsoever I will give it." In the case of the first temptation of the Buddha by Māra (J.I.63), the Buddha's refusal of the Wheel Jewel (*cakka ratanam*), the recognized symbol of temporal power, is as much as to say "My kingdom is not of this world." It is in another sense that the Buddha, like Christ, is both king (*cakravartin*) and Prophet (*isitama*, M.I.386).

The virtually identical character of the three temptations, those of the Buddha, the Christ, and Naciketas lends further support to the view that KU. is the story, not so much of a specific "human sacrifice" as of the dealings of the Universal Man with Death; or if we wish to avoid this conclusion, it is manifest at least that the dealing of Naciketas with Death is a "type" of the conquest of Death by the Universal Man, in the same sense that the sacrifice of Abraham is "typal" of the sacrifice of the Son of Man.

3. Cf. St. Bernard's distinction of *esse* from *proprium*.

4. *Mānasam vittam* would be "rational knowledge" as distinguished from "first principles"; cf. St. Thomas, *Sum. Theol.* II.II. 1.180.1 c "The appetitive power (i.e. *kāma*) moves one to observe things either with the senses or the intel-
tual-self (ātman), the former being what is "obtained by the eye" (symbol of sense-perception), the latter what is "heard by the ear" (symbol of intelligence,—tac chṛṇoto, "what he hears" not without a reference to "śruti").

In our Upaniṣad, Death is the guru and Naciketas the śrāvaka; the distinction of vitta from vitta in BU. corresponds to that which we propose to recognize as between śṛṅkā and śṛṅkā in KU. There is, however, a distinction also of "hearing" from "hearing". "He is not to be apprehended by much hearing of scripture" (na bahuna śrutena...labhyāḥ, KU. II.23): "One man hath ears, but hath not heard her (Vāc, as in RV.X. 125.5; Aditi, as in KU.II. 7; Sophia); but to another (sc. ya evam veda) she unveils herself" tvāṃ vi sasre, RV. X. 71.4, prototype of KU. II. 23 viṣṇute tenum svāṃ). Naciketas is precisely such "another",— tvāḍṛń no bhūyāt naciketaḥ praśṭā, KU.II.9.

More than this, there can be cited a Vedic text which affords a remarkable parallel to Naciketas' refusal of Death's vittamayi śṛṅkā: viz. that of RV. VIII.47.15, where "the whole evil dream, whether it be necklace (niśka) or chain of gold (sraya)" is consigned to Treta Āptya, who as an ab intra aspect of the Sun or Agni, cf. Ahir Budhnya, can easily be identified with Varuṇa (similarly made the recipient of inauspicious things) and with Death; in RV.I.163. 3 the identification of the Solar Stallion with Treta and Yama is explicit, "Yama art thou, O Stallion; Aditya thou; Treta art thou by interior operation".

Our vittamayi śṛṅkā is then the chain or series of all "goods", whether material or mental, considered objectively as something over against the Spiritual-self; all "great possessions" such as those (amongst which may be remarked the moral virtues) for the sake of which the rich man turns away sorrowful,—Math. XIX.20 f. and Mark X.20 f., "and went away grieved; for he had great possessions... How hardly shall they that have riches enter into the Kingdom of God (in our Upaniṣad, 'Death's house,' the Sun)... It is easier for a camel to go through the eye of the needle".

I, 1. This is not a disparagement of the eye as such, but of sensational as distinguished from intellectual recognitions. Its bearing upon the modern tendency to substitute a "visual" for a "verbal" education is obvious. By "visual education" there is meant, of course, a conveyance of factual information in terms of what things look like; and not at all the use of visual symbols or a presentation of traditional art where it is a matter not of appearances but of meanings.

2. We substitute "the" for "a" needle deliberately. The "camel" is a type of the body and lower soul (aisthesis and noesis), the "needle's eye" is the Sun, cf. Rūmi, Mathnawi I.3055-3066 and JUB.III. 14.1-5.

"There is no hope of eternal life by means of wealth" (amṛtyasya tu nāśāsti vittena, BU.II.4.2). Almost all the "cultural values" of modern civilisation are "great possessions".
What then is the *anekarūpā śīṅkā* of KU.I.16? Suspicion that this is another *śīṅkā* is at once aroused by the fact that it is given, like a robe of honour, or insignia, as a free gift from Death to Naciketas, and that nothing whatever in the context suggests that the gift is made by way of bribe or temptation, nor is anything said about a refusal of this gift, nor can we see any reason why Naciketas should have refused this gift, even though that of a golden chain. If “all is not gold that glitters”, it does not follow that all that glitters is nothing but “filthy lucre”. Gold is the recognized symbol of immortality throughout the Vedic and other traditions;

1 garlands are properly worn by the Devas, “immortals”;

2 we take it, indeed, that Death took the *śīṅkā* from his own neck and put it upon that of Naciketas.

If we paraphrase *anekarūpa* by *vīśvarūpa*, as is quite legitimate, we shall begin to understand what kind of chain this was; since “omniform” is one of the most characteristic of the designations of the highest principle throughout the Vedic tradition. Omniformity is primarily Tvaṣṭr’s or Vṛtra’s, and secondarily, Indra’s, Agni’s, and Savitri’s; it is their idiosyncrasy, their mode of being many whilst still remaining one, like Death in SB X.5.2.16. The Spirit (ātman, the Sun in RV.I.115.1; Light of Lights) lends itself to all modalities of being, as water to vessels of all sizes and shapes, each taking what it

1 Explicit in SB.IX.4.4.8, “golden means immortal” (with reference to VS. XVIII.5, “Golden-winged bird”); and TS.V.1.10.3 “Now Agni is Death and gold is immortality”.

2. “There are necklaces (*nisḵāḥ* in the sacrificer’s world” (AV.VII.991).

That our interpretation of the *anekarūpa śīṅkā* is the correct one is strongly supported by the wording of a Buddhist text discovered after the foregoing had been written. We find in M.I.387 “Just as one might weave a manifold garland (*vicitram mālām*), even so in the Bhagvan (Buddha) there is full many a form (*aneka-vaṃga*), yea, many many hundreds of forms (*anekasata-vaṃga*). Who can refuse praise (na vaṃgam karissat) where praise is due?” Cf. *aneka-vaṃgam* in Bg. XI.14.

It may be observed that *vaṃga* (Skr. *vaṃga*) has a variety of closely connected meanings, e.g. colour, aspect, splendour, beauty, caste, rank, ilk, kind, species, likeness, property (in *re*), quality, reason, cause, and praise, practically all of which meanings are present also in *rūpa*, at the same time that all correspond to “form, idea, species, eternal reason, cause,” etc. as these terms are employed in Scholastic exemplarism. The meaning “praise” derives from the root meaning of *vaṃga*, “describe”; and it can be readily understood that a “description” of these countless “attributes” is a “laudation”. The “innumerable forms” subsisting in a single “form”, or of “innumerable beauties” in “beauty” itself (cf. CU.IV.15 discussed in my *Source of and a Parallel to Dionysius on the Beautiful*, in *Journ. Greater India Soc.*, vol. III, p. 38) are not so many “possessions”, but so many “perfections”.

3 Perhaps with the pertinent words of AV.X.6.4 “May this gold-woven jewel (*hiraṇya-svag ayam maṇiḥ*), imparting faith and sacrifice (*yajñam* cf. *yajataṃ* in RV II.33.10) and grandeur (mahat), abide in our house as a guest” (*grhe vasattu no tithiḥ*, cf. KU.I.9 avātiṣṭ grhe me...atītiḥ). As everyone knows, the Hindu to this day garlands his guest, not indeed with such a garland in effect, a “crown”, as Death can bestow upon his Saints, but in imitation (*anukaraṇa*) thereof, and because “We should do what the Devas have done”. 
can receive. In RV.II.33.9-10, Rudra, described in terms of the solar Indra (vajrabāhu, etc.), is multiform (pururūpaḥ) and “radiant with shining golden-gear”, and specific reference is made to the “omiform, reverend necklace” (niśkram yajatam viśvarūpaṃ) that he, the Arhat (arhan)\(^1\) wears. It can be truly said, that “omiformity” is the best of the divine “ornaments” seeing that it is only that all “good” can be referred to God per excellentiam, who were he not both the many (aneka) and the one (eka) could be thought of as a one amongst the many. As integral multiplicity (viśvam ēkam, RV.III.54.8 he is the imago imagivans of each and every imago imaginata,—“the single form that is the form of very different things” (Eckhart).

This is the doctrine of exemplarism, Vedic as well as Christian, but into an exposition of which we cannot enter here,\(^2\) except to note the allusions in our Upaniṣad, V. 9 and 12-13, rūpaṁ rūpaṁ pratīkpo babhūva, ekas tathā sarva-bhūtāntarātmaḥ... eko bhūmān yo vidadhāti kāmān, “One and only Spiritual-essence of all beings, who cometh into being as the counterform of each and every form... the One of the many,\(^3\) who fulfils their desires”.\(^4\) Death’s gift of the anekarūpa-srinkā is an assimilation of Naciketas to himself, an acceptance, and as much as to say, as in JUB.III.14.5 “Who I am, thou art: Come in”.

I.26: tava nṛtya-gīte, “Thine be the dance and song” acquires an added force if referred to JB.II.69-70, where Prajāpati and Death are conducting opposing sacrifices, Prajāpati’s “party” consisting of the chanted lauds, recitative, and ritual acts (in a word, the sacerdotal art) and Death’s of “what was sung to the harp, or ‘danced’, or done by way of vanity” (in a word, secular art). For a fuller discussion see my “Nature of ‘Folklore’ and ‘Popular art’” in Q. J. Myth. Soc., Bangalore, XXVII.

---

1. Arhanā bhūjā devāno amrūttattvam anāśūḥ, RV.X.63.4; cf. texts cited at the head of this article. Agni and Indra are preeminently the Arhats of RV.
2. See my Vedic Exemplarism, HJAS I.1936, pp. 44-64.
3. Rather than “one amid many” as rendered by RAWSON, Cf. AA.11.3.8 (4) “In it in Unity all the Gods subsist.”
4. Or “dispenses their ‘goods’”,—whatever these may be. The Spirit lends itself indifferently to all modalities of being: “The same am I in all beings; there is none hateful to me nor dear.” (BG. IX.29). The participation of essence (ātmāmāni vihhajya pārayati imānil lokān, mu. VI. 26) gives to individual potentialities the opportunity to become what they have it in them to become and this “creation” is a necessary part of the “plan of redemption”, because in the last analysis all pursuit of any good is the pursuit of universal good (“God is called ‘good’ as being that by which all things are”), Dionysius, De div. Nom. IV.1; “It is not for their own sake, but for the sake of the Spiritual-essence that all things are ‘dear’”, i.e. are thought of as “goods”, (BU.II.45 and IV.5, followed almost verbatim by S.I. 75=Udāna 47). But if the divine essence gives to all things indiscriminately their being, the manner of their being depends upon themselves and is determined by the specific virtue that each thing “milks” from the divine nature, Natura naturans, Creatrix, Viraja in AV.VIII.10.22 f., or as it can be otherwise expressed, determined by mediate causes (karma) according to which “fate lies in the created causes themselves” (St. Thomas, Sum. Theol. I.116.2).
We need hardly say that Prajāpati and Death are one and the same "beyond the Falcon", but here considered ab extra under two different aspects: just as the Buddha and Mara are one, but considered in this world necessarily as contrasted and mutually conflicting principles. The Progenitor, the Wake, is the Son, or God, the principle of Life, as distinguished from Death, the Sleeper, the Father, or Godhead, the Ender: it is the Supreme Identity of both "whose likeness is both of Life and Death" (RV.X.121.2), who "unifies some and separates others" (AA. III.2.3.) and can be referred to as saying "I kill and I make alive" (Dent.XXII.39). Light and Darkness, Coolth and Heat (chāya-tapau, III.1, see discussion below) are outwardly contrasted, as the sacerdotal and secular arts are contrasted in JB. But this does not mean that the sacerdotal and the secular art are without analogy, such an analogy for example as we shall presently recognize as subsisting between the anekarūpa and vittamayī "chains": "All music is an earthly representation of the music that there is in the rhythm of the ideal world" (Plotinus, Enneads, V.9.11). "Thine be the dance and song" can have one meaning as spoken by Naciketas for whom in his "simplicity", "Death" is rather the event (punar mṛtyu) than the person (Mṛtyu) "who does not die" (SB.) but another and paramārthika significance for the Comprehensor, ya evāṁ veda. For if the song and dance are Death's in one way in this world, they are his in another way yonder, "in Yama's seat, that 'God-home' hight, there flutes are blown for him, there is he adorned with songs". To have renounced the secular art is to have obtained the sacerdotal, in which the secular exists more eminently; just as to have renounced the vittamayī chain is also to have obtained the anekarūpa. In this sense tava mṛtya-gīte is not so much "Thine be the dance and song" but "Thine are the dance and song" essentially.

(To be continued)

---

SCHOPENHAUER AND INDIA*

By

HEINRICH ZIMMER

The ideas of Europe about India underwent a radical change since its sea-faring peoples, the Portuguese and the Dutch, the English and the French, bent on commerce and conquest, penetrated that distant country, and travellers and missionaries brought new reports of it which added fresh colours and new traits to the obscure and often fabulous picture that ancient tradition had conveyed of the far-off land of India; but it was not until the West stood face to face with the great crisis in its own inheritance, a crisis which was never to end, that the most secret features of the primeval countenance of India, instinct with mystery, assumed real significance in the eyes of the West: when the period of the Enlightenment dissolved the shell of its faith and the Revolution of 1789 tore from its foundations the old structure of mediæval Christian and antique Baroque forms of life and power. Then Europe, unfettered on the path of its own individual fate, mighty to fulfil its destiny, rushed headlong into the adventure of the immeasurable and illimitable, and roused the older, slumbering continents from their repose, dragging them along with it, gradually but forcefully into the vortex of its dissolution, which wrought deeper changes in the crust of the earth, as far as mankind is concerned, than even the primeval transition from the Stone Age to the Bronze Age had been able to do.

Every time when the divine idea grows powerless, the strength of the Titans attains boundless force and merciless dominion: thus does the Indian mythus interpret the world drama and that period of the world’s history when Schopenhauer was born, whose voice was to be the first to give the doctrine of India that mysterious ringing sound in the ears of the West and that lofty position in the choir of spirits which it has ever since occupied in the circle of those who know. The remarkable thing is how little India speaks with her own voice in Schopenhauer’s principal work, especially in his first decisive cast even in the second mature form of his doctrine which gathers the fruit of a long acquaintance with a life rich in its solitude, into the barn with the spirits of the ages, the treasury of ancient Indian words and symbols, which was even then palpable, was only utilized very incidentally.

In Hegel’s great review of world history and world religions we get far more first-hand knowledge from Indian sources about India’s great and remarkable countenance; and if a hundred years after Hegel apt information is adduced to interpret and reveal India from an incomparably richer treasury of sources

---

* Abridged English version of a paper entitled “Schopenhauer und Indien” contributed to the Jubilee Volume of Jahrbuch der Schopenhauergesellschaft, published in Germany on 22nd February, 1938, to celebrate the 150th birthday of that great German philosopher.
which has since been unlocked, it can easily become, as it were, a beautiful exegesis and a fuller painting of the few lapidary traits in the sketch which the eagle eye of Hegel’s historical genius detected beneath India’s dark mask. But it was far from Hegel, as a pioneer of Europe's future in remembering vanishing forms of humanity, to allow himself to fall under the spell of India’s gesture; hence his presentation of India, masterly though it was, did not cast a glamour over anyone; indeed, it was at first lost in the huge masses of his work, until a later epoch brought it to light once more, to separate its immortal part from the dust.

Schelling, who in the depth of his philosophizing, when he is not even thinking about India, was so near to some fundamental figures of its interpretation of the universe—for instance when he speaks of the “wrath of God” or the “madness which rends itself” as the moving force at the bottom of all things—has made a thoroughly rambling study of the ancient Indian gods in his vast work written in his old age, but the precious metal of his thought, which comes to light in many places in gleaming veins, is here, as it were, blasted and lost sight of, among the rocks and stones.

Schopenhauer makes only sparing allusions to India in his principal work; he apparently has no need of India when explaining himself in the mirror of the riddle of the universe; the Greek myth—“the Wheel of Ixion stands still”—says in a single metaphor everything there is to say about suffering and release; but beside it the dictum of the “Veil of Maya” is certainly an immortally stamped sign. But Sophocles and Calderon, Shakespeare and Goethe, are the leading voices of the Chorus with which the hermit holds colloquy; Plato and the Mystics, Seneca and the masters of the sentence in France, England and Spain, are those whom he invokes, in order to say what all ages felt when they rose above the perplexity of life to survey it—but which no philosopher in the West before him had raised to the dignity of a convincing doctrine. The later writings on ethics do, it is true, show a more visible reference to Indian teachings—with a preference for Buddhism—but these writings are complementary in nature; in the Dresden period of the first great cast he is scarcely concerned with guidance for the conduct of life as regards the outside world, or with the social consequences of the new and terrifying aspect of the world. He is concerned rather with the interpretation of existence, its meaning and its profound mystery.

The Upanishads, which have been praised by him so highly, could no doubt furnish a few isolated sayings as a consolatory and fortifying drug against the incurable suffering in life—“the knot of the heart is unbound” —and paint the Fata Morgana of the state of an accomplished inversion of the will, in glowing colours on the iron firmament. But taken as a whole and with reference to their thousands of years’ significance in India, they are the adamant foundation of its deepest faith and its purest piety, they teach the divine sport and the supramundane peace in the fearful convulsion of forces of the timeless course of the universe, and they are the way to bestow on man-
kind the kernel of the divine imperishable in the shell of its individuation so grievously exposed to pain. They are the jewel on the brow of the Hindu faith—and in Schopenhauer they charmed an agnostic, who ushered Europe into the new era of its unbelief, and strode undaunted into the icy blast of an atmosphere mercilessly despoiled of gods.

Schopenhauer does not draw on the Bhagavad-Gītā, which had just been made available through Schlegel's translation, which Humboldt welcomed as the consolation of his old age, and which Hegel appreciated as a document—the fearful and lofty power in the world and the ego, which Schopenhauer called "will," is here certainly conceived as all-divine. All the classical wisdom of India in Hinduism is religious; hence the Indian element in the agnostic "World as Will and Idea" could not be much more than the enchanting note of a strange new instrument in the deep fullness of sounds in this symphony which played lights and shades as yet unknown around the basic melody—but this melody arose alone from the labyrinth of the breast of the solitary world-seer.

A doctrine of release without a way of release—measured by all kindred Indian doctrines of the initiated—a picture of the world by which he who created it with the eye of knowledge has himself become bewitched, and grows chill as though in the magic circle of his own enlightenment, at the same time finds repose under the curse which has fallen upon him, so that, in the pure perception of what is spiritually permeated, he may taste the thrill of inversion and liberation, which, like the Promised Land before the eyes of the dying Moses, appears on the horizon, an unattainable promise.

The goal was certainly more understood than realised; but the primal knowledge which originated in Schopenhauer's mind and needed no hint from India: of the blind will as a world-permeating being and world-moving force, which soaring through realms of forms in Nature and purifying itself is capable of illuminating itself in man,—this is just as closely akin to Indian doctrine, spirit of the spirit of India, as Schopenhauer's personality and mode of life were far removed from the Yogis and Brahmans, teachers and ascetics of India. A specimen of a tenacious capitalist, disgruntled and moody, but who knew how to make the most of life, obstinate and naïve in his vital joy in fame, immortality and long life, godless, and yet strong, and in this a type of the coming era, homeless on earth and in heaven, feeling at home only in the realm of spirits and among his books: that is the outer shell of his individuation—no genuine wanderer in that sphere at whose border all signatures change, the stars fall and the force of gravity comes to a standstill, no mendicant pilgrim with other-worldly smile, whose symbol for India is the wandering wild swan as an allegory of the released soul: he has pulled both feet out of the waters of life and the nourishing mire of ever renewed spontaneous generation, to soar in wheeling flight over fertile tracts and waste lands and to raise himself to the eternal snowy peaks of abstraction, the abode of the gods between crystal lakes.
The formula of the “Veil of Maya” contains the question: By what standard does an individual compare himself with the universe and the ego? What does he recognize to be the essence of the universe and of his own Self? What Schopenhauer called “Will,” is called in India “Shakti,” i.e. “Energy.” Shakti is the last word in Indian world-interpretation in later Hinduism, the almighty keyword for the revealed mystery of the divine in man and universe.

To comprehend that all appearance is material and moving “Energy” of the all-divine—Shiva’s consort clasping the eternal rest of the all-god in eternal embrace of wild surrender, and igniting herself thereat to sport without end, his world-creating side and half—to comprehend Shakti as the sum of substance of all life, means to the Indian to realise the identity of what is lovely with what is destructive. The love-call and the death-dealing thrust gush from the same spring of life which pours forth, tumbling headlong in its desire to rush out into the wide world; the sweet vague aspirations in the charm of childlike youths and in the tender young women are one with the poverty of decay, the horror of disintegration; the vague impulse of life, which goes on reproducing and consuming its warmth, is one Shakti—with the flashing clear glance from the third eye of knowledge.

All are gestures of Shakti—he who plans creation, implies death; lovers, who seek each another with kisses and lose themselves in each another, are of a piece with the dumb diversity of all decay, which is taking place unseen simultaneously all around them and which will soon disintegrate them too: while they in pure spontaneity propagate new life from their inmost energy, and, carried away beyond themselves, complete the circle of creation, the flashing circle of the stream, the same electric power passes through them as, flashing from the sky, transforms the trees into blazing torches and reduces them to charred stumps, which threshes the corn by impregnating the soil.

The insight into the profound oneness of contrasts, which India early developed, regards all the diversity of the gestures of life as ultimately one: as the unending sport of Shakti, as the mimic dance of the goddess of the world-energy, who in the rhythmic motion of her limbs and inexhaustible movements becomes intoxicated with herself.

Here fails the half-breed nature of specious innocence of thought; no room remains for sentimental classifications, as though what is idyllically harmless had no essential part in the unbounded raging of life in constant self-mutilation—as though the one were not always in the other, and all in all, although slumbering in the background only thinly concealed by a single surface: as if kisses and bites, life and death were not unceasingly intermingling. The idyll of a smiling flowering plant is forced up by the passion to reproduce itself unceasingly, by the vaguely embittered struggle for every crumb of earth.

The thousandfold flickering face of divine reality, the essence of which is Shakti, deceives no believer by its light and joyous colours which transform the landscape of life, no more than by its heart-rending darkness and the terror of annihilation which bellows forth from its all-devouring paws. The
Shakti of the god has been world-mother from time immemorial, mother of all creation, and "Thou art the Mother" calls the sacrificial creature towards those jaws which must devour it in the eternal to and fro of universal evolution and devolution—"Thou art the Mother, and I am Thy child"—or: "It is indeed Thou, Lord, in the whirlpool of annihilation as in the sport of becoming, and I am Thou in my deepest essence"—and herewith the victim overcomes the inexpressible violence of life which to the individual certainly must appear as pure destruction, if he gazes without faith into the face of the transitoriness of all individuation.

Meaningless and indestructible, this divine whole, as it renews itself unceasingly, eternally in the play of myriads of rises and falls; in dumb silence the comprehending creature gazes into this spectrum and kaleidoscope of divine power, as it emits sparks—worlds and creatures—and hurls them together in confusion, thereby forming ever new glowing constellations and bursting into flames swallows up all: moments in the life of an individual and great world-epoche incapable of interpretation and pregnant with significance, springing up, mown down and already turned to dust.

A silent pause, as eye to eye: all that am I myself—with all its rainbow colours the most flattering happiness and horror rush through my inner being, a rain of gleaming stars and deadly meteors whirls round about me like the wandering whirlwind of a desert, which scatters night before the eye and chokes the breath, and drags me too like a grain of sand into the divine progress of its deadly vortex—like falling stars we plunge through God's space and are sheltered therein.

The inexorableness of such a vision of reality has been familiar in India from ancient times; to Schopenhauer was given, not the mentality which responds to this in India, but a genuine glimmer of this vision. He was the first among the Western people to speak of this in an incomparable manner—in that great cloudburst of European-Christian atmosphere, the cold breath of which inspired Jean Paul with the title of one of his most beautiful nocturnal visions: "Rede des toten Christus vom Weltgebäude herab, dass kein Gott sei" ("Speech of the dead Christ from the edifice of the universe that there is no God"). As with a magic wand Schopenhauer broke the barrier which separated Europe from the landscape of India's spirits; with his perception life looked at itself as though with Indian eyes; but India herself teaches how life can be a match for this reality which it comprehends in itself.
AN IMPLICATION OF THE BHAGVADGĪTĀ RIDDLE

By

F. O. SCHRADER

The tantalising problem of the 1½ ślokas attributing, in some manuscripts, at the beginning of the Bhīṣmavadhaparvan 620 ślokas to Śri-Kṛṣṇa, 57 to Arjuna, 67 to Saṁjaya, and one śloka to Dhṛtarāṣṭra, i.e., 46 more to Śri-Kṛṣṇa, 27 less to Arjuna, and 26 more to Saṁjaya than in the common Gītā is not removed by the indubitable fact that the passage containing those ślokas (stanzas 1-5 following the Bhagavadgītā) is an interpolation. For, however late that passage may be, the Bhagavadgītā to which it refers must be older and may be even considerably older, and those ślokas must have been composed by one who had actually before him a Bhagavadgītā of that description. Equally the author of the slightly modified corresponding passage in the two Kashmirian manuscripts mentioned by Mr. Tadpatrikar must have really counted the stanzas of his Bhagavadgītā and found that in it Arjuna speaks only 55 and Saṁjaya only 65 stanzas.

There was, then, a Bhagavadgītā different from ours in the mentioned way, and the task is thrown upon us to find out, if possible, something more about the relation of the two than is indicated by the difference in the number of ślokas attributed to the several speakers. We may at once rule out from our inquiry the Bhagavadgītā of the Suddha Dharma Mandala of Madras (published in 1917), because this, not to speak of the artificiality of its composition, agrees but imperfectly with the scheme of our Mahābhārata passage. For, though it does consist of 745 stanzas and makes Dhṛtarāṣṭra speak his one stanza and Saṁjaya 67, Arjuna gets in it not 57 but 68½ stanzas and Śri-Kṛṣṇa not 620 but only 608½. We have, then, here an attempt to fabricate a Bhagavadgītā conforming to our Mahābhārata passage and consequently later than it. Now, as more often than not in the case of a work existing in two recensions the longer one has been found to be the later one, we shall naturally try first to understand our problem from this point of view.

Our provisional supposition, then, is that at a time when the Bhagavadgītā was not yet as sacrosanct as it has been since more than a millennium this same Bhagavadgītā as we now have it was re-written with some additions

and omissions. Now, we can well imagine that the revisor *added* bona fide to, or interpolated in, the speeches of Śrī-Kṛṣṇa some more stanzas of the Lord's known to him from other sources. We can also understand that he saw no harm in adding, where this appeared to be desirable to him for the sake of clearness or otherwise, some ślokas (borrowed or of his own making) to those spoken by Sānjaya. We can, however, not understand his omitting any ślokas of the present Gitā. For, what could have induced him to do so? Certainly not the discovery that as many as 27 out of the 84 ślokas attributed to Arjuna were worth nothing! Nor a compulsion felt to stick to the total of 700 stanzas of the Gitā under revision; for, the revisor's additions (72 stanzas) far outnumber his omission of only the 27 stanzas taken away from Arjuna's share. Nor, thirdly, the wish to gain more room, in a Gitā restricted to 745 stanzas, for his additional 46 and 26 stanzas spoken resp. by Śrī-Kṛṣṇa and Sānjaya; for, in the first place, nobody would in a Kṛṣṇā-juna-sanvāda shorten Arjuna's speeches and increase Sānjaya's (the less so as the latter could even be shortened by at least eight ślokas, viz., I 15-18 and XI 10-13); and, secondly, 745 not being a holy or lucky number, nothing evidently need have hindered the compiler to compose a Gitā of 750 or more stanzas.

No other conclusion can be drawn from this consideration but that those 27 ślokas exceeding in the current Gitā the number of those spoken by Arjuna in the longer one were not known to the compiler of the latter, and thus the supposition that he had before him our present Gitā falls to the ground.

But what does this mean? It can mean nothing less than that those 27 ślokas, since they were missing but cannot have been omitted in Vaiśampāyana's Gitā (as outlined by his śloka summary) must be a later addition to the original Gitā, no matter whether the latter itself or only a later recension truer to the original than those known to us was the basis of the Gitā of 745 ślokas referred to in the summary.

And now we cannot, of course, resist the temptation to see whether and where among the 84 stanzas attributed to Arjuna in our own Gitā we can discover twenty-seven which are not necessary for the context and thus may be regarded as interpolated.

That there are interpolations in the Bhagavadgītā was noticed as soon as it became known in Europe, viz., by the great *Wilhelm von Humboldt* who found it difficult to believe that the last seven adhyāyas up to XVIII 62 are an original part of the Gitā. More than a century has elapsed since (1826), and during it many scholars have expressed their opinion on the problem with the result that in the West the almost general opinion is at present that the Gitā cannot have been from the beginning what it is now. Farthest of all went the late Professor *Winternitz* who, not satisfied with Garbe's deletion of 170 stanzas, refused to recognize as original parts of the Gitā the whole of the famous eleventh canto as well as the whole of the last six cantos with the sole exception of XVIII 55-66. The last one who wrote on the problem
is the late Professor Rudolf Otto of Marburg University.¹ He endeavoured
to show that the Gitā has had much the same evolution as the Mokṣadharma:
as the dying Bhiṣma's "few reconciling and consolatory speeches," which
alone could have been part of the epic proper, became the "nest" of numerous
treatises, so the "primitive Gitā" (Urgitā) of 156 verses² gradually grew,
first by the intrusion of eight "didactic treatises" (Lehrtrakte)³ and then by
many "glosses," the same (with some exceptions) as, and a few more than,
those pointed out by Garbe. His view of canto XI was identical with
Humboldt's, viz., that it is the very acme of the Gitā, and thus diametrically
opposed to that of Winternitz.⁴

We are here concerned with the glosses only, and of them merely with
those belonging to Arjuna's speeches. Garbe eliminates seventeen of Arjuna's
ślokas, viz., VIII 1-2, X 12-18, and XI 15-16, 18-19, and 37-40; while Otto
prints (in small type, i.e.) as glosses merely VIII 1-2 and, with doubt (mark
of interrogation), XI 15-16, 18 and 37-40, and thus not X 12-18 which is
for him an original part of the "treatise" X 12-42, as it is, indeed, also for
Garbe who, without distinguishing between treatises and glosses, excludes X
12-42 from his primitive Gitā. Thus, Garbe and Otto could furnish us at
the best but 10 of the 27 stanzas we are in need of. This shows that we
must direct our inquiry to some other part or parts of the Gitā.

Now, it is easy to see that the bulk of the additions we are looking for
must be contained in canto XI. For, this most admired canto of the Bhagavad-gitā is on account of its highly imaginative character specially favourable
to enlargement, and of the two cantos containing many ślokas spoken by
Arjuna (viz., I with 21 and XI with 33) it is the one where a fairly large
number thereof can be spared. Not much is lost and the context is not disturb-
ed if we omit stanzas 1 and 2, 15 to 30, and 36 to 44. This gives us exactly twenty-seven stanzas, it being remarkable that apparently not one more can be spared in the adhyāya in Arjuna's speeches.
Let us now examine more closely these omissions which, as we have seen, are in
reality additions.

Stanza XI 1 appears in Garbe's translation as part of the original Gitā,
but in his Appendix he has the following note on it: "We could suspect that

¹. See my detailed criticism of his three works concerned in Orientalistische
Literaturzeitung, 1936, columns 107-118.
². Viz., Adhy. I; II 1-13, 20, 22, 29-37; X 1-8; XI 1-17, 20-36, 41-51; and
XVIII 58-61, 66, 72-73 (dash = " to", incl.).
³. Viz., XI 52—XII 20; XIV—XV; XVI—XVIII 57; XIII; V; VI—IX;
II 39—IV; and X 12-42. About the order of this arrangement we are left in
the dark. If it is meant to be chronological, there must be a mistake in it; for,
the fifth treatise is said to be an appendix to the seventh.
⁴. According to whom this canto, caused by the "highly insipid appearance
of Krishna as All-God" in canto X, is only a "dramatic tinsel in the Puranic style"
the omission of which would make one miss "absolutely nothing" (WZKM. 1907,
pp. 196 ff.).
the first verse also of canto XI still belongs to the large interpolation [preceding it, viz. X 12-42]. It strikes one that Arjuna declares already here (when no less than eight cantos are still to follow) that thanks to Kṛṣṇa’s teaching his delusion has disappeared. For, Kṛṣṇa asks about it only where it is to be expected, viz. at the end of the poem, in XVIII 72; and there only (in 73) can Arjuna’s confession be called justified and in the right place. But I do not wish to attach too much weight to inconsistencies like this in a poem.” That the second sūkṣma is also redundant needs the less be proved

as sūkṣma 3 is a perfectly suitable beginning of the adhyāya. The word ugra-rūpo in 31 seems to point back to the expressions of fear (see esp. 20, 21, 23) in stanzas 15-30, but Arjuna’s awe being already indicated by hṛṣṭaromā in 14, those stanzas may as well be understood as an expansion of 31 by a revisor who felt inspired to picture Arjuna’s feelings; and this accounts also for the interpolation of 36-44 intervening between two stanzas the close connection of which is obvious by vepamānaḥ (35) and bhayena ca pravya-thitam mano me (45).

It may be objected that not all of the twenty-seven additional sūkṣmas need be contained in canto XI. But the following consideration will show that this objection can at most affect but two of the sūkṣmas concerned. The author of the Bhagavadgītā of the Śuddha Dharma Mandala has omitted even 30 verses of Arjuna’s from those appearing in the vulgate of the Bhagavadgītā, viz., I 32-44 and 46; II 4 and 8; III 2; IV 4; VI 38; and XI 19-20, 22-27, 29-31. But he could do so only by ignoring the division into 18 adhyāyas and trying to distribute as suited his fancy the 700 verses among the 26 adhyāyas (or subjects) wanted for his “ancient” Gītā, with the result that there remained 30 of Arjuna’s verses which he could not manage and thus quietly ignored. In a Gītā of 18 adhyāyas, however, essentially identical with ours none of those omissions can be justified (neither as such nor as interpolations) except only those in adhyāya XI, and these are included in our supposed interpolation 15-30, with the sole exception of 31 which cannot be missed for the context. All interpolations assumed by Garbe for canto XI are also included in ours, and of the rest there remain only stanzas VIII 1-2 which may, indeed, but need not be an interpolation,—need not, because we do not acknowledge Garbe’s reason for excluding them (and the next two), which is, as in many other cases, his erroneous belief that in the Bhagavadgītā everything advaitic must be

1. The complete absence of a sense of propriety (let alone historical sense) in the author of this fabrication is best illustrated by the fact that he includes in the Bhagavadgītā Arjuna’s devistuti from the last but one of the preceding chapters of the Bhagavadgītā-parvan.

2. It remains curious that he left Sanjāya with a whole skin. But this is evidently due to his looking at Sanjāya’s sūkṣmas as the frame of the Gītā to be preserved at any cost and even requiring enlargement. So he actually added (with the help of other chapters of the Bhiṣma-parvan) 10 and 25 sūkṣmas resp. to those spoken by Sanjāya in the first and in the last chapter of the Gītā.
spurious. Still, it being difficult to account for XI 1-2 as an addition, while the reason for adding stanzas VIII 1-2 could be found in the idea that stanzas VIII 3-4 presuppose (which in reality they do not) a question by Arjuna, we admit that these rather than XI 1-2 may belong to the 27 ślokas added.

The fact that it is just the eleventh canto which has thus been found to contain the 27 ślokas missing in Vaiśampāyana’s Gitā, or at least 25 of them, is another reason for the unlikeness of their having been omitted, as this canto and ask yourself whether any admirer of the Gitā could conceive the idea of shortening it and, supposing even there was one, whether he would have omitted exactly those ślokas. We hold that canto XI, when once it had attained its present shape, could not be shortened. The S. Dh. M. Gitā cannot be instanced against this thesis, because it is a unique case. We have seen that it cannot be the Gitā referred to by Vaiśampāyana, and we cannot reasonably assume that his was a Gitā similar to it, i.e., essentially different from ours. There is too much against assuming that ever before the S. Dh. M. Gitā the disastrous idea entered a person’s mind that, for discovering the original Gitā, the 700 stanzas of the current one must be shuffled like a pack of cards. That ingenious person, indeed, but none else, could think it fit to distribute the majority of Arjuna’s ślokas, as contained in the vulgate, among sixteen of his newly created twenty-six adhyāyas and deliver to oblivion the remaining thirty ślokas.

Adding rather than omitting or a mere copyist’s mistake is possibly also the key to the varietas lectionis mentioned at the beginning of this paper. For, a copyist cannot well have twice mistaken sapta for pañca and it is less likely that Vaiśampāyana’s Gitā should have been shortened, intentionally or by negligence, by two of Arjuna’s stanzas and two of Śrīnāya’s than that a Gitā of 741 stanzas was brought up to the more perfect number 745. In the latter case, then, the reading of the two Kashmirian manuscripts would go back to an older source than the one making the Gitā consist of 745 stanzas, and we get a glimpse of the gradual growth of the Gitā from an unknown stage or number of stages to 671 stanzas (i.e., the vulgate minus 29 stanzas of Arjuna’s) and, from that point, in two diverging lines viz., (1) to a Gitā of 698 stanzas, i.e., 671 increased by 27 of Arjuna’s and then, by means of two more stanzas attributed to him, to the 700 stanzas of the vulgate; and, on the other hand, (2) to 741 stanzas, i.e., the vulgate minus 29 stanzas of Arjuna’s and plus 70 stanzas, not contained in the vulgate, of Śrī-Śrīnā’s and Śrīnāya’s, and from here, viz. by adding from the complete vulgate 2 more stanzas of Arjuna’s and besides 2 more stanzas of Śrīnāya’s, to the 745 stanzas of Vaiśampāyana’s Gitā. If this is what has happened, then not 27 but 29 ślokas spoken by Arjuna have to be accounted for as missing in the

1. Whether from the vulgate or not we cannot tell because in Vaiśampāyana’s Gitā there are 26 stanzas more spoken by S. than in the vulgate, and the two added ones may be among them.
original Gîtâ, and the two latest ones would have to be either XI 1-2, or VIII 1-2, or two of the group X 12-16, say 12 and 13.

My conclusion, then, is that what I call the Bhagavadgîtâ riddle reveals to us by its very form the existence of two recensions not now available of the Bhagavadgîtâ, to wit: one which was longer than the two known to us (the vulgate and the Kashmirian one) and one which was shorter and therefore, at least as regards the eleventh canto, more original than both of the two. There has been, as I said, since W. v. Humboldt’s days the persistent persuasion among Western scholars, shared also by some in India, that the original Bhagavadgîtâ must have been shorter than the current one. But no coercive literary evidence could so far be given for it. The fact that the Javanese Bhagavadgîtâ\(^1\) stops at XIV 26 and has after this stanza only one more, viz., XVIII 66, strangely agrees, though not exactly, with the theory of Humboldt, Hopkins, and others, but can as yet not be claimed as an unequivocal proof for the existence of a shorter Gîtâ earlier than ours. But Vaiśampâyana’s śloka summary, as I believe to have shown, actually implies such proof.

There must have been Bhîşmaparvan manuscripts in which the śloka summary was actually preceded by a Bhagavadgîtâ conforming to it. Might not such manuscripts be still in existence? Their containing the longer Gîtâ may have merely escaped attention, because readers of the Mahâbhârata are apt to pass over the Bhagavadgîtâ (if not already omitted in their manuscripts),\(^2\) as they know it well enough, often by heart. All Bhîşmaparvan manuscripts, not only those containing the śloka record (which may be quite a late addition), should therefore be examined with an eye to the possibility of their containing a Bhagavadgîtâ different from ours (longer or shorter). As regards the Persian translation of a Bhagavadgîtâ of 745 stanzas, which began to attract attention eight years ago\(^3\) and of which manuscripts are

---

1. To which I called attention in 1933 in the Winternitz congratulatory volume and once more in 1936 in my criticism of Otto’s Gîtâ. It has meanwhile been published by Prof. Gonda of Utrecht.

2. It is said to be missing in many manuscripts, and here again, though many a time it may have been actually omitted, the possibility is given that it was not originally in the Mahâbhârata. It begins abruptly, not like a continuation of the preceding chapters, and its very existence is contradicted by the fact that almost immediately before it, viz. in Bhîşmaparvan XXI, the very same Arjuna whose despondency is at the root of the Bhagavadgîtâ consoles and encourages the despairing Dhrîtarâṣṭra and shows himself fully convinced that “where there is righteousness, there is victory” (11) and “where Krishna is, there is victory” (12). My own opinion is that the Gîtâ and the chapters preceding it belong to two different versions of the great epic which were amalgamated in too clumsy a way to render unrecognizable their difference of provenience, and that the Gîtâ thus incorporated consisted originally of only chapters I, II 1-38, and the śloka XVIII 73.

said to exist both in India and England, it will perhaps prove to be a mere attempt (similar to, though less fantastic than, the Ś. Dh. M. Gitā) to conform to Vaiśampāyana's śloka record with the help of the sections preceding the Gitā in the Bhagavad-gitā-parvan or (and) of other parts of the Mahābhārata. But, however this may be, it is now time that Persian scholars should be approached to enlighten us on the subject.

1. Opinions may have differed sometime as to the beginning of the Bhagavad-gitā within the Bagavadgitā-parvan (=adhy. XIII to XLII of the Bhīṣmaparvan), as there is more than one chapter in the latter (e.g., XIX and XX) which could be understood as such.
WHAT IS AVIJÑAPTI (CONCEALED FORM
OF ACTIVITY)?*

By

V. V. GOKHALE

The Buddhists classify the elements of existence—and this is no doubt one of the oldest classifications—into five groups (skandha), among which the first group, viz. the Rūpaskandha, may be said to correspond roughly to the modern conception of matter and the remaining four groups, viz. Vedanā (feelings), samjñā (concepts), Samskāra (volitional forces) and Vijñāna (consciousness) to what we call mind. The Rūpaskandha or "matter" is further analysed into eleven physical elements, viz. the five senses (Cakṣus, Srotra, Ghrāṇa, Jīhvā and Kāya), their five kinds of objects, and Avijñapti-rūpa as the eleventh.

The designation Avijñapti implies, that this particular kind of physical element cannot be revealed to others; unlike the other ten elements of the Rūpaskandha, it is unmanifested and undiscoverable. When we promise to do something and then fulfill the promise after some time, the interval between the promise and the overt action of its fulfilment represents the period, when the physical action remains unexpressed as Avijñapti-rūpa. It must not, however, be confounded with the idea of doing something, because it owes its existence to some material form, like the one implied in making a promise. Thus, the folding of one's hands in prayer and an accidental, unintentional folding of the hands are two different kinds of action, the former being accompanied by a concealed form of moral activity. Obviously, the Avijñapti-rūpa has a twofold character. It is not merely a rūpa, like the visible, the audible etc., because unmanifested as it is, it always implies some kind of activity (kriyā); nor is it mere activity, because it is essentially a product of the material elements and therefore partakes of the nature of rūpa. It lies in the very nature of a manifestation or expression, howsoever concealed, to be both, physical as well as active.

All physical actions are either expressed or unexpressed, both being in their turn either corporal or vocal. Supposing a man orders another man to commit an assassination, the man, who instigates the murder, commits a vocal declaration (vāgavijñapti) when he gives the order, and the assassin commits a corporal act (kāyavijñapti) when he executes the order. Now, however, at the time of the assassination, the instigator has also committed a certain crime, not vocal but corporal, not overt but latent, inasmuch as he has exercised a corporal 'avijñapti'. While the murder was being committed,

* Read at the Ninth All-India Oriental Conference (1937) at Trivandrum.
the instigator might have even forgotten the order given by him, he might be sleeping or thinking of something else. Yet, he was unwittingly doing an act, for which he had made himself responsible by his former ‘vijnapti’, which, howsoever hidden from the public gaze, is none the less real. There is a corporal ‘avijnapti’ born of a former vocal ‘vijnapti’, viz. the act of giving the order. We shall see later on, that such latent acts are also born in a state of deep concentration or passionlessness of the mind, in which case they are always of the right type (kuśala).

This, in short, is the general view of the Sarvastivadin, formulated at length by Vasubandhu in his Abhidharmakośa. There are some schools, which regard Avijnapti, not as a physical, but as a mental phenomenon, like the Dharmalakṣaṇa school. There are others, like the Sautrāntika, who do not admit the real existence of any such element as the Avijnaptirūpa. However, it will be interesting to pass under review the definitions, given by Vasubandhu, debated by his contemporary, Saṅghabhadrā, and commented later on by Sthiramati.

In the Kośa, the Avijnaptirūpa has been defined as:

\[
\text{Vikṣiptācittakasyāpi yo'nubandhaḥ subhāsubhāḥ} | \\
\text{Mahābhūtānyupādāya sāhyavijnaptirucyate} || (I.11)
\]

(Avijnapti is that stream of action, which, being morally either good or bad, is present even in the mind of a distracted or unconscious person, and which is essentially the product of the material elements.)

We do not propose to go here into the detailed manner, in which Vasubandhu’s great contemporary, Saṅghabhadrā, tried to demolish, piece by piece, this formulation, which, according to him, was a most unsatisfactory way of representing the Vaibhāṣika view of Avijnapti. Yaśomitra has quoted in his famous commentary Saṅghabhadrā’s arguments and very cleverly tried to meet them. But Saṅghabhadrā’s criticism could not have gone altogether unheeded. He objected to the word ‘stream’, which seemed to deny the universally accepted momentariness of things. He objected to reference being made only of the ‘distracted or unconscious person’ to the exclusion of one, who is immersed in deep meditation. And then, if the last-mentioned person was to be understood to have been included in the definition by implication, his avijnapti ought to have been specially characterised as being only ‘of the right type (subha).’ In fact, Saṅgha finds faults with almost every word of Vasubandhu’s formulation, which he brands as being “highly defective, unfounded, full of overstatements and superfluities.”

If we give any credence to the tradition, as related by the Tibetan historian, Bu-ston, in his Chos-hByung (II. 144), Vasubandhu had first published only the metrical part of his Kośa for ascertaining the general criticisms of the then known authorities of the Vaibhāṣika school. (Also cf. Paramārtha’s Life of Vasubandhu, trans. by Takakusu, T'oung Pao (1904) pp. 287 ff.) He must, therefore, have had an inkling of the general nature of the
objections, which would be raised against the views represented in it, before he wrote his own commentary (Bhāṣya) in its final form and published it. Because, in the Bhāṣya, Vasubandhu appears to have tried to forestall some of those objections by offering, as an explanation of the versified text, a more direct and simple prose definition of the Avijñaptirūpa. It runs:

Vijñaptisamādhisambhūtan kuśalākuśalam rūpam |
(Avijñapti is that physical element, which, being morally either good or bad, is born of either an overt action or deep concentration.)

The critics, who had remained hesitant, so long as they had before them only the pithy versified text, which could admit of various interpretations, if all the implications were brought out, seem to have become vocal, as soon as Vasubandhu published his Bhāṣya, giving his own definite explanations. Sarīghabhādra, who had formerly approved of the Kośa compilation in general terms, now led the attack, and we have indicated above, how trenchantly he deals with Vasubandhu’s formulation of the definition of Avijñapti.

He had now one more weapon in his armoury, inasmuch as he could now reproach Vasubandhu for not having given some necessary explanations even in his own commentary. Thus he points out, among other things, that it was necessary, at least in the Bhāṣya, to qualify the Avijñaptirūpa as being unimpeded and susceptible to penetration (apratīgha). Sarīgha does not satisfy himself merely by criticising Vasubandhu’s definition, but he offers his own definition in the following terms, in his Samayaprādiṭpikā, quoted by Yaśomitra:

Kṛte'pi visabhāge'pi citte cittātyaye ca yat |
Vyākṛtāpratīgham rūpam sā hyavijñaptiriṣyate ||

(Avijñapti ought to be defined as that physical element, which, being either good or bad, knows no impediment and which is found in either the wakeful, or the concentrated or the absent mind.)

Yaśomitra has tried his best to defend Vasubandhu’s definition against Sarīgha’s attacks and in his turn to find fault with the new definition, offered by the latter. But Vasubandhu himself, as we have indicated above, seems to be somewhat concerned about his own formulation being exposed to such criticisms. Because, later on, when he wrote his Pañcaskandhaka (see my article in ABORI, Vol. XVIII, Pt. iii), he again amends his former definition by dropping altogether the qualifying words: “good or bad,” and adding two more adjectives, viz. ‘unimpeded (apratīgha),’ as suggested by Sarīghabhādra, and ‘undemonstrable (anidarśana)—this latter addition containing an altogether new thought, which might have been inspired by some other criticisms, unknown to us. Thus, in the Pañcaskandhaka the definition runs as:

Vijñaptisamādhisambhūtan rūpam anidarśanam apratīghan ca |
(Avijñapti is that physical element, which is born either of overt action
or in the state of deep concentration of the mind and which is neither imped-
ed, nor capable of being demonstrated.)

The fourth chapter of the Abhidharmakośa, dealing with the whole prob-
lem of Karma in detail, also treats the Avijñapti, giving minute and technical
interpretations of the various terms, like 'good' and 'bad,' involved in its
definition. We shall here content ourselves with a brief reference to Sthir-
ramati's commentary on the Pañcaskandhaka, which, with a smaller exposition,
covers the same ground, though with a certain slight emendation, representing
his own view of the analysis. Sthiramati's exposition of the Avijñapti may
be briefly explained by the following tabular analysis:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Avijñapti.</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I. Kāmāvacarā.</td>
<td>II. Rūpāvacarā.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Dhyānasaṃvāra).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| i. Prātimokṣa-
saṃvāra. | ii. Bodhisattva-
saṃvāra. | iii. Asaṃvāra. |
| | iv. Nobhayaga. |
| 1. Bhikṣu. | 2. Śrāmaṇera. | 3. Upāsaka. | 4. Upavāsastha. |

Thus, Avijñapti has three spheres of activity. In the first one, i.e. (I) the
sensuous world, Avijñapti is born of either a bodily or a vocal action, each of
which may be either good or bad, but never indifferent. Further, it can be
either of the nature of (i) binding oneself to the observance of the laws of
spiritual discipline, on the part of any of the four kinds of monks, male or
female, or (ii) binding oneself to the observance of the discipline of a Bodhi-
sattva, or (iii) avowing oneself to the path of indiscipline, or (iv) owning one-
self to a way of life, that implies neither discipline nor indiscipline. It will be ob-
erved, that the second kind of avijñapti, viz. Bodhisattvasaṃvāra, is an innova-
tion of Sthiramati, who shows himself here a true disciple of the school, found-
ed by the mystical personality of Maitreyā. (In Chinese we have translations
of treatises, attributed to Maitreyā, like the Bodhisattva-prātimokṣa, NANJIO'S
Catalogue Nos. 1096, 1098, etc. Similar texts are recorded in Tibetan, Ur's
Catalogue Nos. 248, 3970, 4081, etc.). In the second sphere, viz. (II) the
higher ethereal world, Avijñapti takes the form of a moral resolution, formed
in the state of a trance. In the third sphere, viz. (III) the Path of Salva-
tion, where pure matter exists, the moral resolution is formed in a state of
passionlessness.

Thus, the Buddhists, who were from the very beginning far more deeply
interested than any other school of Indian philosophy in analysing phenom-
enon of Karma in all its implications and varieties, have tried to explain here
one aspect of it viz. that which passed under the name of "adṛṣṭa" among the
Brahmanic circles. The virtue, involved in giving charities, visiting holy places
and such other acts, could not be satisfactorily explained or logically derived from merely the manifest acts (vijñapti) of such religious discipline. Any outside agency being strictly inadmissible in the Buddhist view of the universal becoming, this concealed activity, called the Avijñaptirūpa was bound to receive a place in the scheme of the dharma-complexes, which go to make up the stream of worldly existence.
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A NOTE ON THE GAUDI RITI

By

S. K. DE

Even though the literary remains of Bengal in the centuries preceding the advent of the Pāla dynasty, are insufficient and uncertain, we come, for the first time in the 7th century, across distinct references to the literary diction of the Gauḍās. Bāṇabhāṭṭa informs us in a well known verse:\n
In the North there is mostly play upon words (Śleṣa),\(^2\) in the West it is only the sense (Artha), in the South it is poetical fancy (Utprekṣā), in the Gauḍās there is pomp of syllables (Aksara-ḍambara).

This apparently disparaging observation regarding the Gauḍās is explained by the suggestion\(^4\) that it reflects a partisan spirit on the part of the court-poet of Harṣavardhana, which is also clear from the feeling which he displays towards his patron’s rival, the unnamed but much maligned king of Gauḍa. But the explanation does not become convincing when we consider that in this verse Bāṇabhāṭṭa is stating that poets of the four quarters of India respectively affect only a few peculiar literary excellences and not all, some putting stress on sound, some on sense, some on both, while others indulge in a play of fancy; for, in the next verse, he regrets that it is difficult to find in one place all that are, in his opinion, desirable excellences of the Kāvya. The position has been often misunderstood, but the view we have taken will be clear if we consider the references to the Gauḍa Mārga or Gauḍi Riti, which are found in the polemic poetics of Bhāmaha and Daṇḍin, and which show that at least in the 7th and 8th centuries\(^4\) the Gauḍi Riti in its proper form was regarded as a distinct and original achievement in the sphere of literary diction. Along with the Vaidarbhī, the Gauḍi figures as one of the two most important modes of poetic expression, although the theorists are not agreed on the question of their relative superiority. While Bhāmaha (i. 31-2) is impatient with the conventional distinction and preference of the Vaidarbhī and declares his opinion that in its proper form the Gauḍiya diction is even superior, Daṇḍin shows a decided partiality for the Vaidarbhā Mārga and a mild aver-\

---

2. This is the usual translation, following Saṅkara, as well as Cowell and Thomas; but the word Śleṣa should be taken here, not in the sense of the figure of speech (Alaṅkāra) which involves punning or play upon words, but in the sense of Daṇḍin’s poetical excellence (Guṇa) of the same name, which emphasises freedom from looseness and compact coalescence of word and sense.
4. On the dates of Bhāmaha and Daṇḍin see S. K. De, Sanskrit Poetics, I, pp. 48f, 62f.
sion to the Gauḍa. But taking the Vaidartha mode as the standard, in which are to be found the essential poetical excellences of a good diction, Daṇḍin believes that the Gauḍa is a clearly distinguishable (prasphuṭāntara) mode of expression, which, however, often presents a different aspect,¹ the conception of the Gauḍas about the essentials of a diction being apparently different from that of the Vaidarbhas. The opinion of the theorists, therefore, seems to be that the ideals of composition differed fundamentally in these two types of literary production, the Vaidarbi demanding the correct and classical manner and the Gauḍī preferring the fervid and the grandiose. Daṇḍin further makes it clear that the Gauḍas thereby often lose themselves in bombast and prolixity. If Bāṇabhaṭṭa singles out verbal bombast (akṣara-ḍambara) in the Gauḍas, Daṇḍin likewise speaks of a kind of ‘mental bombast’ and cumbrous ornamentation when he uses the terms arthika-ḍambara and aḷamkāra-ḍambara in this connexion. Even if their personal preference betrayed disapproval, they had still to take the mode of the Gauḍas into account, presumably because it had attained a commendable position and found favour in an equal degree with a class of writers and readers. It seems, therefore, that even long before Bāṇabhaṭṭa and Daṇḍin, the Gauḍas exhibited a distinctive literary diction of their own,² which, side by side with the widely accepted Vaidarbi, had an established tradition incapable of being completely ignored. Just as Bengal strove politically in these centuries against the constant aggression of Magadha, Thaneshvar and Kashmir to maintain its independence, it attempted in the literary sphere to withstand the domination of the almost universally accepted Vaidartha mode of expression and succeeded in establishing its originality.

These references are important in literary history, because they supply undeniable evidence that by the 7th and 8th centuries there must have grown up in Bengal a Sanskrit culture which attained such importance as necessitat-ed the recognition of its characteristic method of expression. Apart from the lucubrations of Bhāmaha and Daṇḍin, Vāmana in the 9th century explicitly

---

¹ Daṇḍin uses the term viparyya, which does not mean vaiparītya or contrariety (as the Hṛdayāntamā commentary takes it), but anyathātuva or divergence. On this see IHQ cited above, and P. C. Lahiri in IHQ, vii (1931), pp. 59f.

² In the absence of proper data it is impossible to determine when the distinction between Vaidartha and Gauḍa modes was first recognised. H. Jacob (Māhārāṣṭrī, pp. xvi f) suggests that the simpler Vaidarbi style was a reaction against the older and more elaborate Gauḍa style and came into existence probably in the 3rd century a.d. It is possible to argue, on the contrary, that the Gauḍa style, which asserts itself more and more in the later Kāvya, was itself a symbol of further development, exhibiting a tendency towards greater elaboration. Both the standpoints ignore the possibility of the two styles developing concurrently as rival modes. The controversy of the rhetoricians makes it probable that both the Ritis developed side by side and entered into a competition for mastery.—Bharata in his Nāṭya-sūtra (ed. Grossel, iv. 26) speaks of four dramatic modes or Pravṛttis, viz., Āvanti, Paṇḍīla-madhyamā, Dīkṣipātya and Oḍra-māgadhī, the last of which is expressly stated to have been employed in the eastern provinces, including Aṅga, Vaṅga, Pauḍra and Nepāla (xiv. 45-47), there being no special Gauḍī Pravṛtti.
states that the discussion is not academic, but that the names of the recognised literary dictons were derived from the fact that the particular diction was prevalent in the particular locality. It is probable, therefore, that the theory of diction arose, even before Daśā and Vāmana who tacitly accept it, from an empirical analysis of the prevailing peculiarities of literary expression in different localities. This would furnish enough ground for the inference of a lost Gauḍa literature, which received recognition from the theorists, but over which they entertained an honest difference of opinion. In the following centuries, however, the much criticised Gauḍi Riti must have overstepped its geographical limits; and, having been found even in non-Gauḍa works, it became in later Poetics a generic name for a particular kind of pompous diction, abounding in alliteration and long compounds; and as such, it decidedly declined in the favour of the theorists.

1. Kāvyālāṃkāra-sūtra-vṛtti, i. 2. 10.
3. It is curious that at the end of the 10th century Rājaśekhara, who recognises but does not appear to show much admiration for the composition of the Gauḍas in his Kāvyā-mimāṃsā, makes Māgadhi take the place of the Gauḍī in the enumeration of the Ritis in his Karpūra-maṇjarī (i. 1); while Bhoja in the 11th century follows him in mentioning the Māgadhi, along with the Gauḍī, although he regards the former as a Khanḍa-rīti. But the Māgadhī as a separate Riti did not have much recognition; it came into existence through the scholastic zeal for distinctions displayed by later writers, which led to a constant multiplication of the number of styles.
A HALLMARK OF MAN AND OF RELIGION

By

MRS. C. A. F. RHYS DAVIDS

My Indian readers will probably know, that by 'hallmark' we mean the quite essential laksāna of anything, and that the figure so called stamped at the Goldsmiths' Hall on articles of precious metal, attests their purity. I here use the word to mean what is, for me, an essential quality in man's nature as an essential quality in all true religious teaching. Such teaching is not mainly concerned with man as 'one who is,' with man as 'being,' with man as maintaining this difference, that likeness, as to this or that. It sees in the man one-who-is-becoming; it sees him as willing to become a more, however he figure to himself that more. In particular it sees him as willing to become a more in the worthier, the better, the higher.

It is of profound interest to see this sense of man's nature, as presenting a 'more,' emerging into articulate thought in Indian culture. I have treated of it at some length in Birth of Indian Psychology as attesting the new attitude of Analysis that was, it may be in consequence of the almost mythical Kapila's teaching, becoming felt. We see as it were the dawn of this outlook in the distinction, not earlier I think than the Brāhmaṇas, of the one Man into the duality of nāma and rūpa. But in the Chāndogya Upaniṣad we first come upon the idea of analysis as revealing all of man that was not 'seen' (rūpa) by the term 'more' (bhūyas). "Ay, verily, there is more than just names of this or that in nāma." "Sir, tell me that." And the teacher, as from a box, draws forth one mind-way after another. We have here as it were man in the New.

There is as yet no attempt at showing those contents as a series, as a classification. Translators have curiously overlooked this and have seen in the repeated 'more than' a progress from a less to a bigger or worthier content. R. E. Hume with his usual greater accuracy has just "more than," yet he writes of this context as "a progressive worship... up to the universal soul." But Max Müller has, for bhūyas, "better than"; Deussen has "greater than;" the Tatyā edition has "even greater than"; Boethlingk has "mächtiger als." Now there is no such order here meant. It is ruled out by the succession of selected terms. We are reminded in these of a child emptying his Christmas stocking of gifts. It is just a worth of man as a manifold, such as our modern analysis is ever giving us. And to the extent that he is a manifold he has a potency of "more" in his essential nature. We are putting up with man as a Less if we rest complacent in wording him by one word. As a Many we have found in him a More, a more various, a greater, a larger, a more manifold.

We need this, he having heed to the manifold, to a degree we tend to overlook. Our life as a whole—and India needs not to be reminded of that—is a matter not of 'threescore years and ten,' neither is it just that period followed immediately by a vague timeless 'immortality.' In that life as a whole come very many spans of life (bhavā) now here, now there. And in each span man may prove capable of now swifter, now slower becoming a 'more' than in the previous span. I had not long ago a case of this in the man we knew on earth as Cardinal MANNING. I met a lady who had received 'psychically' teachings of high spiritual value. These she, having heard them inwardly, published in a pamphlet as quasi-divine messages, thereby so impressing my venerable friend, the late EDMUND HOLMES, poet and philosopher, that he believed they were indeed of such a nature. Now I, when interviewing her, learnt by clair-audience that the unseen worder was present and was MANNING. HOLMES could not accept or indeed forgive this. He was in some lines strongly anti-Catholic, and held, as it seemed, that MANNING, unworthy in this or that on earth, would necessarily be valuing no better now in another world than he had valued on earth. We are often slow to do justice to the spiritual changes a man may undergo even in this one span of life; and this rigidity of judgment pursues us yet more where should be more credit given to change, namely, where in another world the man's conditions are in many ways so altered.

Let us glance at another man known to us only as of a long past age: Maudgalyāna (Pali: Moggallāna), ranked by Buddhist scriptures with Sāriputra as the Sākyamuni's chief disciples. He is always shown as possessed of very advanced psychic or supernormal powers, and might therewith have done much to bring the truth about the unseen near to men. It is true that to a certain degree he is recorded as having done this. The chief testimonies to this may be read in the two canonical works Pevavatthu and Vimānavatthu and their Commentaries.1 He is shown undertaking to visit the next world—easy enough, India knows, for him to do in deep sleep—expressly in order to report to men how evil and good deeds there found fitting sequel. But what he did report, according to the records, was merely the physical fate of worthy and unworthy. We read nothing as to the result in a spiritual more or less in the persons he talked with. It was an examination of bodily results only: a worthless way of using a precious gift. It is when we seek a spiritual More in man that we are fit and ready to inquire into life as a matter, not of just 'this world only,' but of worlds.

And it is just that spiritual More in every man that religion is concerned withal if it be worthy of the name. A religion that is shown in formulas teaching this or that in a Less in man may have had a divinely inspired beginning, but it has been forced aside into unworthy ways, and altered. We may see the spiritual quest after a More at the very start of the Sākyamuni's mission, when he bade men "seek after the self." In his day young men

1. Published by the Pali Text Society. A translation of both is in preparation for the Sacred Books of the Buddhist Series by H. S. GEHMAN.
were taught this, in these words, by their Brahman teachers. And these words then meant "seek after God." Deity was then worshipped as the self, and it was a most lamentable misrendering by Oldenberg, that he translated this by "seek yourselves," thus giving the ancient idiom a modern, a European worth. No less lamentable was the modern European rendering of "be ye lamps unto yourselves" given by Rhys Davids to the closing words: atta-dīpā viharathā, dhamma-dīpā viharathā" : live as they who have the Self as lamp, Dharma as lamp. We lose all the original force if we render this in the modern, the European way, instead of rendering it as translators of the Upaniṣads rightly render the former compound.

It is only in our so-called Mystics that we can read in English the Indian way, the way of, as Jesus said, "the kingdom of God is within you." "My Me is God," wrote St. Catherine of Genoa, "not by simple participation, but by a process of transformation." So, more in our own day, Anna Bunston:

O little lark, you need not fly
To seek your Master in the sky.
He treads our native sod.
Why should you sing aloft, apart?
Sing to the heaven of my heart!
In me, in me is God!

Here is indeed a very More in man, a More in a divine Becoming. Man here in a Less, a very much less, is speaking, singing of himself as having 'within', as being in a way, the very Most. A dangerous, a heady teaching unless valued with right humility. That is, it is not so much the man here and now who is being spoken of; it is not the actual, it is the potential man they speak of if they speak rightly. Else they forget the long, long way that lies between these extremes. If we remember that great Between, figured by the first Buddhist as a Road, a Way of Becoming, a Way of the worlds, then, as the Suttas put it, "doth the Way come into being; then for us is there no more turning back, then do we see ourselves as further-farers in the life-divine."

Lost to view now is that Buddhist symbol as meaning faring in the great Between of the worlds. The dropping out of 'becoming (bhava), the insertion of 'eight parts' of the good life here as the Way, have practically reduced South Asian Buddhism to just ethics. Its hallmark has got erased. Never now do we hear it cited:—the hallmark of Becoming, of becoming a more (bhīyobhāva). Yet was the word, simple and compound, once its teaching: to quote one of many such contexts: "that good values may persist, may be clarified, for their 'becoming more, for their expansion, for the 'making them

1. Vinaya Texts, I (S. Books of the East) He alone translated the first half of this volume.
2. Buddhist Suttas (S. B. E.) XI.
become,' for the perfecting of them, he brings forth desire, he endeavours, he stirs up energy, he makes firm the mind, struggles."¹ Nor do we ever hear cited how the Śākyamuni is shown saying, he spoke to his co-workers of the happy fate of the worthy who had passed over in order to stir up in them joy, that such a fate they too might look forward to.²

That new analysis of the more in mind proved when misdirected by monastic pessimism to be undoing of original Buddhism.

1. Dīgha-Nikāya, XXI.
2. Majjhima-Nikāya, No. V.
ANTARAGHARA

By

P. V. BAPAT

RHY'S DAVIDS and OLDENBERG translate the word antaraghara as "within the houses" or "among the houses." This word comes several times in the Vinaya, Vol. i. 40; ii. 215; iv. 176, 179-89, 199 and the translators RHY'S DAVIDS and OLDENBERG have given notes on the word (Vin. Texts, i. 56, 59, 65). In one of these notes, they seem to hint at the right interpretation when they say (Vin. Texts, i. 59) : The antaraghara is the space in the village between the huts; not exactly the same and yet in the following rules practically the same, as village (gāma). They realised that the latter meaning only was applicable in several cases but probably they could not account for that interpretation. So they continued to translate the word by "house or houses" (Vin. Texts, i. 56, 59) "a dwelling" (ibid., iii. 290), "inner court" (ibid., i. 65), etc. The passage in the Vin., iv., 176 (Pātidesaṇīya, 1)

"Yo pana bhikkhu ațñātikāya bhikkhuṇiyā antaragharaṁ paviṭṭhāya hatthato kāḍaniyaṁ vā bhogaṇīyaṁ sa-hatthā paṭīqgahetvā ...." is translated something like this :

"A Bhikkhu, when a bhikkhuṇī not related to him has entered within the houses, ........" that this meaning is not correct is obvious from the following sentence (Vin. i. 40, Mahāvagga, I. 23.3)

"antaragharaṁ paviṭṭho pindāya carati."

If he has entered a house, how can he go on a begging-round?

This word occurs also in the Visuddhimagga i. 18 where we have antaragharaṁ pavisanto pi .... Pe MAUNG TIN also following the translators of the Vinaya renders the word by 'enters among houses.' How this translation is not satisfactory is seen further when on the next page we come to the passage (i. 19):

"Idha bhikkhu antaragharaṁ paviṭṭho vithim paṭipanno okkhittacakkhu yugamattadassāvī su-saṅvuto gacchati".

If antaragharaṁ is 'within the houses' or 'among the houses' how is it possible to say of him as 'following a road (vithim paṭipanno)? To avoid this difficulty Pe MAUNG TIN seems to have added the words 'of a village' to 'entering among the houses'. He translates thus: A brother here, on entering among the houses of a village and walking along the streets, goes lowering his eyes, looking before him not further than the distance of a plough, and is well-restrained.
In all these cases the word *antarā* seems to be taken in the usual sense of 'within or among' 'inner or interior' etc. which will be presently shown to be not applicable here.

Dhammapāla, while explaining this word in the *Visuddhimagga*, says: “Antare antare gharāni etthā etassā ti vā *antaragharan* ti laddhavohāraṁ gocaragāmaṁ.” *Antaragharan* means a village for alms because the houses, there, are at a distance from each other. Dhammapāla also seems to have not taken the word *antarā* in the right sense, although the interpretation of the whole compound is given rightly.

The word *antarā* here is to be taken rather in its unusual sense of ‘exterior, lying outside, situated outside’. And for this we have the authority of Pāṇini I. i. 36:

“Antaraṁ bahiryopasaṁvāyānayoh.”

“The word *antarā* is to be taken in the sense of bahiryoga (external, exterior) or upasāmyāna (undergarment).”

The explanation given in the *Siddhāntakaumudi* is:

“Antare antarā vā grhāḥ, bāhyā ityarthāḥ; Antare antarā vā śaṭakāḥ, paridhānyā ityarthāḥ.”

“The houses that are outside (i.e. the houses of a Caṇḍāla and the like, as explained by later interpreters) ; or the garments that are worn.” Here the first interpretation only is applicable, namely ‘the exterior, situated outside.” Arthashastra’s Dictionary also gives this interpretation of the word *antarā* as interpretation No. 6. And this interpretation alone can justify the explanation of the word in the *Sutta-vibhaṅga* (Vin. iv. 176):

“*Antaragharan* nāma rathiyā, byūhaṁ, singhāṭakaṁ, gharāṁ”. Antaragharan means “the streets, blind lanes (*bhyaḥ*), squares and houses,” which are all found in what Dhammapāla calls gocaragāma.

So the word Antaragharan means ‘the house or houses that are situated outside (i.e. outside the monastery), namely the village.’ And it will be seen that this meaning alone is applicable in all the cases referred to above.
NOTES ON THE KATHA UPANIŠAD
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SECOND VALLĪ

At the close of the first Vallī Naciketas has already made his choice and stated his position. It would be only logical to assume that the following verses, II.1-13, are spoken by Death; Naciketas then interposing with his "Tell it" (tad vada=brūhi nas tat in I.29=brūhi m’etam in Sn 346) ; the remainder of the Vallī, from 15 onwards, consisting of Death’s exposition of the Brahma doctrine, which he develops from the imperishable-syllable, Om. This interpretation will involve a reversal of the meaning usually attached to the words atisrākṣiḥ and atyasrākṣiḥ in II.3 and 11; this is discussed below. For the present we shall assume that atisrākṣiḥ in II.3 means, not "thou hast renounced" but "thou hast gotten", and shall discuss the application of this meaning in the context of the whole verse.

Observe the construction of the first two lines of each of vv.1-4. There is no question but that in vv.1, 2 and 4 we have to do with two "very different" (dūraham viṣparīte viṣūci) things; which are, in the first two verses śreyas and preyas (the "more glorious" and the "pleasant" or "dear") and in the fourth vidyā and avidyā ("science"; and "nescience"; i.e. empirical or estimative knowledge); ca in verses 2 and 4 is disjunctive and implies contrast. It would be far from unreasonable to expect a similar construction in the third verse. Let us see if it can be recognized there. Abhidhyāyan, "intensely contemplating", corresponds to sanparītya vivinakti in v. 2, which RAWSON very properly renders by "discriminates". Kāmān is in any case the object both of abhidhyāyan and of atisrākṣiḥ. Suppose now that ca is here also disjunctive, and that here also there is a contrast drawn between two very different things, viz. priyān kāmān and priya-rūpān kāmān, a distinction parallel to that of satyāḥ kāmāḥ ("true desires") from satyāḥ kāmā amṛtenāpidhānāḥ ("true desires overlaid by what is false") in CU.VIII.3.1-2. where moreover it is said that all these "true desires" or "real goods" are

1. With śreyas (as in RV. III 38.4 śreyo vasānaḥ carati svarocih) here cf. śri- and śremāna in AB. VII. 15, and śri in JUB. I.20.8. Perhaps the fullest explanation of śri (a typically solar and regal property) is that given in SB.XI.4.3.1.

2. It is interesting to compare sanparītya here with pariśa in the TB. version of the Naciketas story, RAWSON p. 214 line 4 of the text. In both cases the literal sense is "going round" or "circumambulating" and the ultimate meaning, "considering and understanding" (not excluding the literal meaning, however, in TB). Śaṅkara’s "kruddha-iva" has been discussed above.

3. A like pejorative use of piya-rūpa may be noted in A.II.54 and M.II.42.
to be gotten by going "there"; where indeed one goes every day, viz. to the Brahma world in deep sleep, but without finding the hidden treasure, just because of being "held back by the falsity" (antena hi pratyūdhāh),\(^1\) while per contra "One who goes hence having found already the Spirit (or his own Spiritual-essence) and those ‘true desires’ (or ‘real goods’), becomes a ‘Mover-at-will’ in every world,"\(^2\) CU.VIII.1.6. Similarly, "It is not for desire (kāmāya) of beings (as they are in) themselves that beings are dear, but for desire of the Spirit that beings are dear (priyaṃ)," BU. II. 4. 5.\(^3\) The texts are innumerable in which to be "possesst of all desires" and to be

1. And this "from which one is debarred by falsity" (disorder, or irregularity or lack of form) is precisely the "house of Death", "Where Yama, Death, is king, the place of heaven’s defence, or arrest" (yatṛavarodhanam divaḥ, RV. IX. 113.8, i.e. the Sun as in CU.VIII.6.5. ādityam lokadāvaram viduṣām prapadanaṃ nirodho 'viduṣām the "door" of Math.XXV.10 "and the door was shut", and the Egyptian "sun-door". It is precisely at this "Death’s door" (mṛtyu-mukha, KU. LI.11), the sauram duvāram...surya-manjalam...tena yānti parām gatim of MU. VI. 30, the hiranyamayena pātṛena satvyāpāhīkānau mukham of Iśā, 15 and M.U. VI. 35, at this Porte or Kingsgate, or "threshold", that Naciketas, not yet a Comprehensor (viduḥ, vidvān) has been waiting for three nights. The Keeper of this Gate is the solar Angel with the Flaming Sword ("the opening is all covered over with rays", JUB.I.3.6), the Truth (satyam haśā devatā, JUB.I.5.3), Death (pūṣann ekārṣe yama sūrya prājāpatya, Iśā, 16 and MU.VI.35); he stands on guard (apasedhanti tiṣṭhati) but cannot repel one in whom there is the like Truth (neśe yad enam apasedhet, JUB.I.5.3). Nothing could better illustrate the consistency and universality of these formulae than the words of Nicolas of Cusa, De vis.Dei Ch. IX, "It is the wall of the Paradise where Thou abidest, which none can enter if he has not overcome the Truth that guards its gate".

The meaning of the "three nights" and of Death's "absence" has been explained in a previous Note.

2. The description of the liberated as "Mover-at-will" (kāmācārin), corresponding to "shall go in and out, and find pasture" in John X.9, is of frequent occurrence in the Upanishads, and can be found also in RV. IX.113. 9 yatṛāmukām caraṇam, "where there is motion-at-will", or in other words, independence of local motion. Motion-at-will is a necessary consequence of deification (St. Paul, "Whoever is joined unto the Lord is one spirit"; I Gal.VI.17; "That art thou", CU.VI.8.9-11) if only because it is the Gate of the Spirit that "moveth as it will" (yathā vaśam carati, RV.X.168.4). John III.8 "shall go in and out, and find pasture" corresponds to TU. III. 10.5 imān lokān kāmām kāmarūpy anusam-caran, "goes hither or thither in these worlds eating what food he will and in what shape he will". The most detailed description of this Motion-at-will, which depends upon an habitual samādhi occurs in A.I.254 f. For the exact equivalent in Chinese doctrine see Chuang Tzu, Ch. XIX, (Giles, 1889, p. 231).

3. St. Thomas, Sum. Theol. II.2.7 "But man is not to be loved for his own sake, but whatever is in man is to be loved for God’s sake"; and 1.6.1 ad 1 and 2 "All things, by desiring their own perfection, desire God Himself" (in effect, In omni bono, summum bonum, sc. Deus, desideratur). BU.II.45 and IV.5 na vā are lokānām kāmāya lokāh priyā bhavanitā, ātmamanu kāmāya lokāh priyā bhavanitā are echoed in S.I.75 (Udāna 47) where the attakāmo is approved, as one who finds in the world "naught dearer than the Spiritual-essence" (na...piyataram attanā kvaci).
"without desire" are synonymous expressions;¹ no real meaning, indeed, can be attached to either expression alone, since it is only where all is already one's own that no more can even be thought of or desired (it is in this sense that man and kam are often interchangeable), and only where there is nothing wanting that one cannot want.

II.2 : yoga-kṣemāt. Before proceeding to a discussion of II.11 we shall explain the sense of the second half of II.2. As in the first line of this half-verse the contemplative (ādhirah) is said to choose between two things, so in the second line we might expect that the sluggard (or "fool") is said to choose between two things. Hume's version, based on the assumption that yoga-kṣema means one thing, is hardly grammatical English; Rawson makes the same assumption and produces a better version, in which "prefers the pleasant" is understood to imply "prefers the pleasant to the glorious". But what is meant in our text is a choice between "two very different" habits: it is as among yoga and kṣema that the sluggard makes his choice, deciding for the latter.² That this is the real intention will be immediately realised if we turn to TS.V.2.1.7: here a distinction has already been drawn between those who by means of the liturgy win this world, and those who, striding the Viṣṇu strides, win yonder world, and as the text continues, "and so it is that the minds of some are set on yoga (yoge 'nyāsām praṇāṇām manah)"³ and the minds of others on comfort (kṣema 'nyāsām); and accordingl the Wanderer (yāyāvarah = parivājakah) lords it over the man-of-ease (kṣemiyasya îṣe), and so too that the Wanderer sits him down upon (adhyava-

---

1. Equally in RV., Brāhmaṇas, and Upaniṣads, e.g. RV.IX.113.10-11, SB.X.5.4.15, BU.IV.3.21, and CU.VIII.12.6. With RV.IX.113.10-11 "Where are both desires and the consummation of desires, where the desires of him who desires are possest" (yatā kāmā nikāmā...kāmasya yatrāptaḥ kāmāḥ) compare Traherne's "Whose very wants are endless pleasures, His life in wants and joys is infinite. And both are felt as His Supreme Delight", Witelo Lib. de intelligentiis, XX "In quo...est unio, delectatio est continua, et vita secundum se delectabilis est in eo", and Dante, Paradiso, XXII.64-67 "There perfect, whole, and ripe is each desire; in it alone is every part, there where it ever was, for it is not in space nor hath it poles".

2. Just as in Sn. 220, asamā ubho dūra-vihāra-vuttino, gihī dāraposi, amamā ca subbato, "Unlike and widely divergent are the habits of the wedded householder and the holy man without an 'I'".

It is quite true that in the modern vernacular, yogakṣema is "means of livelihood," "way of life", or "habit". In Pāli, moreover, khaema is often "peace" or "rest" in a good sense (not that of sloth), e.g. Sn. 896, khemāhipassam avīvāda-bhumam, and yogakhema occurs with the same meaning, e.g., Sn 79 viriyam...yogakhamādhivahanam," "energy that bears me onward to peace". But in our text, the older distinction of a contemplative (anagogically "active") from an active (anagogically "idle") life is evidently preserved; yogakṣemāt+yogāc ca kṣemāc ca.

3. "The mind is verily for men the means either of bondage or release," MU. VI.34.
the man-of-ease” (kṣemyaṁ). And so in our text the fool prefers the ease of the householder to the hard life of the yogi.²

II.11: kāmasyāpti, the “attainment of desire”. Can one conceive of a sumnum bonum otherwise, or think of the Brahman as in any respect deficient or in want? Can one think of one who becomes the Brahman as suffering a privation in any sense whatever? So far from this, kāmasyāptim in our text is as much as to say Ātman, for “In full possession of all acts, all desire (or good)...this is my Spirit, within the heart, this very Brahman; he who is assured (addhā)³ of this, that ‘When I go hence, I shall be altogether Him,’ for him there is no doubt” (na viciktsāti CU. III. 14.4⁴). Similarly CU.VIII.1.6 “He who goes hence, having found here the Spirit and those true goods (satyān kāmān), becometh a mover-at-will in every world”. Our kāmasyāpti is assuredly a designation of the immortal Ātman, Brahman, “beyond whom there is nothing more”. The expression na viciktsā-asti, “no doubt remains” is especially pertinent, in view of KU.I.20-21, “This doubt (viciktsā) there is about the man gone forth...even the Devas doubted in this respect of old”⁵; it is true that the matter in doubt is differently formu-

---

1. Adhiśāsa, “sitting before a person’s house without taking food till he ceases to oppose or refuse a demand (commonly called ‘sitting in dharmā’),” NW. The homeless wanderer is the master of the master of the house; kṣemya, from kṣī, “to dwell”, being primarily “one who has a home” and secondarily “one who lives in comfort”. It is of great interest to notice that the contemplative life (so often thought of as one of inaction) is here the really active life, and that the life of the householder (usually termed the active life) is here the really idle life. This is one way of seeing “action in inaction, and inaction in action” (BG.IV.18). But not the only way; for it need not be assumed that it is intended that the “active” life is “wrong” and the “contemplative” life “right” for every man. What is implied is the superiority of the “contemplative” life as such to the “active” life as such; a superiority that is also assumed in Christian doctrine, where it is implicit in the story of Martha and Mary, and explicit in St. Thomas, Sum. Theol. II-II.179-180. It is because the Indian householder is still of this persuasion that he still treats the wandering sādhu or yogin, the sannyāsin or “truly poor man”, as his superior, and would rather serve even those who may be pretenders than run any risk of not serving those who are really what their cloth proclaims them.

It may be added that the relation of the Wanderer to the Householder is ultimately that of Mitra to Varuṇa, and Nāciketas to Yama: Nāciketas is precisely “sitting unfed” at Death’s door, and truly a bhikṣu.

2. Closely related to the thought of our text is AB.VII.15, Pūpo niṣadvara jana, indra ic-caraitah sakā, caraiva, caraiva...sūryasya paśya śrenām, yo na tandrayate carāhi, caraiva, caraiva.

3. Addhā, “certain”, “ascertained”, as in SB.II.3.1.29 “Certain is the (audible) incantation, certain the Spirit.”

4. It is just inasmuch as there is still a doubt (viciktsā) for him, that Nāciketas is na-cikivān, na-cikitās.

5. KU. I. 20.21 and 29 yasmin idam vicikitsanti mṛtyo, yat sāṃparāye mahatī brūhi nas tat are closely paralleled and no doubt followed by Sn 346 where the question addressed to the Buddha is framed as follows, Chind’eva no vicikiccham, brūhi me’tam: parinibuttam vedayaḥ: and 354 nibbāyī so? ādu sa-upādī-seso? yathā vimutto, ahu.
lated in KU. ("to be or not to be, after death"), but there is no essential difference, because "to be or not to be" and "to be or not to be in a state of privation" amount to the same thing. By way of further comment we can only add that "We desire a thing while as yet we do not possess it. When we have it, we love it, desire then falling away" (Eckhart, I,82), and ask and answer with Rūmī "What is love? Thou shalt know when thou comest Me"1 (Mathnawi, Bk. II, Introduction). There are no distinctions yonder of "a within and a without" (BU.IV.3.21 and 5.13): no distinction, therefore, of what one desires from what one has, nor of what one knows from what one is.

II. 11 continued: stoma-mahād urugāya (sc. padam), "The exceeding praised far-going (stride or step)."2 With stoma-mahat compare II.15 sarve vedā yat...āmananti, "that which all the Vedas glorify", viz. yat padam...tat te bravīmi "that stride...of which I am about to tell thee", that is, of course, the third boon (tīṭhīya varam) of I. 19, the "last passage" (sāmparāya) about which Nāciketas asks when he says "tell me that" (brūhi nas tat, I.29).3 The student can hardly by this time have failed to realise that the "three boons" correspond to the "three strides" of Viṣṇu. With the third boon, then, Nāciketas is given to understand the meaning of "the end of the road, which is Viṣṇu's farthest stride" (adhvanaḥ pāram...tad viṣṇoh param-

A definite answer occurs in S. III. 109 "It is an overstatement to say that when the body of one who has destroyed the soul issues has been cut off, he himself is broken up and destroyed and is no more after death" (na hoti param maraṇam). It is only for what is anatī, that "there is no hereafter" (nāparam, S. III. 118).

A systematic collation of parallel passages from the Upaniṣads and the Pītakas is much to be desired, both from the point of view of those whose interests are exegetical, and that of those whose primary interest is in literary history.

1. This is the answer to the question of "Love" as posed in the Middle Ages, Utrum home naturaliter diligat Deum plus quam semetipsum?

2. On the solar character of Viṣṇu in RV see HOPKINS in JAOS. 16. cxlvii.

3. For the Buddhist parallel (a colloquy between Vaṅgisa and the Buddha) see the citation from Sn 346 in a previous Note.

As the Brahman is here the "third born" (tīṭhīya varam), so in Muṇḍ. II. 2. 12 the Brahman is "most boon" (varīṣṭham).

Sāmparāya of KU. I. 29 (= parāyana in Praśna Up. 110) may be compared with samparāya and pāryaya in Sn., where the former is used for "future life" as that about which there may be a wishful thinking, and the latter for "crossing over" or "transition" to a true "beyond" (Sn. 1130 gamano so pāram gamanāya tasmā pāryayam iti). In S. V. 217 maccuparāyano is "crossing over death"; the verse in which the term occurs has been misunderstood; in reality it presents an antithesis to the previous verse, and in saying "He who lives a hundred years, he crosses over death" (yo pi vassasatam jīve so pi maccuparāyano), repeats the doctrine of SB. X. 2. 6. 7 "whosoever lives a hundred years, he, indeed, obtains that immortality" (the assumption being that in the full term of life, all that had to be done will have been done, one becomes krtaḥrit, or in the often repeated words of the Pali texts khinā jāti, vusitam brahmacariyam, katam karaniyam, nāparam, it-tha-tāyāti).
am padam, III.9), “the place of the farthest stride of the wide-stepping Viṣṇu, the far-striding Bull” (urukramasya viṣṇoḥ...atra...urugāyasya viṣṇoḥ paramam padam, RV. I. 154.6). This is assuredly the “last end” (paramām gatim) of VI. 10, and certainly not what Naciketas can be thought of as refusing, but rather as that of which he would know; for as SB. I. 9.3.10 and 20 expresses it, “That is the goal, that the support (etām gatim, etām pratiṣṭhām), now he moves with (and no longer under) the Sun”.

II. 11 continued: abhayam pāram = abhayam tīrṣātām pāram in III.2, i.e. svarge loke (yattra) na bhayam kīcchānāsti, I.12, “the place of no-fear, reached by those who cross over, in heaven-world (where) there is no fear whatever”, and as the text continues “not there art thou”, i.e. Death as Naciketas at first conceives him, punar mṛtyu. There can be no doubt about the meaning of “no-fear”. To have passed beyond fear is to have passed beyond all otherwise, to have found the advaitam: for “Assuredly it is only from another (than oneself) that fear arises” (dvitiyād vai bhayam bhavati, BU. I. 4.2); and “When verily one finds the support ‘no-fear’ (abhayam pratiṣṭhām) in this unseen, despaired, inexplicable, placeless (anilayaṇe), then is he one that has attained to ‘no fear’” (Tu. II. 7). If the separated

1. Asyaivaṃśya anuvartate. This is the raison d’être of all “sunwise turns” (pradakṣiṇaḥ, prasalavyāvṛt).
2. Naciketas, of course, as not yet a Comprehensor, conceives of Death, not “as he is yonder” but “as he is many in his children” (SB. X. 5. 2. 16) and as the cause of natural death (SB. X. 5. 2. 13). The distinction of punar mṛtyu from Mṛtyu himself, of death the “enemy” from Death the “friend” is clearly drawn in BU. I. 2. 7 where the conquest of the one is union with the other: with that Death, viz, “who does not die”, “the Person in yonder Sun” (SB. X. 5. 2. 3) who, though Naciketas does not yet know it, is that very ultimate Person spoken of in III. 11 “beyond whom there is naught, that is the goal post and last end” (purusānam na param kīcīcit, sā kāṣṭhā sāparā gatiḥ),—the Person of Isā 16, asau puruṣoḥ so ‘ham asmi, “Yonder Person, I.”

The same distinction is finely drawn in SB. X. 5. 2. 17 “Is Death near or far away? Both near and far away; for inasmuch as he is here on earth in the body he is near, and inasmuch as he is That One in yonder world, he is far away.” It is “as he is here on earth in the body” (as an “infection”, cf. JUB. IV. 9 etc) that Naciketas rightly says of the Beyond that “Thou art not there.”

3. On the placelessness of God, see the discussion of II. 25.
4. Further, AV. X. 8.44 tam eva vidvān na bībhāya mṛtyor ātmānam dhīram ajaram yuvānām (“He who knows that contemplative, incorruptible, ever-youthful Spirit, has no fear of death”); TU. II. 9 ānandam brahmamo vidvān na bībheti kaścana (“He who knoweth beatitude in Brahman feareth nothing whatever,” cf. “Perfect love casteth out fear”); Praśna Up. I. 10 etat aṃśatam abhayam etat parāyaṇam, etasmān na punar āvartante (“That Sun is the immortal, that the crossing over to where there is ‘no-fear’, thence there is no coming back again”). The condition of “no-fear”, whether of death or anything whatever, is never referred, nor could it be referred, to any other or less state than that the summum bonum and Supreme Identity. The use of the term “no-fear” in our verse is therefore the strongest possible argument for a reference of the whole to a “last end” which if Naciketas had “renounced”, he would have been a “simpleton” indeed.
Persons (Agni, Śūrya, Indra, Vāyu, and Death himself) perform their functions ‘in fear of Him, of Brahman’ (KU. II.3 and TU. II.8.1), this belongs to their separated Personality, and not their being in Him, in Whom, the Imperishable (aṅskara) ‘are all the Devas in one combined’ (AA. II.3.8). Professor Rawson (p. 89) is perfectly right in identifying our pratiṣṭhā with that which is attained by Viṣṇu’s third stride in SB. I. 9.3.10 and 20. But what is thus attained is not a sub-solar Elysium, still in the power of Death, it is the beatitude of those who have made their final crossing (sāmparāya, KU. I. 29) and have ‘entered in by the door’ (per ostium, John X.1 = śūrya-dvārea, Muṇḍ. I. 2.11) to the Father, the Immortal Person (John X.7 and 9 and XIV. 6 and Muṇḍ. I. 2.11). This ‘heaven’ into which one enters by the Sun-door is ‘beyond the falcon’ (imam upari-śyenam svargam lokam, JB. III. 269), is the Empyrean ‘where no Sun shines’ (KU. V. 15), the ‘vault apart from sorrow’ (nākam viśokam) to which one attains, not by the twenty-one syllables of the Sāman chant, but with a twenty-second (dvāvisthānena paramād adityāy jayati, CU. II. 10.5), only to be ‘known’ by ‘one who is qualified to pass through the midst of this Sun’ (ka etam adityam arhati samayaśa? Kas tad veda yat parenadityam? JUB. I. 6.1 and 4). It is that ‘state of glory’ which, as St. Thomas says, ‘is not under the sun’ (Sum. Theol. III Supp. 91.1 ad 1, cf. I. 103. 5 ad 1). If, finally, our ‘support’ is the ‘world’s support’ (jagataḥ pratiṣṭhā) what other support can this be than that of the Brahman, the Breath of the Comprehensor, JUB. III. 33.8 (misunderstood by Oerter, JAOS. XVI. 193).

1. Cf. MU. VI. 35 Apāṇīṇu satyadharmāya viśnave.

2. Note ostium in John X. 1 = mukham in Isā. 15, MU. VI. 30 and KU. I. 11 and III. 16; both as “entrance”, “way in”. For mukha as “entrance” of a city gate, approached by a bridge (samkrama) cf. Arthaśāstra, II, Ch. 21. It is in this sense that “the Mouth receives” (mukha-ādhatte) the Comprehensor, JUB. III. 33.8 (misunderstood by Oerter, JAOS. XVI. 193).

3. Hermeneutically, na-akam, “without lack of any desire” (cf. TS. V. 3.7.1), —na hāsya kaścanād kāmo’nāpto bhavati ya evam veda, JUB. III. 33.8,—kāmasyāpti in our text, and cf. II.16 aṅskaram jñātvā, yo yad ichhati tasya, tat.

4. Corresponding to the twenty-one worlds, or states of being, in the cosmos, viz. twelve months, four seasons, three worlds, and the Sun, AB. V. 1. 10. 3. “Now he who glows yonder (the Sun) is doubtless Death (Mṛtyu), those (of his) offspring that are here below are mortal (nriyante), but those beyond (him), the Devas, are therewith immortal”, SB. II. 3.3.7.

5. Kas tad veda? Kas...mad-anyaḥ, “Who but I”, Ku. II. 21. All that Death teaches Naciketas, who as his disciple does not yet “know”, is an answer to the question “What is Death?”, and could be summarised thus, by “Thou shalt know when thou becomest Me”.

6. The Brahman, Aṅkāra, similarly represented by the “Breath” in AA. II. 3.8(5).
II. 11 continued: atyasrākṣiḥ. It does not appear needful to demonstrate at any greater length that II. 11 describes a summum bonum which Naciketas cannot possibly be thought of as having “rejected”. It remains to be shown that atyasrākṣiḥ here and atisrākṣiḥ in II. 3 do not mean “Thou hast rejected.” Ati presents no difficulty; it is well known to be an intensive prefix, as in JUB. I. 3. 5 atimucaye “He is altogether freed”; ati has precisely the effect of Latin super, and does not change the essential value of the roots to which it is attached. Sṛj is to “free”, “let go”, or “emanate”, passim, and in the latter sense to “make” (SB. III. 2. 4. 6. vijām...sṛṣṭā “producing a harp”, XI. 1. 6. 9 pāṇmānam vā asṛkṣi “I have brought forth evil”, BU. IV. 3. 10 sṛjate, sa hi kartā, “He produces for himself, he is indeed the creator”), and so also to “acquire” or “obtain” (Manu, VIII. 140, vyādham sṛjet, “He may take as interest”); if sṛj is to “release”, this is not in the sense “relinquish”, but as one “sets off” or “sets going” what has been a latent property in or of the subject. Sṛṣṭi, often rendered by “creation” (of the world) is in this sense, passim, precisely what St. Thomas describes as the “emanation of all being from the universal cause, which is God...the emanation of all being, from the non-being which is nothing” (Sum. Theol. I. 45.1.1.) On the one hand, such an emanation does

1. It is in this sense that one “releases” news, or that a film is “released” by a Cinema Company. The release is from potentiality to act, and always for the advantage of the subject. The acts of one who “releases” (sṛjati) and that of one who “discards” (tyajati) a thing are very different. A remarkable parallel to sṛj in this sense of “give effect to” or “reduce to act” can be cited in Witelo, De intelligentis, XVIII, Exunione potentiae activae cum exemplari, ad quod est ordinata, relinquitur delectatio, in qua est vita cognitiva the kāmasyāptim...atyasrākṣiḥ of our text corresponding exactly to Witelo’s relinquitur delectatio, or as Death would have actually said a te relecta est delectatio.

2. Despite St. Thomas’ use of emanatio (loc. cit.) the objection has been made that sṛṣṭi as “emanation” implies the existence of a “materiality” in God. We can only say, in the first place, that it is with the Spirit that the person fills these worlds, dividing himself (MU. VI. 26), it is by his knowledge of himself that Brahma is this All (BU. 1. 4. 10); the emanation not of “matter”, but of “children” (prajāḥ, passim), so that “He is one as he is in himself, and many as he is in his children” (SB. X. 5. 2. 16). In most contexts, indeed, it might well be preferable to render sṛṣṭi by “expression”, rather than by “emanation” (“creation” is in any case inappropriate): by “expression”, that is, as this term is employed by Bonaventura to denote what is at the same time a “conception” and a “luminous raying”. These are, in fact, images that recur again and again in our texts, where we meet again and again with the phrase prajāḥ asṛjata, “expressed offspring”; with the notion a production by manas as father out of vāc as mother. Cf. also JUB. II. 9, 10 where the “rays” of the “Sun” are called his “sons”. Bonaventura’s “For all the eternal reasons are eternally conceived in the vestibule (in vulva = yonau) or womb (uterō = jaṭhare) of the eternal wisdom” (In Hexaem, coll. 20, n. 5) parallels many of the most characteristic ontological formulations of the Vedic tradition, and if occurring in an Indian context would be spoken of as “Tantrak” (cf. my “La doctrine tantrique de la ‘Bi-Unité divine’” in Études Traditionelles, 42, 289-301, 1937). For Bonaventura’s “expressionism” see BISSEN, L’exemplarisme divin selon Saint Bonaventura, 1929, p. 93.
not deprive the subject of anything (AV. X. 8. 29; BU. V. 1), on the contrary, the art remains in the artist and on the other, that which is thus emanated is for the use and advantage of the emanating subject for example, PB. VII. 6. 3 vācam vyāsjrata = BU. VI. 4. 2 striyam sarsje, and SB. IV 6. 9. 24 where vācam visjyarau is simply the converse of vācam yamah “restraining the voice”.

The basic value of sṛj is thus to “reduce from potentiality to act”, to “utter”, “express”, “realise” and “make effective”. When it is really a question of abandonment, the form utsṛj is employed, e.g. S.B. IX. 5. 1. 12 utsṛjya (anṛtam), BU. IV 3. 35 utsarjat (śariram), and Nala, X. 29 utsṛjya (bhāryān); but in JB. III. 235 udrasṛjata (paśūn) is merely “released.” There are not many occurrences of atisṛj : the most notable is in BU. I. 4. 6, brahmaṇo ’tisṛṣṭih, yac chreyaso devān asṛjrata “This was the Brahman’s super-emanation, that he emanated the more glorious divinities”, where the intensive force of ati is evident, and no other change in the value of sṛj is involved; in the corresponding text of SB. XI. 2. 3. 3, where there is no “śreyasah”, sṛj alone is used, without prefix. The only other use of atisṛj that I know of is in Kaus. Up. 1. 2, tam atisṛjrata, “He (the Moon) lets him go freely”, i.e. allows him to enter the Moon-door to heaven unhindered; just as we might speak of St. Peter admitting a soul to heaven, or of an examiner “passing” a student; nobody renounces anything, unless, indeed, we think of the examiner as “renouncing” his right to “flunk” the student.

The problem of a “materiality” in God does not, in fact, arise. On the one hand, it is obvious that all things are, in some sense, in God, because of his infinity (anantaiva) : in this sense the eternal reasons of all “material” things must be in him. On the other hand, Sanskrit has no word for “matter” in the sense of “concrete reality” : for “that which fills space in such a manner that it can be conceived of and/or sensed, Sanskrit has only nāma-rūpa, “name” (idea, species, substantial form) and “phenomenon” (perceptual aspect, accidental form), or in other words the “intelligible” and the “sensible”. “As far as there are ‘name and phenomenon’ so far this universe extends” (SB. XI, 2, 3, 3) ; it is by means of these that the Brahman is manifested, and the world a theophany (ib., 5). It is true that Sanskrit mātrā (measure) and (nir)maṇa—(measured out) are the etymological equivalents of matter and “material”, and that these terms denote whatever belongs to the realm of continuous quantity ; but what is thus “measured out” (by the Sun, cf. Blake’s “Ancient of Day”) is not the physicist’s “matter”, even in its most mental form, but the possibilities of manifestation that inhere in the Spirit,—“inhere”, in the sense that time inhere in eternity, eloquence in silence, or measureable space in the space that cannot be traversed. Mātrā is much nearer to the Scholastic “species” as characterised by “number” than to materia thought of as mass. It may be added that the Platonic and Neo-Platonic concept of “measure” (metron) accords with the Indian : the “unmeasured” is that which has not yet been defined, or future; the “measured” is the defined or finite content of the ordered cosmos; the “immeasurable” is the infinite, which is the source alike of the indefinite and the finite, and remains unaffected by the definition of what of it is definable.

1. Even in SE. I, 3, 9. 23 atka vratam visjrate, “Then he ceases from the operation” (sacrifice), visjrte (does not mean “rejects”, but only “finishes with” in the same sense that a man “finishes with” the Mass when the office has been completed.
which no more lies within his competence than it lies within the power of the Sun to hold back one who gives the right answer (naše yad enam apasedhet, JUB. I. 5. 3). The doubly intensified abhi-ati-stf employed in AV. X. 5. 15=XVI. 1. 5, is also “to let pass”, of abhy-ati-mucyate in JUB. I. 30. 4. It can be said, accordingly, that to make of atisrākṣīh and atyāsrākṣīh in our Upaniṣad “Thou hast renounced” is to force and distort the normal meanings of stf, whether with or without the intensive prefix ati. Nor shall we find anything in our text that compels us to force or distort the essential values of stf in this way. If Śaṅkara himself does so, it is for the same reasons that he altogether changes the meaning of Ku.VI. 4; concerned as he is only with Return (nivṛtti, nibhava, abhava) Śaṅkara deliberately ignores the divine procession (pravṛtti, prabhava, vibhava),¹ the askṣara is not merely for him the “Unwasting” but rather the “Unflowing”, or “Non-proceeding Pleroma”, ūrtam apravartin, CU. III. 12.72. It is from the same point of view that Eckhart says that “In the birth of the Son all creatures went forth life and being, hence all things are lively imaged in the Son. Now when the soul returns again within, she loses the Son...the soul has got to die to all the activity connoted by the divine nature if she is to enter the divine essence where God is altogether idle” I. 275-6).³ This is the “last step” (Pramam padam), indeed in the sense that henceforth one must “walk without feet,” as Rāmī words it; but no more for the Vedanta than for Eckhart the whole story. To be unified with Death (which is the same thing as to have “conquered recurrent death”) is to participate in all of Death’s activities as well as in his “idleness”. Varuṇa’s “still waters” are not merely motionless, but also the Fountain of Life and everflowing source of the Rivers of Life (sindhinām upodaya, RV. VIII. 41-2; their “stillness” or immutability consists in this, that in flowing forth, they are not diminished, “This is the lovely paradox, O men, that while the rivers flow, the waters are at rest” (caranti yan nadyas tathur ēpaḥ, RV. V. 47. 5). The Self (ātman) “apart from any glimmer of a distinctive ‘this’ or ‘such’ or ‘thus’” Śaṅkara, Svāt-

¹. Vibhava is wrongly understood by the translators of Pali texts; vibhū is the same as Viyan, “to be distributively born”, as in AV. X. 8. 13. Vibhava is “omipresence”, a universal as distinct from an individual “becoming”, or “birth”.

2. Perhaps the best explanation of the well-known term Aksara (= Brahman) is that to be found in JUB. I. 43. 8 “Whom do you revere”? The Aksara. How do you mean, ‘Aksara’? It is ‘Aksara inasmuch as though it flows (ksarat) is not exhausted (na kṣiyate)’. The Brahman is the inexhaustible Fons Vite, the “inexhaustible well” (avatam...anupakṣitam, RV. X. 101 5), Plenum (pūrṇam), of AV X. 8. 29 and BU. I. 5).

3. This in answer to the question, “How can there be death in him who says of himself that he is the life”? “Idle” is avrata, apravartin; it is as vṛtya, cahravartin, ratthin that he proceeds, and this is Eckhart’s “divine activity”. The point of the cited text is that to know Him as “eternal rest, eternal work”, one must have crossed over from the working to the rest: whoever’s knowledge is of Mitra only knows not Varuṇa, but whoever returns to Varuṇa through Mitra possesses Mitrávaruṇau both.
manirūpaṇa, 112, cf. S. I. 140 and M. II. 39 nāparam itthatāyāti is also the quickening Self and Sun of all things (RV. I. 115. 1), into which it enters "on wings of gladness and felicity" (Taitt. Up. II. 5, cf. my Two Vedantic hymns, ESOS, VIII, p. 96, Note 3). If the Son returns to the Father, the Father is always becoming the Son.1 The transcendence of suchness is not a privation, but an "all-obtaining" (sātvāpī) the fulfillment of all desires and the realisation of all potentialities, from which "all" we cannot exclude those of formal manifestation. "Whoever is joined unto God is one spirit", as St. Paul expresses it; and the Spirit bloweth as it will, carati yathāvāsam (RV. I. 168. 4). It is with this will that the Comprehensor's will is one, when he says in RV. V. 46.1 "Like a knowing horse, I yoke myself to the pole (of the car and that I draw that ferries o'er and giveth aid, nor do I choose between a being loosed therefrom and a coming back again. May he, the waywise leader, guide me straight." Śrī Kṛṣṇa says of himself, "There is naught in the Three Worlds, O Pārtha, that remains for me to do (kartavyam)2 nor aught ungotten that I yet might get, and yet I am in act" (varta eva ca karmāṇi, BG. III. 22). It is neither by "activity alone", nor yet by "inactivity" that Kṛṣṇa can be imitated: "He who seeth inaction in action, and action in inaction, is wholly in act" kṛtṣṇa-karma-kṛt, BG. IV. 18 = kṛtakṛtyaḥ, AA. II. 5 and Mu. II. I; and S. I. 140 katamkaraṇīyam...abbhaṅgas). In the same way it can be said, and is in fact said by the āptakāmam, ātmakāmam akāmam, of BU. IV. 3. 21, that "He whose desire, or love, is the Spirit, both hath his desire and is without desire, he findeth fulfilment of desire in not desiring."

It has been sufficiently shown that the things that Naciketas is supposed to have abandoned are not those things which are abandoned by a Comprehensor. It is not, in fact, "things" that one abandons, but only false appearances; just as one rejects the notion "rope" when a snake has been diag-

1. Hence the designation of Agni as Tanūnapāt, "own grandson," and in analogous human custom, the transmission of names from grandfather to grandson.

2. More fully in BG. III. 17-18. Kāryam na vidyate, and nāsti kartavyam because in him there is no potentiality (kṛtyā) that has not however been reduced to act (kṛtam): and naiva tasya kṛtenārtho nākṛtena because sarva-sañnisiddhārthak and like Varuṇa in RV. I. 25. 11 abhi paśyati kṛtāni yā ca kartvā = I. 164. 20 aṁyāḥ abhi kāśiti.

On the other hand, when the Deity is thought of in principio, and as proceeding, akṛtārtha as in MU. II. 6, there are always "those things which God must will of necessity" (St. Thomas, Sum. Theol. I. 45. 2 c.), i.e. per necessitatem infallibilitatis (and not coactionis, cf. BG. III, 18 b na cāsya sarva-bhūtesu kāśic-artha-vyapāśrayah). Hence in RV. I. 165. 9 yāni karisyā kṛṣṇi; IV, 18.2 bahūmi me akṛtā kartvāni; VIII 102. 8 abhuvat tvāṣṭā rūpeva takṣyā (i.e. from that "world" from which the worlds are hewn, X. 81. 4), balanced by S. I. 180 na me vanasmin karaniyam atti, spoken by the Buddha by whom all has been done that should be done. The Devāyāna, in other words, is the way of procedure from potentiality to act, from action per accidens to action per essentiam.
nosed, so one rejects any other appearance to which the mind has attached itself, and comes into a possession of a truer knowledge, and in the last analysis of Truth itself; one renounces the reflection (imago imaginata) as soon as one perceives its source (imago imaginans).

II. 14: Naciketas urges Death to proceed to the answering of his question, Naciketas himself describing That of which he would learn, in terms

1. It is worthy of note that the example of the rope and the snake is employed by Sextus Empiricus (Pyrrhonism, I. 227, 228) precisely as in the Vedanta to illustrate the unreliability of all conceptions of reality based on sense-perception. At the same time (ib., I. 19) Sextus points out that the Sceptics, of whom it was said that they abolish phenomena do nothing of the sort; they accept the actuality of phenomena, but we question whether the underlying object is such as it appears, and our doubt does not concern the appearance itself but the account given of that appearance; this also appears to be the Vedantic position, māyāvāda. This is certainly also the Christian position: Augustine, De immort. anima, c. 12. n. 19 “Things are true in so far as they have being”; St. Thomas, Sum. Theol., I. 14. 9 “Things we see around us have distinct being outside the (individual) seer”; but this being is not what we see, rather, ib. I. 13. 12 and 2, “Our intellect cannot comprehend simple subsisting forms, as they really are in themselves”, and I. 13. 7 “Realities existing in nature are outside the order of sensible and intelligible existence”; Augustine, Conf. XI. “Our knowledge compared with Thine is ignorance” (cf. āvidyā). When Augustine also says (Soliloq. lib. II. c. 5. n. 8) “What seems to me to be true is that which is”, he is not saying that any appearance is true or that the senses of reason together can do any more than entertain opinion about the being of things as they are in themselves. “Creation is the emanation of being”, which “being” is God (St. Thomas, Sum. Theol., I. 45. 1); to know their being, or ultimate reality or truth would be then to know them as they are in God, to know God, for which, as the Upaniṣads so often insist, the senses and the mind are inadequate.

2. It may be that the Greek Sceptics did not believe in the possibility of a true knowledge “science” as distinguished from “opinion”, be this as it may, the Sceptics’ position as cited above is indistinguishable from that of the Upaniṣads. We are far from assuming an “Indian influence” and in any case are not immediately interested in problems of literary history, but only in the truths expressed. It may, however, be observed in the present connection that what is said of relief in painting in the Mahāyāna Sūtrālaṃkāra, XIII, 17 and Lāmākavatāra, Sūtra, Nanjio’s ed. p. 91, appears with almost verbal identity in Sextus, (Pyrrhonism, I. 120) and in Hermes (Lib. XI. ii, 17a).

3. And which is therefore a matter of “fond belief”, and to be distinguished from “faith”, the nature of which “consists in knowledge alone” (St. Thomas, Sum. Theol. II. 47. 13 ad 2).

4. “For production (genesis, janma) is the image of being in nature (hūle, the “wood” of RV. X. 31. 7 and 81. 4 = Brahman in TB. 11. 8. 9. 6 h; prakṛti), and the thing produced (gignomenon, jātām) is an imitation of what is” (mimemía tou notos átmane prátimai, SB. RI. I. 6. 13), Plutarch, Moralia, 372, F.

4. The converse position is admirably illustrated by Aesop’s story of the Dog and the Shadow, where the dog, crossing a bridge, and having a piece of meat in its mouth, sees the reflection in the water, and jumps in after it, thus losing the reality in pursuit of the appearance. Incidentally, we wish to recommend to those who interpret RV. “naturallistically”, Plutarch’s remarks on the Greeks who fail to distinguish between “Apollo and the sun”, ib., 400, D.
of the negative theology. In the first line, we agree with Rawson's "Apart from duty and non-duty", though perhaps should prefer "Apart from what is or is not 'in order'". It is precisely from the plane of "conduct" that the liberated Comprehensor, the knower of Brahman, is enlarged: cf. CU. VIII. 4.1 where neither the well-done nor ill-done (na sukṛtaṁ na duṣkuṭtam) can cross the Bridge of the Spirit that holds these worlds apart; MU. VI. 18, vidvāṁ punya-pāpe vihāya, "The Comprehensor, putting away both merit and evil" (also in Muṇḍ., III. 1.3) ; Kaus. Up. I. 4, "This one, separated from the well-done and separated from the ill-done, as a comprehensor of the Brahman, verily goes forth unto Brahman"; BG. V. 15 "The Lord accepts neither the evil nor the well-done of anyone" (cf. JUB. I. 5.1-2); M. I. 135 "If you understand the parable of the raft, you must discard dhamma, and a fortiori adhamma"); John III. 9 "Whoever is born of God, cannot sin"; Galatians V. 18 "If you are led by the Spirit, you are not under the law"; Eckhart, "There neither vice nor virtue ever entered in". In the second line kṛtākṛtāt states the same position, and may be compared with Taitt. Up. II. 9 where the Comprehensor "is not vexed by the thought 'Why have I not done (nākaravam) the good? Why have I done (ākaravam) the evil?'". At the same time the metaphysical technicality of the formula must not be overlooked. The "to be done" (kṛtyā, RV. X. 85. 28; etc., kariṣyam, I. 165.9, VII. 20.1, kariṇīyam M. 11.39) which has "not yet been done" (akṛtam) contrasts with that which "has been done" (kṛtam)1 or "perfected" (sukṛtam) by the "one who has done what there was to be done" (kṛtakṛtyah, AA. II. 5, MU. II. 1), "who has done the whole task" (kṛṣṇa-karma-kṛt BG. IV. 18), as potentiality (=not-being as evil) with act (=being as good) Nāciketas is asking to be told of That in which there is no distinction of potentiality from act, nature from essence. In connection with the third line, we cannot accept Professor Rawson's distinction of "timeless" from "eternal". It is true that "There are two forms of Brahman,2 Time (kāla) and the Timeless" (akāla). MU. VI. 15, and that "it is at the fiat of the Imperishable" (Brahman, BU. III. 8.9) that Sun and Moon, Heaven and Earth, and our times are separated. But this does not mean that any time of ours applies to him whose knowledge of all things is sub-specie aeternitatis; it is a principle from which our time proceeds that is in him; as Augustine so well says (Conf. XI. 13) we can-

1. Kṛtam, also the highest throw in dice, employed as a symbol of perfection, cf. CU. IV. 1.6 yathā kṛṭāya saṁyanti, ..., AB. VII. 15 kṛtam ... saṁpadyuṭe, cf. Jeremy Taylor's expression, "the last throw for eternity." Kṛtam is that perfection to which all kṛti tends, hence AV. V. 9. 8 ut kṛtam, ut kṛtyām, "Up with thee, act. Up with thee, potentiality!", and Īsā. 16, kṛtam smara, "Be reminded of perfection."

2. In this connection, what does professor Rawson (p. 135) mean by "his" (Saṅkara's) two forms of Brahman? Does he think that Saṅkara invented the doctrine of a single essence and two natures? Not to mention that this doctrine recurs again and again in RV., one might ask whether Saṅkara was the author of BU. II. 3, or whether this was not already for him, śrutī?
not ask what God was doing "before" he made the world, because time and the world are aspects of the same thing, and cannot be thought of apart. It is a part of our ignorance (avidyā, cf. Ulrich of Strasburg ignorantia divisiva est errantium) that past and future, cause and effect are apparently divided from one another; no finite being has ever experienced a "now" otherwise than as "a short period of time"; what Naciketas asks is about a now without duration, "where every when is focussed".

II. 13 vivṛtam sadma naciketasaṁ manye, literally "I consider Naciketas an opened house", or as RAWSON rightly renders "An open house, I think, is Naciketas", except that this overlooks the nuance "opened". The meaning is that Naciketas has once and for all broken open the house of life, and will never again be shut up in a "house", i.e. body-and-soul. Exactly the same is expressed in Sn. 19 vivāta kuṣṭi, "opened hut", an expression which briefly summarises what is stated at greater length in the well-known words of the Buddha "Never again shalt thou, O builder of houses, make a house for me: broken are all thy beams, thy ridge-pole shattered (J. I. 76). For "house" as "body" cf. Manu VI. 76-77.

II. 15; padam, "step", With this word Death begins his exposition of the Brahman; it represents the "third boon" of I. 19 and looks forward to Viśṇu's "third step" in III. 9. The word is especially appropriate here, because it is precisely this "end of the road, Viśṇu's farthest stride" or "hightest abode", where there is a "well of honey" (RV. I. 154.4) that is reached when the threshold of Death's house, of the Sun-gate and World-door, is crossed, as can be seen by a collation of MU. VI. 39 "unto Viṣṇu" with Iṣā. 15 and BU. VI. 15 "unto vision". A correlation of the "three boons" with the "three strides" of Viṣṇu is maintained throughout our text, and must always be borne in mind.

---

1. Non enim erat 'tunc', ubi non erat 'tempus'. Cf. DEUSSEN, Philosophy of the Upaniṣads, p. 201, "space and time are derived from the subject. It is itself accordingly not in space and does not belong to time".

2. Cf. S. I. 8. (I. 2.9 Tagtha me kujkā nattthi, kacci nattthi kulāvaka, etc. In Sn. 372, etc. loke vivatta-cekado may mean the same as vivāta kusṭi or may have particularly reference to the breaking open of the roof.

3. The idea of an "empty house" in MU. VI. 10 "As there are none to touch fair women who enter into an empty house (śūnyāgāre), so the truly poor man (sannyāsin) does not touch the objects of the senses" is a different one, although not unrelated. MU. VI. 10 corresponds to S. I. 107 where the Buddha refers to himself as dwelling in an "empty house" or "bare cell" (suṇāgāra-gato mahā muni).

Muṇḍ. III. 2.4 eṣa ātmā viṣate brahma-dhāma, "This Spiritual essence enters into the Brahma-home" is not stated explicitly by KU. II. 13, though it is the logical and immediate consequence of the breaking apart of all mundane habitation. It is in fact through the "roof-plate" of the broken house (apex of the heart, foramen of the skull, sun-door of the cosmos) that one enters into the Brahma-home; what Muṇḍ III. 2.4 implies that there is an open door, an "open house" of another and supra-mundane order, "open" to him whose psycho-physical habitation has once and for all been "broken open". There may be in Sn. 372 vivatta-
II. 23. The last two lines are admittedly difficult; we render literally “By him whom He chooses, by him He may be grasped; this one’s Spiritual-essence unveils its proper form” (tanum svām = svarūpam). For the phrasing compare RV. V. 71.4 tasmai tānām vi saśre, “to him unveils her form”. It hardly appears that any doctrine of “Grace” is necessarily involved: compare SB. II. 3. 3.8 sa yasya kāmāyate, tasya prāṇam ādāyodet, sa mriyate, “He takes unto himself the Breath of whomsoever He desires and he dies,” that whomsoever He loves, He takes unto himself”. The Spirit, indeed, moves always “as it will” (yathā vaśam, RV. X. 168.4, etc.; but this is in accordance with its own nature, and is a matter of “infallible necessity”, and belongs to “those things which God must will of necessity” (St. Thomas, Sum, Theol. I. 45.2 c). Whoever approaches Him as like, to like, He cannot repel, He cannot but “choose”; as in JUB. I. 5.3 neše yad enam apasadhet.

II.20 anor avyān mahato mahīyān “less than infinitesimal, greater than great”; with numerous parallels elsewhere in the Upaniṣads (CV. VI. 8.6, VI. 12.2; Mūndi. 11. 2.2 etc). Cf. Dionysius, De div. nom. IX, 2-3, “Now God is called Great in his peculiar Greatness which giveth of itself to all things that are great and is poured upon all magnitude from outside and stretches far beyond it ... This Greatness is infinite, without quantity, and without number ... And Smallness, or Rarity, is attributed to God’s nature because he is outside all solidity and distance and penetrates all things without let or hindrance ... This Smallness is without quantity or quality, it is irrepressible, infinite, unlimited, and while comprehending all things, is itself incomprehensible.”¹

II. 25. “Who knows truly where he is?” (ka itthā yatra veda sah): like RV. X. 168.3 kuta ā babhūva, “Whence has He come to be?”, with its answer in KU. II. 18 na kutāsīt na babhūva kaścit, “Neither hath He become from any ‘where’, nor hath He become ‘anyone’”. Professor Rawson’s suggestion of an “agnostic interpolation” (1) is ridiculous, and indeed profane.² One might in the same way ask “Who knows what He

echado as direct reference to this breaking out of the roof: for the sun-door is actually raśmiḥbhīh saṁcchannam (UB. I. 3.6), and Buddha is said to have “opened the doors of immortality” (S. I. 138, etc.)

1. We take this opportunity to remark Dionysius, even more perhaps than Eckhart, represents for a European an almost indispensable preparation for any serious approach to the Upaniṣads.

2. In TS. V. 4.3.4 is “In what quarter is Rudra, or in what?” an “agnostic interpolation”? Agnostic: yes, but only as Eckhart uses the word Agnosia, and in the sense of the Docta Ignorantia of Nicholas of Cusa, and “The Cloud of Unknowing”. The answer to TS. would be as for Brahman in MU. VI 17. “The quarters do not exist for him,” or as for the Gāl in JUB. III. 1.9 “The quarters are confused; they are not discerned at night ... They enter into Him” (muhyaṁti diśo na vai tā rātram prajñāyante ... tā etam evāpiyanti), in other words, as they are in Him, are mūrādevāḥ. It is only “by day” that He can be said to enter into them. Mitrāvaruṇa, as Mitra sees the “infinite” by day, and as Varuṇa
is?” and answer with Erivgena that “God himself does not know ‘what’ He is, because He is not any ‘what’”. In the same way God himself does not know “where” He is, because He is not any “where”. As Eckhart says, “His only idiosyncrasy is being.” All this does not contradict the “knowability of the Supreme Being implied in previous verses of KU. and elsewhere; all that it implies is that He cannot be known, but only known of, as thus or thus; whatever can be thought or said of Him, “No, no” (neti, neti). From amongst the innumerable Christian formulations of the negative theology, space permits a citation here only of St. Thomas, “Every relation which is predicated of God from time (or place) does not put something real in the eternal God, but only something according to our way of thinking ... Therefore if anyone in seeing God conceives something in his mind, this is not God, but one of God’s effects” (Sum. Theol. III. 35. 5 c and 92.1 ad 4), Eckhart “To know God really you must know Him as the Unknown”, and Nicolas of Cusa “Deus cum non possit nisi negative, extra intellectualem regionem, attingi” (De fil. Dei, p. 121). One only can know Him, who as Rûmî says, “cannot recognize himself,” only one “whose place is the Placeless, and trace the Traceless” (Ode XXXI in NICHOLSON, Shams-i-Tabriz). Very pertinent also is Rûmî’s “I play the tune of negation: Death will reveal the mystery” (Mathnawi, VI. 722).

**THIRD VALLI**

III. 1 : ṛta, “cosmic order, Greek kosmos, Latin ordo.—As the Sun is Truth (satyaṁ, passim), so the Universe is Order: iyaṁ vā ṛtam usau (āditya) satyaṁ, TS. V. 1. 5. 9. Ṛta is the order of the universe, manifested under the Sun, and seen by whatever it may be that sees through and with the solar “Eye”, the “Eye of Mitrāvaruṇau” (RV. V. 51.1, VII.61.1 and 63.1). JUB. III. 36.5 identifies ṛtam with brahman (om ity etad evaśaram ṛtam);

the “infinite” by night (RV. V. 62.8). “Direction” has no meaning “at night” in the same sense that “infinite cannot be traversed”. The answer taken for granted by KU. II. 25 d is then that “No one knows”, “No one”, that is, who still is “anyone”. Itthā, again, is not so much “truly” or “surely” as it is “thus”, and therefore with the interrogative, “how?” Itthā is probably to be taken, then, with yatra, the question being “Who knows what or where He is”; the answer being that “He is neither in any wise nor anywhere”, or as it is so often expressed in the Buddhist texts, nāparam itthatāyati, “There is no further extension of being in any wise,” or in the words of Erivgena, “God himself does not know ‘what’ He is, because He is not any ‘what’”, or Dante’s “It is not in space nor hath it poles” (Paradiso XXII. 67).

Professor RAWSON’s “agnostic interpolation” recalls those scholars who used to see a satire in the “Frog Hymn” of RV.

“Questions” such as those of our text form an integral part of the scriptural “style”, and are to be understood as if asked in brahmodya; the answers can usually be found elsewhere, or are in any case known to those to whom the question is supposed to be addressed: for example KU. IV. 3 and 4 kim atra pariśiyate? with CU. VIII. 4-5 atiśiyate ... ātman.
whose self-intention is therefore the act of “creation,” as in BU. I. 4. 10 “In the beginning, this-cosmos was Brahman (brahma vā idam agra āsīt). That knew itself, and said ‘I am Brahman.’ Therewith that became the All.” What Mitrāvarūṇau, aparā and para Brahman, thus “know” or “see” is the “World picture (jagac-citram) painted by the Spiritual-essence (ātman) on the canvas of itself, in which it takes a great delight” (Śaṅkara, Svātmanirūpaṇa, 95): the “speculum aeternum,” eternal mirror, in which God sees himself and all things, and in which those Contemplatives who also gaze perceive likewise all things more clearly than in any other way, and so also see “themselves” more truly than “as they are in themselves” (Augustine and Boneventura); for as BU. I. 4.10 continues, “Whoever of the Devas is awakened (pratyabodhyata) thereunto, he indeed has become it, and so too in the case of Prophets and that of men…Yea, here and now (etar-hi), whoever knows that ‘I am Brahman’, enters into that ‘this,’ he becomes ‘This All’ (sa idam sarvam bhavati), nor can any Deva hinder him from thus becoming.”

With these conceptions of the “world-picture” that the twain “drink in” (pībantau, from pā in the sense “feast upon with the eyes, ears, etc., cited by MW. from Manu) compare Genesis 1. 31 “And God saw everything that he had made, and behold it was very good.” It is in “Order” that this “goodness” consists: what God beheld was ‘the admirable beauty of the universe (which) is made up of all things. In which even what is called evil, well-ordered and in its place, is the eminent commendation of what is good” (Augustine, Enchir. 10. 11), what God saw is “the most beautiful Order given to things by God, in which the universe consists” (St. Thomas, Sum. Theol. I. 25. 6 ad 3); “the universal form of this complex” Dante, Paradiso, XXXIII 90).

Ṛtam… parame parārde in our verse corresponds to rtasya pade in RV. X. 177. 1-2, “That which the Winged-one conceives by intellect, that which the Gandharva utters in the womb, that flashing, luminous noumenon the Redesmen are intent upon” (tam dyotaminam svaryam maniśām rtasya pade kavayo ni pānti). Pānti here, from pā “to protect,” is nearer in value to pībantau from pā “to drink” than might at first appear; for “to observe, notice, attend to, follow,” cf. “heed,” are recognized meanings of this other


2. “Speculum aeternum mentes se videntium ducit in cognitionem omnium creatorum, sicut dicit Augustinus (De civ. Dei. XII. 29) quod rectius ibi cognoscunt quam alibi…Unde melius videbo me in Deo quam in me ipso” (St Bonaventura, I Sent., d. 35, a. uniu, q. 1, fund. 3 and In Hexaem., col. 12, n. 9, cited in BISSON, L’Exemplarisme Divin selon Saint Bonaventure, 1929, pp. 39, 44).


4. JUB. I. 5. 3 “The (solar Janus) is not able to drive him away; for he invokes the Truth”; neše in JUB. corresponding to na… isate in BU.
pā (MW), and the interpretation in JUB. III. 36. 5 where the verse is discussed, is evidently correct.—“it is inasmuch as they ‘reflect upon’ that they are said to ‘protect ’” (yat...mimāṁsante...tad...nipāti); or as we might put it, rta- dyumnam maṁsāṁ nipāti, “entertain the luminous idea of Order,” which “entertainment” is also a “maintenance.”

The distinction of pāti, “they reflect upon” and pibantu, “they imbibe,” in the very usual sense of “drink in mentally,” is far from absolute.

A full discussion of rta would be impossible here. But we cannot too strongly emphasize that this word is only properly translatable by its etymological equivalent, “Order.” As “order,” and therefore also “right” and “rite,” rta is distinguishable from the “true” (satiyam) as an application is distinguished from the principle in which it subsists more eminently. Rta is the “right” (not only in a moral sense, but in the broader sense of “correct”), rten “in order” and “regular,” anta whatever is “inordinate” or “irregular” or “informal.” The coming into being of the Kosmos is the production of “Order” out of “Chaos” (kha,2 as in RV. II. 28.5 1ahyāma te varuna khāṁ rtaśya), and this is specifically the Aryan operation (vrata) as distinguished from the inoperation of the Asuras,—“These Comprehenders, Men-of-order, Redesmen (vidvā̄īsah...r̥tvahāḥ...kava)h) possess themselves of the Misers’ ultimate treasure that was hidden in the case (nīdhim pañcāḥ guhā hitam), and having taken note of the disorders antā, sc. of the ‘miserly’ Asuras), returned (from their foray), and took their stand upon the mighty Path’” (RV. II. 24. 6-7), “shaped all this dusty-world, measuring out the homes that erst had been unmeasured” (RV. X. 56. 5), “Ye, Mitrāvaruṇa, Redesmen, fosterers of order, ye in whose hand is (= who maintain) order, have in ‘order’ realised your great design” rtena mitrāva- ruṇāḥ rtaṃyādāhaḥ rtaṃśā kratum bhyāham āśūke kavi, RV. I. 2. 8-9).

III. 1 continued: On the other hand, it is most unlikely that sukṛtaśya loka means “in the righteous world.” Munḍ. I. 2. 6-10 ridicules those who think that “this that has been earned by their merit and what has been well-

1. In RV. I. 2. 8 cited below, rta-sprśā; has this value quite literally, sprś “to touch, handle, take hold of” (MW) corresponding to “maintain,” literally “hold in hand.”

With ni panti cf. RV. I. 1. 8, where Agni is gopām rtaśya; and VIII. 26. 21 where Vāyu, the Gale of the Spirit, is rta-pati. In the latter context, Vāyu as Tvastr’s “son-in-law” = husband of Sūrya = Sūrya, ātmā jagatas tathuṣa ca, RV. I. 115. 1.

2. For some of the connotations of kha see my “Kha and other words denoting ‘Zero’ in connection with the metaphysics of space” in BSOS VII, 1934, pp. 487-497. Thence originate sukha and duḥkha (as remarked by Buddhaghosa, VM. 461).

3. Kratu, “design,” “purpose,” or “counsel” (as OT. passim, “the counsel of the Lord,”—consilium sine dubitatione). In KU. II. 11 krator anantyam. But in KU. II. 11. 20 akraṭa, “purposeless,” “uncalculating,” without an individual will, cf. RV. IV. 46. 1 na...vam... “not as I will, but as Thou willest.”

4. Concreato fu ordine e construtto alle sustanzie, Dante, Paradiso, XXIX. 31 (the sustanzie being, as is clear from the following lines, sattva, rajas, and tamas).
done (punyah, sukṛtaḥ) is the Brahma-world... the fools who delight in that (world won by merit) as their 'better.'¹ (śreyasah, cf. KU. II. 2)... having come into being (bhūtvā) at the summit of contingent being (nākasya prṣṭhe = bhavāgre),² remain in this world or a worse.” Similarly JUB. I. 3. 1-3,

1. The Empyrean Brahma-world is more truly “not made” (akṛta, “uncreated”) than “well made” (sukṛta), unless we understand by “well made,” “self-made” (svakṛta), in accordance with Taitt. Up. II. 7. Sāṁkara must have had this text in mind; but his further interpretation of tta as karma-phala is impossible in a context dealing with the parama parārdha, where there are certainly no “rewards” and to which there is no admission by “merit” (punya) but only by “qualification” (arhana) RV. X. 63. 4.

Here may be noticed KU. II. 24 and Rawson’s annotations. Let us observe, in the first place, that the Upaniṣads, the jñāna kānda, are gnostic treatises by hypothesis, and not ethical treatises; their concern is with the art of knowing God, or in other words with the contemplative life. We cannot expect to find any considerable part of these texts devoted to the exposition of prudence. The most that can be expected in these contexts is a full recognition of the indispensable dispositive value of “means,” and this is just what we find in KU. II. 24 and the corresponding Muṇḍ. Up. III. 2. 3 (which Rawson very properly cites, p. 115), cf. BG. II. 44; it is very clear, however, that the ethical means, however indispensable, are not ends in themselves, but means to an end beyond themselves. This is also the Christian doctrine; prudence is essential to the active life, but accidental to the contemplative life (St Thomas, Sum. Theol. II-II. 180. 2 “The moral virtues do not belong to the contemplative life essentially...On the other hand, the moral virtues belong to the contemplative life dispositively.” (“Theirs is said to be the contemplative life who are chiefly intent on the contemplation of truth...The contemplative life, as regards the essence of the action pertains to the intellect,” and must be distinguished from the mere observation of things by the senses or the intellect and from the pursuit of knowledge for its own sake, ib. 180.1,—the last observation showing very clearly that neither “science” nor “philosophy” in the modern senses of the words pertains to the contemplative life, but to the active life.) It is not, therefore, any defect in the Upaniṣads that they are not expositive of ethics; those “who are especially intent on external actions” are expected to obey the laws of ritual and conduct (karma in both senses) which are laid down in the Dharma Śāstras, in which the first principles with which alone the Upaniṣads are concerned are applied to specific contingencies; which obedience is also and at the same time an indispensable preparation or qualification for the contemplative life, as asserted in our texts, KU. II. 24 and Muṇḍ. III. 2. 3, BU. IV. 4. 9.

2. Nākasya Prṣṭhe is not “at the back of Heaven,” in the sense of on the farther side of Heaven, “but just on this side of Heaven”; in the same way that in AV. X. 7. 38 krāntam satīlaya prṣṭhe is “proceeding on the face of the waters.” The Heavens above and the Waters below are thought of as having their backs turned towards us.

In the same way the Nākasas or “Vault-sitters” are on this side of yonder Sun, while the Pañcacūḍāḥ are on the other side of the Sun (SB. VIII. 6 1. 14, cf. TS. V. 3. 7); a clear distinction of the highest station of the cosmic Devas from the supra-cosmic Gandharvaloka, and thus of what is obtainable by sacrifice alone, and what by gnosis (with or without an actual performance of the rite), cf. the similar distinction of the mundane Devas from the supra-mundane Gandharvas in SB. III. 2. 4. The highest station of the mundane Devas is an Elysium, that of the Gandharvas the Empyrean. That in TS. V. 3. 7. 2 the Pañcacūḍās are called “Apsarases”
where there is no admission to the Sun “by what thou hast done ill or well” (idam pāpam akar...yo vai punyakṛt syāt) ; cf. RV. VIII. 70. 3 “None attaineth him by works or sacrifices” (na kṣi tāṃ karmanā naṣat...na yajñāir), BG. V. 8 “By no means ought a harnessed man, a knower of the principle, consider that ‘I am the doer of anything’” (naiva kīnicī karomiti yuktō manyeta tatvavīti) and in accordance with this both JUB. I. 3. 3 “Thou (God) art the doer thereof” (tvam vai taśya karāśi), and Tauler, Following of Christ, 16, 17 “By their works they cannot go in again...If any man is to come to God, he must be empty of all works and let God work alone.”

III. 1 continued: Parame parārdhe=parame vyoman, “in uttermost empyrean” (RV. X. 129.7). Cf. RV. I. 164.10 and Praśna I. 11 paṇca-pādām diva...pare ardhe pitaram, apare (ardhe) vicakṣānam “Five-footed Father in the farther half of heaven2 (beyond the Sun), the Far-seer (Sun) in the lower half,” where again it is a question of two aspects of deity, para and apara Brahman, Varuṇa and Mitra, etc., of whom the one sees by means of the other as being his “Eye” (RV. X. 88. 13 b, AV. X. 7. 33, Buddhist cakkhum loke, etc.); and of the distinction of an Empyrean from an Elysium. It is the former, the Empyrean, that is referred to in KU. V. 15, “There no sun shines, nor moon, nor any star,” cf. Apoc. XXI. 23 “And the city had no need of the sun.” It is, moreover, precisely to this “farther half” that Brahman, after emanating the lower and the higher cosmic deities, retires atha brahmaiva parārdham agacchad,—i.e. “rested on the seventh day,”—and thence that he ‘descended from heaven’ or more literally “went down again by means of name and aspect, or phenomenon” (pratīvaid rūpena caiva nāmnā ca whereby the Devas, originally mortal, became immortal (SB. XI. 2. 3. 1-6). In the citation of RV. I. 164. 10 above, we retained paṇca-pādām because this epithet of the “Father” (cf. RV. x. 82.1 Viśvakarma, “Father of the Eye,” i.e. of the Sun) lends itself to a further demonstration of the

“who wait upon the Sacrificer in yonder world” is consistent with the story of Purūravas and Urvāśī (SB. XI. 5. 1), his final reunion with Urvāśī in the Gandharvaloka being evidently “in high heaven” (bhūdīva, RV. V. 41. 19).

1. “The works of a man who is led by the Holy Ghost, are the works of the Holy Ghost rather than his own” (St Thomas, Sum. Theol. II-I. 93. 6 ad. 1).


3. In the te brahmanāpuḥ amṛtām of the text, the instrumental value of brahmanā is significant, and should be retained in translation. Needless to say that it is as Agni or the Sun that the Brahman comes back into the cosmos, and that to say that the cosmic Devas “obtain immortality by means of the Brahman” (manifested by name and aspect) is the same as to say with RV. I. 31. 7 “Thou, Agni (vicaraṇe in v. 6 like vicakṣānam in I. 164. 10, viṣāyatī in III. 62. 9, and Vipassi as former Buddha in D. II. 35) does appoint the mortal unto highest immortality,” or with IV. 53. 2 “Thou, Savitṛ erst for the Devas, whom we worship, brought forth their immortality, highest of all participations; and furthermore by way of gift to men didst open up the sequence of their lives.”
Father’s nature; pañcapādam pitaram corresponding, for example, to the aksaram pāñcavidiham of AA. II. 3. 8, and to the “fivefold Prajāpati, Year and Gale” of SB. VI. 1. 2. 17 f. the five forms or selves being those of the seasons or quarters; with which Śaṅkara’s gloss on Praśna I. 11 is in full agreement, the “five feet” being explained as the “five seasons,” which are the “feet” of the Annual-self of the Sun, by which feet (or rays) his procession is effected (padair . . . āvartate). Similarly in MU. II. 6, where Prajāpati, “dividing himself fivefold,” proceeds accordingly; the whole context “He, indeed, being of unaccomplished purpose because of his remaining within this heart of ours, considered, ‘Let me enjoy, or experience, objects’ (sa vā eṣo ’smād hydantarād akṣṭārtho manyaśārthān aṣānāmi), wherefore breaking open these openings (the doorways of the sense perceptions), and now arisen, by means of his five rays eats of the objects of the senses” atha khāṇīmāni bhīvodiṭāḥ paṁcabhīṁ naṁśāhīṁ viṣayān atī) throws a vivid light not merely on the present passage, but also upon KU. IV. 1 and 6.

III. 1, concluded: Chāyā-tapau, “shadow and glowing or light”: “so different,” as Rawson says, although one and the same, are the immanent and transcendent “selves,” the taster and the looker on, God and Godhead, Mitra and Varuṇa, apaṇā and para Brahman. Cf. KU. VI. 5 where again the Brahman is to be seen “in the Brahma world,” in his highest aspect, as chāyā-tapau. Similarly Böhme, Three Principles, XIV. 76 “And the deep of the darkness is as great as the habitation of the light; and they stand not one distant from the other, but together in one another, and neither of them hath beginning nor end.” “Mitra is the day, Varuṇa the night” (PB. XXV. 10. 10); “Mitra and Varuṇa are a conjoint pair” (SB. IX. 5. 1. 54). Considered together, it can be said of the Supreme Identity that “His shadow is life and his shadow death” (RV. X. 121. 2), for he is indeed the Year that “separates (gives distinct being to) some and unifies (slays) others” (AA. III. 2. 3); “I kill and I make alive” (Deut. XXXII. 39). Considered apart Agni or the Sun are both “shadow” as “likeness” (RV. V. 44. 6 and GB. I. 3) and “shadow” as “shelter from the heat” (RV. VI. 16. 38), “for in his shadow is all this universe” (SB. VIII. 7. 3. 13), cf. Isaiah XXV. 4 and XXXII. 2 and Lamentations IV. 20. In other words it is the sheltering Light that is the “shadow,” and the Darkness that is the “burning heat.” At the same time, from the point of view of the absolutely negative theology it can also be said that the Aksara (Brahman) that it is “without either shadow or darkness, without a within or without” (BU. III. 8. 8); “He is, by that alone is he apprehended” (KU. VI. 12), like Damascene, De fid. orth. I, “He who is is the principal of all names applied to God.”

III. 2: The symbol of the Bridge (setu) is of the highest significance in the Vedic as well as in other traditions; this is the Cinvat bridge of the Avesta and the “Brig of Dread” in folk-lore. The theme demands a detailed exposi-

1. For a fuller discussion see my Chāyā, in JAOS. 55, 1935.
tion elsewhere. Here we shall remark (1) that the Bridge identified with Brahman in our text is elsewhere identified with the Ātman, e.g. CU. VIII. 4. 4. (ya ātmā sa setuḥ), BU. IV. 4. 22 (aja ātmā...esa setuḥ), Munḍ. II. 2.5 tam evaikam jānatha ātmānam (amṛtasyaiva setuḥ), cf. RV. X. 61. 16 (Sun, or Soma) vipras...svasetuḥ, and John XIV. 6 “I am the Way, the Truth, and the Life”, and (2) that the word setu itself, according to its derivation from sī to “bind,” as though with cords, is most significant, not only when it means a “bond” or “fetter”, as in RV. IX. 73. 4, but also in its more usual sense of “bridge”. For the Bridge of the Spirit is literally a “tie” that links together Heaven and Earth, the Sun to the heart; the solar Spirit is the Pontifex; the symbolism of the Bridge coincides with that of the “Thread-spirit” (sūtrātmān), and its peculiar aptitude must have been even more apparent when bridges were usually made of rope, and not as they are now solid constructions of stone or steel, than it is to-day. Whoever has seen a rope-bridge, extended like a spider’s thread (which we say advisedly, because the related symbolism of the solar Spider is also involved) from shore to shore of a raging Himalayan torrent, can well appreciate the words of KU. III. 14 b “Strait as a razor’s edge, hard to be passed over (duratyayā, cf. RV. VII. 65. 3 setu duratyetā...mitrāvariṇā), a difficult path”!

III. 3-4 : The Chariot is here, as usual, the body, or rather body and all that we usually mean by “soul”. Rawson, in a useful discussion (p. 216) scarcely brings out the consistency of the various “parables”. We propose to consider only one point, in its bearing on the Milinda-pañho version. In KU. the Ātman, as Rawson rightly expresses it, is the “lord of the chariot”, i.e. the master who drives about in it, knowing and willing its course, though he delegates the actual operation of the vehicle to an assistant or coachman (the distinction of rathin from sārathin being that of passenger from driver), in AA. II. 3. 8 we have the very usual formulation according to which the Breath of Spirit “takes up its stand upon” (prăṇo ‘dhitiṣṭhati) its vehicle, which is accordingly its “stand” (adhiṣṭhānam, CU. VIII. 12. 1), cf. BG. XV. 9 adhiṣṭhūya, cited in a Note above; in MU. II. 6 the Ātman is the “instigator” (pracodayitī) who sets up the body in possession of conscious, and this is again the “taking of a stand” (avasthānam) or hypostasis. In each case the distinctoin of the Ātman from the buddhi, manas, indriyāṇi, etc. is emphatic, and the same as that of the Knower of the field from the field itself in BG. XIII. If the steeds, the senses, are sometimes unruly (KU.III.5) we have the situation described in BG. V. 6, “Then indeed the Ātman has to behave as an enemy, at war with what is Not-the-Ātman” (anātmanas tu śatrutve vartetātmāvā śatruvat), the Spirit wars with the flesh. The Milinda-pañho does not, with the word anātā, deny the Ātman, but merely asserts, in accordance with so many other of the Pali texts, that this (chariot), like this (commonly called “Nāgasena”), “is not the Spirit”, or “is not my

1. Cf. viprā viprasya bhāto vipācitaḥ (savitaḥ) in RV. V. 81. 1 and tvam agne agnīnā viprasya...samidhyase in VIII. 4v. 13.
spirit”, “not-ātman” (na me so attā, “This is not my spirit”, passim). The Buddha, as Mrs. Rhys Davids has recently remarked (JRAS. 1937, p. 259), took the existence of the ātman for granted. We should add that in KU. III. 9, the correspondence of vijñāna with the buddhi of III. 3 is to be noted; and furthermore, in the second line, the construction of the first is repeated, so that we have manah-pragrahavān naraḥ, where manah-pragraha- corresponds to vijñāna-sārāthīḥ and -vān naraḥ to yas tu in the first line, and accordingly, “the man who has mind as reins”, not “the man who has mind well-reined” if this means, as it seems to mean, “who curbs his own mind”, for that is the business, not of the nara but of the buddhi. The steeds will not be unruly, if controlled by vijñāna (buddhi) curbing the senses, not directly, but by means of the manas. It is the man without vijñāna (discrimination), the man whose manas (reason) has not been harnessed, whose steeds are unruly, who does not reach the goal, as stated in KU. III. 7, of which III. 9 states the converse. The man’s fault in 7 consists in not having attached the reins to the bit, and given them into the hands of his coachman; his merit in 9, in having done just this. Whatever happens, the ātman will not be affected; but when the vehicle is unmade at death, and the Spirit ascends, the “man” So-and-so, he who thought in terms of “I” and “mine”, will not be “in it”, will not have “found himself”, or “known who he is”; there will be nothing left of him, of So-and-so, but his karma, or in other words tendencies, to be inherited by others. The point may seem to be a fine one, but it seems to us important to preserve, as in the text itself, the hierarchy of the powers, and not to confuse the “man”, of whom the senses are a part, with that one of his powers, of which it is the business to control the senses. Such a confusion would imply a participation of the senses themselves in their own government—a truly “democratic”, situation, and like all conceptions of “self-government” in the sense of “government of the people by the people”, an impossible thing, since it is impossible for any power to function simultaneously in one and the same relation both actively and passively.

1. Verse 9 is very nearly a paraphrase of RV. V. 81 yuñjate mana utsa yuñjate dhiyāḥ viprā viprasaya bhato vipāscitāḥ (savituḥ) where dhiyāḥ, “contemplations” (āvānāni) corresponds to the buddhi and vijñāna of our text, and yo yuñkte dhiyāḥ to the dhāraḥ, “contemplative” of KU. IV. 1. We take this opportunity to remark that the customary renderings of dhi and dhāraḥ as “thought” and “wise” are most inadequate; it is not by “thinking” that the vision of God is attained, but in “contemplation.” “Thinking, as the modern philosopher “thinks,” pertains to the active life, and is far from what is meant by dhi. Cf. St Thomas, Sum. Theol. I. 34. 1 and 2, “When the intellect attains to the form of truth (i.e. svarūpam sampadyate : when there is adequatio rei et intellectus, in samādhi), it does not think, but perfectly contemplates the truth,” and Richard of St. Victor, De Contempl. I. 4, distinguishing between contemplation, meditation, and cogitation (“contemplation is the soul’s clear and free dwelling upon the object of its gaze; meditation is the survey of the mind while occupied in searching for the truth; and cogitation is the mind’s glance which is prone to wander”).
III. 10-11: Most of Rawson's difficulties arise from his belief in an "evolution" of Indian thought, and consequent preoccupation with literary history. He reaches nevertheless the right conclusion as regards avyakta, the "Unmanifested", in the light of BG. VIII. 18-21 (cf. II. 25, 28 and VII. 24), when he says, p. 139, that "the avyakta is the supreme Person's own nature". For the Supreme Identity is precisely the identity of a manifested essence and an unmanifested nature, "being and non-being" (sadasat), and in this sense "beyond" both: The Supreme Identity, in other words, is vyaktavyakta, "Shown and Unshown"; just as Prajapati is repeatedly spoken of as niruktāniruktā, and as in RV. X. 129. 2 the Supreme Identity is "at once spirated and despirated" ānīd avātām tād ekam).¹ That the avyakta of our text is not the Śāṅkhyan pradhāna (primary matter, the "lower prakṛti" of BG. VII. 5, nature divided from essence) appears immediately from the treatment of the "two avyaktas" in BG. II. 28 and VIII. 18-21; of which one (the Śāṅkhyan avyakta = pradhāna) is that from which, and the other that to which all beings proceed; just as there are two mātrās, one the not-yet-measured out (nirmāta) from which "chaos" all things are measured out, and the other the immeasurable; the vyakta lying in between the two avyaktas, just as mātrā (etymologically "matter", but more precisely, the realm of number) lies between the two mātrās...Nothing in the bearing of KU. III. 11 would be changed if we substituted vyaktah param avyakta: what Rawson fails to realise is that the ātmā mahān is precisely that vyakta beyond which lies the avyakta, the Unshorn, or better, Unshowable. Now this ātman, this mahat, is precisely the Lord of the Chariot, the rathin of KU. III. 3: in other words, the Supernal Sun, the solar Ātman of RV. I 115. 1, correctly identified by Śaṅkara (and Deussen) with Hiranyagarbha²; that Sun, viz. whose disk is the gateway of Death's house the way into the Person who is "beyond" both the Light of the Sun (vyakta) and the Divine Darkness (avyakta) "where no Sun shines" (KU. V. 15), and "beyond which there is nothing whatsoever; that is the pillar (kāśṭhā), that the last step" (KU. III. 11 and IV. 9, cf. BG. VII. 7). Ātmā mahān is almost a cliché for the "Sun", the manifested (āvis) God as distinguished from the unmanifested (gūhā) Godhead, Mitra as distinguished from Varuṇa, aparā from para Brahman. Mahān aja ātmā is the Sun in BU. IV 4. 22, the Lord and Master of the All. And if, as will presently appear, in connection with KU. V. 13 eko vaśi, this Sun is also Death

¹ Eckhart, "Equally spirated, despirated, where these two abysses hang, there is the Supreme Being" (Dādiu zwei apgründe in einer gleichheit swebent gegeistet un engegeistet da ist ein höher wesent, Pfefier, p. 517).

² Rawson's argument against the equation ātmā mahān = hiranyagarbha is so weak that he has to support it by at least two false assumptions, (1) that the doctrine of the two forms of Brahman is specifically Śaṅkara's, who therefore drags in the Hiranyagarbha to support "his doctrine," and (2) that Śaṅkara understands by ātmā mahān the "individual self" (it is, of course, the composite ratha, the savijñāna kāya, that is the individual self or "I", the rathin, whose vehicle it is, being the Universal Self or Spirit).
himself, this too is in accordance with the designation of Death as mahātmā in I. 16.¹ So too in KU. II. 22 mahāntam vibhum ātmānām “the great and omnipresent Self” in Rawson’s version is in the same way none but the Sun, “the Self of all that moves or is at rest” of RV. I. 115. 1. The whole logic of the enunciated hierarchy depends upon an intelligible sequence on the one hand of what is cosmic (artha, manas, buddhi) and on the other of ātmā mahān, avyakta, puruṣa: ātmā mahān, and mahat of the following verse are the sun, the “manifested” (vyakta; what is beyond the Sun, “unmanifested” (avyakta): and beyond the unmanifested”, the Person, the Supreme Identity of vyaktilvyakta, sadasat, Mitra Varuna, apara and para Brahman, “That One both spirant and despirited” of RV. X. 129. 2. This priority of the Person to the Sun is stated more briefly already in RV. X. 90. 2-3, where the “Lord of immortality, uprisen on food” is the Sun, and “great as His greatness may be (etāvān asya mahimā), superior unto him is the Person” ato jyāyaṇī ca puruṣah).

III. 11, kāṣṭhā, “post” or “pillar”, Rawson’s “end”, and my “goal-post”, above.² The meaning of the word can be more fully developed, so as to show how it stands in the present context for “last end”. Kāṣṭhā occurred in a significant relation in JUB. I. 20 where, as usual, Heaven and Earth are “pillared apart (viśkabdha) by a third principle, which is variously designated, and here by the “atmosphere” (antarikṣa), hermeneutically “inter-axle” (antary-aśa), and thus “as two wheels are propped apart by the axle-tree (akṣena), or as two tree-plank (pañāse) by a post (kāṣṭhena)”.³ The “atmosphere” is “ya evāyam pavata, i.e. the Gale of the Spirit, Vāyu: it is, in fact the Spirit (ātman) that both holds apart these worlds and connects them, as a bridge connects the banks of a river (RV. X. 61. 16, BU.

1. In JUB. III. 1-3 (= CU. IV. 3 with some variations) the “greatness” (mahima) of the Spirit (ātman), the Spiritual-essence of Devas and of mortals (ātmā devānām uta marṣyānām, cf. RV. I. 115. 1), the Sun completely risen (i.e. the Sun that no more rises or sets cf. CU. III. 11, Sol, Invictus), the Shepherd of the Universe, and Seizer (gṛahaḥ) and Devourer (babhasah in CU. preferable to rapasaḥ in JUB of the four powers (Agni, Aditya, Candrasas, Diśaḥ considered as functional Persons who come forth and return) consists in this, that “not being eaten himself, he devours whatever eats” (yad adantam, in JUB., preferable to yad anannam in CU). It is just in this way that Death in KU. I. 16 is mahātmā, and by the same token the Sun, as elsewhere, passim. The identity of Love and Death represented in the equation of Kāmadeva-Māra in Buddhist texts, goes back to the oldest sources.

2. Kāṣṭhā here as “goal,” as in RV. VII. 93. 3 and IX. 21. 7 (GRASSMANN, Ziel der Rennbahn), cf. kāṣṭha-bhṛt in SB. as “leading to a mark or aim.” Kāṣṭhā in the derivative sense of “way”, found several times in RV., (the “post,” giving its name to the “course”) is not imperinent to kāṣṭhā as “goal post” also, because the Axis of the Universe is, although the end of the way in any given world, is also the “way up and down the world” considered in the plural, the trunk of the Tree, with its branches, in this sense, corresponding to “Jacob’s ladder” with its rungs.

3. Better, perhaps “as two palāsas (i.e. root and branches) are separated by the trunk.”
IV. 4. 22, CU. VIII. 4. 4. etc.), cf. RV. X. 85. 12. where the axle-tree of
the cosmic chariot is the "distributive breath" (vyāna). The two wheels
of the cosmic chariot are Heaven and Earth, or Sun and Moon, the axle their
mover (RV. I. 30. 19, V. 29. 4, X. 85. 18, X. 89. 4, etc.). A full discussion
of the various aspects of the Axis of the Universe, skambha = Greek stauros,
cannot be undertaken here; this "axis" or "pillar" is the "end" because
it passes through the navel or centre of all planes of being, towards which,
therefore, all paths converge. The word palāśe rendered above by "two
tree-planks", i.e. two planes or platforms of palāśa wood, representing Heaven
and Earth, may be noted, however, as of considerable interest, because in RV.
X. 135. 1 it is precisely "in the fair palāśa tree" (vṛkṣe su-palāśe) that
Yama's Paradise is located; this "Tree of Life" beyond the Sun being
analogous to the "Tree of Life", or rather "of the knowledge of good and
evil" of which the trunk connects the earthly and heavenly poles.

(To be continued)
ECHO-WORDS IN TODA*

By

M. B. EMENEAU

In the languages of India, Indo-Aryan, Dravidian, and Munda, "echo-words", as they have been called, are frequent. A small and in its meagreness tantalizing amount has been written on this phenomenon. Not all the possible references are accessible to me at the present time, but some references may be given to indicate the interested reader where discussions of the subject are to be found. Most of the grammars of Dravidian languages mention the subject; e.g. A. H. ARDEN, A progressive grammar of common Tamil (4th edition revised by A. C. CLAYTON; Madras, Christian Literature Society for India, 1934), on p. 301 under the heading "Colloquialisms" gives a few examples without however describing the formation or the function of the forms. HAROLD SPENCER, A Kanarese grammar (Mysore, Wesleyan Miss. Press, 1914), p. 208, gives a list of words of this type showing a number of different formations, none of which is exactly described. The corresponding section in F. KITTEL, A grammar of the Kannada language (Mangalore, Basel Mission Book Depository, 1903), is on pp. 304-5; this treatment also is somewhat unsatisfactory. W. W. WINFIELD, A grammar of the Kui language (Calcutta, Asiatic Society of Bengal, 1928), on p. 146 in a section "Balance of words and phrases" gives examples of the phenomenon for the Kui language; that the account is incomplete seems clear when one compares the facts given for Kuvi, a very closely related dialect, in the Circular of the Linguistic Society of India referred to below. The So:ra: language, one of the Munda group, seems to be particularly rich in formations of this kind; see G. V. RAMAMURTI, A manual of the So:ra: (or Savara) language (Madras, Superintendent, Government Press, 1931), especially pp. 150-2. I am unable to give references for the Indo-Aryan languages, apart from those in the next paragraph, but the phenomenon seems to be somewhat better known for these than for the Dravidian and the Munda languages.

* Acknowledgment is due to the American Council of Learned Societies, whose support made possible the work of which this paper represents a small part. The paper was read at the Ninth All-India Oriental Conference at Trivandrum in 1937. The phonetic symbols used are in general those approved by the IPA. The writing is strictly phonemic. Some of the symbols used need explanation. ð and ð: are mid, mixed, rounded vowels. All successions of vowels represent diphthongs. tc is a unitary affricate, palatalized post-dental. The italics t, d, s are alveolar phonemes, distinct both from the dentals or post-dentals and from the retroflex phonemes. sh represents the palatalized alveolar sibilant phoneme. l is a voiceless retroflex lateral, a distinct phoneme in this language from the voiced retroflex lateral and from the voiced and voiceless alveolar laterals. Of the three turbulent phonemes, r is a voiceless post-dental trill, r a voiceless retroflex trill, Ɂ a voiced post-dental one-flap phoneme.
A general discussion of the problem was published by the Linguistic Society of India in its earliest publications, which, being in the form of cyclostyled sheets, will unfortunately not be accessible for many scholars. The references are: Circular 3 (14th May 1928), pp. 7-8, in which the discussion was initiated by Prof. S. K. Chatterji; Circular 4 (25th June 1928), p. 2 (A. D. Azahar on Panjabi and Urdu), pp. 8-10 (Prof. Siddheshwar Varma on Lahndi, Bhadarwahi, and Kashmiri), pp. 13-14 (Prof. L. V. Ramaswami Ayyar on Kuví, Brauí, and the south Dravidian languages), p. 16 (Pt. Gauri Shankar on Dogri; the same material also in Indian Linguistics, vol. 1, parts II-IV, “A short sketch of Dogri dialect,” p. 81 of the monograph). In these contributions some interesting facts emerged, not least of which for Dravidian studies is the indication that while Kuví of central India shows a formation similar to that found in most of the other Dravidian languages and to that to be described in this paper for Toda, Brauí on the other hand has a formation of a different character, whose parallel is perhaps to be found in some of the Iranian or the Indo-Aryan dialects.

Valuable as some of these contributions have been, nowhere have I been able to find a clear statement of the formations and functions of “echo-words” in any one language (with the possible exception of the description for So:ra:). It is evident from most of the accounts that several different formations are found in each language and, although exact functional descriptions are almost entirely lacking, it can be suspected that the different formations have different functions. Comparative study within each of the language stocks and the further study of the possible interactions between the stocks will give valid results only after such descriptive accounts are at hand for the separate languages.

In this paper I propose to give a detailed account of one formation and its function in the Dravidian language spoken by the Todas of the Nilgiris. I shall ignore at this time the type of alliterative and rhyming compound seen in such sentences as the common Toda greeting: süd,sod 'uutá: “is the news good?” A literal translation would be: “news-noise good-query?” süd is found only in this compound as a variant of südy, which is obviously derived from Sanskrit śuddhi, and sod is from Sanskrit śabda. Both words are borrowings in Toda through the medium probably of Badaga. The formation which will be discussed is a reduplicative one with the insertion of a substitution morpheme between the stem and the reduplicating portion.

Nouns make an extended form by partial end reduplication with insertion of an element between the noun and the reduplicating portion. Toda nouns are of various forms, usually monosyllabic of type CV^n or CV :C^n (C^n denoting an indefinite number of consonants), less frequently disyllabic or with more syllables than two, the first syllable in these cases always bearing the accent. For the purpose of stating this formation they may all be schematized as CVX or CV :X, X representing all that follows the vowel or

1. I am indebted to Prof. L. V. Ramaswami Ayyar for a loan of these circulars.
diphthong of the first or of the only syllable. Either C or X or both may be zero. The inserted element is -ki- or -ki:, with a short vowel when the vowel (V) of the noun is a short vowel or a short rising diphthong ua or uu and with the long vowel when the vowel (V:) of the noun is a long vowel, a long rising or falling diphthong (iu:, ua:, ue:, uu:, ou, au), the triphthong uu:u, or a short falling diphthong (öu, au). The extended formation then is made up of the original noun, the inserted element, and the part of the noun following the first vowel or diphthong, i.e. X. It may be formulated thus, with accents written:

CVX > 'CVX,-ki-X and CV:X > 'CV:X,-ki:-X.

In the preceding paragraph I have called ki/ki: an "inserted element." Further analysis will make clear its unique position in the economy of the language. This is seen from two criteria. First, the complexes -ki-X and -ki:-X have a secondary accent on the first syllable or if the complex is monosyllabic on the only syllable, the primary accent being on the first or on the only syllable of the complex CVX or CV:X, i.e. on the stem syllable. In this the formation resembles compounds. Suffixes on the other hand are unaccented. Contrast 'uə, xi with 'uə:x "buffaloes." Secondly, suffixes with which this element has a superficial affinity, can be stated as morphemes which show no sandhi variations (e.g. -ti 3rd personal ending in some paradigms of the verb), or in some cases as clusters of morphemes (e.g. -k, -g dative suffix) whose variations are selected on principles different from those which regulate sandhi between words or between members of compounds. The initial consonant of this element however varies according to the rules for sandhi between words or between members of compounds. Consequently, we must evaluate the complex -ki-X/-ki:-X as if it were the second member of a compound, though it is to be understood that such a complex can never stand as an independent word (if it should coincide with an actual word in form apart from the matter of accent, it does not do so in meaning and the resemblance is accidental and of no significance). The element -ki/-ki: then cannot be considered to be a suffix; it must be described as a morpheme which substitutes for the CV part of the stem.

The sandhi rules regulating the form of -k- in these formations are: after vowels or diphthongs and after any consonant but the nasal m or the velar consonants k, g, x, -k- > -x-; after m, -k- > -g-; after the velar consonants -k- is assimilated completely to the velar consonant and the resulting long consonant is shortened (in intervocalic position after a short vowel the voiceless stop k closes the syllable and is phonetically long, though evaluated phonemically as short), i.e. -kk- > -k-, -gk- > -g-, -xk- > -x-. The element is written formulaically with k, since as was just stated the complex -ki-X/-ki:-X is evaluated as if it were the second member of a compound, i.e. as if it could stand as an independent word, in which case it must begin with k, no initial g or x being found in the language.

Two other phonetic rules must be invoked in these formations: i:y > i:
and iy > i:. The first is seen to operate elsewhere in ‘ti:uyi “it did not scorch” < *’ti:yu:yi. This latter hypothetical form is postulated on such analogies as ‘ku:si:“ he will do”: ’ku:uy-uyi “he did not do”: ’ars-ti “he knows, will know”: ’ary-uyi “he did not know”: ’ti:s-ti “it will scorch”: *’ti:i-uyi. Another morphological set showing the same rule operating is ’podnuur “if I come”: ’podnuur “if he comes”: ’podnyuur “if you come”: ’udnunur “if I say”: ’udnunur “if he says”: ’udynur “if you say”: ’pi:nuur “if I go”: ’pi:nuur “if he goes”: *’pi:-

Examples of the operation of the rule in this formation are: ’no:ym,gi:m < *’no:ym,gi:ym from no:ym “dispute, assembly,” ’pa:ym,gi:m < *’pa:ym,gi:ym from pa:ym “story of actual event,” pa:ym,gi:m < *’ko:y,xi:y from ko:y “unripe fruit,” ’kua:y ,xi: < *’kua:y,xi:y from kua:y “bamboo pot used at ti:-dairiz.” The parallel rule iy > i: operates in such forms as ’koy,xi: < *’koy,xi:y from koy “hand,” ’nu:y,xi: < *’nu:y,xi:y, from nu:y “ghee.” To find this rule operating elsewhere we must look to relationship terms. “Elder brother or parallel male cousin” is represented by on or the reduplicated form ’onen, “elder sister or parallel female cousin” by okn or the reduplicated form ’okon, “father’s sister, mother’s brother’s wife, or spouse’s mother” by my or the reduplicated form mimimi < * mimimimy. The word for “mother or mother’s sister or parallel female cousin” is af; its reduplicated form afaf shows irregularity in the vowel of the reduplication. For “father or father’s brother or parallel male cousin” we find in and ’eyi; the latter is made from a stem ey (seen also in the vocative ’eya:), with reduplication iy > i:; the vowel in the reduplication is irregular. In this last form we see the operation of the rule iy > i:.

Further examples of the formation are:

from nay “jackal”

"eľf “bone”

"isy “rat”

"půsy “tiger”

"kőb “vessel”

"ogm “rope”

"up “salt”

"todzox “woman”

"u:u “female buffalo”

"u:ask “grain-pounder”

"ku:ng “bell”

"ka:k “crow”

"me:n “tree”

"ni: “water”

"ti:of “line, row”

"kő:r “pool”
'po:t,xi:t  "po:t "song"
'u:xi:  "u: "piece"
'kuru:xi:x  "kuru: "owl"
'nou:xi:  "nou: "song"
'mau:xi:  "mau: "rain"
'kiu:n,xi:n  "kiu:n "mushroom"
'ua:r,xi:r  "ua:r "Ochlandra sp. (a bamboo-like plant)
'kue:/xi:/  "kue:/ "tube, flute, curl"
'kuru:,xi:f  "kuru: "Kota"
'to:u,xi:  "to:u "plank"
'ka:u:xi:  "ka:u "forked stick"
'kuau:,xi:  "kuau: "carriage"

In all these examples it is the uninflected form of the noun that forms the base of the formation. A few examples have been found in which a form with inflectional suffix is the base; in these the suffix is found in both X's. E.g. 'mox,kixk from moxk, dative of mox "child, boy, son" (note that the consonant combination -xkk- simplifies to -xk-); 'kuur,f,kixk from kuur,fk, dative of kuur:"Kote"; 'me:n,ki:ntk, from me:nk, dative of me:n "tree" me:n:si:nts from locative of me:n; 'ko:t,ki:flk from ko:fk, dative ko:r "pool." Such instances are rare since appropriate contexts are rare, but it seems probable that, given the context, such forms may be made ad infinitum.

The function of the formation is to refer to a specimen which the speaker does not care to identify from among a hypothesized collection of identical discrete entities of infinite number or from a hypothesized infinite extension of a non-discrete handleable entity. When the noun denotes the demeanour1 of another object, it seems to be treated as if it denoted a non-discrete handleable entity; the formation then denotes a specimen divided from the infinitely continuous quality, relation, etc. In some cases the collection of discrete entities by implication includes all other entities that might replace the expressed entity in the situation envisaged in the utterance. In a few instances 'ofody "all" is added to the formation, and the whole word then denotes all the unidentified specimens of the hypothesized extension. The forms are used in negative statements, prohibitions, commands, questions, and hypothetical clauses; i.e. it is denied that the unidentified specimen formed or forms or will form an element of a situation, or it is prohibited or commanded that it should form an element of a situation, or it is asked whether it formed or forms or will form part of a situation, or it is hypothesized as part of a situation. An affirmation that the unidentified specimen forms part of a situation has been found only with 'ofody "all" and no other use could be elicited from the informants.

1. i.e. when it is an abstract noun; see L. BLOOMFIELD, Language,2 205.
New Indian Antiquary

'ath 'pe1o1by,xio1by 'xuyuyui "he did not make any complaint at all."
'on 'polo,y,ki1yk:u'tfuxeni "I did not enter any dairy at all."
'monm, g1m:n, ofody 'fif:utcc "all my self-respect is gone."
'atfo:k 'madty 'tanoci:k' ni:1otyxyuur't 'tuurr,t,xior,ofody 'xuurrtn "then the woman [not a Toda woman] poured water for her husband (to wash) and gave him all kinds of food and the like."
'pe1o1by,xio1by 'xusfu1to1i "do not make any complaint at all."
'ni: 'pe1o1by,xio1by 'xusfu1tc "you should not make any complaint at all."

'no:y 'kuac:u,xi: 'thuudfu1csk "let the dog not eat any carrion."
'koi:ri,t,xi:1,utfu1csk "may no one die at all (in the meantime before we have finished the second funeral.")
'kö:1,ki:1k 'fuko1i "do not enter any pool (or river or the like) at all."
'me :nt,ki :ntk 'otyo1i "do not climb any tree (or anything else climbable) at all."

'ob, xib,inem 'kurk 'uettca : "have you put in your pocket any knife at all?"

'polo,y,ki1yk 'fuktca : "did you enter any dairy at all?
'kuup,xip 'tua:nf "sweep out any rubbish that may be there."
'kuup,xip,ofody 'tua:nf "sweep out all the rubbish that may be there."
'pe1o1by,xio1by 'xuy "make some complaint or other."
'me :nts,xi :nts 'bu :x "hang yourself on some tree or other (or on anything else on which one can hang oneself)"; an abusive expression.

Verbs also may make a similar formation. The rules for making the forms are the same as for nouns, but apply not to completed forms but to the stem only. Interestingly, only one of the two stems of a verb can be thus treated. In Toda the primary stem is the basis used in forming the negative tenseless paradigm (e.g. 'kuuy-eni "I am not doing, did not do, shall not do"), a future tense which is usually voluntative ('kuuy-kin "I will do"), the imperative (kuuy "do"), and a number of other formations. The secondary stem, made from the primary by some modification, is the basis for the present-future tense ('kuss-pini "I shall do, am doing"), the past tense ('kuss-spini "I did"), the prohibitive ('kuss-o1i "do not do"'), the gerund (kuus "doing, having done"), and a number of other formations, and by composition a number of modal and aspectual forms (e.g. 'kussfu1tpini "I shall certainly do," 'kussu1tpini "I shall do in spite of everything," 'kussus1pini "I have done," 'kussus1pini "I habitually do"). It is this secondary stem only that can have the substitution morpheme and reduplication. The negative of the first given of these compounded forms is in most cases made by negating, not the nuclear verb stem, but the auxiliary stem. So to 'kussfu1tpini "I shall certainly do" corresponds the tenseless negative 'kussfu1deni. Forms of this mode, which I call asseverative, are in ordinary speech much more common than the simple verb forms, and in fact tend to lose their modal force and to be used as the equivalents of the simple forms.
In the reduplicative formation under discussion, uncompounded forms are conceivable, e.g. in the prohibitive (‘pu,kikōti “do not enter at all”), though in the negative tenseless paradigm they are impossible since the primary stem does not undergo the modification. But in all the examples that occur in the material it is the asseverative form that is found.

This verb formation is found in negative statements, prohibitions, and questions. Hypothetical clauses are no doubt to be found, but I have no examples. Affirmative statements and commands with these forms have not occurred in the material, and affirmative statements could not be elicited from the informants, though it is possible that given the proper context they may occur. The function of the forms is, parallel to the function of the noun formations, to denote a specimen, unidentified by the speaker, of the action denoted by the verb, separated from a hypothesized infinite extension of the verbal action, discrete extension if the verb stem refers to an action regarded as punctual, non-discrete if to an action regarded as durative. This specimen is affirmed not to form an element of the situation, or it is commanded that it should form an element of the situation, or it is asked whether it forms part of a situation.

‘o:n 'polık' 'fu,kikfurçeni “I shall not enter the dairy at all.” The dairy is a particular one, the action of entering is an unidentified one from the infinite number of possible cases. With this contrast 'o:n ‘polyk'ilık 'fuxeni “I shall not enter any dairy,” and ‘o:n ‘apolık 'fuxeni “I shall not enter that dairy.” (Stems : pux-, puk-.)

‘o:n ‘al ‘uwx,xidfurçeni “I shall not stay there at all.” (Stems : umwux-)

‘i:nk’fod, xidfurṭoti “do not come here at all.” (Stems : pox-, pod- with irregularities.)

‘ang ‘inem ‘öshy,xishyfurṭoti “do not tell him at all about anything.”
(Stems : ösh-, öshy-.)

‘ang ‘öshy,xishyfurṭoti “do no tell him at all (about this matter).”

‘uwx ‘uwxly,xidlyfurṭc “you should not run at all to the buffaloes (i.e. you should not run at all to catch buffaloes at this funeral).”
(Stems : uwx-, uwxly-)

‘ur, faṭy,xityfurṭc “you should not catch buffaloes at all (at a funeral).”
(Stems : pa-, paṭy-.)

‘puṣa:sxuṭk ‘fi;xidfurṭc “you should not at all go near the child-birth-hut (or you will be polluted).” (Stems : pu:x-, pi:- with irregularities.)

‘al ‘θuṭd,xidfurṭca “did you eat at all there?” (Stems : tun-, tuṭd-)

‘poyk’fu, kikfurṭca “did you enter the dairy at all?”

These formations, both of nouns and verbs, are said by my informants to be very frequent in conversation. They are however very rare in the material that was dictated to me and it was only after I accidentally discovered their existence that on my insistence such forms were used at all in the texts dictated. They do not occur at all in my large collection of song-
texts and it is probable that they are never used in songs. The impression gained is that, as in other Dravidian languages where similar formations are used, they are felt to be highly useful and racy forms, but somewhat too undignified to be used in literature, or in songs which may take the place of literature with an illiterate people. In the prose texts dictated to me the forms occur generally in conversational passages, and their rarity even here may be due to a feeling that the process of dictation is too serious and dignified a matter to allow of their use.

It is perhaps premature to attempt a comparative treatment of the substitution morpheme that appears in the formation discussed, particularly in view of the lack of authoritative descriptions for most of the Dravidian languages. However, examination of the printed grammars together with my own work on the Toda, Kota, Coorg and Kolami languages and my observations on Tamil and Kannada supplies sufficient data for a preliminary comparative treatment.

The morpheme is found in the following forms:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Form</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tamil</td>
<td>-ki/-ki-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toda</td>
<td>-ki/-ki-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kannada</td>
<td>-gi/-gi-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kota</td>
<td>-gi/-gi-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coorg</td>
<td>-gu/-gu-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telugu</td>
<td>-gi/-gi-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kuvi</td>
<td>-gi/-gi-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kolami</td>
<td>-gi/-gi-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Brahui does not use this morpheme, nor apparently does Malayalam. For Tulu there is no information, and for the northern Dravidian languages, Kurukh, Gondi, etc. no grammars are available to me at present.

All of these languages show the vowels i/i:, except Coorg, which has u/u:. These vowels of Coorg are phonemically valid for this language, but result secondarily from original i/i:, as I shall demonstrate elsewhere. It may be concluded then that the vowel in primitive Dravidian was i/i:.

The question of the consonant is more difficult and is involved in the whole question of initial voiceless and voiced stops in Dravidian. Tamil and Toda both show k. In Toda no initial voiced stop phonemes are found (nor is there an initial v-phoneme). In Tamil also no initial voiced stop phonemes are found in words other than borrowings from Sanskrit, which may be ruled out as evidence for Dravidian phenomena. In all other languages represented in the table voiced stops occur initially, both in Dravidian and in borrowed words (it is not yet clear for Kolami whether Dravidian words begin with voiced stops.) The conclusion then seems obvious that for these languages g is the phonemically correct consonant in this morpheme.

Confirmatory evidence can be given for Kota and Coorg. In each of these two languages and in Toda, I have recorded a story, or rather a tale built around a motif, whose point lies in a word-play on the second member of an echo-word of the kind described in this paper. In all three versions a
man who fears that there may be a tiger in his vicinity talks aloud, to himself or to his domestic animals, and says that they must guard against any possible tiger. In his speech "any possible tiger" is represented by the echo-word. The tiger hears, and thinks that it is the tiger of the echo-word but does not know what is the nature of the creature named in the second member of the compound, though it fears that the creature is even more dreadful than itself. When something unexpected then happens to the tiger, it imagines that the agency is the unknown creature. This story-motif I shall treat elsewhere. At the moment the point of interest is the form taken by the meaningless word in isolation. In Toda it is, as we should expect from the treatment above, kisy, with initial k. In Kota "tiger" is pudj and the meaningless word is gidj, with initial g. In Coorg "tiger" is 'nari and the meaningless word is 'guri, with initial g. In the latter two languages, it is evident that the morpheme begins with g. For the other languages this particular piece of confirmatory evidence is lacking at present. In Kannada we find however sentences of the type: 'huli 'illa 'gili 'illa "there are no tigers at all." Here the initial g, combined with the occurrence in the language of initial g in meaningful words is sufficient evidence that g is the initial of the morpheme. Similar evidence is no doubt to be found for the other languages of the table.

May we conclude then that the Kannada, Kota, Coorg, Telugu, Kuvi, and Kolami evidence warrants us in setting up the primitive Dravidian morphemes as -gi/-gi:-, and in regarding the k-forms of Tamil and Toda as the results of changes made within these two languages? My bracketing of Tamil and Toda does not of course commit me to the opinion that these two languages are more closely connected with each other than either is with some other of the southern group; in fact, I am of the provisional opinion that Toda is more closely connected with Kannada than with Tamil, and consequently that the phenomena of the initial stops are the results of independent development in the two languages. It seems useless to attempt to answer our question as to the primitive Dravidian form of the morphemes until the larger question has been settled of the possible initial stops in primitive Dravidian. This question has been discussed, notably by Bloch in Sanskrit et Dravidien (BSL 24), in which paper he suggests that primitive Dravidian had in initial position only voiced stops. This is diametrically the opposite of the usual view of Dravidian scholars, viz. that primitive Dravidian had in initial position only voiceless stops; this view finds expression, e.g. in K. V. Subbaia, A primer of Dravidian phonology (Indian Antiquary 38 [1909], 195 and in L. V. Ramaswami Aiyar, Kui words and Dravidian origins (Journal of Oriental Research, Madras, 4 [1930], 171-2). It is assumed that accent-shifts and assimilation will explain the initial voiced stops of those languages that have them. But it seems that the problem is still far from a solution and, until a solution has been reached, it is futile to attempt to decide between -ki/-ki:- and -gi/-gi:- as the primitive Dravidian form of the substitution morpheme in echo-words.
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When Sekhoji died there were none at Kolaba to fill up his place. He died without any issue. His wife performed Sati and the widows of Kanhoji hastily summoned Manaji from the Sidi's land. But the whereabouts of Sambhaji, the next in succession, were still unknown; probably he was out with his fleet. Sambhaji received the unhappy news at Jaigad, but three weeks elapsed before he arrived at Kolaba. On his way he had to touch at the important station of Suvarnadurg. His absence did not prejudice Sambhaji's cause in the least. Under the shadow of death, the Angria brothers forgot their personal grievances, and overwhelmed by the unexpected calamity, they realised the need of united action. Haughty and overbearing as Sambhaji was, he was not blind to the difficulties of his position and made a genuine effort to conciliate his brothers. Like Sekhoji, he conferred important offices on them. To Dhondji was entrusted the civil administration of Kolaba, while Manaji was appointed to command the fleet. The merits of Tulaji and Yesaji were also similarly recognised. But Sekhoji's death had apparently disheartened the Marathas, and cessation of arms became the common talk of the camp and court.

Meanwhile the allies were not idle. They were unremitting in their military and diplomatic exertions. Sekhoji died in the last week of August; a month later Sidi Sat visited Bombay in person. About the same time came Sidi Masud, the chief Admiral of the imperial fleet, from Surat. They were closely closeted with the Governor discussing ways and means for recovering the lost territories. In December a formal treaty was concluded between the seven Sidi chiefs and the Government of Bombay, and they were pledged to join their respective forces by land and sea to wage a war of extermination against the Angrias. Captains Inchbird and Macneale were sent with reinforcement to Anjanvel and Rajpuri. The English cruiser fleet under Captain Frampton Lewis set out on their accustomed mission. The disaster of 1731 left the Bombay authorities unshaken in their resolution and they persisted in their futile efforts to confine the enemy fleet in the harbour of Kolaba. Commodore Lewis succeeded no better than his predecessor. On the 6th of November the Kolaba fleet slipped out of the port after sun-set, and in the chase that followed the pursuers came out the second best. Eleven days later they overtook an Angrian ghurab near Antigheria and fired a few shots at it, but it does not appear that much damage was done, for the ghurab got into a river out of the enemy's reach. This was the only achievement of the English squadron during the season and the Angria's fleet kept the sea as usual. Apparently its efficiency was still unimpaired and the allies soon realised that Sambhaji was as good a sailor as his father and elder brother.
In May 1734 the English decided to build a new man-of-war as the Council pointed out—"Our marine force is considerably diminished at a time that the common enemy Angria has greatly increased his, having his whole fleet now at Gereah consisting of thirteen grabs and thirty gallivats and as he is but too well acquainted with our circumstances in spite of all our endeavours to prevent it. It is to be feared he will be out earlier than usual the next fair season with his whole fleet trusting to the superiority of his numbers and may greatly distress the trade of this coast and ports". But within a few months all fears were set at rest and Bombay learnt with delight that Angria brothers were united no more and their maritime ascendency might very soon be a thing of the past.

What led to the civil war we do not precisely know. In a contemporary letter, attributed to Lakshmibai Angria, the blame is laid entirely at the door of Sambhaji. But Lakshmibai was herself an avowed partisan and her version need not be taken at its face value. She says that in 1733 Sambhaji had left the administration of Kolaba entirely to her and Manaji. They had been unsparing in their exertions and done their duty to the best of their abilities. When Sambhaji returned in 1734 they had really expected approbation and appreciation from him but received nothing but unmerited rebuke. At length Lakshmibai was turned out of Kolaba on a charge of maladministration. Manaji fled to Revdanda when he learnt that his life was aimed at. Meanwhile the Sidis assaulted one of the outposts of Thal, but Sambhaji left for Suvarnadurg without providing for its defence. His brother’s indifference towards Kolaba led Manaji to seize Chaul, enlist the support of the Portuguese and the English and to take upon himself the government of this important station. With the help of the Portuguese he surprised Kolaba and put out the eyes of Yesaji. Sambhaji was a short-tempered person and he had himself been guilty of insubordination during the life time of Sekhoji. It is quite likely that the party feelings at Satara accentuated if not encouraged this dissension in the Angria family. Sambhaji was suspected of a friendly understanding with the Pratinidhi, while Manaji enjoyed the confidence of the Peshwa. In any case Sambhaji’s version of this affair has not come down to us, and whoever might be most to blame this unfortunate incident caused a permanent breach between the two brothers and, for the time being, the embarrassment of Sambhaji offered a welcome relief to the Sidis.

Clever as Lakshmibai’s defence of her protégé is, there is little doubt that Manaji was impelled more by motives of self-aggrandisement than impulses of loyalty and patriotism. The English were at the moment the worst enemy of the Maratha empire and the remaining strongholds of the Sidis would have capitulated long ago but for the reinforcement they regularly received from Bombay. To seek English and Portuguese alliance against Sambhaji was, therefore, nothing but treason against the State of which Manaji professed to be a dutiful subject. The English naturally welcomed this excellent opportunity of weakening Angria, and Captain James Inchbird proceeded to Chaul to encourage Manaji in his evil designs. Manaji, how-
ever, needed no prompting from outside. He had already gathered round him a sufficiently large body of adherents and had matured a well conceived scheme against Kolaba. He needed nothing but munitions and money for the success of his enterprise and the English hastened to remove this deficiency. "We are convinced", they wrote on the 6th December 1734, "that it would be a very great advantage to us to keep up the dissension between the two brothers and thereby divide their force, and if Manajee succeeds in his design on Colabbo, he will greatly distress his brother, and for a want of a fleet will not have it in his power to prejudice us; should he hereafter be inclined so to do; it is, therefore, agreed that we advance him for the present four thousand rupees and supply him with the stores desired, being seven small iron guns, two hundred shot, thirty barrels of powder, twenty slabs of lead, three thousand small shot for partridge and twenty pieces of Dangaree. And that Captain James Inchbird do return to Chaul to supply him with the money as he may have occasion for it and to take all opportunity of spiriting him up to carry on his resentments against his brother." In February 1735, they further decided to keep the Bombay "cruisers at port to be ready to prevent the ill consequences of any attempts Sambojee may make on Colabbo".

The family feud at Kolaba was clearly to the interests of the English, but it was equally detrimental to the best interests of the Maratha empire. It is, therefore, strange that neither Shahu nor the Peshwa Baji Rao I made a serious effort to bring the two adversaries to reason and to restore that unity without which the war could not be brought to a happy conclusion. The Peshwa unfortunately preferred to be misled by personal feelings and pursue a policy of "divide and rule". He decided that the fleet and territories of Kanhoji should be divided between Sambhaji and Manaji. Sambhaji did indeed retain his father's title of SARKHEL but Manaji obtained the independent government of Kolaba with the new title of VAZARTMAV. The Peshwa did not find any difficulty in securing the royal approval for this unfair decision and Manaji informed his Bombay friends in December, 1735 "that the Sou Rojah had sent him a commission appointing him Governer of the District of Colabbo with as full powers as his father and brothers enjoy'd and at the same time the Sou Rojah had ordered him to supply his brother Sambajee with grain for the subsistence of his possessions to the southward which orders he says he is obliged to comply with in return Sambajee is to deliver up to Manajee two grabs that formerly belonged to the Colabbo fleet." Sambhaji naturally resented this decision and was never reconciled to the partition which, he complained, had been caused by the Peshwa with the deliberate design of perpetuating dissension in his family, and unfortunately the charge was not altogether unfounded.

It is not difficult to surmise that his preoccupations at home prevented Sambhaji from conducting the siege operation at Anjanvel and Govalkot as effectively as he would like. And to add to his difficulties, his territories had
been invaded by Sambhaji of Kolhapur. In December of 1735 Shahu brought about a good understanding between the chief of Gheria and the ruler of Sawanta Wari and an angry remonstrance from his powerful cousin brought the weak Raja of Kolhapur to reason. With all these troubles at home and abroad Sambhaji cannot be blamed for the scanty success with which his arms were attended. He was not altogether idle or inactive for the Sidi often communicated to Bombay alarming rumours about Sambhaji’s intended expeditions against his country. Sambhaji himself attributed his lack of success to the activities of the English fleet of invigilation. In a letter to Shahu he explained that an English squadron was constantly on the lookout for his fleet and it was due to its interference that his ships could not be employed against Sidi’s strongholds for any length of time. Like his late brother, Sambhaji also urged the necessity of peace with the English and the Portuguese, and before the year was out his fleet brought a valuable prize to Suvarnadurg which offered Sambhaji a welcome opportunity for opening negotiations with Bombay.

The prize in question was the DERBY, Captain Anselm, and the story of its capture may be very well reproduced in the language of that officer. “The 26th December at five in the morn (in 17° N. Latt. about 16 leagues from shore) fell in with four galivats and five grabs belonging to Angria, they attacked us by six o’clock in morn having so little wind all day that our ship wou’d neither stay nor wear, they took care we should not bring any guns to bear on them but what we got out of our stern ports which we kept close firing, by eight o’clock they destroyed most of our rigging, at ten carried the Mizzen mast by the Board, at one shot away our main mast and at the same time received two double headed shot between wind and water aloft which was secured, found two foot water in the hold and still proved leaky, soon after they loaded two double headed shot in the Foremast, continued on in our engagement till four or five o’clock in the afternoon, then thought it in vain to proceed, so submitted.

Seven of our men were kill’d, five more their legs shot off and many others wounded.

There is one hundred and fifteen of us now prisoners with Angria. He seems to insist on peace or no redemption for us which we leave to Your Honour’s disposition if convenient to restore us.” Captain Anselm’s hints went unheeded and during the next few months the English fleet was repeatedly sent out to find out and punish Sambhaji’s squadron but the contemporary records mention no fresh contest with Angria, although in March 1736, the Rose, the Caroline and the Neptune encountered the squadron of “Khem Savant” now an ally of Angria and captured one of his ghurabs. Sambhaji sincerely wanted peace and he himself took the initiative soon afterwards.

On the 7th May 1736 “the President acquainted the Board” that two days since he received a letter from Caitan de Souza Captain of Choul advis-
ing him that one Mowa (Moro?) Punt was arrived there with full powers from Sambhajee Angria to treat with us for making peace and had desired him to send down Captain Inchbird to hear what proposals he had to make intimating that this might prove a favourable opportunity for getting away our people prisoners with Angria.” The Bombay authorities received the message with suspicion but ultimately agreed to send Captain Inchbird to Chaul with a view to explore all avenues of securing the release of the English prisoners. Captain Inchbird accordingly proceeded to Chaul and discovered before long the real reason of Sambhaji’s pacific attitude. He wanted to recover Kolaba and was eager to secure the neutrality of the English by restoring the Derby and its crew. Moro Pant, therefore, requested Inchbird to send an envoy to Gheria and the Bombay government expressed their disapproval of these terms in no uncertain manner. They apprehended that Sambhaji would break the peace as soon as his main object was attained and to send an envoy to Gheria would expose them to the contempt of their neighbours. Captain Inchbird was consequently ordered “to acquaint Samboji’s Vakeel that we cannot agree to any such conditions, but that if his master is so desirous of a peace as he pretends that he first release all the prisoners of our nation as a mark of his sincerity, when we shall be ready to hear and agree to any reasonable terms for making peace.” Sambhaji responded by sending fifteen of his prisoners to Chaul, and Inchbird war for a second time sent there to confer with Angria’s agent. The Bombay government could not persuade themselves that the release of fifteen common sailors formed a sufficient evidence of Sambhaji’s sincerity, and though they were still unwilling to send any of their employees to Sambhaji’s headquarters, the president “was desired to write Sambhaji (in answer to his letter) that if he is desirous of coming to terms of peace with us we will agree upon a cessation of arms for six months upon his delivering up our prisoners, when he will have time and opportunity to send proper persons hither with such proposals as he thinks fit to offer.” Inchbird, however, soon perceived that Sambhaji meant business, and a journey to Gheria would not only mean no risk but would be entirely to the profit of those of his countrymen who were held prisoners by Angria. His official superiors were at first unwilling to give him the necessary permission but he ultimately had his way. His mission was fully justified and the English prisoners were all set at liberty, and it was decided to present to Captain Inchbird about Rs. 500 in appreciation of his good conduct. After this Sambaji might expect a respite for six months at least, if not permanent peace, if he kept his hands off Kolaba, but not only did the English not reciprocate his courtesy but attacked his fleets “at a place call’d Baccanore a little to the northward of Mangalore” and captured one of his ghurabs.

The only justification that we can discover for this apparent breach of faith is to be found in the following entry in the Bombay Public consultation of the 26th November, 1736,—“The President acquaints the Board that on the return of our cruisers from the southward, Captain Inchbird had inform-
ed him that an Embassadour from the Carnatic Rajah was with Sambhaji Angria, who he supposes may have been soliciting him for assistance in his expedition against the Malabars by convoying and protecting his army and provisions, and Captain Lewis had inform'd him that the day after our fleet left Gereah they received intelligence by a Boat that five of Sambhaji's Grabs and ten Gallivats were gone out, and they believe stood to the southward, and as by our last advices from Tellichery we find that some of our garrison people were assisting at the siege of a Fort in the Caraneees possession with suspicion but ultimately agreed to send Captain Inchbird to Chaul with a view to explore all convoy of Sambhaji's Grabs might be attended with dire consequences." Four cruisers were, therefore, sent for the protection of the English settlement at Tellicherry and it was this squadron that fell upon Angria's Ghurabs near Mangalore. Sambhaji was naturally incensed and did not renew his correspondence with Bombay until 1738. He might very well argue that his fleet had been molested during a truce without any just offence whatever, for, he had offered none. The presence of a Kanaree envoy provided no proof positive of his alliance or even enmity with the Karnatik Raja. 1736 was evidently an unlucky year for Sambhaji. His pacific efforts had ended in failure and humiliation for him, and Manaji's credit at the court of Satara was visibly improving while Sambhaji's influence had steadily declined.

The annihilation of the Sidi became an obsession with Shahu at this moment, and Sambhaji's traducers insinuated that he had a secret understanding with the enemy. In 1737, Sidi Sat took advantage of the dissension between the Angria brothers and surprised Bankot with the help of the English. Sambhaji could not be justly blamed for this mishap, the Peshwa being responsible for the defence of Bankot and several other stations conquered from the Sidi. The Peshwa's agents tried to console Shahu as best as they could and at last Chinmaji Appa had to take the field. Elated by his late success Sidi Sat invaded the district of Kolaba and was defeated and slain by Chinmaji's force at a place called Charai. Manaji's contingent naturally co-operated with Chinmaji's army and the new lord of Kolaba gained the golden opinion of his sovereign. The death of Sidi Sat was followed by a peace between the Marathas and their Abyssinian neighbours, but Sambhaji soon found fresh opportunities of rehabilitating his reputation.

In 1737 war broke out between the Marathas and the Portuguese. This is not the place to examine its causes or even to attempt a detailed narrative. Suffice it to say that Maratha success was both rapid and decisive. The Portuguese evacuated their military stations one after another and made their stand at Bassein which stood a prolonged siege. The Angria brothers identified themselves with the Maratha cause, but in spite of their undoubted superiority on the sea, communication between Goa and Bassein was seldom interrupted. The reason is obvious. Sambhaji and Manaji never made any united effort to cut off the enemy fleet, nor did they attempt a systematic
blockade of Bassein. Concerted action was out of the question as the two brothers continued to be open enemies till the last. Nor were they at any stage in a position to devote their undivided attention to the Portugese. The Maratha empire was apparently at peace with Bombay but Sambhaji was not. Consequently his ports were often blockaded by the English fleet. Moreover the very tradition of the coast created fresh enemies for him as we shall see, and Sambhaji could not rely even on the good faith of the Peshwa. His record for the next five years was as brilliant as that of his father and single-handed he fought the English, the Portugese, the Dutch and, last but not least, the joint forces of Kolaba and Poona.

In 1737 Sambhaji captured a few unimportant trading boats on their way to Bombay. The English fleet failed to check his depredations, and though the financial loss caused by him was inconsiderable, it was apprehended that grain boats might fear to visit the English island unless their safe passage was ensured. It was, therefore, decided to blockade his ports and Commodore Bagwell set out for Gheria on the 28th September, 1738. After paying a visit to the Savant's country Bagwell appeared before Gheria and anchored his ship with a view to keep a constant watch over the enemy. This was a mistake as he soon realised. On the 3rd November as he reported to Bombay, "about twelve at night about thirty of Angrias gallivats came out of Gerreah and attacked the Dolphin and Dulbadull galivats, the latter was boarded by seven of them and after smart firing about fifty of the enemy on board him, they set her on fire by having in a pot of combustibles, the master seeing that and the impossibility of saving her he blew her up." Next morning the Commodore held a consultation of all the captains and "it was their opinion we ought not to lye anchor for that we gave the enemy advantages thereby, over gallivats and boats were liable to be taken or destroyed." The Commodore frankly told the Bombay Government that they had underestimated Sambhaji's strength and resources and concluded his letter thus:—"I assure your Honours that lying so near his fort is a great gall to him and am sorry and obliged to leave it; but as our strength is not sufficient to withstanding him and we cannot I think share the fleet we have for I assure Your Honour he is a stronger enemy than you or a great many think him to be I doubt not you'll think the same when this comes to hand." On the 22nd December Bagwell got an opportunity of attacking the Gheria fleet which had come out of the harbour. The English compelled the Angria's vessels to return to their port after suffering considerable damage.

But earlier in the year Sambhaji had taken rich prizes from the Portugese and the Dutch. His fleet captured the Portugese Pataxo of war São Miguel and, according to a contemporary Portugese letter, the vessel carried a cargo of ivory worth 10,000 Xerafsins. About the same time three Portugese parangues fell into Sambhaji's hand, and one of these boats carried forty thousand Rupees in cash alone. Elated with this success, Sambhaji's
squadron proceeded southwards with the avowed intention of intercepting the Portuguese merchant fleet conveying provision from the ports of Kanara. The capture of this fleet might compel the besieged garrison of Bassein to capitulate immediately for lack of provision, but luckily for them Sambhaji allowed himself to be diverted. On the 23rd March, he sighted three Dutch vessels near Barcelona and captured two of them. Next year the Dutch sent a fleet of eight men-of-war and some light vessels to punish Angria. The Portuguese Viceroy welcomed the Dutch fleet at Agoada and proposed an alliance against the common enemy. But Sambhaji was apparently too strong for them.

In March, 1739, Sambhaji’s fleet sailed once more for the south and advanced as far as Mangalore. It was clear that he intended to make some amends for his mistake of the previous year by intercepting the Portuguese provision fleet. But he was foiled in his attempt by a gallant Portuguese captain, Antonio de Brito Freire. Sambhaji’s fleet was numerically superior to that of his enemy, but his opponent was a better seaman and he attributed his success to superior artillery. If Sambhaji was disappointed in his projects against the Portuguese, his efforts against Bombay met with better success. His fleet often appeared in the neighbourhood of that island and in May the Bombay Government decided to release the Angria prisoners “as the expense of maintaining them exceeded the value of their labour and also in the hope that Sambhaji will also release the prisoners then with him or those who may fall into his hands in future.” This courtesy on the part of Bombay made a good impression on Sambhaji and he expressed his readiness to compose his differences with the English. The terms proposed by Sambhaji were, however, considered extravagant, and we are informed that his envoys proposed that the English “should not navigate these waters without taking his passes” or in the alternative pay him two crores of Rupees annually in lieu thereof. Negotiations, however, still continued, and Mr. Rigby, the Marine Superintendent of Bombay, was sent to Gheria with the double mission of treating for peace and blockading Angria’s headquarters. Sambhaji had suggested a cessation of arms, but to this the English would not agree. Rigby, however, could not tarry long before Gheria and before the peace parleys could be opened he went in pursuit of Sambhaji’s fleet. The journey ended disastrously for him as the fleet was overtaken by a storm and Rigby went down with three of his best vessels. Sambhaji’s men in the meantime captured the Anne near Diu head.

In January 1740, Sambhaji’s fleet made an unsuccessful attack on the English squadron consisting of the Harrington, Pulteney and the Ceres, but in the same month he captured the entire Portuguese flotilla of the south. Next month the victorious fleet appeared before Bombay to prejudice its commerce and to demonstrate that Sambhaji was the master of the neighbouring seas. This demonstration was probably intended to conceal his real designs, for next month he invaded Kolaba and would doubtless reduce that
principality had not the English fleet and Peshwa’s army hurried to Manaji’s rescue. He was about to be caught in a trap when he succeeded in effecting his escape with Manaji’s complicity. But nothing could reconcile Sambhaji to the loss of Kolaba and in 1741 he settled his differences with Sidi and simultaneously opened negotiations with the Portuguese and the English, but before anything tangible could be achieved he died on the 12th December 1741.

SOURCES:

*Kaifiat Yadi*

*Parasnis: Itihas Sangraha*

*Brahmendra Swami*

Bombay Public Consultations (India Office).

Contemporary Portuguese Pamphlets and Records in the Archivo Ultramarino of Lisbon.

For a comprehensive bibliography see Sen, *Military Systems of the Marathas.*
A MANUSCRIPT OF THE STHĀṆAĞA SŪTRA ILLUSTRATED IN THE EARLY WESTERN INDIAN STYLE

By

W. NORMAN BROWN

A finely illustrated manuscript of the canonical Śvetāmbara Jaina work, the Sthāṇāṅga Sūtra (Thāṇaṅgasutta), belonging to Mr. ROBERT GARRETT, of Baltimore, has a number of interesting features that deserve to be put on record. It is, I believe, the first illustrated example of that text to be reported, and we can therefore add that text to the number of Śvetāmbara works which pious patrons had artists enrich with paintings. Further, it bears a copying date of Saṅvat 1588 varṣe vaiśākha vadi 6 guruvāra (Thursday, April 8, 1501 A.D.), and from this fact we are able to add to our knowledge of manuscript manufacture and miniature painting at that period. For the size of the folios is larger than that of other known positively dated manuscripts of approximately A.D. 1500, and the workmanship of the paintings, while essentially typical of the period, is better than that of most of their known dated contemporaries.

Typical manuscripts of this time are as follows:

[Examples of folios or paintings reproduced in full size in my Kalpasūtra book¹ (for references see pp. 2-3)]

4. Ibid. Hd. Kalpasūtra. Saṅvat 1559. 9 lines. 9.6 by 4.2 inches.
5. Ibid. He. Kalpasūtra. Saṅvat 1569. 7 lines. 9.6 by 4.25 inches.
[Example reproduced in full size and full colour in my Kālaka book,² figure 25.]

6. Vijaya Dharma Lakṣmi Jāana library, Agra. 1632.75 Kālakācāryakathā Saṅvat 1549. 9 lines. 10.25 by 4.25 inches.

---

1. The Story of Kālaka ... by W. NORMAN BROWN, Washington, Smithsonian Institution, 1933.
Mr. Garret’s manuscript is conspicuously larger than these and differs in format. It measures 12.5 by 4.8 inches, and the number of lines of writing is 13. Such large folios and even larger become common in the 17th and 18th centuries; and while it is impossible to say that this is the earliest manuscript ever to use such a large size, it is evident that it is an early example. Most of the Jain manuscripts of the rest of the 16th century continue to employ the smaller sizes (see my Kālaka book, figure 38; I have photographs of other unpublished paintings dated in the latter part of the 16th century).

The paintings, which are four in number, use much gold and blue and give a brilliant effect, as is common in this art during the latter part of the 15th century and in the 16th century. The drawing is careful, with sure lines, and the paint is laid on to correspond exactly to the drawing—by no means the invariable case with this style of painting. There is a profusion of fine detail, worked out with precision. Although the best period of the Early Western Indian style, in my opinion, is from about 1350 to 1450, these illustrations are among the best of their own time.

Description of the Illustrations

Figure 1. Mahāvīra’s Samavasaraṇa. Cf. my Kalpasūtra, p. 38, figure 80. A Samavasaraṇa may be round or square, as is noted there. In this painting a triple parasol surmounts Mahāvīra, four attendants wait upon him, and two dīgnāgas pour water over him with their upraised trunks. Before him are two dancing girls, probably apsarās. At the extreme top of the painting is a bent tree.

Figure 2. Mahāvīra preaching (presumably the Sīhānāga Sūtra). Cf. my Kalpasūtra, p. 40, figures 85, 86. He sits on the conventional seat, which has for its back a spired throne tilted back, that is, a symbolic representation of the shrine in which he is ideally conceived as sitting (see my Kālaka, pp. 118, 128). His auditors are arranged in four rows, not to show that some occupy a higher position than others, but to fulfil the convention of this art that one figure should not trespass upon the ground of another. Under Mahāvīra’s right arm is his broom; in his right hand is a manuscript of palm-leaf or his mouth cloth. The white pattern over his golden coloured robe merely indicates that the robe is white; no ornamentation is meant. In the topmost register sit two laymen, perhaps kings, or possibly gods, who are regularly represented as kings. They wear beards, as is frequent in this art, although the Jain sādhus speak with disapproval of beards as being dirty.

1. The manuscript has 90 folios numbered consecutively from 1 to 90, with additional numbers from 121 to 210 in the upper right hand corner. The latter numbering shows that the manuscript with at least one another was combined in a collection.

2. See an article which I am publishing in the Journal of the Indian Society of Oriental Art for 1937, on the subject “Early Western Indian Miniature Painting at around 1400 A.D.”
Fig. 4. Part of Mahāvīra’s audience as he preaches

Fig. 3. Mahāvīra preaching
This fact and the Vaishnava U-shaped mark on the foreheads might indicate that the artist who made the illustration was a Hindu—these Vaishnava marks are frequent in the Jain paintings, although by no means invariable, and it may well be that the patrons of the Jain manuscripts gave their commissions indifferently to their co-religionists and to Hindus. The two men appear to be waving scarves. On the second register, and meant to be facing Mahāvīra, is a monk, perhaps intended for Mahāvīra’s chief disciple Indrabhūti Gautama, and in front of the monk is the sthāpanācārya, the stand with the symbolic representation of the absent guru, who in this case is present and needs no representation. On the third register are four laymen, three smooth-shaven and one bearded. On the bottom register are two nuns, distinguishable from monks by their robes which extend up behind the neck, both holding manuscripts (or mouth-cloths), and behind them two laywomen, who, like the men, seem to be waving scarves.

Figure 3. Mahāvīra preaching (presumably the Sthānāṅga Sūtra). This scene corresponds to the upper part of Figure 2. Overhead is an elaborate architectural setting, with a balcony containing pierced stone or wooden panels separated by columns. I am inclined to think that the material is meant to be wood, and the two rows of hamsas and lions are shown as though painted; for painted wooden shrines are frequent with the Jains of Gujarat.

Figure 4. Part of Mahāvīra’s audience as he preaches. This scene corresponds to the lower part of Figure 2. Unfortunately, at some time the folio was repaired with transparent gummed paper and only part of the faces in the top register can be seen clearly. The three registers of the painting are separated by two carefully executed ornamental rows, one showing hamsas, the other a geometrical design. In the top register are four monks; in the middle register four laymen; in the bottom register two nuns and two lay women. As usual in this art the designs of the clothing are clearly distinguished.
PARALLEL PASSAGES IN THE DAŚAVAİKĀLIKA AND THE ĀCĀRĀNGA

By

A. M. GHATAGE.

The chronology of the different books of the Ardha-Māgadhī canon is as yet unsettled except in a general way, by which some books like the Ācārāṅga, Sūtrakṛtāṅga are assigned to the oldest stratum while others like the metrical Paināgas are said to form the latest additions. Other books are put in different places between these two extreme limits. When we come to decide more exactly the place of a particular book and its relative chronology with reference to some other work of the canon, we find that such general considerations are of no great use and the relative chronology of any two books of the canon or even parts of books must be decided by a close comparison of these works with each other, with a view to find out which is older and which is younger.

There are three chapters in the Daśavaikālika which have a very close parallel in three chapters of the second part of the Ācārāṅga, from which an attempt can be made to decide the relative chronology of these two books of the canon. These parallel passages were already noted by W. Schubring and Patwardhan who have also concluded about their chronology. Schubring has expressed his opinion that the Daśavaikālika is younger of the two and naturally draws upon the passages of the Ācārāṅga in writing its own chapters. Prof. Patwardhan has also come to the same conclusion and expresses it with greater conviction. Before, however, these conclusions can be accepted, it is necessary to go through their arguments and also to compare both the texts more closely.

The view that the chapters of the Daśavaikālika are younger and draw for their sources on the Ācārāṅga appears to be based upon considerations of a general nature, that the latter work is older and that the Daśavaikālika is accepted by all to be a work of a compulsory character. Here it must be pointed out that both the parts of the Ācārāṅga cannot claim the same antiquity and the second part from which all the three parallels are to be derived is considerably younger than the first one. Another reason for this supposition must have been the general impression that the language of the prose portions of the canon shows an older form than the one used in the metrical portions and because the passages in the Ācārāṅga are in prose and those of the Daśavaikālika are in verse, the verses must be younger. Prof. Patwardhan further thinks that this position is strengthened by the fact that Das. VIII. 49 makes a reference to Āyāra., thus showing its acquaintance with it.

All these considerations of more or less general nature are not sufficient to prove the relative chronology of these few parallel passages. That Ācārāṅga
is one of the oldest books of the canon may be accepted in a general sense, but the text itself is found in two distinct parts of different ages, and while the first part can be said to be fairly old, the second is younger. As all the parallel passages occur in the second part only the high antiquity of the first part is not sufficient unless it is proved that the second Śrutaskandha is also equally old or older than the Das. The other fact that the Das. is admittedly a compilation made by Sejjambhava for the benefit of his son is not sufficient in calling them as versification of the prose of the Ācārāṅga. The reference to Ācāra. in the Das. verse is at best doubtful. We are thrown back upon an actual comparison of all the parallel passages to decide the chronology, and no argument of a general nature would settle the case one way or the other.

I give below the two texts in parallel columns where some kind of verbal agreement is to be found. Generally the topics of all these chapters are the same and the contents of both the books are nearly the same.

**Ācārāṅga**

1. II. 1.1.1. se jjaṃ puṇa jānejjā : 

    asaṇṇāṃ vā pāṇāṃ vā khāimaṇ vā 
    sāimaṇ vā pāṇehīṃ vā pāṇaehīṃ vā 
    biehīṃ vā hariehīṃ vā samsattar uṃmissan sīdo 
    daṇa vā osittan rayasā vā 

    parighāhīṣyam taḥappagārāṃ asaṇṇāṃ vā ... 

2. II. 1.1.2. se tam āyaṇa egantam 

    avakkamejjā ahe jhamatham diḷamāsi vā ... tao samjayaṃ eva 

    pariṭṭavejjā | 

3. II. 1.1.3. taruṇiyaṃ vā chivādiṃ 

    anabhikkantabhajjiyaṃ pehāe... 

    no padigāhejjā | 

4. II. 1.3.9. tivvadesiyaṃ vā vāsamāṇaṃ pehāe, tivvadesiyaṃ vā 

    mahiyyaṃ saṃnivayānaṃ pehāe mahāvāna rayaṃ samum 

    bhūtāṃ pehāe tiriṣcāpatīmā vā 

    pāṇa saṃthadā saṃnivayānaṃ pehāe... 

**Daśavaikālika**

V. 1.57 asaṇṇaṃ pāṇaṇaṃ vā vi khāiya 

    mā sāimaṇ tahā | 

    pupphesu hojjha ummissaṃ bīsu 

    hariyesu vā | | 

V. 1.59. asaṇṇaṃ pāṇaṇaṃ vā vi 

    khāimaṇ sāimaṇ tahā | 

    udagaṇṣi hojjha nikkhittaṃ uttiṅga 

    paṇaṇaṃ vā | | 

V. 1.72. vikkāyamaṇaṃ pasaṇḍhaṃ 

    raṇa paripāsyaṃ | 

V. 1.85-86. 

    hatthena tam gaheṇaṃ egantam 

    avakkama | | 

    egantam avakkamittā acittam padilehiyā | 

    jayam pariṭṭhavejjā pariṭṭhappa 

    padikkame | | 

V. 2.20. taruṇiyaṃ vā chivādiṃ āmiy 

    yāṃ bhajjiyaṃ sain | 

    dintiyaṃ padiyāikkhe na me kappai 

    tārisaṃ | | 

V. 1.8. na carejjā vāse vāsante mahiyāe 

    vā paṇante | 

    mahāvāe ya vāyante tirischasampāimesu vā | |
5. II 1.5.2. se tattha parakkamamane payalejja vā pavađejja vā, se tattha payalamane vā pavađamane vā . . .

6. II 1.5.6. se jjam puṇa jänejjā samanaṃ vā mahanāṃ vā gama-pindolagaṃ vā atihim vā puvva-pavitthaṃ pehāe no te uvāikkamama pavisejja vā obhāssejja vā | se tam āyāe egantam avakkamejjā anāvayaṃ asamloce citṭhejja | aha puṇa evam jānejjā padisehie vā dinne vā tao tammi niyattie, tao samjayāṃ eva pavisejja vā obhāssejja vā ||

7. II 1.6.2. no gahavaikułassa dagacchaďdaṇamattae citṭhejja ... no gahavaikułassa sīnaṇassa vā vaccassa vā samloce sapadiduvarē citṭhejja, no gahavaikułassa alo- yam vā thiggalaṃ vā sandhiṃ vā dagabhavanam vā . . . nijjhāejjā |

8. II 1.6.4. tahappagārena purekammakaena hathena vā (mattena vā davvie vā bhāyaṇena vā) ap- häsuyam anesanijjam jávā no padigāhejjā |

9. II 1.6.5-6. no purekammaena uda-ulletha tahappagārena uduullena hathena vā 4 asanaṃ vā 4 aphä- susuyam anesanijjam jávā no padigāhejjā | no uduullena sasiniddhe-nna sesam tam ceva | evam sasar- akkhe uduulle sasiniddhe maṭṭiyya ose, hariyāle himgulae manośilā amjane loce geruya-vanniysediy-a- sorrātthiya-piṭṭha kukkusaka-kae- ya-ukkutṭha-samsatthena |

---

**Dāśavaikālika**

V. 1.5. pavađante vā se tattha pak-khalante vā samjae |

V. 2.10-11. samanām mahanāṃ vā vi kivinaṃ vā vanimagām | uvasamkamantam bhataṭṭhā pāṇa- tthāe vā samjae || tam aikkamittu na pavise na citthe cakkhuγoyare | egantam avakkamittā tattha citṭhejja samjae ||

V. 2.13. padisehie vā dinne vā tao tammi nivattie |

V. 1.25. sīnaṇassa ya vaccassa samlo- gam parivajjae |

V. 1.15. aloyaṃ thiggalaṃ dāram samdhim dagabhavanāni ya | caranto na vinijjhāe samkāṭṭhānam vivajjae ||

V. 1.32. purekammena hathena davvie bhāyaṇena vā |

V. 1.33-34. evam— uduulle sasiniddhe sasarakkhe maṭṭi- yā-ūse | hariyāle himgulae manośilā amjane lope || geruya vanniya sediya soraṭṭhinya piṭṭha kukkusakaye ya | ukkaṭṭhamasamsatṭhe samsatthhe ce- va bodhavve ||
10. II. 1.6.10. se jjaṃ puṇa jānejjā 
apaṇaṃ vā (pāṇagaṃ vā khaিম-
maṃ vā sāimaṃ vā aganinikkhi-
ptaṃ) tahappagāraṃ asaṇaṃ vā 4 
apāhāsavaṃ jāva no padigāhejja | 
asaṇaṃ bhiṅkhatthiyya osimca-
maṇe vā nisimcamāṇe vā āmaja-
maṇe vā pamaṇjamaṇe vā oyāre-
maṇe vā uyattemāṇe vā aganījive 
himṣejja |

11. II. 1.7.1. asaṇaṃ bhiṅkhatthi-
yyya pāḍaṃ vā phalaṃ vā nis-
ṣeyjam vā udūhalāṃ vā āhaṭṭu 
uussaviyya duruhejjja se tatthā du-
ruhamāṇe payalejja vā pavadejjja 
vā se tatthā payalamāṇe pavaḍa-
maṇe hattham vā pāyaṃ vā 
...lūṣeejja pāyaṇi vā abhihanjja 
...tam tahappagāraṃ māloha-
dam asaṇaṃ vā 4 jāva no padigā-
hejja |

12. II. 1.7.7. aha puṇa evaṃ jāne-
jja cirādhoyam ambilaṃ vok-
kaṃtam paniṭam viddhat-
thaṃ phāsuyam jāva padigāhej-
ja | 

13. II. 1.8.3. se jjaṃ puṇa jānejjja 
sālumat vā viraliyam vā sāsav-
naṇiyaṃ vā |

14. II. 1.10.2. se egaio maṇunnaṃ 
bhoyanajjyaṃ padigāhatta paṃ-
tena bhoyaṇena padicchāei : mā 
metaṃ diyaṇaṃ saṃtaṃ daṭṭhū-
naṃ sayamāie, |

15. II. 1.10.3. se egaio ammataram 
bhoyanājayaṃ padigāhettā bhad-
dayam (bhaddaṇyam) bhocca vi-
vaṇaṃ virasam āharati |

Daśavaikālika

11. V. 1.61. asaṇaṃ pāṇagaṃ vā vi khai-
maṃ sāimaṃ tahā | 
agaṇiṃsi hojjja nikkhittam |

11. V. 1.63. evaṃ ussakkiyā osakkiyā 
ujjāliyā pjjāliyā nivvāviyā us-
ṣiṃciyā nissiṃciyā uvvattiyā oyā-
riyā dae |

11. V. 1.67-69. 
nissiṃ phalaṃ pīḍham uṣaviti-
taṃ māruhe |
manṣakilaṃ ca pāśayaṃ samaṇa-
ṭṭae vā dāvaë || 
durūhamāṇi pavaḍejjja hattham yā-
yaṃ ca lūsae |
pudhaviyye vi himṣejja je ya tām 
nissiyā jagā || 
tamā mālohaḍam bhikkaṃ na 
padigeṇhanti saṃjaya |

12. V. 1.76-77. 
jaṃ jānejja cirādhoyam maie dam-
ṣaṇena vā |
ajivaṃ pariṇayaṃ naccā padigāhe-
ja saṃjaye |

13. V. 2.18. sālumat vā viraliyam ku-
muyam uppanāliyam |
muṇāliyam sāsavaṇāliyam. |

14. V. 2.31. siyā egaio laddhum lobhe-
ya vinigāhai |
mā meyaṃ daṭṭhāṃ saṃtaṃ daṭṭhū-
naṃ sayamāye || |

15. V. 2.33. siyā egaio laddhum vivihaṃ 
pāṇabhayaṃ |
bdaddaraṃ bhaddaraṃ bhocca vi-
vaṇaṃ virasam āhare ||
16. II. 1.10.4. assiṃ khalu padigāhiyamśi appē sīyā bhoyaṇajāe bahu-ujjiyadhammē, tahappagāraṃ no padigahejja |

17. II. 1.10.5. se jjam puṇa jaṇejjē bahuyaṭṭhiyam vā maṃsāṃ ma- cchaṃ vā bahukamṭagam, assiṃ khalu padigāhiyamśi appē sīyā bhojaṇajāe bahuujjihiyadhammē, tahappagāraṃ

18. II. 1.111. ime pinde ime loe ime tittae ime kāduyae ime kasaē ime ambile ime mahure

19. II. 4.1.13. pannavaṃ se bhikkhū vā 2 antalikkhe ti vā gujjhā- nucarie ti vā sammuccie ti vā nivāe vā pāoe vadejjē vā vutṭha- valākhe tti |

20. II. 4.2.7. se bhikkhū vā 2 manu- ssaṃ vā goṇaṃ vā maḥisaṃ vā migamaṃ vā pasuṃ vā pakkhiṃ vā sirisivam vā jalayamaṃ vā se ttaṃ parivudhakāyaṃ pēhāe no evaṃ vadejjē thulle ti vā pameile ti vā vatte ti vā vajjhe ti vā pāime ti vā |

21. II. 4.2.9. se bhikkhū vā 2 virū- varuvāo gāo pēhāe no evaṃ vadejjē, taṃ jahā : dojjhā ti vā dam- mā ti vā gorakā ti vā vākimā ti vā rāhajogga ti vā |

22. II. 4.2.10. se bhikkhū vā 2 virū- varuvāo gāo pēhāe evaṃ vadejjē, taṃ jahā juvām gave tti vā dhe- nū ti vā rasavai ti vā hasse ti vā mahalle ti vā mahavvaē ti vā sanvahaṇe ti vā |

23. Daśavaikālika

V. 1.74. appē sīyā bhoyaṇajāe bahu-ujjihiyadhammē |
dintiyam paṭiyāikkhe na me kappai tārisam ||

V. 1.73. bahuaṭṭhiyam poggalam anīmisam vā bahukamṭayaṃ |

V. 1.97. tittagaṃ vā kāduyam vā ka- sāyaṃ ambilan vā maharaṃ lāvanam vā |

VII. 52-53. taheva mehaṃ vā nahaṃ vā māna- vam na deva deva tti giram vaejjē |
sammucchie unnae vā pāo vaejjē vā vutṭha balāhaga tti || antalikkhatti naṃ būyā gujjhānu- cariyatti ya |

VII. 22. taheva manuṣaṃ pasuṃ pakkhiṃ vā vi siriṣivam |
thule pameile vajjhe paiame tti ya no vae ||

VII. 24. taheva gāo dojjąhā dammā goraha- ga tti ya |
vāhimā rahajogga tti nevaṃ bhāse- jja pannavaṃ ||

VII. 25. juvaṃ gave tti naṃ būyā dhenuṃ rasadaya tti ya | rahasse mahallae vā vi vae sanva- haṇe tti ya ||
23. II. 4.2.11. se bhikkhū vá 2 takeva gamtum ujjānaṃ pavayāṇi vaṇāṇi ya, rukkhā mahallā pehāe no evam vadejja pāsāyajoggā ti vá toranañjoggā ti vá gihajoggā ti vá phalihañjoggā ti vá aggalajoggā ti vá nāvājoggā ti vá udajoggā ti vá donī-pīḍha-camgagaveraṇananggalkuliyā - jaṁta-laṭṭhi-nābhi-gamdi-āsana - sayana - jāna - uvassyā - joggā ti vá |

24. II. 4.2.12. se bhikkhū vá 2 takeva gamtum ujjānaīm pavayāṇi vaṇāṇi vá rukkhā mahallā pehāe evam vadejja : taṁ jahā : játimantā ti vá dhīhaṇṭā ti vá mahālayā ti vá payātasālā ti vá pāsādiyā ti vá |

25. II. 4.2.13. se bhikkhū vá 2 bahuṣambhūta vaṇaphalā pehāe no evam vadejja, taṁ jahā : pakkā ti vá pālakahajjā ti vá velociyā ti vá tālā ti vá pehā ti vá |

26. II. 4.2.14. se bhikkhū vá 2 bahuṣambhūtā vaṇaphalā pehāe evam vadejja, taṁ jahā : asampaṭhāda ti vá bahuṇiṣṭimaphalā ti vá bahuṣambhūyā ti vá bhūta-rūṇā ti vá evappagāraṃ bhāsaṃ asāvajjam jāva bhāsejja |

27. II. 4.2.15. se bhikkhū vá 2 bahuṣambhūyāo osaḥio pehāe tahā vi tāo no evam vadejja, taṁ jahā : pakkā ti vá niliyā ti vá chaviti vá lāimā ti vá bhajjimāti vá bahuṣhajjimā ti vá |

28. II. 4.2.16. sa bhikkhū vá 2 takeva gamtum ujjānaṃ pavayāṇi vaṇāṇi ya, rukkhā mahallā pehāe no evam vadejja pāsāyajoggā ti vá toranañjoggā ti vá gihajoggā ti vá phalihañjoggā ti vá aggalajoggā ti vá nāvājoggā ti vá udajoggā ti vá donī-pīḍha-camgagaveraṇananggalkuliyā - jaṁta-laṭṭhi-nābhi-gamdi-āsana - sayana - jāna - uvassyā - joggā ti vá |

29. VII. 26.29. taheva gamtum ujjānaṃ pavayāṇi vaṇāṇi ya |

30. VII. 30.31. taheva gamtum ujjānaṃ pavayāṇi vaṇāṇi ya |

31. VII. 32. taheva gamtum ujjānaṃ pavayāṇi vaṇāṇi ya |

32. VII. 33. asamthaḍḍa ime ambā bahuṇiṣṭimā phalā | vaejja bahuṣambhūyā bhūyarūva tti vá puṇo |

33. VII. 34. tahosahio pakkāo niliyāo chavī ya |

34. VII. 35. laimā bhajjimāo tti pihukhajja tti no vae |
Ācārāṅga

28. II. 4.2.16. se bhikkhū vā 2 bahusambhūyā osahīo pehāe tathā vi tāo evam vadejjā, tām jahā : rūḍhā ti vā bahusambhūtā ti vā thīrā ti vā uṣadhā ti vā gabbhiyā ti vā āhūtā ti vā sasārā ti vā eyappāgāram bhāsāṃ asāvajjaṁ jáva bhāsejjā |

29. II. 15.29. tao ṇañā samañé bha- gavaṃ Mahāvīre uppanaṇāna- damśaṇadhare Goyamādiṇāṃ sama- nāṇaṃ niggamthānāṃ paṃca mahavavyāṁ śaḥvāvyaśām chaj- jivanikāyāṃ āikkhai bhāsai pa- rūvei, tām jahā : pūdhavikāe jáva tasakāe ||

30. II. 15. padhamamaṁ bhante ma- havvyayaḥ paccakkhaṁ savvaṁ pāṇāvayaṁ, se suhumāṁ vā bā- yaraṁ vā tasanāṁ vā thāvaram vā neva sayam pāṇāvayaṁ karejjā 3 jávavijjāe tivihāṃ tiviheṇaṁ ma- ṇaṣa vayasa kāyasā tassa bhante padikkamāmi niṃdāmi garahāmi appāṇaṁ vosiṟāmi.

Dasavaiṁkālika

35. rūḍhā bahusambhūyā thīrā uṣadhā vi ya | gabbhiyā paśyāo sasaṛāo tti ālave ||

IV. imā khulu śa chajjivaṇiyaśa- majjhaṇyaṃ samaṇeṇaṃ bhagav- vaya Mahāvīreṇaṁ kāsavaṇeṇa paveiyyā... tām jahā : pūḍhavi- kāyā ... tasakāiyā |

IV. padhame bhante mahavae pā- nāvayaṁ veramaṇaṁ | savvaṁ bhante pāṇāvayaṁ paccakkha- mi, se suhumāṁ vā bāyaraṁ vā tasanāṁ vā thāvaram vā | neva sayam pāṇe aivāejjā nevannhe pāṇe aivāyavejja pāṇe aivāyaṇe vi anne na samaṇu[a]nāmi, tivih- āṃ tiviheṇaṁ maṇeṇa vāyāe kāeṇa na karemi... tassa bhante padikkamāmi niṃdāmi gari- hāmi appāṇaṁ vosiṟāmi |

An exact parallel of this very nature is to be found in the remaining portions dealing with the other four vows, which need not be repeated here, as the first comparison is sufficient for all the purposes.

Before we note down the result of this comparison it is to be pointed out that though apparently the text of the Ācārāṅga is in prose, there are indications in the text itself which would go to show that in its original form it was in metrical form or at least contained many metrical lines. In fact what is proved by Schubring for the first Śrutaskandha of the book is true of the second as well, though to a less extent. We can note the following lines in the part chosen for comparison : samie sahite sayā jae Ay. II. 1.1. 14; II. 1.2.7.; padisheie vā dinne vā tao tammi niyāṭṭie Ay. II. 1.5.6; sasarakke udaille sasipiddhe maṭṭiyā ose | hariyale hingulæ manosilæ amjaṇe loπe | geruva-vam- niya-sediya-soraththiya-piṭṭhakksakae ya | Ay. II. 1.6.6; sāluyan vā virā- liyan Ay. II. 1.8.3; ma metam dīyaṃ santran daṭṭhunam sayam āie | Ay. II. 1.10.2; bhaddayaṃ bhaddayaṃ bhocca vivanaṛnaṃ virasaṃ āhare | Ay. II.
1.10.3; appe siyā bhoyaṇajāe bahuujjhiyadhammie | Ay. II. 1.10.4; bahuyaṭṭhiyam vā maṃsaṃ macchaṃ vā bahukantaṇāgam | Ay. II. 1.10.5; vedejja vā vuṭṭhabalāhage tti | Ay. II. 4.1.13; taheva gamtum ujjāṇam pavvayāṇi vanāni vā | rukkhā mahallā pehāe | Ay. II. 4.2.11.

This list can be greatly extended if we make slight changes usually of dropping the disjunctive particle vā or ti vā which would turn many of these prose passages into perfect metrical lines. But what is more important for our present purpose is the fact that all these metrical lines also occur in the Daśavaikālikika in exactly the same form, where they are preserved in their original metrical garb.

From the comparison itself we can make out the following points:—

1. In most of the parallel passages the order of the words to be enumerated is the same. Cp. Nos. 4, 7, 9, 14, 15, 18, 20, 21, 22, 23, 27 and nearly all the remaining passages with slight changes in them. Now it is impossible to believe that exactly the same order of the words can be kept throughout if we regard the Daśavaikālikika passages to be a versification of the prose of the Ācārāṅga. It is more natural to suppose that the verses were re-written in prose where the order can be easily preserved.

2. It is equally striking that to read the prose passages as verses we are required to drop merely the particles like vā or ti vā which have no sense of their own, and again it appears more probable to suppose that they were added by the writer who turned the original verses into prose, than the other way.

3. We have further individual cases by examining which one can clearly see the process of turning the verses into prose. The mechanical method of inserting the disjunctive particle after every word has led the prose writer to produce passages which have no meaning. Thus we find the compound udagadoni of the verse written as udagajoggata tti vā doni; the sentence dammā gorahagā into dammā ti vā gorahagā ti vā; niliyāo chavi into niliyā ti vā chavi ti vā—all these prose passages giving no consistent meaning.

4. It is impossible to suppose that the same order to such an extent can be preserved in changing the prose into verses, particularly in such a case as No. 18 where the words in the same order have given two lines of such a refined metre as Svāgatā.

5. In the prose passages we find the order of the words which are otherwise in prose somewhat peculiar and not the normal one. Cp. vadeṣja vā vuṭṭhabalāhage tti; taheva gamtum ujjāṇam pavvayāṇi vanāni vā; aha puṇa evam jānejja ciraṭhoyam etc.

6. In one case we find that the verse uses the form uvassae as Loc. sing. which the writer of the prose has understood as the Nom. and has added the word in the list of things in No. 23.

All these considerations go to show that out of the two parallel texts the one found in the Daśavaikālikika is the older and is preserved in the original form while the prose of the Ācārāṅga is younger and is a mutilation of the original verses.
BUDDHISM IN THE KĀTHAKA-UPANIŚAD?

By

HELMUTH VON GLASENAPP

The last two stanzas of the 4th vallī of the Kāṭhaka-Upaniṣad (4, 14.15) are as follows:

*yathodakam durée vrṣṭam parvateṣu vidhāvatī,*
*evam dharmāṇ prthak paśyas tā evānuvidhāvatī. || 14 ||*
*yathodakam śuddhe śuddham āśiktam tādrg eva bhavati*
*evam muner vijānata ātmā bhavati Gautama! || 15 ||*

"Just as water that rain showered down to a defile loses itself in the mountains, so also a man who looks upon the dharmas separately loses himself in them. As pure water poured into pure water becomes the same, so also the ātmā of the wise muni, o Gautama."

Professor and Mrs. W. GEIGER¹ have already drawn our attention to the fact that the word "dharma" has here a special meaning which reminds us of the use of this term in the sacred books of the Buddhists. They translate the passage as follows: "Wer so die Dinge (Objekte, Erscheinungen) einzeln betrachtet, läuft hinter ihnen her nach allen Richtungen, d.h. er kann sich nicht auf das Reale konzentrieren." There seems indeed to be no doubt that here philosophers are warned against pursuing separate phenomena (dharmanas without a dharma) and that according to the opinion of the Upaniṣad salvation can be attained only by him who holds the monistic view of the Upaniṣads and believes in a Universal Soul.

Professor STICHERBATSKY² writes: "What emerges from the passage of the Kāṭhaka cited above is that there was a doctrine opposed to the reigning soul theory, that it maintained the existence of subtle elements and separate elements (prthag dharma) and that such a doctrine, in the opinion of the author did not lead to salvation. Saṅkara in his commentary agrees that Buddhism is alluded to, but, very bluntly, he interprets "dharma" as meaning here individual soul. As a matter of fact, dharma never occurs with this meaning in the Upaniṣads. Its occurrence in the Kāṭhaka leaves the impression that it is a catch-word, referring to a foreign and new doctrine, some anātma-dharma theory."

I think that Prof. STICHERBATSKY’s opinion is corroborated by the Buddhist texts. For in several passages of the Pāli Tipiṭaka the simile of the

---

water that rain poured down on the mountains is made use of to explain the Buddhist theory that gradually one thing (dhamma) begets another, so that at the end apparently trifling causes have very important consequences.


The parable itself has the following form in Sanhyyutta-Nigāya: "Seyyatāpi bhikkhave uparipabbe phullaphusitake deve vassante tam udakam yathā ninnam pavattamanam pabbata-kandara-padarasākkhā paripūre ti, pabbata-kandara-padarasa sākkhā paripūrā kusubbhe paripūrenti, kusubbhā paripūrā mahāsobbhe paripūrenti, mahāsobbhā paripūrā kumadāyo paripūrenti, kumadāyo paripūrā mahānādiyo paripūrenti, mahānādiyo paripūrā mahāsamuddam sāgaram paripūrenti, evam eva kho bhikkhave..."

These lines are translated as follows:!

"Just as when, brethren, on some hill-top when rain is falling in thick drops, that water, coursing according to the slope, fills the hill-side clefts and chasms and gullies, these being filled up, fill the tarts, these being filled up fill the lakes, these being filled up fill the little rivers, these being filled up fill the great rivers, and the great rivers being filled up fill the sea, the ocean, Even so, brethren..."

After this the different things which by and by lead to good or bad consequences are enumerated.

Aṅg. 4 N. 147 confines itself to explaining that the hearing of the Law, the discussion of the Law, calm (samatha), and introspection (vipassanā), if properly cultivated, gradually bring about (anupubbena) the destruction of the āsavas. Sanhyy. 55, 38 says the same of the three jewels.

Aṅg. 10 N. 61 and 62 show the different things which lead to avijjā or vijjā; in N. 62 the effect of avijjā viz. taṇhā is also added to the series. The different links of the two chains, when put in juxtaposition, are as follows:

| asappurisa-sāriṣeṇa | sappurisa-sariṣeṇa |
| asaddhāma-savāṇa | saddhāma-savāṇa |
| asaddhiyā | saddhā |
| ayoniso-manasikāra | yoniso-manasikāra |
| asatā-sampajaññā | sati-sampajaññā |
| indriyāsahāvara | indriya-sahāvara |
| 3 duccarita | 3 sucarita |
| 5 nivarana | 4 satipaṭṭhāna |
| avijjā | 7 bojjhaṅga |
| (bhava-taṇhā) | vijjā-vimutti |

Samyutta XII, 23, which bears the name "Upanisā,"1 shows the causal connection between the 12 nidānas of the paṭiccasamuppāda from avijjā to jāti; the effect of jāti (in the place of jāma-raṇa-soka-parideva-dukkhado manassupāyasa) is dukkha. From dukkha saddhā is produced and this is then the cause of the gradual rise of the different mental conditions which end in salvation. The following table when read in descending order shows the gradual development of dukkha, when read in ascending order the salvation from dukkha:

1. avijjā  
2. saṅkhāra  
3. viññāna  
4. nāma-rūpa  
5. salāyatana  
6. phassa  
7. vedanā  
8. taphā  
9. upādāna  
10. bhava  
11. jāti  
12. dukkha  
23. khayenaṇa  
22. vimutti  
21. virāga  
20. nibbidā  
19. yathābhūtam-ñāṇdassana  
18. samādhi  
17. sukha  
16. passaddhi  
15. pīti  
14. pāmojja  
13. saddhā

Ang. 3 Nr. 93, 5 contains only the links 14 to 18 of the ascending order.

The sense of all these passages2 is the same: one dharma is the cause of the production of another, and salvation can only be reached step by step by him who knows the connection of the different dharmas and is able to eliminate the bad ones and to produce good ones.3 The word dharma (Pāli: dhamma) is used here of course in the sense which it has everywhere in the Suttapiṭaka and not as the philosophical technical term of the elaborate Hinayāna systems. For in the Suttapiṭaka there is not yet the tendency to draw up a list of 75 or more dharmas as “ultimate elements of existence” and to reduce all other dharmas to them, as I shall show elsewhere.

In any case: the Pāli passage seems to my mind to have some direct or indirect relation to the words in the Upaniṣad and is qualified to elucidate them. Now the question of chronology arises. The Kāṭhaka-Upaniṣad belongs to the older set of Upaniṣads and is generally believed to be pre-Buddhist. If for other reasons the relation to the passage in the Tipiṭaka does not invalidate this theory we have to assume that the two last stanzas of the fourth

---

1 The word upanisā is etymologically = Sanskrit upanisad, in which form it is also given in Buddhist Sanskrit text, e.g. in Vasubandhu’s Abhidharmakośa, translated by L’École Prashe, vol. II, pp. 106, 245. It is used as a synonym of *ketu*, *pratyaya* “cause”.

2. A similar allegory is also given in Samyutta 12, 69, 3 f. (vol. II, p. 118).

3. Majjh, Nikāya I, p. 223 it is said: “pāpake akusale dhamme nādhivāseti, pujakati, vinodeti, byanikaroti, anabhāvam gameti”, and Ang. I, p. 11 is said of the “appamāda”: yena anuppānā vā kusālā dhammā uppajjanti uppannā vā akusālā dhammā pariḥāyanti.
vallī, which stand in no close connection to the preceding ones, are a later addition to the text which formerly concluded with the emphatic words: etad vai tat. Otherwise we must surmise that the simile of the rain is an old simile of a pre-Buddhistic anātma-vāda, which the Buddhists themselves had adopted when they revived an ancient doctrine (Sanhīy. Vol. II, p. 105).

PŪRVĀ

By

D. R. BHANDARKAR

The word pūrvā occurs in many inscriptions, and appears to have been used in a sense afterwards lost to it. The expression asyāṁ pūrvvāyāṁ or ētasyāṁ pūrvvāyāṁ is met with first in the Kushāṇa, and, afterwards in the Gupta, inscriptions. In the first group of records it occurs in various Prakrit forms, and the phrase has been translated by BÜHLER thus: "on this (date specified) as above" (E. I., Vol. I., p. 381 ff. and Vol. II, p. 202 ff.). And he has been followed by Prof. LÜDERS (I.A., Vol. XXXIII, p. 36 ff.) and Prof. VOGEL (E.I., Vol. VIII, p. 176). In the case of the Gupta records, FLEET has in every case added the footnote: 'supply tīthau.' This no doubt seems to receive support from the specification of the date found in some Plates of the later Chaulukya kings of Anāhilapātaka, namely, asyāṁ sāṃvatsara-māsa-paśa-vāra-pūrvvāyāṁ tīthau with slight variants (see D. R. BHANDARKAR'S A List of the Inscr. of North Ind., Nos. 451, 455, 478; cf. also No. 241). But here the word tīthau actually occurs in this text. And, as a matter of fact, what that tīthi is has been specified in every one of these Chaulukya records. And it seems not a little suspicious that in all cases where the phrase asyāṁ or ētasyāṁ pūrvvāyāṁ is used, whether in the Kushāṇa or Gupta records, there is not a single instance where the word tīthau is employed as in the specification of the date in Chaulukya grants just referred to. Next, what we have to note is that no tīthi has at all been specified in any one of the Kushāṇa epigraphs and that, on the contrary, there is evidence that the days mentioned there are solar (compare, e.g. Nos. 16, 20, 29, 32 and so forth of LÜDERS' List of Brāhmi Inscriptions &c., where the number standing after di or divasa exceeds fifteen which is the maximum number of a paśa). What then becomes of the word pūrvā occurring in the Kushāṇa records? The word tīthau cannot possibly be understood after it, because none of them makes mention of any tīthi. It is true that in the Gupta inscriptions tīthis are mentioned in the specification of dates, but it does not follow that in the expression asyāṁ pūrvvāyāṁ, when it occurs in any one of them, we have to understand tīthau as FLEET has invariably done. If his view is accepted, how is it possible to interpret the expression asyāṁ = divasa-pūrvvāyāṁ which is found in l. 7 of his No. 10? We cannot possibly understand tīthau after it as FLEET has done in the footnote attached to it. First because no tīthi has been actually specified in this record. And secondly because the word divasa here must mean the day intervening between sunrise and sunset, and may sometimes comprise more than one tīthi. We have therefore to seek for some other meaning for pūrvā. Let us find out in what other inscriptions the word occurs. Thus it is found in v. 12 on p. 192 of E. I., Vol. IX
and, above all, in v. 44 of the celebrated Mandasör Inscription of Kumāragupta I. and Bandhuvarman (Gupta Inscr., No. 18), where, however, Fleet remarks: “supply prāṣastiḥ.” This is a curious proposal, because at one time the word tithau and at another the word prāṣastiḥ is understood by Fleet after pūrvā. The question arises: why not take pūrvā as a substantive as seems natural, instead of taking it as an adjective? Because it is rather strange that, in all these cases which are many, we find we have to supply either tithau or prāṣastiḥ after it. That pūrvā is in such cases used as a substantive may be seen from the following which occurs in Gupta Inscr., No. 36: evam raja-varṣa-māsa-dinaiḥ ētasyām pūrvvāyām svalakṣanair yuktā-pūrvvāyām. In this sentence the term pūrvvā has been used, not once, but twice. We are therefore compelled to take both the pūrvvā, at least the first of it, as a substantive. And further it seems that the word was used probably in the sense of ‘detailed order,’ or ‘descriptive sequence.’ The phrase may, therefore, be translated as follows: “when thus with the regnal year, month and day, this was the detailed order (of the date), the detailed order being invested with its own characteristics.” This may be compared with similar wordings in Gupta Inscr., Nos. 23 and 25. That pūrvā had some such meaning appears also from a Nāgarī Inscription, where we meet with asyām Mālava-pūrvvāyām, “when this was the detailed order (of the date) according to the Mālavas” (D. R. Bhandalkar’s List, No. 5). In all other records, therefore, where asyām or ētasyām pūrvvāyām occurs, we had better for the same reason translate it “when this was the detailed order (of the date).”
GOTRA AND PRAVARAS OF THE KADAMBAS

By

JOGENDRA CHANDRA GHOSH

Dr. Dines Chandra SIRCAR has published a note on the ‘Origin of the Kadambas,’ in the Indian Culture, (Vol. IV, pp. 118-123). He has shown therein that the Kadambas, in almost all the inscriptions have claimed to be of the ‘Mānavaṇya gotra’ and ‘Hārītiputra.’ But it is stated in Banavasi grant of the eighth year of Mrgeśavarman’s reign (Ind. Ant., Vol. VII, pp. 35-36) that they belonged to the Ṛngirasa gotra. Again in the Talgunda inscription, (Ep. Ind., Vol. VIII, p. 31ff), it is said that they are of ‘tryāraṣa-vartma,’ i.e. their pravaras having the names of three seers. How to reconcile this difference in gotra-names? Let us see if we can throw any light on the subject.

‘Ṛngirasa’ as the name of a gotra is not found in any of the standard works on gotras and pravaras. In fact Ṛngirā himself is not the founder of any gotras, but his descendants, Gotama and Bharadvāja. All the gotras under these two groups have got the pravaras beginning with ‘Ṛngirasa.’ Besides some Kṣatriyas having become Brāhmaṇas, affiliated themselves with the clan of Ṛngirā. Their pravaras also begin with ‘Ṛngirasa.’ They are called Kevala or ‘only’ Ṛngirasa, because their pravaras do not contain any other names of the seers of the Ṛngirā’s real descendants. The gotras under Gotama and Bharadvāja are called simply Ṛngirasa or Ṛngirasa proper. Any of these can go by the name of Ṛngirasa gotra. Some of these Ṛngirasas have got three pravaras, some five pravaras and some alternate sets of three and five.

Although the standard authorities do not recognise any gotra-name as ‘Ṛngirasa,’ they are in existence among the present-day Brāhmaṇas, with different pravaras. To which of these Ṛngirasas did the Kadambas belong? This cannot be said unless we know their pravaras. Dr. SIRCAR, on the authority of the Šabda-Kalpaḍruma, suggests their pravaras as :—‘Ṛngirasa, Vāsiṣṭha and Bārhaspatya.’ This appears to be a dyāmuṣyāyaṇa or double gotra formed of the Bhāravāya and Vāsiṣṭha gotras, as it contains the pravaras of both. The Šabda-Kalpaḍruma has quoted from Gotra-pravara-Viveka in the Dharmapradīpa of Dhanaṅjaya, which deals with the gotras and pravaras generally found in Bengal. But Ṛngirasa gotras with different pravaras are found among the Brāhmaṇas and others of different localities. The Moḍh Brāhmaṇas have got Ṛngirasa gotra with the three pravaras of Ṛngirasa, Autathya and Gautama (Brāhmaṇotpatti-mārtanda, p. 164). These are found in the Aśvalāyana, Āpastamba and Kātyāyana Śrauta-sūtras, under the name of Autathya-Gautama (Gotra-pravara-nibandha-Kadambam, p. 223). The Kheḍāvāḷ Brāhmaṇas of the village Hiroli have got the Ṛngirasa gotra with the pravaras of Ṛngirasa, Naidhruva and Saunaka (Brā. Mārt., p. 460). It seems
to have pravaras of three different gotras. The Dhāmaṇakaras of the Karhād Brāhmaṇs are of the Āngirasa gotra. They cannot marry in the Kevala Āngirasa gotras of Kutsa and Murgalga among them. This shows that they also belong to the Kevala Āngirasa. The Vālmika Brāhmaṇs have got an Āngirasa gotra with the pravaras of the Āngirasa, Bhārmyśva & Maudgalya (Ibid., p. 538). This goes by the name of Maudgalya in the standard books. Besides these the Nāgar, Dārola and Mahārāṣṭra Brāhmaṇs, and the Daman Prabhus of Konkan and Mahārāṣṭra have got Āngirasa gotra. But we do not know their pravaras. It is clear from what we have shown that any gotras under Āngirasa proper or Kevala Āngirasa can go by their general name of Āngirasa. So we are not in a position to ascertain the pravaras of the Kadambas from the mere mention of Āngirasa gotra with three pravaras.

Let us see if the mention of Mānavya gotra can be of any help in this direction. The standard authorities speak of three Mānavas. They are :

1. The Kṣatriyas are said to have only one set of Ārṣa-pravaras of their own, viz. Mānava, Aīḍa and Paururavas. The Kadambas were Brāhmaṇa, besides there is no Āngirasa in it, so this cannot apply to them.

2. The Matsyapurāṇa (Ch. 196, Verses 49-50) alone speaks of a Mānav gotra, under the Bhāraudvājas, with the five pravaras of Āngirasa, Bhārhaspatya, Bhāraḍvāja, Māntravara and Ātmabhūva. This may be the Mānavya gotra of the Kadambas. But it has got five pravaras, without any alternative of three pravaras.

3. The third Mānav gotra is Sārvavartika, i.e. for all. Sārvavartika has been interpreted as traiśvarika, i.e. for Brāhmaṇa, Kṣatriya and Vaiśya only, because the rules and regulations about the gotras and pravaras do not apply to the Śūdras. Kātyāyanas has gone further. He says that it is for the Vaiśyas only. (Gotra-pravara-nibanda-Kadambam, p. 133f.) This can hardly be accepted. It seems this was meant for people other than the descendents of the eight Ēṣi founders of the gotras, viz. Viśvāmitra, Jamadagni, Bharadvāja, Gautama, Atri, Vasiṣṭha, Kaśyapa and Agastyo.

In fact gotra in this special sense can only be applied to the descendents of these eight Ēṣis. Even the Kevala Bhrigu and the Kevala Āngirases do not strictly speaking come under the category of gotra, but they are treated as such because they have been dealt with in the chapter of Pravaras in the Srauta-Sūtras, along with those of the eight Œṣis. Besides these there were, no doubt, other Brāhmaṇas, who were gotraless, but this is hard to believe now-a-days. The Pancauṃśati-Brāhmaṇa (20, 15, 10) speaks of the anārṣeya or pravaraless brāhmaṇas. The Vṛātyas were another class of Brāhmaṇas, who were taken into the Brahmanical fold by performing the Vṛātyastoma sacrifice, had no gotras. Some rites, such as Śrāddha prescribed for all the four Varnas, required the recitation of gotras. What should a man without a gotra do in such cases? Probably for these people the Sārvavartika gotra of Mānavya was prescribed, because all are descended from Manu.
We do not now-a-days meet with the Māṇavya or Māṇava gotra. The reason seems to be that at a later period this gotra has made place for Kāsyapa gotra, which are treated as the Sārvavarnika, as all according to the Śrutī are descended from Kasyapa (Nirṛayasindhu, p. 280, Venkatesvara Press). These gotraless Brāhmaṇas probably taking up the gotras of their Ācāryas have, by and by, been all merged into the descendants of the eight Rṣis (Kauśitakīgrhyasūtra, 2, 2; S. B. E., Vol. XXIX, p. 62). This seems to be the reason why we do not find any gotraless Brāhmaṇas now-a-days.

The Kadambas seem to have belonged to the Dvyāmusyāyaṇa or double gotra, formed of their patronymic Māṇavya gotra and the metronymic Hārita gotra, showing that they were debarred from marrying in either of the gotras. In earlier times the putrikāputras and the Kāṇīna-putras formed into dvyāmusyāyaṇas in this way (Bhaṭṭoji Dīksita’s Paṅcaviṃśatimatasāṇgraha, Benares Edn., p. 105). We understand that the custom of Putrikā-putras is still prevalent among the Nambutiri Brāhmaṇas of Southern India. The Hārita gotra belongs to the group of Kevala Āṅgirasa. These Dvyāmusyāyaṇas can go by either of the two gotras of which they are formed or by both formed into a compound name. Thus they could be called Āṅgirasa, which is the bigger group-name of the Hāritas. The patronymic Māṇavya gotra of the Kadambas shows that they were originally gotraless Brāhmaṇas, and metronymic Hāritiputra goes to prove that they were putrikā-putra or Kāṇīna-putra of a girl of Hārita gotra. Their three pravaras were probably Māṇavya, Āṅgirasa and Hārita.
RAVIVARMAN KULASEKHARA
(The Emergence of Travancore into Historical View)

By

S. KRISHNASWAMI AIYANGAR

The Extent of Territory included in Travancore.

The state that goes by the name of Travancore now and occupies the southwest corner of peninsular India, falls into two distinct parts as it were, one Tamil and one Malayalam. The southern part of it extending from Cape Comerin to much past Quilon strikes a traveller as being more or less part of the Tinnevelly District, judging from the people whom one meets on his way. The northern portion is equally distinctly Malayalam. This state of things seems to be the result of the history of the country of long standing, and could hardly be a matter of late history. Apart from the general question of the differentiation of Malayalam from Tamil, and the period of time when that differentiation did actually take place, we have to remember that, in the days of the Sangam literature, the Tamil part of Travancore was included in the territory of the Aay chieftains and afterwards came to be distinctly known as Nāñjil Nāçu, forming a separate political entity under the suzerainty of the Pandyas. That this state of things continued to almost the end of the 8th century is in evidence in the Pandya copper-plate charter called the Vēlvikkudī plates published in the Epigraphia Indica, where the Pandya contemporary of the great Nandivarman II. Pallava Malla is stated to have undertaken an expedition against his united enemies who had mustered strong in the Kongu country. The charter claims for him a very thorough victory over his enemies in the region of Kongu, defeating the great Pallava himself. But what is really important to us in the present context is that as a result of this victory he was able to march across the whole of Kongu against the Chēra. Having defeated the Chēra and put him under tribute in the region of the Chēra kingdom proper at the time, namely, the state of Cochin and the part of Malabar dependent thereon extending southwards to the northern limit indicated above of the Travancore country, the charter states that he landed in what is now the Travancore country and marched across, as if through his own territory, into the Tinnevelly District reaching his capital of Madura ultimately. These give us unmistakably to understand that practically the whole of what is now Travancore was under the authority of the Pandyas at this time, as a result of conquest. There is much evidence in Tamil literature

1. Vol. XVIII.
2. Sewell's Historical Inscription of Southern India, p. 31 under date 1933-34 & note 3.
which would confirm this for three or four generations preceding this great Pandya ruler. Even in the days of the great Chola dynasty which came into power at the end of the 9th century and gradually extended its authority so as to take into the Chola dominions even all the west coast almost, we have the clearest indication that the campaigns that the Cholas had to undertake against the southern coast of this region, were more or less a part of the campaigns that the Cholas had to undertake against the Pandyas, and campaigns which were definitely called wars against the Chēra rulers of the time, have reference, as in the Pandya charter above, to the region much farther north of what is now Travancore.

The Chēra Kingdom.

The history of the Chēras therefore during the first millennium and more, is practically the history of the region of Malabar including within it what is now called North Malabar, what is called British Malabar and the territory now under the authority of the State of Cochin. It is well known from widely scattered statements in Tamil literature that the distant south, India south of the Krishna-Tungabhadra frontier, was the territory of the three crowned kingdoms of the south, and its equivalent in Sanskrit. In the period of Pallava ascendancy when the Pallavas actually claimed rule over the whole of South India, they gave themselves a title Tṛai-rājya-Pallava, meaning thereby that their authority extended over the three kingdoms or the territories of the three kings of the south. These were Chola, Pandya, Chēra or Kerala. That there was an independent Kerala as one of the three kingdoms in the days of Asoka is clearly in evidence in his rock edicts, the 4th and 13th of which actually mention Keralaputra among the southern powers with whom he came into diplomatic relations more or less. This term Kēralaputra is the Sanskrit equivalent of the Tamil Chēramān, and seems to be, though not very obviously, a derivative therefrom. The Tamils always call these people Śēras, and their rulers Śēran. But the name is somewhat modified also, in authoritative works of Tamil literature, by the addition of a syllable, making it Śēral in the singular and Śēralar in the plural. “Śēral, Śembian, śinam, kēlu, Tittiyān” occurs in the Sangam works. In more modern Tamil one often meets with expressions Śēralar Kōn as in references to Kulaśekhara Āvar. A form like Śēralam or Śēralam for the country, does not seem an impossible formation, and, if it had any vogue as the name of the country, its adoption by the Sanskritists would certainly be nothing strange. The term Kērala therefore of the Sanskritists seems to be formed on the Tamil word Śēralan or Śēralar, singular or plural. That does not however explain why the king should be called Kēralaputra in Sanskrit or Pāli, corrupted into Greek Cherobothras, equivalent for Chēraputra or Kēralaputra. This formation comes from the Tamil word Śērar- or Śēralar- Perumakan which in combination seems to be used as equivalent to prince or ruler. The term as Vaḍukar-Perumakan, and

1. Maṇḍurikāṇji in the Collection Ten-Tena Pattupāṭṭu.
even śērar Perumakan, occurs. Perumakan would literally be "big son" which certainly is capable of being interpreted as the great son, and thus easily becoming the equivalent of prince. This gets modified in usage into Perumān, another variant of which would be Perumāl. We then find that the Kērala-putra of the Asoka edicts is nothing more than the Śērar-Perumakan translated. It should therefore refer to nobody other than the Chēra contemporary of Asoka, thereby giving us unmistakably to understand that there was a definite Chēra kingdom with a crowned Chēra monarch along with the corresponding Chola and Pandya, among the three crowned kings of the south.

Chēra dominance in South India.

This Chēra kingdom existed during the first three or four centuries of the Christian era, and a number of Chēra rulers of note can be picked up and even arranged in a list of succession, if not actually a genealogical list, to the number of a dozen or more, some of whom having had the good fortune to leave records of their achievements in these poems. Some of these poems are actually intended to incorporate, as far as poetry can, the history of the Chēras. The poem Pādiṟṟupattu is one of this kind and lays itself out to celebrate the exploits of ten Chēra rulers who ruled over this kingdom. The poems concerning the first and last of these ten are lost. We have got the poems relating to the other eight. A few more names could be picked out from the other Śāngam miscellanies. The state of things that we find in this body of literature shows the Chēra kingdom to be a comparatively small extent of territory comprising all the central tract of what is now the state of Cochin and the territory immediately adjacent thereto. It gradually extended to take in the adjoining portions, the expansion being particularly notable in the north and the east. The northern expansion necessitated the creation of a viceroyalty, at or near Cannanore, which may at one time have developed into a kingdom comprising what is now North Malabar, taking into it even South Kanara district. But somewhat later began an eastward expansion which necessitated the creation of a Chēra viceroyalty in the Salem district under the chieftains known as the Adigāmāns of Tagaḍūr, modern Dharmapuri.1 At the height of this eastward expansion perhaps came into existence another viceroyalty which created modern Karūr and the territory dependent thereon, the aggression at one time reaching as far as Nēṟivāyil near Trichinopoly in the South, and Kanchi itself and the territory to the north of it dependent on it. One of these early rulers claims to have anointed himself with the waters of both seas at one and the same time at Ayirai (Hagari river in Mysore), the commentator explaining it that the waters from the western and the eastern seas were brought by relays of elephants for his anointment somewhere in the middle. When the Chēra dominance ceased the territory naturally would break up; and fell to pieces certainly in the usual fashion of India by the subordinate governments becoming independent kingdoms. We cannot say that the state

---

1. See Mr. K. G. Sesha Aiyar's recent work on the Chēras for further details.
under the Zamorin started so early. But we do know that the chieftain Adigaman and his descendants ruled independently of the Chēras in the region of the Salem district. The territory which now constitutes the state of Travancore must have dropped out as well, and perhaps been early incorporated in the territory of the Āay chieftains on that borderland, or by their Pandya overlords when they established their supremacy there. What actually was the character of the political constitution of this southern territory we have no knowledge of during this period.

**Pandyas dominate Southern Malayalam.**

When next we come to the age when the Pallavas of Kanchi were gradually building up an empire to dominate the whole of the south, the Pandyas set up a reaction against them. This seems to have resulted from a general folk movement which brought about an upsetting of the general political order in the south. Very early in the course of this Pandyan revival, we are able to see the Pandyan campaigns are against the territory of the Chēras, and all the battles, several of them naval engagements, were fought out in the southern part of Travancore. This war between the Pandyas and the Chēras seems to have been more or less a protracted war, and the actual responsibility for the aggression varied, sometimes the one and sometimes the other actually beginning the war. The series of these campaigns culminated in the invasion of the Chēra territory by the Pandyan king Neḍumāran who, we mentioned already, undertook an expedition of the Chēra territory westward from the Salem district, and carried the campaigns successfully through the kingdom of the Śēras proper, and then proceeded southwards into his own territory which forms part of what is now the state of Travancore. This indicates more or less that in these centuries, sixth to the ninth, what now is Travancore formed a part, almost an integral part, of the territory of the Pandyas.

**The Pallava-Pandya struggle detrimental to Chēra power.**

The general trend of South Indian History so far has been that in the earliest historical period known to us, the period of the Śangam literature extending from the date of Aśoka, 3rd century B.C. to the commencement of the 4th century A.D., Tamil India pursued its course by itself alone, generally unmolested by enemies from the northern frontier except on an occasion or two, an invasion under the Mauryas and perhaps one or two in the latter period of the Andhra successors of the Mauryas. From the beginning of the 5th century commences the period of the Pallava ascendency. The Pallavas established themselves in Kanchi, the northern province of the Chola empire, and gradually extended their power so as to exercise at least an overlordship over the well known Tamil kingdoms of the south. This is the period of Pallava ascendency, and the success of the Pallavas was great enough to justify their calling themselves Trai-rājya-Pallavas, the Pallavas, overlords of the three well known kingdoms of the south. That state of things could not remain unchallenged, and was not allowed to go without an effort on the part
of some of these. The Chola kingdom was so near the Pallavas and had been so early put out of action effectively that she had to bide her time for long before making any effort with a possibility of success. This rôle of opposition to the dominant power fell to the lot of the Pandyas farther south, as they did not suffer perhaps quite so much either in the Kalabhras' invasion, or in the establishment of the Pallava ascendancy as the Cholas did. Even so, it is stated clearly that a new Pandya power had to emerge from the Kalabhras' submergence, and it is this newly risen dynasty of Pandya rulers that took the field against the Pallavas. We have some information of five or six generations of these Pandyas, and such information as we possess regarding them shows them monarchs of a territory extending from coast to coast, fairly well consolidated to throw the whole weight of their resources against the Pallavas. In the earlier part of this period they had to do a good deal of fighting in the western frontier of Vēṇāḍ, and many a naval and land victory is claimed by one at least of the earlier members of this dynasty, so that we may take it as a fact of history that Nāṇjanāḍ and Vēṇāḍ, parts of Travancore, in fact the great bulk of what is now Travancore territory, had been brought under their control, and the Chēra territory was actually reduced to narrow limits and confined to the north of the extended Chēra kingdom of the previous period. That it was actually so is borne witness to by the actual achievement of the Pandyan referred to previously who conducted a campaign against the great Pallava Nandivarman Pallava-Malla successfully marching across to the west coast through the Chēra territory, and getting into his own territory in the Tinnevelly District across what is practically part of his own dominions. This persistent war between the Pandyas and the Pallavas, lasting through four or five generations almost continuously, naturally sapped the resources of both the powers.

The extinction of the Pallava Ascendancy.

The Pallavas had to fight Janus-faced through all this period with the Chālukyas in the north across their northern frontier and the Tamil powers, the Pandyas and the Cholas in the south. When in the middle of the eighth century the Chālukyas were overthrown, and when a new dynasty, that of the Rāṣṭrakūṭas, came into power there, the policy towards the south changed only for a short period and soon resumed the normal position of hostility to the south. Therefore the Pallava activity against the Pandyas of the south weakened when the Pandyas assumed the aggressive owing to the pressure put upon the Pallavas from the north. Time was against the Pallavas, and this pressure on both sides was certain to exhaust the resources of the Pallavas and so it did. When the Pandyas, two generations later, advanced through all the Chola country, and almost into the heart of the South Arcot District carrying their arms successfully, the time had come for the Pallavas to make a last effort. They were this time lucky in getting all their southern feudatories to co-operate with them, and, as ill luck would have it for the Pandyas, they embroiled themselves with Ceylon, wherefrom an invasion happened to
be threatening. The occasion was taken advantage of by the Cholas in the middle who had been biding their time all along to take the tide at the flood, and restore themselves to their former position of importance, if not of dominance. In the result we see that at the commencement of the 10th century, the Pandya king Varaguna II and his successor had to withdraw after a defeat from the Chola territory and face an enemy from Ceylon as a matter of greater urgency. That was the extinction of the Pandya dominion.

The Establishement of the Chola ascendency.

The Cholas made themselves masters of their own ancestral territory in the Kaveri delta first. Then they extended their power to take in Tonḍa-manḍlam, the region dependent upon Kanchi in the north, extending westwards to take into the rising empire, the territory of Kongu which happened to be the bone of contention between the Pandyas and the Cholas. In the course of this progress, the Cholas got into alliance with the Chēras of the west, who had their own grievances against the Pandyas. Thus was established in the course of the 10th century, the Chola ascendancy which crippled the Pandya power as a necessary preliminary, thanks to the timely intervention of the Ceylonese in a Pandya civil war, and, what is really important to Chēra history, the chēras saved themselves by a timely marriage with the rising great Chola Parântaka. The Chēra territory, such as it was, was left intact, and the Cholas carried their wars against the Pandyas till the Pandya power was crushed beyond possibility of their making any useful effort to regain their former power. In this early period of Chola ascendancy we do hear sometimes of battles in the territory of Travancore both naval and on land. These were battles not against the Chēras, or the rulers of Travancore separately, but as part of the general campaigns against the Pandyas thereby giving us to understand clearly that the territory remained Pandyan, the region actually figuring in these contexts being called Vēṇāḍ, giving us the surest indication of what territory it was that was actually involved in this struggle, the territory namely of what is now Travancore. The Chēra kingdom lay farther north and therefore safe. The Cholas found occasion to go to war against them separately. The establishment therefore of Chola ascendancy in South India meant for the Chēras an alliance to begin with, consolidated by a marriage of a Chēra princess to the great Chola Parântaka, but war against the southern portions of the Chēra territory, the region of Travancore being involved in war, not so much as Chēra territory but as forming a part of the Pandya kingdom. The establishment of the Chola ascendancy under Rājarāja the Great shows the Chola power exercising authority not only over their own ancestral territory but over the whole of what was the Pandya kingdom and even portions of Ceylon.

The Chēra kingdom under Rājarāja.

One feature of Rājarāja's connection with the Chēras is noteworthy. While early in his reign he is recorded in all his inscriptions to have gone to war against south Travancore and gained a naval victory, the first great event of
distinction at a place called Kândalûr Sâlai identified with a part of Trivandram sea-shore, which must have formed a roadstead at the time, it is later on in the reign that we hear of him undertaking campaigns against the Chêra land proper in the west. It seems probable that in the course of his conquest of the Pandya territory, the policy changed either because the Chêras took sides with the Pandyas, or because something else necessitated this war. Either way, the later records of his reign include the kingdom of the Chêras among the places that Râjarâja brought under his authority before his campaign extended to the islands of the western sea. By the time therefore that Râjarâja reached the high tide of his fame, he had brought the three kingdoms under his control, and justified the name Mumudu Sóla, which he seems to have assumed somewhat later in the reign as distinguished from an early title Mumudi Chola which would ordinarily mean nothing more than “a Chola thrice over,” the most excellent among the Cholas as it were. The title Mumudi Chola is distinct in reference certainly to his having brought the three kingdoms, Chola, Pândya and Chêra under his authority. As a matter of fact, it seems fairly clear that about the end of his reign, and through the exertions of his warrior son Râjendra to become later the Gangaikondachola, a western campaign was carried to success by the conquest even of the islands of the sea. It is just possible that Râjarâja found it worth while bringing this about as a necessary preliminary to the campaign against the Châlukyas which was to be the preoccupation of the Cholas for practically a whole century, that is the 11th century. Râjarâja must have already matured his plans of campaigns against the later Châlukyas of Kalyâni, who had risen to power by the overthrow of the Râstrakûta dynasty about the same time that he came into prominence in the Chola territory, gradually working themselves up to instal themselves firmly in their newly won territory and brought about peace on both their northern frontier against the rulers of Malva, and the north-eastern against the rulers of Vengi, with both of whom the Châlukyas were in deadly enmity. Once that was satisfactorily done, it was natural that the enemy would be thundering at the gates along the north-western frontier of the Cholas. Râjarâja’s plan of campaign therefore was in anticipation of this, and the Chola-Châlukya struggle was a feature of the foreign policy of the great Cholas from Râjarâja to Kulottunga I. The campaign against the Chêras therefore may well have been a mere effort to protect his flank as against this great war. We do hear now and again of the Chêras in the course of the next century, and also sometimes there is an occasional mention of a campaign, but generally speaking the Chêras seem to have remained under the authority of the Cholas for the rest of the period. This refers of course to the Chêra kingdom proper, and not to the southern part of it which included the territory that now forms Travancore.

Kulottunga III and the Pâñdyas.

This part begins to figure again in the wars against the Pandyas which supervened what seemed a change of dynasty about the last quarter of the
12th century in the Chola empire. The line of Chola rulers in regular succession seems to have ceased, and a prince of a collateral family had to be placed on the throne. There was the possibility of a disturbance, and there seems to have been some actual effort also. This contributed to weaken the Chola power somewhat. The Pandyas found their opportunity. They managed to secure the assistance of an ambitious monarch of Ceylon who established himself as the ruler of the whole island putting an end to Chola authority there. The invasion therefore must have had the idea of making it impossible for the Cholas to reassert their authority in Ceylon, and that could best be done by throwing their weight on the side of the Pandyas when they showed themselves restive, and stake their fortunes on a campaign, almost a life and death campaign, against the Cholas. Kulottunga III who ruled from A.D. 1178 to A.D. 1216 was the great Chola who achieved distinction among the Cholas by preventing the dismemberment of the empire by successful campaigns against the Ceylonese and the Pandyas, beating back the former and punishing the latter almost to the point of destroying their power altogether. The rival power, the Chalukyas in the north, suffered a severe calamity and did not have the good fortune to recover from it, as the Chola power did. First a usurpation, then a restoration under a weakling monarch, had brought about the dismemberment of that empire, which fell into three kingdoms, the Yadavas with their capital at Devagiri, the Katakaivas who had taken the place of the Eastern Chalukyas with their capital in Warangal in the Nizam’s Dominions, and the Hoysalas in the south with their capital at Hulabed and Bellur, the three dynasties whose territory comprised the whole of the Chalukyan empire. Kulottunga’s victories drastic in their character suppressed the trouble for the moment to bequeath to the empire the deadly hatred of the Pandyas who only waited for an opportunity to crush the Cholas out of existence if possible. The advent of Kulottunga’s son and successor, Rajaraja III was the opportunity for the southern power to try its strength against the Cholas. The Chola Pandya struggle becomes a feature of the following half century, culminating in the extinction of the Chola power and the establishment of the Pandya ascendancy for the time.

The end of the Chola Empire and the Pandya Ascendancy.

Kulottunga’s rule extended well beyond the first years of the 14th century, and when his son Rajaraja succeeded to the throne he seems to have become heir to the Chola empire together with a crop of troubles which arose within its own boundaries. We do not know for certain what the cause of the civil trouble was actually due to at this time, but practically all the northern part of the Chola empire, the Tondayamandalam and the farther north of that region up to the banks of the Krishna, including the Chola territory proper reaching down to the banks of the Kaveri almost, seem to have become a seething cauldron of trouble and discontent. Rajaraja had a brother Rajendra who seems to have held rule, in the earlier years of Rajaraja, in the region bordering on Mysore. Whether he had anything to do with this,
we do not know, but the chief source of the trouble appears to have been the ambitious and enterprising Pallava ruler hailing from the South Arcot District with a capital at Cuddalore to give place ultimately to Tiruvadi or Tiruvadigai, Ko-Perumjingga by name. Three successive battles had to be fought in which the names of other chieftains of the northern part of this country also figure, and Rājarāja for the time managed to extricate himself from the trouble owing to the good offices of his relative, the ruler of Mysore, Narasimha II, Hoysala. These disturbances were certainly taken advantage of by the Pandyas looking out for an opportunity for revenge. The young and enterprising contemporary of Rājarāja III was Māravarman Sundara Pandya who ascended the Pandyan throne about the same date as Rājarāja III, in 1216. He undertook an invasion of the Chola country in the south, and carried fire and sword up to the capital cities, Tanjore and Uraiyyur. The empire was certainly in danger of collapse from which it was saved this time again by the intervention of the Mysore ruler. This became so necessary afterwards as the open hostility of the Pandyas, and the somewhat veiled hostility of the Pallava chieftain and his coadjutors in the north, were not as yet rooted out. This brought down the Mysore ruler again to intervene on behalf of Rājarāja III as against the Pallava or Kāḍava chieftain Kö-Perumjingga. Thereafter the Hoysalas found it necessary and perhaps even advantageous to themselves, to have a permanent camp in the Chola country which ultimately developed into the Hoysala capital called Vikramapura at Kāṇṇanur, some four or five miles across the Choleroon on the northern side from Srirangam. It was a strategic point from which the Hoysalas could watch movements both north and south, and thus be effective protection against the enemies of the Cholas, among whom we may now definitely count Rājendra III, a brother of Rājarāja also. So to the southern powers we have now to add the Hoysalas, and any achievement of the Pandyas, particularly against the Cholas, must in fact be through the overthrow of the Hoysalas in the south. The Pandya-Chola war therefore assumes the character of a Pandya-Hoysala war to establish the influence of the one or the other in the Chola country. For the moment, however, the Hoysalas held the field, and were efficient protection against the rebel chieftain, Kö-perumjingga and to some extent hemmed in the Pandya flood from advancing too far to the detriment of the Chola kingdom. This went on through one generation. In the last years of Rājarāja a fratricidal war arose between him and his brother Rājendra III which seems more or less to have sealed the fate of the empire. Rājarāja’s reign ended in A.D. 1246 and his brother Rājendra had hardly been a few years in authority when there came to the Pandya throne a very ambitious and powerful prince who became famous in history as Jaṭāvarman Sundara Pandya.

The Need for Pandya Intervention.

Jaṭāvarman Sundara Pandya became heir to the policy of his predecessors on the Pandya throne. His two predecessors carried on an aggressive war
against the Cholas with considerable success, and were held in check only
by the Hoyśala intervention in favour of the Cholas, which was partly,
if not entirely, responsible for bringing about the war. The Hoyśala monarch
Vira Somēśvara found it necessary to establish himself more or less per-
manently in a capital of his own, not far from that of the Cholas at Uraliyūr
and Tanjore, both of which suffered from the Pandya invasions. Somēśvara’s
position at Kaṇṭanūr on the north bank of the Coleroon over against Śrī-
rangam offered some security to the Cholas against the aggressions of the
Pandyas in the south, and perhaps even against the active enemy, the Kādava
chieftain Kō-Perumjingga, in the South Arcot District. The Chola empire
which at its height extended through the whole of the Madras Presidency
has been narrowed to some extent in the north by the rise of a new power,
the Kākatiyas, so that the northern boundary of the Cholas even under
Kulottunga III could not have gone beyond the Krishna river. The region
between the Krishna extending southwards to Kanchi, nay in fact to the
southern Pennar and beyond, became a seething cauldron owing to the struggle
among the feudatories of the empire each one of whom made the best effort
that he could to set himself up independently of the central power. In the
northern part of the empire, particularly this discontent seems to have found
encouragement owing to the rivalry of Rājendra III to the reigning Chola
Rājarāja III. Rājarāja achieved very considerable success against these
northern chieftains, early in the reign, by his effective operations against
the Kādava chieftain Kō-Perumjingga. But then the fortunes of war often
went against him, and he was even made prisoner of war by this self-same
chieftain, and was saved three several times only by the timely intervention
of the Hoyśalas on all these occasions. The establishment of the Hoyśala
power in the Chola country therefore came in as an act of benevolent inter-
vention to begin with. The existence of a powerful chieftain like the Hoyśala
in the heart of the Chola country must therefore have been unsatisfactory
from the point of view of the aggressive Pandyas on the one side and of the
feudatory malcontents in the Chola empire itself on the other. Such a posi-
tion would not conduce to the maintenance of peace, and the war therefore
now assumed the character of a war between the Pandyas and the Hoyśalas,
the Chola feudatories taking part on the one side or the other, not in obedience
to the demands of their loyalty to their liege-lord, but in accordance with
their self-interest and friendliness either to the Hoyśalas or to the Pandyas.
The accession of Jaṭāvarman Sundara Pandya therefore came at a time
when he could hardly remain at peace even if he were so minded.

The Pandya Ascendancy under Jaṭāvarman Sundara Pāndya.

Jaṭāvarman therefore had to undertake an expedition against Vira
Somēśvara in the Kaveri delta and carried the war further through the Chola
empire in an effort to destroy the Hoyśala influence and bring the Cholas
more or less under his own influence instead. He carried a successful and
glorious campaign across the whole extent of the Chola country to the
banks of the Krishna,² whereat he stopped his further progress, as one of his poetical panegyrists would have us believe, because it was a woman that was ruling across the Krishna frontier. This seems rather an anachronistic statement, as queen Rudramma had not yet come to the Kākatiya throne, and it was still Gaṇapati who was the Kākatiya ruler. But as Gaṇapati is mentioned in the preceding verse,³ these perhaps refer to two campaigns one following the other. Be that as it may, the flood of Jaṭāvarman's invasion had the effect, so far as the Cholas were concerned, of turning the Hōysalas from out of the Tamil country for the time being, and bringing the Kāḍava chieftain of South Arcot into some kind of loyalty to the Chola empire; this also made the northern chieftains realise the danger of their ways. Jaṭāvarman was able to celebrate the assertion of his authority by great benefactions to the temple at Srirangam and otherwise signalise his success by his coronation in Chidambaram, thus establishing a period of Pandya ascendancy over the whole of the Chola empire which lasted for the next half a century almost unmolested. In the course of Jaṭāvarman Sundara Pandya's great campaign northwards, either because there were disturbances, or because of an anticipation of such, two of his co-regents had to be active, one by name Vira Pandya in Ceylon⁴ and another by name Vikrama Pandya⁴ in the western regions of Travancore. Their campaigns were about as successful as those of Sundara Pandya himself and the Pandya power had some respite for the next half a century.

**Condition of the Tamil Country at the beginning of the 14th Century.**

One feature of Pandyan rule at this period must be noted here. During the 13th century, the Pandyan kingdom seems to have been ruled by a king as usual, but the ruler seems to have been assisted in the administration by a number of collateral relations, often brothers, who held the more important governorships and viceroyalties. This arrangement seems to have been so prominent, and perhaps even permanent, that to intelligent foreigners it seem-

---

1. Miḷāvaḷḷchella Vēṅḍar tāṅgalai venṟa taḍan-Tōḷān madurai-man Sundara Pāṇḍiyar sūṇidirainji Yāḷāna mannvar tannēval šeyya vavanimuṭṭa Valāḷ vāṭi tirandān vaḍa vēndari mātriandē-

2. Puyalunndaruvum porukaip puvaneka vira punal Vayalunndaralāṁ daru korkai Kāvalavaranppappor Muyalun-Gaṇapati moytta šenjōti mukattirand̐u Kayalundenumaduo munivāriya kāraṇamē-


ed as if the empire was governed by five rulers in combination as it were, the notion being more or less strengthened by one of the Pandyan titles *Panchavan*. Whatever it be, during this period there were Pandyan princes ruling who could be regarded more or less as kings not merely by foreigners alone but even by the very inhabitants of the country. Jaṭāvarman Sundara Pandya was succeeded by another Jaṭāvarman, but it is doubtful whether he was really the successor to the Pandya throne, as very soon after we find the great Māravarman Kulašēkhara on the throne who ruled for the long period of about 44 years. It seems likely, however, that Jaṭāvarman Sundara Pandya II came in for a comparatively short rule between Jaṭāvarman Sundara I and Kulašēkhara. At the end of the 13th century and the beginning of the 14th, the condition of South India was somewhat as follows. The whole of the Tamil land was under Pandya rule, the boundary extending as far north as the Krishna itself in the lower course of the river, and taking in the whole of the Tamil country under their authority. To the westward of them along a frontier running through what is the state of Mysore now, happened to be the territory of the Hoyśalas who had asserted their independence at the end of the last century when the later Chāḷukyas of Kalyāṇi gradually weakened and ultimately passed out of existence as a political power. Almost simultaneously, in fact somewhat earlier the Kākatiya who had already been a powerful feudatory of the Chāḷukyas, showed a tendency to throw off the yoke of the central power and gradually established himself in independence, the Kākatiya territory occupying the eastern half of the Nizam’s dominions with the capital first at Anamakonda and next at Wārangal, not far from it. To the westward of this, and to the north of the Hoyśala power, lay the dominions of the Yādavas, another feudatory dynasty under the later Chāḷukyas, who about the same time as the Hoyśalas established themselves in independence. The Yādavas held their territory from the Vindhya southwards to as far south as Sholapur, but sometimes extending their frontier as against the Hoyśalas to bring it down practically to what is now the northern frontier of Mysore. The Hoyśala territory took into it all the state of Mysore now, and several of the districts of the Bombay Presidency next adjoining the Mysore frontier of today. Thus placed, the Yadavas and the Hoyśalas were constantly at war, as the frontier that separated them was a variable one, owing to the absence of natural features which could mark them off distinctly. The southern frontier of the Hoyśalas was marked off certainly distinctly by the hills at the foot of the Mysore plateau, but the political exigencies already adverted to, called for their expansion into what was the Chola kingdom. It was this that called for activity on the northern boundary from the Yādavas, but at the time to which we have now arrived, there was something like an understanding between the two in respect of their frontiers, particularly as the advance of the Pandya power pushed back the Hoyśalas into their own territory. In regard to the frontier between the Kākatiyars and the Pandyas, there certainly was a great river, the lower course of the Krishna, which does make some-
what of an effective frontier. But what was really a more important point is, it was a frontier more distant from the headquarters of the Pandyas than when their capital was in the Chola country as under the great Māravarman Kulaśekhara, the last great ruler. Further the northern feudatories remained for the time being loyal under the empire, particularly the Yādavarāya chieftains who claimed descent from the Chālukyas themselves and held a very considerable part of the northern territory of the Chola empire.

The Character of the Muhammadan Intervention in the South.

It was in this position of affairs that the newly established Muhammadan power at Delhi which had extended its authority to take practically the whole of Hindustan effectively now looked forward across the Vindhya with a view to conquest. In the last years of Māravarman Kulaśekhara, the ruler of Delhi was Allaud-din Khalji, whose preoccupations were pre-eminentely the keeping of the invading Mughals outside the Punjab frontier and providing against their effective advance on that frontier. That meant very heavy military expenditure and the maintenance of an efficient army which could keep the nomads who appeared in millions pouring into the country, out of the frontier by sheer force. Allaud-din’s policy therefore was much rather the maintenance of the empire that he already had, in efficiency rather than its expansion to take in distant territory across difficult mountains and deep rivers. He had, however, clear notions, by a previous raid or two that he conducted into the Dakhan, as to the wealth of the country there, and the possibility of defeating the rulers who had the government of these territories. He developed therefore a policy of sending out invasions across the Vindhya mountains to defeat the Indian states of the south and draw from their stored up resources the wealth that he so much needed for his own campaigns against the Mughals. He sent out invasions therefore against Dēvagiri, the state next across the Narmada river. After having brought it under his authority first indirectly and then perhaps a little more directly, he sent out an invasion to the next neighbour, the Kākatīyas of Wārangal. After bringing them into submission, his general could next go forward further south to capture the resources of South India, the wealth of the temples of which was one irresistible attraction. But what was really more, in those days the military necessity for possessing fighting elephants in number was great; and South India and Ceylon were regarded as the home of a powerful breed of these beasts which proved so efficient in the campaigns of those days. An invasion of South India therefore had to be undertaken; but then they could not leave the flank under enemies, and therefore the Hoyśala power also came in for their attention. The Hoyśala adopted the cautious policy of submitting to the inevitable at need and waited upon the future for an opportunity to regain independence, if need be by force so that the Hoyśala state was left more or less intact when the invasion of the south was undertaken. This distant campaign while meeting the views of the general in command was actually brought about as a result of a civil war between two brothers, the
successors of Māravarman Kulaśekhara. For one reason or another, Māravarman entrusted a natural son of his by name Virapandya, perhaps really the more capable, with the government of a part of his territory to the neglect of the heir-apparent, as the prince concerned took it. Through treachery of Vira-Pandya or other provocation, he proceeded to murder the father and assert his rights. Being defeated by his more capable brother he could only fly to the Muhammadan armies encamped across the frontier, and this brought on the invasion of the south by the Muhammadans.

The Condition of the South after the Muhammadan Invasions.

The story of the Muhammadan invasions of the south is briefly told. The invasion came ostensibly as in respect of the other Dakkan kingdoms more for reasons of wealth than of actual conquest. In the case of South India, however, the wealth wanted included the strong breed of elephants of the south, more warworthy than the other breeds. The invasion ostensibly came upon South India alone; but it halted at the southern frontier of the Yādava kingdom near Sholapur, and from there a raid was undertaken against the Hoysalas. The Hoysala kingdom suffered and was threatened sufficiently to sue for peace, and the Hoysala prince was despatched to Delhi with a recommendation from Malik-Kafur for favourable treatment. So Malik-Kafur’s flank was safe more or less, and an invasion could march south without molestation. The object was the suppression of Vira Pandya ostensibly with a view to placing Sundara Pandya on the throne. Battles were fought in the central region of the Tamil country between the foothills of the plateau and Trichinopoly. Vira Pandya was defeated and driven out and Sundara Pandya was placed on the throne. After plundering at least the bigger temples of the south, such as Śrīrangam and Chidambaram the army marched on Madura, where the capital was easily occupied and a plundering raid sent as far down as Ramesvaram itself. After sweeping the country clean of all extra wealth, Malik-Kafur thought it prudent to retire having carried out to his satisfaction completely the campaigns upon which he came to the south. Kulaśekhara’s son Sundara Pandya, was placed upon the throne, and, with a fabulous plunder, Malik-Kafur returned to Delhi.

The condition of things in South India was deplorable in many ways. The Hoysala was left in power, but with much crippled resources, his very capital having suffered serious damage by the Muhammadan raid. But he was in resources enough yet to make a more or less successful effort to regain his lost position to a considerable extent if only he were allowed the time that was necessary to rehabilitate himself in peace. One of the disturbing factors preventing this would have been the activity of his Pandya contemporaries, but since Vira Pandya happened to be overthrown, Sundara

1. Ep. Car., VII, Shimoga 68. For a fuller account of these invasions, &c., see the Author’s South India and her Muhammadan Invaders. Oxford University Press.
Pandya was in no condition to cause any disturbance from the South. So the Baḷḷāla was left more or less to himself. In regard to Sundara Pandya, we have hardly any detail as to what his doings were, whether he made any serious effort at all to rehabilitate himself. It looks as though Malik-Kafur left a few garrisons here and there to maintain a sort of hold upon South India while leaving the restored rulers to continue to administer their own kingdoms. The Pandya territory at the time was extensive and at least nominally extended as far north as the banks of the Krishna. But the northern feudatories who were already troublesome under the last Cholas were inclined to throw off the yoke of the Pandyas equally, and seemed to have had the countenance, and to some extent even the assistance, of the Baḷḷāla for the time being. So the Pandya Kingdom showed the natural tendency to collapse. This was aggravated by the civil war first, and the Muhammadan invasions after, so that we could imagine that Sundara Pandya was confined more or less to the home territory of the Pandyas, the more recent conquests being of doubtful allegiance. It therefore became more or less a question of what exactly either of the South Indian rulers could do to reclaim South India either jointly or singly. Joint action would involve the two powers being more or less in a satisfactorily strong condition. While this condition might have been satisfactory in respect of the Hoysala, particularly after the prince had returned with favourable conditions granted by Allaud-din, it is not possible to say as much about the Pandya. Whether the Hoysala was going to step into the breach seemed yet doubtful. It was clear that the Pandya was in no condition to completely recover the possession of his kingdom, thanks to the activity of his defeated rival Vira Pandya, and this state of things gave the opportunity for an enterprising ruler to essay more successfully this difficult task than the feeble Sundara Pandya.

Conditions favourable for the rise of a new power.

This was not unlikely in the circumstances as Vira Pandya had only been defeated by Malik-Kafur and had escaped into the Kongu country, and perhaps across into the Kerala country, for protection. So long as he was free, it was not likely that Sundara Pandya would be left in peace. Therefore he would, as we should ordinarily expect in the circumstances, be occupied nearer home too much to pay sufficient attention to the affairs of the empire to which he had become heir as the successor of Māravarman Kulaśekhara. Such a peaceful condition of affairs had been a great deal negativated by the fratricidal war first and the Muhammadan interruption following on it and as a consequence of it. We see the evidence of it in the northern territory of the Chola empire getting into the possession of the powerful Chola feudatories who had begun, even when the last Cholas were

ruling, to conduct themselves as if they were independent powers. This tendency on the part of these feudatories found encouragement in the slow advance of the Hoyśala influence into these regions. It was not as if the Hoyśala made any conquest or annexed territories, but it looks much rather as if the Hoyśala gradually extended his influence and placed himself in a position of leadership, it may be leadership against their Pandya overlords, and ultimately becoming himself the overlord of these northern states. That would account satisfactorily for the Hoyśala finding it necessary to be in Tiruvanṉāmalai often as a convenient centre to begin with. Tiruvanṉāmalai ultimately developed almost as the capital of the Hoyśala in his later wars against the Muhammadans. But for the present, the Pandya ruler, Sundara Pandya, was troubled by the possibility of a Ceylon invasion; but what was much more real, the activity of Vīra Pandya which he was likely to resume the moment that he knew the Muhammadan power had left the South. If ever a Kerala ruler, or one of the feudatory princes of Kerala had a chance, it was now, and we do find a prince of Kerala taking the tide at the flood.

Jayasimha of Kūpaka and his son Ravi Varman Kulaśēkhara.

Immediately north of the small kingdom known as Vēṇāḍ already referred to, was another division of Kerala generally known by the term Kūpaka, the capital of which at the time seems to have been what is now Quilon, called Kūḷam by the Muhammadan historians of the time, Kolambam by the early European writers, and Kōlamba in Sanskrit which would mean a boat. This part of Kēṟaḷa was ruled at the time by a prince who claimed to be a descendant of the dynasty founded by Yadu, and belonged to the Sōmavārīṇa in consequence. His name was Jayasimha in consequence of which probably the little kingdom of Kūpaka over which he ruled came to be known as Jayasimhanāḍ. He seems gradually to have built up the kingdom in such a way not merely to consolidate his position in the ancestral kingdom of Kūpaka, but even to extend his influence over Vēṇāḍ and the rest of South Travancore as a counter effort against Pandya extension. He seems to have assumed the title Vīra Kēṟaḷa also. He was married to a princess by name Uma, and by her had a son who was named Ravivarman, who later assumed the full style Ravi Varman Kulaśēkhara. It was this prince, born in the year A.D., 1165-66, who was to achieve the greatness of his country by taking advantage of this opportunity. It seems likely that the father had laboured hard to extend his frontiers by imposing his authority over Vēṇāḍ and even the Tamil districts beyond; but it does not appear that he had brought these small states definitely under his authority. Prince Ravi-varman when he succeeded his father might have taken steps to rivet his authority over these southern states. We have a few definite statements concerning this ruler, which, if carefully interpreted with adequate knowledge of the historical surroundings of the time, would yield us definite details re-
garding his history. It seems from a fugitive Malayalam stanza quoted in grammatical works that he defeated a Vikrama Pandya in Vēṇāḍ and took from him possession of that region. Having made this conquest and adding these southern states to his own, he consolidated his position in South Travancore. What, according to the verse in question, follows in consequence of this is of some considerable importance, namely, that he took the territory from Vikrama Pandya and made it over to a Pandya ruler who, in gratitude, gave him his daughter in marriage, as in fact the Pāṇcāla monarch Drupada gave—at any rate vowed to give—his daughter Draupadi to the Pāṇḍava prince Arjuna who
defeated him. As the statement appears in the verse it looks as though he overthrew Vikrama Pandya who attempted a usurpation of authority, and handed him over with the territory to the Pandya monarch for the time being. We know of a Vikrama Pandya who was contemporary of the great Jatāvarman Sundara Pandya who came to the throne in A.D. 1251. Among his brother Pandyan princes who co-operated with him, we find the names of two, a Vira Pandya and a Vikrama Pandya, the former distinguishing himself in campaigns against Ceylon, and similarly the latter achieving distinction by his conquest of Vēṇāḍ and extension of Pandya authority over Kēraḷa country. This Vikrama Pandya might have survived Jatāvarman Sundara and remained in government of Vēṇāḍ under his successors. It would therefore seem as if Ravi Varman began his political career by operating against this Vikrama Pandya when he made an attempt to set up in rebellion, it may be against the great Pandya Māravarman Kulaśekhara, and by that act won the favour of the great Pandya to the extent that the Pandya monarch gave him, in gratitude, his own daughter in marriage.

Ravivarman Kulaśekhara’s Achievements.

It would perhaps be the most convenient way to understand Ravi Varman Kulaśekhara’s achievements by a careful study of the Aruḻāḷa Perumāḷ inscription of his fourth year in the Vīshṇu temple at Conjivaram, as the inscription sets forth in five ślokas the whole of his career which may require to be explained, so that what is stated in the verses may be understood clearly. We shall therefore set forth the verses in translation and proceed to explain them in the light of the historical information at our disposal. The first of these verses states “In the country of Kēraḷa there was a king

1. *Lilatilakam*, a Malayalam Grammar in Sanskrit of the 14th or 15th Century
I am indebted to Mr. T. K. Joseph, B.A., L.T., for the information and the verse.—Drōṇāya Drupadam Danaḥjaya iva Kshmāpāla bāḷām bāli; Vēṇāṭṭin uḍaiyōru Ravi Varmākhyō Yadinām pathiḥ; Pāṇḍyam Vikrama pūrvakam paḍaiyil-vaccoṭtipidichchaññanē; Pāṇḍyēśāya kuḍuttu tasya tanayām padmānanām agrahit.

2. Records of his 14th year: A.D. 1266. in Tinnevelly & S. Arcot.


4. Svasti Śri Jayasimha ityabhhihitōḥ Somānvottamsakō; Rājasidhī Kēraḷēshu vishayē nātho Yadukshmābhrītāṁ Jātōsmād Ravi Varma bhūpatiḥ Umā dēvyaṁ Kumāra Śivāt Dēhavyāpya (1188) Sakābda bhāji samayē dēhiva viro rasāḥ.
the lord among Yadu kings, the most excellent among kings of the lunar dynasty called śrī Jayasimha, from whom was born, through his queen Umādevi as Kumāra from Sīva, Ravivarma as if he was the embodiment of valour itself, in the Śaka year 1188 (expressed by the chronogram Dēhavyāpya) ". What is worth remarking in this verse is that Jayasimha is already spoken of as the lordly among the Yadu kings, among the Kērala rulers, which seems to indicate that he had already established something like an overlordship over the petty sovereigns among whom the Kērala country was divided. The queen that bore the son Ravivarma is called Umā Dēvī, and Ravivarman is here given credit for great valour. The next verse2 states it: "That one (Ravi Varma) led on to destruction the armies of his enemies as he did the strength of this sinful Kali age. Having done this, he made the Pandya Princess his queen in the same manner that she did the Goddess of Victory. So doing he attained to the position of ruler over Kerala, as indeed he did to that of fame, in the 33rd year of his age. He then protected his kingdom as he did protect his own city of Koḷambha." The statements in this verse require to be carefully examined. Omitting the similes for the moment, he is said to have conquered his enemies, and, along with his victory, obtained the princess of the Pandya monarch for his wife. He attained to the position of suzerain ruler over Kērala in his 33rd year, which would mean Śaka 1221, or A.D. 1299. This statement seems a little too general for making anything out of except the broad fact that he reduced to submission to him his colleagues in the region of Kērala and brought them under his authority. This he was able to achieve as he defeated his enemies, and, as a result thereof, gained the hand of the princess of the Pandya. A stray Malayalam verse quoted in grammatical work Līla Tilakam,2 considered as a work of the 14th or the 15th century, seems to throw some light upon this matter. That verse is translated:—"Ravivarman, the king of the Yadus of Vēṇād, defeated the Pāṇḍya with the prefix Vikrama at the head of his army, and, handing him over along with the territory conquered from him, to the king of the Pāṇḍyas, as Arjuna brought king Drupada of Paṇḍhala and handed him over to Drona the strong one obtained in return the daughter of the king." This Malayalam verse seems to convey these facts regarding a Ravivarman ruler of the Yadus. Ravi Varma belonged to the Yadu Vamśa and was to achieve rule among them. He defeated a Vikrama Pandya on the field of battle and handed him over to the Pandya ruler of the time. In return for this act of service, he received from the Pandya, the Pandya princess for his queen. The obtaining of the Pandya princess for his queen is also stated in the second verse of the Kanchi inscription quoted above. He is also said to have married the princess as a result of victories that he won

1. Kshayam nītvā sōyam Kalibalamiva arātīnivahān
   Jaya Śrīvat Kṛtva nija sahacharim Pāṇḍyatanayām;
   Trayatrimśādvāravē yaśa iva yayau Kēralapadam
   Raraksha sōyam rāṣṭram nagaram iva Kōḷambam-adhipaḥ.
2. Līla Tilakam, see above p. 163.
in war against his enemies. This statement is followed up by another that he attained to suzerain rule over Kērāla also in consequence. Obviously this seems to be explained in the Malayalam verse where we are told that Ravi Varma defeated a Vikrama Pandya in battle, and, by handing him over to the Pandya ruler of the time, obtained the Pandya’s daughter for his queen. We may therefore take it that Ravi Varma fought against a Vikrama Pandya who apparently ruled over Vēṇāḍa, and defeated him in battle; and the fact that he handed over Vikrama Pandya to the Pandyan ruler of the time, seems to indicate clearly that this Vikrama Pandya set up as a rebel, at any rate, set up as an independent ruler in the country of Kērāla. We found, as we stated above, that among the rulers that assisted in the government of the Pandya empire, a Vikrama Pandya under Jaṭāvarman Sundara. In this century it seems to have been more or less the general practice that the ruling Pandya was assisted by a number of his brothers. The foreign travellers who visited the country generally stated that there were five Pandyas ruling at the same time. We noted already that we have mention of two such rulers, a Vira Pandya, conqueror of Ceylon and a Vikrama Pandya of the Travancore country. There are some Tamil verses relating to the latter. One of them is a general one stating that “the hill Podiyil, the streams running down the sides of which scatter their spray in front of the rising sun, is the hill of the Pandya, Vikrama Pandya, who wore the garland of Indra, and who, in great anger, defeated the king of Vēṇāḍ.” ¹ Another verse also found in the temple at Chidambaram like the previous one, addresses this Vikrama Pandya and warns him against marching northwards against his enemies ‘having once returned from there, as the ruler there happened to be a lady.’ ² Here is a Vikrama Pandya who is said to have conquered Vēṇāḍ, the Travancore country proper, and who went against the Kākatiya kingdom, and is said to have returned from there without conquering that kingdom as the ruler there happened to be a woman. The woman there of course is queen Rudramba who succeeded her father Ganapati. This incident and this war belongs to the period which falls within the 33rd year of Ravivarma Kulaśekhara’s age, and refers specifically to the conquest of Vēṇāḍ by Vikrama Pandya. We have to infer from this that this Vikrama Pandya who conquered Vēṇāḍ perhaps made an effort to set himself up against the last great Pandya Māravarman Kulaśekhara, and Ravivarman Kulaśekhara’s services consisted in defeating him and handing him, and the territory perhaps, over to the Pandya ruler for

¹ Endumaruvi-iravipuruvirinnum
Pāṇḍivalai viśum Podiyil—Kānduśina
Vēṇāḍanai veṭra Vikkirama Pāṇḍiyan meyp-
Pūṇāram pūṇāṇ poruppu.

² Vengan madayānai Vikkirama Pāṇḍiyanē
Pongi vaḍa disaiyirpōkkādē—Yangiruppāl
Peṇgeṇīr minḍa Perumāḷē pērisaiyāḷp-
Pannoṛum Vēyvāypakai.
the time being, who in return bestowed his daughter upon him. This would mean that Ravi Varman Kulaśēkhara defeated the rebel Vikrama Pandya and earned the gratitude of Māravarman Kulaśēkhara Pandya, whose daughter he married in consequence. Māravarman Kulaśēkhara was ruler of Madura, and if the statements of Marco Polo and other travellers are to be given full credit, there must have been in this reign a number of Pandya princess ruling over different parts of the country, and a Vikrama Pandya, the valiant lieutenant of Jatāvarman Sundara, holding rule in Vēnāḍ, might have set up as a rebel. All this Ravi Varman Kulaśēkhara achieved before A.D. 1299. The next following verse which gives Ravi Varma the title Sangrāma Dhīra, the great in war, states that “having defeated in a great battle his enemy Vīra Pandya, Sangrāmadhīra brought under subjection to the Kērāla rule, the Pāṇḍya and the Chola kings as if these rulers were indeed policy embodied. In the 46th year of his age, he crowned himself on the banks of the Vēgavati, and, placing himself upon the throne, he bespoiled for a long time in the company of the goddess of the earth, and the goddesses of Victory, Learning and Wealth”. This verse tells us plainly that 13 years after the first achievement, he conquered the Pandya and Chola kingdoms and brought them into subjection to him as ruler of Kērāla, and, as if to mark this great achievement, he crowned himself at Kāṇchī and was ruling prosperously for a long time thereafter; that is, between the years A.D. 1299 and 1312, he defeated the enemy by name Vīra Pāṇḍya, reduced the Pāṇḍya kingdom and the Chola to subjection, and anointed himself at Kanchi as the supreme ruler of the Tamil land. This Vīra Pandya must be the Vīra Pandya, the natural son of Māravarman Kulaśēkhara, whose accession to power it was that brought about the fratricidal war which provided the occasion, if an occasion were wanted, for the Muhammadan invasion of the south. We have noted above that Māravarman Kulaśēkhara in the late years of his reign (A.D. 1293) appointed Vīra Pandya to a co-regency which his son Sundara Pandya probably by the crowned queen, resented and showed himself hard-hearted enough to put his own father to death ultimately by assassination. This brought on the civil war in which Vīra Pandya had the upper hand, and Sundara Pandya had to flee to the camp of Malik Kafur and invite him to invade the Pandya country. When Malik Kafur successfully defeated Vīra Pandya and placed Sundara Pandya on the throne and left on the return journey with his army, Vīra Pāṇḍya probably tried to take advantage of the opportunity and placed himself on the throne again. Ravi Varman Kulaśēkhara must have gone naturally to the help of his brother-in-law, Sundara Pandya, and thus reduced, the Pandya was in subordination to Ravi Varman Kulaśēkhara in

1. Jitvā Sangrāmadhīro nrpatiradhiraçām vidvisham Vīra Pāṇḍyam Kṛtvāsa Pāṇḍya-Cholam naya iva tanumān Kērālēbhōpyadhānīnā; Shaḍchhatvārimśadadbastaṭabhuvi makuṭam dhārayan Vēgavatyaḥ kriḍan Simhāsanasthāśchirimakṛta mahī Kirtī Vāṇī Ramābhiḥ.
respect of his kingdom which at the time included even the kingdom of the Cholas, as the Chola power had become practically extinct almost for two generations as a distinct kingdom. The statement therefore seems so far correct, that, by his defeat of Vira Pándya, Ravi Varman Kulaśekhara brought the Pandyas and the Chola kingdom into subordination to him. The next verse proceeds to state that “having brought the Kerala, Chola and Pandyas under his authority, and, having celebrated his conquest by his coronation, he turned out from Konkan (to which Vira Pándya had gone after his defeat for protection) into the forests further north, his great enemy Vira Pándya, by thoroughly defeating him at the head of his great army, King Sangrāma Dhira wrote out his fourth year in the city of Kāñchik. This ruler, the head jewel of the family of Yadus, enjoys the rule of the earth extending from the Himalayas in the north to the Malayas in the south, and bounded by the eastern and the western mountains”. The point requiring explanation in verse 4 is the year 4. His coronation on the banks of the Vegavati is already under reference in a previous verse, and his writing down the fourth year in Kanchi should mean that it must be the fourth year after this coronation of his and would give the date of the grant which provided for the celebrations of certain festivals, etc., in the temple. The coronation on the banks of the Vegavati, was in his 46th year. This must therefore be his 50th year, which would mean the year A.D. 1315. He established himself as the ruler of Kerala in 1299 in succession to his father. He made himself suzerain over the Tamil kingdoms and crowned himself in Kanchi in A.D. 1309-10, and indicted this inscription in A.D. 1314-15. A prose passage following in Sanskrit describes him in glorious terms, giving him the same attributes as in the verses above, but adding one or two characteristic features of his. One term which calls for attention is that he is described here, the worshipper at the lotus feet of Śri Padmanābha. He is said to be an expert in the 64 kalās or branches of learning, and in consequence he is called a Dakshina Bhoja. He is also given the supreme titles of Rājādhirāja, Paramēśvara and Tribhuvana Chakravarti as if to leave it in no doubt that he established himself as the suzerain ruler of the whole of South India.

Other Inscriptions of Ravi Varman Kulaśekhara.

An inscription of his which is found in the temple at Śrīrangam, is


almost in the same terms, and indicates his devotion to the God at Śrīrangam without giving the details in a specific form in which he has done it in the Arulāla Perumāl inscription. He seems to indicate in terms in verse 31 of this record, that he restored the temple of Śrīrangam by re-establishing the deity there with all the holy ceremonies necessary after the defilement of the Muhammadan invasions. He is in the course of this record described as a man who had full knowledge of the religion of the Veda, and did all that was necessary to make Śrīrangam the holy place that it was before the Muhammadan invasions. The grant itself refers to the provision that he made for the gift of money to a certain number of very learned Brahmans on a particular day in the year, and to be continued from year to year. This is followed by a laudatory poem composed of 18 couplets of which 16 are in praise of him, the two others being the necessary concluding stanzas, by a poet Kavi Bhūshaṇa. The poem, of course, is cast in the characteristic style of laudatory poems, and what is stated in verse 2 deserves attention. Sangrāma Dhīra is here described as the strong support, in the age of Kali, of Dharma that had grown weaker on account of the character of the age in conformity with the general principle that a king is the champion-protector of the weak. In the course of the poem he is addressed more than once as Dakshina Bhoja and in the closing verse, verse 16, his title Sangrāma Dhīra is described as the holy Panchākshara, the name of five letters, giving similar relief to those who might make incantations therewith, as the real Panchākshara of Śiva. The next inscription of importance of this ruler in the Tamil country is one coming from Tiruvadi in the South Arcot District from the Viratānēśvara temple. The inscription is dated both in the Kali and the Saka years, the former, 4414, and the latter obviously 1235, of which it is only the last two digits that are clear. The date works out correctly to A.D. Dec. 29, 1313. He is again stated to have performed the great ablution of the whole sanctum of the temple from the pinnacle to the basement and provided it with a stone called Puraścharāṇa stone. This usually is a sort of an entrance pavilion, or chamber, where those who have to enter the sanctum for worship do all that is necessary to put themselves in a condition of spiritual fitness for the holy office. This is a feature of temples which is not generally marked off distinctly in South Indian temples, at any rate not called by that name. But a single stone platform with a pavilion over is a prominent feature of the temple of Padmanabha in Trivandum. The ceremony of Puraścharāṇa is provided for in

1. Labdhā sāgara nēmi bhūmi vishayā rantum pratishtā yata-
   Stasmai Śrī Kulasēkharō Yadupatiśrkuśatrahudamanīḥ;
   Rangēsmin Kamalā sahāya Harayē ramyam pratishtām dadau
   Sāntaḥ pratyuapakurvatē-hyupakṛtē Sarvē Kimatraēbdhutam.
2. Durbalasya balam Rājētyēśhē satyā Sarasvatī;
   Sangrāmādiḥo Dharmasya durbalasya balam Kalau.
3. Sangrāmādiḥa ityētam mantram panchāksharam buddhāḥ;
   Japanto durgatim nitva prāpinvari parām śivam.
the Āgamas, particularly the Pāñcarātra texts, and it should naturally be that in the Śaiva Āgamas as well. While the ceremony is prescribed as a common feature, the pavilion feature is not so well known in South Indian temples. This brings us to the grand climacteric in the meteoric career of Ravi Varman Kulaśekhara. Before closing this section, it must be mentioned that another inscription of this ruler is found in Poonamalle called Śēra-Pāṇḍya Chaturvedimangalam, but undated, conveying, however the same kind of information as the previous ones. The insignia on the top of the inscription, however, shows the elephant goad (Aikuśa), the sign of the Chēras, surmounting the fish and the tiger, the signs of the Pandyā and the Chola, thereby indicating clearly the establishment of the dominance of the Chēra over the other Tamil kingdoms, Pandyā and Chola.

Critical Examination of Ravi Varman’s Claims.

This somewhat detailed examination of the inscriptions of Ravi Varman Kulaśekhara sets forth the career of this ruler in some detail; but this account taken from his records by themselves, would still fall short of history without some confirmatory evidence in regard to at least those points where the deeds of Ravi Varman Kulaśekhara bring him into contact with other rulers of South India of the time. We shall therefore have to examine this account in the light of the information available in regard to the condition of South India at the time. Taken in series we may accept the date of his birth A.D. 1266 without further question. When he came to the throne of his father, Jayasimha had managed to increase the prestige of the family by extending his influence over the neighbouring princes of the Chēra, so that he was perhaps something more than the mere hereditary prince of the Kūpaka Dēśa. He seems to have made an effort to bring Vēnāḍ under his influence, if not exactly under his authority, and to extend his authority into the really Tamil parts of the Chēra kingdom, probably not without success. When he died and the state descended to his son, it was not merely the hereditary state of Kūpaka, or Jayasimhanāḍ as it came to be called, but a somewhat extended territory. The first landmark in Ravi Varman’s career is his 33rd year by which time he had achieved primacy among the rulers of Kēraḷa, thanks to the exertions of his father, and perhaps also his own. Now we come upon a definite historical statement that, when he ascended the throne of his father in his 33rd year, that is, A.D. 1299, he could give credit to himself of a signal achievement which resulted in his marriage with the Pāṇḍya princess. We shall have to find out who this Pāṇḍya Princess actually was and how he managed to secure her hand in marriage. There is some collateral evidence, and we quoted from literature a Malayalam verse which goes a little further than his inscriptions and gives the detail that he distinguished himself by a successful campaign against a Vikrama Pandyā, and that it was by means of this victory that he gained the Pāṇḍya princess for his queen. We mentioned already

that the name Vikrama Pandya is fairly common in the list of the Pandyas of the time, and that the name occurs among those who co-operated with Jataavarman Sundara Pandy, and pointed out at the same time that that seemed at first sight a little anachronistic. We have now to consider who this Vikrama Pandya was, and how by defeating him Ravi Varman Kulashekara earned the gratitude of the reigning Pandya for the time being. We have noted already that the reigning Pandy was Maravarman Kulashekara, who came to the throne some time in A.D. 1268, and had a rule of at least 42 years. He was the last great Pandy, and ruled over the Pandyan and the Chola kingdoms combined into one empire almost. So the Pandyan ruler with whom Ravi Varman Kulashekara got into alliance should be no other than this Maravarman Kulashekara Pandy. While he began his reign peacefully and perhaps continued to reign for some years in peace notwithstanding the fact that other Pandy princes who claimed to rule some region or other of the Tamil country simultaneously with him, and, in consequence, foreign travellers describe South India as being governed by Five Pandyan kings simultaneously, generally taken as brothers. Some time later in his reign, comes into prominence one of these a Maravarman Vikrama Pandya, for whom we have dates ranging from A.D. 1283 onwards in certain regions of the Tamil country. He claims credit for being the conqueror of Kakatiya Gana Pati and the Chalukya ruler Vijaya Gandagopa. As Gana Pati died about A.D. 1260, these achievements of his could be no other than the achievements of Jataavarman Sundara Pandya I with whom he might have co-operated in his northern campaigns. But what induced him to give himself titles of sovereign ruler in A.D. 1291 is not very clear. There must have come about some kind of a relaxation in the hold over these in the later years of Maravarman Kulashekara, that perhaps led to, it may be, an effort on the part of Vikrama Pandya to set himself up independently of Kulashekara. Since the records of this Pandya before A.D. 1291 do not make the claim, we may take it that it was about that year that the Pandya prince found some reason to set up this extraordinary claim. By A.D. 1290 Ravi Varman Kulashekara would have been about 24 years, and, as a young man, he might have operated against Vikrama Pandya in his father's campaign, and achieved the signal distinction referred to in the Malayalam verse quoted above. Vikrama Pandya's activities in Venaad find mention in the Tamil verse found among those on the east gopura of Chidambaram one of which states categorically that the hill Podiyil is specifically the hill of this Pandya, and that he conquered Venaad. This must have been under Jataavarman Sundara I as his records claim this conquest. If Ravivarman turned him out of Venaad either in co-operation with his father, or by himself alone, he could give himself credit for having beaten him, and, if actually he made a prisoner

2. Epig: 116 of the Collection for 1900.
of him and sent him over to the Pandya ruler for the time being against whom Vikrama Pandya would have been a rebel by his act, it would seem only natural that he did so. So this achievement of the defeat of Vikrama Pandya, the conquest of Vēgaṭī and the extension of authority of the Kūpaka prince to South Travancore in fact, would naturally follow, the more so, if, in gratitude for this victory, the Pandya had bestowed the princess upon Ravi Varman Kulaśekhara. Ravi Varman Kulaśekhara, would then have become the son-in-law of Māravarman Kulaśekhara, the last great Pandya and brother-in-law of his son Sundara Pandya, not Jaṭāvarman Sundara Pandya II. but perhaps the Pandya prince who figures in inscriptions as Māravarman Sundara Pandya. The claim therefore that by the 33rd year of his age, Ravi Varman Kulaśekhara achieved primacy among the rulers of Chēra, and attained to the position of being the chosen son-in-law of the great Pandya contemporary Māravarman Kulaśekhara himself seems well founded. This would be about the year A.D. 1299, which seems to fit in very well with what is recorded in Māravarman Vikrama Pandya’s inscriptions. It seems therefore historically demonstrable that his early achievements are real.

*The Significance of his second Coronation.*

The next set of achievements have reference to the period following and take us to the 46th year of Ravi Varman Kulaśekhara which would be A.D. 1311-12, and 12 to 13 years from his coronation and marriage with the Pāṇḍya princess. In his 46th year he is said to have crowned himself on the banks of the Vēgaṭī. Vēgaṭī is a stream which runs through the town of Kānci and quite close to the Arulāḷa Perumāḷ temple in Conjeevaram. He had already crowned himself in succession to his father as the suzerain ruler of Kērala, and what should this coronation be about, and that in a place like Conjivaram? The coronation here is obviously his crowning himself monarch with imperial pretensions to rule over the Tamil kingdoms of the Pandya and the Chola. It was stated already that as a result of his previous achievements he became the son-in-law of the great Pandya, Māravarman Kulaśekhara. If so, how are we to account for this conquest of the Pandya kingdom by Ravi Varman? Māravarman Kulaśekhara’s reign was very much disturbed in the later years. First there was the trouble created by his disaffected lieutenants among whom Vikrama Pandya was a prominent example. Later on he appointed one of his sons, Vīra Pandya, generally regarded as not the legitimate son, which may mean nothing more than that he was not the son of the crowned queen, to a government, leaving aside the heir-apparent Sundara Pandya. That prince seems to have taken the neglect too seriously, and perhaps made efforts to counteract the mischief that might arise from this act of the father. This must have led naturally to misunderstandings between the princes, often leading to perhaps even disturbances in the kingdom. It is stated that the legitimate prince Sundara Pandya put his father to death and asserted his own claims to succeed to
his father's position, and thus brought on the fratricidal war. This crime of Sundara Pandya does not appear to have been committed, soon after the appointment of Vira Pandya in A.D. 1296,1 as we have inscriptions of Māra-varman Kulaśekhara going down to his 42nd year, that is almost A.D. 1310.2 Sundara Pandya's crime, if it was actually committed, must have been more than a decade after the actual appointment of Vira Pandya to an important position. This would mean that Vira Pandya gradually consolidated his position, and perhaps had the countenance of his father as against, it may be, the machinations of the brother who did not wish that this Vira Pandya should gain too much power into his own hands and set up in succession to his father. When the matter was found to be well beyond peaceful solution, perhaps Sundara Pandya took upon himself the responsibility to assert his claims by even committing this crime. In the struggle that followed for the throne, he had the worst of it, as in fact he must have feared all the while, and had to fly for protection to the camp of Malik-Kafur and invite the Muhammadan army to invade the Pandya country. The Muhammadan invasions came and went, ostensibly defeating Vira Pandya and leaving Sundara Pandya to make good his claims to his ancestral kingdom, depleted of all the resources, which they left behind. It may be that Sundara Pandya was not as capable a prince as Vira Pandya, and, whatever capacity he had, it was impossible, could prevail against Vira Pandya in the crippled condition of the state. The evacuation of Madura by the Muhammadans was the signal for Vira Pandya to return and reassert his claims as against Sundara Pandya. In those circumstances if Ravi Varman went to the assistance of Sundara Pandya it would perhaps have been quite natural. But if Sundara Pandya was not able to do much for himself, and there was danger of anarchy in the Tamil country, the opportunity would have been too good for Ravi Varman Kulaśekhara to attempt to establish his supremacy over the Tamil kingdoms. Almost through the reign of Māra-varman Kulaśekhara, the Chola and the Pandya kingdoms seem to have been regarded as almost one, and the capital of Māra-varman is often spoken of as in the Chola town of Jayamkoṇḍaśolapuram, a few miles from Gangaikonduśolapuram. Ravi Varman’s intervention in the civil war in the Pandya kingdom and carrying the war farther northwards beyond the Pandya kingdom would but be natural in the circumstances; and, if he achieved the conquest of these two by beating the Muhammadan garrisons out of the kingdom if any were left behind and asserted his authority, not over the Pandya kingdom of his brother-in-law which may seem rather unnatural or improper to do, but over the Tamil empire of the time composed of both the Chola and the Pandya kingdoms, such an achievement would be great enough to be celebrated by a second coronation of the ruler in the holy city of Conjivaram; and such a coronation would follow the well established precedents of the Pandyas as well as the

Cholas. The coronation therefore on the bank of the river Veṅkā (Veṅgavatī) is not the coronation of Ravi Varman as ruler of Kēraḷa which had taken place already more than a decade before this, but as the suzerain king of the Tamil country in succession to the great Pandyas, Jaṭāvarman Sundara Pandya prominently and his successors. He apparently had other campaigns to conduct before he could feel sure of his new position as the supreme ruler of Kēraḷa, Pāṇḍya and Chola. Having conducted these campaigns successfully and to his satisfaction, he could return to Kanchi and set the seal of his great achievement by his donation to the temple, and the record that he made of it in the temple itself. The Vira Pāṇḍya that figures in these campaigns is certainly not the Vira Pāṇḍya we hear of in the earlier inscriptions, but the Vira Pandya, the son of Māravarman whom he appointed to a government in A.D. 1296. This is made certain by the statement that after being defeated in the Pandya country, this Vira Pāṇḍya fled to Konkan where from he had to be hounded out into the forests farther north, and it was only then that Ravi Varman could feel his achievement complete. Even so, we shall notice this very Vira Pandya returns and proves to be the means of undoing the achievement of Ravi Varman Kulaśekhara not very long after. But for the time Ravi Varman Kulaśekhara remained supreme ruler of South India. He was not content with having set up this inscription in the Conjiāram temple, but even went to other places, such as Srirangam and Tiruvadi where he restored the worship in the temples by performing the holy ablution and otherwise repairing the damages the temples had suffered from the spiritual as well as the material point of view. He also set up inscriptions detailing his achievements in places like Poonamalle in the Chingleput Dt., among these a victory over a Sundara Pandya, in the 4th year after his coronation on the bank of the Veṅkā (Veṅgavatī) as the supreme ruler of South India. His coronation on the bank of the river must have taken place in A.D. 1310-1311, and the inscriptions in these places are dated 1314-15.

A Historical Estimate of Ravi Varman’s Achievements.

This series of achievements of Ravivarman Kulaśekhara seems at first sight to be no more than warranted by the political exigencies of the time. We have high authority for the statement that statesmen, administrators and men of action generally have to adopt policies and courses of action according to the demands of the moment generally included in the term expediency, as the late Mr. Ramsay MacDonal told the members of a History Conference. But the proper appraising of the various influences that called for a particular course of action and the consequences to which such action usually led are matters which are to await the arrival of the historian whose function it is to weigh and consider the influence of each one of the factors that contributed to the adoption of a particular course of action, and the

---

results or further action to which this actually leads. Here is the case of Ravi Varman Kulaśêkhara, it may be the example of the father that led him gradually to the extensive conquests or extension of his authority. Jayasimha's efforts were to make the influence of Kūpaka dominant in Kēraḷa, which meant the extension of his authority over Vēṇāḍ and the Tamil part of Travancore lying to the south of it as a preliminary. The conquest of Vēṇāḍ and the districts next adjoining would add very considerably to the prestige and influence of the ruler of Kūpaka, and perhaps entitle him to a primary among the small Chēra states comprising the whole of the kingdom of Chēra. That is one thing. But incidentally it should have brought Jayasimha and his son into hostile contact with the Pandya which naturally would lead them on, according to the exigencies of the moment, to take further action as occasion called for against the Pandyas unless they were in an unassailably strong position and maintained themselves in such a position. As it happened that was not to be the case with the Pandya kingdom as it was at the time. There was much that is unsettling in the position, and the political balance of power could not be maintained with any chance of permanence. But more than this chance of simple aggression, the very operations in South Travancore brought Ravi Varman Kulaśêkhara into contact with the Pandyas which fructified into more intimate relationship between the two ruling families. The extinction of the authority of the usurping Pandya prince, Vikrama-Pandya, led on to a marriage alliance, which is only symbolical of a political alliance. This necessarily would bring the Kēraḷa ruler to take more active interest in the affairs of the Tamil kingdoms. The time when Ravi Varman Kulaśêkhara succeeded his father happened to be one of the great stir in the Pandya country through an act of the great Pandya Māravarman Kulaśêkhara who created for himself a crop of trouble by the appointment of Vira Pandya to a government as it seemed to the neglect of the heir-apparent. The consequential struggles of this impolitic act of the great Pandya naturally would give Ravi Varman Kulaśêkhara the opportunity for intervention even if he should be peacefully inclined so far as the territory across the mountain border of Travancore is concerned. The death of Māravarman Kulaśêkhara Pandya accentuated the further crisis by the acts of Vira Pandya on the one side struggling for the throne as was anticipated, and by the effort of Sundara Pandya to come into what was legitimately his own, and offered a good political crisis for Ravi Varman's intervention on behalf of his own brother-in-law as against the ambitious, if unlegitimate, Vira Pandya. But Sundara Pandya's flight to the Muhammadan camp instead perhaps stayed any action that Ravi Varman Kulaśêkhara could have taken, and the fact that Ravi Varman did not then interfere is evidence of his prudence. If Malik-Kafur on behalf of Allaud-din sympathised with Sundara Pandya and rendered him assistance, Ravi Varman's intervention would be superfluous, and would lead to consequences which would complicate his position badly. Perhaps he also suspected as many others must have and in fact Sundara Pandya himself must
have done, the Muhammadan garrisons were not going to settle down there permanently, or effect permanent conquest of the distant Tamil parts at all, in the face of Allaud-din’s caution that his ambition was not the conquest of a distant empire. When the Muhammadan garrison left Madura, Vira Pandya who had been defeated and driven away would naturally appear again, and that was the occasion which would call for Ravi Varman’s intervention, and so he intervened. Vira Pandya again fled from the field of battle and escaped into Konkan wherefrom he was driven farther north into the forests by Ravi Varman Kulaśekhara himself. But this intervention in behalf of Sundara Pandya could not be such a simple matter as Māra-varman Kulaśekhara’s empire took into it the whole of the Chola country and the Chola feudatories were up in arms against Rājarāja, the last Chola ruler and his successors. That naturally drew him on into the Chola empire to see to it that the rebel feudatories of the Chola country did not create further trouble for Sundara Pandya. That meant military intervention and more than one campaign which occupied him three years in all, perhaps more than three years, at the end of which he could count himself upon having accomplished a complicated task, of which at least he must have had some idea even at the outset of his intervention. It is in token of this successful accomplishment that he crowned himself at Conjeevaram, the northern capital of the Cholas and the city particularly which was the bone of contention between the powerful northern feudatories of the Cholas and the Cholas themselves. It besides signified the assertion of the authority of the southern rulers as against the one other Hindu power that was left, the Hoysala which was left in peace by the Muhammadans because of his obvious early submission. The Hoysala ruler found it profitable to take advantage of the disturbances in the northern frontier of the Tamil kingdoms to extend his own authority gradually into this region. So Ravi Varman’s coronation at Conjeevaram would signify at once the assertion of his authority over the two Tamil kingdoms, and would amount to an assertion of his authority over the three Tamil kingdoms. In fact his coronation in Kanchi would have been a Trātrāja Paṭṭābhideka or an imperial coronation as the conferment of the title Trākshatrachūḍāmaṇi in the Śrīrangam epigraph will show. Having done this to symbolise the assertion of his authority, he had to make it good by actual campaigns, and he did so by marching further northward and fighting and placing on record the consummation of this achievement by donations to the great temples of the south, Conjeevaram, Śrīrangam and Tiruvadi, and even comparatively smaller places such as Poonamalee in the Chingleput District. Poonamallee is called Śrā Paṇḍya Chaturvedi Mangalam perhaps in honour of his brother-in-law, and so it is named in this inscription, and that in the inscription the ankuśa is made to dominate the tiger and the fish is again another clear indication, if such were wanted, of

1. The epigraphists’ report ascribes this to the defeat of Jaṭāvarma Sundar Pāṇḍya II. (Vide Ep. Rep., 1911, p. 79.)
this assertion of his overlordship. We therefore seem entitled to infer that Ravi Varman Kulaśekhara’s intervention in the Tamil country was not merely the result of accidents or the exigencies of his position as the son-in-law of the last great Pandya and the brother-in-law of the legitimate aspirant to the throne, but an act of Ravi Varman Kulaśekhara with a view to establish his authority as the supreme ruler of the South in succession to the great Cholas and the Pandyas in the centuries before him.

Apart from this imperial act, there is much to the credit of Ravivarman Kulaśekhara which ought to receive attention in any estimate of him as a man and ruler. He seems to have been highly educated, as in fact several members of this dynasty of Travancore rulers were, and stood high in the estimation of the Pandits of his court as a scholar. He is credited with having written the drama Pradyunmbhyudayam intended to celebrate one of the striking exploits of Krishna-Vishnu, and the drama is said to have been intended to be put on the boards on the Yātra festival of Śrī Padmanābha, apparently the God in Trivandrum. There is nothing on the face of it to call this authorship into question. We know it has been in respect of the great Harsha of Kanauj, and it is sometimes taken for granted, rather too easily, that some poet of the court composed the drama and foisted it upon the ruler for the time being as patron. While on the face of it, it seems possible, it does not appear to us unlikely that rulers essayed writing these pieces as exhibitions of their own scholarship; and there is nothing to prevent such works being published, if need be after revision by the Pandits of the court, provided they received the approval of the assembled Pandits after being read before them as was usually the case. It seems therefore not at all unlikely that Ravivarman Kulaśekhara wrote the drama above mentioned. The more so, as he is stated, beyond all possibility of doubt, to have been so competent a scholar in poetics and rhetoric that he was requested by the poets of his court to be their guide in reading through Maṅkhuka’s Kāvyas Alanikāra Laksanam. The exposition made by him to the assembled Pandits of his court has been incorporated by Samudrabandha as Alanikāra Sarvasva and is available to us now. That the assembled Pandits of a court should discuss a work on poetics and rhetoric such as the one mentioned, in the presence of the king seems more or less the usual practice when the sovereign was a man with some pretensions to learning. Of course, the Pandits would discuss points of doubt, difficulty and importance, the king following the discussions usually with intelligence and understanding. But when a king did happen to be a scholar, he was usually made the President and his award as to the proper understanding or interpretation would be accepted in cases of doubt. This in fact is said to have been the practice in regard to the holding of assemblies of learning called Brahma Sadas. It is laid down that a Brahma Sadas should be assembled only by a king with high qualifications in learning, qualifications which would entitle him to occupy the presidential chair, and his awards were, whenever they were called for, accepted as final. We have a record of such assemblies held, one in
Ujjain and one in Pātaliputra, in the Kāvyamāṁśā of Rājaśekhara, where these formal assemblies were actually held, and degrees in proficiency were conferred on various exponents not only of literature but even of the arts. Apart from these formal assemblies convened for the purpose of examining learned people and setting the seal of approval of a learned body upon the degree of proficiency to which they had attained, the courts of Indian princes were in many cases informal assemblies of learned men on many occasions, and interesting discussions often took place in which particular sovereigns when sufficiently competent took an active part also. It would therefore be nothing unlikely if a talented prince like Ravivarman Kulaśekhara should have exhibited sufficient learning to have struck his courtier poets as being worthy to act as their guide in the discussions upon this difficult rhetorical work. In the light of this knowledge we possess, of some at least of the rulers of India, it may be carrying scepticism too far to decline to accept what the poet Samudrabandha states in so many words in the Prolegomena to his Alanākārasarvasva. He says in effect that the assembled poets requested Ravivarman that, in their difficult voyage through the sea of Alanākāra, as expounded in the text of Maṅkhuka, he might prove to be their ship to carry them across in safety. Ravivarman himself is said to have given the exposition called afterwards Alanākārasarvasva on Maṅkhuka’s work, which was collected and edited by Samudrabandha. It seems therefore clear that Ravivarman as a prince, was a cultivated prince with a taste in literature which led him almost instinctively to correct judgments which evoked the admiration of the poets of his court, and it is perfectly likely that they should have sat down and discussed day to day before him the work with his approval, and the result of these discussions might well have been recorded by a careful scholar which, in the actual circumstances of the case, might justifiably be held to be the work of the prince and allowed to pass as such. The Alanākārasarvasva of Samudrabandha may have been a work of that kind, for the quality of which the ruler Ravivarman may have been essentially responsible. It is to the great credit of an active ruler like Ravivarman Kulaśekhara that he should have cultivated a difficult branch of learning to this high degree of proficiency, and left us sufficient evidence of his achievement therein. That he should have found it possible to do so in the course of a life of great activity in other departments of work is greatly to his credit.

1. Kadāchin Maṅkhukopajñām Kāvyāāṅkāra lakṣaṇam || Pradarṣya Ravivarmāṇam Prārthayanta Vipaśchitaḥ || Gambhiram nas titirshūṇām Maṅkhukagranthasāgaram || Naurastu bhavataḥ prajñā sthēyasi Yadunandana ||

   * * *

   Ityuktvaisha manishāvaibhava paribhūta vāsavāchāryaḥ || Budha parishad alanākāro vyākhyadalāṅkārasarvasvam ||

   Avadhytayi Yadupatīnā vivratasya garīyasastadarthasya ||

   Kaśchid vyadhita vipaśchid śabda nibandham Samudrabandhākhyāḥ ||
Why Ravi Varman's Achievements proved Ephemeral.

Such as it was, Ravi Varman Kulaśekhara's achievement, though for a moment it succeeded, and perhaps even gave promise of permanence to those that assisted in his coronation as the supreme ruler of the Tamil land, still proved to be disappointingly short-lived. This was not because that there was anything inherently impossible in his ambition, but it seems to have been in the actual position of affairs at the time and the accident of his death soon after his accomplishment. We know from South Indian inscriptions that the last year of Māravarman Kulaśekhara was his 42nd year. That would take him to the year A.D. 1309. His successor, according to the practice of the Pandyas must have been Jaṭāvarman Sundara Pandya. We have a record of his 11th year dated January 1314,1 which would mean that he must have come to the throne about January 1303. This would make the crime of patricide open to doubt, as the son and the father ruled together for about 11 years, unless Sundara put his father to death after this period, and some time at the beginning of A.D. 1309. Whatever that be, we have records of a Māravarman Kulaśekhara who must have been the successor of this Jaṭāvarman Sundara Pandya. The date of commencement of his rule is somewhere about January 1315, his earliest record being one of his 2nd year with a date equivalent to January 1316.2 Therefore Jaṭāvarman Sundara Pandya must have died before December 8, A.D. 1315, which is the date of the first record of Māravarman Kulaśekhara II.3 So soon after Ravi Varman Kulaśekhara's 4th year after his imperial coronation Jaṭāvarman Sundara Pandya died, and Māravarman Kulaśekhara succeeded to the Pandya throne. But about the same time, Ravi Varman Kulaśekhara seems to have died as well. We find inscriptions of Muppidi Nāyaka, the general of the Kākatiya king, one of which states that he effected entry into Conjivaram on March 25th, and issued two grants in favour of the temple on June 11th and 16th, A.D. 1316.4 This Muppidi Nāyaka claims to have appointed a certain Mānavīra as the ruler of Conjivaram. This person seems to have been a Telugu Chola chief, as the record orders the payment in the coinage of Gandāgōpāla.5 Whether this is real or no, the fact gives clear evidence of the establishment of the Kākatiya authority in Conjivaram, which would mean the definite ejection of Ravivarman's authority from the place. The next year A.D. 1317, the ruler of Travancore is said to be Vira Udaya Mārثāṇḍa Varman,6 as successor to Ravi Varman Kulaśekhara. He may have been his son or some other. Ravi Varman Kulaśekhara would have been then 50 years in the year A.D. 1316, and while it is not impossible that a

2. Ep., 103 of 1920.
5. Sewell's Historical Ins. of South India, 170-180.
man could die at 50, it looks likely that there was war between the Kākatiyas and Ravivarman Kulaśēkhara, and probably he fell in the fight. If this should have been actually so, the death of Ravivarman Kulaśēkhara would be a prime factor in the undoing of his work of empire building for Travancore. The aggression of the Kākatiyas under Pratāparudra would be understandable, as there was constant contention for the possession of the territory extending northwards from Kanchi to the banks of the Krishna, between the Kākatiyas on the one side and the rulers of the Tamil country Chola or Pandya. In this constant struggle, the Hoyśala was gradually and slowly establishing his authority in this region; but at this particular stage, he seems to have had no influence in what happened. The death of Ravivarman Kulaśēkhara therefore left the empire without a warden, and happening as it did so soon after he established it, the other forces asserted themselves and brought about the dismemberment again. In the same year we have a record of Jātāvarman Virapāṇḍya in the Tinnevelly District dated in his 21st year in October 1317. That would mean Virapāṇḍya had recovered his position so far as to hold rule over a part of the Tamil country, and in the next following years, we find his inscriptions fairly all over the central region of the Tamil country. This gives clear evidence of the undoing of the work of Ravivarman Kulaśēkhara.

Permanent Results of Ravivarman’s work.

Ravivarman Kulaśēkhara’s achievements therefore amount to the creation of the State of Travancore as it is at the present time as a political entity. His further effort to step into the breach as the leading power in South India was so far successful that had he continued to live longer and carry out his project a little further, it might have brought him into a clash with the last Hoyśala which might have proved detrimental to South India if the rivalry between the two powers actually developed into a war for supremacy. But even so, it is only a comparatively short period of respite that was given to the south during the confusion of the last years of the reign of Allaud-din, and aggravated by his death, which was followed by a struggle for succession. When Sultan Mubarak emerged successfully from out of this and adopted a vigorous policy, it looked as if South India would have to face another Muhammadan invasion ending in perhaps a more permanent occupation. The difficulties at headquarters necessitated the return of the general of Mubarak, Khusru, and his return was the signal for another revolution which ended in the abolition of Khilji rule and the establishment of a new dynasty under the Tughalaks. It was given to the second Tughalak, Muhammad, who succeeded to his father’s position after a short reign of about five years to re-establish the Muhammadan power in the south. He was responsible for the establishment of a Muhammadan government in South India at Madura. Ravivarman Kulaśēkhara would have had to face this new flood of Muhammadan invasions. Whether he would have held out successfully against that is more than we can say for the present.
That rôle of champion of Hindu rule in the South fell to the lot of the last great Ballāla, Vīra Ballāla III, because of the disappearance of Ravivarman Kulaśekhara, who struggled hard throughout the last decade of his reign and fell in the efforts in his own turn. Notwithstanding this failure, the work that he attempted was carried to a successful conclusion by those who succeeded him and ended in the establishment of the Hindu empire of the South, which became known in history as the Empire of Vijayanagar. Ravivarman Kulaśekhara's effort may therefore be regarded as the first effort of this struggle which culminated in the successful establishment of the empire.
A Sanskrit Index to the Chândogya Upaniṣad

(With References to Other Sanskrit Texts.)
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I. a.


2. a- (2) (an- before vowels), neg. prefix. Gr. α’, α’; Lat. in- (as in Ital.); Germ. and Goth. un-; Eng. un-., in-. See Whitney, A Sanskrit Grammar, pp. 496-99, 508; Wüst, op. cit. p. 204ff.

3. Akārtṛ, m. : non-agent, non-doer. -tō (nom. sg.): VI, 16.2; VII, 9.1.

4. Ākāmacāra, a. : not moving at desire (will). -ras (nom. sg. m.): VII, 25.2; VIII, 1.6. For ātmaratir ātmakriṣa... cf. Muṇḍ. U. III, 1.3.

5. Akṛta, a. : uncreated (undone, unperformed, not made, incomplete).


8. Akṣāṇa, n. : eye. -ṣā (instr. sg.): IV, 17.9; -ṣās (gen. sg.): I, 7.4; -ṣāṇi (loc. sg.): I, 7.5; IV, 15.1; VIII, 7.4. Cf. B. Ā. U. II, 3.5; V, 5.2; Kauś. U. IV, 17.

9. Akṣara, n. : syllable (a : imperishable). -ram (nom.-acc. sg.): I, 1.1, 5, 7, 8; 2.14; 4.1, 4, 5; II, 10.3; -rasya (gen. sg.): I, 1.9, 10. -re (loc. sg.): I, 1.6. -tāni (nom. pl.): II, 10.4; 23.3 VIII, 3.5 (trīṇy ak-

ṣarāṇi saṭiyam iti cf. B. Ā. U. V, 5.1). See P. M. Modi, Aksara, A Forgotten Chapter in the History of Indian Philosophy, pp. 123-142; Baroda, 1932.

10. AKŚI, n.: eye. -siṇī (nom. du.): I, 6.7.
11. AKŚITA, a.: imperishable. -tam (nom. sg. n.): III, 17.6.1
12. AKŚETRAJṆA, a.: not knowing the place (country). -jñās (nom. pl. m.): VIII, 3.2.
13. AKHĀDANT, a.: not eating. -dan (nom. sg.): I, 10.4.
14. AGADA, a.: free from desease. -das (nom. sg. m.): III, 16.2, 4, 6.
15. AGNI, m.: fire; sacrificial fire; Agni. Gr. αἴγιλη and αἰγλαός; Lat. ignis; Lith. ugnis; Slav. огн; Goth. ahun-s. -nis (nom. sg.): I, 3.7; 6.1; 13.1; II, 2.1, 2; 20.1; 21.1 (cf. M. U. IV, 5; VI, 35); III, 13.3; 18.2; IV, 3.1; 6.1, 2; 7.3; 11.1; V, 4.1; 5.1, 6.1; 7.1; 8.1; 21.2; VII, 12.1; VIII, 1.3. -nim (acc. sg.): II, 12.2; III, 15.6; IV, 6.1; 7.1; 8.1; 17.1.
16. AGNITVA, n.: fiery state. -vam (nom. sg.): VI, 4.1, 4.
17. AGNIHOTRA, n.: fire-sacrifice. -ram (acc. sg.): V, 24.1, 2, 3, 5.
18. AGRA, n.: front; beginning; loc. at first. -re (loc. sg.): I, 8.2; 10.5; III, 19.1; VI, 2.1, 2; 11.1.
19. AGRASTA, a.: not swallowed. -tās (nom. pl. m.): II, 22.5. See Rg-Veda-Prātiṣākhya III, 14, 2, 3 edited by Max Müller, pp. CCLXXVF.
20. ANGA (1), plcl. emphatic. IV, 1.5; VI, 12.1; 13.1, 2.
21. ANGA (2), n.: member; limb; body. -gena (instr. sg.): II, 19.2.
22. ANGĀRA, m.: coal. -ras (nom. sg.): VI, 7.3. -ram (acc. sg.): VI, 7.5. -rās (nom. pl.): II, 12.1; V, 4.1; 5.1; 6.1; 7.1; 8.1. -rān (acc. pl.): V, 24.1.
23. ANGIN, a.: having members or limbs. -gi (nom. sg. m.): II, 19.2.
24. ANGIRAS, proper name (m.). -tās (nom. sg.): I, 2.10. -rasam (acc. sg.): I, 2.10.
25. ACITTA, a.: inconsiderate. -las (nom. sg. m.): VII, 5.2.
27. AJA, m.: a drove; goat. -jās (nom. pl.): II, 6.1; 18.1.
28. ANJALI, m.: the two open hands held together hollowed. -lau (loc. sg.): V, 2.6.
29. ANIMAN, m.: subtility (also as a superhuman faculty). -mā (nom. sg.): VI, 6.1, 2, 3, 4; 8.6; 9.4; 10.3; 11.3; 12.3; 13.3; 14.3; 15.3; 16.3.
-māṇam (acc. sg.): VI, 12.2. -mānas (gen. sg.): VI, 12.2; VIII, 6.1.

---

1. ... aksitam ası, a-cyutam ası, PRĀNA-SAMŚITAM ASI ıti ||

Dr. Papesso's translation (op. cit., p. 145—see No. 36) is an acute and concise interpretation of the passage: "... tu sei l'imperituro, sei l'inconsusso, sei L'AFFILATO DAL SOFFIO VITALE." Cf. Atharva-Veda X, 5.35.
30. ANIŚTHA, a. : smallest. -thas (nom. sg. m.): VI, 5.1, 2, 3.
31. ANU, a. : minute, subtle; small; atomic. anyyas (nom. pl. f.): VI, 12.1.
32. ATAS, adv. : from this; hence; therefore. I, 3.5; 12.1; III, 13.7; V, 10.6; VI, 12.1; VII, 25.1, 2; VIII, 4.2.
32bis. ATI, adv.-prep. : beyond I, 8.5, 7.
33. ATIJJHAVAN, a.: uninhabited. -ne (loc. sg.): VI, 14.1.
34. ATIDHANVAN, proper name (m.). -vā (nom. sg.): I, 9.3.
35. ATMIRTYU, a. : beyond death; overcoming death. -yu (acc. sg. n.):
II, 10.1, 6.
36. ATIVADIN, a. : over talkative. -di (nom. sg. m.): VII, 15.4:—
prāṇo ky eva etāni sarvāṇi bhavati. so vā esa evam paśyan evam manuṣāṁ evam vijad dhavati. tan ca ced bruṣyāḥ: ati-vādy asi iti. ati-vādy asmi iti bruṣyāt na apahnuvita ||
37. ATIVIMĀNA, a.: beyond measurement. -nam (acc. sg. m.): V, 18.1.
38. ATIŚEṢA, a.: remaining. -śin (acc. pl. m.): I, 10.5.
39. ATRA, adv.: here; there; in this place. II, 24.6, 10, 15; IV, 9.3; VI, 12.1; 13.2; VIII, 1.2; 3.2; 9.1, 2; 10.2, 4; 11.1, 2.
40. ATHA, adv.: now; then; so. I, 2.3, 4, 5, 6, 7; 3.1, 3, 6, 8; 5.1, 3.5; 6.5, 6; 7.1, 4, 5, 7, 8; 11.1, 3, 4, 6, 8; 12.1; II, 1.3; 2.2; 8.1; 9.1, 3-8; 10.1; 22.4; 24.2, 5, 9, 13, 14; III, 2.1, 3.1; 4.1; 5.1; 7.1; 8.1; 9.1; 10.1;

1. "Il paraît impossible de séparer ce texte d'un passage de la Mundaka-Upaniṣad, III, 1, 4, qui semble dire exactement le contraire, à savoir que celui qui connaît le prāṇa n'est pas un ativādin. Ou des deux textes l'un vise l'autre, ou ils visent l'un et l'autre quelque formule qui avait cours dans les écoles. Il n'est d'ailleurs pas impossible de les expliquer l'un et l'autre avec vraisemblance. Etymologiquement, ativāda se peut justifier soit pour dire 'langage excessif, violent, injurieux' (et cette acception est consacrée), soit pour dire 'langage sans mesure, bavardage inutile.' La seconde acception conviendrait bien à la Mundaka-Upaniṣad; ici ni l'une ni l'autre n'a d'application. Nous voyons par le paragraphe suivant que ativādati est entendu 'avoir l'avantage par la parole, dans la discussion', ce qui explique parfaitement ativādin. En même temps l'addition: 'Qu'il déclare qu'il est ativādin, qu'il ne s'en défend pas' implique que le rédacteur avait dans l'esprit l'autre sens, défavorable celui-là, d'ativādin pour dire 'un bavard, un diseur de riens', comme il est employé par la Mundaka-Upaniṣad. Il est donc probable que notre texte sacrifie ici une fois de plus au goût des jeux de mots, lequel y tient tant de place. Il se peut fort bien que le vers de la Mundaka-Upaniṣad vise le présent passage et prétende le redresser au nom du sens courant d'ativāda. Ne peut-on pas d'autre part supposer que l'application particulière qui est faite ici d'ati-vād s'inspire de tout l'exposé qui précède, dont le cadre est une accumulation de termes superposés, donc, en un sens étymologique, un ativāda?" (Émile Senart, "Chândogya-Upaniṣad", Paris, 1930, p. 101-2.)

11.1; 13.2, 3, 4, 5, 7; 14.1; 15.5-7; 16.3, 5; 17.2-4; 18.1, 2; 19.3; IV, 1.2;
3.3, 5; 5.1; 10.4; 11.1; 12.1; 13.1; 15.5; 16.4; 17.5, 6; V, 1.12-14; 2.4, 6,
7; 3.4; 9.1; 10.3, 5, 7, 8; 13.1; 14.1; 15.1; 16.1; 17.1; 20.1; 21.1; 22.1;
23.1; 24.2; VI, 7.2, 4; 8.5; 11.2; 13.1, 2; 14.2; 15.2; 16.1, 2; VII, 3.1; 4.1;
5.1, 2; 6.1; 8.1; 9.1; 10.1; 11.1; 13.1; 15.3; 17.1; 18.1; 19.1; 20.1;
21.1; 22.1; 24.1; 25.1, 2; VIII, 1.1, 6; 2.2-9; 3.2, 4, 5; 4.1; 5.1-3; 6.1, 4, 5;
7.4; 9.1; 12.4, 5.

41. ATHAKĀRA, m.: the sound atha. -ras (nom. sg.): I, 13.11
42. ATHARVĀNGIRAS, proper name (m.): member of the sacerdotal race
of Atharvan and Āṅgiras. -rasas (nom. pl.): III, 4.1, 2.
43. ADATKA, a.: toothless. -kam (acc. sg. n.): VIII, 14.1.
44. ADADĀNA, a.: not giving. -nam (acc. sg. m.): VIII, 8.5.
45. ADARŚANIYA, grdv.: not to be shown. -yam (acc. sg. n.): I, 2.4.
46. ADDHĀ, adv.: certainly; truly; indeed. III, 14.4.
47. ADYA, adv.: now-a-days; now. VI, 4.5; VIII, 8.5.
48. ADRAṬṬ, m.: non-seer. -ṭā (nom. sg.): VIII, 9.1.

49. ADVITĪYA, a.: without a second; unique. -yam (nom. sg. n.): VI,
50. ADHARA, a.: lower; inferior. -re (nom. pl. n.): IV, 1.4, 6.
51. ADHARĀṅC, a.: southwards. -rāṅ (nom. sg. m.): VI, 14.1.
52. ADHARMA, m.: unrighteousness. -mas (nom. sg. m.): VII, 2.1.
-mam (acc. sg.): VII, 2.1; 7.1.
53. ADHASTĀT, adv.-prep.: below; down. IV, 1.8; VII, 25.1, 2.
54. ADHI, adv.-prep.: on account of; concerning; on. V, 3.2; VI,
2.3, 4.
55. ADHIDAIvATAM, adv.: in reference to the divine. I, 3.1; 5.2; 6.8;
III, 18.1, 2; IV, 3.2.
56. ADHIPATI, m.: ruler; Lord. -tis (nom. sg.): V, 2.6.
57. ADHIŚṬHĀNA, n.: standing-place. -nam (nom. sg.): VIII, 12.1.
58. ADHYAYANA, n.: reading, studying. -nam (nom. sg.): II, 23.1.
59. ADHYATMAM, adv.: in reference to self. I, 2.14; 5.3; 7.1; III, 18.1,
2; IV, 3.3.
60. ADHVAN, m.: a road; way; space. -vana (acc. sg.): V, 10.5.
61. ADHVARYU, m.: officiating priest. -yus (nom. sg.): IV, 16.2.
62. ANA, m. breath; spiration. -nas (nom. sg.): V, 2.1. -nasya (gen.
sg.): V, 2.1
63. ANAGNA, a.: not naked. -nas (nom. sg. m.): V, 2.2.

1. -ayam vāva loko hau-kārah, vāyur hāi-kārah, candramā atha-kārah, ātmā
ika-kārah, agnīr i-kārah. According to SENART, op. cit., p. 16, footnote 1, "ces
diverses syllabes, appelées stobha, ont leur place marquée dans certaines parties du
chant liturgique. Par exemple atha est la lune parce que a est la première syllabe
d'α-nna, 'nourriture', que tha (qui se trouve dans sthita) évoque une idée de per-
manence, et que la lune, comme réceptable de l'ambroisie, est essentiellement nourri-
ture, etc."
64. ANADYAMĀNA, a. : not eating. *nas (nom. sg. m.): IV, 3.7.
65. ANANUVIDYA, grd. : not having discovered. VIII, 1.6; 8.4.
66. ANANUSHIYA, grd. without giving indication. V, 3.4.
67. ANANUCYA, grd. : not having taught. VI, 1.1.
68. ANANTA, a. : limitless. *tas (nom. sg. m.): I, 9.2.
70. ANANDHA, a. : not blind. *dhas (nom. sg. m.): VIII, 4.2; 10.1, 3.
71. ANANNA, n. : non-food. *nam (nom.-acc. sg.): IV, 3.7; V, 2.1.
72. ANAPĀNA, a. : not breathing out. *non (nom. sg. m.): I, 3.3, 4, 5.
73. ANASITU, m. : non-eating. *tum (acc. sg.): IV, 10.3.
74. ANASŪRI, m. : not unwise. *ris (nom. Sg.): IV, 3.7. (According to LÜDERS, ana-sūri [instead of an-a-sūri] “Lord of the breath”.)
76. ANĀRAMBAṈA, a. : having no support. *nāmi (nom. pl. n.): II, 9.4.
77. ANĀŚAKĀYANA, n.: a course of fasting. *nam (nom. sg.): VIII, 5.3. (According to another possible division (a-nāśaka-ayana), the word would mean “entrance into the unperishing.”)
78. ANĀHITĀŅI, a. : not keeping up the holy fire. *nis (nom. sg. m.): V, 11.5.
79. ANIRASTA, a. : not thrown forth. *tās (nom. pl. m.): II, 22.5 (See No. 19).
80. ANIRUKTA, a. : unuttered; not clearly explained. *tas (nom. sg. m.): I, 13.3; II, 22.1.
81. ANIŚTIṬHANT, a. : accomplishing naught. *than (nom. sg. m.): VII, 20.1. (For a discussion of the rendering of nistiṭhati, see SENART, op. cit., p. 103.)
82. ANU, adv.-prep. : after, along, over, near to; according to; in order. III, 16.2, 4, 6; IV, 2.2, 4; 17.9; V, 3.1, 4; 19.2; 20.2; 21.2; 22.2; 23.2; VIII, 9.1, 2; 12.4.¹
83. ANUJÑĀ, f. : assenting, permission. (nom. sg.): I, 1.8.
84. ANUTKRĀNTA, a. : not departed. *tas (nom. sg. m.): VIII, 6.4.
85. ANUTTAMA, a. : unsurpassed; best; without a superior. *mesu (loc. pl.): III, 13.7.
86. ANUPATĀPIN, a. : not ill. *pī (nom. sg. m.): VIII, 4.2.
87. ANUPANIYA, grd. : without having received. V, 11.7.
88. ANUPALABHYA, grd. : without having comprehended. VIII, 8.4.
89. ANUPĀNA, n. : drink. *nam (nom. sg.): I, 10.3.
90. ANUCĀNAMĀNIN, a. : thinking oneself learned. *ni (nom. sg. m.): VI, 1.2, 3.

91. ANR̥TA, a. : not true; false; n. falsehood. -tam (acc. sg. m.; nom.-acc. sg. n.): I, 2.3; VI, 16.1; VII, 2.1; 7.1; VIII, 3.1. -tena (instr. sg.): VI, 16.1; VIII, 3.2. (See Taitt. U. II, 6). ³
92. ANR̥TAPIDHĀNA, a.: having a cover of what is false. -nas (nom. sg. m.): VIII, 3.1. -nās (nom. pl. m.): VIII, 3.2.
93. ANR̥TABHISANDHA, a. : declaring untruth. -dhās (nom. sg. m.): VI, 16.1.
94. ANEVARVID, a.: not knowing thus. -dam (acc. sg.): IV, 17.10.
95. ANTA, m. : end, limit; object. -tam (acc. sg.): VIII, 1.5; 2.10.
-†āt (abl. sg.): VI, 13.2. -te (loc. sg.): V, 3.6. -teṣu (loc. pl.): VIII, 7.4.
96. ANТАTAS, adv.: finally. I, 2.9; 3.12.
97. ANTAR, adv.-prep. : in the middle; between; among. I, 6.6; 7.5; III, 12.4, 8, 9; 13.7; 14.3, 4; V, 8.1; 9.1; VIII, 1.1.-3.
99. ANTARIKṢA, n. : the middle of the three spheres or regions of life (in the Veda); atmosphere. -ṣam (nom.-acc. sg.): I, 3.7; 6.2; II, 2.1, 2; 17.1; III, 1.1; 15.5; IV, 6.3; VII, 6.1; 8.1; 10.1. -sāt (abl. sg.): III, 14.3; IV, 17.1. -se (loc. sg.): IV, 9.4.
100. ANTARIKṢAKIT, an: dwelling in the atmosphere. -te (dat. sg.): II, 24.9.
101. ANTARIKṢODARA, a. : amid the atmosphere. -ras (nom. sg. m.): III, 15.1.
102. ANTARHIDAYA, a.: in the heart. -yas (nom. sg. m.): VIII, 1.3.
103. ANTAVEYĀ, f.: hour of death; final hour. -lāyām (loc. sg.): III, 17.6.
104. ANTEVARṢIN, m. : pupil. -sine (dat. sg.): III, 11.5.
105. ANDHA, a.: blind. -dhas (nom. sg. m.): V, 1.9; 13.2; VIII, 4.2; 9.1, 2. -dhām (nom. sg. n.): VIII, 10.1, 3. -dhe (loc. sg.): VIII, 9.1, 2.
106. ANNA, n. : food. -nam (nom.-acc. sg.): I, 3.6; 8.4; 11.9; 12.2, 5; 13.2; II, 22.2; IV, 3.6, 8; 11.1; V, 2.1; 6.2; 7.2; 10.4, 6; 12.2; 13.2; 14.2; 15.2; 16.2; 17.2; 18.1; VI, 2.4; 5.1; VII, 4.2; 7.1; 9.1, 2; 10.1; 26.1. -nena (instr. sg.): VI, 7.6; 8.4. -nasya (gen. sg.): I, 8.4; 10.6; VI, 4.1-4, 6; VII, 4.2; 9.1, 2. -nāt (abl. sg.): VI, 8.4; VII, 9.2; 10.1. -ne (loc. sg.): I, 3.6.
107. ANNAPATI, m.: possessor of food. -te (voc. sg.): I, 12.5.

1. सच व्याख्यान । निरहुक्त चारिणीम् । निमित्तम् चानिमित्तम् । बिनाम् च चारिनवान् ।

"... though the Brahman has in this way been described as 'anṛta', the word anṛta does not mean false or unreal;... in the Taittiriya-upanisad... it is stated that 'this anṛta (invisible) Brahman is the pratiṣṭhā (support) of the world, that it does not depend on anything else, and that he who has realised this need not fear anything.' (B. G. Tilak, Gitā-Rahasya, I, p. 337; Poona, 1935. Transl. by B.S. Sukthankar.) See A M. Pizzagalli—E. G. Carpani, Taittiriya-Upanisad (Italian Translation with Critical Notes), Philosophical Series, 1, Italian Branch of the Indian Res, Institute."
108. ANNAPĀNA, n.: food and drink. -ne (nom. du.): VIII, 2.7.
109. ANNAPĀNALOKA, m.: the world of food and drink. -kena (instr. sg.): VIII, 2.7.
110. ANNAPĀNALOKAKĀMA, a.: desirous of the world of food and drink. -mas (nom. sg. m.): VIII, 2.7.
111. ANNAMAYA, a.: composed of food. -yam (nom. sg. n.): VI, 5.4; 6.5; 7.6.
112. ANNAVANT, a.: having food. -vān (nom. sg. m.): I, 3.7; 13.4; II, 8.3. -vatas (acc. pl.): VII, 9.2.
113. ANNĀDA, a.: eating food. -das (nom. sg. m.): I, 3.7; 13.4; II, 8.3; 12.2; 14.2; III, 13.1, 3; IV, 3.8. -dī (nom. sg. f.): IV, 3.8.
114. ANNĀDYA, n.: food; food in general. -yam (nom. sg.): III, 1.3; II, 2.2; 3.2; 4.2; 5.2; 13.1, 3; VI, 2.4. -yena (instr. sg.): V, 19.2; 20.2; 21.2; 22.2; 23.2.
115. ANYA, a.: another; another person; other. -yas (nom. sg. m.): I, 1.6; VII, 24.2. -yat (nom.-acc. sg. n.): II, 21.3; VII, 24.1; VIII, 3.2. -yam (acc. sg. m.): V, 11.3. -yasmī (dat. sg.): III, 11.6. -yasya (gen. sg.): I, 1.6. -yasmīn (loc. sg.): VII, 24.2. -ye (nom. pl. m.): I, 10.2; 12.2; IV, 3.8; 9.2. -yāni (nom. pl. n.): I, 3.5. -yās (nom. pl. f.): VIII, 6.6. -yān (acc. pl. m.): I, 11.2; IV, 10.1.
116. ANYATARA, a.: either of two; one of two. -rā (nom. sg. f.): IV, 16.3, 4. -rām (acc. sg. f.): IV, 16.2, 3.
117. ANYATRA, adv.: elsewhere. VI, 8.2, 4, 6; VIII, 11.3; 15.1.
118. ANYATHA, adv.: otherwise. VII, 25.2.
119. ANYARAṆJAN, a.: having another as sovereign. -jānas (nom. pl. m.): VII, 25.2.
120. ANYADRśA, a.: of another kind. -śas (nom. pl. m.): IV, 14.2.
121. ANYĀVAYATTA, a.: in accordance with. -tā (nom. sg. f.): I, 10.9-11; 11.4-9. -tās (nom. pl. m.): II, 9.2-8; III, 16.1, 3, 5. -tāni (nom. pl. n.): II, 9.2, 4.

(To be continued.)
ROUND THE MEHARAU LI INS CRIPTION

By

O. STEIN

The personality of a ruler, named Candra, in the Meharauli inscription, on the iron pillar near the Quṭb Mīnār, has formed the subject of many discussions and recently a new interpretation has been added. There existed till now three main hypotheses with regard to the ruler, mentioned in the short, kāvya-like written record. While the former views saw in the Candra either Candragupta I or II of the Gupta dynasty, to the earlier age of which the palæography would point, or Candravarman, known from the Mandasor and Susuniā inscriptions, a contemporary of Samudragupta, by whom he was vanquished, but re-instated, the latest view brought forward proposes to identify him with Candragupta of the Maurya dynasty. It is only in connection with other views, expressed by the same author, that we proceed in this paper to consider such a hypothesis; it is difficult to decide whether one should wonder more at the suggestion of such a hypothesis or its detailed exposition.

The reasons brought forward for an identification of Candra in the Meharauli inscription with Candragupta of the Maurya dynasty are: Candragupta did not inherit a big empire, but conquered by his own efforts at least the whole of India; there is no doubt that a considerable part of the country south beyond the Vindhayas (?) was also included in the Maurya empire, and as it is certain that Asoka did not conquer it, it was either Candragupta or his son Bindusāra. The author decides himself for the former, referring to V. A. SMITH and RAYCHAUDHURI. To these arguments Dr. SETH adds a passage from the Mahāvaṃsa and Mudrārāksasā, Act III, verse 19 and 21). Further, he refers to his paper in which he has shown, as he asserts, that Candragupta’s empire extended beyond modern Afghanistan and included considerable parts of Eastern Persia as well as considerable parts of Central Asia, so that the statement in the Meharauli inscription that the ruler has crossed the seven tributaries of the Indus and

1. The best description of the pillar is given by V. A. SMITH, JRAS 1897, 1 ff. An illustration of the upper part of the pillar is found in COOMARASWAMY, Geschichte der indischen und indones. Kunst, Fig. 150. A full picture in FERGUSSON-BURGESS, History of Indian Architecture (2nd ed.) II, 207 ff. Fig. 370.
3. Early History of India, 3rd ed., p. 149; but see below note 23.
4. Political History of India, 183 ff., who gives references to S. KRISHNASWAMY AIYANGAR’S Beginnings of South Indian History.
5. V, 16 ff.
conquered the Bāhlikas (Bactrians) will be true. His overthrowing of the confederated enemies in Vaṅga may refer to his overthrow of Nanda and his campaigns further east. Thus the pillar inscription "can apply to none so well and correctly as to the great founder of the illustrious Maurya dynasty."¹

The opening argument which declares that a considerable part of the country south beyond the Vindhya was included in the Maurya empire and that it is certain that Aśoka did not conquer it, lacks any proof. All that can be said positively is that the first Maurya emperor Candragupta established his reign in Pātaliputra, Magadha, and that this realm extended probably through the whole northern part of India. This is to be inferred from the reminiscence in Rudradāman's Junāgadh inscription (line 8)² that under Candragupta the rāṣṭriya Vaiśya Puṣyagupta had constructed the dam of the late Sudarśana, a work which was repeated under Aśoka by his governor Yavanarāja Tuṣāspha, under Rudradāman by the Pahlava Suviśākha, and, as another inscription reveals, under Skandagupta by Parṇadatta's son Cakrapālita.³ As the locality of that lake leads to Surāṣṭra, into the neighbourhood of Girinagara, the modern Junāgadh, where, along with Aśoka's inscriptions those of Rudradāman and Skandagupta are incised in the very same rock, the realm of Candragupta must have extended from Magadha in the East to Surāṣṭra, Kathiawar, in the west, apart from the conclusions to be derived from the indications in the records of classical authors about the peace between the Indian ruler and Seleukos I Nikator. The inference from the mentioning of the dam-reconstruction under Aśoka holds good for this ruler's time and, as no war seems to have intervened, for the latter's father, Binduśāra. For an extension of the Maurya empire under Candragupta to the South Dr. Seth refers to Dr. Raychaudhuri's statements, namely, that Plutarch and Justin say Candragupta had overrun and subdued the whole of India, or, was in possession of India, respectively. It is doubtful, whether the words of Plutarch (Alex. 62, 2) and of Justin (XV, 4, 20) can be taken literally, as for the authors—as sometimes for modern authors too—India means northern India. That these two authors had any geographical knowledge of the country and a possibility or even intention to state exactly the extension of the dominion of Candragupta at all, may be doubted. For, till the times of the geographer Ptolemaios (2nd cent. A.D.) the real form of India is misrepresented, and if the authors speak of Alexander's subjugation of India, they do not differentiate between northern and southern India, as even the historians of Alexander's time knew only the former. The reference to Māmunānār, stating the invasion of a great army,

¹. JIH XVI, 127.
². Ep. Ind. VIII, 43.
³. CII III, 58ff. The view that Parṇadatta has been an Iranian as the late Charpentier (JRAS 1928, 904f.) suggested, is not likely in view of his son's name.
led by "Vambar Moriyar," a Maurya upstart, is neither chronologically reliable nor historically of any value, as no name is given.

The expression "Vambar Moriyar" has been interpreted by Tamil scholars in various ways. While some explain vamba as "new," others take the word in the meaning "bastard" or "unsettled." Again the Vaḍukas, known to be the vanguard of the Moriyar in their war, helping the Kośar, against the chief of Mohūr, are said to be "Northerners", but as they are believed to be the modern Badagas of the Nilgiris, the view that they came from the western coast appears quite plausible. As for the Kośar who have been tried to be identified with the Satiyaputas of Aśoka's 2nd rock-inscription, their home has been perhaps the Tulu country which points to the North of the Tamil country and would explain their designation. The odes of Tamil poets do not contain an allusion that a Moriya line ruled over the Tamil country, and if there is any explanation possible then only that the Moriya must be the Mauryas of the Kōṅkaṇa. The connection of Moriyar with the Nandas in Ahanāṇūru 251 may be a reminiscence, but the term vamba, if it means "new", is evidently a hint to the new line, i.e. the Kōṅkaṇa line, of the Mauryas. The passage in Māmūlaṭ 265 about the wealth of the Nandas which has been swept away by a flood of the Ganges has been declared as 'wrong together.'

Nowhere is it stated that Candragupta or Bindusāra extended their realm to the South, though achievements of this kind have been ascribed to

1. Cf. CHI I, 596.
3. CHI I. c.
4. T. N. Subramaniam, JRAS 1923, 93ff.; S. S. Desikar, also translates "unstable" IHQ IV, 141.
5. V. R. Ramachandra Dikshitar also says so, Indian Culture I, 99 as before him K. G. Särkar, JRAS 1924, 667. Thurstōn, Castes and Tribes of Southern India I, 67: "The name Badaga or Vadugan means northerner, and the Badagas are believed to be descended from Canarese colonists from the Mysore country, who migrated to the Nilgiris three centuries ago..."; their number is given (p. 63) as 34,178 in 1901. Ibid. VII, 266 s. v. Vadugan (180,884 individuals in 1891) is said the word means "a native of the northern or Telugu country."
6. Särkar, 1. c. 666.
8. Against their identification with the Satiyaputas and that the Kośar occupied Tuluva in the early centuries of the Christian era see B. A. SaletoRE, Ancient Karmājaka, Poona 1936, I, 48ff.
9. S. S. Desikar, IHQ IV, 145, where the discussions are referred to. Also K. G. Seshha Aiyar, Cera Kings of the Sangam Period, London 1937, denies an invasion of the Mauryas in Southern India, as to be seen from the review by U. N. Ghoshal, IHQ XIII, 366.
12. S. Krishnāswamī Aiyangar, Beginnings of South Indian History 206, as quoted in IHQ IV, 136f.
the latter, on insufficient grounds. For Candragupta, however, the argument, used by Lassen, still holds good to some extent, that the military forces only of southern peoples are mentioned in the list of peoples and kingdoms, going back apparently to Megasthenes; thus these people did not belong to the Maurya Empire under Candragupta. This tallies with the fact of the war which Aşoka waged against the Kalingas, a people described by Megasthenes (Plinius, n. h. VI, 66) as independent, so that even under Bindusāra they have not been permanently subdued, if ever before Aşoka. It has been asserted that certain Mysore inscriptions refer to Candragupta’s rule in North Mysore; that is an exaggeration. The Nāgakhaṇḍa inscription (Shikarpur Tāluq) belongs, as stated by Dr. Raychaudhuri on the authority of Rice, to the 14th cent. A.D. and says nothing positively for Candragupta Maurya; and if Dr. Raychaudhuri and Dr. Seth have perhaps in mind the Śravaṇa Belgola inscription, that inscription has been shown as of no historical value with regard to the first Maurya emperor. A passage from the Mahāvamsa V, 16f. that the Brāhmaṇa Cāṇakka anointed a glorious youth, known by the name of Candragupta, as king over all Jambudvīpa, ranks with the reports of the classical authors, mentioned above, and has, considering the facts under Aşoka, no weight as referring to an extension of the realm to the South. Dr. Seth quotes two passages from the Mudrārākṣasa, which, however, do not state if a passage in a drama, composed centuries later than the main figure of it lived, is able to state anything—the extent of the dominion, but contain only the wishes of Cāṇakya, as the answer of Candragupta (after III, 19) shows. The second passage (III, 24) mentions in a conventional form the extent of the dominion up to the four oceans.

2. Ind. Alt. II (2nd ed.) 219ff.; CHI I, 473f. By the way, Dr. Seth quotes, as remarked, Smith, Early History p. 149 in favour of his view that Candragupta subjugated Southern India; firstly, the quotation is incomplete, as Smith in the preceding lines believes it more probably that Bindusāra extended his reign to the South; secondly, the quotation is taken from the 3rd edition, while in the last edition, according to which it is a custom to quote, the late author holds it more probable that the conquest of the south was the work of Bindusāra than that it was effected by his busy father (4th ed., p. 157).
3. Mysore and Coorg, 10.
4. Cf. Archiv Orient. I, 369, n. 3; Smith, Early History 154 is disposed to believe that the tradition probably is true in its main outline, but the epigraphical support is far from conclusive. Shantilal Shah, The Traditional Chronology of the Jainas (Bonner Orientalist. Studien 9), Stuttgart 1935, 45ff. arrives at the conclusion that “the stories of Candragupta Maurya and Śrutakevalin Bhadrabāhu are productions of popular fancy.” On the same sources, on Plutarch and the Mysore inscriptions, B. L. Bhargava founds his view that the ruler did conquer a considerable part of the Deccan. cf. Chandragupta Maurya, Lucknow 1935, 37.
5. The same is said of Aşoka V, 20.
6. For nāśāsyate exist vv. 11.
DR. SETH bases his identification of the ruler Candra in the Meharauli
inscription with Candragupta of the Maurya dynasty on a paper of his in
which he tried to show that the dominion of Candragupta included Afghan-
nistan and considerable parts of Eastern Persia and of Central Asia. There-
fore the statement in the inscription that he crossed the seven tributaries
of the Indus and conquered Bahlilikas (Bactrians) is the “bare truth”.

In this paper alluded to,1 DR. SETH starts with Aśoka’s inscriptions
as far as they mention the peoples Gandhāras, Kambojas, Yonas and Nā-
bhakas, then he uses again the Mudrārākṣasa and refers to two other papers
of his.2 But neither can the people of the North-West who are men-
tioned in Aśoka’s inscriptions, prove anything for the time of Candragupta,
as they do not rank with the subjects of his dominion,3 nor are to be found
there the Pārasikas who are supposed to have been conquered by Candra-
gupta according to the Mudrārākṣasa. The surmise that Candragupta is
to be identified with Sāsigupta (Sisikottos)4 and belonged therefore to Gan-
dhāra, is absurd. One may not trust Plutarch much, but on the whole
he might be chronologically right when he records that Candragupta as a
boy has seen Alexander.5 Sisikottos partook already in the usurpation of
Bessos, afterwards joining Alexander by whom he was installed, after the
capture of the Aornos citadel, as commander there; thus he must have
been an adult man already in 330 B.C., as he made politics at that time on

1. IHQ XIII, 400ff.
2. ABORI 1937 (not available) and IHQ XIII, 361f, that according to the
former inscription the Yonas, Kambojas and Gandhāras seem to belong to the
borders; he believes that XIII shows them included in the dominion proper. But
that is not correct; for, on the latter passage (line 8f. Kāsi) the iteration of
hevan evā shows that the king as with other peoples, mentioned before, so also
in his own realm he has won his victory, consisting in dhamma. With the Yona-
Kambojesc begins a new sentence, and they are summed up by savatā and ranked
with those where his envoys do not go. As he stated before (line 38) that there
do not exist Brāhmaṇas and Sramaṇas, it is obvious that the king nevertheless
sent messages to them; the Yonas are the representatives of those peoples, men-
tioned afterwards. How Aśoka behaved towards those borderers, has been pointed
3. BHANDARKAR (Aśoka, 2nd ed., p. 29 and 312) believes the peoples, occurr-
ing in Rock inscriptions V and XIII as “subject peoples, occupying some of
the frontier districts of Aśoka’s empire”. While he (p. 312) admits.
4. The Sanskrit equivalent Sāsigupta is not even sure. CHARPENTIER, JRAS
1928, 902ff, explains the name as Sisigupta, but does not exclude an Iranian origin.
For Iranian names, formed with Sisi, cf. JUSTI, Iranisches Namenbuch 303f. DR. SETH
goes so far to assert (IHQ XIII, 411, referring to his paper in the “Indian Re-
view”, June 1937) that Candragupta was responsible for driving Alexander out
of India. That is more than any student who has once read the history of Alexan-
der’s invasion in India, will be ready to take seriously. Of the same value are
the etymologies, e.g. Komoroi Komedaï in Ptolem. VI, 13, 3, which are explained
as Kom + Rāi and Kom + Dev respectively (IHQ XIII, 1937, 403); similar
are the derivations of other people’s names.
the Persian side. Unintelligible is the inference that, if the Maurya empire extended to the highlands of Balkh, Badakshan and Pamir, the Tibetan traditions are correct "that even the adjoining region now known as Chinese Turkestan was also within the Mauryan empire" (p. 412). "These stories seem to be merely mythological explanations of the fact that the ancient civilization of Khotan was derived from both India and China," says Smith, on whose remarks about the Tibetan traditions that amazing statement is based. But even granted that Asoka had some political connection with Khotan, that would prove nothing for the incorporation of Chinese Turkistan into his dominion and still less into that of Candragupta. Reliable sources, Chinese specially, have nothing to tell about an Indian regime in Chinese Turkistan in the 4th and 3rd century B.C. Thus constructing the extent of Candragupta's realm in the North, Dr. Seth explains the crossing of the seven tributaries of the Indus and the conquering of the Bahlkikas (Bactrians). The sapta mukhâni Sindhor in the Meharauli inscription are to be taken as the seven rivers which formed the source of the Indus, according to Ptolemy. Even the perusal of McCrindle's translation (ed. Majumdar, p. 81) must have shown that Ptolemy VII, 1, 26f. does not mention seven rivers as the sources of the Indos, but enumerates the order of the rivers which are confluents of the Indos and come from the Imaos mountain. Of these, seven in number, again their own sources are given and the confluence of the rivers (VII, 1, 27). Notwithstanding the apparent mistakes in Ptolemy's description of the river system of the Indus, he never believed these rivers to be the sources of the Indus, as he states the longitude and latitude of his source (VII, 1, 26) by 120°30' and 37° (ed. Renou) respectively. It is questionable whether sapta mukhâni means at all the seven sources", or, rather "the seven mouths"a; most probably the expression means the Punjab, being a kāvya-like circumscription of the many rivers there and perhaps a reminiscence of the sapta sindhavah. However that may be, it is a fact that even in Asoka's inscriptions the ethnicon Vahlkika is not found, which is to be expected there, if Candragupta had subjugated the people and as other peoples of the North-West are mentioned in his grandson's inscriptions. That the overthrowing of the federated enemies in Vanga may refer to the overthrow of Nanda is impossible. Under the quite natural supposition that the victories, mentioned in the Meharauli inscription, are arranged in a chronological order, such an explanation would contradict the hypothesis of Dr. Seth, who suggested that Candragupta overthrew Nanda with the help of Sakas, Yavanas, Kiratas, Kambojas, Pârasiskas and Vahlkikas, as the war in Vanga is mentioned before the overthrowing of the Vahlkika. Apart from this, the sources say nothing of a war be-

1. Early History, 203.
2. Thus also Allan, Catal. Gupta Coins XXXVI; L. de La Vallée Poussin, Dynasties et Histoire de l'Inde depuis Kanishka 50.
tween confederated peoples and Nanda on one side, and Candragupta on the other side; rather, the stories about the beginning of Candragupta’s career point to his gaining slowly more and more followers till he could get so much power to ascend the throne, appearing as a liberator too.

The other arguments of Dr. Seth are less of a historical character: that Candra of the Meharauli inscription ruled a big empire like Candragupta; that the type and size of the iron pillar implies a very advanced stage of the development of the industrial arts, is an illusory argument. For, though the so-called Kauṭiliya Arthaśāstra may show mining and metallurgy including the melting of iron as well advanced in the supposed time of Candragupta Maurya, even granted for that sake, that the work has as its author the prime-minister of Candragupta, the fact that Aśoka did not use iron pillars, is remarkable. An explanation that only Candragupta did it is insufficient, if nothing of this kind of pillars has been found as yet of his time, of his son or grandson, and as must be added, of later times. The “Persian” form of the pillar (that means of the capital) does not exclude a later date. The position of the pillar in the neighbourhood of which two pillars of Aśoka have been found and have been removed to their present position by Firoz Shah, cannot prove that Candragupta erected his pillar in the centre of his realm. For, if such comparisons are of any value, Aśoka erected pillars not only in the centre, but also in all provinces and parts of his dominion; the real centre of the Maurya empire was Magadha; the contents of the Meharauli inscription are not of that kind to need, like an important political and historical record, an erection at the geographical centre; lastly, the present position is not the original spot where the pillar once had its founding. Dr. Seth did not take into consideration that Aśoka never used Sanskrit, all his inscriptions are not only in different Prākrit-dialects, but also entirely in prose, while here Sanskrit and the Śārdula-vikrīdita metre are used.

From Hillebrandt’s edition of the Mudrārakṣasa from which Dr. Seth quotes, he could have seen that just the passage VII, 16, where the abbreviation Candra is used for Candragupta, is not found in those MSS., which Hillebrandt (Introd. p. IV) marked as belonging to the second group, containing the best and most reliable text. A veiled reference to Viśnu-gupta in line 6 of the Meharauli inscription (pranidhāya ... Viṣṇo matim) presupposes a short-name for Viśnu-gupta which nobody would have understood, apart from the question whether such short-names, which may not be confounded with the exceptional short forms on coins, have been in vogue in ancient India as in modern times; for, the name in ancient India as in other

1. SMITH, JRAS 1897, 5 and note 3. An iron pillar exists at Dhār, from 1591–92, with a Persian inscription of Akbar; one is said (Encyclop. Brit. 14th ed. 12, 681) to exist at Mount Abu (probably as a column); on the iron pillar on Kaniska’s stūpa cf. BEAL, Buddhist Records I, CIV; on the iron beams in Konarak see FerguSSON-BURGESS II, 107; on the Dhār pillar II, 247.
cultures was a kind of mysterium and formed one of the Saṃskāras. Such a suggested pun in the inscription is impossible from the context which points clearly to the god in honour of which the pillar with the (now lost) figure was erected, and would mean an offence of the god which the pious ruler would not have intended to commit. The sentence cannot be translated "following with devotion the counsel of Viśṇu (gupta)," as neither maṭī means "counsel" nor praṇidhā "follow": though Viśṇu is a clerical mistake for Viśṇau, it is easier to explain than the omission of r in the suggested reading Viṣṇor; further the veiled reference to Viṣṇugupta pre-supposes the original sense with regard to the god, and here the expression maṭīn praṇidhā needs the supplementary object in the locative. That remoteness of the events is indicated by the use of adyaṃpi in lines two and four and by the use of ṣaṇvena, is not convincing, as the inscription has been believed by most of the scholars hitherto as posthumous; in no case can it prove that Candragupta Maurya is meant by Candra in the inscription.

The main difficulty of Dr. Seth's hypothesis, the palæographical state of the inscription, is tried to be removed by the explanation that the iron pillar was erected by Candragupta, and that the inscription put by him was blurred out in course of time. This is a contradiction to his former statement (p. 127) that the present inscription on the iron pillar was put on the pillar after Candragupta's death. Even granted that Samudragupta, as Dr. Seth proceeds to explain the gap between Candragupta's time and the palæography of the inscription, had put the present inscription on the iron pillar, there arise some questions: if that original inscription was blurred out, such an assumption pre-supposes that the original inscription must also have been incised after the death of Candragupta, as Dr. Seth stressed the remoteness of the events (p. 129); or, the present text of the inscription cannot be the same as that of the original. Further, inscriptions in stone since the time of Aśoka are quite well preserved; as to be seen from the lithograph in CII III, PL. XXI a, the "engraving is good; but in the process of it, the metal closed up over some of the strokes (CII III, p. 140); nevertheless, no vestiges of a former inscription are to be seen and it is not probable that such a one should have been blurred out within the time between Candragupta Maurya and Samudragupta, but not between that of the latter and the present day. Why should Samudragupta have put, conceding to him such a liking for a "revival of the glorious tradition", an inscription referring to this "mysterious"? emperor Candra, so that nobody could understand who this emperor might have been and who is still a riddle to modern historical research? And who can at all assert that Samudragupta is the author of the present text or even only of the revival of the text? There are so many questions which Dr. Seth does not discuss, except in general sentences about the revival of a glorious tradition. Lastly, as mentioned

above, the use of Sanskrit in the inscription points to a time not earlier than the second century A.D., so that for that reason also Samudragupta’s text must have differed from Candragupta’s original, apart from the characters which belong to the Gupta time.

It is to be seen with what right Dr. Seth can claim to have based his hypothesis of an identification of the Candra in the Mehrauli inscription with Candragupta Maurya on sound reasons.

Two terms in the Mehrauli inscription would deserve a closer consideration: the geographical term Vaṅga and the ethnical appellation Vāhlikā. Both of them are connected with historical events, about which nothing as yet has come to light. Vaṅgāḥ, the plural of a people’s name, is found in a curious compound in Ait. Ār. II, 1, 1; in Baudh. Dh. I, 1, 14 and Ath. Paris. I, 7, 7. Common to all these passages is the occurrence of Vaṅga in connection with other peoples, among which such of the East are found too. In the Mehrauli inscription Vaṅgēṣu must have the sense of the country, i.e. a part of present Bengal. Such a use of Vaṅga is late, certainly later than the time of Candragupta Maurya who would have used Magadha as the country of the battle. In Patañjali’s Mbh. the plural of the people’s name can be used, according to the Vārttikākāra as the name of the country.¹ In Harṣa’s time again, as to be seen from Hiuen-Tsiang’s itinerary, present Bengal and Bihar were divided in seven parts.² From the epigraphical point of view the Mehrauli inscription offers the first mention of Vaṅga as a country, without the Aṅga, Kaliṅga, Suhma etc. as is the case also in later inscriptions. But it is not clear which part of present Bengal may be meant by the term, which otherwise denotes Eastern Bengal.

Vāhlikā again has hardly anything to do with Bālkh. That Candragupta should have conquered the ancient Bactria, is out of question. He could have done so only after Alexander’s raid on Bactria. The satraps Amyntas, Philippus, Tapasor are known from the sources till the partition of the dominion at Triparadeisos 321 B.C.; afterwards Bactria fell to the share of Seleukos I Nikator;³ the country remained with the dynasty of the Seleucids till the middle of the 3rd cent. B.C., when, apparently the younger, Diodotos, the son of the “prefect of the thousand cities”, revolted under Antiochos I and built up his own kingdom.⁴ Thus there is no space left for a reign of Candragupta Maurya, which would also contradict the evidence.

¹ II, 4, 62, V. 1, 4; IV, 1, 170, V. 1; IV, 3, 120, V. 5; especially IV, 2, 52, V. 1.
³ For the satraps see the histories by Droysen, Beloch; Berve, Das Alexanderreich II, nos. 60, 29, (216, 219), 785, 719; Arrian (ed. Roos) II, p. 266, ft. 1, 36; Justin XV, 4, 11.
⁴ Justin XLI, 4, 5; CHI 1, 435ff., referring to the coins. Also Strabo XV, 1, 3 mentions that Eukratides had 1000 cities under himself.
borne by the effigies and legends of the coins. For the meaning Vāhlika it is difficult to decide whether a people and which people should be understood. There exists a confusion, as it seems, between the different forms Bāhlikha, Bāhlīka, Vāhlīka etc. It is, however, noteworthy that Pargiter has differentiated between a people of the North and one of the Punjab, both called Vāhlīka; but the readings in the passages of the Mābh. and Rām. are so unreliable that it is difficult to arrive at definite conclusions. In Varāhamihira's Bṛhats. (V, 37, 80; IX, 10; X, 7; XVI, 1; XVII, 13, 25; XXXII, 15) the forms Vālhika, Vāhlīka, Vahlīka, Vahlīka, Vāhlīka, Vāhlīka are found, sometimes in connection with eastern peoples; according to Parāśara the Bāhlīka are located in the South-West. Though in an inscription of Taxila of the year 136 a Bahalia from Noaca occurs, which place seems to point to Balkh, Bactria, there is no proof that later on Vāhlīka etc. means this country.

In the recent discussions on the identification of the Viṣṇupada, where the Meharauli pillar is stated to have been erected, the vicinity of the Viṣṇuśa in passages from both the Epics has been referred to. According to Yādavapraśa's Vaijayantī (ed. Oppert) 37, 53f. the Bāhlīka, are Tarkas, the Vāhlīka identical with the Vāhlīkas. The Tarkas again appear as Takvas in Hemac. Abhidh. 959, where they are said to be another name for the Vāhlīkas. This people of the Tarka or Takva are the Takka. Passing over the many passages in the Rājatara., Hiuen-Tsiang offers the possibility of a location of their settlements. He mentions the soldiers of Tse-kia, a country which he entered on his way from Rājapura in a south-eastern direction and which he reached after a journey of 700 li and crossing a river. It was 10,000 li in circuit and lay between the river Pi-po-she (Bibas = Viṣṇuśa) in the East and the Indus in the West. Also the Dharmakosā identifies the Vāhlīka with Takka, as has to be read there. The equation Bāhlīka = Tarka, Vāhlīka = Vāhlīka, in the Vaijayantī, and Vāhlīka = Takva, Vāhlīka = Vāhlīka, shows that the Vāhlīka are also Vāhlīka, i.e. Takka. These Takka seem to belong to the Anatīs, and all these peoples, less rigid in their Brāhmaṇical faith or altogether staying outside the religious and social frame

2. Kirfel, Die Kosmographie der Inder 86.
3. CII II, Part 1, p. 74f.
4. The material seems to point that the word has undergone a change of meaning between the Taxila and Meharauli inscriptions, Bāhlīka has been identified with Vāhlīka or rather vice versa; the Bahlika of the Ath. Veda are still to be explained.
7. Zachariae, Beitr. z. ind. Lexik. 16.
of Aryavarta, belong to the Punjab. It is possible that Vahlïka of the inscription denotes the people of the Punjab and Sind, which latter province the “seven mouths” of the Sindhu seem to imply. That the mouths and not tributaries are to be understood, is likely with regard to the “Southern ocean”, which does not point to the Deccan, but rather to the coast of the Indus delta.

As for the historical interpretation of the Meharauli inscription the proposals made hitherto are not convincing. It seems better to acknowledge the impossibility of identifying the ruler named Candra of that inscription on account of the lack of sources than to force it into the Procrustes-bed of an identity with a brother of Mihirakula,¹ Candragupta I,² Candragupta II,³ Chandravarman,⁴ apart from Candragupta Maurya, attempts which show already the uncertainty. Neither can the indications, contained in the Meharauli inscription, be applied to one of these rulers, nor can they be said to have done the acts of the hero of the inscription. The posthumous character of the inscription has been contested in the last papers,⁵ as yet with no convincing arguments. Not only no titles of the late ruler are given, but also no pedigree and no country where he reigned are offered by the panegyric inscription. This does not prove that Candra was no longer on the throne. But even the panegyric tenor of the prasasti must not mislead to the assumption of a ruler of great power. The “mysterious” inscription will still, as it has been, remain an open field of rich conjectures.

---

2. Ibid. Text p. 140, n. 1; R. Basak, Ind. Ant. 48, 1919, 98ff
3. Hoernle, Ind. Ant. 21, 42ff.; V. A. Smith, JNAS 1897, 1ff.; Dasharatha Sharma, JIH XVI, 1937, 13f.
5. Bhandarkar, Ind. Cult. 3, 511 = JAHRS X, 86; D. Sharma, JIH XVI, 17f.
NOTES ON THE KAṬHA UPANIṢAD.*

By
ANAND K. COOMARASwAMY

FOURTH VALLĪ

IV. 1 khāni vyatryṇat ... āvṛtta-caksur; : see above on III. 1 and the discussion in IHQ. XI, 1935. Khāni vyatryṇat is fully elucidated by MU. II. 6 where Prajāpati, desiring to partake of his purposes (arthaṁ),1 "breaks open these doorways (of perception), and now arisen, by means of his five rays eats of the objects of the senses" (khānimāni bhītvodītah pañcabhir raśmi-

* The two previous instalments of this paper have appeared in the April and May issues, pp. 43 ff. and 83 ff.

1. Cf. KU. III, 10 where the "objects" (arthaḥ) are prior to the sense-powers themselves (indriyebhāyaḥ paraḥ). The word artha corresponds exactly to Late Latin intentio, of which the meaning is in the first place "object" as "purpose" foreseen, and in the second place "object" as that which is actually seen (intentio visibilis). The "object" as foreseen is evidently prior to the being in act of the organ by means of which it is actually or accidentally seen. But more than this is implied in our texts. Observe that what is being discussed here is not "the eye's intrinsic faculty" according to which "I" see by a physical light reflected from the "object", but the manner in which God (Svayambhū in KU. IV. 1 = yo bhūtebhīr vyapāyata in KU. IV. 6, Prajāpati in MU. II. 6) sees in me. What my eye sees is a simple aspect of which I have no knowledge, but only a sensation; but what God sees in me is the idea of the object by which he both knows it and gives it being. Insofar as "I" see an already existing object, its being does not depend on "me"; but insofar as my vision coincides with His, esse est percipī. Insofar as I see empirically, what I see is accidental; insofar as I see with (anupaś) His ray (raśmi), for the sake of which the eye is really opened ("subtract the mind, and the eye is opened to no purpose", ECKHART) I see the thing as it is in Him, rather than as it is in itself.

Our texts, inasmuch as they are dealing with His manner of seeing, employ the traditional (Neo-Platonic as well as Indian, etc.) interpretation of perception as taking place by means of a projected through the "eye", in which light the "object" itself inheres: the "eye" in this case being as it were the lens of a projector, which sees what is projected upon the screen (the "wall" of Plato's "cave") by the image-bearing light that passes through it. We see, then, as God sees, to the extent that we see not with the "eye of flesh" (māṁsa-caksuś), but with the "angelic eye" (divya-caksuś), "which sees in the eternal mirror, where it sees both all things and itself better than anywhere else." On the other hand, as is evident, to see God himself, and not merely some of those things which He sees the eye must be inverted (āvṛtta-caksuś), so as not to look outward with the ray, but inward at its source, the fons lucis, and Light of lights (jyotiśaṁ jyotis); and this inverted eye is the "eye of gnosis" (jñānacaksuś).
bhīrā ṣīṣayān atti). It is God himself that "opens the gates of the senses" (which senses are not themselves the gates, but make use of them) in order that He himself, who is the only knower and seer, may see out through them, coincidentally with ourselves who see out with them only, in so far as we observe only empirically, with the "eye of flesh" (māṁsacakṣusū). To the extent that we see intellectually, with the "angelic eye" (divya-cakṣusū), we see what He sees. And to the extent that we see with an "inverted eye" (āvṛttacakṣusū), i.e. with the "eye of gnosis" (jñāna-cakṣusū), along the ray to its source, we see Him, and can truly say with Eckhart (Pfeiffer. XCVI) that "that eye, with which I see God inwardly, is the same eye wherewith God sees in me;" which "seeing in me" is just what is denoted by KU. IV. 6 b, the whole verse reading "Him born of old of the glowing, who erst was born of the waters, him stationed indwelling the cavern (of the heart), who looked about in beings.—this, verily is 'That'", without any emendation of the text.

1. Paṇca raṣmāyaḥ here = paṇca jñānāni in KU. VI. 10, and paṇcendriyaṇi or paṇca prāṇāḥ commonly elsewhere.
Paṇca jñānāni in KU. VI. 10 recalls BG. XIV. 11 "When the gnostic light arises from the doorways in the body, then may it be known that one is more in being" (sarvadvāreṣu deheśvin prakāśa upajāyate, jñānām yadā, tadā vidyād vīyddham sattvam ity uto, where dvāra = kha).
2. "A parcel of myself, even the Lord, when he taketh up his stand on hearing, vision, etc., himself enjoys the objects of the senses" (mamāvāṁśo... īśvarah... adhiṣṭhāya śrotam cakṣuh... visayān upasereṇa, BG. XV. 7-9).

The situation is paralleled in the rite of the "opening of the eyes" of an image, wherewith the image is brought to life. Only when this analogous rite has been performed can one think of the Deity as looking out through the image, and of the image therefore as a connection made between the worshipper and the Deity whose image it is. It is significant that the Chinese expression for the "opening of the eyes" of an image, k' ai kuang, often rendering by "to light up the eyes" (and rather awkwardly by Takacs as "punning the eyes", viz. painting the eyeballs") is literally "to open a ray", or "open up the pathway for a ray" kuang being the equivalent of Sanskrit raśmi, while k'ai can mean to "cleave" or "cut" in the sense of "cutting a path", Latin secare viam, while k'ain in combination with the character for "eye" means "to open the eyes; to gain experience." It is precisely an opening of the doorways of the senses in order that the immanent Spirit may look out of these opened windows that is meant by khaṇi vyattṛpat in KU. IV. 1. It must also be borne in mind that in traditional optics, knowledge of an object is acquired, not by light reflected by the object seen (which produces only a reflex image in the retina, and not an understanding), but by the light of the intellect which is directed to the object through the eye; in just this way, for example, Eckhart distinguishes a seeing with the eye from a seeing through the eye.

3. Ruysbroeck's "in-staring" (instaernde, Book of Supreme Truth, Ch. XIV) —"But those who turn outwards and find consolation in outward things, do not feel this, and if I should say much more of it, yet they would not understand".
4. We take the accusatives in IV. 6 to be in apposition to those of IV. 5, which are governed by ya... vedə.
5. "That", as usual, Brahman and here specifically as the Svayambhū of IV. "Who looked about in beings", or "looked out through beings", cf. AV.
One sees how utterly absurd are those modern, Indian or European, interpretations of IV. 1 which assume that it is meant that “God injured the senses” (Rawson, p. 149, note 1) and agree with Rawson that this is an unacceptable interpretation. We see, however, no reason to believe that this was what Śaṅkara meant by ṛṣayāḥ = hitisatvān hanañam kṛta-vān ity arthaḥ, since it is not the sense-powers that are pierced (kha is never a “power” but always a “space” or “opening”, as in AA. II. 3.3 khaṇi sa ākāśaḥ) but the gates of the senses that are, as MU. II. 6 expresses it, “broken open”. With all the words meaning to “pierce”, or “cleave”, or “break open”, which are used with khaṇi in the various parallel passages may be compared Latin secare in the expression secare viam, “to cut a way”, which certainly does not mean to injure that which is to use the way. It is through the open gateways of the senses that the Inner Being, God himself, looks forth; and this assuredly does not imply any disparagement of the “world picture” that he thus “depicts for himself and delights in” (Śaṅkara, Svātmānirūpaṇa, 96, cf. Genesis, I. 31 “and saw that it was very good”).

IV. 5 na tato vijugupṣate: without rejecting Rawson’s various explanations, we suggest that the general sense is “thereafter need not fear”, and the more particular sense “no longer needs to guard himself from evil doing” (JUB. IV. 25.4 pāpāt karmano jugupṣeta, but with a negative),—parallel, therefore, to I John III. 9 “Whoever is born of God, cannot sin” and Gal. V. 18 “If you are led by the Spirit you are not under the law”.

IV. 7: Rawson introduces a great confusion by failing again to distinguish between the divine nature (prakṛti) that is one with essence from the separated nature (prakṛti) of the Śaṅkhya, i.e. the lower from the higher nature of BG. VII. 5 (aśā and parā prakṛti, corresponding to aparā and para brahman); by a failure to distinguish, in other words, Aditi as

XIII 29 “The Son of Aditi beheld all beings” (vyakhyad aditeḥ putro bhuvanaṁ viśvā), AA. II. 4.3 “The Spirit, born, thoroughly considered beings” (sa jāta bhūtāny abhyāksat), and BU. I. 4.1 “Scrutinising, he beheld naught other than himself” (so’nvikṣya nānyadātmanaḥ paśyāt). It is moreover, to this way of seeing that we should aspire,—it is the “sameness of vision” that the unified-spirit enjoys when it “holds itself stationed in all beings, and all beings in itself” (sarvabhūta-stham ātmānam sarva-bhūtāni cātmāni ikṣate, BG. VI 29). “His sight for ours—what a goodly recompense” (Rūmi, Mathnawi, I. 922).

It is of course as the Supernal Sun and by means of his rays that the Self-existent sees all things; and we take it that it is precisely as the “Seer” that Ikṣvāku (Rv. X. 60.4) denotes the solar Self-existent the ancestor of Rohita (AB. VII. 15), Bhagiratha (JUB. IV. 6.1), Bṛhadratha (MU.) and of that other ādicca-bandhu, the Buddha (Sn. 991).

1. BG. VII. 4 describes the Śaṅkhyan “nature”: VII. 5-6 continues “This is my lower (aśā) nature, therefrom distinguish (ataḥ ... vidddhi) my transcendent nature (prakṛtim ... parām), living-being, whereby this moving world is kept in being dhāryate jagat possest of (upadāhāya holding, bearing, etc.) and qualifying aham,—not as usually rendered, an imperative, cf. Pāṇini III. 1.38) this, the wombs (etad yonini) of all beings, I am the coming-forth (prabhavah) and the dissolution of the whole moving-world”. As the text im-
Magna Mater from Aditi as Mother Earth, or in Eckhart's terms, "Mary ghostly" from "Mary in the flesh". The Essence (m.) and Nature (f.) of verses 6 and 7, both referred to as guhām praviṣya, are the kṛṣṇaprutau... sakṣitā ubhā... māṭārā of RV. I. 140.3, parikṣitā pitarā of III. 7.1 and the "conjoint principle" of St. Thomas, Sum. Theol. I. 27.2, whence the Son proceeds "by way of generation and parturition". The Aditi of verse 7 is, of course, the Vāc of RV. VIII. 100. 10-11 and X. 125: guhām praviṣya tiṣṭhantim corresponding to the question kva svid asyāh paramam jagāma of VIII. 100.10, devatāmyai to devīn, ib. 11, yā práṇena sambhavati to akham eva vāta iva pravāmi in X. 125.8, and yā bhūtebhīr vyajāyata to adītī jātam adītī janitvam in I. 89.10. As Edgerton has observed, "Everything contained in at least the older Upaniṣads, with almost no exceptions, is not new pleies, these two Natures aparā and para are one Nature in the same sense that the aparā and para brahman are one Brahman. It is just as in Christian formulation, where there is one essence and two natures; but nature and essence are one in Him.

Aditi: Natura naturans, creatrix, Deus. Merely to say that Vāruṇa's para Brahman's "world is the waters" to recognize that the "nature" of the Godhead is one of universal possibility, is to speak of a maternity as well as a paternity in divinis; and we find, accordingly, that the Brahman is repeatedly referred to as a "womb", e.g. BG. XIV. 3 mama yonir mahat brahma... sambhavah sarva-bhūtinām tato bhavati; Munḍ I. 1.6 and III. 1.3 aksaram bhūtayonim... puruṣam bhūtayonim; Brahma Sūtra I. 4. 7.27 yonī ca gayate.

Incidentally, it may be remarked that the "two wombs" (yonini, pl. for du.) of BG. VII. 6, whether as "two natures" (prakṛti, f.) or as essential and separated natures (puruṣa, m. and prakṛti, f.) correspond to Vāruṇa's kukṣi in AV. IV 16.3, samudrau... jāthare in TS. III. 2.2, sarasvatiyau... kūkṣyau in XIII. 35, hiranyamayau... kūkṣyau in JUB. I. 56, dve yoni JUB. IV. 27, JB. I. 17 and GB. I. 33 (dve yoni ekam mitthunam) etc.; and considered in their identity, to the single womb or belly in texts such as RV. III. 29.1 where Agni is born asurasya jātharāt, and those in which Prajápati is spoken of as garbhīn, "pregnant". A full collation of all the parallels would require far greater space than can be devoted to it here.

1. Neither the devatāmyai of KU. nor Śarīhkarā's sarva-devātmikā can be translated by "soul of the gods". Devatāmyai is simply "divine", just as dārumayi would be "wooden". Sarva-devātmikā is "whose nature is to be all the gods", just as in AA. II. 3.8 "all the gods are unified in the aksara (Brahman)", cf. Eckhart, I. 469, "All the Persons being clapt into their nature vanish into the dim silence of their interior being". Sarva-devātmikā merely restates RV. I. 89.10 viśve dērā aditiḥ. We can say that "her’s is" but scarcely that "she is" ātmā devānām: it is her Breath (prāṇa), the Gale (vāta, vāyu), her Child (garbha), the Sun (āditya, sūrya) that is ātmā devānām, RV. I. 115.1, IX. 74.5, X. 168.4, JUB. III. 2.4 and 14, etc.—Hiranyakarbhya therefore ātmada, like Agni, RV. X. 121.2, I. 149.3. Aditi is the viśve devāh, but apart from her spirative process by which she gives them life, and which is her motherhood, without distinction of spiration from generation in divinis, they have no independent being, but are all one in her unmanifested, guhām praviṣya: ab intra, as in RV. VIII. 48.2 "When thou (Somo) art entered in, thou becomest Aditi" (antaś ca prāgā aditiḥ bhavast). See also my Angel and Titan. Note 38 in JAOS. 55, p. 405, and La doctrine tantrique de la 'Bi-Unité' divine, in Etudes Traditionelles, 42, 1938, 289—301.
to the Upaniṣads, but can be found set forth, or at least *very* clearly fore-shadowed, in the older Vedic texts". (JAOS. 36, p. 197); cf. Bloomfield, "*mantra* and *brāhmaṇa* are for the least part chronological distinctions ... Both forms existed together, for aught we know, from the earliest times".

IV. 8 *dive* *dive*, "daily": with reference to the 36000 daily *agnyarkāḥ* of SB. X. 5. 3. 3, viz. the "contemplative fires" (*dhyeyā agnayeḥ*, Śāyana) that are to be kindled within you on every day of the hundred years of a complete life.

IV. 9. The "home" (*astam*) has been discussed above in connection with I. 10 and 11. The Sun, of course, "never really rises nor sets" (AB. III. 44) for the Comprehensor, it is rather Day and Night that rise and set (*pramlocanti, anumlocanti*, SB. VIII. 6. 1. 18), "Day and Night together are Death, they do not affect the divinity Aditya (Sol Invictus), for they are only the occasion whereby this divinity 'goes forth' and again 'goes home':" (*anv astam eti*, Vadhulasūtra, see Acta Orientalia, pp. 26-27). "He indeed neither rises nor sets (*udeti na nimlocati*), and for the Comprehensor of this, it is evermore high noon" (CU. III. 11.3).

The first two *and* the fourth lines of KU. IV. 9 are from AV. X. 8. 16 (not as Rawson has it, the first two only from AV. X. 18.6). In AV. the third line reads "that same I deem the best" (*jyeṣṭhām*, i.e. the Brahman of the first verse of the hymn, who is referred to as the Breath in BU. I. 523). The third line in KU. is identical in value with AV. X. 7.38 *tasmin* (in the Brahman-Yakṣa) *chravante ya u ke ca devāḥ*, and close in wording to AV. X. 8.6 *tatra* (in Brahman) *sarvam ādam arpitam*: and thus as in RV. I. 35. 6 *ānim na rathyam*, (Dante's *il punto dello stelo al cui la prima rota va d'intorno*) *amṛṭa adhi tasthuḥ* "As 'twere upon the axle-point of the chariot-of-light depend the immortal (Devas)" Professor Rawson's remarks to the effect that the ancient Vedic gods are but shadows of themselves in the Upaniṣads, "all their reality consisting in the One from whom they derive their being", are altogether without foundation in fact; the individual Devas are no more and no less "shadows" in the Upaniṣads than they are in RV., AV., and Brāhmaṇas, where their dependence upon the "One" is as plainly stated as it is in any later text.

IV. 10: *iha*, contrasted with *amutra*, means as usual, "here", "in this world", "now"; in the last two lines, the meaning is that though things appear to be diverse here (cf. verse 14), he who sees them in their unity, and does not run after them in their apparent difference, escapes recurrent death. The first two lines enunciate the well known doctrine of the correspondence of all states of being: "as above, so below". It is only because of this analogy, taken for granted alike in Vedic, Neo-Platonic, and Christian

---

1. Rūmi, Mathnawi, II. 1107-8, "The rising-place of the sun is the pitch-coloured tower of heaven: *my* Sun is beyond all rising places. His 'rising-place' is only in relation to His motos; His essence neither rose nor set."
doctrines of exemplarism,¹ that an adequate symbolism is possible, so that a person "by the mortal aspires to the immortal" (AA. II. 3.2), and Death can say "By contingent things I have obtained the eternal" (KU. II. 10). By an "adequate symbolism", we mean, of course a natural and inevitable as distinguished from a conventional symbolism: no better example can be cited than that of the sun, employed as an image of God in the Vedic and all other traditions, of which usage Dante remarks that "No object of sense in the whole world is more worthy to be made a type of God than the sun" (Convito, III. 12).²

IV. 11. Manasaivedam áptavyam is apparently in flat contradiction to KU. VI. 12, na manasā prāptum and many similar texts.³ Śaṅkara's explanation of the mind as a means, i.e. an upāya in the sense of Muṇḍ III. 2.3, covers at least a part of the ground. The same problem is presented, however, by KU. VI. 9 manasā abhikīpto ya etad viduḥ, and enhanced by the fact that it so often affirmed that it is not by the formation of mental concepts that the Brahman can be truly known, as for example in Kena IV. 4-5, where "that which in the lighting flashes forth, and at which one can only gasp" is contrasted with "that which comes to mind and by which one continually remembers," viz. "concept" (saṅkalpa).

As to this, it may be observed in the first place that abhi adds a force to klp of the sort that "Super-" might add to "conceive", just as abhi-jñāna is "supernatural knowledge" as distinguished from jñāna as "know-

---

¹. See my Vedic Exemplarism, in HJAS. I, 1936, pp. 44-64.
². Our modern exponents of what they call "natural religions" and "solar myths" are afflicted, of course, with that same myopia that Plutarch ridicules in the Greeks when he says that "the (physical) sun has made all to be ignorant of Apollo by using the power of sense-perception (aesthesis) to turn aside the power of the intellect (dianoia) from the being to the phenomenon" (Moralia, 400 D).
³. Cf. Kena I. 6 "That which thinks not with a mind (cf. BU. IV. 3. 28), but by which, they say, the mind is thought, know That as Brahman, not what men worship here" (idam upāsate). "What men worship here" is of their own imagining, to which He lends himself, yathopāsate tad eva bhavati, SB. X. 5. 2.20; which is not, of course, a denial of the value of such conceptual and iconolatrous "worship" for the Wayfarer: on the contrary, "In that one worships (upāsate) Him as one to be made a friend of, that is his form as the Friend", AB. III. 4. The iconoclasm of Kena I. 6 simply affirms with Eckhart that "To know God really you must know him as the Unknown", with St. Thomas that "Every relation which is predicated of God does not put something real in the eternal God, but only something according to our way of thinking" (Sum, Theol. III. 35. 5), with Augustine that "God evades every form of our intellect" (De vid. Dea, Ep. cxlvi), and with Dionysius that "Negations about God are true; but affirmations are vague" (De coel. hier. II).

4. Memory is, of course, a temporal, not an eternal virtue. As Plotinus asks, "What subjects of remembrance can there be for souls whose lot is to remain unchanged? ... In other words, they have seen God, and do not remember? Ah, no: it is that they see God still and always, and that as long as they see, they cannot tell themselves they have had the vision; such reminiscence is for souls that have lost it" (Enneads, IV. 4. 6).
ledge” though jñāna alone, as “gnosis” may have a like value. What is of all of more significance, however, is the question of what sort of mind it is by which he can be obtained; for as Maitri VI. 34 makes evident, “the mind is two-fold, clean and unclean: unclean when connected with desires, and clean when unconnected with desires”; and in the same way KU. II. 24 nāśānta-mānas ... enam āpnyāt, “One whose mind is not at rest cannot obtain Him” implies the converse “One whose mind is at rest (śānta-mānasah) may obtain Him.” “At rest” means something more than simply peaceful; the sacrificial victim is “at rest” when it “has been given its quietus” (śamyaṭe); and let us also remember that it is always assumed that the victim is a willing victim. It is then for the mind to cleanse itself (by contemplative practices, for the most part), to put itself to death. “The contemplative here and now attains the station (padam) of the ‘mind at rest’ (manah-śānti) . . . having brought the mind to a standstill, when he proceeds to de- mentsation, (amanī-bhūva) that is the last step, (paramam padam); the mind is to be arrested in the heart until its undoing is reached, this is gnosis, this liberation, and all else” (Maitri. VI. 34). It is thus that one obtains Him “by the mind.”

**FIFTH VALLI**

V. 8 tad u nātyeti kaścana, “beyond it none soever goes”: cf. M. II. 40 “the ultimate (parama) beyond which there is no further leading (panītataram), ECKHART, “On reaching God, all progress ends,” and Anselm, Et quidem credimus te esse aliquud quo nihil majus cogitari potest (Proslog. c. 2).

V. 11 Ekas tathā sarvabhubhūtarātmā na lipyate loka-duḥkhena bāhyāḥ “So the one immanent Spirit in all beings is untouched by the grief of the world, being outside it.” The same is often expressed in terms of the lotus, growing in water, but unwetted thereby (CU. IV. 14. 3 and MU. III. 2). Cf. Dionysius, De div. nom. II. 10 (quoting S. Hioretheus), ‘It is the Being that pervades all beings at once though not affected by them.’

V. 12 ekam rūpam bahudhā yah karoti “Who maketh his one form to be manifold” Cf. Dionysius, De div. nom. II. 11 “that single Existence of his is said to become manifold through bringing forth many existences from itself while yet remaining One in the act of self-multiplication,” and Plotinus, Enneads IV. 4. 1 “The unity of the Power is such as to allow of its being multiple to another principle, to which it is all things.”

Parallels throughout our texts are innumerable, for example RV. I. 146. 5 puruṣā...abhavat; VI. 47.8 puruṣūpā iyate; VIII. 58.2 ekam vā idam vi babhūva sarvam; III. 54. 8 viśvam ekam (the “integral Multiplicity” of Plotinus and “Indivisible Plurality” of Dionysius). The KU. text recurs in MU. VI. 26. The implications could only be fully developed by an extended

1. “This knowledge dements the mind” (ECKHART, I. 370).
treatment of the Exemplarist doctrine involved of that of the Divine procession as the radiation of a Light.\

The complete statement implied by the *sam ca vi ca eti* of VS. XXXII. 8 is explicit in S. II. 212 *eko pi bahudhā homi, bahudhā pi kutvā eko homi* in A. I. 254 this power of being one and becoming many, and of being many and becoming one is connected with the possession of *samādhi* as an unbroken habit; it is one of many powers, amongst which are those of walking on the water, and of motion-at-will in various senses. The bearing of this upon the problem of the Divine unity in variety and variety in unity will be apparent if we recall that "procession (considered as a local motion) implies duality" (*krama=devita, Tāttiriya Prātīsākhya, XXI. 16) and that "there is no (such) procession in *samādhi*" (*krama nāsti samāhite, Laṅkāvatāra Sūtra, II. 117).

Rawson's difficulty (p. 178, last paragraph) is unreal. Śaṅkara rightly says that the Ātman is "unmodified" (*avikṛta) whatever the forms it assumes and this is true, because these visible forms are not its "modifications", but its "possibilities of manifestation" reduced to act.

V. 13 *Eko vaśi here and sarvasya vaśi* in BU. IV. 4.22 applies equally to the Sun and to Death, so constantly identified. *Sarvakūtāntaratātmā "the Spirit indwelling all beings," as in KU. V. II and RV. I. 115. 1 *sūrya ātmā jagatas tathūṣaḥ," the Sun, the Spirit of all that moves or is at rest." Vaśa denotes the sun in R. V. VIII. 46. 33, X. 171. 4, etc. In BU. IV. 4.22 *mahān aja ātmā...sarasvyēśānaḥ* are definitely solar terms, while *sarvasvāy-

---

1. We have discussed Professor Rawson's Patripassianism elsewhere. Here we shall only add that to deny that there is (and affirm that there ought not to be) any principle apart from suffering is to deny the basic Christian doctrine (Hindu also and Buddhist) that "man's last end is one of beatitude." The problem is very clearly treated by Śaṅkara on *Brahma Sūtra* II. 3. 45-47: the Supreme Self cannot be thought of as feeling the pain of individual selves, because this pain depends upon the Agnosia (*avidyā*) according to which the individual self literally sympathises with its own psycho-physical affections or with those of others, in this way identifying itself with what-is-not-the-self (anātman, Buddhist anattā). The Supreme Self does not suffer, because it does not thus ignorantly identify Itself with any of the accidents to which its various psycho-physical vehicles are subject: It distinguishes Itself from what is not-Itself. It is precisely this un-sympathetic and un-sentimental nature of the Supreme Self that gives value to such dicta as "That art thou." The scriptural texts admit both a distinction and an absence of distinction (*bhedābheda*); but because we are already only too conscious of distinction (*bheda*) and misunderstand its nature (which is that of illumination from light, and not of illuminated things from light), the emphasis of the texts is laid upon the indoctrination of non-distinction (*abheda*),—"Their intention is to teach non-difference only, because it is by the realisation of self-identity with Brahman (*brahmātmātva-pratīppardat*) that man's last end (puruṣārtha) is won."

Cf. KU. VI. 2-3 "A great fear (mahād bhāyam) ... Through fear of Him" Are we to suppose that "He" also fears? and if so, what? It is precisely the "Weltenschmerz" of Vol. 11 that is the "great fear": *dukkham assa (lokassa) mahābbhāyam*, Sn. 1033. The goal to which Naciketas is directed is an *abhayam pāram*. 
1. Unless, of course, we properly distinguish "inner soul" = spirit from "our individual soul" = psyche. As Philo says, "The word 'soul' is used in two senses, with reference either to the soul as a whole or to its dominant (hégeomonikon = antaryāmin) part, which latter is, properly speaking, the soul of the soul (psyche psychēs)" (Quis rerum divinarum Heres, 55), this "dominant" being the "Spirit of God" (pneuma theion), (De specialibus legibus, IV, 123). But like most Western scholars, Rawson renders atman by "soul" in a quite indiscriminate way.

2. As he is in himself, ab intra, God is sadasat, "being and non-being" (RV. X. 5, 7, Munḍ. II. 2, I, Praśna Up., II. 5-6). As also in St Thomas, Sum. Theol. I. 45. 1, oportet considerare...emanationem (=sargam) totius entis a causa universalis, quae est Deus. Et hanc quidem emanationem designatam nomine creationis...ita creatio, quae est emanatio totius esse, est ex non ente, quod est nihil. ("We must consider the emanation of all being from the universal cause, which is God. And this said emanation we call 'creation.' So that creation, which is the emanation of all being, is from the non-being, which is nothing").
a "piece," but "a part, as it were" (as in BG. XV. 7). The theme would admit of a long development, but all that need be pointed out here is that Śaṅkara by no means denies, but explicitly endorses, bhedaābheda doctrine.

V. 14 : kim u bhāti vibhāti vā, "Does it shine, or does it shine forth?" The question raises the whole problem of "uncreated" and "created" light, and could only be fully elucidated in the light of the whole doctrine of light, which is the common property of Indian, Islamic, and Christian theology. The question is asked in Brahmodya style and answered in the following verse. The question itself must first be understood. Bhāti presents no difficulty. Vibhāti is bhāti combined with vi, the particle having its usual distributive value; the forms are parallel to those of bhū and vibhū, "to be," and "to be distributively" or "be forth," and so indeed are the meanings, since in this doctrine lux et ens convertuntur. Vibhāti is not "reflects," for which we should expect either ābhāti, or the anubhāti of the following verse in which, however, there is a nuance suggesting a participation rather than a mechanical reflection. The rather naïve question of whether "it" ("the true Light, which lighteth every man that cometh into the world," John I. 9) is itself illuminated by some other source of light is not raised at all. What is propounded has to do with the distinction of light from illumination as this is drawn by Bonaventura, who "distinguishes between the light (lux) and its raying (lumen, 'Lichtausstrahlung'), without always maintaining a sharp distinction between the two notions." What is asked, whether the Light of the Spirit (which shines when all other lights have gone out, BU. IV. 3.6, like KU. V. 15), whether the Light of lights (jyotir jyotisām, RV. I. 113.1 and BG. XIII. 17) is a simple and hidden or also an omniform and manifested light. The answer of KU. V. 15 is that there is no light that shines there (cf.

1. Our question is, then, virtually the same as that of SB. X. 5.2.16 "Is Death one or many," with its answer "One and many, one as he is yonder, and many as he is in his children," as also in BG. XIII. 16 "Both undivided, and also divided in beings" (avibhaktam ca bhūteṣu vibhaktam, where avibhaktam corresponds to bhāti and vibhaktam to vibhāti in our text).


3. Cf. Witelo, Lib. de intelligentis, VI "Light (lux = jyotis) is the primordial substance; whence it follows that all other substances participate in the nature of light."

4. Baeumker, Witelo, Münster, 1908, p. 396. Bonaventura, in fact, distinguishes three modalities of light: Sicut lux potest tripliciter considerandi, scilicet in se et in transparenti et in extremitate perspicuit terminati: primo modo est lux, secondo modo lumen, tertio modo hypostasis coloris" (I Sent. d. 17 p. 1 a unic. q. 1). In this division lux corresponds to jyotis or bhāsa, lumen to raśmi and vibhāsa, and hypostasis coloris to ābhāsa; or in other words, lux to svarūpa, lumen to viśvarūpa, and hypostasis coloris to prātrūpa or anuvīrūpa.

5. As "hidden," of course, the Light of the Spirit does not "shine forth," but is "obscured": KU. III. 12. gūḍho 'ṭmā na prakāšate. Hence the perpetual quest of
GB. XV. 6, and Rev. XXI. 23, appropriately cited by Rawson), but only the uncreated (akṛta as in CU. VIII. 13) Light of the Spirit (BU. IV. 3.6): “Him-shining the world-all after-shines (tam eva bhāntam anubhāti sarvam) by His shining this all shines forth” tasya bhāsā sarvam idaṁ vibhāti). (bhāti ca vibhāti ca); i.e. “shines” as He is yonder, in himself, in the darkness, and “shines forth” here, as he is in us, as light.

SIXTH VALLĪ.

VI. 9 hṛdā maniṣā manasābhikāptah, “super-conceived by the heart, by thought, by the mind”: cf. RV. I. 61.2 hṛdā manasa maniṣā, and X. 177.2 hṛdā paśyanti manasa…maniṣāṁ ni paṁti.

VI. 4 Tatāh sargesu lokeṣu śārīratvāya kalpate, “Then in the emanated worlds he is fitted for embodiment” (the sarvesu kāleṣu of one Ms. merely substitutes time for space); corresponding to KU. III. 17 anantyāya kalpate, “is fitted for infinity, or endlessness,” and Manu I. 98 brahmabhīṣyāya kalpate “is fitted for becoming Brahman.” We have discussed this passage at some length elsewhere in a wider context. It is easy to see from what point of view Śaṅkara should have wished to evade the plain meaning of the words. We agree with Rawson that it would be “better frankly to emend the text and supply a negative” than to twist its meaning. In fact, however, no emendation whatever is necessary. For what or who is it but the Brahman, Atman, that is

the “hidden Sun” gūlham sūryam, RV. passim). On the other hand, in proportion as it is “found” or “known” it reveals itself, and shines with its own Light (svaprkāsa), becoming more and more manifest (āvistarām),—tasya ya ātmānam āvistarāṁ vedāṁ nute havir bhūyaḥ.

1. The “Dark Ray” or “Radiant Darkness” of Dionysius, “hůnding by excess of light.”

2. Anubhāti: for example CU. IV. 9.2 brahmavid īva…bhāsi (“Thou shinest as though a Knower of the Brahman” and TU. III. 10.6 svareṇa-jyoṭih ya evam veda (“Thereof the Comprehensor shines with golden light”). Cf. Witelo, Lib. de intelligentiis. VIII. 1 Unumquodque quantum habit de luce, tantum retinet esse divini. Unaquaque substantia habens magis de luce quam alia dicitur nobilior ipsa (“Insofar as anything has ‘light,’ to that extent it contains divine essence. Whatever substance has more light than another is therefore called ‘more noble’ ”).

We little realise to what extent the technicalities of the traditional doctrine of light (“The perfection of all things in the cosmic order is light,” Witelo, l.c.) survives in current speech. When we speak of a “clear complexion” or “sparkling wit” or of a “bright lad” or a “shining example,” we are speaking superstitiously, i.e. without understanding the proper significance of these expressions.

3. Note bhāsā, instrumental; like brahmānuṣ in S.I. 2.3.6 and prāņena in JUB, IV. 14.1.

Sarvam idam. the subject of vibhāti, is “sūryādhi, “ the sun, etc.” (Sāyana).

4. Dante’s splendore…risplendendo, Paradiso, XXIX. 14, 15.


“embodied in the emanated words”? What but the śarīrātman, aśarīrāḥ śariresu? Who but the Ātman, who but Agni, is the rider in the chariot of which the wheels are Heaven and Earth and the axle-tree the Axis of the Universe? If Saṅkara balks, it is as Agni balks at the task of becoming the Devas’ charioteer in RV. X. 51, as the Buddha balks at the turning the Wheel, and as Christ says “May this cup be taken from me”! He would become the Brahman, but only in one nature, not in the double nature predicated of the Brahman in BU. II. 3 and as implied throughout RV.; he would be the Ātman that shines but not the Ātman that shines forth (forgetting his own bhāti ca vibhāti ca cited above); of the Supreme Identity of Being and Non-being (sadasat, passim) he would be only asat. Saṅkara’s goal is that of a Pratyeka Buddha. In Christian terms, he would be united to the Father, through the Son, but not with the Supreme Identity of Father and Son. But as is explicit in our Upaniṣad, III. 10-11, while one must have gone beyond the Manifested (Sun) to reach the unmanifested (Darkness), the Person and last end lies beyond the Unmanifested; one has not reached the end of the road until one knows Him both as Manifested and Unmanifested (vyaktāvyaktāḥ). “That One” is equally spirated, despirated” (tad ekam ānīd avātam, RV. X. 129. 2), not only despirated. That One is not only Infinite (ananta, in the sense “without beginning or end”) but also Indefinite (ananta, in the sense of BU. IV. 1. 5 “What is its endlessness? Just the quarters of heaven”). That One is both the silent and the vocal Brahman ābādāśabda); madāmadā, starīr uttvad sūtaḥ,—not only indifferent but also exhilarated, not only impotent, but also progenitive. In a word, one essence and two natures.

“Know that he on whom the worlds, the mind, and all the powers are woven is the One Ātman...Where the vectors meet, like spokes in the hub of the wheel (i.e. in the centre, in the heart) therein he moves, multifariously born” (tam ekam jānatha ātmānam...antaś carati bahudhā jāyamanaḥ Muṇḍ. II. 2. 5-6).1 We must not, however, misunderstand the nature of this “motion” and “birth”; it is as Unmoved Mover that he carati bahudhā jāyamanaḥ, as in KU. II. 21 “Seated, he travels afar; recumbent, he goeth everywhere”, and Iṣā 4 “Standing, he foregoeth them that run.” It is by means of his rays, or “feet” as they are sometimes called, that he travels (carati svarociḥ RV. III. 38. 4): the solar omnipresence is a vision, and not a local motion,... “The Sun is the Eye...Truth is the Eye; it is with the Eye that the Person ranges the dimensioned” caksuṣā hy ayaṃ mātrās carati, MU. VI. 6). The “embodiment” for which the Wake is prepared, even here and now if he is Wake, is not an incarnation under the Sun as so-and-so, but such as the Universal Man, the Eternal Avatar takes part in, not by any necessity of ends to be gained, but because it is the nature of the Light not only to be the Hidden Light but also one that shines. All that our

1. In the same way Prajāpati “wanders in the (Golden) Germ, and whilst remaining within, unseen, is multifariously born abroad (prajāpatiś carati garbhe-antar adhyāyamāno bahudhā vi jāyate, AV. X. 8.13).
verse affirms, then, is that the Wake are fitted for a state of Universal Being, as distinct from that of the private being which is the mark of those who are still asleep. Whoever participates in the Being of the Sun is a Mover-at-will in every world. We do not see why anyone should have wish to explain this away.\(^1\)

VI. 11: *prabhavāpyayau*, also Māṇḍ 6 where “He (Brahman, Atman, in “deep sleep”) is the *prabhavāpyayau* of beings”, and alternatively *mity-apiti* in Māṇḍ. 11. DEUSSEN’S “schöpfung und vergang” and HUME’S “origin and end” are much nearer to the meaning than is RAWSON’S “acquired and lost”.\(^2\) RAWSON’S rejection of HUME’S and DEUSSEN’S versions “as involving much later ideas which are foreign to the Kaṭha” introduces in any case a confusion of literary history with the history of ideas,—which have no history. In the present case, however, it is a question of ideas which are not merely implicit in “older” texts, but explicit there.

As *prabhū*, literally to “forth-become” or “come forth” (“hervorragen,” GRASSMAN) and *prabhava*, “forth-becoming”, “manifestation” (“sich hervorhuen”,\(^3\) GRASSMANN) are to be found in RV., and we know too that “a fourth (pādaḥ) of him is all beings, a fourth of him becomes (abhavaḥ) here” (X. 90. 3-4)\(^4\), no difficulty is presented by the rendering of *prabhava* as “origin”, or rather, “origination”. This is further supported by the substitution of *miti* for *prabhava* in Māṇḍ. 11, since the act of being which we

---

1. Cf. Isā 12-13 condemning equally the goals of “coming to be” and “not coming to be”, the truth being that the Person is neither of these in the sense that he is not also the other. Sāṅkara’s position can only be defended if we understand that his polemic, like Eckhart’s, is directed not against the divine activity and immanence as such, but against the pantheistic view that the whole of the divine nature finds expression in this activity, leaving nothing over. This is probably his true position; but one that is not explicit in the present context. See also the discussion of KU. II. 11, above.

2. The problem of an “acquisition and loss” of Yoga is not raised by our text. “The difficulty some have found” (RAWSON, p. 199) in conceiving such an idea may nevertheless be noticed. “Yogi” (like “Sūfi”) is strictly speaking the designation of one who has reached the end of the road, and for whom no fall or loss is possible (at this point also the notion of an “acquisition” loses its meaning, —“When I enter there,” as Rūmi says, “no one will ask me whence I came”). On the other hand, those are also called Yogīs who are still on their way (just as some are called Sūfis who are really only mutasawwuf), and in this case, “yoga” being considered as a method, or technique, one can speak, as in BG. VI. 37, of a “wandering from yoga and failure to attain perfection in yoga”. This is what is implied by the common expression “to lose one’s dhyāna”. How deeply these ideas are embedded in the racial experience can be judged from the use of the expression dhyān karo even in schools, when students are called to attend to their work.

3. To “distinguish”, “signalise” (FLÜGEL); cf. ECKHART, I. 394, “Creation is his love of clear discrimination”.

4. Related to this is AA. II. 2.2 _esa vai padam esa himāni sarvāni bhūtāni pādi_.

---
call "creation" is described throughout RV. and later as one of "measurement".1

Apy-aya, from api-i, to "approach" or "mingle with," "come into", "combine with" (whether sexually, as in RV. II. 43. 2, or otherwise), or "flow into" (as rivers into the sea), and hence also to "die" in the sense of "die and go to heaven", as in RV. I. 162. 20 apiyantam "as thou diest" and at the same time "as thou enterest" into immortality).2 The locus classicus for apyaya is SB. X. 5.14 where we find a hermeneia (nirukta) of svapna "sleep" as svāpyaya "entering in of one's own", viz., the "breaths that are 'one's' own (svāh)"3 These are, of course, "the divine immortal breaths" of BU. I. 5. 17, where they are said to "enter into him"4 (enam ...āviṣanti), just as in SB., enam...apiyanti. Again in CU. VI. 8. 1. we find "When a person here sleeps (svapīti), as it is called, then, my dear, he has attained (sampavno bhavati), he becomes 'one who has come into his own' (svam-apitah). So they say of one who sleeps that 'He has come into his own'". It is, then, more than sufficiently evident that the meanings that Rawson rejects as "late" are already explicit in texts which he himself accepts as much older than the Katha. We render accordingly, Tāṁ paramāṁ

1. In KU. V. 8 also, Kānam kānam puruśo nirmāṇaḥ cf. BU. IV. 3.9 asya lokasya mātrām ...svayam nirmāya, and Māṇḍ 11 minoti ka vā idam sarvam. BU. IV. 3.9. vihatya...nirmāya corresponds (in reversed order) to the mity-apīti of Māṇḍ 11 and prabhavāpyaya elsewhere; but it should not be overlooked that while the reference of vihatya ("striking off") and apīti ("coming into") sc. one's own, whence the hermeneia svapīti, "sleeps") is to one and the same act of being, the words themselves are not synonymous, but refer to the same act under different aspects. The same applies in the case of prabhava and miti: the act of "coming forth" is an act of "measurement".

2. Similarly in CU. IV. 3. 1 "When Agni blows out (intransitive), he just enters into the Gale of the Spirit" (Yadā vā agnir udvāyati, vāyum evāpyeti), and JUB. III. 1.7 Sa etam (vāyum) evāpyeti.

3. Eggeling renders svāpyaya by "being taken possession of by one's own people", as if apy-aya had been āpyaya. The result of this too free translation is a false assimilation of the present text to that of XI. 2. 3. 6, cited above, where the Devas, originally mortal "take possession of immortality by means of the Brahman" ("by means of", because "Himself the bridge", "I am the Way"). The "entering in" (apyaya) of the immortal principles is an activity on their part: the taking possession (āpyaya) an activity on the recipient's part. These activities are coincident; unification is the "coming into one's own" of the one and the other that are "unified"; to find Him and to find oneself is the same, as is explicit in JUB. IV. 14. where the Brahman says "with the breath of my mouth ye shall obtain (upāpnavāthe) yourselves, and shall obtain me." Whichever way we look at it, it is a matter of "coming into one's own": nevertheless, these "ways of looking at it" should not be confused in a translation.

4. "Into him", viz. the Comprehensor (evānivit), when he has made the "full-bequest (sampratti = sampradānam, Kaus. Up. II. 15), and as he departs from this world, enters into his son (putram āviṣati) with mortal breaths, or powers, at the same time that the immortal breaths or powers into him (enam ...āviṣanti). The text is important, because of the clear distinction made between metempsychosis and transmigration, and of both from "reincarnation".
gatim) 'yogam' iti manyante sthiram indriya-dhāranām...Yogo hi prabhava-
pyayau, "The which (last step), 'yoga' to wit, they understand to be the
'firm hold of the senses'...Yoga is both the coming forth and the entering
in". The senses are the steeds: yoga is expert driving (cf. BG. II. 50
"Yoga is skill in action"), start and finish of the race. Yoga is the true
art alike of living and of dying; contemplatio ars vivendi et moriendi.

VI. 13: "'He is', thus only can be apprehended; when he is appre-
prehended as 'He is,' his essential nature shines out clearly (prāsidati)", cf.
Damascene, De Fid. orthodox. I, "'He who is' is the principal of all names
applied to God; for comprehending all in itself, it contains existence itself
as an infinite and indeterminate sea of substance; and Eckhart, "God's only
idiosyncrasy is being". Cf. also SB. II. 3. 2. 1 'In him that exists'.
Prāsidati here recalls prasādāt in KU. II. 20, "by the shewing forth of 
", or "by the clear light of ", rather than "by the grace of".
ŚLEṢA IN BĀṆA

By

V. RAGHAVAN

In his note on the Gauḍī Riti in the NIA, I. i, p. 74, Dr. Dē says in footnote 2 that the word ‘Śleṣa’ in Harṣa-carita introductory verse 7, is usually rendered as ‘play upon words’, following Saṇkara, but that it should not be taken in that sense, that is, as an Alarṇkāra and that it should be taken "in the sense of Daṇḍin’s poetical excellence (Gṛṇa) of the same name, which emphasises freedom from looseness and compact coalescence of word and sense."

Firstly, as far as I am able to see, Daṇḍin’s Gṛṇa, Śleṣa, refers only to Śabda and to explain it as ‘coalescence of word and sense’ seems unjustified.

Secondly, Bāṇa’s Śleṣa in Harṣa-carita, introductory verse 7, refers only to Śleṣa Alarṇkāra; for, verse 8 which follows here and which Dr. Dē certainly notes, offers a commentary on verse 7 and shows what Bāṇa means by the term Śleṣa. When in the next verse, Bāṇa says that Śleṣa should not be strained,—‘Sleṣo aklīṣṭah’—He evidently means by Śleṣa the Alarṇkāra of play upon word.* What is the relevancy of ‘Kleṣa’ or ‘Akleṣa’ in the Gṛṇa of Śleṣa?

---

* I may be permitted here to refer to my humble contribution to the subject Riti in the Mm. Prof. S. Kuppuswami Sastri Comm. Vol. pp. 89-90.
APABHRAŚA AND MARĀṬHĪ METRES

By

H. D. VELANKAR.

1. It has been proved almost beyond doubt, that the Vernaculars like Marāṭhī and Gujarati have descended from a particular stage called Apabhraśa of the ancient Prakritic languages. In the following paragraphs, it will be my attempt to show that the vernacular metres have also directly descended from the Apabhraśa metres and that the so-called pure Marāṭhī metres are nothing but a developed form of some one or the other of the old Prakrit and Apabhraśa metres. What is true of the Marāṭhī metres can also be shown to be true of the metres in the other vernaculars, which are similarly derived from the Prakrits through the Apabhraśa stage.

2. Before we actually begin the discussion of the subject, it is very necessary for us to know and to remember a few peculiarities of the Apabhraśa poets. First, that they were, as a rule, of the masses and wrote their poetry for the masses; secondly, that they liked greater freedom of diction and, for this purpose, chose generally the Mātrā Ṛttas for their compositions; and thirdly that they cared more for the time-keeping capacity of their poems than for their structural ornamentation and rhythm secured by the use of long and short syllables at particular places. Their poems were to be sung and not merely to be recited, and the singing was usually accompanied by a time-keeping musical instrument, as also by the movements of the hands and feet. The quantity of the individual letters was unimportant for them; a short letter could be made to yield two or even more Mātrās by the introduction of a metrical pause or rest if necessary, and similarly a long letter or even a group of letters could be so quickly pronounced as to yield only one Mātrā. They never cared to know how many letters intervened between the two strokes of the time-keeping instrument, but they always faithfully observed the rule regarding the number of the Mātrās or the metrical moments, which must occur between them. Mātrā is indeed a theoretical unit in connection with a metre, its existence being postulated only for the purpose of measuring the time. All the letters, therefore, intervening between the two strokes were pronounced by them in such a manner that they yielded only the required number of Mātrās and no more nor less.

3. Another important peculiarity of these poets that ought to be noted is that, when they actually compose their Kaḍavakas (Kaḍavaka is a group of stanzas in the same metre, preceded and followed by stanzas in a different

metre and which forms the unit of the cantos in a poem), they use any of the Mātṛa-vṛtta Catuspadis or even the Varna-vṛtta Catuspadis but they do not treat them as Catuspadis. They form their Kaḍavakas with any number of rhyming couplets and not quartets as might be expected, of lines composed in such metres. Thus Pajjhaṭikā or Bhujaṅgaprayāta may be a Catuspadī metre, but the poet actually uses any number of couplets of lines in these metres for their Kaḍavakas and not necessarily a number of lines which is divisible by four, which would be obligatory, if the metres were treated as Catuspadī metres. This means that they do not observe the rule regarding the number of lines which a stanza in the Pajjhaṭikā or the Bhujaṅgaprayāta metre must contain, though they do not disregard the rules regarding the formation of a line in these metres. This practice of considering halves of Catuspadis as independent units with which to compose the Kaḍavakas is indeed very common among the Apabharanīśa poets and the same may be said of even the Ardhasama Catuspadis and the Śatpadis. Halves of these latter seem to have been treated as independent metres in a similar manner. The Dhruva Padas or the Sthāyis of the modern Padyas in the Vernaculars are surely to be traced back to the similar halves of the Ardhasama Catuspadis in the Apabharanīśa language, treated as independent metres. In Śatpadis whose 3rd and 6th lines are considerably long, there also appears to be a growing tendency to split them up and to make the earlier part rhyme with the preceding lines, after making it also equal to them in length. The latter part, of course, then, remains shorter than the first three lines, and the whole half, when considered by itself, assumes the appearance of a stanza having three and half lines. Four such halves are put together to form the metre called the Trībhaṅgi. In each of these four halves we get four short lines of 10, 8, 8, and 6 Mātrās respectively. These halves of a Śatpadī which contain 2 or 3 rhymes and which are divisible into four short lines, the last of which is the shortest, are naturally of various kinds. But the most popular among them seems to be the one which is divisible into four lines of 8, 8, 8, and 6 Mātrās respectively. The Śatpadī which is made with two such halves, but which is treated as a Catuspadī by Pīṇgala,2 is the Caubolā. It is indeed one of the Upajātis described by Hemacandra, in his Chandaṃśūsāsana.3 These halves appear to have been largely used as independent units for the songs intended to accompany the various kinds of popular dances. The well-known Tipari song in Marāṭhī, i.e. 'Eka tiparisā ghe, dusarisā mār ge, tisari deunī cavathī ghe &c.' is composed in these halves and so are the Fatkas of Anantafandī. The beat of the Tāla, indicated by the stroke of the Tiparis in these, occurs on the first Mātrā of each of the four short

---

lines, and a pause of 2 Mātrās is introduced at the end, to fill up the gap left by the shortest line.

4. It is this particular half of an Apabhraṃśa Śaṭpadi, treated as an independent metre consisting of 3 and ½ lines, and which may therefore be described as Ardhacatuspadi, which seems to have gained great popularity among the early Marāṭhi-speaking masses influenced by the Apabhraṃśa poets. Women appear to have composed and sung their songs in this metre while doing their work, or while enjoying their leisure on the household swings. The songs with which they lulled their babies to sleep in their cradles, or with which they tried to forget the hard labour involved in their daily grinding of corn, were also without doubt, composed in this same metre. Later on the metre came to be called Ovī and is preserved in practice even till to-day, though, in course of time its origin from the Apabhraṃśa parent was altogether forgotten. We may however have a glimpse of it through the significant name Ovī which it has received. I have no doubt, that the name Ovī is to be derived from the Sanskrit word Ardhačatuspadi through the following process:—Aḍḍhauṇḥāvai-Aḍḍhudṛṇāvai-Aḍḍhudṛṇāvai-Aḍḍhudṛṇāvai-Dhūṇāvai-Hūṇāvai-Hūṇāvai-Hovāi and finally ovāi-ovī. It may appear a rather lengthy process, but the word Auṭa derived from the Sanskrit Ardhačaturtha offers a good parallel, and nothing in the process is impossible according to the rules of Prakrit grammar, which after all are based on the observation of the process of deterioration. The name is significant because, in its remodelled form, the Ovī has actually 3 and ½ lines. The last line—the shortest of all—has a history of its own in the development of the Ovī metre through the first five centuries of the second decade of the Christian era. We shall consider this and also the other derivations of the word Ovī in separate paragraphs below.

5. We have seen that the Marāṭhi Ovī has developed out of the half of that particular kind of a Śaṭpadi, which is divisible into three shorter lines of 8 Mātrās each, and one of 6 Mātrās and which is treated as a separate metre. We shall now examine the structure of these lines of the Ovī. Normally, we find that the first three lines of the Ovī contain six letters and 8 Mātrās each, while the last one contains 4 letters and 6 Mātrās only. The six letters in the first three lines may be distributed over the 8 Mātrās in any way so long as the two clear divisions of 4 Mātrās each are maintained. As almost all Apabhranṣa metres are Tālageya Vṛttas and since Ovī is an Apabhramśa metre in a developed form, it was originally a Tālageya Vṛtta to be sung to the accompaniment of a time-keeping instrument and it has still remained so in the form of the Abhaṅga. Abhaṅga, as will be shown below, is nothing but the original Ovī of the common Masses in its Tālageya form, the new name being probably invented for distinguishing between this and the other form of the Ovī, which it assumed in the hands of the Marāṭhi poets, who turned it to the service of a literary nature. It is for this reason, that, in the original form of the Ovī, called Abhaṅga
in later days, the clapping of the hands or the strokes of the time-keeping instrument must accompany the first Māṭrā of each of the four lines, while at the end, a pause of 2 Māṭrās has to be introduced, to keep the Tāla undisturbed; for, the Ovi too, like its original, is sung in the Dhumālī Tāla of 8 Māṭrās. Sometimes, this Ovi i.e. the Abhaṅga is sung very slowly. The line is then so pronounced that it yields 16 instead of the usual 8 Māṭrās, and the stroke of the Tāla occurs twice, once at the beginning and once in the middle of the line, but the number of letters remains the same, i.e. 6. The 16 Māṭrās, then, are distributed over the 6 letters as follows:—Each of the first four letters is pronounced long, thus yielding 8 Māṭrās and forming the first Tālagaṇa. The remaining two letters are made to yield the other Tālagaṇa of 8 Māṭrās. For this purpose, both are pronounced long and a pause of 2 Māṭrās is introduced after each. Occasionally, the second pause of 2 Māṭrās is shifted from the last letter of the first line of the Ovi-Abhaṅga to the 2nd letter of the second line, its first letter being substituted for this pause which is shifted. This of course, is only a stylistic peculiarity and is observed only in the case of the first line.

6. This popular Ovi was adopted for their literary compositions by the Marāṭhī poets towards the 10th or the 11th century A.D. For a long time it appears to have been handled by the Mahānubhāva poets only, and was thus restricted to the Marāṭhī-knowing followers of that sect alone. It cannot, therefore, be properly regarded as the real Marāṭhī literary metre, till the great Jñānesvāri was written in it in 1290 A.D. This work finally and fully established the claims of the Marāṭhī language and of the Ovi metre, to be regarded as worthy of being employed for literary purposes. We find abundant references in the Jñānesvāri, showing how till that time, both the language and the metre were treated with little respect among the learned Pandits. It is indeed abundantly proved, that the Mahānubhāvas had employed both these, for a sort of semi-religious poetry, but in spite of the literary merits that may have existed in some of them, they had never succeeded in establishing the supremacy of either, in the field of Literature. This is perfectly natural, because, these semi-literary compositions were actually closed to a large portion of the Marāṭhī-reading public, since they were scribed in a secret script, known only to the followers of the Mahānubhāva sect. It is no wonder, therefore, that in spite of their efforts for over a century, they could not make the Marāṭhī language a literary language or the Ovi metre, a literary metre. On the other hand, owing to the association of the Mahānubhāvas with them, they must have become an object of contempt, like them. But the internal development of the language and of the metre is another matter altogether. Being handled for a century or two by persons gifted with literary talents, the growth of these was inevitable, from a purely literary point of view. We are more or less concerned with this. It must, therefore, be admitted that before Jñānesvāra first handled it publicly, so to say, for a literary purpose, the Ovi metre had already undergone some changes in its form. It would seem that at the time of Jñānesvāra, the
origin of Ovī from its Apabhraṃśa parent was almost forgotten and that it was regarded as a sort of peculiar popular metre with three complete and one half lines. The peculiarity of the short fourth line has been studiously observed by every one of the Marāṭhī poets till the last days of Classical Marāṭhī Poetry, though Vāmana sometimes slightly disregarded it and though Ekanātha and Mahīdharā introduced some important changes in it. The first three lines of the Ovī on the other hand, had, at the time of Jñānēśvara, already lost their original proportion of length, though they were carefully rhymed as before. Their length was undetermined and almost left to the caprice of the individual writers. This was due to the fact that in its literary form, the Ovī was free from the influence of the Tāla, which alone controlled the length of the lines till then. Thus from a Tālāgeya Vṛtta, the Ovī in its literary form, was turned into merely a Svarageya Vṛtta. The Apabhraṃśa poets had chosen the Tālāgeya Vṛttas, i.e. the Mātrāvṛttas, because they did not like to be bound by the rules regarding the number and quantity of letters which have to be observed in the Varnavṛttas. They, however, imposed upon themselves the rules of Tāla, which determined the length of their lines, though it left them free, as regards the choice of letters. Their descendants, the Marāṭhī poets, went however, a step further. They flung away even this restriction of the Tāla. They were thus not only free in the choice of the letters with which to compose their lines, but there was also nothing to restrain them in respect of the length of the lines of their Ovī. It is clearly the conviction of every Marāṭhī poet, both old and new, that theoretically, he was free to employ any number of letters in a line of the Ovī, though he appears to have made use of this freedom only when he was in some difficulty as regards a suitable word or an expression which would both be short and capable of yielding the very essential rhyme. The usual practice of the Marāṭhī poets in this respect is to employ not less than 6 letters and not more than 10 or 12 letters in the normal lines of an Ovī. It must be remembered, however, that the tendency to compose short lines is found to disappear gradually, as we move farther away from Jñānēśvara and his times. This was probably due to the fact, that in the early days of Classical Marāṭhī Poetry, both the literary and the popular forms of the Ovī metre were recognized by the common name Ovī, and thus the real nature and length of the lines of a proper Ovī, preserved in its popular form, known as Abhaṅga in later days, was constantly kept before the eyes of the early Marāṭhī poets.

7. The popular form of the Ovī, i.e. the Tālāgeya one, which ran side by side with the above-discussed literary form and which existed only among the uneducated masses till the days of Nāmadeva, was revived by another class of Marāṭhī poets, who put it to the use of oral religious instruction. These poets, the earliest of whom is Nāmadeva, a contemporary of Jñānēśvara, composed their songs in the Ovī metre, and sang them to the accompaniment of a pair of cymbals and a lute, while instructing the masses in their Vaishnavite creed. They frequently describe these songs as 'Ovīs',
but never as Abhaṅgas. The name Abhaṅga is evidently of a late origin. It must have been given to the popular form of the Ovi, which is sung and not merely recited, at a time when there arose a necessity to distinguish this form from the other i.e. the literary one, which in course of time, became completely free from any metrical restrictions except the Antya Yamaka as explained above. Curiously enough, the new literary form retained the old name, while the original old form got a new name. In this connection, it must be clearly understood that in the early days of its currency, the word Abhaṅga must not have signified any simple metre. It only meant 'an unbroken or musically uninterrupted' group of stanzas composed in the Ovi metre. It may indeed be pointed out that the word retains this sense even to-day. To sing an Abhaṅga means, to sing not this or that stanza, but a group of stanzas forming a unity owing to the common idea and the concluding portion, containing the name of the poet and such other things. In this capacity, the Abhaṅga may be compared with the Apabhṛṣṭa Kaḍavaka. Only later on, the word must have been used in a secondary manner to signify the Ovis themselves of which the Abhaṅga is made. Authors like Nāmadeva and Tukārāma describe their stanzas as Ovis and not as Abhaṅgas. Attempts have been made to trace the word Abhaṅga and its meaning, as far back as possible in the works of Marāṭhī poets, including the Mahānubhāva ones. But except in a few Abhaṅgas of a doubtful authenticity, it is nowhere found to signify any simple or even a strophic metre. In all the three passages of the Khrista Purāṇa, the word is without doubt used euphemistically in the sense of the 'conclusion' or the 'end'. A word signifying end or finish is never used in connection with holy things such as the saubhāgya Kumkuma by orthodox women even to-day. In most other passages, the word signifies 'imperishable', which is the real meaning of the word in its Sanskrit form. Rājvāde, Marāṭhī Chan-da, p. 8, derives the word from Bhaṅga, which according to him means 'a melodious group of letters' i.e. an Akṣaragaṇa like Yaṇaṇa, Maṇaṇa, &c. Abhaṅga is that metre in which no such Gaṇas exist. A. K. Priyolkar, Vīvidhajñānavistara, 1933, p. 279, on the other hand, tries to connect the name with an important episode in the life of the great saint Tukārāma, namely, the non-destruction of the books containing his poems, even when they were thrown into the water. Both these derivations appear to me unsatisfactory. In prosody, the word Bhaṅga is not known to me, to have been used in the sense of 'a melodious group'. In words like Dvibhaṅgi and Tribhaṅgi, it has the sense of 'a component part'. It may also mean 'an extended tune' in passages like Hemacandra, Chandonuśāsana (NSP. Ed.), p. 34b/12. But in any case, the derivation of the name Abhaṅga from some technical Bhaṅga seems to me to be improbable. As regards the second derivation, it is indeed difficult to believe that this particular strophic metre existed for over 200 or 300 years and had not yet obtained any specific name for it, till the middle of the 17th century. To me it appears, that the name was originally applied to the strophic metre, which
consisted of an 'unbroken group of Ovis,' resembling the Kadavaka of Apabhramsha Poetry and then in course of time it was applied to the constituent Ovis themselves. This indeed is a perfectly natural course. This may have taken place even during the 'boom period' of the Abhaanga, i.e. when every Marathi poet or poetess, who could compose, tried his or her hand on the Abhaanga metre. The mere presence of the word Abhaanga in the sense of a metre occurring in a poem therefore, need not drive us to the conclusion, that it is of a doubtful authenticity, if it can be proved to be otherwise authentic.

8. By the side of this most predominant form of Ovi-Abhaanga, we find some other forms of it in the Abhaanga literature. The more important among these is the one which is modelled just after the main variety. But instead of 8 Matras and 6 letters in each of the first three lines, we get here 16 matras and 8 letters, while in the 4th line, we have 14 Matras represented by 7 letters, with a Yati and mostly a Yamaka after the 8th Matra or the 4th letter. In point of Matras, this variety is almost the double of the first. This form of the Ovi-Abhaanga it is, which very probably was the origin of Ekanatha's Ovi with four Yamakas. The general rule of pronouncing 2 or more letters so quickly as to be equal to one long letter\(^1\) and of pronouncing any letter short or long according to necessity, applies even to this variety. If we remember this very simple rule, so very patent to every reader of Prakrit Poetry, all the 20 and odd varieties, mentioned by Rajwe, Marathi Chanda, pp. 9-10, resolve themselves into only four or five, which we propose to discuss. The lines of this second variety as a rule contain 8 long letters and though I have said that they were modelled after those of the primary variety, yet the mode of singing them and the presence of 16 Matras in each, may indicate the influence of the commonest of the narrative Apabhramsha metres of 16 Matras, namely the Pajhjhatikā. The shorter fourth line, however, shows the main source of inspiration in its composition. The 3rd and the 4th varieties of the Abhaanga are each of two lines, and respectively represent the first and the second halves of the above-mentioned second variety. The 3rd variety has thus two lines, each normally containing 8 letters and 16 Matras, while the 4th has also 2 lines, but the first contains 8 letters and 16 Matras, and the second has only 7 letters and 14 Matras. The second line of the 4th variety, is further characterized by the Yati and the Yamaka occurring after the 4th letter or the 8th Matra in it, as in the fourth line of the second variety. There is one more variety of the Abhaanga, but it is only a variation of the third variety. Instead of the 8 letters and 16 Matras, we get here only 6 letters and 12 Matras in the first line, while the second line is the same as in the 3rd variety. All these varieties are Tālageya Vṛttas. The first two of these are more suited to narration and

---

the last three to an impassioned appeal, an angry outburst, a forceful argument and the like.

9. We shall now look a little into the history of the fourth short line, which is the peculiarity of the Ovī, whether in its popular or literary form. The origin of this line is no more a secret to us. We saw above that it is really the latter part of the third line of the original Śatpadī-half, which became transformed into the Ovī. This third line of the Śatpadī-half contained 14 mātrās originally. But later, when the Yati and the additional rhyme came to be introduced after the 8th Mātrā within it, it became divided into two parts, the 1st containing 8 Mātrās and normally 6 letters, and the 2nd containing the remaining 6 Mātrās represented normally by 4 letters. Thus eventually the original 3rd line gave rise to two shorter lines of 8 and 6 Mātrās, and the original half of the Śatpadī which formerly had three lines of 8, 8, 14 Mātrās, became now possessed of four lines and thus turned out as a full-fledged metre like the other Catuspadīs. The great difference between this new metre and the other Catuspadīs, however, could not be overlooked. It was observed how, when the other Catuspadīs stood on all their four feet, the recently born metre was standing on its three feet alone, while its fourth foot—the short one—was hanging in the air without touching the ground. The popular bards did not, however, dislike their new-born metre on that account and rather took pride in having their own metre with some kind of peculiarity. They, therefore, not only did not seek to correct the defect, but on the other hand, commemorated the same by giving a significant name to it, namely, Ardhacatuspadi or Ovī. This is then how the shorter line originated and persisted, and though already at the time of Jñānesvara, the origin of both the Ovī and its short leg were well nigh forgotten, yet the Marāṭhī poets have as a rule, never sought to make whole the defective Pāda, thus remaining true to tradition. Its growth, on the other hand, was inevitable, and it would be very interesting to trace it through the whole period, in which older Marāṭhī poetry flourished.

10. In the early days of its employment for literary purposes, this line kept very much nearer to its original form, in which it contained 4 letters and 6 Mātrās. But gradually as the consideration of the Mātrās entirely vanished in the new literary form—that of the letters was already neglected—the first three lines of the Ovī lost their normal form and length, and did not conform to the older standard of 6 letters and 8 Mātrās. They became unequal in length and often contained as many as 10 or 12 or even more letters. The natural result of this was a corresponding disturbance in the length of the fourth line. In the Jñānesvari, the fourth line generally contains from 4 to 7 letters, but it is frequently seen to contain more than 7 letters. Now it is important to note, that when this line contains 4 to 6 letters only, a Yati or a narrative pause in its middle is unnecessary. When on the other hand, it contains 7 or more than 7 letters, the necessity of such a pause is felt at once. The line which contains 7 letters forms, as a matter
of fact, the transitional stage. While reciting such a line, one feels inclined to split it up into two parts. But when there are 8 or more letters in it, it definitely requires to be split up, and here it is that the Yati in the middle of the 4th line of the Ovi is found to be definitely established. Such fourth lines containing more than 7 letters are comparatively few in the Jñāneśvari, but the growing tendency towards such lines is clearly noticeable in it. They are seen again, in an increasing proportion, in the two subsequent works of Jñāneśvara, namely the Amṛtiśūrabha and the Uttaragītā Tikā. When however, we come down to Ekanātha in the 16th century, such a fourth line had already become the rule rather than the exception.

The next natural step after the introduction of the Yati is the introduction of the Yamaka and just as the original 3rd line of the Šatpadī had become split up into two owing to the Yati and the Yamaka, so now, the fourth line of the Ovi became almost split up into two, when Ekanātha and Mahipati introduced the Yamaka, in its middle. Only the tradition of the ‘limping fourth foot’ must have saved the Ovi from being transformed into an Ardhapaṅcapadī! It is probably out of this consideration for the tradition, that this rhymed portion of the 4th line occurring before the Yati has never been raised to the status of a real foot, which means that its length is never made to approach that of the other three lines. If we conceive the Ovi in its original form, as a limping quadruped, touching the ground with its three legs only and if we further imagine its three Yamakas to be the sounds produced by its striking the ground with its three hoofs, then we may say, that the new Ovi with the 4 Yamakas is also a limping animal, but it nevertheless strikes the ground even with its short leg and produces the sound though this last sound produced by the lame foot is easily detectable, be cause it comes much too early than the others and disturbs the rhythm in an evident manner.

That portion of the new 4th line which comes after the 4th Yamaka does not hang in the air like the old 4th line but is, so to say, dragged on over the ground. The 4th line in the Ovis of poets like Śrīdhara, Mukteśvara, Vāmana and Rāmadāsa is also long like that of Ekanātha, but it contains only the Yati and not also the Yamaka. Even Vāmana, who takes utmost liberty with the first three lines, observes the sanctity of the lame foot invariably, in all his writings.

11. The word Ovi has been derived from the Marāṭhi root ‘ovanē’ meaning ‘to put together’ (which again is to be traced back to the Sanskrit avāṁ/mā) by Rajwade, Marāṭhi Chanda, p. 18 and the derivation seems to have been unchallenged so far. In support of it, Rajwade points out how the word ‘ovanikā’ occurs as a synonym for Ovi in a Mahānubhāva work called Darśanaaparakāśa, composed in A.D. 1638 (published at the Chi

trashala Press, Poona, 1901). Mr. A. K. Priyolkar, Vividhajñānavistāra, Sept.-Oct. 1933, p. 272, further points out how the Marāṭhi root ‘ovanē’ is used in the sense of ‘compose together’ in a metaphor, where words are said to be gems, in a work called ‘Bālavabodha’ of Tryambaka, who was a contemporary of Eknātha. The derivation is not impossible, yet it presupposes
that Ovi is a purely Marathi metre invented by the Marathi poets and that there is no connection whatsoever between the Ovi and the Prakrit or the Apabhramsha metres! RAJWADE indeed wants us to believe that (1) the peculiar Ovi metre with its characteristic ‘lame foot’ is but a rejuvenated old Vedic metre, and that (2) it is only an Aksara Vṛtta like the Vedic metres; cf. Marathi Chanda, pp. 30-31. He further explains how in the Vedic metres there are several lines which are undersyllabled and how the ‘lame foot’ of the Ovi may have been imitated from such lines. He indeed admits that there is a great difference between the undersyllabled foot of the Vedic metres and the ‘lame foot’ of the Marathi Ovi because while the former is an exception and may occur in any of the three or four lines of the stanza, the latter must occur as a rule, in the fourth line alone. But he offers an explanation that the fourth line of an Ovi is always kept short in order that the reader might know where one Ovi ends and the other begins! cf. Ibid, p. 30. All these assumptions of the great scholar are, however, most unconvincing. Firstly, it is impossible to imagine that the illiterate masses, with whom the metre originated, could have gone for their inspiration to the old and long-forgotten Vedic metres, leaving aside the common Apabhramsha metres which were in vogue fully at the time when the Ovi originated. Secondly, the Ovi cannot be regarded as an Aksara Vṛtta like the Vedic metres. It is a Tala Vṛtta proper as shown above, where all importance is attached to the Mātrās intervening between the two strokes of the Tala and none at all to the number of letters. The general employment of a definite number in its lines and the indiscriminate use of long and short letters may give it the appearance of an Aksara Vṛtta. But the fact that in its original and purer form of an Abhaṅga, it is always sung to the accompaniment of a time-keeping instrument, and that while singing, the letters assume only a secondary rōle, being twisted according to the necessity of the Tala, ought to leave no doubt that the Ovi was originally a Tala Vṛtta and is still so in its popular form of the Abhaṅga. Only those Marathi poets, who gave it the new literary form, removed this characteristic from it, and made it an entirely ‘free verse’, without any restrictions as to the number of the Mātrās and letters or their quantity. If we maintain that the lines of the Ovi may contain any number of letters, how can we say in the same breath, that it is an Aksara Vṛtta? In an Aksara Vṛtta, the number of letters that ought to occur in each line is restricted. But RAJWADE himself has said in the beginning (cf. Ibid, p. 20), that any number of letters from 6 to 18 may occur in the lines of an Ovi, of course, in the first three lines. It is thus impossible to assume that the Ovi is an Aksara Vṛtta. That the Ovi was borrowed from the illiterate masses by the Marathi poets is not at all to be doubted. Jñānesvari XIII, 1743, describes the Ovi as the ‘Abāla-subodha bandha’, i.e. a metre which is well-known even to a child. That originally it was a metre to be sung, but lost this characteristic, when it became a literary metre is also proved from Jñānesvari, XIII, 1742 (jānitvete miravi, giteṁvinaṁ raṅgu dāvi) ‘it shows the characteristic of a song, and
possesses the beauty of a song though it is not a song.' At Mānasollāsa, the Ovī is said to be the song which is sung by the Marāṭhī women while unhusking corn (probably while grinding it).

12. As regards the 'lame foot' of the Ovī, the remarks of Rajwade are equally beside the point. It has obviously nothing to do with the exceptional and irregular undersyllabled lines of the Vedic metres, more particularly so when the connection between the Ovī and the Vedic metres itself is highly improbable. Nor is the reason offered by Rajwade for its regular occurrence at the end of the Ovī, in any way convincing. If the last line of the Ovī is to be kept short in order to show where the earlier Ovī ends and the later one begins, why could the same rule not be applied to any other Catuspadī metres for the same reason? The fact is that the reason was given by Rajwade because some reason had to be given and that, therefore, it need not be taken into consideration by us, in a serious manner. Finally, this short line of the Ovī should not be traced back to a similar short 4th line of the Prakrit metre Gāthā, because logically a connection between the two cannot be established. Gāthā is a very old Prakrit metre, which had almost become sacred to the Buddhist and the Jainas. It was not held in great favour by the Apabhraṃsā poets, though its derivatives like the Gītī were sometimes employed by them for their strophes. Besides it was obviously regarded as the metre of the 'learned'. Hence it was employed by even the Sanskrit Pandits for their compositions. There is again no similarity between the two as regards the construction or form. All this discussion ought to prove that the Ovī is a legitimate property of the Marāṭhī-speaking masses, inherited by them from their Apabhraṃsā-speaking ancestors, and then the derivation of the word Ovī from the Marāṭhī root 'ovane' appears only to be a make-shift invented by those, who had forgotten the original significance of the word. The evidence of an author, who lived in 1608, is as good or as bad as the evidence of another living in our own times! On the other hand, the designation of a metre from the number of lines it contains, is a very common thing in the Apabhraṃsā language. Thus the Dvipadi, the Catuspadī, the Śatpadī and the Aṣṭapadī are well-known names. It is also possible to derive the word Ovī from the Sanskrit 'Upajati', which is the name of the particular type of the Śatpadī, from the half of which our Ovī is derived; see above para. 4 and Hemacandra, Chandonuśasana, p. 38b/14ff. But I am personally inclined to believe that the word is best derived from the Sanskrit Ardha-catuspadī. The name becomes very significant as it explains its connection with the Apabhraṃsā metres and also its own peculiar characteristic, i.e. the short 4th line.

13. Thus far, we have traced the origin and history of the two most important and widely employed Marāṭhī metres, i.e. the Ovī and the Abhaṅga. We shall now briefly examine the nature of the other two Marāṭhī metres, the Diṇḍī and the Sāki, which stand next in importance to the Ovī and the Abhaṅga. Both are Mātrāvruttaś and not Akṣara or Akṣaragana
Vṛttas. All popular metres are indeed Mātrā Vṛttas, except when they are borrowed from the Sanskrit metres. The Diṇḍi is to be traced to an Apabhramśa Catuspādi Gaṅita, containing 19 Mātrās in each of its four lines. The Mātrā Gañgas with which the 19 Mātrās are to be made up, are 3, 2, 2, 2, 3, 3, 2, 2. The last two Dvimātrika Gañgas are to be represented by two long letters, and a Yati must occur after the 9th Mātrā. The other Mātrā Gañgas may be made up in any way, so long as their separateness is maintained as described by me in my 'Apabhramśa Metres', para. 13, in \textit{BUJ.}, Nov. 1933, p. 38, by avoiding the use of a long letter at the junction of the two Mātrā Gañgas. Thus the 3rd and the 4th, the 5th and the 6th, the 7th and the 8th, the 9th and the 10th, the 12th and the 13th, as also the 15th and the 16th Mātrās must never be combined into a long letter. The name Diṇḍi is very probably to be derived from the Sanskrit Diṇḍima and not from Daṇḍikā, which is a stringed instrument. Diṇḍi, like every other popular metre, is a Tāla Vṛtta and a stringed instrument is generally not used for keeping the Tāla. Diṇḍi therefore could not have derived its name from a stringed instrument, with which it could not have been sung, in a proper manner. It is true, that some popular bards sing their songs to the accompaniment of a stringed instrument like the 'Ekatāri', which serves the double purpose of keeping the Tāla and helping the Svara; but this is possible in the case of every metre and there is no special reason why Diṇḍi alone should get its name from it. There is much sense on the other hand, in deriving it from the Diṇḍima. When sung, the metre produces a sound, which is very similar to the one produced by the Diṇḍima, which is small hand-drum, similar to the Đamaru.

14. The next metre is the Sākī. It is really a Dvīpadī, whose lines contain 28 Mātrās each. There is a double Yati in the line. First it comes after the 8th and then after the 16th Mātrā. The Yati is not accompanied by the Yamaka. The Mātrās are made up by employing any of the Caturmātrika Gañgas. Regarding the name Sākī, RAJWADE derives it from the Sanskrit Śakvari, which is a name given to all those Sanskrit metres, whose lines contain 14 letters and thus make up a total of 56 letters in all their four lines together. Our Sākī contains 56 Mātrās in its two lines together, and thus owing to the similarity in point of the number 56, we are required to believe that the name Śakvari is secondarily applied to the Sākī! I am not at all sure about this. If at all, the name Sākī is to be derived from a Sanskrit word, I can only say, that that word cannot be Śakvari. It may be any other word, but not this one at any rate. The Sanskrit ra is never dropped in the Prakrits. It is either changed to la or even to da; cf. PISCHEL, \textit{Grammatik der Prakrit Sprachen}, Secs. 256-258. I am however, unable to offer a more satisfactory derivation at the present stage. Besides, I am not quite sure, that the name is not of a purely local origin, having very little to do with any corresponding Sanskrit or Prakrit name. When the Sākī is used singly, it has generally the appendage of two more lines, the 1st having 10 and the 2nd only 14 Mātrās in it. This appendage takes
the place of the Dhruvapada, when several Sākis are used to form a Kaḍavaka, or a Padya. This appendage is evidently to be traced back to the half of a similar Ardhasama Catuṣpadī. There are no special Mātrāgalas, for the lines in this appendage. They may be formed with any Dvimātrikā or Caturmātrikā Gaṇas. Trimātrikā or Pañcamātrikā Gaṇas cannot be used for fear of disturbing the Tāla, which is Dhumalī of 8 Mātrās.

15. There are two more metres, which are regarded as pure Marāthī metres. They are the Ārati and the Ghanāksari. The former is not noticed by RAJWADE. It is so called on account of its connection with the Ārtikya ceremony in the idol-worship. Ārati indeed is a very general term and may signify many different metres. The particular metre which I mean is however, the commonest among them. It is a Dvipadi with 22 Mātrās in each line, with the Yati after the 12th Mātrā. In its Prakrit form, it is known as Vicchitti to Virahāṅka. The Ghanāksari is fully discussed by RAJWADE in his Marathī Chanda, pp. 5-8. It is regarded by him as a separate metre. As a matter of fact, however, it is only the second variety of the Abhaṅga, sung in a slightly different way. The first three lines in the Ghanāksari, as in this variety, contain 8 letters and 16 Mātrās each, while the last line contains only 7 letters and 14 Mātrās. Naturally, all the letters are expected to be long, so as to yield the required number of the Mātrās in each line. It is for this reason, that the metre is called Ghanāksari. Even though the Ghanāksari is identical with the second variety of the Abhaṅga in all respects, this condition of all long letters seems to have been laid down only in the case of Ghanāksari, on account of the peculiar way in which it is to be sung. The rule however, is very elastic as will be shown below, and there is practically no difference between the two metres. This being so, RAJWADE's entire discussion of the metre is clearly beside the point. His contention that the lines of Ghanāksari are made with Trimātras, which have a long letter in them, is never borne out by facts. He is perfectly conscious of this (cf. p. 6), but seeks to ignore it. His interpretation of the word Ghanāksari, considered by him as an equivalent of Gurvalakṣari, as meaning ‘Having a long letter in each of its Trimātras’ is entirely fanciful, and is only illustrative of his usual irresponsible and high-handed treatment of such topics. He also blames GODBOLE for correctly printing the Ghanāksari in his Vyttadarpana! This is because, he cannot satisfactorily explain the facts with the help of the theory that he has formulated. The facts therefore, must change so as to suit his theory!

16. In all the Tālavṛttas, where the number of letters in a line is restricted by the common practice of the poets and not by the necessities of the metre, such as e.g. the Abhaṅgas of all kinds and the Ghanāksari, it is important to remember, that the most essential thing even here, as in the other Tālavṛttas is the number of the Mātrās and not the number of the letters or even their quantity. It does not matter in all such cases,

how you pronounce the individual letters so long as you put in all the Mātrās that are required to occur between the two strokes of the Tāla. Thus, in the Ghanākṣāri or the Abhaṅga, where all letters are expected to be pronounced long, no real harm is done to the music even if the short letters are pronounced as such; only the deficiency of the Mātrās has got to be made up by the introduction of a sufficient number of the metrical pauses. We shall make this clear by taking a concrete example of the lines of the Ghanākṣāri and the second variety of the Abhaṅga. Thus the lines ‘Tīna śirem sahā hāta’, and ‘Mhaṅe Bharata hā Rāma’ contain 8 letters and 16 Mātrās each. Every letter therefore, is normally expected to yield 2 Mātrās and must, on that account, be pronounced long. But if we desire to read the short letters as short for the sake of Įuddhavācana, we might do so; but then, the Mātrās that are dropped in so doing, must be restored. Again, as the metres are sung in the Dhumāḷi Tāla of 8 Mātrās, such deficiency must be made up within the same Tālagaṇa. To explain, the lines of the above-mentioned metres become divisible into the two Tālagaṇas of 8 Mātrās each. The deficiency in each must therefore be separately made up within itself. Thus the letters ‘nā’ and ‘śī’ in the first half of the 1st line, when pronounced short, leave a deficiency of two Mātrās in the first Tālagaṇa. This has to be made up by introducing a pause of 2 Mātrās after ‘re’; similarly the deficiency of one Mātrā caused by the short pronunciation of ‘sa’ in the second half is to be made up by the insertion of a pause of 1 Mātrā after ‘hā’. Generally, these pauses are to be introduced after a long letter; but when this is not possible, they must even be introduced after a short letter, which then, must be pronounced long. In the first half of the second line i.e. ‘Mhaṅe Bhara’, the deficiency caused by the short pronunciation of ‘mha’ and ‘bha’ must be made up by introducing a pause of 2 Mātrās after the short letter ‘ra’, which of course, has to be pronounced long, because the 1st Tālagaṇa ends with ‘ra’, and the Tāla does not brook disturbance, whatever may happen to the individual letters. It is for this reason, that these Metres cannot be regarded as the Akṣaravṛttas, though the number of letters in them is generally restricted by the common practice of the poets. We say ‘generally’, because, such Abhaṅgas containing more than 8 letters are abundantly found in the Abhaṅga literature, and in their case, the rule of quickly pronouncing two or more letters, so as to yield only the necessary Mātrās, as explained at the end of para. 2 above, has got to be applied. The discussion will also prove that the charge of correctly printing (!) the Ghanākṣāris, after observing the rules of ‘hrasva’ and ‘dīrgha’, which is levelled by RAJWADE against GODBOLE, the editor of the Vṛttādarpaṇa, is quite baseless.

17. The other Marāṭhi metres like the Savāi, the Kaṭāva, the Paṭkā, the Lāvaṇi and the like have not been noticed here, because they are either to be traced to the Sanskrit Akṣaragaṇa Vṛttas, or to some one or the other Catuspadi or Śatpadi metres in the Apabhraṃśa language. They are most of them Mātrā and Tāla Vṛttas.
A NEW PERSIAN EMBASSY TO THE VIJAYANAGARA COURT

By

B. A. SALETORE

Historians of Vijayanagara were till now aware of only one embassy from the king of Persia to the court of Vijayanagara. This was the famous mission of 'Abdur Razzāk who came to India from the court of Sultan Shah Rukh, and who stayed at the court of Vijayanagara from the end of April 1443 till the 5th of December, 1443. The generosity which the Hindu monarch Deva Rāya showed the Persian ambassador was unique. Few ambassadors were treated in that magnificent manner in which 'Abdur Razzāk was received by king Deva Rāya. It may be that the later Persian court wished to reciprocate this royal treatment, and that made a later Persian monarch, therefore, send another ambassador to Vijayanagara.

The good feelings which existed between Vijayanagara and Persia seem to have been deliberately fostered by king Narasinga (A.D. 1496—A.D. 1503). He caused horses to be brought from Ormuz and Adeem (Aden) into his kingdom, and thereby gave great patronage to merchants, paying for the horses just as they asked. He took them dead or alive at three for a thousand pardoas, and of those that died by sea they brought him the tail only, and he paid for it just as if it had been alive.

These two causes, among others, may have been responsible for the second Persian embassy to the Vijayanagara court in the first half of the sixteenth century A.D. Our two sources of information for this interesting chapter in the foreign relations of Vijayanagara are Firistah and the bas-reliefs on the walls of the throne-platform in the capital itself.

The Muhammadan historian mentions the Persian embassy in two different contexts—once while describing the events in the reign of Ismāil 'Adil Shah of Bijapur, and, then again, while describing the events of the kingdom of Gujarat. In the latter connection he has quite a number of interesting details to give. Firistah writes thus while dealing with the Bijapur monarch:—"Some years previous to these events, the king of Persia Shah Ismāil Sufvy had sent ambassadors to the several states of Hindooistan, who had been received with due respect both by the Ray of Beejanuggur and the king of Guzerat. At this time Mahmūd Shah, also, received an ambassador

1. Sewell, A Forgotten Empire, p. 87; Saletore, Social & Political Life in the Vijayanagara Empire, I., pp. 43-44.
2. Read Saletore, ibid., I. p. 396.
from him with proper attention, and wished to dismiss him with royal presents, but was prevented by Ameer Bereed. In this dilemma the ambassador wrote to Ismael 'Adil Shah, complaining of his being detained at Ahmudson Bad Bidur. The king of Bejaipur demanded the dismissal of the Persian ambassador, who, having obtained his audience of leave, came to Bejaipur, where he was met by Ismael 'Adil Shah at Allapor. He was honoured with rich presents, and a suitable escort attended him as far as the part of Dabul, from whence he embarked on his return to Persia." The king of Persia deputed in return for this attention paid to his ambassador, Ibrahim Beg Turkman, with letters and presents to Ismael 'Adil Shah. But this was in A.D. 1519. The Bijapur Sultan honoured the ambassador in a fitting manner and even ordered the recital of prayers at the mosques on Fridays for the royal family of Persia.

From the above account of Firistah the following may be deduced:—

(a) That the king of Persia Shah Ismael Sufvy sent ambassadors to several courts of India;

(b) That the Persian king sent again an embassy to the court of Bijapur in A.D. 1519 as a result of the special favour shown to the Persian ambassador on the previous occasion; and

(c) That it was on this previous occasion that the Persian king had sent an ambassador (or ambassadors) to three courts—that of the Bahmani Sultan, of the king of Gujarat, and of the ruler of Vijayanagara.

Now we have to ascertain the year when Shah Ismael Sufvy of Persia had sent an embassy to the court of Gujarat. This is gathered from the following account of the reign of king Mahmud Shah I of Gujarat which Firistah describes thus:—

Shortly after his return from Ahmedabad, Mahmud Shah I fell dangerously ill. He summoned his son Prince Muzzaffar from Baroda. However the king recovered but having a relapse of his complaint, he again sent for the Prince. "At this period, Yadgar Beg Kuzilbash arrived as ambassador from Shah Ismael, king of Persia; but before he could obtain an audience, Mahmood Shah died, on the 2nd of Ramzan, A.H. 917 A.D. 1511, (Nov. 23), in the seventieth year of his age, and the fifty-fourth of his reign."

It may be noted, by the way, how long the Persian ambassador remained at the Gujarat court. On the death of Mahmud Shah I, his son Muzzafar

1. I assume the ruler Mahmud Shah mentioned by Firistah was no other than the Bahmani ruler of that name, called Mahmud Shah II, who ruled from A.D. 1481 till A.D. 1518. [Firistah, The Rise of the Mahommedan Power in India till the year A.D. 1612, II, pp. 519-552. (Trans. BRIGGS.). The reference to Amir Barid and Ismail 'Adil Shah confirms this view.—B.A.S.]


Shah II ascended the throne. Firistah continues to narrate that "on the following month Yadgar Beg, the Persian ambassador, reached the capital, and all the principal officers and heads of departments were deputed to meet him at some distance from the city, in order to welcome him in the king's name, and to escort him to a handsome palace fitted up for his reception. At his first audience, the ambassador delivered his credentials and some of the rarities of Persia, when he and the rest of the suite were honoured with robes."

"Some time afterwards" Muzzafar Shah II went to Baroda where Sahib Khan, a refugee prince from Malwa, sought his protection against Sahib Khan's brother the ruler of Malwa. This Sahib Khan contracted a close intimacy with the Persian ambassador which ended in a street scuffle between the Persians called Kuzilbash or Red-haired and the Indians. This street scene does not concern us. But we may note that the Persian ambassador was in the Gujarat court at least for some months. Firistah does not give us the exact date of the arrival and departure of the Persian ambassador Yadgar Beg.

But from his statement made in an earlier connection, it is evident that the Persian ambassador "was received with due respect both by the Ray of Beejanuggur and the king of Guzerat" almost at the time of the death of Mahmud Shah I on Nov. 23, 1511. "In the next month" he was received by Muzaffar Shah II. Hence we may legitimately place Yadgar Beg's arrival at the Gujarat court on Nov. 23, 1511, and his official reception in the same court in the next month of December, 1511. If we allot one more month for the Sahib Khan—Yadgar Beg episode mentioned by Firistah, it may mean that the Persian ambassador remained in all three months at the court of Gujarat.

From Firistah's testimony it seems as if we are to assume that Yadgar Beg was the same Persian ambassador who also visited Vijayanagara. For the Muhammadan historian mentions the Persian ambassador in connection with both the Raya of Vijayanagara and the king of Gujarat. If our assumption that Yadgar Beg may have left the court of Gujarat somewhere in December 1511 is correct, and if we allot about a month for him to cover the distance from Gujarat to the Hindu kingdom of the South, Yadgar Beg may have arrived at the court of Vijayanagara towards the end of December 1511 or early in 1512.

The only monarch who sat on the throne of Vijayanagara about this time was Krishna Deva Raya the Great (A.D. 1509-A.D. 1529). Therefore, if Firistah's statement is accepted, Shah Ismail Sufy of Persia sent an embassy to the court of Krishna Deva Raya the Great in A.D. 1512.

1. Ibid., IV, p. 79.
2. Firistah, op. cit., IV, pp. 80-81.
Now it must be admitted that so far as the reception of the Persian ambassador at the court of Vijayanagara is concerned, Firistah's testimony is not directly borne out by any epigraphic evidence. But this does not mean that Firistah has given us incorrect information. From a parallel case we may argue that such direct epigraphic evidence concerning the arrival of a foreign ambassador at the court of Vijayanagara is not necessary. In regard to the earlier and more famous embassy of 'Abdur Razzâk, there is no epigraphic evidence at all. And yet it is an undisputed fact that 'Abdur Razzâk did visit the great capital of Vijayanagara. Turning to the embassy of Yadgar Beg, we find that there is one piece of corroborative evidence which is lacking in the case of the mission of 'Abdur Razzâk. And this is the faithful depiction of the scene of the reception of the Persian ambassador by Kṛṣṇa Deva Rāya the Great, on the east wall of the steps on the south side of the Throne-platform at Vijayanagara. Before we turn to this side of the question, it may be observed that notwithstanding the fact of the epigraphs being silent on the topic of the reception of the Persian ambassador, yet their evidence may be indirectly utilized in connection with his arrival at Vijayanagara. To decide whether Kṛṣṇa Deva Rāya received any embassy, the following points have to be solved—(a) when the coronation of that monarch took place; and (b) where that ruler was soon after his coronation—whether in the capital itself or outside on his numerous campaigns. The coronation of Kṛṣṇa Deva Rāya the Great was celebrated in Śaka 1430, expired Śukla Māgha śu. 14 (= A.D. 1509 Feb. Sunday the 14th). A Both on the strength of epigraphs which we shall cite presently, and on the evidence of a foreign witness, we know that Kṛṣṇa Deva Rāya was in the capital at least for two or three years after his coronation. Nuniz, the Portuguese traveller, who visited Vijayanagara in A.D. 1530, relates that soon after his coronation, Kṛṣṇa Deva Rāya sent his nephew to Candragiri, and he himself stayed "in the city Bishnaga for a year and a half without going outside it, learning the affairs of the kingdom and looking at the testaments of past kings." But we know from epigraphs that Kṛṣṇa Deva Rāya was in the capital at least for four years after his coronation. That is to say, he did not undertake his famous campaigns from A.D. 1509 until A.D. 1513. It is here that we utilize indirectly the evidence of these epigraphs to show that there was a foreign embassy at the court of that great monarch. Inscriptions dated A.D. 1511, 1512, and 1513 bestow great praise on Kṛṣṇa Deva Rāya. Thus in the Mattoḍu copper plate grant dated A.D. 1511 we have three significant phrases used in connection with that monarch:—"From his wide spread fame all nature became as if of the same (white) colour (kīrtīya yasya samantataḥ praṣṭayā viśvam rucaikyaṁ vraja). Kṛṣṇa Deva Rāya seated on

2. SEWELL, op. cit., p. 316.
the jewelled throne in Vijayanagara, shone with surpassing fame (Vijayana-
gare ratna) simhāsanasthāḥ kṣmāpālān Kṛṣṇarāya kṣitipati-adharikratya . . .
kirtiṃ simindhe). And finally, we are told that the copper plate which regis-
tered a grant of land by the renowned king Kṛṣṇa Rāya, was composed with
soft expressions by Sabhāpati (tad-idam avani vanīpaka vinuta-dhārāyasya
Kṛṣṇarāyasya śāsanam uru-Kavi-vaibhava-nivaha-nidanasya bhūri dān-
asya). These phrases are not given to any of the predecessors of Kṛṣṇa
Deva Rāya, although king Narasimha had many conquests to his credit. And
as regards the successors of Kṛṣṇa Deva Rāya, the epithet great is given in
A.D. 1532 to king Acyuta, obviously because he came after the Great Kṛṣṇa
Rāya and because of his munificence.

The above statements in the Mattōdu copper plate grant are significant.
We know that in spite of the composer Sabhāpati’s assertion that Kṛṣṇa Deva
Rāya “filled with the accounts of his victories to each point of the com-
pass,” that that monarch had nevertheless not embarked on the series of
campaigns that were to make his reign the most glorious in the history of
southern India. For in this year A.D. 1511, only two years after his coro-
nation, Kṛṣṇa Deva Rāya was still in the capital; and, if we are to believe
the evidence of Nuniz, the monarch was busy looking into the details of ad-
ministration. Then what made the composer of the above Mattōdu copper
plate state that in A.D. 1511 Kṛṣṇa Deva Rāya’s fame had become “wide-
spread”, and that he shone with “surprising fame”?

The reference is ob-
viously to the celebrity of the monarch in the courts of neighbouring and
foreign rulers. It is not unlikely that because of the news of the arrival
of the ambassador from Persia at the court of the Vijayanagara monarch
that the latter is described to be “famous” in A.D. 1511. Whatever that may
be, on the basis of the above Mattōdu copper plate grant, it may be asserted
that Kṛṣṇa Deva Rāya was in the capital in A.D. 1511.

The uncommon fame of the Vijayanagara ruler as given in the
purely official record of Mattōdu, may be compared with the praise bestowed
on the same ruler in a private grant of the next year. This is the Sātanūr,
stone inscription found at Sātanūr, Māgaḍī tāluka, Mysore State, and dated
A.D. 1512. In this record we have the following—Srimān mahā-Kṛṣṇa-rāyara
kāladali (In the time of the Great Kṛṣṇa Rāya). Perhaps because of the
fact that the fame of Kṛṣṇa Deva Rāya had reached foreign lands that he
is called Mahā Kṛṣṇa Rāya in this year.

In another official record, too, an identical epithet is used in regard to
that monarch. This is the Shimoga Uragaḍūra copper plate grant dated
A.D. 1513, which says the following:—That in the presence of the god Virū-
pākṣa on the Tungabhadrā, the Great Kṛṣṇa Deva Rāya (Kṛṣṇa Rāya mahā

---

2. Ibid., IV, Ch. 115, 122, pp. 16, 17.
3. E. C., IX. Mg. 22, p. 54, text, p. 108.
matīḥ) made a specified grant of land.¹ Then, again, in the Bhandigere stone inscription, Chāmarājanagara tāluka, Mysore State, dated also in the same year (A.D. 1513), the same ruler is styled Śrīmān mahā Kṛṣṇa Rāyaru.²

The above records indirectly suggest, therefore, that Kṛṣṇa Deva Rāya had become uncommonly famous between the years A.D. 1511 and A.D. 1513. Since we know that he started on his famous campaigns only in the year A.D. 1515, and since there is no evidence of his having done anything remarkable while in the capital during the first four years after his coronation (A.D. 1509—A.D. 1513), we are to suppose that he had become celebrated because of some uncommon event in his court. A foreign embassy from a ruler outside India was precisely such an event which increased the fame of Kṛṣṇa Deva Rāya both in and outside his dominions.³

More direct and convincing evidence of the arrival of an embassy from Persia is afforded in one of the bas-reliefs on the walls of the imperial buildings at Vijayanagara. These bas-reliefs are well worth a detailed study, since they form by themselves a mine of information concerning the daily life of the princes and people of Vijayanagara. For our purpose we may observe that one scene on the walls of the Throne-platform illustrates admirably the incident of the Persian ambassador. It is the following where the monarch is represented as seated in the customary Hindu manner with his legs crossed over on the throne, and before him are two persons with a boy leading a horse by the bridle behind them. (Figure 1).

Before we proceed further with this interesting bas-relief, an objection may be raised. It may be maintained here that the foreigners described in this scene were Jesuit Fathers who also visited the Hindu court about this time. But a careful consideration of (a) the dress worn by the Jesuit Fathers and the Persians, and (b) the dates of the Jesuit missions and of the Persian ambassador, will reveal that the sculpture representing the Persian scene is quite distinct from that representing the Jesuit mission.

(a) The embassy of the Jesuit Fathers has been represented in an equally suggestive manner by a separate bas-relief on the east wall of the same Throne-platform. (Figure II) Here the same monarch Kṛṣṇa Deva Rāya is seated on the throne along with his two queens. One of the legs of the monarch is let down the throne, while his left hand is raised to acknow-

---

1. Ibid., VII, Sh. I, p. 1.
2. Ibid., IV, Ch. 109, p. 15, text, p. 41.
3. For another record to show that Kṛṣṇa Deva Rāya was in the capital, see ibid., IV, Ng. 81, p. 133. His capture of Ḷoṇḍavīḍu was effected on June 23, 1515 (257 of 1892) ; and in the next year the conquest of Kalinga (Saka 1438, Dhātri). (244 & 245 of 1899 ; Rangacharya, A Top. List., II, p. 765 ; III, p. 1675). Hence Kṛṣṇa Deva Rāya’s great conquests began after A.D. 1513. These military victories and the celebrity which he had secured in the earlier part of his reign, among other causes, were responsible for his being called the Great Kṛṣṇa Deva Rāya in A.D. 1523 and 1529 (E.C., IV, Ch. 1, and 99, pp. 1, 13).
ledge the salutation of the foreigners. These foreigners are undoubtedly Jesuits, as is proved by the manner in which they wear their head gear, their mode of salutation, and, finally, their dress. On their heads are European hats; their hands are carefully couched, the wrist of the left hand holding the elbow of the right (in both cases); and they bow in the customary European manner, with their heads gently and respectfully inclined more towards the right. Their robes are the typical Jesuit robes, which stretch from their necks down to their ankles hiding their trousers. Their beards are pointed at the end in the manner of the Jesuits. Behind them are two elephants, each fully caparisoned and led by a māhut, and one following the other.

Now have we contemporary evidence of the visit of the Jesuits to the court of Krṣṇa Deva Rāya the Great? On three different occasions the Portuguese sent embassies to the Vijayanagara court. The above scene (Figure II) which we shall style the Jesuit embassy, refers to two of the three embassies sent by the Portuguese. Before we give further details about these three European embassies, it is worth while to note the causes which made the Portuguese send embassies to Vijayanagara. Firstly, it was the anxiety which the Portuguese felt for their commercio-political designs. They desired the aid of Vijayanagara to repel an attack on one of their coastal centres by their enemies. Thus in A.D. 1509 the Portuguese Governor Albuquerque sent Father Luis of the Order of St. Francis as an ambassador to Vijayanagara to beg Krṣṇa Deva Rāya to come by land and reduce the Samuri (Zamorin) of Calicut, promising himself to assault simultaneously by sea. Secondly, the Portuguese sent ambassadors to the court of the same ruler to secure permission from him to build a fort at Bhatkal. Thus in A.D. 1510 the same Governor Albuquerque sent Gaspar Chanoca on a mission to Vijayanagara. The object of this mission was to ask the Vijayanagara ruler to renew the request of Albuquerque's predecessor Governor Almeida to build a fort at Bhatkal. And, finally, the Portuguese sent ambassadors for purely commercial reasons. Thus in A.D. 1517 Correa relates that Governor Lopo Soares sent Christovão de Figueiredo as factor with horses and elephants to the court of Krṣṇa Deva Rāya. Paes and Nuniz also mention the personal visit of de Figueiredo to the court of the Vijayanagara monarch.

Which of these three ambassadors—Father Luis, Gaspar Chanoca, and Christovão de Figueiredo—is represented in the bas-reliefs under discussion?

An answer to this question will be secured when we ascertain the fate that befell one of these three ambassadors.

(a) Father Luis' mission:—Fr. Luis' mission was due to the great concern the Portuguese felt in subduing the Zamorin of Calicut. As related

1. SEWELL, op. cit., p. 123.
2. SEWELL, ibid, p. 124.
3. SEWELL, ibid., p. 251.
4. SEWELL, ibid., pp. 251, 343.
above, it was Governor Albuquerque that had sent him to Vijayanagara. This viceroy succeeded Almeida at the end of A.D. 1509 as the head of the Portuguese settlements on the coast.\(^1\) Since it is improbable that Albuquerque sent Fr. Luis as soon as the former became viceroy, we have to assume that Fr. Luis was despatched to Vijayanagara in the month of January 1510. The Jesuit ambassador left Cochin, reached Bhaktal, and thence came to Vijayanagara.\(^2\) Here it is worthwhile to remember that Governor Albuquerque promised in future to supply Vijayanagara alone with Arab and Persian horses, and not to send any to Bijapur. But in spite of this assurance, no answer was given to Fr. Luis by the Vijayanagara Emperor.\(^3\) And poor Fr. Luis never returned from the great Hindu capital: he was murdered there under unknown circumstances.\(^4\)

(b) *The embassy of Gaspar Chanoca*:—This followed closely on the heels of the former. Albuquerque had by the beginning of A.D. 1510 captured Goa from the Bijapur Sultan Yusuf 'Adil Shah; and he entered that city triumphantly on March 1, 1510.\(^5\) It was immediately after this success that he sent Gaspar Chanoca to Vijayanagara with the request mentioned above. Barros tells us that although Chanoca was received most solemnly and courteously by Kśra Deva Rayā, yet the latter gave Chanoca merely a diplomatic answer without granting the Portuguese Governor's request.\(^6\)

What we have to remember is that these two embassies followed immediately one after the other, almost to give the impression that both were sent at the same time. For whereas Fr. Luis led an embassy in January 1510, Chanoca followed him in March of the same year.

(c) *The embassy of de Figueiredo*:—As regards its nature, there is some difference of opinion. According to Correa, as we have already seen, he was sent in A.D. 1517 essentially as factor with horses and elephants; but as pointed out by Sewell, this is doubted by Senior Lopes.\(^7\) From the account of Paes we are to suppose that de Figueiredo went to see the Emperor along with Paes himself and others. This is clear from the following statement of Paes:—"When we came to this country the king was in this new town, and there went to see him Christavão de Figueiredo with all of us Portuguese that came with him, and all very handsomely dressed after our manner, with much finery; the king received him very well, and was very complacent to him. The king was as much pleased with him as if he had been one of his own people, so much attention did he evince towards him; and also towards those amongst us who went with him he showed much kindness. We

were so close to the king that he touched us all and could not have enough of looking at us. Then Christavão de Figueiredo gave him letters from the Captain-Major and the things he had brought for him, with which he was greatly delighted; principally with certain organs that the said Christavão de Figueiredo brought him, with many other things (pecas). The king was clothed in certain white clothes embroidered with many roses in gold, and with a pateca of diamonds on his neck of very great value, and on his head he had a cap of brocade in fashion like a Galician helmet, covered with a piece of fine stuff all of fine silk, and he was barefooted; for no one ever enters where the king is unless he has bare feet, and the majority of the people, or almost all, go about the country barefooted. The shoes have pointed ends, in the ancient manner, and there are other shoes that have nothing but soles, but on top are some straps which help to keep them on the feet. They are made like those which of old the Romans were wont to wear, as you will find on figures in some papers or antiquities which come from Italy. The king gave to Christavão de Figueiredo on dismissing him a cabaya (tunic) of brocade, with a cap of the same as the king wore, and to each one of the Portuguese he gave a cloth embroidered with many pretty figures, and this the king gives because it is customary; he gives it in token of friendship and love.  

From the above account of Paes we may deduce the following:

(a) That de Figueiredo went along with Paes and other Portuguese traders to see the monarch Kṛṣṇa Deva Rāya;

(b) That all of them were dressed “very handsomely” after the manner of their country, with much finery;

(c) That the king was wearing rich dress and had on his head a cap of brocade with a piece of fine stuff all of fine silk (kullāyi), and he was barefooted; and

(d) That the monarch gave fitting presents to every one of the Portuguese.

It is significant that Paes does not mention that the monarch was seated, and that the latter’s two queens were seated likewise on the throne by his side. Neither does his account help us to fix the date of the visit of Christavão de Figueiredo to the Vijayanagara monarch.

But Nuniz’s account helps us to assert when exactly de Figueiredo saw Kṛṣṇa Deva Rāya in person. Nuniz relates the following, while describing the great victory which that monarch won at Raichur:—“These things done, he (the Emperor) turned again upon Rachol and pitched his camp as he had done before. During this return of the King there came to meet him Christavão de Figueiredo, who was at that time in the city of Bisanga with horses, and he took with him twenty Portuguese musqueteers, he also himself

having his musquet. The King took much pleasure in his company, glad
that he should see the war and his great power; and he ordered some tents
to be given to him of those taken from the Ydallcão, and commanded that
he should be lodged close to his own quarters. One day Christavão de
Figueiredo told the King that he wanted to go and see the city, but the
King said that he should not set his heart upon that because he did not
want any disaster to befall him. But Christavão de Figueiredo replied that
the whole business of the Portuguese was war, and that this would be the
greatest favour that he could do him, namely that His Highness should
permit him to go and see the Moors." 1

According to Sewell, Kṛṣṇa Deva Rāya won the famous battle of Raichur on May 19, 1520. 2 Accepting this date as correct, we may maintain that
Christavão de Figueiredo visited the Vijayanagar Emperor in May 1520.
It may be noted in this connection that along with de Figueiredo were
twenty Portuguese musketeers, and that he himself carried a musket.

Neither the account of Paes nor that of Nuniz is applicable to the two
figures which are found in the bas-relief which we have styled as one re-
presenting the Jesuit mission (Figure II). There are no musketeers and no
guns in this particular scene. As for the account of Paes, the fact that
in the sculpture under discussion the king is bare headed is alone enough
to prove that the scene represented therein is different to the one mentioned
by Paes. The bas-relief in Figure II, therefore, represent only the two
missions of Father Luis and Gaspar Chanoca. Since, as we have above,
one followed soon after the other, the sculptor represented both as having
taken place at one and the same time. This representation is not really
erroneous. Although Father Luis may have reached the city of Vijaya-
nagara in about January 1510, yet he seems to have continued to stay
in the same city for more than a month. Otherwise we cannot explain his death
in the capital soon afterwards. It can hardly be that he was murdered
as soon as he had reached Vijayanagara. His stay in the capital, therefore,
seems to have synchronised with the visit of Gaspar Chanoca—hence the
two are represented as having seen personally the monarch together in
Figure II. 3

Having dispensed with the bas-relief representing the Jesuit ambassadors
from Goa, let us now turn to the bas-relief depicting the Persian embassy.
(Figure I) Here the monarch is squatted on a raised platform in the usual
Hindu manner. His left hand is raised in acknowledgement of the salute
by the two foreigners, while his right hand is placed akimbo. The two

---
2. Sewell, ibid., p. 147
3. The Rev. Fr. Henry Heras has discussed the question of the Jesuit embas-
sies in his article styled "Historical Carvings in Vijayanagara" in the Quarterly Journal
of the Mythic Society which particular issue unfortunately is not accessible to me
when I am writing this article.—B. A. S.
Fig. I. Persian Embassy

Fig. II. Jesuit Embassy
foreigners are seen bowing to him in the Oriental manner with their right hand raised respectfully from near the ground to their heads. They are doing obviously the salâm. Their head wear is typically of the Persian type. They wear tapering turbans which seem to fall behind in a sort of a tuft. Their outer robe is long, it stretches down their knees, while below it flows their inner garment. The left hand of both the Persians is respectfully placed on their body; and as in the case of the Jesuits in Figure II, both are doing obeisance at the same time. We may note that none of the details mentioned in connection with the embassies of Father Luis, Chanoca and de Figueiredo, is applicable to this scene in Figure I which undoubtedly represents the great Kṛṣṇa Deva Rāya receiving the Persian ambassador Yadgar Beg and the latter’s secretary or attendant. We assume that it was no other than Yadgar Beg from the manner in which Firistah couples the “Ray of Beejanuggar” with the king of Gujarat in the passages cited above. It was not uncommon in those days for one and the same ambassador to visit two royal courts. Thus, according to Firistah, Syud Ahmad Hirvy was the ambassador whom, first, the Bijapur Sultan Yusuf ‘Adil Shah sent to the king of Persia, and whom later on Yusuf ‘Adil Shah’s successor Ismā’il ‘Adil Shah sent to the court of Ahmadnagar. And we already cited the example of the (unnamed) Persian ambassador who first went to the Bahmani ruler Muhammad Shah and then went to Ismā’il ‘Adil Shah of Bijapur.

We may now chronologically fix the various foreign embassies to the court of Vijayanagara in the early years of the reign of Kṛṣṇa Deva Rāya the Great, thus:

Fr. Luis’ embassy January 1510
Gaspar Chanoca’s embassy March 1510
The Persian embassy December 1511—January 1512
Christavão de Figueiredo 1517

We thus find that from A.D. 1510 till A.D. 1517 there were four distinct embassies to the court of Vijayanagara—three sent by the Portuguese, and one by the Persian monarch. Of these two embassies sent by the Portuguese have been represented in one bas-relief on the walls of the imperial buildings, as they were sent almost at the same time. These were the embassies led by Father Luis and Gaspar Chanoca. While the Persian embassy has been depicted quite distinctly in another bas-relief also of the same building (viz., the Throne-platform) at Hampi. Although we are in the dark as to the actual reception that was accorded to the Persian ambassador, whom we have provisionally identified with Yadgar Beg, yet there cannot be any doubt that Kṛṣṇa Deva Rāya the Great must have received him in a manner befitting the dignity and grandeur of that celebrated monarch.

KADAMBA MAYŪRAŚARMAN

By

DINES CHANDRA SIRCAR

According to the Talgunda inscription, the Kadambas belonged to a Brāhmaṇa family devoted to the study of the Vedas. There the family has been described as tryāra-vaṃṭma, hāriti-putra and Mānavya-gotra. In this family of dvijas was born an illustrious and learned Brāhmaṇa named Mayūraśarman who went with his preceptor Viśrasiṃha to Kāśīpurā, the Pallava capital, in order to prosecute his Vedic studies. There Mayūraśarman was drawn in a quarrel with the Pallavas,1 and considering the illtreatment he received a dishonour to the Brāhmaṇas, "he unsheathed a flaming sword eager to conquer the world". He then easily defeated the frontier guards of the Pallava king (antak-pālān pallav-endrānām)2 and established himself in a dense forest near Śrīparvata. His power gradually increased, and he levied tributes from the Bhad-Bāṇa3 and other kings. At length a compromise was brought in, and Mayūraśarman accepted service under the Pallava kings of Kāṇcī, from whom he received the patṭabandha-sampījā, that is to say, the status of a subordinate ruler, as well as the territory extending from Apar-ārjava (Western or Arabian sea) and Prehāra (river?) with a specification that no other chief would enter into it. The era (Gupta?) in the eightieth year of which the Halsi grant of Kākusthavarman (Ind. Ant., VI, p. 23) is dated, is supposed to have begun from this time.

KIELHORN is of opinion (Ep. Ind., VIII, p. 29) that as Mayūraśarman is said in the Talgunda inscription to have entered into the service of the Pallavas, he seems to have become a đaṇḍanāyaka (field-marshal) of the Pallava king of Kāṇcī. This view is further supported by verse 3 of the

1. May the passage āśva-saṃsthenā kalahena suggest that the quarrel of Mayūraśarman was in connection with a horse-sacrifice (see my Early Pallavas. p. 35)? Among the Early Pallavas Śivaskandavarman and Kumāraviṣṇu of the Omgodu (no. 1) grant are the only kings known to have performed the Aśvamedha. This fact appears to suggest that Mayūraśarman lived about the time of the great Śivaskandavarman who is known to have held sway over the greater portion of Lower Deccan. Kumāraviṣṇu seems to have ruled in the second half of the fourth century.

2. The plural number in Pallavendrāṇaṃ, etc., may suggest that the quarrel of Mayūraśarman was not limited within the reign-period of a single Pallava king of Kāṇcī, but continued in several succeeding reigns. Antak-pāla (Warden of the Marches) is mentioned in Kauṭiṭyā's Arthaśāstra (Samasantry's ed., pp. 20, 247). The salary of an Antak-pāla was equal to that of a Kumāra, Paura-vyāva-hārika, Rāṣṭrapāla and of a member of the Mantri-parīṣat.

3. Bhad-Bāṇa appears to mean the great Bāṇas or the greater house of the Bāṇas. Cf. Perumbāṇappādi in Tamil.
same inscription in which the Kadamba family is called the great lineage of leaders of armies (*kadamba-senāni-bhakdanavaya*), as well as by verse 22 in which Mayūrasarman is said to have been favoured and anointed *Senāpati* (general) by Śaḍānana and the Mothers (*ṣaḍānanāḥ yam = abhiśiktavān = anudhyāya senāpatiṁ mātybhīḥ saha*). In this connection it is interesting to note that in almost all the Kadamba records the family has been described as *anudhyāta* (favoured) by Śvāmi-Mahāśena (Śaḍānana) and the Mothers. It must also be noticed in this connection that the Sirsi grant (*Ep. Ind.*, XVI, p. 264) of Ravivarman describes the king as *Kadamba-mahāsenāpati-pratima*.

A very late inscription found at Talgunda (*Ep. Carn.*, VII, Sk. 178) says that Mayūrasarman (or Mayūravarman as there written) performed no less than eighteen horse-sacrifices. G. M. Moraes says, "It may safely be maintained that he really performed one or perhaps a few more which thus formed a historical foundation for the exaggerated version of the later records." The suggestion is however untenable in view of the fact that Mayūrasarman is never credited with the performance of any sacrifice not only in his own Chandravalli record but also in the inscriptions of his immediate successors. The Kadamba family is said to have been rendered pure by the bath of the Aśvamedha only after the time of Kṛṣṇavarman I who is the only Kadamba ruler known to have performed the horse-sacrifice.

The Chandravalli inscription of Māyūrasarman (*Mys. Arch. Surv.*, A. R., 1929, p. 50) records the construction of a tank by the king who belonged to the Kadamba family and conquered the Trekūta, Ābhīra, Pallava, Pāriyāṭrika, Śakasthāna, Sayindaka, Puṇāṭa and Mokari. This record is engraved on a boulder at the entrance of the Bhairaveśvara temple at Chandravalli and is so obliterated that it is difficult to be definite regarding the reading of some of the names mentioned in connection with Mayūrasarman's conquests.

I. Trekūta appears to signify the Traikūṭakas who probably received their name from the Trikūṭa mountain in Aparānta, mentioned by Kālidāsa (*Raghu*, IV, verses 58-59). An inscription (*A. S. W. I.*, p. 124f) of the Vākāṭaka king Harisenā (circa 500-520) refers to the kingdom of Trikūṭa. The copper-plate grants of the Traikūṭaka kings are all discovered in the neighbourhood of Surat and Kanheri (*Bhandarkar's List of Inscript-"

---

1. The word *senāni* means "leader of an army," cf. Gitā, X, 24; *Kumārasambhava*, II, 51. It is also a name of Kārttikeya, the divine general (*Raghu*, II, 37). Mayūrasarman was possibly styled "General" like Puṣyamitra Śungra.

2. The passage has been taken by Kielhorn and others to mean that Mayūrasarman was anointed by Śaḍānana after he meditated on Senāpati with the Mothers. This interpretation is certainly untenable. The subject in the sentence is Śaḍānana; but he cannot be said to meditate on Senāpati (Ṣaḍānana himself?). The verb *anudhyāya* (after favouring) is the same as in *anudhyāta* (favoured) in passages like *mahāsenā-mātrga-anudhyāta* (favoured by Mahāśena and the Mothers) occurring in almost all the Kadamba records (*JAHRS*, X, p. 229).
tions, Nos. 1199, 1200, 1202, etc.). The Kanheri grant of the year 245 of the Traikutaka era (A.D. 493-94) refers to a monastery at Kṛṣṇagiri (Kanheri) itself. The Pardi inscription of Dahrasena is dated in year 207 (A.D. 455-56). The date of the Surat inscription of Vyāghrasena is the Traikutaka year 232 (A.D. 479-80). The evidence of the Traikutaka inscriptions thus shows that the family ruled in southern Gujarat and the Koṅkaṇ about the second half of the fifth century. It is possible that the Traikutaka were ruled in the same place also about the time of Mayūrasarman. The era used in the Traikutaka inscriptions is said to be the same as the Kalacuri or Cedi era which begins from A.D. 248-49 (Rapson's Catalogue of Coins, pp. clx-xlxi).

Traikutaka coins have been discovered not only in southern Gujarat and the Koṅkaṇ, but also in the Marāṭhā country on the other side of the Ghats. The fact that the Traikutaka coin-types are very closely imitated from the Western Kṣatrapa coins shows that they were intended for circulation in districts where the Western Kṣatrapa coins had become familiar to the people. "Local conservatism in regard to coin-types is a marked characteristic of Indian numismatics." (Rapson, loc. cit.). It is therefore clear that the country of the Traikutakas was originally a part of the dominions of the Śaka kings of Ujjain. According to the Ajanta inscription (A.S.W. I., IV, p. 138ff.) the Trikūta country was conquered by Vākāṭaka king Harisena who appears to have ruled about the beginning of the sixth century A.D.

II. The earliest mention of the Ābhīras seems to be in Patañjali's Mahābhāṣya, I, 252 (Ind. Ant., XLVII, p. 36). There they are associated with the Śūdras. According to a verse of the Mahābhārata, these two tribes lived near the place where the Sarasvati lost itself in the sands (cf. IX, 37, 1: Sa śātra nasāṭ sarasvati). Elsewhere however the same authority places the Ābhīras in the Apārānta (II, 51). The country of the Ābhīras has been mentioned as Abiria in the Periplus and as Abēria in the Geography of Ptolemy. According to the Greek geographer (Geog., VII, i. § 55), the land about the mouth of the Indus was generally called Indo-Scythia which consisted of three countries, viz., Patalēnē (Indus delta), Abēria (Ābhīra country) and Surastrēnē (Kathiawar).

The Purāṇas (e.g., Vāyu, 99 v. 359) mention the Ābhīras who ruled after the Andhras (Śātavāhanas). An Ābhīra chief named Rudrabhūti is known to have served as general of a Śaka king of Ujjain. The Gunda inscription of Śaka 103 (A.D. 181), belonging to the reign of Rudrasimha I, records the digging of a tank by the Ābhīra general Rudrabhūti. It is also known that for a time the Śaka Satraps of Western India were shadowed by an Ābhīra king named Mādhāriputra Iśvarasena, son of Śivadatta. The Nasik inscription (Ep. Ind., VIII, p. 88) of this king records the investment of 1500 kārṣāpanas in the trade-guilds of Govardhana (Nasik) for the purpose of providing medicines to the monks dwelling in the monastery on the Trirāṃi
mountain.\textsuperscript{1} Coins of a Mahākṣatrapa named Iśvaradatta have been found in Kathiawar. These are silver coins of the same style and type as the coins of the Śaka Kṣatrapas. Iśvaradatta dates his coins in the regnal year and not in the Śaka era like the Western Kṣatrapas. According to Bhagwanlal Indrajit, Iśvaradatta was probably an Ābhīra connected with the dynasty of Iśvarasena of the Nasik inscription, and it was Iśvaradatta who founded the Traikūṭaka era of A.D. 248-49. Rapson however has no doubt that Iśvaradatta reigned between A.D. 236 and 239,\textsuperscript{2} that is to say, about ten years before the establishment of Traikūṭaka era. It is not possible to determine whether the Ābhīras and the Traikūṭakas belonged to the same dynasty or race. It may however be said that the two groups of kings ruled over substantially the same territory and had a similar formation of names, which facts possibly suggest some sort of relation that may have existed between the Ābhīras and the Traikūṭakas (Rapson, loc. cit.).

III. We have already noticed Mayūraśarman’s quarrel with the Pallavas of Kāṇcī. About the beginning of the fourth century, the Pallavas appear to have held sway not only over the Andhrāpatha and Sātāhanirattha (Bellary district) in the north and the north-west, but possibly also over the Kuntala country in the west (Early Pallavas, pp. 35-36).

IV. Pāriyātra seems to signify the people dwelling on the Pāriyātra, which has been identified with the Aravelly Range and the Western Vindhyas (Raychaudhuri, Indian Antiquities, p. 128ff.).

V. Śakasthāna means the country of the Śakas. It has been mentioned by the author of the Periplus (§ 38) as Scythia which was situated in the valley of the Lower Indus and was under the rule of Parthian chiefs, engaged in unceasing internecine strife. As has already been noticed the Indian Śaka country is described in the Geography (VII, i. § 55) of Ptolemy as Indo-Scythia which included Patalēnē, Ābērīa and Surastrenē. At the time of Mayūraśarman, i.e. about the middle of the fourth century A.D., Śakasthāna seems to have signified the kingdom of the Śaka Satraps of Ujjain. The line of the Śakas of Ujjain was founded by Caṣṭana (a contemporary of the Greek geographer Ptolemy) in the first half of the second century. The Śakas continued their rule in that locality upto the beginning of the fifth century when Candragupta II of the Imperial Gupta dynasty of Magadha conquered Mālwā from the Śaka king Rudrasimha III.

VI. Sayindaka has been suggested to be the same as the country of the Sendraka. It is generally identified with the Nāgarakhanḍa country which

\textsuperscript{1} The Nasik district “may have passed immediately into the power of these Ābhīras, either during the reign or after the reign of Sri-Yajña, or it may have first been held by the Cuṭu family of Sātakarnīs, the ‘other Andhras’ or ‘Andhra-brhṭyas’ (‘servants of the Andhras’) of the Purāṇas, who undoubtedy were in possession of the neighbouring maritime province of Aparānta” (Rapson, op. cit., p. cxxiii).

\textsuperscript{2} Bhandarkar places the rule of Mahākṣatrapa Iśvaradatta in 188-190 A.D.
possibly formed a part of the present Shimoga district of Mysore. The Sendrakaviṣaya is known to have been included in the dominions of the Kadamba king Kṛṣṇavarman II. The Bennur grant (Ep. Carn., V, p. 594) of Kṛṣṇavarman II records the gift of a village called Palmanda which was in the Sendraka-viṣaya. A Sendraka chief named Bhāṇusakti seems to have been a feudatory of the Kadamba king Harivarman (see the Halsi grant of the eighth year of Harivarman’s reign; Ind. Ant., VI, p. 31). After the fall of the Kadambas, the Sendrakas transferred their allegiance to the Calukyas of Bādami, who succeeded the Kadambas in the suzerainty over Kuntala. A record of Pulakēśin I (Ind. Ant., VII, p. 211ff.) who was the first great Emperor of the Calukya dynasty, mentions the Sendraka tājā Rundranila-Goṇḍa, his son Sivāra and grandson Sāmiyāra who ruled the Kuhuṇḍī viṣaya with its head-quarters at Alktaka-nagarī.¹ The Chipulkun grant (Ep. Ind., III, p. 50ff.) says that the Sendraka prince Śrī-vallabhaka Senānanda-rāja was the maternal uncle of Pulakesin II. An inscription (J. B. B.R.A.S., XVI, pp. 228-29) of the tenth year of Vikramāditya I mentions the Sendraka chief Devaśakti who appears to have been his feudatory. According to the evidence of the Belagami record (Ind. Ant., XIX, p. 145; Ep. Carn., VIII, Sk. 154) the Sendraka Mahārāja Pogilli, a feudatory of Calukya Vinayāditya I, ruled over the Nāgarakhanḍa division of the Bana-vāsī province.

VII. Punāṭa has been taken to be the same as modern Punnāḍu in the southern part of Mysore. Ptolemy seems to have mentioned it (Geog., VII, i. § 86) as Pounnata where beryls were found. According to the Kudlur grant, the Punnāḍ (= Punnāṭa) country is known to have formed a part of the dominions of the Gaṅga king Durvinita. It may be noticed that Ptolemy’s Pounnata was a city. The capital of Punnāḍu however was at Kirtipura, identified with Kittūr in Southern Mysore. For Punnāṭa, see Sāletore in Ind. Cult., III, p. 302ff. His chronology is however not acceptable.

VIII. Mokari has been taken to signify the Maukhari of Eastern and Northern India. Inscriptions of the Maukhari kings have been discovered in the Jaunpur and Bara-Banki districts of U. P. and in the Gaya district of Bihar (Bhandarkar, op. cit., Nos. 10, 1601-1605). The Haraha inscription (Ep. Ind., XIV., p. 115) of Maukhari Iśānavarman is dated in Vikrama 611 (A.D. 544). About the sixth century a line of the Maukhari is known to have established themselves in the Kanauj region. Maukhari Grahavarman of this line married the sister of the illustrious Harsavarthana (A.D. 606-647) of the Pusyabhūti family of Thāneswar. Maukhari princes appear to have ruled over small principalities in Eastern India as early as the fourth century A.D. The Chandravalli record however appears to refer.

¹ Records like the Bagumbra grant (Ind. Ant., XVIII, pp. 266-268) of Nikumbhallasakti show that the Sendrakas were granted jāgirs in Southern Gujarat after the country was conquered by the Calukyas.
to the Maukharis of Rajputana (cf. Bādvā records of Kṛta 295 = A.D. 238; Ep. Ind., XXIII, p. 42ff.).

It is interesting in this connection to note that the published reading of the Chandravalli record does not speak of the Bāṇas who are, according to the evidence of the Talgunda record of Sāntivarman, known to have been harassed by Mayūraśarman. The Bāṇas were a very ancient ruling family in the Chittoor and North Arcot districts. On the evidence of the Penukonda Plates it may be suggested that about the middle of the fifth century A.D., the Pallava kings Śimhavarman and Skandavarman installed the Gaṅga feudatories Āyyavarman and his son Mādhava-Śimhavarman for the purpose of crushing the Bāṇas who had possibly become unruly (Sewell, op. cit., p. 331). According to Hultzsch (S. Ind. Ins., III, p. 89), the capital of the Bāṇa dynasty appears to have been Tiruvallam as one of its names was Vāṇapuram and as it belonged to the district of Perumbāṇappādi (country of the great Bāṇa). Tiruvallam is 40 miles west by north of Conjeevaram. The early history of the Bāṇas is wrapped up in obscurity. The earliest rulers of the family, whose time is known, are Vikramāditya-Bali-Indra who was a vassal of Calukya Vijayāditya (A.D. 696-733), and Vikramāditya (the same as Bali Indra?) who governed the country “West of the Telugu Road” as a vassal of Pallava Nandivarman II (A.D. 717-779).

According to Dr. M. H. Krishna (Mys. Arch. Surv., A. R., 1929, p. 56) the Chandravalli inscription is to be assigned to circa 258 A.D. He suggests that the rise of Mayūra is to be placed between A.D. 250 and 260. All his arguments are however based on an untenable view regarding the date of Pallava Śivaskandavarman whom he places about the end of the first half of the third century A.D. It appears that Dr. Krishna too is inclined to place Mayūraśarman a little later than Śivaskandavarman. Pallava Śivaskandavarman, as I have elsewhere shown (e.g., Early Pallavas, p. 15ff.) ruled in the first quarter of the fourth century. Mayūraśarman, the Prakrit language of whose Chandravalli record is a little nearer Sanskrit than that of the grants of Śivaskandavarman, should, in my opinion, be placed not earlier than the first quarter of the fourth century A.D. (ibid., p. 36). See also my paper in J.I.H., XIV, p. 344ff.

The Malavalli inscription (Ep. Carn., VII, Sk. 264) possibly also belongs to king Mayūraśarman. Here however the issuer of the grant is simply said to have been kadambarānām rājā (king of the Kadambas) and Vaijayanti-dhamma-mahārāj-ādhirāja (Dharma-Mahārājādhirāja1 of Vaijayanti or

1. Titles like Mahārājādhirāja were derived from Rājātirāja, etc., of the Scytho-Kusānas. They were first used in Northern India by the Guptas who were the political successors of the Kuṣānas in the sovereignty of Āryāvarta. In Southern India, the title Dharma-Mahārājādhirāja first appears in the Hirahadagall grant of Pallava Śivaskandavarman. No other early Pallava king is known to have used the title. Śivaskandavarman himself has been called Yuva-mahārāja in the Mayidavolu grant. The early Gaṅga kings call them-
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Banavāsī); but the name of the king is not mentioned. Nevertheless, as the Prakrit language of the record is decidedly later than that of the grants of Śivaskandavarman, the issuer of the Malavalli grant must have been either Mayūraśarman himself or his immediate successor.

The grant was executed in the fourth year of the king’s reign, on the second lunar day of the first fortnight of autumn, under the first asterism Rohinī. The grant was in the form of a Bahma-dijja (Brahma-deya) which was meant for the enjoyment (deva-bhoga) of Mañapālidesa. It consisted of a number of villages which are said to have been previously granted by king Mānavyasagotra Hāritiputra Śivaskandavarman, lord of Vaijayanti. The Brahmadeya was granted for a second time, with all the parihāras including abhaṭa-praveṣa, to a Brāhmaṇa named Kauṣikiputra Nāgadatta of the Kopaṇinya gotra, who is said to have been an ornament of the Koṇḍa-māna-kula. The necessity of granting for a second time is said to have been the fact that the ownership of the estate was abandoned. The villages granted were Sāmapaṭṭi, Koṅginagara, Mariyasā, Karpendulā, Para-Muccuṇḍi, Kunda-Muccuṇḍi, Kappennalā, Kunda-Tapuka, Veḷaki, Vegura, Koṇa-Tapuka, Ekkaṭṭhāhāra and Sahalā. The king’s oral order seems to have been written down by Viśvakarman and engraved on the stone-column by Nāgadatta who is possibly not the same person as the donee.

The grant begins with an adoration to Mañapālidesa and ends with the maṅgala: javayi lokanātha[h] nandaṃtu go-brāhmaṇa [h]; siddhir = astu, śrīr = astu. This Sanskrit maṅgala at the end of a Prakrit grant reminds us of a similar maṅgala at the end of the Hirahadagalli Prakrit grant of Śivaskandavarman. Many of the grants of Mayūraśarman’s successors also end with similar maṅgala.

The Dharma-Mahādhīrāja. Since no early Kadamba king is known to have been called Dharma-Mahārājādhīrāja, may it be supposed that this title of the Kadamba king (independent after his overlord’s death?) of the Malavalli record was an imitation of the title of Pallava Śivaskandavarman who, as we have suggested, was possibly suzerain of the Kuntala region in the first quarter of the fourth century? May it be further suggested that the name of Mānavyasagotra Hāritiputra Vaijayanti-pati Śivaskandavarman who seems to have been the immediate predecessor of Mayūraśarman was after that of Pallava Śivaskandavarman, just like the name of the Gaṅga king Mādhava-Sinhavarman was imitated from that of his father’s overlord king Siphavarman (c. A.D. 436-458) of Kānci?

1. It has been suggested (e.g. in Lüders’s List, No. 1196; Journ. Ind., Hist., XIII, p. 361) that Śivaskandavarman was the name of the Kadamba king who issued the Malavalli grant. The composition of the record however clearly shows that the theory is untenable; cf. vaijayanti-dhamma-mahārājādhīrāja patikatakasanjkāyi-caccāparo kadambānaṃ rājā sivakhadavaṇṇa mānavaṇṇasottena hāritiputtena vaijayantilpatinā puvavadatt-eti, etc. It must be noticed that the word [kadambānaṃ] rājā with all the epithets preceding it is in the first case-ending, while sivakhadavaṇṇa and all its epithets following it are in the third case-ending. Moreover, the epithet vaijayanti-dhamma-mahārājādhīrāja applied to kadambānaṃ rājā and vaijayanti-patinā applied to sivakhadavaṇṇa show beyond doubt that these two identical epithets refer to two different kings.
The above inscription is engraved on a pillar in front of the Kalleśvara temple at Malavalli in the Shikarpur taluka as a continuation of an inscription dated in the first year of Mānavyagotra Hāritiputra Viṣhukāḍa Cūṭukulānanda Sātakarṇi, king of Vaijayanti (Banavāsi). This grant also begins with an adoration to the god Malapalidēva for whose enjoyment a Devabhoga was granted in the king’s first regnal year on the first lunar day of the second fortnight of summer. The Devabhoga was in the form of a Bamhadijja (Brahmadeya) of the grāmakāra of Sahalātavī which was granted to Takīṇcīputra Koṇḍamāna who has been called Hāritiputra and is said to have belonged to the Kaunḍinya gotra, with all the parihāras such as abhaṭapraveśa and others.

It must be noticed that the Malavalli record of the Kadamba king also mentions Sahalā (Sahalātavī of the present grant) and there the donee is one who belonged to the family of this Koṇḍamāna (koṇḍamāna-kula-tīlaka). Since the linguistic and palæographical standards of the two Malavalli records agree in placing them very near each other in time, I think it possible that the Koṇḍamāna-kula-tīlaka Kausikīputra Nāgadatta of the Kaunḍīny gotra (donee of the Kadamba grant) was the son of Takīṇcīputra-Hāriti putra Koṇḍamāna of the Kaunḍīny gotra (donee of the Cūṭu Sātakarṇī grant).1 We should however notice the facts that in the Kadamba record the twelve villages including Sahalā are said to have been previously granted by a Vaijayanti-pati named Śivaskandavarman and that the ownership of the estate is said to have been abandoned. It may be that Sahalā was granted by Viṣhukāḍa Cūṭukulānanda Sātakarṇi while the eleven other villages were granted by Śivaskandavarman, his immediate successor. Or was the grāmakāra consisting of twelve villages? The cause of abandoning the ownership of the estate by the heir of Koṇḍamāna seems to have been the political troubles caused by the rise of Mayūraśarman. The cause appears to be the same as with Śivaśarman who received the village of Polamuru from Mādhava-varman I Viṣṇukanḍin and with his son Rudraśarman who fled to Asanapura during the Calukya invasions and received back his father’s argrahāra from Jayasimha I Eastern Calukya when the latter was established in the Guddavādi viśaya (see my Suc. Sāt. E. Dec., pp. 93-95).

The order of king Viṣhukāḍa Cūṭukulānanda Sātakarṇi for the execution of the Malavalli grant is said to have been given to a Rajjuka whose name was possibly Mahābhava. Rajjuka (from rajju) has been taken to be the same as a class of officials described by Megasthenes (M’Crindle, Anc. Ind., pp. 53-54). These officials are said to have measured the land, collected taxes, superintended rivers and the occupations connected with land, had the power of rewarding and punishing, inspected sluices, constructed roads and carried out other works of public utility. Some of these have been described as the functions of the Rajjuka or Rajju-gāhaka-amacc in

1. See e.g. Naiṣadhiya, V, verse 124, in which Nala, son of Virasena has been described as virasena-kula-dipa.
the Kurudhamma-jātaka. From the inscriptions of Aśoka we know that the Rājukas were appointed over many hundred thousands of men and were placed in direct charge of the jānapada jana; they therefore seem to have been the highest district officers (see BHANDARKAR, Aśoka, 2nd ed., pp. 59-60). The Rajukas were possibly employed in this region when Kuntala formed a part of the Maurya Empire. The existence of such an official in South-Western Deccan in the first half of the fourth century shows that the official machinery of the Maurya age was still functioning in Southern India (see RAYCHAUDHURI, Pol. Hist. Anc. Ind., 2nd ed., p. 321).¹

---

¹ This paper is essentially the same as that at pp. 238-51 of my Successors of the Sātavāhanas, Vol. I (in the press).
AN ILLUSTRATED MANUSCRIPT OF THE BHĀGAVATA-PURĀṆA COPIED IN A.D. 1648

By

P. K. GODE

The late Rao Bahadur D. B. PARASNIS published in 1909 a note on a MS of the Bhāgavata purāṇa prepared with profuse illustrations for Raja Pratap Singh of Jaipur (A.D. 1779-1803). Pratapsimha was a great lover of art. He had under his patronage numerous artists with whose help he got prepared a MS of the Bhāgavata purāṇa, containing beautiful coloured illustrations to illustrate certain episodes of this purāṇa. These illustrations give us an idea of Indian art at Jaipur in the 18th century. This MS was prepared at great expense and the work of preparing it was spread over many years.

Nana Fadnavis, the celebrated minister of the Peshwa got information about this illustrated MS of the Bhāgavata. He at once wrote to Apajiram Dabholkar, the Dewan of the Sindhia to make inquiries about this MS and send it to him. Apajiram wrote to Nana Fadnavis as follows:

"Respectfully I have to state as follows:

Received your letter of (1 ccha Jamādīlāval), in one of the supplements to your letters you have directed me to forward to you an illustrated MS of Śrī Bhāgavata, which you learn on reliable authority, has been prepared by Raja of Jaipur. You have also asked me to request Pāṭilbāvā to make a demand for this MS (polhi) during the course of his negotiations with the Raja of Jaipur (Jaipurkar). Or if this course is not possible you may request Rāyāji Patil, who is engaged in some diplomacy with the Raja of Jaipur to do this private work of ours. I have already spoken about the matter to Rāyāji Patil and he has promised to carry out my wishes without fail, circumstances permitting. At present, however, the chances of pro-

2. This Pratap Singh Copy of the Bhāgavata, with illustrations reminds me of the illustrations prepared by Shrimant Bala Sahib Pant Pratinidhi, Raja of Aundh for the critical edition of another purāṇa, viz., the Mahābhārata that is being published by the Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute, Poona, under the editorship of Dr. V. S. Sukthankar.
3. As the year is not recorded the exact date of this letter cannot be determined.
curing this MS are not favourable and hence the work will be effected as intimacy (with Jaipurkar) develops."1

PARASNIS states that no further letters on this subject can be traced but information is available that Pāṭilbāvā (Mahadjī Sindia) succeeded in procuring this unique MS for Nana Fadnavis. He also states that this MS is still in existence.2

The above information about an illustrated MS of the Bhāgavata prepared at Jaipur between A.D. 1779 and 1803 reminded me of another illustrated MS3 of the Bhāgavata available in the Government MSS Library at the B. O. R. Institute, Poona, prepared about 130 years earlier than the MS of the same work referred to by PARASNIS. It would appear that both these MSS were prepared in Rajputana, one at Jaipur and the other at Udayapur, both are profusely illustrated in colour and both illustrate the same purāṇa, viz., the Bhāgavata, though the difference of time between the B. O. R. I. copy and the Pratapsimha copy is more than 130 years. I have no evidence to prove that the Pratapsimha copy was modelled on the earlier copy in the Government MSS Library dated A.D. 1648. As the B. O. R. Institute copy is now 290 years old lovers of Indian painting will find it very useful to study the characteristics of the Rajputana style of painting prevalent in the middle of the 17th century. I shall therefore describe this MS in brief in order to give the students of Indian art some idea about the number of illustrations contained in this MS and the particulars about the date of this copy as recorded by the scribe.

The date of the MS is recorded in the colophon4 of Skandha XII as Sanvatsar 1705 month of Bhādrapada, Suklapakṣa, līthi 2, Gurusvārā which is

1. Cf., Peshwa Daftar Selection, No. 14 (Letter No. 38 of 13th October 1735) Pilaji Jadhav, a Marāṭha Sārdar sent to Peshwa Bajirao a MS of the Bhāgavata Purāṇa (excluding three chapters which were missing).
2. PARASNIS does not state in whose possession the MS exists.
3. This is MS No. 61 of 1907-1915. It contains 334 folios, comprising Skandhas VIII, IX, XI and XII of the Bhāgavata. Skandha VIII contains 16 quarter-size 2 half-size, and 35 full-size illustrations. Skandha IX contains 1 quarter-size, 3 half-size and 28 full-size illustrations. Skandha XI contains 13 quarter-size, 2 half-size and 12 full-size illustrations. Skandha XII contains 1 quarter-size, 3 half-size and 13 full-size illustrations. The total number of illustrations is 129 (=31 quarter-size +10 half-size +88 full-size). The paper of the MS is getting brittle but on the whole the MS is well preserved. The size of each folio is 15½ inches × 8½ inches.
4. This colophon reads as follows:— "इति श्री भागवतमार्थनीतिचिन्तां श्रीसुंदरभरतितितिविशयं द्वादशकं श्रीसेवाप्रथयां. ॥ ११॥ अतिलक्षविदितथं विषयत्वात नवयुगवस्तु विसारं दामनेवं न दुःखेवं. निवश्यकयात्रं श्रीसेवयां श्री विकल्पश्च तस्मात् ॥ १॥ संभूतं उद्वक्त्वमस्त्रयस्त्रयं विबंधशेषम् संस्कारणम् कल्याणं च श्रीसेवयां श्रीसेवायुगवस्तु विसारं दामनेवं न दुःखेवं. निवश्यकयात्रं श्रीसेवयां श्री विकल्पश्च तस्मात् ॥ २॥ श्रीसुंदरभरतितितितिविशयं द्वादशसंवत १७०५ वेष्टं ॥ भाद्रश मुदि २ गुरुस्य लिखितं वेष्टं पुस्तकं श्री उदयरुपेनर ॥"
equivalent to Thursday, 10th August 1648. The copy was written at Udayapura. At the bottom of the full-size illustration on folio 5 of Skandha VIII we find the endorsement: "|| चालक चौतारी सहाय्यदी ||" which possibly contains the name of the painter. The name of the scribe is Jasanavanta who is styled as "Bhaṭāraka" in the colophon1 of Skandha VIII on folio 84. He copied this MS and Udayapura which is identical with Udayapura mentioned in the colophon of Skandha XII. The Government MSS Library at the B. O. R. Institute possesses MSS2 of the Bhāgavata copied in years earlier than A.D. 1648, the date of the Udayapura copy referred to above but none of these MSS is illustrated. There is, however, one illustrated Persian MS in the Government MSS Library, which is a prose summary3 in Persian of the Bhāgavata Purāṇa divided into adhyāyas and skandhas as the original Sanskrit work.

Coming now to the several coloured illustrations of the B. O. R. Institute MS of the Bhāgavata of A.D. 1648 I have to state that they are all

1. This colophon reads as follows:—
   "श्रीशामसामविचरिन्तायो श्रीभगवदे
   महापुराणेष्व अवतरकं चालकतारी-सहाय्यानि
   संख्यामिति: || २४ ||
   भाटारक जासबंत लिखिते नेनकोकल्याणमेतु
   द्वियां महन्तध: || द्वियें महन्त ||
   आचार्याः विवेदेः पुस्तिकाः ||
   भागवतिकादि
   प्रोणः ||
   सत्यध्रवतिर्घोपुर्वः कठेन लिखिते शास्त्रः
   यत्नेन परिपूर्णेत्: ||
   भिजुतानामुर्मेण लिखिते ""

2. Some of these MSS are noted below with their dates:
   No. 435 F of Viśrāma I—Sarivat 1612 = A.D. 1556.
   No. 435 A of Viśrāma I—Sarivat 1616 = A.D. 1560.
   No. 216 of 1895-1902 Sarivat 1616 = A.D. 1560.
   No. 435 G of Viśrāma I—Sarivat 1622 = A.D. 1566.
   No. 435 D of Viśrāma I—Sarivat 1664 = A.D. 1608.
   No. 435 E of Viśrāma I—Sarivat 1678 = A.D. 1622.
   No. 110 of 1884-87—Sarivat 1692 = A.D. 1636.

   The colophon of MS No. 435 F of Viś. I reads as follows:—
   "संख्यै १५२ वर्गे माहसुखः पंचम्या मुर्गीं लिखितौं
   द्रमस्मकमे: ||"

3. MS No. 819a of 1875—76. This MS. contains 245 folios and is bound in leather. The date of the copy as recorded in the colophon is Sarivat 1909 (month of Phālguna) = A.D. 1853. The MS is well written and contains some fine illustrations:—God Ganapati and goddess Sarasvati riding a peacock (folio 1), Raja Parikṣit listening to the recitation of the Purāṇa (folio 16); the Varāha incarnation (folio 29); the Nṛṣimha incarnation (folio 63); the Amṛta manthana (churning of the ocean) (folio 70); the Vāmana incarnation (folio 78); the Matsya incarnation (folio 81); killing of Pūtaṇā by Kṛṣṇa (folio 102); revelation of the cosmos to Yaśodā by Kṛṣṇa (folio 103); Kṛṣṇa taking away the garments of Gopīs (folio 115); Kṛṣṇa lifting up the Govardhana mountain (fol. 118); Kṛṣṇa’s Rāsa-krīdā (folio 126); Kṛṣṇa destroying the demons Cāṇiṭra, Kaṇiṇa and others (folio 147); Kṛṣṇa destroying the demon Bānāsura (folio 187); meeting of Kṛṣṇa and his friends Sudānā (folio 212); Uddhava receiving Kṛṣṇa and Kṛṣṇa imparting spiritual instruction to Uddhava (folio 239).

   The copyist is Pandit Totārām, whose patron’s name appears to be Lala Mihirchand Chopra as stated in the colophon. (I am thankful to Mr. G. H. Khare, Curator, Bharat Itihāsa Sahāsodhak Manḍal, Poona, for reading out the pertinent portion of this Persian MS to enable me to describe the MS in the above manner).
in good condition and appear to have been executed with great care. It is, however, a matter for the students of Indian art to study these illustrations carefully, and assess their full artistic value. Before I conclude this note on the Bhāgavata MS I may invite the attention of scholars to one good illustration depicting the immolation of Kṛṣṇa's wives on the funeral pyre after his demise which is painted on folio 129 of Skanda XI.²

As the history of Indian painting has been latterly engaging the attention of Indian³ and foreign⁴ scholars the MS of the Bhāgavata described

1. My friend Mr. M. R. MAJMUDAR of the Oriental Institute, Baroda, the author of the Jain Chitra Kalpadruma (Baroda, 1936), will be studying these illustrations in the near future. He has already made a close study of the different styles of Indian paintings such as the Mughal style, the Rājasthāni or the early Rajput style, the Gujarati style, etc. He writes to me in a private communication dated 23rd May 1938: "I have so far traced out two illustrated MSS of Bhāgavata Daśama Skandha, one being the Gujarati verse-rendering by the poet Bhālana (early 16th century) with 17th century miniatures, and the other being the dated MS at Jodhpur, with about 200 miniatures with notes in old Gujarati prose. The date is Sānvat 1667 (= A.D. 1611), the painter's name being Govinda. My paper in Gujarati on these two sets will appear next month in Nava Cetan (June 1938, pp. 213-230) a monthly published from Calcutta. The Jodhpur MS was announced by me at VII Oriental Conference held at Baroda in 1933 (Proceedings, p. 833)". Vide, also his article on "Some Illustrated MSS of the Gujarati School of Painting," in these Proceedings (pp. 827-835). The colophon of the Jodhpur MS reads: "संवत १६६७ वर्षे | कार्तिकासितिप्रभुवाभुवनेश्वरीं रथिदिनें । लिखित: सुरजीवन \| दत्तसहवीकयः \| मधुलिंगकण्ठसेवन \| लेखितोऽभोज्यसुमुद्यिना \| नारदस्तुतेनैव गोविधास्येव चित्रितः।"


3. Vide M. R. MAJMUDAR's article "The illustrated MSS of Ratirasaya of the Gujarati School of Painting" (Bom. Uni. Jour., Vol. V, Part VI, May 1937, pp. 134-144). According to Mr. MAJMUDAR the "Gujarati School of MSS—Illustrations flourished from 12th to the 17th century after which it was more or less modified by Mughal and Rajput influences". Mr. MAJMUDAR refers to the following studies on Indian painting:— (1) N. C. MEHTA: ('Indian Painting in the 15th century, an illustrated MS' [Rupam, No. 22-23 (April-July 1925)]; "Studies in Indian Painting", Ch. II, Secular Painting in Gujar, XV century (1926); "Gujarati Painting in the 15th century: A Further Essay on Vasant Vilās" (1931, London). (2) O. C. GOGOLY: "A newly discovered illustrated Indian MS" (Andhra His. Res. Soc. Jour., Vol. IV, 1929); "A newly discovered illustrated Indian MS" (Indian Arts and Letters, Vol. IV, No. 2, New Series, 1930); "A newly discovered illustrated Indian MS (Mālaviya Comm., Vol. 1932), (3) Hiranandā SASRI: "Indian Pictorial Art as developed in Book-illustrations "Gaikwad Archaeo. Series, No. 1, 1936.

in this note may have some value both artistic and historical as it is a dated MS, rich in large and small well-preserved coloured illustrations. At any rate it is a source for the history of Indian painting deserving a careful study and reproduction of at least some of its coloured illustrations, representative of the school of painting to which it belongs.
SOME SIDELIGHTS ON ĀNAYA THE GREAT CHANCELLOR

By

H. C. SETH

Elsewhere we have suggested that Candragupta Maurya originally belonged to the Gandhara region and that the starting point of the big empire created by him was the north-west of India and we have also suggested the following reconstruction of the events succeeding Alexander’s invasion of India. Candragupta headed a revolt west of the Indus against Alexander himself about the time when the latter was at the bank of the Beas. This revolt was the real cause of Alexander’s sudden retirement and flight through Sindh and the Makran desert, where most of his army was destroyed. Candragupta’s power was first consolidated in or about 325 B.C. in his own home provinces in the north-west of India, and it also extended to Central Asia and part of Persia.

The conclusion of ours that Candragupta’s position was first consolidated in the north-western India is borne out by the accounts of him given both by some of the early European historians and the Indian literary traditions. Justin and Plutarch inform us that Candragupta was in the north-western parts of India at the time of Alexander’s invasion, and, had some considerable dealings with him, as according to Justin, Alexander ordered his beheadal. It thus seems that the north-west of India and the Punjab were the scenes of the early activities of Candragupta. The drama Mudrārāksa bears out this conclusion. According to it the forces with the help of which Candragupta conquered Magadha were all drawn from the north-west of India and beyond. We have also suggested that Parvataka,


We have discussed these views in a greater detail in a paper “Gandhara Origin of the Maurya Dynasty and the Identification of Candragupta and Sasigupta”, read before the Ninth All-India Oriental Conference.

2. We have put forward this view in a paper “Was Alexander routed in India?” Indian Review, June 1937.

3. In a paper “Central Asiatic Provinces of the Mauryan Empire,” IHQ, Vol. XIII, Pt. III, we have discussed that the Mauryan Empire included a considerable part of Eastern Persia and of modern Russian and Chinese Turkistan.

4. अर्धि ताबच्चदानविक्करणां दशात्वस्य वानस्पतिक वाली च सत्ताभिज्ञानवेत्वमपि प्राचीन षुरुक्षितवटिकालिकममरि: समस्तादुम्पदं कुसुमपुरम् || (Act III).

We have discussed the identity of all these people in the paper referred to in the above footnote, and have shown that they all belonged to north-western India and beyond.
Candragupta's ally in the overthrow of Nanda of Magadha, was none else than the great Porus of the Greek historians.¹

The overthrow of Nanda King of Magadha was undertaken by Candragupta after he had uprooted the Greek power west of the Indus. It is absurd to say, as Vincent Smith² and some others do, that several years afterwards Candragupta came from Magadha to destroy the Greek forces left behind by Alexander in the Punjab and the north-west, when really none worth the name were left there within a few months of his retirement. As a matter of fact even before Alexander had left the confines of India, almost all the Greek satraps he had appointed, Nicanor, west of the Indus, Philips of royal family, satrap of the Punjab, and Apolloninesis, satrap of Gedrosia, were killed. The only person who stayed for sometime in India was a petty official Eudamus, who perhaps took service under the mighty Porus, or may be under Candragupta himself, in the latter case the force under Eudamus may be the Yavanas which according to Mudrārākṣasa formed part of Candragupta's army which invaded Magadha. Eudamus is not even as much as mentioned in the partitions that were made of Alexander's conquests after his death, first in Babylon in 323 B.C. and then at Triparadeisos in 321 B.C.

The following passages from the drama Mudrārākṣasa also suggest that with the help of Cāṇākya, Candragupta even prior to the conquest of Magadha had conquered some other parts of the country.

(1) राजा:—(असानहुत: चाँकहसं पादी गुहीतवा)। आर्थ चन्द्रगुप्त: प्रणमति।
राज्यस्य अनुस्मरित पन्न सर्वम् ततुपिनिश्चत्वायथ:।
(Act III).

(2) चायक्ष्य:—
अम्बाशीद्रो तमाल्प्रभवक्षिलन्यद्यावलवनाम:।
आ परिभाषतुष्कम् चुदानकिलमित्वोभितान्त्वज्ञानाम:।
मलेश्वराणपुण्य नन्दुपिलिश्चक्तयथा वा भ्रोमि:।
सा मन्नेश्व स्वल्पनां प्रथमति विन्यालहते ते प्रभुवम्।।
(Act. III.)

1. We have given detailed reasons for this view in our paper "Identification of Porus and Parvataka", read before the Ninth All-India Oriental Conference.
2. It appears probable that before he undertook the expulsion of the foreign garrisons he had already overthrown his unpopular relation, "the Nanda King of Magadha". Early History of India. (3rd Ed.) P. 118.
Magadha was the biggest kingdom in India at the time of Alexander’s invasion. But its overthrow by Candragupta was facilitated because of the extreme unpopularity of the reigning monarch, which is mentioned alike in the Greek and the Indian traditions.

This reconstruction of the events of the period throws new light on Cāṇākya’s character and achievements. We learn from the Buddhist sources that Cāṇākya also belonged to the north-west of India. According to Mahāvamsa Tiṅka he was a Brahmin of Takṣaśīlā. It is likely that as a young prince Candragupta received his early education at the feet of Cāṇākya in the great University of Takṣaśīlā. The drama Mudrārākṣasa everywhere shows very cordial relations between Cāṇākya and Candragupta, and also a deep appreciation by them of each other’s merits, which could only be the result of a long and intimate contact between the two.¹

As belonging to north-western India Cāṇākya witnessed the dangers of a divided country at the time of Alexander’s invasion. He must have seen that only a well organised and closely knit imperial India could successfully withstand a foreign invasion like that of Alexander. It has been correctly surmised by the authors of the Cambridge Ancient History that “it seems to have been among the Brahmins of the Punjab that the reaction started which placed Candragupta on the throne of a united India.”² In view of the facts that Cāṇākya belonged to Takṣaśīlā and that the Indian literary traditions so closely associate him with Candragupta, the central figure in this revolt, in establishing the vast Mauryan Empire, it seems that Cāṇākya was the instigator and the leader of the revolt against the Greeks. The vision of a strong, united and unconquerable India, which he then formed, was successfully realised within a few years.³

---

1. The following passage from the drama clearly indicates that Cāṇākya was his preceptor, and it also shows how cordial were the relations between the two.

चन्द्रगुस : —अयांकृष्ण भम लक्षणगीरवस्य
बुद्धि: प्रवेदायकवेविवर्ग्र वर्गातः।
ये सत्यमेव न गुहेन प्रतिमानवतः
तेषां कथं न हुदयं न भिन्नति क्षणम्।

(Act III.)


3. Compare the following remarks of Vincent Smith. “The conception of an Indian Empire extending from sea to sea and embracing almost the whole of India and Afghanistan, was formed and carried into effect by Candragupta and his minister in the brief space of twenty-four years. History can show few greater political achievements. Not only was the empire formed, but it was so thoroughly organised that the sovereign’s commands emanating from Pataliputra were obeyed without demur on the banks of the Indus and the shores of the Arabian Sea. The immense heritage thus created by the genius of the first emperor of India was transmitted intact to his son and grandson.” Asoka, p. 104.
Cāṇakya was thus associated with Candragupta right from the beginning in establishing a vast empire, over practically the whole of India and far beyond in Central Asia the starting point of which was northwestern India. His help in the conquest and the annexation of the kingdom of Magadha to the empire of Candragupta was perhaps the last episode in his political career. After this, as the following passage addressed to Rākṣasa in the drama Mudrārākṣasa indicates, he retired from active politics, which may explain the absence of reference to him in the fragments of Megasthenes, which have been reported by the early European historians.

चाणक्यः —तपोवने यामि विहाय मैथिले
ल्वो चाहिक्षिरायचिक्षुर्य मुन्यम्।
लियिः सिधते वायवधिपतिसुद्धी
भुकु गामिन्द्र इश्वे चन्द्रः॥

(Act II.)
(Hillebrandt's edition)

If the drama represents correct court traditions then Cāṇakya's winning over of Rākṣasa, the popular minister of Nandas, was a master stroke of diplomacy. It quashed completely whatever opposition there might have been in the east to the newly founded empire of the Maurya. The drama Mudrārākṣasa not only throws light on how Candragupta's position was secured in Magadha, but how even the ineffectual opposition raised by Rākṣasa and Malayaketu with the help of Kashmir, Sindh, and some other western powers was nipped in the bud, and with the fall of Magadha the supremacy of Candragupta was fully established over a great part of India. It was only after he had seen the Great Candragupta seated firmly on the throne of a united India, that Cāṇakya, one of the most resolute, self-denying and incorruptible souls produced by India, passed out of the political horizon, but, perhaps, only to devote the resources of his mighty intellect to the bigger social and religious problems that faced the vast empire which his genius had helped Candragupta to create.

It is a pity that by taking the view that Cāṇakya was involved only in a family quarrel between Candragupta and the Nanda kings, and that the driving motive of Cāṇakya for the great political upheavals and carnage of blood, which he undertook, was just an insult by the Nanda king or according to some stories by the king's maid-servant,¹ we have made him look very mean and revengeful. The following passage from Mudrārākṣasa correctly tells us that Cāṇakya undertook the overthrow of Nanda king, because he disregarded the kingly duties.

नन्देविस्मुक्तमन्ये क्षितिज्ञानः
अव्यासितं च दुधेन दुर्बेण राजाम्।
सिद्धहसी सस्यायचिक्षुते च
प्रतीति गमिन्द्रगुणसमति गुणा ममेते॥

(Act III.)

¹ Hemacandra’s Sthavirāvalīcarita.
The Pauranic traditions also attest to the hatred in which the Nanda king was held. The extreme unpopularity of the king of Magadha reigning at the time of Alexander’s invasion is also recorded by the Greek historians. According to them he “was a man of worthless character, the son of a barber, and that he had obtained the throne by the murder of his predecessor whose chief queen he had corrupted.”¹ JAYASWAL was, perhaps, right in concluding that “the powers in Gandhara when faced with Alexander’s invasion looked towards the imperial power of Magadha.”² But no help was obtained from that quarter and Cāṇakya found that for the safety and the imperial unity of India Nandas like so many other monarchs and the republics³ had to go.

Cāṇakya’s was the administrative genius which firmly established over almost the whole of India and far beyond the mighty and very efficiently organised empire of Candragupta.⁴ If we remember that it was only the great political fabric which was raised with the help of his genius, which made it possible for India in the time of Aśoka to send to the world for the first time the message of peace, love, and universal brotherhood, that we can rightly regard Viṣṇugupta Cāṇakya as a maker of one of the greatest ages not only in the history of India but in the history of the world.

---

3. This explains the intolerance shown towards the republic in the Arthaśāstra, (Book XI). They could not withstand an invasion like that of Alexander.
4. Compare the following remark of Vincent SMITH “Akbar’s machine of government never attained the standard of efficiency reached by the Mauryas eighteen or nineteen centuries before his time.” (Akbar the Great Mogul, p. 396).
AUSTRIC SUB-STRATUM IN THE ASSAMESE LANGUAGE*

By

B. KAKATI

§ 1. The province of Assam and its language are very insufficiently known abroad. Yet by its earlier name of Kāmarūpa, it is better known to Hindu India as a land of magic and witchcraft with its famous Tantric shrine of Kāmākhya with which it is frequently associated together (Kāmarūpa-Kāmākhya).

§ 2. The province was differently called in different historical periods. Its most ancient name was Prāg-jyotiṣapura. By this name it is referred to in the two great epics—the Rāmāyaṇa and the Mahābhārata and the principal Purāṇas. In classical Sanskrit literature both Prāg-jyotiṣa and Kāmarūpa occur as alternative names of the country. Kālidāsa refers to it by both the designations (Raghu : Canto IV. 83.). In epigraphic records the name Kāmarūpa was first mentioned in the Allahabad inscriptions of Samudra Gupta in the fifth century. (Fleet : Corpus Inscriptionum Indicarum : vol. iii. p. 8).

§ 3. The modern designation Assam was connected with the Shān invaders of the Brahmaputra Valley. Since 1228 the easternmost portion of the Valley came under the domination of a section of the great Thāi (Tāi) or Shān race which spreads eastwards from the border of Assam over nearly the whole of further India and far into the interior of China. It seems curious that while the Shān invaders called themselves Tāi, they came to be referred to as Asām, Āsam, Asam, Ācām in contemporary Assamese literature. In modern Assamese they are referred to as Āhom, which is a modern phonetic development of earlier Asām.

§ 4. No satisfactory explanation has been offered by historians about the origin of the term Asām as applied to the Shāns. It seems likely that Asām is connected with Tāi }$/\check{\text{Chām}}$, “to be defeated”, with the Aryan-Assamese privative prefix ə-, the whole formation Asām meaning “undefeated” ‘victorious’, thus being a hybrid equivalent of the word Thāi, (Tāi), meaning “free”.

§ 5. The word Assamese is an English one built on the same principle as ‘Canarese’ ‘Cingalese’ etc. It is built on the English word Assam by which the tract consisting of the Brahmaputra Valley is known. But the people call their country Āsam and their language Asamīyā (L. S. I. Vol. 1. p. 393).

---

* Adapted from the present writer’s unpublished manuscript “Assamese, its formation and development.”
§ 6. Assamese is the easternmost modern Indo-Aryan language spoken in the Assam Valley districts with Lakhimpur in the extreme east and Goalpara in the extreme west. It meets Bengali in the west and is surrounded on all sides by Non-Aryan speeches of which the principal are the Tibeto-Burman and the Khasi (of the Mon-Khmer family).

§ 7. Though a full-fledged modern Indo-Aryan language both in respects of grammatical structure and a large percentage of vocables, the surrounding Non-Aryan languages have made inroads into the speech in several directions. It is not, however, with speeches of the Tibeto-Burman family which are spoken all through Assam by different mountain tribes but with the distant speeches of the Pagan races of the Malay Peninsula and with Muṇḍāri, Santali and Khasi (nearer home), that Assamese Vocabulary shews a considerable percentage of correspondences. These similarities seem to constitute an essential Sub-stratum of the Assamese language. Famous place-names regarded as of Sanskritic origin, various words for the sex-organs which are hardly registered, as being indecent, in current dictionaries but always uttered as slangs, terms of relationship according to various grades of life, the names of various descriptions of animals, all seem to shew Austric contact. Certain idiomatic structures also seem to betray Austric influences. But in the present paper word-correspondences only will be noted.

These correspondences are grouped below into (A). Place-names: (B) Names of common animals; (C) Terms of relationship; (D) Slangs indicating sex-organs; (E) Miscellaneous.

A

PLACE-NAMES.

§ 8. Kāmākhyā or Kāmākṣi. The name of a goddess so called and worshipped in a Śākta shrine situated in a hill named Nilācala near Gauhati. The hill itself is now called Kāmākhyā. According to Pauranic legends the organ of generation of Satī fell when here her dead body was carried over from place to place by Śiva.

Cf. the following Austric formations in this connection:—
kamoi, demon (Old Khmer); Kamoit, devil (Cham);
Kamel, corpse (Khasi); Kambru, Kamru, name of a lesser divinity worshipped by the Santals; Komui, grave (Tareng); Komuoch, corpse (Stieng); Khmoch, corpse, ghost (Khmer); Ke-moyd; ke-moit, ghost (Sem). Ke-mut, ke-muyl, grave (Bes. Sep).

If mere correspondence in sound and meaning be of any value for etymology, Kāmākhyā or Kāmākṣi may be a Sanskritisation of such non-Aryan formations as komuoch, kumoch. In that case all the Austric formations would lead on to the place having been connected with some one's dead body. The Pauranic legends make it the burial place of a part of Satī's dead body.
§ 9. Kāmarūpa. The mediaeval name for the province of Assam. According to Pauranic legends, Kāmadeva, the god of love, regained his form (rūpa) in this locality after having been burnt to ashes by Śiva.

Hiuen Ts'ang called it Ka-mo-lu-p'o (Kāmarūpa). Watters notes also a place mentioned in T'ang-Shu called ko-me-lu (Kamru) (Watters: Vol. ii, p. 186). Alberuni calls this place Kāmrū (Sachau: Vol. i, p. 201). Mogul historians always referred to this place as Kamru or Kamru-d. (Raverty: Tabaquat-i-Nasiri, p. 564). Perhaps popularly the country was known as Kamru or Kamru-t(d). Cf. Santali, Kamru, Kambu (§ 8; -t being a suffix of place-names (§ 11).

Kāmarūpa having been a place famous for Tantric Practices, Kamru-t would suggest some sort of connection with a land of necromancy. The Pauranic legend speaks of the revival of a dead person here; Kāmarūpa may be a Sanskritisation of Kamru-t.

Other place-names with Kām- are Kāma-tā in Coch-Bihar: Comilla in north Bengal both having Tantric Shrines.

§ 10. Lohita (also popularly Luit). It is the principal river in Assam also called the Brahmaputra. In an Ahom (Tāi) chronicle written in the Ahom (Tāi) language and published with parallel English translation by the Government of Assam (1910), the river Brahmputrā has been frequently referred to as Ti-lao. This was perhaps the popular name of the river when the Tāis first entered the place. Ti-lao is not a Tāi word, the river being referred to as nam-dao-phi in that language.

Austric equivalents for water are:

taya, tiu, tu, tueh (w30) : lao, clean water (w35). The word indicating water is placed before or after other words: Cf. ti menu, a big river; tiu me, a small stream: kuod teu, a tributary stream.

Lohita or Luit would seem to be a Sanskritisation of some such formation as lao-tu. Other river names in Assam and North Bengal are Kara-toyā (Hiuen Ts'ang's Ka-lo-tu) ; Tistā, in North Bengal : Ti-hu; Ti-pām; Tiyak in Assam.

§ 11. Place-names in -t. Austric equivalents for earth, place are Ta, te, teh, tek, tik, etc. (E 12). Santali, ato, at

Cf. the following place names: Kāma-tā, Cāma-tā; baka-tā, etc., in Assam; bhāba-tā; Saka-ti, names of villages in the Bogra district, North Bengal.

(B)

Animals

§ 12. āhekiyā-patiyā, the royal tiger; cf. diagign; pato (T. 129 E 130-6). nāhar-phuṭuki, leopard, cf. menahar (T. 136).

lātā- phuṭuki, leopard cf. lataik (T. 129).
hāpā, hebā, wild cat, cf. hapa, hampet B. 74 (193).
kerekētuvā, squirrel, cf. ker; kekah; taba M. 145, 146.
kukur-neciyā, wolf, cf. nyah; chinnih. T. 129, 129 (d).
kuvāng, wild dog, cf. kohang. T. 133.
jahā-māl, a kind of wild cat, cf. juho, tiger. T. 129 (b).
jihā, a thread-like earthworm, cf. jelo. leech.
ui, white ant, cf. yui, F. 199.
hām, kāyem, a kind of water-fowl, cf. ayam, fowl (F. 258). Kā is
an article placed before singular nouns in Khasi.
Kāwai, a kind of fish, cf. kaa, fish. (F. 138).

(C)

TERMS OF RELATIONSHIP

ābu, grand-mother; cf. abu, abuh, father. F. 40.
bāpā, bopāi, father; cf. bapa; bapai, fathers. F. 44 (a).
āi, mother. cf. ai, father. F. 45.
kākā, kakāi, elder brother, cf. kaka, elder brother. B. 426.
bāi, elder sister: also a term of address to an elderly lady. cf. bhai,
ibhai, elder sister; ba, bii, mother. B. 413.
tāwai, fathers’ equal. cf. ta, tata, grandfather.

(D)

§ 14. WORDS DENOTING ORGANS OF SEX AND HARDLY RECORDED IN DICTIONARIES, AS BEING OBSCENE.

cet, penis. cf. set, seat. mons veneris. N. 18.
gid, anus, cf. kit, kid, anus. A. 118.
keti, clitoris. cf. keto, exterior skin. S. 2366.
kela, penis, cf. klao, klau, penis, P. 52.
pel, testicle, cf. pelokn, peluk, egg. E. 37.
buc, female organ (Santali; buya, cucu).

§ 15. Words having reference to different bodily functions and limbs.

∴ā-kar, open the mouth widely: cf. ang, gape. M. 199.
bāi-√di, thrust something long and round into a cavity: cf. ya
bai dig, bore through. D. 127.
bēt- mouth. cf. beto, face. F. 228.
bhet—cakuwā, dim-sighted, cf. buta blind.
celâuri, eye-brow. cf. chelu, see. S. 78.
gorâ, heel ; cf. gor lower part of leg. H. 69.
kámor, bite as an insect. cf. kemor, insect. B. 143a.
kilâ-kul elbow. cf. kula kut, nail, E. 42.
lepețâ-kârâh, sit on the hams, cf. lempao, thigh.

(E)

MISCELLANEOUS WORDS

§ 16. The list of miscellaneous words is long. It includes both verbal roots and substantives. They refer to matters of daily home life. Only a few are selected as specimens.

ācu, coloured threads used for embroidery work cf. achu, pattern, picture. P. 42.

bôkâ, mud. cf. boka, muddy-water. W. 36.
√bâk, pour. cf. ba-ak ; bahak. F. 178.
holâ, a pool of water. cf. ho. W. 29.
   S. 62.
pâhâr, a hill, cf. pau. H. 93. Santali hara, a hill.

tilâ, a mound, hillock. cf. tul, teula. M. 199.

etc. etc. etc.

§ 17. The list of correspondences is pretty comprehensive and they refer to matters connected with the daily business of life, and yet it is hard to arrive at a definite conclusion. Similarity in sound and meaning is not a sure guide in etymology and the comparative grammars of the Auristic and other non-Aryan languages are not yet fully settled. One cannot therefore be sure about the origin of any word found in them. Most of the words of relationship quoted above (§13) occur also in other modern Indo-Aryan languages in slightly modified forms and meanings. Some of them may be equated to Sanskrit formations, e.g. āmai, mother’s equal, may be equated to Skt. ambâ; bâpā, bopāi, father, to Skt. vapra ; tâvāi, father’s equal to Skt. tâta. Other words like gorâ, heel) ; bôkâ, mud, may be equated to Prākrit godda ; Vaṅka ; kâvai, a kind of fish, to Lex. Skt. Kavayi ; pel, testicle, to Lex. Skt. pelaka. But Sanskrit and Prākrit absorbed a fair percentage of non-Aryan words and a Sanskritic form is not a sure index of a word being of Aryan origin. It seems admissible, however, from the nature and number of the corresponding vocables that Indo-Aryan Assamese was foisted upon a people who spoke some language intimately allied to the Auristic languages and that Auristic elements constitute a sub-stratum of Indo-Aryan Assamese.
Certain idiomatic peculiarities of Assamese pointing towards conclusion in the same direction may be touched upon in some future paper.
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WERE HERMAEUS AND KUJULA KADPHISES JOINT RULERS?

By

M. GOVIND PAI

A certain group of copper coins with the name Kujula inscribed in Kharoṣṭhī and Kozola (Kujula) Kadaphes in Greek, falls into two classes: (1) those which bear the name of the Greek king Hermaeus and the Kushāṇa Kujula, and (2) those which bear the name of Kujula alone—

(1) obv. Basileōs stēros su Ermaiou.
   (Bust of king right. Omicrons squared).
   rev. Kujula Kasasa Kushana yavugasa dhramaḥhidasa (Hercules standing)¹ . . . . . . . A.

(2) obv. χοραν su *koou Kozola Kadaphes (Head of king to right resembling that of the Roman emperor Augustus in his last years)
   rev. Khusanasa yāisa Kuyula Kaphsasa sacha-dhrama-thitasa (King seated to right on a chair)² . . . . . . B.
   or
   rev. Khusanasa yāisa Kuyula Kaphsasa sacha-dhrama-thitasa (King seated to right on a chair)³ . . . . . . C.

The former set which contains the bust of the Greek king Hermaios or Hermaeus, seems to bear witness to a certain connection between Hermaeus and Kujula who would thus seem to have ruled for sometime conjointly. From this apparent association of the Greek and the Kushāṇa, Prof. RAPSON once considered⁴ that these coins showed clearly the process by which the Kabul valley passed from Hermaeus, the last ruling member of the line of Eucratides, to his conqueror, the Kushāṇa Kujula Kadphises, while Prof. Sten KONOW likewise once inferred⁵ that when Kujula invaded An-si i.e. according to him the Parthian realm in and near Kabul, Hermaeus entered into an alliance with him, through which he tried to strengthen his position and make himself independent of the Parthian suzerain, who had oppressed him, but as the Kushāṇa ruler did not long leave him free to enjoy his independence, he had to share the government with him and was soon entirely replaced by Kujula.

1. RAPSON : Indian Coins (RIC) Pl. II. 7; Cambridge History of India, I (= CHI) p. 589. Pl. VII 28 ; BROWN : Coins of India (= BCI) Pl. IV. 1.
2. Corpus Inscriptioinum Indicarum, Vol. I, Part I (= Corpus Int, p. lxiii,
3. BCI, Pl. IV. 2; RIC, Pl. II. 9.
4. RAPSON : Ancient India, pp. 133, 146.
5. Corpus, p. lxiv.
But later on however, Prof. RAPSON took a different view,¹ which Prof. Sten Konow has now accepted,² that while the last Yavana (Greek) king Hermaeus may have been reigning for sometime before and after circa 40 B.C., as would seem to be indicated by the square omicron □ in his later Greek coin legends, a coinage bearing his name and his types was issued by his conquerors, who according to him, were Pahlavas and Kushānas, until a much later date, in the same way and for the same reasons that the East India Company continued for many years to strike rupees bearing the name of the Mughal emperor Shāh 'Alam, and the Kushāna king Kujula's imitations are of a still later date when more than 70 years after the death of its last Greek king Hermaeus, the Kabul valley passed from the Pahlavas to the Kushānas.

But then side by side with the square omicron, the round form also occurs on some of the coins of Gondopharanes,³ for whom we have the undoubted date 29-30 A.C. of the Takht-i-Bāhi inscription,⁴ exactly as on the coin D (infra) containing the name Hermaeus on both the sides. Besides the occurrence of the square omicron cannot be an infallible chronological test as has been acknowledged by Prof. RAPSON himself.⁵ Though there is evidence of the coins of the Sakas as well as the Pahlavas having been struck with the characteristic types of their fore-runners the Yavana kings, it can hardly be maintained with absolute certainty that the reverse type of the coins of the Pahlava king Spalirises,⁶ the brother and successor of Vonones and the father and predecessor of Azes I,⁷ is borrowed from those of Hermaeus,⁸ as asserted by Prof. RAPSON, as if it cannot have been imitated from the earlier Yavana coins, such as those of Heliocles or Amyntas,⁹ unless the Hermaeus of coin D was different from the Hermaeus of coin A, and the former was an earlier ruler. Nor could the parallel suggested by Prof. RAPSON that the East India Company continued for many years to strike rupees bearing the name of Shāh 'Alam, avail in any way to strengthen his case inasmuch as in the period under survey there is hardly any instance of the wholesale legends with names and portraits of much earlier kings of entirely different nationalities having been restruck or retained on the coins of much

1. CHI pp. 561-62.
2. Journal of Indian History (= JIH) XII, p. 29.
3. CHI pp. 590, 592, Pl. VII. 32, 34.
4. Corpus p. 62. This article forms a part of the longer work on the Chronology of the Sakas, Pahlavas, Kushānas &c (yet to be published) in which the year of this inscription is shown to be 29-30 A.C.
5. CHI p. 572 In. l.
6. Ibid., pp. 562, 591, Pl. VII. 37, 38.
7. According to RAPSON (CHI, p. 574) Azes II (and not Azes I) would seem to have been the son and successor of Spalirises, but in our chronology of the Sakas etc. we have shown that it was Azes I who was the son and successor of Spalirises, and that Azes II was the son and successor of Azilises who was the son and successor of Azes I.
8. Ibid., p. 591.
later kings of other races and other dynasties, and that too on the side of honour, the obverse. Besides while in the case of the East India Company it was to its own advantage as the virtual ruler of the dominions of the then king Shāh 'Alam to strike its coins with his name and continue the process for many years, it is hardly possible to imagine of what earthly use it could have been to the Kushāṇa king Kujala, who as is further evident from the type of his coins B and C, went in for the more or less contemporary Roman denarii of emperor Augustus1 (ob. 14 A.C.), to have retained or restruck the entire Greek legend of a Yavana king, who as Prof. Rapson believes, had been dead more than 70 years before his time.

Now there is a syllable su or sy (ΣΥ) which on the obverse of the first set of coins A, stands between stēros and Ermaìou, and which different scholars have tried to explain differently. Prof. Rapson2 once thought that the legend stēros su might be rendering of stērasya, Skt. sthavirasya = of the elder, while χοραν su, on coins B and C, might stand for Kushāṇasya; but now he seems to be convinced3 that it is the corrupt form of the Greek word sōtēros, genitive singular of sōtēr = saviour (Skt. trātāra), as is not improbable when and where the Greek language was no longer properly understood by the die-engravers. M. Senart4 draws attention to the fact that the word tratarasa (g.s.) which usually occurs on the reverse of the (silver) coins bearing also the name Hermaeus—

obv. Basileōs sōtēros Ermaïou
(Bust of king right. Omicrons round)

rev. Maharajasa tratarasa Hermayasa
(Zeus enthroned)2

is absent when the obverse shows the corrupt Greek legend stēros su, and as this coincidence precludes, he thinks, the idea of stēros su being simply a corruption of sōtēros, and as also Kujula’s coins are the oldest Indian coins where we find an ethnic designation, Kushāṇa, he thinks it possible that su has a similar meaning and stands for Syrou (gen. sg. of Syros = a Syrian), of the Syrian, supposing that Syria had for those far-off Greeks come to stand as the last representative of the independent Greek power. But then it is far cry from the Afghanistan or the further east of Hermaeus to the Syria of the Seleucids; and since they had once severed connection with Syria in c. 250 B.C. when Diodotus of Bactria became independent of his suzerain, the Seleucidan king of Syria,6 neither the Bactrian Greeks nor their successors in India were ever likely to look back to Syria as their original home, or call themselves Syrians, or even to look upon Syria as the last.

2. Corpus p. lvii.
5. CHI p. 591, Pl. VII. 37.
6. Ibid., pp. 434-35.
representative of the independent Greek power, especially when since 65 B.C. it had once for all become a Roman province.¹

Prof. Thomas² suggests the possibility of seeing in the su of stéros su a genitive suffix corresponding to the Tocharian tse; Prof. Kirsch sees in it the abbreviation of the Greek word symbolon;³ and Baron Staël Holstein takes it to be the genitive of a word corresponding to Persian shah, comparing the forms Sapórēs, Shāhpūr (the name of some of the kings of the Sasanid dynasty), where sh is rendered as s, and satrapu Zeiōnusou,⁴ where u (i.e. the final 'u' of 'satrapu') stands for the genitive suffix. Prof. Sten Konow however remarks that though the explanation of su as an abbreviation of symbolon is the only one which does not lead to the assumption of a clumsy or mistaken orthography, the position of the syllable, which might be intelligible in the seal-legend⁵ su Theiđamasa where we have Kharoshthi letters, is hardly so in Basileōs stéros su Ermaioù; or χόραν su zaoou Kozola Kadaphes, and that as on some of these coins Hermaeus is associated with Kujula Kadphises, as he then believed, he was inclined to think that the addition of the syllable su bore witness to an alliance between them, in which case su must evidently be a Kushāna title connected with the word shau used by Kanishka and his successors⁶ and also by Iranian rulers in Chinese Turkestan, so that when Kujula, who once retained the bust of Hermaeus during their joint government, replaced it later on, he would also seem to have introduced the syllable su in his legends.

But none of these explanations however is satisfactory. The word which appears incorrectly spelt as stéros on coin A, is no doubt sōleros (g.s.) in its proper orthography, and if as M. Senart has remarked, its equivalent tratarasa (g.s.), saviour, is absent on the reverse, it is either because the reverse shows not the same name as stands on the obverse, Hermaeus, who bore that title, but quite a different name, that of Kujula Kadphises, who on the other hand was known as dhrama-thida (= dhrama-sthita, righteous), and not as trataro, or because the Hermaeus of coin D is different from the Hermaeus of the coin A. There are other instances too of mistaken or mutilated orthography in the coin-legends of that period, e.g. Basileōisileōn.

2. Corpus, p. lxiii.
3. The primary meaning of the Greek word symbolon (= symbol) is a sign or mark to infer a thing by, and while in the singular it also means a ticket or a cheque, it signifies in the plural two pieces of a coin etc. which two contracting parties broke between them and preserved, as well as a covenant or treaty between two states for mutual protection of commerce; but how any of these senses could fit in with the context in the coin-legend, we are not told.
4. This extract is obviously from the Greek legend on the coin of Zeonises, which however Prof. Rapson reads (RIC, Pl. II. 3)—Manniglo siou satrapou Zeiōnusou. If he is right, the penultimate word would seem to be in its correct grammatical form, satrapou (g.s.)
5. Corpus p. 6, Pl. I—3.
6. BCI, Pl. 4, 5, 6, 7, 8.
for Basileōs Basileōn 'of King of Kings,' Undophrr for Undopherrou (g.s.), 'of Gondopharnes', megal for megalou (g.s.), 'of great', on a coin of Gondopharnes¹, &c.

The next syllable su or sy is quite an independent syllable and no part nor affix of the previous word stéros, and it is evidently an abbreviation of a word which is obviously in apposition with the three parallel genitive singulars, Basileōs, stéros, i.e. sōtēros, and Ermaïou, meaning respectively 'of king', 'of saviour' and 'of Hermaeus'. And that word is nothing if not the genitive singular of some Greek compound-word having syn, or its other forms syl, sym or sy² for its prefix, such as the nouns syn-thronos = joint-ruler, sym-basileus = joint-king, or sy-zugos = joined together, conjoint, united, associated, etc., or the present participles of the verbs³ such as syn-anassō = to rule as king with another, syn-archō = to rule conjointly with, sym-basileuō = to rule conjointly with etc. Of these several words, sy-zugos seems to be the likeliest, because the actual syllable in the legend is neither syn, nor sym, nor syl, but is simply sy, and also because the idea of kingship having once been definitely expressed by the word Basileōs (g.s.) with which the legend (coin A) begins, it would not be found any more necessary to express it again by means of such words as syn-thronos, sym-basileus etc., which convey the same idea. Besides it is the word sy zugos itself which also appears on coins B & C, as we shall presently see.

Sy⁴ then stands for sy-zugou, the genitive singular of sy-zugos, and if this explanation is right, it is self-evident that Hermaeus and Kujula Kadphises were actually joint rulers for sometime, and Hermaeus who occupies the obverse with the Greek legend in their joint coins, was apparently the senior of the two.

A similar sy occurs on the coins of the second set, B and C, where it stands between χωταν and zaoou. The middle letter of χωταν which appears like an r, is in fact not an r: it is a peculiar letter which is hardly met with in the ordinary Greek alphabet, but is of frequent occurrence in the Greek coin-legends of Kujula as well as of Kanishka and his successors, where from its appearance in the name

1. CHI, p. 590, Pl. VII. 32.
2. In forming compound words the final u of the Greek prefix syn becomes l before words beginning with l (Greek: syl-labē = syllable), and it becomes m before those beginning with b, m, p (sym-bolon = symbol; sym-metria = symmetry; sym-patheia = sympathy), while it is dropped before words with an initial z (sy-zygia = syzygy).
3. There are examples of the use of the present participle basileuontos (g.s.) instead of the noun basileus in the coin-legends of Antiochus II and Agathocles (CHI pp. 450, 451 & 465) as well as in those of Abdagases (Corpus, p. xlvi).
4. As the Greek letter upsilon in the prefix syn is usually rendered by y in English (e.g. syllable, symmetry, symbol, sympathy, syndic, synod, system &c.), we shall spell the syllable in question with a y as sy, rather than with a u as su.
Kanishka as also in the title ‘shaonano shao’ of himself and his successors,¹ it has been rightly made out as sh. The word χοραν is thus properly transliterated and pronounced as χοσαν, and stands for their ethnic designation Khushāna or Kushâna. The next word zaos is no doubt the genitive singular of zaos. Prof. Sten Konow explains² zaos as the Graecized form of the native yavuga, found in the Kharoshthi legends of both the sets, and yavuga again he explains as the same word which the Chinese render as hi-hou (ruler), and he further believes³ that the position of a yavuga or jaiva (i.e., zaos, yaüa &c.) was inferior to that of a kshatrapa, satrap. No doubt Kujula was himself a hi-hou before he had reduced the other hi-hous and made himself the sole king of the Yüe-chi, as recorded in the Chinese annals⁴ Hon-Han-shu. But when once he had attained that higher position, he had therewith also transcended his former inferior status as hi-hou, so that he would hardly any longer style himself a hi-hou or yavuga, if of course these titles were identical. When yet later on he had seized Kabul and conquered the Pushkalâvati kingdom of the Pahlavas, he of course grew much greater and it is inconceivable that he would still call himself a hi-hou, as if it were a dynastic or ethnic designation.

As aptly remarked by Prof. Rapson,⁵ the deterioration of art and the debasement of the coinage, which these coins present, is best explained as the result of a complete change in the character of the civilisation of the region of their issue, where it is clear that the Greek language was no longer properly understood. As a matter of fact it was still employed there as before, though without the former regard for preciseness whether in etymology or orthography. Greek words as a matter of course would now appear in a non-Greek guise in the Kharoṣṭhī legends, and as might further be expected, these again would be mechanically rendered back in the Greek legends in strange pseudo-Greek forms, as is inevitable when the proper words in their proper forms were no longer known. Neither yavuga nor zaos could then be a Kushâna word. They evidently represent two different corrupt forms of perhaps the same Greek word, which was first distorted as yavuga and then re-Graecized as zaos, through sheer ignorance no doubt of its original form. It is thus necessary to think of some Greek word which would easily become yavuga as it appears in the Kharoṣṭhī legend, and then would be rendered back in Greek as zaos as it stands in the Greek legend.

Perhaps the likeliest word that also sensibly fits in with the context, is the Greek zeousgos, which when compounded with the preposition syn becomes sy-zugos, and both of them alike mean joined together, conjoint, united,

1. BCI Pl. IV. 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9; RIC Pl. 12.
3. Corpus p. 27.
4. Ibid., p. lxii; JIH., XII, 13-14, 27.
5. CHI p. 561.
associated. The z-sound which is conspicuous by absence in Kharoṣṭhī was often rendered in it by ya, as we know from several coin-legends, e.g., of Azes I and II,1 Gr. Azes = Kh. Aya, of Azilises,2 = Kh. Ayilisha, and of Kujula himself,3 Gr. Kozolo or Kozoula = Kh. Kuynula; and the Greek upsilon, i.e., u or y, becomes consonantic vu in Kharoṣṭhī, i.e., Gr. Eukratidou (g.s.) = Kh. Euvкратитаса (g.s.),4 of Eucratides. Accordingly the Greek nominative singular ze-u-gos readily renders itself in Kharoṣṭhī as ya-vu-ga, which again with the vocalisation of its final ga and then of the medial vu, as is usual in Prākt, becomes ya-ū-a; and in zaos the nom.-sing. of zaouou, we have simply the latter form ya-ū-a re-Graecized as za-o-os.

As regards the syllable sy occurring between xorān and zaouou on the coins B and C of the second set, it is evidently the prefix sy-(n) of the subsequent word zaouou, so that together they form the compound word sy-zaouou, which is only a corrupt form of sy-zugou, gen. sg. of the Greek compound word sy-zugos, and sy-zugos, as we have just said, is quite synonymous with the simpler zeugos. It thus appears that the inference is not unreasonable that the word indicated by the syllable sy on the obverse coin A is also sy-zugos.

It would thus appear that while the connection between Hermaeus and Kujula is duly expressed by the initial syllable sy of the Greek word sy-zugos on the obverse of their joint coin A, where the name of the Greek ruler occurs, the same has been expressed by an equivalent word yavuga, i.e. zeugos on its reverse which contains the name of the other joint ruler the Kushāṇa Kujula; and in the case of the other coins B and C issued by Kujula alone, while of course they were yet joint rulers, the same connection is expressed by the compound word sy-zaos, i.e., sy-zugos on the obverse and by yaii, which is only a variant of yavuga, i.e. zeugos, on the reverse. There can thus be hardly any more doubt that Hermaeus and Kujula Kadphises were actually joint rulers for sometime.

After the expulsion of the Sakas from Bactria, they are known to have gone southwards and made themselves masters of Ki-pin, i.e., Kāpisa5 which was then evidently in Greek occupation, as might well be inferred from the city of Kāpiśa type of the coins of some of the earlier Greek rulers, on perhaps the earliest of which the reverse legend reads Kaviśya nagara devatā.6 Thereupon when the Sakas moved south-west to Sakastāna, i.e., Drangiana or Seistan,7 the Greeks must have re-occupied Ki-pin, and during the rule of the Saka king Mauas (Maues) as well as the subsequent rule of the Pahlavas of

---

1. BCI., Pl. III, 5, 7; CHI., pp. 590-91, Pls. VII. 30, VIII, 45.
2. BCI., Pl. III, 9.
3. RIC., Pl. III. p. 8, 9; CHI., p. 589, Pl. VII. 28.
5. Corpus, p. liiv; CHI., pp. 566-67; JIH., XIV., pp. 321, 325-27. This territory known as Ki-pin in the Chinese annals, has been identified with Kāfīristān by Prof. Rapson.
the family of Vonones (of East Iran), in India, the Greeks were in possession of Ki-pin and perhaps also the upper valley of Kabul where neither the coins of Mauas nor those of the Pahlavas from Vonones down to Azes II have been obtained. The case however was different when Gondophares succeeded Azes II. The Pahlava kingdom then extended from beyond Seistan in the west to beyond the Taxila region in the east, and as the Kabul valley was thus evidently included in it, the Greek rulers during his reign would seem to have been left with only Ki-pin, or may have even lost their independence. Naturally therefore when Kujula seized Kao-fu, i.e., the Kabul country, from the Pahlavas, Hermaeus would forthwith make an alliance with him, and both of them together must have put an end to the Pahlava rule in India. And this is amply borne out by the figure of Nikē, the Greek goddess of victory, as well as the significant word *yaunga*, e.g., *zeugos*, meaning joint-ruler in the reverse legend, *Maharajasa Rajatirajasa Khushanasa yavugasa* (g.s.) on a Sirkap coin; the obverse of which shows the bust of a king believed to resemble Wima Kadphises, whereas in fact it is that of his father Kujula, as is once for all decided by the specific word *yaunga*, which could by no means appear on the coins of Wima as he never ruled conjointly with another. Thereupon Hermaeus and Kujula carried on the government of the conquered dominions as joint rulers, Hermaeus ruling in the west with his capital perhaps in Ki-pin itself and Kujula in the north and east with his capital in his home-province of Badakshan rather than in India, as may well be inferred from the fact that while the name of Hermaeus does not appear in either of the contemporary Indian records, the Panjtar inscription and the Taxila Silver Scroll, Kujula is referred to in them by his nationality as *Maharaya Gushaya* in the former and *Maharaja Rajatiraja devaputra Khushana* in the latter, and not mentioned by his personal name; and though to judge from the words *yaunga*, i.e. *zugos*, and *su-zaoos*, i.e. *su-zugos*, in their coin-inscriptions, they would seem to have been of equal status as joint kings, the appearance of the name Hermaeus invariably on the obverse and that Kujula on the reverse of their joint coins suffices to decide that Hermaeus was the senior of the two.

In the Chinese annals Kujula is said to have conquered and entirely possessed the kingdom of Ki-pin after he had seized the territory of Kao-fu, i.e., the Kabul country, and triumphed over and possessed the kingdom of Pu-ta, i.e. the Pushkalāvati kingdom. In other words it means that sometime

2. Corpus, p. lxiv.
3. Corpus, p. 70. Our date for the Panjtar inscription is 48 A.C.
4. Ibid., p. 77. Our date for the Taxila Silver Scroll is 63 A.C.
5. JIH., XII, pp. 13-14; Corpus, p. liv.
6. The Chinese name Pu-ta was pronounced Puk-dat or Puk-tat in the 6th century A.C. (Corpus, p. lxiv, in 1; JIH., XII, p. 31). These latter forms evidently seem to represent the Greek name Peukelaotis or Peukelaitis (CHL, p. 558) of the city of Pushkalavati, which was the chief city of the kingdom of that name.
after he had made himself master of the Indian dominions of the Pahlavas, Kujula conquered Ki-pin. And therewith he must have overthrown his colleague Hermaeus and become the sole king of all the countries which he himself as well as both of them together had conquered. Though we cannot be exact as to how long Hermaeus and Kujula were joint rulers, it seems probable that Kujula may have extinguished his ally between the year 48 A.C. of the Panjtar inscription and 63 A.C. of the Taxila Silver Scroll, i.e., in about 50-55 A.C.

Hermaeus was thus overthrown in 50-55 A.C., and with him passed away the last Greek ruler in the East. The rule of the Bactrian Greeks, which began with the establishment of the two rival houses of Euthydemus (c. 200 B.C.) and Eucraides (c. 170 B.C.),¹ would thus seem to have lingered on till about 50-55 A.C., and not ended, as is usually supposed, in the first century B.C.

The coins which bear the name of Hermaeus, the joint ruler of Kujula Kadphises, are all of copper. Accordingly he could not well be the Hermaeus of the silver coin D (supra). The coins of these joint rulers Hermaeus and Kujula are coarse in workmanship and degraded in style and fabric, and besides their epigraphy is faulty and omicrons squared.² In a word they betray a numismatic condition when art had deteriorated and coinage was debased. These are very far removed from the other fine silver coins bearing also the name of Hermaeus,³ which on the other hand are of superior quality and are sound in epigraphy, as in the case of the coin D. These besides contain no squared letters, and some of them further represent on their obverse the jugate busts of the king and the queen, Hermaeus and Calliope,⁴ so that they will have necessarily to be assigned to a period before the deterioration of art and the debasement of the coinage had set in, and any of the squared letters had been introduced in the Greek coin-legends, i.e., sometime before 74-73 B.C. when the squared letters first appeared on the victory coin of Vonones of East Iran.⁵ Accordingly Hermaeus the consort of Calliope and Hermaeus the colleague of Kujula could hardly ever be identical, as supposed by Prof. Rapson⁶: they were removed from each other by more than a century. For

to the west of the Indus; and as it was the capital of the Pahlava kings (or one of their capitals, the other being Takshašilā, i.e., Taxila), Pu-ta evidently stands for the entire Indian dominions of the Pahlavas.

1. CHI., p. 541 ; XIV, pp. 317-19.
2. CHI., pp. 561, 589, Pl. VII. 28 ; RIC., Pl. II. 7, 8, 9.
3. CHI., pp. 560-61, 591, Pls. VII. 37, XXX, h.
4. CHI., p. 560.
5. Ibid., p. 592, Pl. VII. 50, where however as also in Corpus (p. xliii), this Vonones is said to be king Vonones I (8-11 or 12 A.C.) of Parthia (CHI., p. 578; Corpus p. xxxix) ; but in our Chronology of the Sakas &c., we have shown that he was not the king of Parthia, but was the first independent king of East Iran, who began to rule in 74 B.C. when also he issued this Victory coin, showing the figure of Nikē i.e. Victory, on its reverse.
the Hermaeus, whose coin-type (coin D supra) is said to have been imitated by Spalirises, could by no means be the colleague of Kujula, who ruled till about 50-55 A.C., but must have flourished fairly long before Spalirises, who having succeeded his brother Vonones, who founded the autonomous monarchy of East Iran in 74 B.C., and having preceded his son Azes I, who is known to have ruled about the middle of the first century B.C., must have himself flourished in the second quarter of that century.
THE "KÔLIKÔN" IN MOHENJO DARO

By

THE REV. H. HERAS, S.J.

In an article published in the Journal of Oriental Research, I have shown how one of the titles of the Pândya kings is found in some of the inscriptions discovered in the Indus Valley. In this paper I shall disclose another title also found in some of those inscriptions, a title which was used by another ancient South Indian Dynasty, the Cōlas.

The ancient capital of the Cōlas was Uraiyyur, which is now a suburb of Trichinopoly; but Uraiyyur is not the ancient name of this city. It was called Kôji and this name is explained in ancient tradition by relating the fact that in that place a Kôji "a cock", defeated an elephant. The historical fact behind this tradition seems to be that the tribe of the Kôjis defeated the tribe of the Elephants. That these wars between tribe and tribe were in ancient times remembered by reference to their totems, the very seals of Mohenjo Daro manifestly declare. When the tribe of the Minas was defeated, their totem, the unicorn is supposed to be killed and its skin is represented spread to the four corners of the universe. Similarly another seal of Chanhu Daro shows a kôji, a hen, being trampled by a monster half bull and half lion, evidently meaning that the united tribes of the bull and the lion defeated the tribe of the Kôjis.

Now in the fight between a Kôji and an Elephant, the latter is represented as a totem in several seals of Mohenjo Daro, but we do not know what tribe had this animal as a totem. As regards the Kôji tribe, these are expressly mentioned in some of the inscriptions of Mohenjo Daro. One runs as follows:

2. Tamil Lexicon of the Madras University, II, p. 1200.
6. Kôji, "fowl" is not spelt like the name Koli applied to these people. In the course of centuries and influence by European ears which do not easily appreciate such subtle differences in pronunciation, Kôji very likely has been converted into Koli. Moreover, the Mohenjo Daro script does not pay attention to the quality of the vowels nor to the different sounds of the consonants.
which reads: कौलि नाल मारम्, "many trees of the कौलि".

In several parts of northern and western India there are tribes of कौलि, who are very likely remnants of that ancient tribe. But they also seem to have been settled in Southern India. The ancient Tamil name for कोल्माण्डळा or Coromandel is कोल्लक्कारை. Now this word is evidently a corrupted form of कोल्लक्कारை; in the Dravidian languages of North India, the \( \hat{\imath} \) often changes into \( \hat{u} \). Similarly, in one of his inscriptions, Ashoka mentions the Cōdas for the Cōlas. Moreover, it is a fact that the ancient name of Uraiyyur was Koli, as said above, and that the capital of the कौलि was established there after these people defeated another tribe whose totem was the elephant. Now it is well known that the ancient Dravidian initial \( k \) often has become \( s \). Thus kei, "to make" has become sei; kāvu, "to die" has become sāvu, etc. Koli similarly became Soli as it is found in Marco Polo, meaning the Tanjore country, and was used till modern times in Ceylon. In the Harāhā inscription of the Maukhari King Isānavarman, they are probably meant by the name Sulikas, as they are also called Solikas and कोलिका in other epigraphs. But the title did not suffer any change and the Cōla king continued to be called कोलिकोन. In fact a passage in the Puranāṇīru seems to combine the old and new designations of the Cōla kings:

कोलियोने कोप-पुरुष् कोलान
does not mean: "the great Cōla, the king is, he of the कौलि".

Now two early Cōla kings are apparently mentioned in the Mohenjo Daro inscriptions, and these references are of extraordinary interest, for the character of both kings is briefly but masterly described. One runs thus:

\[ \begin{array}{cccc}
\top & 4 & 3 & 2 \\
\hline \\
1 & 2 & 3 & 4
\end{array} \]

2. See note (3) above.
5. Marco Polo, Bk. III, Ch. 20.
8. Ep. Ind., X, p. 105; E. C., V, Ak. 102a; XII, Mi. 95, 96, 102; X, Gol. 76.
9. Puranāṇīru, 212 (I am also indebted to Fr. Gnana Prakasar for this reference).
The signs of this inscription read as follows:

Sign No. 1. By comparing it with the Proto-Chinese $\text{\textcircled{1}}$ which means "prisoner", it is evident that the original pictograph from which both signs proceed was $\text{\textcircled{2}}$, that showed a man in great distress, with hands lifted up, surrounded by a wall. Therefore, our sign will read sere, "prisoner", "captive".

Sign No. 2 is a compound sign. The two elements are $\text{\textcircled{3}}$ kōli and $\text{\textcircled{4}}$, which is also depicted thus: $\text{\textcircled{5}}$. It is a chair; but since chairs were only used by kings in those early days, it stands for kōn "king" (also in Sumer this sign reads en, lord, noble, king). Therefore, both signs combined will read kōlikōn, "the king of Kōli" or the Kōli king.

Sign No. 3. The original sign was $\text{\textcircled{6}}$ which reads ten, "coconut plantation". Our sign is a little changed and its phonetic value becomes tan, "to reduce".

Sign No. 4. The numeral "two", ir.

Signs Nos. 3 and 4 combine and read tanir, "cold water" (The modern word is tanir). The reduplication of the consonants was not in use those days.

Therefore the inscription reads:

*Sere kōlikōn tanir*

which means: "The captive Kōlikon (is) cold water".

Before explaining this sentence we should proceed to study the second inscription. Here it is:

1. Photo, H. Neg. 4876, No. 2.
Now these two signs combine reading *venir*, "hot water" (now *veniūr*). (Cf. what we have said about the reduplication of consonants).

Sign No. 3. The same as No. 2 in the preceding inscription, with the difference that here the *kōli* is flying. Hence it will read *parakoḷikōn*, "the flying *kōlikōn*", i.e., "the glorious *Kōlikōn*".

Sign No. 4. Another shape of the most common sign in Mohenjo Daro, $\mathfrak{u}$, which is the suffix of genitive *adu*, "of".

Sign No. 5. Numeral "three" also written sometimes this way:

$\mathfrak{mūn}$.

Sign No. 6. The pictograph representing the course of a "river", *ār*.

Sign No. 7. The substantive verb "to be", *ir*.

Signs Nos. 6 and 7 also combine reading *ārir*, the plural form, "rivers". Therefore the whole inscription reads thus:

*Venir parakoḷikōn adu mūn ārir*

which means: "three rivers of the glorious hot-watered *Kōlikōn*".

It was indeed interesting to notice that in these two cases two different sorts of water are mentioned in connection with two Cōla kings in two different circumstances. "Cold water" is spoken of in connection with a king who is said to be in prison; while when a glorious king is referred to then hot water is introduced as an epithet qualifying the king. That was a puzzle to me which could not be solved.

Accordingly I proposed the question to my friend Fr. GnanA Prakasar, who kindly replied to my query by stating that the Tamils of Jaffna speak of a phlegmatic cowardly person as "cold water", and of a choleric or high-spirited person as "hot water". Apparently such colloquial phrases seem to be very old. Accordingly the meaning of these inscriptions would be the following:

1. "The captive *Kōlikōn* is a coward".
2. "The three rivers of the high-spirited glorious *Kōlikōn*".

Evidently both inscriptions cannot speak of the same king, for one is said to be glorious and high-spirited, while the other is described as actually being in prison and being a coward. Two characters diametrically opposed and two fates contrary to each other. It is a great pity that the proper names of these two kings are not communicated to us.

One final observation about the three rivers that apparently flowed through the kingdom of the high-spirited glorious Cōla. One of these three rivers was beyond doubt the Kāvēri. It is the Cōla river *par excellence*. 


It passed along their capital Kōlij; their second capital Kāvēripatnam was built on its bank; their last capital Tanjore was not very far from it. The other two rivers called Vellār were of importance for they marked the northern and southern boundaries of the primitive Cōla kingdom; the Northern Vellār reaches the sea near Porto Novo, while the southern Vellār's mouth is at Manmelgudi. Though the boundaries of the Cōla kingdom were always very elastic on account of their wars with neighbouring monarchs, yet it is a fact that these three rivers are mentioned as the Cōla rivers in a venba ascribed by some to Auvaïyar.¹

In any case it is extraordinary that the traditions about the ancient existence of the Cōla Dynasty in South India should also be unexpectedly confirmed by these two Proto-Indian inscriptions found in Northern India.

---

AN INDIAN PRINCE IN A GREEK PROSE ROMANCE

By

K. K. HANDIQUI

An Indian prince is one of the minor characters of the Greek prose romance Ephesiaka or the Ephesian History of Xenophon of Ephesus. Prof. DALMEYDA says in the Introduction to his edition of the work (Paris, 1926) that it has been assigned to various dates ranging from the second to the fourth century A.D. and even the fifth. But the general tendency is to ascribe the work to a comparatively early date among the prose romances of later Greek literature. CROISET in his Histoire de la Littérature Grecque Vol. 5, p. 793 says that Xenophon appears to belong to the third century, while WRIGHT in his History of Later Greek Literature, p. 295 assumes him to be earlier than Longus and Heliodorus who are generally placed in the third century.

We read in the romance (3.11) that an Indian prince named Psammis is on a visit to Alexandria for the purpose of sight seeing and commercial transactions (kata thean tês poleós kai kata chrēian emporias). The heroine Anthia in course of her adventures is sold as a slave to Psammis who looks like a wealthy merchant rather than a ruling prince. We see Psammis on his way back to India, accompanied by Anthia, at the head of a prosperous caravan consisting of horses, camels and donkeys, with an abundant store of gold, silver, and costly raiments. But after crossing the frontiers of Ethiopia Psammis is attacked and killed by a band of robbers (4.3). Reference is also made in the novel (4.1) to the city of Koptos near the frontiers of Ethiopia, and it is stated that large numbers of merchants pass through this place, some to Ethiopia and others to India (ēpi Indikēn). It may be assumed that when the work was composed commercial relations between Egypt and India were a common feature of the times.

Another detail not very important may be mentioned. Anthia in order to protect herself from the advances of Psammis plays on his superstition by telling him that her father at her birth consecrated her to Isis till the day of her marriage, and that dire vengeance would be the lot of anyone doing violence to what belonged to the goddess. The Indian believes the story, pays homage to the goddess (kai tēn theon prosekunei) and keeps aloof from the girl. The practice of consecrating maidens to Isis reminds one of the Indian custom of devadāsī.
A NEW VERSION OF THE AGADAḌADATTA STORY

By

L. ALSDORF

Among the precious treasures of Indian folk tales which the religious zeal and literary interest of Jaina monks and preachers have preserved to us, one of the finest ratnas is no doubt the interesting and attractive story of Agaḍaḍatta. It has till now been known from two very different versions which are both contained in JACOBI'S "Erzählungen in Mahārāṣṭri." 1 One (No. X a) is a short and very concise prose setting taken from Śantsūri's Uttarādhyaayana commentary; it covers barely two printed pages and gives only the first part of the story. The other (No. X) is found in the famous Uttarādhyaayana-ṭīkā of Devendra; it consists of 328 gāthās and might well be called a little Prakrit epic. 2

A new version in Prakrit prose has come to light but recently in the Vasudevahīṇḍi of Saṅghadāsa. 3 In this bulky Prakrit work which contains the Jaina remodelling of Guṇḍhya's Bṛhatkathā, an Agaḍadattacarita 4 is inserted in the so-called Dhammillaḥākinḍi which, as I shall show elsewhere, is a later addition to the original Vasudevahīṇḍi but even as such cannot be later than the 6th century A.D.

As the new version can be shown to be the oldest and most original of the three and is therefore apt to throw some light on the two other versions as well as on the growth and development of the Agaḍadatta tale—never investigated hitherto—, a description and comparative analysis of it may not be deemed superfluous. I shall first make clear the relation between the new version of Saṅghadāsa (henceforth called Sd) and that of Śantsūri (Śś) and then compare Sd with the version preserved by Devendra (Dev.).

The relation between Śś and Sd is best defined by saying that of a common original Śś reproduces the first portion only in a very condensed and abridged form while Sd is a complete but perhaps slightly amplified copy. Nearly the whole text of Śś is contained in that of Sd either verbatim or with insignificant changes, most of these being merely due to the fact that in Sd Agaḍadatta himself relates his own adventures while Śś tells of him in the

1. Leipzig, 1886.
2. Both these versions have been translated into English by J. J. MEYER in his "Hindu Tales" (London 1909) and into Italian by A. BALLINI (Agaḍadatta, Firenze (1903)). A German translation of No. Xa is found in J. HERTEL'S "Indische Märchen" (Jena, 1921), of No. X in J. J. MEYER'S "Kāvyasangraha."
3. Edited by Munis CATURAVIJAYA and PUṆṆAVIJAYA, Bhāvnagar 1930-31 (Ātmānand Jain Granth Ratnamālā 80-81).
4. Pages 35 (bottom) to 49 of the printed edition.
third person. In order to illustrate this more clearly, I give a synoptical text of two corresponding passages of the two versions.

Sd (Vasudevaṁdi, p. 39, 27 ff.): tato harṁ haṭṭha-
Śs (Jacobi, Erzählungen p. 67, 15 ff.): tato haṭṭha-tūṭṭha-
māṇaso raṇṇo caḷaṇesu paṇamiṇa niggao rāyakulāo. cintiyāṁ ca mayā māṇaso niggao rāyakulāo. cintiyāṁ c' aṇeva sattha-nidditṭhehiṁ uvāehiṁ: “pāṇa duṭṭha-purisa-takkarā pāṇāgarā-
jāha: “duṭṭha-purisa-takkarā pāṇāgarāi-
UPPORTA-sāḷāsu kusarīya-anāṇa-paṇḍaga-parivāyagāvasaṁa-ratt' ambara-

vaṭṭha-kotṭhayā-dāsi-ghara-ārām'ujjāna-sabhā-pavāsū sunna-deula-
vihāresu saṁsiyā accchanti. tattha ya corā ummaṭta-parivāyaga-

nāṇāvīha-ving-vesa-pariccchaṁna bambahna-vesa-dhāriṇo vīvīha-sippa-

nāṇāvīha-ving-vesa-pariccchaṁnā
kusalā ya vigaya-visaruvayā (?) ya bhamanti. tato aham eyāṁ
bhamanti. oo aham eyāṁ

ṭhāṇāṁiṁ appaṇā cāra purisehi ya maggāvemi cāra vemi.” cāra vemi ya
ṭhāṇāṁiṁ appaṇā cāra purisehi ya maggāvemi.”
maggāvēṇa
uvāya-kusalo niggao nihāiṇa ekkao ceva aham ekkasa nava-
niggao nayaraō, niddhāiṇa ekkao ekkasa
hariya-pallava-bahu-sāha-siyāla-cchāyasa sahayāra-pāya vassā heṭhā
siyāla-cchāyasa sahayāra-pāya vassā heṭhā
nivīṭṭho dumbala-maila-vattto coraggahanopāyaṁ cintayanto acchami.
nivīṭṭho duvvala-maila-vattto coraggahanopāyaṁ cintayanto acchati.
navari ya dhāru-ratta-vattta-parihio ēga-sādiyā-uttarāsaṅgo saṅkha-

navari ya

khaṇḍiya-baddha-parikaro tidaṇḍa-kuṇḍiolaiya-vāma-hattha-khandha-
padeso ganettiyā-vāvada-dāhi-vā karā nava-raiyā-kesa-marisū-kammo
kimpi muṇamunāyanto tair ceva sahayāra-pāya vasa cchāyaṁ uvagao parivvā-

kimpi suṇusunāyanto tair ceva sahayāra-pāya vasa cchāyaṁ uvagao parivvā-
yao. vivitta-bhūmibhāge tidaṇḍayam avalambeṇa amba-pallava-sāhaṁ

yao.

amba-pallava-sāhaṁ
bhaṇjiṇaṁ uvavīṭṭho. pecchāṁi ya naiṁ padiha-rūḍha-nāṣāṁ ukkuḍuṭ-

ya-bhaṇjiṇaṁ uvavīṭṭho. dīṭṭho ya teṇa

sirā-vedhiya-caḷaṇiṁ ubbaddha-piṇḍīya-dīha-jaṅghāṁ. āsaṁkiyaṁ ca me

uvvaddha-piṇḍio -diha-jaṅgho. daṭṭhūna ya

hiyayaṁ tair daṭṭṭhuṇa: “takkara-jaṅha-pāva-kamma-sūyaṅgaṁ [ca] se imāṁ
āsaṁkio hiyaena:

“pāva-kamma-sūyaṅgaṁ
jārisayāṁ lingāṁ disanti, nūnāṁ esa coro pāvakāri” tti. bhānai ya
lingāṁ nūnāṁ esa coro” tti. bhānīśa ya

mamam: “vaccā, ko si tumaṁ adhi-bala-sarītatto? kimni-

so parivvāyagenā: “vaccā, kāo tumāṁ, kimni-

1. vikṣṭa-visvarūpataya?
mittam vā hindasi? katto vasi kahin vā vaccasi?" tti. tato mayā mittam vā hindasi?"

bhanio: "bhavaṁ, Ujjēnio 'ham parikhīna-vihavo hindāmi" tti, tato bhanīyam: "bhagavaṁ, Ujjēnio aham pakkhiṇa-vibhavo hindāmi." teṇa para-citta-hārinn bhanio 'haṁ: "putta, mā bīnehī, aham te viu-

bhanīyam: "putto, aham te viu-

laṁ atha-sāraṁ dalayāmi." mayā bhanio: "ānughiṁ mī piu-nivvisesheṁ
tam attha-sāraṁ dalayāmi." Agaladatto bhanī: "ānuggahito mhi
tubbheṁī." ti. jā ya evan anāmaṁṣaṁ samalavāmo, tāva ya loya-
tubbheṁī." evam ca

sakhi adariṣaṁaṁ gao dinayaro, aikkantā ya samijhā.
addaṁsaṁaṁ gao dinayaro, aikkantā samijhā.

The considerable amount of space devoted to this synoptical text seems justified by the clearness with which it demonstrates the manner in which Sāntisūrī has dealt with the old text of the tale which he had before him. That is he who abridges and not Sd who expands is on the whole quite obvious. The end of the passage quoted above is particularly instructive in this respect. Here Ss’s “evam ca addaṁsaṁaṁ gao dinayaro” “and thus we the sun became invisible” is certainly a little awkward: instead of “thus” we rather expect something like “at that moment” or “in the meantime” (say “etth’antare”). But everything becomes quite clear when we compare Sd and find that evam is but the rest of the sentence “jāva ya evam anāmaṁṣaṁ samalavāmo” “and while we thus conversed with one another.” At a later passage (p. 68, 12), Ss reads “dīṭṭhā ya sā tāo bhavaṁābhavaṇāvāsīṁ viva pecchaṇīja,” for which Sd has: “niggayā ya tāo bhavaṇāo………” Here the redactor of the abstract has worked so carelessly that he has left standing the ablative tāo bhavaṇāo without the verb (niggayā) on which it depends, thus causing a special footnote in J. J. Meyer’s translation (p. 233 n. 3).

We may add here that the new version furnishes several evidently better readings for the text of Ss.

The robber’s sister invites Agaḍadatta to rest on her couch; he accepts but entertains grave suspicions. Here Ss (p. 68, 16 f.) continues: “tato so ya niddālaṁ uvaṇgao,” “Thereupon he did not yield to the lassitude of sleep.” But Sd (p. 41, 18) reads: “tato aham tattha niddā-lakkhaṁ uvaṇgao,” “then on it (sc. the couch) I assumed the pretence of sleep,” “I pretended to sleep,” which is much more natural and better suited to the context.

At the very beginning of the tale, Jacobi reads (66, 24): “so ya annayā abhikkhaṇāṁ royaṁānaṁ māyaṁān pucchati. tie nibandaṁ kahiyān jahā………” The corresponding passage in Sd (36, 8 ff.) runs: “tāṁ ca tahā dukkhiṇaṁ sarireṇa parihīyamāṇī (sic!) abhikkhaṇāṁ abhikkhaṇāṁ ca rovamāṇi pāśīṭā pucchaṁi: ‘ammo, kisa rousi?’ tti. tato māmaṁ nibandaṁ kae samāṇe kahiuṁ āraddhā jahā………” Here Sd’s rovamāṇī confirms the conjecture rovamāṇīn made by Ballini and J. J. Meyer; the spelling “ṇi-” instead of “nim” at the same time furnishes the graphical explanation for the
corruption into "no. In the Vasudevahindi, feminine accusatives in "i (and "im) are not infrequently met with. They may be simple mistakes, but it is also possible that we have here to do with forms of the popular language which might be classed as semi-Apabhraṃśa: accusative in-i and -u are common in the language of the Pāumacariya (cf. JACOBI, Bhavisatta Kaha, p. 60).—Apart from the reading royamāni, the passage quoted is another excellent illustration of the true nature of Śs: there can be no doubt that the question "ammo, kisa rouasi?" has been left out in Śś where a hint, however short, to the contents of Agaḍadatta's question is decidedly missing; and similarly the laconical "nibandhe" is doubtless abridged from Sd's "nibandhe kaś samāne."

In answer to her sons' question, Jasamaś explains the reason of her grief and says in Śs (66,26): "...........tumani ca akaya-vijjaat datapthum ato ativa daijhami," "seeing that you have not acquired the sciences I am therefore exceedingly grieved (lit. being burned)." Here ato is pleonastic and superfluous. It has been corrupted by the mere omission of a dot from Sd's "as ito ativa daijhami," "I am being terribly burned inside" which is moreover confirmed by a preceding sentence wanting in Śs: "māya me sukka-kotara-rukkho tva vana-davena soy'agginā anto anto daipjhai," "my mother was being burned inside by the fire of sorrow like a dry hollow tree by a forest-conflagration."

Śs p. 67, 18 (cf. synoptical text) niddhāiṣya is a needless repetition of the preceding niggao. Sd's nihāiṣya "having looked about" is much better and is confirmed by Dev. 100: "joyantō disicakkā."  

Śs. p. 67, 35, the passage "tāva ya āgao pariivāyao jakkha-deulao saiellae dālidda-purise ghettuṇa" is translated by J. J. MEYER: "And forthwith the religious mendicant came from the temple of a Yakṣa, bringing poor men of his own." JACOBI derives saiellaya from sva, and MEYER gives the following explanation: "svākiya+illa+ka>sāia+ellaya>saiellaya."

Even if this derivation were acceptable, the meaning assigned to the word would not suit the context. The robber does not employ "men of his own" (whom he would certainly not kill afterwards) but he uses some poor strangers for carrying his loads; these of course he must kill afterwards in order to guard his secret. For saiellae, Sd reads satthillae, i.e. sārthikān "caravan people, saices, kulis."

1. The "Pāia-sadda-mahanṭavo" of Hargovind Dās T. SHETH also says: sāi-
esāhga devo s = sv

2. This is said more clearly in the beginning of the Maṇḍiya story, the relation of which to our story will be discussed below. In the Maṇḍiya story, it is Mūladeva himself whom the robber engages with the words: "chī, manusam karem."

J. J. MEYER translates this: "Come I will make you a man." This is of course quite meaningless. manusā has here the same sense as puruṣa "servant," and the above sentence must therefore be translated: "come, I will make you (engage you as, employ you as) my servant."

3. satthillaya occurs also Dev. 202 and in the corresponding passage of Sd. (p. 42, 28 and 43, 15).
This would give a good sense, but I believe that for this once the reading of Sd is a later conjecture made because saiellae was not understood. There can hardly be any doubt that saiellae is = Skt. sayita; saia = supita is found in Hemacandra’s Desinamamala (VII 28), and the addition of ellaya to past participles without a change of their meaning is nothing abnormal as is shown e.g. by dimnellaya = datta. The passage in question, therefore, means that the robber brought from the temple men who had been sleeping there, cf. J. J. Meyer’s note to Dev. 116 (p. 253 n. 3): “Wayfarers and beggars frequently had to sleep in temples.”

The place which the Agadadatta story occupies within the Vasudevahinidi makes it certain that it was not originally composed as a portion of that work. This presupposes an original independent Agadadatta-carita which in all probability has been the actual source of Sd, Ñs, and Dev. Of this hypothetical original, Sd is no doubt a very faithful representative. It stands to reason that it was not incorporated in the Vasudevahinidi without some minor changes—one of these consisting in the tale being put into Agadadatta’s mouth. In particular, it is not impossible and perhaps even probable—that neither this nor the contrary can be definitely proved—that Sd is here and there a little puffed up. But on the whole and for all practical purposes we may regard Sd as the original itself. Santisuri, on the other hand, not only greatly abridges what he takes over, but the new version now reveals the fact that his story is only a fragment: he restricts himself to the robber tale omitting by far the greater portion of the story which, as we shall see below, is common to Dev. and Sd.

The comparison of Ñs and Sd is of more general interest as well. Jacobi in his introduction to his “Erzählungen” (p. XIX) distinguishes three different styles of Prakrit tales: “a simply reporting one of epitomizing briefness, a somewhat broader yet still stiff one . . . . . and finally an adroit and fluent one.” The comparison of Ñs and Sd shows that the “epitomizing briefness” which in some Prakrit tales is carried to such an extreme as to make the text almost unintelligible, may not be due to primitiveness or lack of skill but merely to the abridgment of an original in natural and even very circumstantial style. There is indeed no reason to suppose that the beginnings of Prakrit fiction literature were marked by a primitive shortness and abruptness. Not only the Vasudevahinidi, which I regard as the oldest non-canonical Jain prose work, proves the contrary: the narrative portions of the canon itself may perhaps be called primitive in a certain respect, but they are certainly any-

1. Cf. Pāia-sadda-mahanavaya—dimnellaya occurs also in the Vasudevahinidi but unfortunately I have failed to note it so that I cannot give the reference.

2. It is, however, interesting to see that e.g. where (synoptical text) the list of places frequented by badmashes is cut short and the description of the parivrājaka (dhaunratta . . . . manisu-kammo) is left out in Ñs, a list and description corresponding as exactly as can be expected in a metrical rendering is found in Dev. 91 f. and 101 f. This, of course, might merely prove that Dev. goes directly back to Sd, but I do not think this very probable, cf. below.
thing but concise and abrupt. On the contrary, their verbosity and tiresome prolixity is perhaps unparalleled. It is very unfortunate that we know the older kathānaka literature almost exclusively from its reflection in the canonical commentaries. The authors of these commentaries according to their varying literary and poetical taste and ambitions took a very different interest in the stories which according to tradition had to form part of the explanation of the text they commented upon: some of them reproduced the tales rather fully, while others vistara-bhayāṭ gave mere skeletons on which the flesh had to be put afterwards by the preacher in his dharmadeśanā; it was thought sufficient to supply him the catchwords.

Sāntisūri’s treatment of the Aṅgadatta tale is but in keeping with his general attitude towards the stock of tales incorporated in the Uttarajjhayāyaṇa tradition. J. Charpentier, in the introduction of his edition of the Uttarajjhayāyaṇaśīl (p. 55 f.), thinks it “a most extraordinary fact” that “while Devendra gives us for the most part very long and exhaustive stories, of which the best specimens were selected for inclusion in Jacob’s well-known Māhārāṣṭri Tales the identical story occupies in Sāntisūri’s work some two or three lines, or at most and only in a very few instances extends to a single page or somewhat more.” I fail to see what there is to be wondered at. Charpentier himself has pointed out that Sāntisūri concentrates his interest on the explanation of the text, enumeration and discussion of pāṭhāntrar etc., where he is much more comprehensive than Devendra, so that it is but natural that he is less interested in and utterly neglects the tales. Devendra, on the other hand, must have had a special fancy for tales, so that it is he to whom we owe some of the most beautiful specimens of Prakrit narrative literature—the finest of all from the literary point of view being no doubt the Aṅgadatta poem.

Concerning the probable sources from which Devendra has taken his fuller versions of the stories, J. Charpentier has put forth views—mostly based on those of Leumann—which I think wrong and misleading. I take this opportunity to discuss them in a few words.

Charpentier says 1. c. p. 55 f.: “Leumann [WZKM V, p. 113 f.] thinks the reason for this most extraordinary fact is that Devendra in these passages absorbed into his work materials from various other sources, and especially from the fourth part of the drṣṭivāda, which seems to have been of a legendary and biographical content; consequently, Sāntisūri would here represent the true Uttarādhyayana-tradition, while Devendra has mixed it up with a variety of materials belonging to other parts of the canon. This point of view is probably the correct one. For Devendra himself (Ausz. Erz. p. 55, 9-10)—in a passage already pointed out by Leumann—tells us that: etānī ca caritānī yathā pūrvaprabandheṣu dṛṣṭiṇāi tathā likhitānī. Although it is not quite easy to find out the correct meaning of the word pūrvaprabandhāḥ, I assume that Leumann must be right in the main in suggesting that this expression denotes some part or other of the drṣṭivāda. For the pūrvapra-
bandhāḥ can scarcely mean anything but ‘commentaries on the pūrva’s’ and, consequently, we may suggest that Devendra has here made use of some old compositions containing tales and legends, meant to illustrate some tenets of the oldest part of the canon.”

I must confess that I do not believe in the legendary and biographical contents of the fourth part of the Drṣṭīvāda but regard the Jain tradition on this point as unfounded. I agree with Schubring (Lehre der Jainas, § 38) who has made it at least very probable that the real contents of the Drṣṭīvāda consisted of an exposition and refutation of heretical doctrines, and that this was the reason of its loss: it was thought undesirable to preserve these old discussions because their study could lead to a revival of heretical views and actions. The four parts of the Drṣṭīvāda, viz. parikamma, suttāin, puvvagaya, and anuoga, contained the “introductions,” the “teachings” and the “pūrva-pakṣas” (this, and not “old texts” being the real meaning of “puvva”!) which were refuted by the “investigation” (anuoga). This well-nigh excludes the possibility of legendary and biographical contents of the Anuoga; and I think the reason why such contents were ascribed to it later is not difficult to find. It is certain that, though the traditional subdivision of the Drṣṭīvāda is probably genuine, the detailed tables of contents given in the Nandi and in the 4th Anga are entirely fantastic because at the time when they were composed the text was already lost and its contents were no longer known. Now when the real contents of the Drṣṭīvāda had been forgotten, this text became a convenient place where everything could be located which it was thought desirable to invest with canonical authority. And since a continuous and systematical account of the Jain mythology and hagiology, the “History of the 63 Great Men,” was not found in the existing canon, it was attributed to the last part of the Drṣṭīvāda. The Vasudevahinḍi, too, solemnly professes to be derived from the prathamānuyoga portion of the Drṣṭīvāda, but it need hardly be pointed out that the Jain version of the Bhākakathā is not likely to have formed part of one of the oldest works of the Jain canon.

Even if the opinions expressed above concerning the true nature of the pūrvas were not accepted, it would be difficult to understand how such a perfectly simple and clear expression as Devendra’s “pūrvaprabandheṣu” could be so strangely misunderstood. The number of words denoting some kind or other of Jain commentary or gloss is great enough, but prabandha does not belong to them. It should be noted that for the impossible interpretation “commentaries on the pūrva’s” Charpentier alone is responsible: Leumann much more cautiously merely spoke of “some part or other” of the Drṣṭīvāda. I think there can be no doubt that Devendra’s “pūrvaprabandhāḥ” are simply “old literary compositions,” i.e. specimens of an old independent kathānaka literature which is for the most part lost to us. The Agaḍādatta poem is introduced by Devendra as “vṛddhadhāḥ”—a synonym which clearly shows the true meaning of pūrvaprabandha. This latter expression might well be applied not only to the Vasudevahinḍi, but also to compositions like e.g. the Kālakārṇya-kathānaka.
After this digression we return to Agaḍadatta. WINTERNITZ (History of Indian Literature, Vol. II, p. 488) calls Dev. “far more beautiful and undoubtedly older” than Śs. To the first of these judgments every reader of the two versions will readily subscribe: the perfect ease and natural elegance of its style and composition make Dev. worthy of the highest praise, and J. J. MEYER is quite justified in regarding it as the best of all the selections included in JACOBI’s book. As to WINTERNITZ’s second judgment: “undoubtedly older,” it is not difficult to show that the contrary must be true. The very perfection of the style—here JACOBI (Erzählungen p. XIX) is certainly right—assigns it to a later period of Prakrit literature. Further, the old tales are invariably written in prose, interspersed with a stanza or group of stanzas here and there; to compose a tale entirely in gāhā is the fashion of later times. An excellent illustration of this is furnished by the Kumārapālapratibodha of Devendra’s contemporary Somaprabha. Here a comparison e.g. of the Mūladeva story with the version of it preserved by Devendra shows that the prose portions are taken over nearly unchanged from the old tale reproduced by Devendra, while the gāhā portions are of Somaprabha’s own composition. No less than fifteen out of the 58 tales of the Kumārapālapratibodha are written entirely in gāhā. If, therefore, Devendra introduces our poem as a “vydhavādaḥ,” we must take this expression relatively; if Dev. is old, this merely means that Śs/Sd is considerably older still. This is definitely proved by a comparison of the contents.

The very beginning of the two versions differs: according to Śs/Sd, Agaḍadatta is the son of a charioteer, and he goes abroad in order to learn from a friend of his father what the latter’s premature death prevents him from learning at home. In Dev., Agaḍadatta is a prince and his father banishes him because of his bad conduct. Here the choice is not difficult: the fairy tale will rather make a prince of an ordinary man than an ordinary man of a prince. Moreover, it is easy to see that in this particular case the original and individual beginning of the Agaḍadatta story has been displaced by a motif taken from the beginning of the Mūladeva story: Mūladeva, too, is banished by his father on account of his incurable passion for gambling. But while, apart from this single vice, Mūladeva is in every respect a splendid fellow endowed with every accomplishment, Dev. shows the typical secondary exaggeration: Agaḍadatta is possessed of every vice imaginable, so that it is rather

2. It may be remembered here that in the canon, too, the gāhā marks the latest stratum of the metrical portions. It need, therefore, hardly be remarked that gāhā tales such as the Agaḍadatta poem or the tales of the Kumārapālapratibodha have nothing whatever to do with the rare specimens of ancient ballads preserved in the Uttarāṣṭhapatiśiḥin and written in the old metres, viz. śloka, triṣṭubh, vaitāliya, etc.
3. This is by no means astonishing: we shall soon have occasion to notice other instances of the continuous mutual influence which the old Prakrit tales exercised on one another.
inconceivable later on how this abominable creature has so suddenly been transformed into a very decent young man and model lover and hero. Here the secondary nature of Dev. is quite unmistakable.

After the description of Aagdaadatta’s friendly reception by his guru and the studies he takes up under his guidance, there follows in Sd as in Dev. a portion left out in Šs, viz. the story of Aagdaadatta’s falling in love with the daughter of his teacher’s neighbour. Sd p. 37, 1-38, 9 fairly well agrees with Dev. 23-50, but the girl is called Somadatta¹ instead of Madanamañjari. Which of the two names is the old one we have no means of ascertaining, nor does it matter very much. More interesting is the fact that Sd omits the statement that Somadatta is married (Dev. 34 : ih’eva vivāhiyā nayare). Here for once Dev. has preserved an original trait which has disappeared in Sd : Somadatta’s being married explains why Aagdaadatta can only abduct her and never tries to woo her. On the other hand, that a married woman should elope with her paramour was too shocking to be retained particularly in a Jain tale.

The next episode of our story is entirely different in the two versions. In Šs we read² : “when he had mastered the sciences he went one day with the permission of his teacher to the court of the king in order to show his proficiency. And there he exhibited everything just as he had been taught, how to hold the sword and the shield, and other acquirements. The hearts of all the people were ravished. The king said : “This is nothing wonderful,” and he was not surprised at all. And he said : “What, what shall I give you?” He answered respectfully : “Lord, if you do not give me your approbation, what is the use of another gift?”

Sd alone adds the following story which is to explain why the king was not surprised and thought Aag.’s performance nothing remarkable :

In his previous birth, the king—Sd calls him Jitasastru³—was Ananda, son of Subuddhi, the minister of king Hariśena of Kauśambi ; his mother’s name Simhali. His bad karman caused him to become a leper. One day there arrived at king Hariśena’s court an ambassador from the king of Greece. He chanced to see the leprous son of the minister and asked the latter whether in his country there were no medicines or no doctors. The minister replied that both existed but his son’s illness was incurable, whereupon the ambassador recommended a bath in the blood of a young horse.⁴ In order to cure his son,

1. The MSS. call her “ kvacit Somadatta kvacit Sāmadattā” ; the editors unfortunately have adopted the obviously wrong form Sāmadattā.
2. I quote J. J. MEYER’s translation (p. 230). But for some minor omissions, the text of Šs agrees almost verbatim with that of Sd.
3. Neither Šs nor Dev. mention the name of the king of Kauśambi ; in Šs as well as in Sd, Jitasastru is the name of the king of Ujjayini.
4. In P. L. VAIDYA’s just published edition of Puspadanta’s Adipurāṇa (Manikchand Digambara Jainā Granthmālā No. 37) I happened to come across the following passage in the summary of the contents of the 20th paricheda (p. 642) : “One day Aravinda suffered from a terrible burning sensation in his body, and, when he
Subuddhi killed a horse from the royal stable. On hearing this, the king ordered the whole family to be killed. Ānanda alone escaped through a ditch or underground passage (? khāl) and fled to a hermitage (? panniyavāda) where he was kindly received by the “pannavādasāmi.” One day Jaina monks visited the hut on their begging tour and preached the dharma; Ānanda took the šikṣāvratas and the anuvratas. This caused him to be reborn as king Jitaśatru, and when, at the sight of some sādhus, he obtained jātismarana, he realized that he had won his royal splendour through the “šikṣā” given him by the begging munis. This šikṣā, therefore, is infinitely superior to Agaḍadatta’s worldly šikṣā, as is stated in the two introductory stanzas pronounced by the king:

“kiṁ sikkhiṇa tuujhāni ? majjham sikkham tu avahīo suṇasu !
iha cēva aham nayare Simhali-suya-Nandanō āśi.
sirii, dīyāṇatti, āsa-vivatti ya kulaghara-vināṣo,
niggamaṇain khāyāē, ja doppadigheppanā bohi.”

“What is your learning good for? But listen attentively to my learning! In this very town I was Nandana, the son of Simhali. Leprosy, the ambassador’s advice, the death of the horse and the destruction of the noble family, escape through the ditch till: ‘difficult to obtain is enlightenment.’”

Before we discuss this story and Agaḍadatta’s visit to the king as described in Śs/Sd, we shall first see what Dev. has to offer us instead. Agaḍadatta, we are told there (51-79), once rode through the city when suddenly a great panic was caused by a mast elephant who had broken the post to which he had been tied. While the terror-stricken people fled in great haste, Ag. courageously met the onrush of the elephant, succeeded, after a prolonged struggle, in rendering him submissive to his will and mounted his back. This scene was witnessed by the king who at once enquired who the young man was. Having learned Ag.’s story from his guru, he forthwith sent for him, received him with great honour and was exceedingly pleased with his modest behaviour.

The only point of agreement between the two versions of this episode is the final result: Ag. is in the presence of the king at the moment when the

found that it did not alleviate by any remedy, asked his son Kuruvinda to prepare a pool of blood of animals, bathing in which, he said, would stop his sufferings. Kuruvinda obeyed his father’s command, but prepared a pool of artificial blood (liquid lac). When Aravinda entered it, he tasted the liquid and found that his son had deceived him. He then ran after his son to kill him, but stumbled on the way and was killed by his own sword.” Re. the belief in the blood bath as a cure for leprosy cf. TAWNEY-PENZER, The Ocean of Story, vol. I, p. 98 note.

1. The printed text has doppadatappanā for which one MS. reads ṃdāgheppanā. doppadigheppana might be derived from padigheppai pratighyate, but I confess that this is far from satisfactory.
2. Afterwards in the tale itself he is called Ānanda.
3. This must be the meaning of the mysterious siriya (a euphemistic expression?). In the tale, Ānanda gets the “kuṭṭha-roga.”
citizens arrive and complain of their being robbed by the thief, and it would seem that to bring about this result is the only object of the episode which thus appears as a kind of introduction to the robber story. Now as to the way in which Ag. is brought into the king’s presence, no doubt is possible that the version of Dev. is a secondary innovation. In Śs/Sd, Ag., having failed to win the king’s approbation, takes the opportunity to convince him of his abilities by offering to catch the thief. This individual turn of the story is replaced in Dev. by a stock motif: the taming of a mast elephant running through the streets and killing all who come in his reach by the hero who is afterwards summoned by the king is told in the Vasudevahinī as well as in the Dhammillahinī,1 and we shall see below that the curious way in which the elephant is subdued here perhaps points to Dev.’s actually going back to the Dhammillahinī.

The reason for the innovation in Dev. probably was that Ag.’s. failure was found unsatisfactory, particularly as the king’s behaviour must seem strange and unreasonable. It was this latter deficiency—if we will really call it thus—which Sd tried to heal by the insertion of the story of Subhūtī and Ananda. That this story is a later interpolation is obvious: the explanation it offers for the king’s behaviour gives the tale a religious turn and breathes a truly monkish spirit most decidedly absent from and utterly foreign to the original Agadadatta story. On the other hand, the saṅghahāni-gāhā put into the king’s mouth2 clearly shows that the inserted story is old and not specially invented for its present purpose. Its contents point in the same direction: when we go through it we cannot help feeling that such as we read it in Sd it has been made to serve a purpose it was not originally meant for, that the original purport of a curious and interesting old story has been somehow distorted so that it is not possible now to say what the original story was like. As, however, this story is undoubtedly old, it is by no means impossible that it was not inserted by Sd but was already found in the source of Śs and left out by Sāntisūri: if the author of Dev. had before him an Agadadattacarita with the Ananda-Subhūtī tale, he certainly had even better reasons for his innovation.

Nobody who reads the next episode describing Agadadatta’s adventure with the robber can fail to notice the many points of agreement between it and the story of Manḍiya.3 In both stories, a burglar becomes such a public nuisance that the citizens complain to the king. He has a sister living in an underground dwelling outside the city where he hides the stolen goods. He uses others for carrying home his booty and treacherously kills them after-

2. This stanza is an exact counterpart of the six saṅghahāni-gāhās in which the whole argument of the Samarāiccakāhā is contained and which are quoted by Hari-bhadra as his source at the beginning of his work, cf. Jacob’s edition, p. XX f. and p. 6.
3. “Erzählungen” p. 65 f.; “Hindu Tales” p. 223 ff. It is strange that nobody seems to have paid any attention to the obvious identity of the two stories.
wards. He engages as his helper the very man who has come in order to catch him. This is certainly more than enough to prove the original identity of the two stories. The only question that remains is: which is the model and which the copy? Fortunately, a definite answer can be given.

On his way home, Agaḍadatta encounters a second adventure with a robber in the garb of an ascetic.1 The robber succeeds in murdering Ag.'s travelling companions by poisoned food of which the cautious and suspicious Ag. has not partaken. Seeing that Ag. remains alive, the ascetic tries to kill him, according to Dev. by a sudden shower of arrows—we wonder where he has so suddenly got them from—, according to Sd—and this is much more natural—by a sword which exactly like the Kauśāmbī burglar he draws out of his tridāṇḍa. Ag. wards him off and fatally wounds him according to Dev. by an arrow, according to Sd by his sword with which he cuts off both his legs. What follows in Dev. is an almost exact counterpart of the end of the first robber story: The robber, who calls himself Duryodhana, gives Ag. his sword and sends him to where behind a temple (cf. the mysterious sanṭiṣṭa-gāhara of Ss.2) his wife lives in an underground dwelling in which he has also hidden all his treasures. Ag., fulfilling the robber's last request, cremates him and goes to the place he has been told. He "makes a noise as he had been enjoined ", the young woman comes out of the bhūmigraha and bids him enter. But "while the prince, seeing her beauty, gazes on her with rapture," Madana-maññi suddenly becomes jealous, and the faithful Agaḍadatta at once leaves "that wood"3 and proceeds on his way.

The corresponding passage of Sd (p. 44, 7-12) runs as follows: tao so bhanai: "putta, ahaṭa Dhanapuṇjaṇa nāma coro, na keṣai chaliya-puva. sāhu! tunmaṇi si supuriso ekko māge jāo" tti. puṇa ya me sanlavai: "vaccha, eyassa pavvayasa puracchimille kolambe doṇham naṇhaṁ majjha-desa-bhāe athi mahāmahāliyā pattkha-silā. tattha bhūmigrahān tattha mayā suppa-bhūyaṁ dhanayān vidhataṁ. vacca, geṣhasu! mama ya aggi-sakkāro ḍarekhi" tti bhanītta kāla-gao. tao ahaṭa dūre sāharittā jhāmemi, jhāmettā hatthe pāe ya pakkhalettā rakhavariñ joettā paṭṭhio, cinṭiyāṁ ca mayā: "kim me dhanayān?"

"And then he said: "Son, I am a robber called Dhanapuṇjaṇa; nobody has outwitted me before. Bravo! You are the only hero (ever) born by a mother!" And again he spoke to me: "Child, on the eastern slope4 of

---

1. Dev. 208-238. Sd. p. 43, 1-44, 12.
2. No new light is thrown on it by Sd where the MSS. read sanṭiṣṭa" and "jja".
3. This, of course, is the only possible translation of "vajjeyi tam vanam sahasā." The other interpretations tentatively offered by J. J. MEYER in a footnote (p. 274 n. 2), viz. BALLNTJ's vaṇa = vaṇa and his own derivation of vaṇa "desire, lust" from the root van are utterly impossible in this context.
4. kolamba (v. 1., kālambo) is an unknown word. puracchimillakolambe corresponds to vāma-pāsammi Dev. 228.
this mountain, between two rivers, there is an enormous rock and in it an underground chamber. There I have collected exceedingly great wealth. Go and take it. And perform my cremation.” Having spoken thus he died. Thereupon I collected wood and burned him. Having burned him and washed my hands and feet I harnessed (the horses to) my chariot and proceeded. And I thought: “What is wealth to me?”

Though this is fundamentally the same story as in Dev., all those characteristic details are wanting in it which in Dev. make it so strikingly similar to the first robber story: there is no temple and no young woman in the bhūmigṛha, the robber does not give Ag. his sword, and Ag. does not visit the bhūmigṛha at all because he does not care for the robber’s wealth! It is obvious that we have here the original version which in Dev. has been “improved upon” and amplified by the introduction of details from the story of Ag.’s first adventure with a robber to which this second adventure has been assimilated as far as possible. The rather strange end of the episode in Dev. where Ag. visits the treasure hole but leaves it at once without even entering it because of the jealousy of Madanamañjarī is clearly a compromise between the end of the first robber story and the end of our episode as related in Sd where Ag. does not visit the bhūmigṛha at all.

If, now, leaving aside this unoriginal version of Dev., we compare with one another (a) the Manḍiya story, (b) the story of Ag. and the robber at Kauśāmbī, and (c) the story of Ag. and Dhanapuṇjiaka as related in Sd, it is easy to see that (b) is nothing but the result of an attempt to combine (a) and (c). This assumption not only accounts for all the differences between (a) and (b) but also explains some weak points in the composition of (b).

(a) and (c) have one single point of contact, and that point cannot prove anything as to an original connection between them: for that a robber hides his spoil in a bhūmigṛha is such a perfectly natural thing that no conclusions must be drawn from this coincidence. Apart from this single point, the two stories are completely different in every detail: in (a), a city burglar disguised as an invalid tailor breaks into the houses at night; for each burglary, he entices an accomplice, uses him as carrier of the stolen property, brings him thus to his bhūmigṛha and has him murdered there by his sister; the hero (Mūladeva) escapes this fate because the sister takes compassion on him. In (c), a jungle robber disguised as a wandering ascetic poisons the caravans passing through the neighbourhood; the hero (Agaḍadatta) not only frustrates his plan but mortally wounds him; before he breathes his last, he—in what we might call a chivalrous spirit—reveals his identity, acknowledges his defeat, praises his conqueror and offers him the wealth he has piled up; the hero, however, as a true kṣatriya, cares for fame, not for wealth and proceeds on his way after he has chivalrously paid the last honours to his adversary by cremating him according to his request.

1. Dev. calls him a mahāvratika; Sd uses here as in (b) the word parivrājaka.
In (b), we have the city burglar as in (a), but he is disguised as parivrājaka as in (c). He entices the hero as his accomplice as in (a), but is killed by him as in (c). The hero, therefore, visits the bhūmigṛha and is admitted by the sister as in (a), but instead of being accompanied there by the living he is sent there by the dying robber—who bequeathes him his treasures—as in (c).

We have seen that in (c) the robber first kills Ag.'s unsuspecting companions while Ag. himself has been more cautious and therefore not only escapes him but kills him in self-defence. By transferring all this minutely into (a), the author of (b) has created an impossible situation. The necessary companions he obtains by adding to the robber’s one original accomplice and carrier a number of mere carriers fetched by the robber from the yaksā temple. This, though obviously unoriginal, yet is at least possible. But it is simply absurd that the robber kills his carriers before they have reached their destination: utterly absurd is the very way in which here the clever leader of a gang of thieves goes to sleep with his men leaving the stolen property lying about in the park instead of bringing it to its hiding place as quickly as possible. The author seems never to have asked himself what the parivrājaka, if he had not been killed, would have done with his heavy bales after he had killed all those who were to carry them. No such absurdity is to be discovered in the two original stories (a) and (c), and it is only the combination of these disparate materials that has brought it about.

If, then, the author of (b) drew upon (c) as well as (a), it follows that he had before him an Agadadattacarita to which he added his new story, i.e. (b) is not only secondary as compared with (a) but it is also a later addition to the original Agadadattacarita. Once this is recognized, we cannot fail to notice how in Dev. as well as Sd the love story is cut in two by the robber tale. In order to make the insertion of the latter possible, Agadatta has to put off the girl—who is threatening to die from love—without any apparent reason (in fact we do not see why he does not start with her at once) and when the robber tale is ended a go-between has to come to remind him of his beloved and ask him once more to abduct her. Taken by itself, this might not prove very much, but in the light of the knowledge we have gained it strengthens our conviction that just the one part of the Agadatta story which has been reproduced by Sāntisūri—and which on account of this fact naturally has been taken to be its most important and characteristic portion—
is a later interpolation.

It stands to reason that Agadatta is amply rewarded by the king, and Ss/Sd do not omit to mention this. In Dev., however, the king not only gives him a thousand villages, elephants, etc., but also gives him his daughter

1. Winternitz in his History of Indian Literature, Vol. II p. 488, classes the Agadatta story as “another robber tale.” Our investigation has shown that this designation is quite wrong and misleading.
Kamalasenā in marriage. And just when Ag. has received Madanamañjari's new urgent appeal to abduct her, two messengers of his father arrive, mounted on camels, in order to fetch him home. Their unexpected arrival helps him to obtain the king's consent to his departure. He sets out in full state but sends Kamalasenā and his whole "army" ahead and waits for Madanamañjari who is fetched by her friend Sarigamī and arrives in a litter; Ag. takes her on his chariot and fetches up with his "army."

All these details are later additions, exaggerations, and "embellishments." The version of Sd is as much simpler as it is more original. Ag. does not marry the king's daughter; when he has received Somadatta's message, he sends her word that he is now ready to depart. She comes, he fetches the chariot which she has given him(?) and starts with her. Impelled by an indomitable pride and desirous of glory (niyaga-bala-dappan asahamāno jayassā kitti-vivarāni magganto) he proclaims the following challenge: "jo bhe, devā-nuppiyā, naviyāde māhe duddham pau-kāmo, so mama purao ēhau! esa aham Agadadatta Sāmanī ghettuṇa vaccāmi!" "If one of you, gentlemen, is desirous of drinking a new mother's milk let him oppose me! Here am I, Agadadatta, going, having abducted Somā!"

According to Dev., Ag.'s first adventure on his way home consists in the sudden attack by the Bhilla chief. We are a little surprised to learn that "the prince's army was scattered instantly to the four quarters of the compass," but that subsequently Agadadatta all alone puts to flight the whole host of Bhillas except the chief with whom he engages in single combat.

In Sd, this Bhilla adventure is the very last which Ag. encounters on his journey; he is travelling alone with Somadatta, and he fights at once with the Bhilla chief whose hosts flee when Ag. has killed him by the ruse described Dev. 189-193.⁴

---

1. The text is not quite clear here.
2. i.e. of being killed and reborn!
3. He is called Arjuna; Dev. gives no name. Before Ag. enters the jungle with the two merchants, the satthilayas warn him of the dangers threatening there, viz. according to Sd (42, 25) the elephant, the serpent, the tiger, and "Ajjuṇa cora-senāvai." In Dev. (203/4), where the Bhilla adventure comes before this, the robber chief Arjuna has been replaced by the parivrajaka who, as we have seen, is called Dhanapūñjaka, i.e. "Heaper of Riches," in Sd while Dev. names him Duryodhana: the change of Dhanapūñjaka to Duryodhana is easy to understand if the bearer of this name has taken the place of an original Arjuna—as was the case in the above enumeration.
4. When Ag. realizes that he is unable to kill the Bhilla with his weapons alone, he quotes the Arthaśāstra: "attasatthe ya bhaniyam: visesena māye sattheya ya hantavo appaṇo vivadhamāno sattu iti."—The dying chieftain pronounces the following gāhā:

\[ nāham bānēna haō, haō mi bānēna Mayarakceussa, \\
\[ jo bhanyanjē payattō mahilāna mukanī palēmi.\]

"I have not been slain by (thy) arrow, slain I have been by the arrow of Cupid, I who engaged in battle have looked at the face of women." It is noteworthy that
When we compare these two versions, we cannot suppress the suspicion that the author of Dev. has placed the Bhilla adventure at the beginning merely because it afforded a convenient means to get rid again of Ag.’s retinue and of Kamalasenā for whom there was no room in the rest of the story. The way in which not only Ag.’s magnificent “army” vanishes in a moment but also Kamalasenā—who is his legal wife and of much nobler descent than Madanamaṇji—disappears for ever without even her name being mentioned is certainly very significant.

In Sd, then, there comes first the parivṛṣajaka adventure which has been fully discussed above. Between it and the concluding Bhilla adventure are inserted the fights with the animals, viz. the elephant, the serpent, and the tiger.¹

Of these adventures—except the story of the parivṛṣajaka—we read a third version only a few pages after the Agāḍadatta tale in the Dhammillahinḍī (Vasudevahinḍī p. 54, 25—56, 4). Dhammilla, too, has to travel through a wild jungle alone with a young girl and her nurse; he encounters the serpent, the tiger, the elephant, a buffalo who has no counterpart in the Agāḍadatta story, and the “corasenāvai” Arjunaka. The nature of the Dhammillahinḍī leaves no doubt that these adventures are borrowed from the Agāḍadatta tale. The principal difference between these imitations and the originals in the Sd version of the Ag. carita is this: in Sd, Ag. chases away the elephant and the tiger and kills the serpent by different kinds of arrows, i.e. he fights them all with his bow,² whereas Dhammilla relies not on his arms, but on magic and on ruses: he uses spells, mantras, and “māyā” against the serpent, the tiger, and the Bhilla chief; he chases away the buffalo by imitating the roaring of a lion, and he subdues the elephant in the curious manner described in Dev. 59, i.e. by throwing down before him his upper garment.³ Now it is significant that the version of Dev. agrees rather with that of the Dhammillahinḍī than with the original Sd: Agāḍadatta kills the tiger with his sword, but he paralyzes the snake and he subdues the elephant by throwing down his garment and then mounting him. Even if we will not conclude

this stanza has not been taken over by the author of Dev. where, however, the first half of 195 is an exact paraphrase of the first line of our stanza:

“nāhaṁ tuha sara-pahao, pahao Kusumāhuḥaṃ bāneha! 
ahāvā: kim ettha cojjani? Mayānehaṃ ko vi na hu chalio?”

1. In Dev., the order is: elephant, tiger, serpent; but obviously the order of these animal adventures is quite immaterial.

2. Is it too bold to assume that—originally at least—the choice of the right kind of arrow in each case is to illustrate Ag.’s knowledge of the Dhanurveda which he has acquired at Kaushambi?

3. Vasudevahinḍī p. 122, 16 ff. Vasudeva subdues a wild elephant. By his agility and quickness he fatigues the animal.

“parissantam ca jānīṇa uttarīyaṁ se paṛa khoṭtan tammi nisanno. 
ahām avi abhiḥo mahā-gayassya dante pāyaṁ kāṇaṁ ārūḍha turiyaṁ.”

“And when I saw that he was exhausted, I threw down my upper garment before him; he sat down on it. And I having without fear put my foot on the great elephant’s tusk quickly mounted him.”
from this that the author of Dev. was directly influenced by the Dhammika-kīndī, it is clear that this coincidence proves Dev. to be less original than Sd.

Ag.'s arrival at home is described in Sd in accordance with the beginning of Ss/Sd which, as we have seen above, is different from the beginning of Dev. I give it in full as another specimen of the style of Sd.


"After this victory, having slain Arjuna and comforted Somadattā, I started for Ujjjayīnī, arrived there in due course and entered my mother’s house. When she heard of my arrival, my mother came running out full of tenderness to her son. I descended from the chariot, and weeping she embraced me and kissed me on the head. I made Somadattā, too, descend from the chariot and she fell at my mother’s feet who with joyful heart embraced her, greeted her with the good wish that she might never become a widow, and led her into the house. And to all my relations, friends, and acquaintances who came to enquire after my well-being I gave presents according to my means. The servants brought the horses and the chariot to their proper places and locked them in, and they brought all my belongings, arms, weapons, and utensils into the house. On the next day having bathed, eaten, and dressed, I went to the king’s court in order to pay my respect to the king. Having been announced by the doorkeeper, I entered, went into the presence of the king, and bowed to him. And he was told: “This is the son of such and such.” Thereupon the king was pleased to grant me all my father’s functions, and he made double my wages and honour. Having thus obtained honour from the king I went to my house and lived together with Somadattā, intent upon devotion towards my mother.”

This is the typical happy end of the fairy tale. Yet we have still a considerable portion of the story before us. It is told in rather exact agreement Dev. 262—end, Sd p. 46, 19—49, 19. 1 Some minor discrepancies of the two

1. The stanza Dev. 322 forms the end of Sd. It is no doubt to be regarded as a quotation of a popular maxim to which Dev. has added a number of others to the same effect.
versions are hardly worth discussing, but the tale itself calls for a few remarks. Nobody who reads it even perfunctorily can fail to notice that it is not only rather inconsistent with the preceding story but also pervaded by a totally different spirit. The tendency of this additional tale, viz. to illustrate the perfidy and absolute wickedness of women, is so manifest and so grossly exaggerated that its origin cannot for a moment be doubtful: it is the typical monk’s tale and might be called the Jain contribution to the Agaḍadattacarita—the duty the latter had to pay for being admitted into Jain literary territory. That it should form an original part of the Agaḍadattacarita is inconceivable.¹

At the end of his translation, J. J. Meyer adds the following footnote (p. 288 n. 4) : “In conclusion I call attention to the fact that our tale seems to have some connection with the Serpent Genii of India. Pits, subterranean dwellings, and treasures in the earth play an important part, and some of the names are suggestive of the same mythological and folkloristic ideas. The hero’s name, Agaḍadatta, “Gift of the Well” immediately reminds even the Non-Sanskritist of Basnak Dau and Tulisā; and the name of Bhuyan-gama, the sham ascetic and robber, who is killed by our Serpent Prince, means “the Snake.” So our poem can claim kinship with tales and motifs that reach back for thousands of years. Apulejus’ story of Cupid and Psyche is a link of that chain.”

Our analysis has deprived of their foundations most of these ingenuous conjectures. Agaḍadatta, whether his name points to an original connection with the nāgas or not, is certainly no “Serpent prince” but a young ksatriya pure and simple, the son of a charioteer. The story of “Bhuyan-gama, the sham ascetic and robber,” has proved to be a later addition to the Agaḍadatta tale; moreover, the name Bhuyan-gama is found only in Dev., neither Śs nor Śd mentioning the name of the Kausāmbī burglar. Of the items enumerated by Meyer, there remain as belonging to the original story only the bhūmigrah of the robber Dhanapūjijaka and, of course, the name Agaḍadatta—but this is hardly enough to serve as a base for Meyer’s theory.

The original Agaḍadatta tale such as it presents itself after the elimination and rectification of all those portions and details in which we have recognised secondary accretions and alterations, is a typical fairy tale, but at the same time a true ksatriya story breathing something of the ancient spirit of the epics: A young ksatriya whom the premature death of his father prevents from attaining the position in life to which he feels himself entitled, goes abroad and makes there his fortune. Through an excellent teacher, a friend of his father, he acquires to perfection all knightly accomplishments,

¹ The story of Maṅgi and Vajramuṣṭi in the Digambara version of the Hari-vanṣapurāṇa materially agrees with the story of the perfidy of Agaḍadatta’s wife, cf. my “Harivaṃśapurāṇa” (Hamburg 1936) p. 448, note 1 on 89, 10. As I have said there, it is hardly doubtful that the story of Maṅgi is borrowed from the Agaḍadatta story. Theoretically the contrary is also possible, but I think it very unlikely.
and at the same time he wins the love of a beautiful maiden whom he boldly abducts openly challenging the whole city. All alone with her, he traverses the wild jungle, bravely defying its manifold dangers. The wonderful skill in the handling of arms which he has acquired enables him to fight his way through robbers and wild animals; he brings his bride safely home where everything which he had wished for is now bestowed on him.

It is greatly to be regretted that for this attractive story which so undoubtedly has not grown on Jaina soil Brahmanical or Buddhist parallels do not seem to be forthcoming. They might, as they do in the cases of so many other Jain stories, further help us to elucidate its character and origin and perhaps also to fix its date within certain limits. Concerning this latter question, we can only say at present that the tale certainly does look very old, but as far as I see it does not contain anything that might give us a definite clue. At any rate, the new version has made it possible to free if from a number of later additions and alterations and to restore it to a form which, if it is not the original one, at least comes very much nearer to it and gives us a better idea of its true character. In conclusion, I may suggest that this new version of the Agadadatta story which is also quite remarkable from the literary as well as the folkloristic point of view, is certainly no less, and perhaps even more worthy of a complete translation than the two less original ones which have been translated into three European languages.
CITTA PA,† A FORGOTTEN SAMSKRT POET OF BHOJA’S COURT

By

E. V. VIRA RAGHAVACHARYA

In literary and historical research, sometimes a stray reference, an allusion by the way, a short citation or even the mention of a name of a work, place or person may lead to undreamt-of investigations which, in the end, give us the key to some of the complicated problems in history and literature. Years ago, while I was eagerly perusing the published fascicle of the famous Śṛṅgāra-prakāśa of king Bhoja of Dhārā, I met with a ‘śloka’ with which the work was said to begin: ‘अचिन्तनेष्ठात्मकम्यन्यमोष्णमुद्यम्’ etc. I was under the impression that the verse was from the pen of Bhoja himself when in the Modern Review for June 1928, I found an article on king Bhoja, from the late lamented Vidyāmahodadhi Dr. K. P. Jayaswal of Patna. On perusing the article, I was surprised to know that the verse in question was attributed to a certain poet Cittapa, in the Sadukti-karṇāṃita, the famous Sanskrit anthology by Śridhara-dāsa, edited by the late Prof. Mahā-mahopādhyāya Sāhityācārya, Rāmāvatāra Śarmā, of Patna. Jayaswal has also pointed out therein that Cittapa was the Poet Laureate of Bhoja, according to a verse which he had found in the Subhāṣita-Ratna-Bhāndāgāra, a Sanskrit anthology of the modern period. These clues hastened me to work on the subject ‘Cittapa’ and his poetic fragments.

In Sanskrit Literature, anthologies (सुभाषितमथवित्स), works on Sāhitya and commentaries on Sanskrit works are eye-openers as it were to a knowledge of Sanskrit writers and works hitherto unknown to, or long forgotten by, the modern Sanskritist. It may be presumed and rightly too, that the Sanskrit works and authors buried under oblivion are far greater than those that are extant or actually known. The late lamented M. M. Haraprasāda Śāstrī said that 8,000 Tibetan translations of Sanskrit works are known from the ancient Tibetan literature while only 200 originals in Sanskrit are now known, and that 1,300 Sanskrit works are known through Nanjio’s catalogue of the Chinese ‘Trīpiṭaka.’

A poet or a literary composition attains immortal fame, not through his or its merit alone but sometimes through extreme good fortune. The maxim

† Variously spelt—Cittapa, Chittapa, Chittipa, Chinnama, Citrama, Chitrama and Kṣittapa.


2. Presidential Address to the V Session of the All-India Oriental Conference, Lahore (Dec. 1928).
'पुष्पांग्नि तन्मये,' seems to be true to the letter. Else, how can we account for the enormous popularity of works of lesser merit while master-pieces like the 'Trivandrum plays' attributed to Bhāsa (whoever be the author) and the Kūndamalā of Diṃnāga (Dhīranāga or Vīranāga) were deemed to have been irretrievably lost till very recently? The names of a great many Saṁskṛt poets are known through the old Saṁskṛt anthologies like the Kavindra-vacana-Samuccaya, Śridhara-dāsa's Sadukti-karnāṁta, Śāṅgadhara's Padhāti and Vallabhadeva's Subhāśītāvali which are treasuries of gems collected from Saṁskṛt works some of which are now known only by name. Though Bhoja's Śṛṅgāra-Prakāṣa is a work on grammar and poetics, its anthological aspect should not be overlooked. It is the most voluminous work in Saṁskṛt Poetics, and contains according to Prof. Rāmakrishṇa Kavi, 16,000 quotations in Saṁskṛt and Prākr̥t, from works rare and hitherto unknown to the Oriental world, and most of which may be deemed to have been lost to us. Prof. Rāmāvatāra Sārmā wrote an article (in Hindi) on the Śṛṅgāra-prakāṣa in which he had pointed out that the verse under reference was attributed to Cittapa in the Skm. and that he had with him several verses of this poet.

Cittapa’s Date:—(11th Century A.D.)

Mr. Jayaswal’s opinion that Cittapa was a coeval of Bhoja and that he was not merely the poet-laureate of Bhoja’s Court but that he must have been also the right-hand man in all his literary endeavours seems to be highly probable. From the verse, ‘तथ्योक्तम्’, etc. already referred to which is preserved in the Sbhv. many centuries old, we learn that Bhoja attained fame through Cittapa, Bilhaṇa and others.

(भोजस्थिताप्रकिल्लनप्रमूलितम्:)

The famous Telugu poet Pina Virabhadra (1430-80 A.D.) also says in his Telugu ‘Prabandha,’ Śṛṅgāra-Sākuntala that the glory of the chief or king of Dhārā (i.e., Bhoja) is known from the literary compositions of Cittapa:

‘सितस्वाध्यन्ताजिनिजिन्तनंदनं दारं-(धारा?)-महापुरुषाध्यान्त महिम’

—I. 17.

Like Bilhaṇa who had immortalised his patron Vikramāṇkadeva by means of his Vikramāṇkadevacarita, perhaps Cittapa too might have written a poem singing the glories of his patron, Bhoja or it might be that Cittapa was of great help to Bhoja in his literary pursuits. Otherwise, Bhoja would not have given the topmost place in his own work to a verse of his protégé. That Bilhaṇa was responsible even to some extent for Bhoja’s reputation does not appear to be true. We learn from the last canto of the Vikramāṇkadevacarita (which is autobiographical) that Bilhaṇa, though a contemporary of Bhoja, did not visit his Court.

The central idea in the verse ‘बलीक्रमवेण रामनुपति’ does not seem to be quite convincing. A great poet, in spite of his merit, and a great patron of letters in spite of his eminence, are mutually responsible for their reputation. If Śrī Rāma has attained eternal fame thanks to his biographer, Vālmīki, it might, with equal force, be asserted that Vālmīki has gained immortality because he has sung the praises of such a great hero as Śrī Rāma, just as a piece of string, valueless in itself, which binds together some sweet-scented flowers, adorns the head even of a great person through its association with those flowers.

If Bhoja is said to have become well-known because of his protégé, Cittapa, this latter too might be said to have gained fame because he basked in the royal favour of such a poet-scholar as Bhoja. The fame of poets and their patrons is interdependent. Thus runs the ‘Subhāṣīta’—

1. कविन्य व विषु विषुना व कविः, कविन्य विषुना व विषाणि समा
   मणिन्य बलवेन मणि, मणिन्य बलवेन विषाणि करः

Bilhana too says thus in his poem:

2. प्रवृटिपते: सनिति न वस्य पार्थ कवीत्वास्तव तत्त्वो यज्ञासि
   भुपा: किवत्नो न वस्यप्रवृत्ताः जानाणि नामाणि न कोट्ने तेषाम्
3. निरं प्रक्ष्यत्वम नीतिपत्तां माध्यम भविष्यं शुद्धितं शुद्धितं:
   के वा न शुद्धां सरसमतिस्तिनलस्वतं भविष्यिनी मृत्युप्तिति धारायति.

—Vikramāṇkadevaracitra, I. 26, 28.

Bhoja ruled for a considerably long period from (1010—1055 A.D. or) 1005—1054 A.D.¹ and hence his laureate, Cittapa, must have flourished in that period or roughly in the 11th century A.D. They were thus contemporaries of Bilhana (1030—1100 A.D.), Dhanapāla (1000—1050) author of Tilaka-mañjari, and Dhananijaya, author of Daśarūpaka.

King Rāja-rāja-narendra, the patron of Nannaya-Bhaṭṭa, and Nannaya-Bhaṭṭa, (about 1050 A.D.), the dictator of the literary world of those days, the earliest among the Telugu poets and the first of the triumvirate who translated the Māhā-Bhārata into Telugu flourished in the same period.

References to Cittapa in Telugu Literature:

Chittapa was not quite unknown to Telugu literature. I could pick out

---

five references to our poet from the ‘Prabandhas’ in Telugu: [Transliteration of Telugu quotations are given below.]

1. Śrīnātha (1360—1400 A.D.): Bhīma-khandā, I.

‘प्रणितितु…मतिचित्तव (प?)कोबि—दृष्टिप्रियतेलकु
मीलकोडपुरु मोहलिमे मेशरोचि.’

2. Śrīnātha: Sīva-rātri-māhātya, I.

‘चित्तवादमभमप्रक्षु’ चित्तपादस्व’


‘चित्तपादनराजिष्यम्यानवन
दर—(चारा?)—महापुराण्यक्ष महिम.’


‘श्रोहु चित्तु सिवदासु सिभम्भु
समिमिलिन्य सुन्नु सारवलासु, नातम दलिलि.’


‘हु हु चित्तु शालबाहु सुन्नु……
प्रथितमिर्बाणकुल्लु श्रातित सेस.’


‘कक्षदास-मज्जलत-मयुरान
बाश-हर्ष-जयदेव-सुन्नु\nचित्तपाद-(दि?)—कविवर्षसम्कात
नाथयापरमणाय नमामि.’

Probably the Telugu literary world of Śrīnātha’s days might have known of Cittapa, or perhaps Śrīnātha, the Kavi-sārvabhauma, being a searching investigator into the literary treasures of the Sanskrit language of the various parts of India, might have known the poetic compositions of Cittapa. It is not also unlikely that Pina Virabhadra, Jakkana, Somaya, and Potayārya might have taken the name of Cittapa from the ‘kavidraśasti’ verses of the works of Śrīnātha, for Śrīnātha was perhaps the only Telugu poet who had mentioned so many Sanskrit poets in his works.

The mention of Cittapa in the Introductory verses of the Sīva-rātri-māhātya is of special importance to Telugu literature. Some eminent scholars, seeing the dissimilarity of style between this poem and the other acknowledged works of Śrīnātha came to the conclusion that it is not a work of Śrīnātha but only attributed to him. This allusion to Cittapa in S. R.
M. taken in conjunction with the reference to Cittapa in Bhima-khaṇḍa, enables us to conclude that S.R.M. also might have been a work of Śrīnātha. The immaturity of its style might be due to the fact that it was the product of the author’s juvenile endeavours.

Conclusion :

From the quotation in the S. R. M.

चिन्तवर्त्तमण्डल्ये चिन्तपत्त्ये,

we can infer that Cittapa was an adept in what is known as ‘Citra-kavītā’. The verse ‘कमलने यदि’ was cited by Bhoja in the S. K. A. as an example of चिन्त्रकीक. Probably our poet had written a poem (replete with चिन्त्रकीक) which might have been lost to us. We are inclined to think that Bhoja might have cited anonymously in the Sr. Pra. many श्लोकas’ of our poet. This point has yet to be investigated after the complete publication of that work. To satisfy the curiosity of literateurs, we shall append below the verses of Cittapa so far as they could be gleaned from the anthologies and works on ‘Sāhitya’.

List of Abbreviations and Bibliographical Notes.

11. C.M.Kh.—Citra-mimāṁśā-khaṇḍana : (K. M. 38, 1907).
15. P.V.—*Padya-vanī : By Veṇiḍatta.
18. R.J.—Rasika-jivana : By Gadādhara (printed in Nāgari, no date).
25. S.Sam.—*Sārā-saṁgraha: By Śaṅbhudāsa.
30. Su.Sam.—*Subhāṣīta-saṅcaya.
33. S.M.—*Sūkti-Muktāvali: By Jalhana. (To be out in Gaekwad's Oriental Series).
34. S.R.I.—*Sūkti-ratnāvali: By Vaidyanātha.

(N.B.—Books marked with an asterisk are not printed. For quotations from these, Dr. Thomas' Introduction to K.V.S. is our authority).

1. 'श्रामारामकार्यनाथरः,'

अन्ततमेकमलमल्लदोप्रमूखः
मघास्तुम्मनमवीक्षितवतन्नान्ति
कान्तालङ्कितमपुपु:कुलविवर्णम्
सम्भोजस्वास्थ्यिन्य पाठु वपु: हमः-[प? ] रारे:

[Skm. 1. 28. ii. śl. p. 22. ('स्तित्तस्य') S. Pra. 1. 1 śl. (Anonymous)].

2. 'मुजः'

अत्युर्व: परितः: सुरूपां निरतः: स्वारामत्वाभोधः:
तानेतान्तिकर्त्ता फिन्तिकान्तान्तितुम्यं नमः:
आवेशस्य मुद्रांदृश्यं स्तुनिमित्ति प्रस्तौतिम ग्रन्थवादरभुताम्ब्रह्मां
स्तांस्वतिकान्तान्तिकान्तान्तिकान्तान्तितुम्यं नमः:.
3. समुद्रान्योग्यः

अन्यः कः क्षारवाहे तस्मि निप्रभमतो वानरेवा नरेवा
विश्रूपितको हनुमासवमिव करुपस्तोधमाशेण पीतः
जत्य निचछे (sic for लसिदिः or लतः) पुरुषैवन्वितवर्तकतेनकृतिहारः
स्वप्नः भते पक्षोपविधकमिधिपुरुषेन नित्यतो वस्त्रदागः
[Sml. (P. 150 a) ‘वि-(sic for छि) लसिदिः’]

4. ‘सायाद्वारः’

अन्यः साधिगताः लथा कः युष्मी यस्यः स मानमही
वते हृदयमोहिः प्रमावधे संप्रत्यक्षसत्तति
अस्माकं पुनरपूवन्वशताः शेषेष्मात्मात्माः
मेताहत्यमहापुवपरिप्रेष्यो कुला साधिगतम्
[Skm. V. 24. iv. p. 294 (‘शिलसप्तस’).]

5. ‘अतिरामः’

अन्तिमिद्रवेशं विराहकथमपि भ्रायेत्व वर्धिन्ति
नायं तस पुनरं चिकित्त्विन्न: प्रकरितिः यज्ञसमविश्वथति
प्रासी विनितात्मात्रं ददस्य च विनित्तिरुक्तवर्दे
लामातत्त्व विदीश्ये वदि न तदृ प्राच्य विनितामणि:
[Skm. III. 18. v. p. 199. (‘शिलसप्तस’).]

6. ‘उभारयणां’

अन्तिमता यसुत्तो दलितेन रिपुः
विश परमं क्षेत्रिता विशिक्षकमर्याद्यः
एकेन जनमिः क्रृतं तदनेन वृना
ज्ञानायेव यद्यरोऽपि युष्मः पुराणः
[Sml. (B. 165 a) (‘शिलसप्तस’) Skm. III. 54. i. p. 224. (‘श्रीरूमुताः’); Bh. P. 216 śl. p. 48 (Attributed to Śakalya); S. K. A. ad. I. 76. p. 71 and V. 176. p. 716 (Anon.) Variants in Bh. P.: अन्तु for अनुः दलितोपरिवर्तेन: for दलित औद्यम; क्षेत्रिते for क्षेत्रम; वातात्ता for क्षेत्रिता.]
7. ‘अके’
आकर्ष्यित गाय धमिलित खरः पथार्मुक्तिविव
ब्रह्मकुपितिविव खर निमितिविव दिसो वायुगुर सभानिव
साधारणकता स्पष्टितिविव मही हृदयमृत्युमणिव
चन्द्रमावस्वीमयावनदनेः श्रीमान् हृदय धावति.

[S. P. 5383 sl. (‘श्रीसिद्धि’); Shbh. 2419 sl. (‘श्रीसिद्धि’);
Skm. III. 25. i. p. 203 (‘छिंतपस्व’); Variants in Skm.—वर्णन for धमि:
खराम for खरे; The rest 3 lines……विद्वा पुरांपथर्मणिव साधारणकता स्पष्टितिविव धरां वाते सभानिव
श्रीमान्य सदिविलात् तत कर्थ महामिंद्रां गोचरः.]

8. ‘मुक्ति’
अदायां मांसमिकते स्तनवर्जे मात
मां मुच्छ वायुरिक याहि कुह प्रसादम्
अदापि श्रष्कपापवायुमणिभि
मथर्मचबलः शिष्यं मदीयः: (छिंतपस्व)

[Skm. IV. 47. V. p. 259; S. P. 4015 (‘कोपाणि’); Shbh. 660 (Anon.);
Sml. (B) (‘इश्नदेववर्मणि’); P. R. XIII. 14. (‘कथारि’)) Su. Sam. (Anon.)
This verse is found in the ‘Kurangi–paṇcaka’ of unknown authorship (vide
Bhāt–stotra–ratnākara, vol. II. In Telugu Characters). The above paṇcaka
is included in the Stotra–pāthā or ‘Prayer–book’ of the South Indian
Vaiśānavites. Variants in Shbh.(a) अश्रात् for अश्रा (c) गानकबलप्रायमनायाम
for श्रष्ककवायुमणिभि (d) मन्नास्वोढळपरस्तर्वयो मदीयः.

9. ‘शिव’
कस्तुर्यार्थिषय्येण कल्पजनों नृत्यायमन्नःकिरिनी–
स्येण प्रलम्यायमूलवानव्यायेन कल्परपम्य
भूमिपलस्यकालपरसदित्तानपन्यतात
बानानुपसेवसहस्तात व: कल्पानुशास्त्री शिवः.

[Skm. I. 5. ii. p. 5. (‘छिंतपस्व’)]

10. ‘अभय’
कल्पात्ते श्रमितत्रिविकम्महाकाळादन्ती स्तुर–
शेषस्यसूत्वमुसंहिरामासिस्माशिकोत्त्वमियः
विशिष्टकार्यविनिमातनानुपुस्तिवती ती मस्तखमांसुमोली
कषन्धिवर्तां गौतमस्य महामोहं महाभैरवः.

[Skm. I. 18 ii. p. 15 (‘छिंतपस्व’); S. P. 95 (‘छिंतपस्व’); Sml.
(B and P) (‘छिंतपस्व’); S. K. A. III. 104, sl p. 361 (Anon.); S. R. Bh. I. 54
sl. p. 5.]
11. ‘कौतिः’
   का ले कुलसदन्तस्तरतवह कौतिस्निता न कौतिः
   साध्वस्तास्तव कुस्तूत बद वामघरात् कुमारिः
   कालात्तथानि च वो लिङ्गभरस्तिः वदने शंकरिः
   कालिभङ्गङ्गनेव यम पुनर्याच्यायिर वर्णमभृत्.

   [Smk. III. 50. i. p. 221. (‘छिठपस्य’).

12. ‘नर्मदायः समुद्रस्य च संवादः’
   कालिन्दिक छरि कुम्भसिद्धस्तवि नाम गुणमाति कसमात्
   शायोम मन्दाय लवणिः ब्रह्म ये नाम कस्मात् सुपरिायः
   माळिक्यं तह्य कस्मात्तुहारिष्म किर्मस्त्रेष्मीलोखनोऽ
   वाणम्भिति: किमायं समजनमु कुपित: कुलसदन्तग्निपालः

   83 (Anon); S. Sanh. III. 101. (Anon.); S. R. K. 79 (Anon.); Attributed to
   Murari in R. J. II. p. 20. Dr. F. W. Thomas says (Intro. to K. V. S. p. 38)
   ‘From a poem relating to a Kuntalesvara as the above ‘का ले कुलसदन्तः.’
   He adds (p. ix) ‘The verse नामनाति तिकतिर कुलसदन्तसुता is perhaps by the same
   author’ i.e. Cittapa.]

13. ‘किते निर्दिता:
   [Dr. Thomas takes this as the ‘pratika’ of a verse perhaps lost to us.
   Commenting on the verse ‘कालिन्दिक’ given above, Visvesvara writes (A. K.
   p. 274): ‘अत्र किमायं समजनति माळिकोरोदनिमिति गुणे तत्तत्रपरम्यपरनिमित्तमनायाम
   कुपित: कोणिपायः इति तत्तकारणमनिहितिन्ति कारणिविवन्याः. अत्रव माळिकम्याति प्रस्थतेन
   कुलसदन्त्यरण ‘किते निर्दिता:’ इति प्रत्ये तत्तथानात्तमिदापत्यस्वरुपमनिहितिन्ति अत्रव
   कार्यनिवन्यायांस्य, पुरुषस्याः प्रति शास्त्र: उत्तसांतु आये इति विशेष इत्यादः:’.

14. ‘रधम्’
   किते विलितिताः न न महामूल्यादिता किं न न
   आनाधारकिते न न संनिपातलोकाधृतिः न किं न
   तत्परोदिति मुग्धाति शशिति किं संस्करने व धर्मे सुखम्
   द्वारक पवत्तिकारणिरपु: श्री मोहेर्षाः.

   (‘छिठपस्य’).

15. छिठपस्य: किविता.
   किते बोधीणितेन किं मुखरोहुःकार्येनापि किमु?
   कन्दरर्युरसिद्धेन तारोहुःकार्येनापि किमु?
   श्रीमर्मत्तपतस्तकवेवि च चोदर्गमकम्भलोः
   मुक्ताम्भुःसुभुःसुभस्वराः कणोरे गाथेः.

   [Smk. 37 b. 193 ष्ठ. (‘छिठपस्य’)]
16. 'उच्चावचम्'

किमस्मानं बिद्वेशिका क्षणिकतदत्वश्चतिकरानं
गुणानं वैदेयानं विश्वमुदयिनं विविषयमिनामां
परिच्छेदः शाच संवन्यपरता चेन्द्रगुजो
विषेकोशः कृत्यं न खलु व्रतमयप्रतिष्कृयः

[Skm. V. 75. ii. p. 327. (‘छिलपस्य’)]

17. ‘पश्याविश्चनाम्’

कुशलं तस्या जीवःति कुशलं पृष्ठार्थि जीवतीयुक्तम्
पुनरिपत तदेव कथचित मृतां नुः कथयामि या शस्तिति.

[Skm. II. 31. iii. p. 89 (‘छिलपस्य’); S. K. A. I ad 76. 97 sl. p. 70
(Anon.); A. S. VIII. ad 2. p. 21. (Anon.). R. J. VI. 83. p. 146 (Anon.).]

18. प्रतापप्रेय:

कुम्भ: पादोमस्य विद्युजुणगप्तिरसी भाजनं मृतभावी।
शैलोपुर: समुद्रत: कन्यनमिरियं वत्तवास्त्रंहोः।
अविचक्षणद्वेषीयगंगममिनिभासं कल्याणं दुःखमाना।
शानुभेष्यो पत्तं ज्वालति सुधुपत वतियं त्यसप्रतापप्रेवः।

[Sml. (P) 140 a. (‘तपस्य’).]

18a. गार्गाविभ्यमाणाः।

[Skm. I. 10. iv. p. 9 (‘कस्यपति’); Sml. (P) 3 b (‘छिलपस्य’). As
this is found in Murārī’s Anargha-Rāghava (VII. 118) it is not given here
in full.]

19. ‘हृद:’

तत्सुपपतं पदे पदेय विविषितमानानम्।
प्रतिपुनुक्तिनीपत्रत्यं प्रतिस्वामितम्।
नयनसहित्यज्ञानं ग्रहालयो।
जलशक्तिमां हृतं नाशंक विषेकोश गमित्तम्।

[Skm. IV. 67. v. p. 274 (‘छिलपस्य’); P. R. XI. 40. (‘कस्यपि’)
S. A. S. VI. (25 b) (‘कस्यापि’).]

20. ‘संवादादुवादः’

तेषां ते निरिकासामसहं मानोच्चतासत्यस्तो।
गतयेन भवतानि तत्स्यहस्ति ते वायुसेय यासि चेति।
गार्दं मेलक्ष्य बताचित्तमिति: कणोमस्तेनाहात।
किसि: पादत्थे तद्विक्षरणो मन्ये चिरें स्थास्यति।

[Skm. V. 24. ii. p. 294 (‘छिलपस्य’).]
21. ‘अविभूति’

विकासवाचनम् यस्य विभुता यत्त्र विविधते
व्यक्तित्वम् सूचीमयवित्ति किरणा राखे स यासमाभुतः
यस्तात्वित्वम् सूचीय विभेचन्य यस्य जीवाते
वेदा यदृष्टमेव मन्नमार्गो न्यायः पानु तो नूतने:.

(Anon.); K. A. as an ex. of ‘Ekāvali’ p. 118. (Anon.); S. R. Bh. I. 77 शा.
7 p. (Anon.).]

[Variants in S. K. A.—‘स यस्य हृदिते ’ for ‘योक्त्य सिवष्ये’)].

22. ‘खद्गः’ [‘राजप्रशस्ता’]

देव लोकतान्त्रिकोंसि भवत: श्रीखण्डशालि भुजः-
स्तास्मात् कालमुखजाति निवसति स्वहरा रुपाणिचक्षुः
एव स्मार्तमेण रिपुतुरसन्धे सुभवहनः
दीर्घ व्योमवितानित्वात्त्विश्रोभिन्मेवकमुन्मुचति.

[Skm. III. 28. i. p. 206 (‘छित्तस्य’) S. R. Bh. 185 शा. p. 112. (Anon.)
D. Kh. P. 101 शा.]

23. ‘युद्धक्षोऽ’

देव लटुजार्यांके न गदितु वाचा वर्य शाकः
कुबोधं हसेयपः तपुलकितः प्रायम्बेते वयम्
शका सेव पुनःवातासिपतनिच्छदातिकन्यरा—
रत्नाङ्कंदस्मृतिरेव युद्धक्षोऽ जयिताम्.

[Skm. III. 39. i. p. 213. (‘छित्तस्य’).]

24. ‘प्रियावश्यायाम्’

दौन्ते भाति जगद्धिष्ठम् गमने विचं चतुर्थवातम
पवातानायं न वाचवमयं फसायको मनस्य:
सामायं: परिवालनस्तु धिष्यते धमणादम्
दिकृतथोवनन्ते तितितितिन्कृ तथौ भ्राजति.

[Skm. III. 11. iv. p. 194. (‘छित्तस्य’). The king to whom the verse is
addressed seems to be King Bhoja.]

25. ‘छित्तस्य’

‘न पुक्कले ते स्वविकों जनता कितु सामगी
विकल्पों शरक्षामाने महती निधक्तीप्यते’.
इतिसामान्येनाह. कयं विकर्तु कलविखोशीपातिनो
निजामीवितानित्वाद्वांव भवति भोजोपिः—
‘महल्ला निवसितस्यायामिति मंडी.’

[G. R. M. (Ed. Eggeling. p. 80; Bhimasena Śarmā’s ed. p. 44
I. नामगुणावायः; ad. 46 शा.)]
26. ‘स्वर्गोत्तरः’

निरालन्तः कौन्दे मुखो बिङुरो बालवकूले
रसाइ साल्बो लबामगि लबाइ न रसाइ
प्रियनी नासां रंगपि न चूंति बिनरति
समंतविसोति अतमभमभंगुराने मुखुराः


Dr. Har Dutt Sharma writes on p. 66 of his Introduction to the Skm: ‘Auchrecht remarks that the reading (for Navakara’s verse in Skm. II. 156. iii. p. 170 — ‘निरालन्तः कौन्दे मुखो परिसूचीक्षितरस’ etc.,) in the सरस्वतीकालिनमणल I. 81 (Nirnayasagara edn.) is much better. I therefore, give the verse in full,’ and cites verbatim the first line of Navakara as cited above and lines 2–4 of S. K. A. Though the ‘pratikas’ of the two verses are identical and though both of them treat of a त्रमग, the two verses differ from the latter part of line 1. The first line of Navakara is cited, as noted by Dr. Sharma, by Vāmana in his K. A. S. III. 1. 12 and hence the author of this verse should have been earlier than Vāmana (750—800 A. D.) and much earlier than our poet Cittapa who was a coeval of King Bhoja. To remove this confusion the verse of Navakara also may be cited here:

‘वसन्तोत्तरः’

निरालन्तः कौन्दे मुखो परिसूचीक्षितरसे
बनेन्द्रभोजानामविकल्तुत्सुङ्गक्षुत् प्रतिक्षातः:
दरानी चूनाना मुकोमछुँकु मेमसरससे—
नवीनीतवकूलं दशति परिगाढं मुखुरिसः

—Skm. II. 156. iii. p. 170 (‘नवका—क—रस्य.’)]

27. ‘रिपुः’

पदमासुतुम्बं विभज्य भूजयोमयं निपीक्षोरसा
प्रतेशु प्रमां प्रहल नवरेत्रानीविवत्वयाधरम्
संसातनविवेचन गुप्तद्वितां भूलोकपि भुलेश्वे वने
कि कान्ता दुरीक्षिणी, नदी न विद्रोही करारानान्

[Skm. III. 41. iii. p. 215 (‘छितपस्य’); S. K. A.v.500 śl. p. 731 (Anon.)]

28. ‘कुपित खेंगः’

पर्वतां राजद्वस्तरः हिरितसमनवः पाक्षाचेतस्वस्तरः
भार्यक्षयिन्द्रबल्वविजयकरिस्तमनादानमयुष्मः
संग्रहानात्तमतःतरपनितुष्ठश्रोराजह-साम्यवादः
खासः: शास्त्रीविद्वादः सामसति विज्ञयसे मातवाच्यवध्रवसः

[ Skm. III. 30. i. p. 207 (‘छित्रस्य’); S. R. Bh. 110 श्ल. p. 123.
Variants: Line 2 above is l. 3 and l. 3 is l. 2 in S. R. Bh. ल्यान् for स्त्र्यान,
tाम्यमुरुपयति तत्ताम्यकरपतिष्ठु. (The last line above in S. D. X. ad. 33; p. 525.)]

29. * सामन्यचारः:

* * * (Lost)

पञ्जयेवुदु तदाध्यायादिशाधिरूपम् न स्त्रायति
नूर्त मातव्राजदिग्धाविवधों तैः पोतममोनिची-
मोक्षदृष्टिसंपन्नमदनिगम्यां मयां व:.

[ Skm. III. I. iii. p. 187 (‘छित्रपस्य’). ]

30. a. भूस्यावभत्नानुवल्लम जगताः
c. विवेध भवति....

[ Sml. (‘छित्रपस्य’). Not available to the present writer in full. ]

31. ‘ पूर्णस:’

मेके: कोशमाचार्यमित्वतमथ महानगितं कच्चे:।
पाठक्षेतुपाहरीराठ्यायिनयं मुद्मूर्तितम:
तार्किकाव सरस्वानःकल्याणेन्द्रगाथं वचनितम्
वेनाकुमरनिलभवनकरिणां युवं: पव: पीयोते:

[ Skm. IV. 23. v. p. 242 (‘छित्रपस्य’); S. P. 777 (‘अकालज्ञवस्य’)
P. V. VI. 62 a (‘अकाळज्ञवस्य’); Sbhv. 843 (‘दाश्रिणापस्य’); Su. Sām. XI. 3
(Anon.); S. R. K. III. 72. (Anon.); P. R. XIV. 77. (‘मोक्षपचव्याद’) Bh. P.
201 श्ल. (Attributed to a Brāhmaṇa); S. R. Bh. 65 श्ल. p. 223 (‘दाश्रिणापस्य’).
Dr. Thomas says (Intro. to K. V. S. p. X.): ’Translated by TAWNEY
Prabandha-cintāmaṇī, p. 43.’ Two of the anthologies (S. P., and P. V.)
attributed the verse to Akāla jalada. If this is correct, the verse should have
been composed by a poet much anterior to Cittapa, for we know from
Rājaśekhara that Akāla jalada was his great grand-father (vide: Intro. p.
xxx to K. M.). The poet is so called probably because of the use of
‘अकालज्ञव’ in this stanza.

32. नमेदानवि.

मजम्बाततःस्वस्वतुष्टमदिरोदितलराजिवानां
सत्तां: सिद्धानानां कुक्षयुवकान्तकुम्भस्वरस्मृतमः
सायं प्रातामुनीर्मुक्षुमयच्व मत्तस्तीरस्तीनिके
पाथातो नमेदानम्: करिकरमकरकान्तरंहस्तःस्मृतमः.

[ Skm. V. 11. iii. p. 285. (‘छित्रपस्य’)]
33. ‘यश:’

मातृ: ख्रिनिमयं ततान गुणकः कृष्णेन शास्त्रात्
रागावशास्त्रं पुरुषरूप्रियं रक्षकवाचारः
ज्ञानं नियमतितं तदात्मकं निम्नसचीति-
नामात स दासां गणस्तुणितवैधसि तत्कीर्तिने।

[ Skm. III. 47, ii. p. 219. (‘छित्तपस्य’); Sml. (B). 168 a (‘हनुमतः’).]

34. ‘भृजः’

मिथ्या देव भुजेन तेजब्विविषय: कल्हुम: स्थर्थे
नवेति समवनद्रायामभायमहाकी गायणोदचति
भिन्नस्तत्रत्वभण्ड सकल्पितं प्रवृत्तेत्सद्दारामे
कल्पते स्विनेवर्य प्रविष्टस्य विचरणसिहं छावायु छोड़ते हृति।

[ Skm. III. 8, iii. P. 192; (‘छित्तपस्य’);
S. K. A. III. 101 श्ल. p. 359 (Anon.).]

35. ‘अनुक्रि:’

मौर्यी धारय पूवरीकम्मिवत तन्त्रात्मै विक्रमे
तथापं वह पादपद्रमवनीं दोषां समस्युदर
कश्यी प्रृविन्हतेन विवेकवव व चायान मवविशिस्ते—
विशालनः कपालीचाचर िवधां िवाते हृति: खलवति।

[ Skm. III. 12, i. p. 194. (‘छित्तपस्य’).
S. K. A. I. 90 श्ल. p. 64, (Anon.).]

36. [Not available now in full.]

सब्यायो गमणे रसालमुर्मङ्गोभोिमथंतरे

[ Sml. B. 168 a. (‘छित्तपस्य’).

37. ‘कौरि:’

राम: सैन्यसमविनत: इत्तिमसेतुवयं दामास्तिचि:
पारे तंदुरसावान पुरा तदचुः नानावनस्वरांध्वेत्
एकाकस्य प्रेयसेतुवयहितानि साधारि धारी निन्दिते—
हलाभसंतम देव कौरिविनिता यस्मातमुखहिति।

[ Skm. III. 50, ii. P. 221. (‘छित्तपस्य’).

38. ‘काव्यगमः’

कम्भस्य यद्य वाल्क्षतानि वसुनामावर्षार्धसंगमे
देव प्रेयबजनस्वचव भवति भवत्वतां वाच्यायति
नय्येत्तरमाधर कश्चि नु मरणं कायायमनो विचयुति—
दश्च जीव मनस्तवद्धिकम्भे कायोव्य नहे केवलम्

[ 1. Sadukti. III. 14, iii. p. 196. (‘छित्तपस्य’)
2. S. K. A. II. 344, P. 255 (Anon.).]
39. ‘राजणििरक्षेत्’

[ Sadukti. V. 22. v. p. 293. (‘छितपस्य’). ]

40. ‘अरिपुरम्’

[ Sadukti. III. 45. iii. p. 218. ‘छितपस्य’ ]

41. ‘वाचा…सरमणस्तथेवचिे लोमद्’.

[ Given by Dr. Thomas in his Intro. to K. V. S. as from Skm. III. 3, but it is not found in the Lahore ed. of Skm. ]

42. ‘भुज्’

[ Sadukti. III. 8. i. p. 191. ‘छितपस्य’ ]

43. ‘प्रििवाभ्रात्र्यानम्’

[ Sadukti. III. 11. iii. p. 194. ‘छितपस्य’ ]

44. ‘अभ्यूह्वात्’

[ Sadukti. III. 36. v. p. 212. ‘छितपस्य’ ]
45. ‘पौष्यम्’

समाजे सधारण, सदति विवुधा, धार्मिक धर्मिना
निकाये नीचवालामणि ज रमणीयैं परिवादि
कर्मिकाः पर्वम: क्रमसत्यसत्वं द्रव्यमः
समृद्धिमोक्षेण: सुमुग! भवत: पौष्यकथा:।

2 S. R. Bh. 152 २. p. 110. (Anon.). ]

46. हनुमद्वन्नायाम्

समालम्ब्यायनेयं मधुरचरणाः कम्पनजुयो
न यात्ताः के धरति जलविघटने करिभाका:
तदाकोमेकवाचकवित्तदुसरस्यंस्यंसमु-
समुद्ध्वत्स्य भावातपरमपराः स हनुमानः।

[ Sadukti. IV. 72. v. p. 277. ‘छिल्पस्य’. ]

47. ‘यथा छिल्पस्य’

‘साक्षात्केताः क्लणे कृतिदिशुमुखानाः
शन्ति[०००३]विचिपि विजेक्कलाइमास्ते
आर्याक्षाः कृतनम्भरस्तुवोर्थमें
कृत्वा च नृपति च नृपस्य जगमु’

[Ganaratnamahodadhi, II Samāsaganāḍhyāya, under २. p. 98, p. 140
g. (Eggeling’s ed.) P. 77 (Pandit Bhimasen Sarma’s ed.).]}

48. ‘गुणः’

‘सुन्यं क्षमावताः न किं न किमं प्रहादकशन्द्रमः
गम्मरो न किमधुः: भिनि प्रभा रमः स जेता न किमः
किं लब्धकाण्डुत्तीत न हि वयं वक्तान्ति: दुरगणः
भर्तृहां समिश्रनसवाय नृपति लामेकक्षव नृमु:

[Sadukti. III. 4. ii. p. 189. ‘छिल्पस्य’. ]

49. भोजदेवप्रत्यं

(a) ‘स्वविस्मुज्ञानाथ ! चूर्द्वांविपावऽस्मै चन्द्रमः
पांसी मां प्रच्छोऽस्मै सादु विवेक जनमसुती द्रव्याम्
राजा युधसेविताहिरस्यवित्त्दुम्मायल्लहाराये
रससिद्धात्म भविष्यति विनित्तेक श्रीमोदेवोपयमः’

[Sadukti. III. i. p. 186. ‘छिल्पस्य’. From this verse it is plainly known that
Bhoja and Cittapa were contemporaries. ]
49. (b) ‘अस्युक्तः’

‘ईस्योत्स्न्याकुमुदविशिद् शैवतेऽवसितम् सर्ववा
बादुपूर्तं चित्तरसभूभृतियान्: क्योद्वित्
एको बृहो च भवमिहतं खेतं खेतम् केताम्
स तं तत्त्वं कथय भवता को हस्तस्त्र नूतनः’.

[ (1.) Sadukti. III. 12. ii. P. 194. ‘छिल्पस्य’. (2.) This śloka is found quoted in Rājaśekhara’s ‘Kāvyaminīāṁśā.’ P. 43; IX Ch. (Anon.) beginning with ‘ज्योत्स्नापुरुप्रसरविशिदे’. As the verse is quoted by Rājaśekhara (880–920 A. D.), it cannot be Cittapa’s. (3.) Dhvanyāloka–locana, p. 110 (N. S. P. ed. 1911)—(Anon.)—beginning with ‘ज्योत्स्नापुरुप्रसरविशिदे’ and with some variants: केशिं for कैटभ etc. (4.) S. K. A. IV. 88. p. 454 (Anon.)—beginning with चन्द्रज्योत्स्नान (5.) K. A. p. 17. (Anon.) ‘चन्द्रज्योत्स्नाविशिद’. (6) Vyakti–viveka III. p. 126. (‘ज्योत्स्नापुर’ Anon.) (7) Hemacandra’s commentary on his own Kāvyānuśasana, p. 147. (ज्योत्स्ना etc. Anon.)]
ASAT = ‘UNDIFFERENTIATED’, ‘FORMLESS’, ‘INCAPABLE OF PERCEPTION BY THE SENSES’ IN VEDIC PROSE

By
HANNS OERTEL

It is well known that the Vedānta scholastics in their cosmogonic and ontological discussions interpret sat as nāmarūpavyākṛtam vastu ‘an object differentiated as to name and form’, while they define asat not as ‘absolute non-being’ (śūnyaparātva, ayanatsatvat) but as avyaktavasthā, prāñ nāmarūpavyākāraṇāt ‘a state in which individualization and differentiation have not yet taken place’ (e.g. Śaṅkara on Ved. Śū. 1.4.15; 2.1.17; on Brh. Ār. Up. 1.2.1; Śaśānta, RV Commentary, Introduction, p. 7, 22-25 of Max Müller’s second ed.)

It seems worthwhile to call attention to a few Brāhmaṇa passages in which the meaning of asat ‘formless, without distinct shape, not accessible to sensual perception’ is clear:

1. Asat as epitheton of antarikṣa.

TS 5.4.6.4 asad iva vā antarikṣam cannot mean that the space between heaven and earth does not exist but must refer to its invisibility, its lack of definite form. The parallel passage K.21.8 (47, 21-23) characterizes the antarikṣa by the epithets anārambhana and anāyatana with which compare KB. 29.5 (140, 21-22 Lindner’s ed.) anārambhanaṁ vā idam antarikṣam apratisṭhānam. Both passages refer to the intangibility of the antarikṣa.

Very similar is PB. 3.10.2 = 21.7.3 in which earth and heaven (ayāṁ lokah and asau lokah) are contrasted with the antarikṣa. PB. 3.10.2 discusses a certain kind of viṣṭuti in which the first and the third viṣṭāva (subdivision of a stoma) are sung fifteen times in all three rounds, while the middle viṣṭāva is used fourteen times only. This viṣṭuti is therefore called nirmadhya literally ‘without (Wackernagel, Ai. Gr. ii. 1, p. 283, 26) middle’ i.e. ‘defective as regards the middle viṣṭāva’. The three viṣṭāva are then identified with the three worlds: the first and third with earth and heaven respectively, the second with the antarikṣa. Then the text continues: astiva vā ayāṁ loko ‘sīvāsau chidram ivedam antarikṣam (cf. KB. 20.3 [90, 17 Lindner’s ed.] viṣṭām iva hidam antarikṣam where KB viṣṭām = PB. chidram). Caland translates PB. 3.10.2 ‘This world (the earth) can be said to exist and yonder world (the sky) can be said to exist [with the note: ‘in so far as they are visible’], but the intermediate region is a hollow, as it were’ and PB. 21.7.3 ‘This (earthly) world exists, as it were (visibly); yonder world (the sky) exists, as it were (visibly), but the intermediate region is a void, so to speak’, following the Commentary: ayāṁ bhūrloko ‘sīva vai prāṣīnām
āśrayabhūtaḥ san spaśtam upalabhyamāno 'vatiṣṭhate, tathāsau dyuloka-
cāśtivgraḥanakṣatrāddhibhiḥ prakāśamānatvād, ubhayor madhye 'vasthidām
idam antarikṣaḥ chidram iva susūram iva nirātmakam (on 21.7.3 chidram
iva nirāśrayam ivāmūrtatvād) bhavati.

The invisibility of the antarikṣa is also stressed at JB. 1.300 = 2.431
(CALAND, Das Jaiminiya-Brāhmaṇa in Auswahl §169, p. 229, 9) dvāv imau
lokāνāvīṣṭamāṇaḥ iva ' (Of the three worlds) these two (viz. earth and heaven)
are most discernible, so to speak.' And at Ait Ār. 1.2.3 (84, 15-85, 1 KEITH’s
ed.) triṇi phalakāṇi syur ity āhūs trayo vā ime trivṛto lokā eṣām rūpeneti,
tat tān nādṛtyaṃ, dve eva syātaṃ, dvau vā imau lokāv adhātāmānāṃ
evā śrī-
yete..., antareṇākāṣāḥ so 'ntarikṣalokas, tasmād dve eva syātaṃ, 'Some say
(the swing) should have three boards in conformity with these (worlds),
for these tripartite worlds are three (in number). But let him pay no attention
to this; there should be two (boards) only, for it is only these two worlds
(viz. earth and heaven) which are seen most distinctly; the space between
them is the (invisible) antarikṣaloka ; therefore there should be only two
(boards)'.

There is no Brāhmaṇa passage in which the epithet asat is applied to the
wind which shares invisibility and formlessness with the air (but cf. Ch Up.
8.12.2 aśarīro vāyuḥ). But Bahidhara on VS. 13.3 sataṣ ca yonim astaṇaḥ ca
vivah 'he opened the womb of the sat and the asat' glosses asataḥ by amūrt-
asya vāyuvādeḥ 'of the incorporeal, e.g. the wind', while he paraphrases
sataḥ by vidyamānasaya mūrtasya ghaṭapatādeḥ 'of the perceptible, corporeal,
e.g. a jar, a cloth'.

Note: Parallel to TĀ.8.7.1 = TUp.2.6.1 asad vā idam agra āsīt we
find the frequent K.8.2 (84, 9) = Kap.6.7 (66, 3 ; K.22.9 (65, 13) = Kap.
35.2 (179, 15) āpo vā idam āsān sālilam eva ; JB.1.237 (CALAND, Auswahl
§88, p. 92, 14) = JUB. 1.56.1 āpo vā idam agre mahat sālilam āsīt ;
TS.5.6.4.2 ; 5.7.5.3 ; 7.1.5.1 ; TB. 1.1.3.5 āpo vā idam agre sālīlam āsīt.
OLDENBERG (Vorwissenschaftliche Wissenschaft, p. 175, note 1) rightly remarks : 'Das
Wasser wird auch als das selbst Formlose erschienen sein'. Water like ghee,
Soma, omentum, and semen lacks a clearly defined body and shape, cf. JB.2.
159 (CALAND §143, p. 173, 6 from bottom and p. 174, 5) aśarīra vā āpo 'śarī-

1. For āvīṣṭama, which is wanting in the Petersburg Dictionaries, cf. JB. 2
333 (unpublished) catvāry u ha vai devānām āvīṣṭamāṇaiva jyotiṣya : aghīrhīti-
vyaṃ ādīrāvī divi candramā naṣṭatreṣu vidyudv apsu.

2. Cf. the adverbial addhātāmāṃ SB.7.4.1.8 iyam hy evaiśām lokānām addhāta-
māṃs ; 1.6.2.9 agnir vai devānām addhātāmāṃ.

3 Invisble and incorporeal is also the manāḥ, hence the Manes (piṭaraḥ) are
at PB. 6.9.19-20 compared with it (the commentary : na caṣṣurisyyā bhavantii).

4. This passage is cited at JB.3.359 (CALAND §212, p. 295, 9-10) yad vā imā
āhur (the ms. imām āsur) : āpo vā idam (the ms. imām) agre mahat salilam āsid
ity etās tā āpaḥ.
2. Asat = alakṣaṇam ‘without distinctive marks’.

SB.7.2.17. alakṣaṇaḥ (scil. īṣṭakāḥ) bhavanti, yad vai nāsti tad alakṣaṇam which simply means that whatever lacks distinct shape (whatever is not rūpavyākṛtam), is not perceptible to our senses. Compare with the nāsti in this restricted sense the āsti in the same restricted sense at PB.3.10.2 = 21.7.3 (above sub. 1). The SB. passage continues: asantam tat pāpānāṁ niṣrtiṁ kurute which is semantically equivalent to SB.7.2.1.4; 14-16; 10.4.3.2 pāpānāṁ niṣrtiṁ apahate; it does not mean that he annihilates evil and destruction but that he causes them, as far as he is concerned (hence the middle kurute), to be absent; cf. the contrast between ᾱπ’ ᾱν ‘present’ and

3. Asat = ‘hidden, concealed from view’.

K. 13.4 (184, 12-15) oṣadhībhīyo vekatam ālabheta prajākāma, oṣadhiṁnāṁ vā ēṣā priyā, tā etāṁ sūtōh2 paribādhante, tasmād ēṣā sarveṣāṁ priyā,” pa oṣadhiya, ᾱpo ’sat khananti, tā eva bhāgadheyenopadāvati, tā asmai prajāṁ khananti3; MS. 2.5.4 (51, 16-52, 1) oṣadhībhīyo vekatam ālabheta prajākaṁ, oṣadhināṁ vā ēṣā priyai, ’tā vā etāṁ sūtōh paribādhantā, oṣadhayāḥ khalu vā estasya prajāṁ apagūhantī yo ’lāṁ prajāyai san prajāṇa navindate, tā eva bhāgadheyenopāsarat, tā asmai prajāṁ punar daṇḍatī, ᾱpo vā oṣadhayā, ᾱpo ha tveṣat khananti, tā asmai prajāṁ khananti.

‘He who desires progeny should sacrifice a barren cow to the plants, for she is dear to the plants. It is they (the plants) which interfere with her pregnancy (cf. TS.2.1.5.3. oṣadhayāḥ khalu vā estasyai sūtum apighnanti yā vekad bhavati), therefore she of all animals is dear to them; (now) the plants are (identical with) the waters, the waters dig out the asat (i.e. that which is hidden, invisible); it is the plants which he resorts to with their own share (in sacrificing a barren cow to them); they dig out progeny for him’; MS.

‘. . .it is the plants which hide the progeny of one who, though he is capable of (producing) progeny, does not obtain progeny; he resorts to these (plants) with their own share; they give him progeny again; the plants are (identical with) the waters; it is the waters which dig out the asat; they dig out progeny for him’. The parallel passage TS. 2.1.5.3. ends with ᾱpo evāsmā asataḥ sad daṇḍatī, tasmād āhūr ᾱoś caivaṁ veda ᾱoś ca nā: ’pas tvāvāsataḥ sad daṇḍitī.

1. Cf. Manu 1.5 āśīd idāṁ tamo bhūtam apraṇātām alakṣaṇam aprakāsas avijñeyam.
2. Cf. RENOU, Monographies Sanskrites ii (1937) §11, p. 11, 32 where MS. 2.5.4 (51, 16) should be added.
3. For khan ‘to dig out’ (= khan + nis SB.7.5.2.52) cf. SB.6.3.1.37; 43; 6.3.3.11; 26; 6.4.1.1; 35; 6.5.4.1-3.
Note. It seems to me exceedingly unlikely that in Brahmanic cosmogony *asat* ever had the meaning of ‘non-existence’ \( \mathfrak{o} \, \mu \) \( \mathfrak{v} \), the verbs which are used to describe the act of creation appear to exclude such a notion; thus *taks* (in the Mantra TA.11.1 *asatah sad ye tatakṣuh*) and *taks+nis* presuppose some sort of material out of which an object is fashioned (cf. Delbrück, *Altind. Syntax*, p. 457, 16 ‘das Kunstwerk steckt in dem Stoff, aus dem es herausgebracht wird’); the same is true of *mā+nis* which takes their place in the Brāhmaṇa Prose K.6.7 (56, 7) = Kap. 4.6 (44, 4); K.10.10 (136, 4-5); K.21.2 (38, 15-16) = Kap.31.17 (165, 7); K.34.6 (39, 19); K.34.7 (40, 14); K.35.20 (67, 5) = Kap.48.18 (308, 20-21); K.36.5 (72, 5, parallel to MS. 1.10.10 [150, 9]); MS.1.4.6 (53, 19-20); MS.1.10.5 (145, 5-7) = K.35.12 (66, 15-67, 2) = Kap.48.18 (308, 15-18); MS.3.1.3 (3, 11; 14); MS.3.10.5 (136, 11-12); MS.4.7.6 (100, 17-18); 101, 1); TS.2.1.4.4; 2.2.8.6; 3.2.6.3 (parallel to TB.3.8.4.3); 7.1.1.4; 5; TB.1.1.10.4; 1.5.3.1; 2; 3; 1.5.4.1; 1.5.4.2; 1.7.1.5; 2.1.6.5; 2.2.11.1; 1-4; SB.1.1.27 = 1.3.1.21; 2.2.3.8; 14; 26; 27 (Kānya 1.2.3.6; 12; 27); 2.2.3.9 (Kānya 1.2.3.8); 2.2.3.11 (Kānya 1.2.3.9); 6.5.3.3; 5; 7.5.2.6; 8.1.1.5; 8; 8.1.2.2; 5; 8; 10.4.2.28; 31; 12.1.2.1-3 (parallel to GB.1.4.7 and 9); AB.4.23.1; 5.7.2; GB.1.1.5; 6; 8; 10; 12; PB.13.4.1; SB.2.3.3. Nor do the frequent *jan* ‘gignere’ and *sṛj* ‘emittere’ admit the idea of a *creatio ex nihilo*. These two roots, in fact, imply the substantial identity of creator and created object, because the act of creation the substance of the former passes over into the latter (cf. *Oriental Studies in honour of Dasturji Saheb Cursetji Erachji Pavry*, 1933, p. 359, 25). Hence at SB. 14.4.2.10 (= Brh Ar Up.1.4.10 Mādhy. =5 Kānya) the Atman knew: *ahāṁ vāva sṛṣṭir asmy, ahaṁ hidāṁ sarvam aśṛṅkṣi*. The Ch. Up. 6.2. 1-2 expressly objects to the idea of ‘some’ that the existent (*sat*) could be derived from the non-existent (*asat*): *sad eva somye- dam agra āśid ekam evādvitiyam, tad dhaika ākura: asad evedam agra āśid ekam evādvitiyam, tasmād asatah sad ajāyateti kutas tu khalu somyaim svād iti hov Sacramento asataḥ saj jāyeta, sat tveva somyedam agra āśid ekam evādvitiyam.* In the beginning, my dear, there was only the *sat*, one (i.e.

1. *The Holy Bible in the Sanskrit Language*. . . . translated . . . by the Calcutta Baptist Missionaries with native Assistants, Calcutta, 1848, renders the first verse of Genesis: *ādito Iśvara ākāśam prthivīm ca sasarja* which not only fails entirely to express the Hebrew notion of a *creatio ex nihilo* but (on account of the *sarṣa*) is directly misleading. It would require a paraphrase to convey the Hebrew thought so as to prevent misunderstanding; something like: *ādita eva na kīncaṇa, tado Iśvarāḥ krutunāva śūnyād divām ca prthīvīm ca cakāra.*

2. Cf. RV. 10.72.2; 3 asataḥ sad ajāyeta; TA.8.7.1 = TUp.2.7.1 asad vā idam agra āśit tato vai sad ajāyata.

3. Cf. Epicurus’ *οὐδὲν γίνεται εἴκ τῶν μη ὅντως*
undifferentiated), without a second. Regarding this some say: "In the beginning there was only the asat, one, without a second; from this asat the sat was begot." But, my dear, how should this be so? he said, How should the sat be begot from the asat? No, in the beginning there was only the sat, one, without a second'. This is the only Brähmana passage in which asat may, with a fair degree of certainty be interpreted as to १० मुष्टि ०४८२. It is, for instance, impossible to say what difference there was in the author's mind between sat and asat at ChUp.3.19.1 asad evedam agra āsīt tat sad āsīt, cf. JUpB. 1.53.1 dvayaṃ vāvedam agra āsīt sac caivaśac ca.
THE BHILS OF MAHARĀŚTRA

By

R. N. SALETORE

Like the turbulent Bēḍars and the Minās who so often harassed the armies of the Marāṭhās and were so constantly in league with these rulers from the seventeenth to the early days of the nineteenth centuries, the Bhils too played an important part in the politics of Mahārāśtra during this period. They were, as will be shown presently, no mere free-booters who could be subdued once or twice, or even wiped out by constant oppression, but they proved to be a formidable tribe whose martial nature was a menace to the fighters for supremacy in India during this era of turmoil. Such was the extent of their depredations that the Pēśwās on more than one occasion had to enter into treaties with these people, while formidable Marāṭhā rulers like Hōlkār had to warn redoubtable English generals about their existence in apparently secure places in order to safeguard the English army from their ravages.

The Bhils in Pre-Marāṭhā times.

These Bhils who became so prominent in Marāṭhā days have had a memorable past, at least as an incendiary people. The Bhils, figuring in the traditional history of Rajputana, are recorded to have been the inhabitants of Iḍār, and during the critical times before the accession of Gōha to the gādi of Mewar, they emerged into the political limelight. "At this period," writes Tod, "Edur was governed by the chief of a savage race of Bhil; his name was Mandalica. The young Goha frequented the forests in company with the Bhils, whose habits better assimilated with his daring nature than those of the Brahmans. He became a favourite with the Vanapootras or "children of the forest" who resigned to him Edur with its woods and mountains. The fact is mentioned by Abul Fazil and is still repeated by the bards, with a characteristic version of the incident, of which doubtless there are many. The Bhils having determined in sport to elect a king, the choice fell on Goha; and one of the young savages, cutting his finger, applied the blood as the tīkka of sovereignty to his forehead. What was done in sport was confirmed by the old forest chief. The sequel fixes on Goha the stain of ingratitude, for he slew his benefactor, and no motive is assigned in the legend for the deed. Goha's name became the patronymic of his descendants who were styled Gohilote, classically Grahilote, in time

1. See my forthcoming articles on the other wild tribes in Marāṭhā times: The Ghassias and the Minās, The Bēḍars and the Kōḷis.
2. Cf. B. A. Saletore, Wild Tribes in Indian History, pp. 75-77.
softened to Gehlote." 1 Apart from the confirmation of the fact whether the Bhils were instrumental in raising Goha to a throne, this traditional incident reveals the real environments of the Bhils in the forests of Iḍār, where they must have had their own chiefs and their own tribal organisation. According to the Rāṣ Māla in Gujarāt too, these Bhils lived in such wild surroundings, which gave them a sort of freedom from the domination of the monarchs of that country. "In these, says the bard, there was not so great a population in Goorerat, but there was much forest and the Beels and Koolies lived in security. They were doubtless then, as now, hereditary and professional plunderers, "plunderers of the night," as they described themselves. Raja Karun Solankhee is the first ruler of Goorerat on record, who devoted his attention to putting a curb upon these wild tribes,—a task which has enjoyed the solicitude, more or less, of all his successors down to the present time." 2 These references to the Bhils show that they were not only the dwellers of the woods, but that they became such a menace to the rulers, who made it a policy to root them out, age after age. Nevertheless that these Bhils had some sort of tribal organisation was known to the celebrated emperor of Vijayanagara, Kṛṣṇadeva Rāya the Great, for he remarks in his famous poem, Āmuktamālyadā, in this way about them: "It is essential that a king should be able to enforce his commands. Even the Ābhiras and the Bhils of the forests are able to enforce their orders, as by the sign of the arrow and the piece of thread. Much more is it necessary that an emperor (sārvabhauma) should be able to enforce to his command." 3

The Bhils in Marāṭhā Times

It is no wonder, therefore, that these Bhils who attracted the attention of emperors like Kṛṣṇadeva Rāya of Vijayanagara should have become an object of consternation to the political successors of the Rāyas, the Marāṭhās. They first came into the political limelight in the seventeenth century. A record of the reign of the emperor Jehangir, dated a.d. 11-11-1608 records the grant of a village in Khandesh, the haunt of the Bhils. This epigraph says: "The village of Akar has been given as a gift by the court of the above Pīr (Paulad) of Khandesh in the district of Mulhēr, for bravery and firmness in cultivating and making habitable (waste lands) to Veru Achut Patel, son of Raoji Patel of the community of Marathi, of the tribe of Morē and Haulu Naik, son of Achut Naik Bhil of the tribe of Barīr." 4 This shows that some of these Bhils at least attempted to take to agriculture provided it paid, of course, but the majority of them remained the children of the forest, the vanaputras. Consequently just like their kinsmen the Bēdars, the Bhils too became a political force during the Marāṭhās.

2. Forbes, Rāṣ Māla, Hindoo Annals of the Princes of Goorerat in Western India, I, p. 103. (1921 ed.).
3. Āmuktamālyadā, IV, 206; Journal of Indian History, IV, p. 65.
Pitāji Gaekwad, the agent of Trimbak Rao Dhabađē is said to have leagued himself with the Bhils and Kōlis of the country and on this account were considered formidable by the Muhammadans.\(^1\) Three years later the prominence of the Bhils was again felt in connection with the activities arising from the murder of this Pitāji Gaekwad. This murder was not unaccompanied with advantages expected from it by Abhai Shingh, whose agents murdered this Marāṭhā chief. But his triumph was short lived for Dāmāji with the help of Dilla, a dēsāi of Padra, near Baroda, who had lived in friendship with Pitāji, instigated the Bhils to rise all over the country, and awaiting an opportunity afforded by the march of troops to quell the insurgents, sent intelligence to Mahadaji Gaekwad, the brother of Pitāji, who had occupied Jambusar, advising him to attack Baroda.\(^2\) This information of Grant Duff is supported by contemporary documents. A letter from the chief and Factors at Surat, dated March 24, 1733 A.D., says: "As Ahmadabad is at present infested by the Ganims, they cannot at present contract for the lemmanees, that being the place where they are usually made; but they have ordered musters to be made at Surat; and if they can be got there, or a happy turn of affairs should happen at Gujarāt, they will advise us of it."\(^3\) This disturbance must have continued during the next year as well. Another letter from Henry Lowther to Robert Cowan states: "Dāmāji, the commanding officer of the Ganims, twice advised the Chief that, if stopping the Bar will not bring the Governor to a compliance, he is ready to march before the town with any number of men the chief shall think necessary. But these are dangerous experiments and only to be tried at the last extremity."\(^4\) The motive underlying Dāmāji’s letter to the trading English is worth noting, for on February 10, 1734, he wrote to Henry Lowther: "I heard you, once a friend and assistant to the Hubsis, whom good fortune seems to forsake, and upon their account you bear hatred to Teg Bakht Khan. My opinion (upon considering of this) is that, as you are a merchant, it cannot be for your interest to be at variance with him, and continuing friendship to the former will be very destructive to your nation. I expect you will return an answer to this immediately, that I may take measures accordingly."\(^5\) These letters show that Dāmāji, at the head of the Ganims, who as tradition has it were Bhils and Kolīs\(^6\) when the relations between Teg Bakht Khan, who had assumed the governorship of Surat in his own name, and the English became extremely strained, offered his assistance to Henry Lowther, the chief of the Surat Fac-

---

2. Ibid., p. 381.
5. Ibid, p. 15.
6. Cf. Baroda State Gazette, I, pp. 445-46. Ganima or Galima (Arabic: Ghanima) used in Marāṭhi to mean 'looter' or 'enemy'.
tors, who did not give credence to it.\textsuperscript{1}

Once the Bhils were shown such a systematic method of ravaging the country, it is no wonder that their raids became constant. The consequences were simply disastrous. Foreseeing such a fate, Henry Lowther wrote to Robert Gowan, on the 1st of February, 1734,:\textsuperscript{2} "...in case we can't bring him (Damaji) to reason, he and his evil councillors will soon swallow up all the other merchants in their turn and ruin the city; which agrees with our own sentiments and (those of) the inhabitants in general, who were all in our interest and have at their meetings, which have been frequent on this occasion, declared that, in case the English withdraw from Surat, they would follow us down to Bombay."\textsuperscript{3} These Bhils not only disturbed trade but, owing to their ravages, also put the Marāṛhā government to serious losses. In A.D. 1764-65 Venkat Rāmadeśtri informed the Pēswā administration of Poona that, owing to the raids of the Bhils, Gosāvis and a desperado, Bajaji Matkar, the parganās of Dhargaum, Kāsarābad and Mandalēśvar, did not prosper and consequently the revenue of the government suffered. He was therefore authorised to entertain the necessary troops and crush the marauders. For this purpose he was allowed to levy from the Matkhar's territory a sum not exceeding Rs. 25,000 in order to administer properly the territories inhabited by them.\textsuperscript{4} To entertain such temporary levies whenever local disturbances arose, became one of the settled practices of the Marāṛhā government. There was a disturbance of Bhils in Khandesh and the subhēdar of the locality, Cintāman Hari, was ordered to entertain 100 sowārs for the whole year and to maintain their establishment accounts.\textsuperscript{5}

These predatory Bhils had their own leaders. Ditya Bhil, one of such leaders, residing in the hills of Kukudmundē, burnt five villages and caused considerable disturbance in several others in the neighbourhood. On reporting this to the government, the houses and property of the horsemen and soldiers in his service were ordered to be attached and their families imprisoned as follows in the three sanads sent by the Poona government to its respective officers:\textsuperscript{6} (a) 119 persons including horsemen (svar) siledārs and peons (pyadē) (foot-soldiers) serving in the parganā of Sultanpur, under Tukoji Holkar: the kāmavisdar of the place being Dhondo Ballāl.

(b) 52 persons including Thorkhedkar alias Rānlekar, serving under Mādhav Rao Kadam.

(c) 52 persons Kāmavisdār, parganā Nandurbar; Kāmavisdār, Dimat Tukōji Holkar, parganā Majakūr.

\textsuperscript{1} Gense and Banaji, op. cit. I, p. 15.
\textsuperscript{2} Ibid., p. 14.
\textsuperscript{3} Satara Rajas' and Peswās' Diaries, IX, (325), p. 298: tari dāha hazār vis hazār pancaivis hazār ṛtayēparyant śībāndī ēksāl kharça kārūn śībāndī ṭhevūn, gōsāvi va bhilla va matkar yāncē pūripatya uttam prakāṛēkarun āhānē.
\textsuperscript{4} Ibid., (330), p. 302: "yājkaritāṁ ravūt āśāmi (100) śambhar āśāmi rōjmiśarvāva ākkhēśi paryant ṭhevūn hazāri gair hazāri zarukūṁ prānt majkūr yēthic subhēca hiśēbhī saḍrūhū śambhar rautāncā rojmiśa kharcā lihiē."
So in all three notices were served for the confiscation of the property of 241 people, who were held responsible for a rising in A.D. 1769-70.\(^1\)

In addition to such punishment, when culpable Bhils were actually caught, terrific cruelties were inflicted on them. In A.D. 1763-64 Babya Bhil along with Sarif Khan, Padaji Sêtya and a Câmbhâr of Goregaum, were captured and the government ordered that one hand of all these prisoners should be cut off.\(^2\) But it is doubtful whether or not such exemplary chastisement had any salutary result, for the incorrigible Bhils, as the Marâṭhâ records reveal, still continued their nefarious activities as though the powers of the Pêśwâs could neither reform nor subdue them.

Nevertheless the Pêśwâ administration took great care to stamp out the destructive activities of these wild tribes. One of their policies was to grant permission to the local authorities affected by the incursions of these Bhils to entreat additional men to preserve the peace. In A.D. 1771-72 in the pargâna of Bhâmrē the Bhils created disturbances and as Hari Kâmavisdar represented that it was necessary to employ more soldiers to meet the emergency, the government granted him the necessary permission.\(^3\) If these officers failed to perform their duties they were not spared by the State. Nisbat Govind Hari, the Kâmavisdar of prânt Bâglan in A.D. 1765-66 failed to quell the incendiaryism of the Bhils and as he was dismissed in his place Cimnāji Dalpatrao was appointed Kâmavisdar. He was given a full account of the revenues of the province and was commanded to administer it in peace. In addition he was ordered as follows: \((a)\) He was to entertain 100 soldiers at the rate of Rs. 6 per month (per soldier). \((b)\) He was therefore obliged to put an end to this Bhil menace, to make the province peaceful as before, and on behalf of the government he had not only to make it prosperous but he had to see that there were no more reports of Bhil risings.\(^4\)

**The suppression of a Disturbance.**

When such a rising actually occurred the government must have striven its best to crush it. How this re-establishment of the public peace was carried out can sometimes be ascertained from contemporary Marâṭhâ documents. On 18th of October 1769 Nâropant Nâna received a report of a disturbance of the Bhils and the Gardis, led by Cimnāji Dēsmukh, and how it was stamped out. The trouble appears to have commenced in the afternoon of Thursday at about two o'clock, when the news was received that below the Ghâts, Vârseyân, Gârdis, Sidis and Bhils and about 75 horsemen were seen all

---

together sallying forth from Songhad towards Saleri, devastating the whole neighbourhood (tamām gāṇv jaṅṅit pōlit cālīlā). On hearing this, at once by night, the writer accompanied with all his forces rode forth to meet them through the Kalāmbah (pass) gate. The road seems to have been full of shrubs, hills and grass, but still they reached their destination in the early morning. There the rebels appeared to be ready. Owing to the protection of the hills, the forces of government were well able to deal properly with the rioters in the fight that ensued. Many Gārdis were slaughtered: two hundred to two hundred and fifty of them were killed, while the same number were wounded. Those who sought the protection of the grass, fled. Ciman (Cimnāji) Dēsmukh himself, being wounded, fell down beside his horse, but it could not be ascertained whether he escaped or fell down among the slain, despite a keen search for him. Some said that he ran away, while others stated that he hid himself amidst the grass. The rest of the Gārdis and Bhils decamped. The Government soldiers were consequently able to gather all the guns, swords and other weapons of these rebels, together with fifty horses, big and small. In the ranks of the Government nearly twenty spear-men (bhalō) and five or six cavalry men (ghodeēn) by only were wounded. All of these returned to their camp at about three in the evening.1

It is interesting to note in this connection that this cimmanārō Dēsmukh (styled also as Ciman or Cimnāji) of Bāglān evidently did not perish in this suppression of the revolt of A.D. 1769. This is because he recommenced his atrocities later on with the assistance probably of Bhils and similar desperadoes. In A.D. 1774-75 Govind Hari, Kāmavisdār of Bāglān, was at his own request permitted to reduce this adventurer, who was pillaging the par-ganās of the State. The amount of Rs. 25,000 to 30,000 required for this purpose was ordered to be recovered as far as possible by forfeiting this Dēsmukh’s property, while its adherents, Šankarāji Khandērāo and Lakṣmān Viśvanāth in the talūka of Mūlhēr, were to be fined.2

It may therefore be inferred that the Marāṭhā State slowly evolved certain definite principles of subduing the Bhils, who became a constant source of trouble to the government as well as to the people themselves. One of these and probably one primarily and constantly utilised was the employment of military force against the insurgents. Officers who failed to crush these rioters were deprived of their office and they were replaced by others, who were specially instructed to see that disturbances of the peace did not recur within their spheres of influence. These officials were assisted by the State with the finances generally recovered from the territory of those who led the Bhils, or if the Bhils were wealthy, from the lands of the Bhils themselves. In addition, the associates of these leaders were usually fined and the fines were apparently used to suppress these ravages.

Nevertheless recalcitrant persons who invariably utilised the Bhils to create trouble to the government, were not easily coerced into submission. One of the means for restoring the peace was the despatching of troops to the affected area. The Pēśwā Mādhav Rao Ballāl I on 25-12-1769 ordered Balaji Janardhan to send two hundred troopers to Khandesh where a disturbance was made by Dabhađē, Toke and the Bhils. The order added that it would be good if these soldiers were requisitioned through Rama-candra Ganesh, in whom probably the Pēśwā had some reliance or it may be that this person had trustworthy soldiers who were considered fit to meet the emergency.¹

The Bhil Paṭṭi

Probably the Pēśwā government found it unnecessarily expensive to send constantly such punitive expeditions to quell the increasing risings of the Bhils. The Pēśwās therefore resorted to a strange expedient for meeting such expenditure by levying an extra charge from the affected areas in addition to the usual government demands of revenue. There was an occasion to enforce this measure in A.D. 1776-77 when the Bhils, inhabiting the land extending from Kasarbari to Ajintha, caused havoc in that area and rendered the roads unsafe for travel. Nāro Kṛṣṇā, the Sur Subha was directed to put down this riot. The officers of the various mahāls were also ordered to recover from their spheres of jurisdiction, in addition to the Government revenue, such amounts as might be required by the Sur Subha for the expense of the troops employed for quelling this disturbance.² This disturbance appears to have spread to the other localities in Khandesh in A.D. 1776-77. The Bhils, for example, residing in the villages of Pōr, Jambūpāṇi and Jāmthi, in the hills on the borders of the parganās of Jainabad, Edlabad, and Jalgaon of Khandesh enjoyed inām lands and were in charge of Cowkis on the high roads. Nevertheless they took to highway robbery and in consequence the neighbouring villages as well as the trade of the country suffered. Naro Kṛṣṇa was therefore directed to put down these Bhils and to collect money for this purpose from the inhabitants of these māhāls.³

The propriety of advocating and enforcing such a financial measure in order to combat the Bhil menace cannot be said to be justifiable. First because such a levy was an extra tax, which must have been a cause for discontent and a burden to those people who were already ravaged by the destructive Bhils. Secondly the formation of the estimate of such an ex-

¹. Selections from the Peskwa Daśtar, 39, (119) pp. 120-121 : Khāndēśāṭ Dabhāḍē va Tōkē va Bhil labāḍī karitāt tyācē pāripatyaś sarsūbhakadē dōnsē rāvut dīlyē pāhījē-aisās khāndēśacāyā kāmās dōnasē rāvut Rāmacandra Gaṇēs yājkaḍān devīle uttam kēlē.


penditure was left to the discretion of the Sur-Subha and naturally therefore
the amount of this tax depended upon the whims, the honesty of this official
and the circumstances in which he was placed. Thirdly the central govern-
ment appears to have put an end to the system of sending troops to the
affected areas and it was probably difficult to know the exact results of the
pacification of a local disturbance achieved through a provincial official.

Despite all these considerations, which must have been certainly ap-
parent to the shrewd Marāṭha statesmen of this time, this occasional levy of
Bhil-paṭṭi for safeguarding the common people from the ravages of the Bhils
became, in the 18th century, an established financial exaction. In the
year A.D. 1778-79 a wooden fort was built in the Kukkermundé tīlūka for
keeping down the Bhils and some soldiers also were stationed there. Tukaji
Holkar, the holder of the adjoining mahāls of Sultanpur and Nandurbar, had
to pay Rs. 5,000 for maintaining them. It was now ordered that the amount
should be recovered from the rāyats as the erection of the fort saved them
from the attacks of the Bhils. From an economical point of view, this was
a blunder, simply because this due to the State only increased the burden
and the sufferings of the already miserable agriculturists. The Marāṭha do-
cuments are all silent about the economic effects of such levies on the farm-
ing population and it may almost be taken for granted that such a recurring
tax was paid with the loudest murmurs by the suffering populace.

This tax called the Bhil-paṭṭi was levied in all localities infested with
the Bhils. As a result of their depredations it was deemed necessary by the
government to establish for the sake of protecting from the Bhils thānās or
stations above and below the ghats from Kasadbhāri to Ajintha. The duty
of establishing these thānās was entrusted to Nāro Krṣṇa and to Jyotyaji
Jadhavrao Waghajkhar, who were authorised to levy for this purpose a tax
called Bhil-paṭṭi assessed on the revenues of the fifteen pargānas noted below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pargāna</th>
<th>Rate</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Rs. a. p.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rajdhārē</td>
<td></td>
<td>21,690 0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mehubārē</td>
<td></td>
<td>14,065 2 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calīsgāurī</td>
<td></td>
<td>46,561 1 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pācoreñh</td>
<td></td>
<td>45,406 2 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sēndūṛṇī</td>
<td></td>
<td>19,340 6 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nimbāyint</td>
<td></td>
<td>54,940 8 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bhādgaoṁ</td>
<td></td>
<td>43,930 7 0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Ibid., (647) p. 256: sabab śibandī kharcā baddal rupayē 5000 pānc-hazār
rupayāñcī rayēt tanagapajī karūṁ tālūkē majkūrākađē aivaz dyāvayācā karūr kēlā
asē.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pargañā</th>
<th>Rate</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Rs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lōhārē</td>
<td></td>
<td>36,461</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bāhājā</td>
<td></td>
<td>52,631</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cikkalīwahāl</td>
<td></td>
<td>21,722</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jhōdagehī</td>
<td></td>
<td>7,312</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manākpunjī</td>
<td>Hiserśīdh Tanākhā</td>
<td>6,187</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jāmēr</td>
<td>Nimē</td>
<td>58,188</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dhuḷē</td>
<td></td>
<td>41,221</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utrāṇa</td>
<td></td>
<td>49,488</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5,19,153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4 9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Bhil-paṭṭi which was to be recovered at the rate of five per cent. on this whole amount came to Rs. 25,957-8-0 and this sum had to be carefully recovered and utilised wholly for stamping out the Bhil disturbance. The officers concerned were further instructed that, even in those pargañās the total revenue of which amounted to Rs. 18,190 (sardēśmukhi) and where the Bhil trouble was excessive, the assignment of the tax was to be made according to the estimated rate and in those places where this havoc was comparatively less, the tax was to be recovered according to half of the estimated rate.¹

The recovery of this Bhil-paṭṭi in this case was entrusted to Nāro Krśṇa, who was specially instructed to spend this sum with care (cauksaśine kharca karūn), to safeguard the people from the Bhils, submit the accounts thereon to the government at the end of the year and employ Dimat Khan Rohillah evidently for crushing the Bhils.² Though these officers were directed to recover this Bhil-paṭṭi or Bhil-tax, specified instructions were issued to them regarding its refunds. Nāro Krśṇa, for instance, was ordered in A.D. 1784-85 to levy the Bhil-paṭṭi in Khandesh only from those villages which were subject to attacks from the Bhils. The amount levied by him from a pargañā which was not so subjected to such a depredation had to be refunded.³ This Bhil-tax was to be utilised only for the purpose for which it was recovered and any misuse of it was not at all countenanced by the Marāṭhā govern-

2. Ibid., p. 162.
ment. In A.D. 1785-86 the duty of bringing the Bhil plunderers to justice was entrusted to Sivaram Narayan on the condition of maintaining, out of the revenues realised by the Bhil-patī, the necessary force and to make good any loss sustained by the people on account of plunder. A Bhil disturbance occurred, but Nāro Kṛṣṇa, the Sar Sūbha, instead of compelling Sivaram Narayan to fulfil his stipulated condition, levied a fresh cess from the people of the locality to meet the charges for an additional force which was entertained by him. A complaint was naturally lodged by the sufferers to the Pēśwā and the amount thus recovered was directed to be refunded.1

Another measure was adopted by the Pēśwās to keep the Bhils in check, especially if they leagued with the villagers themselves. This measure was meted to the villagers of Kasbē Sirūr in pargānā Bandapur which belonged to Ahilyabai Holkar. A feud existed between the village-officers and the Kāmvisdārs and they had been quarrelling for four months. Balwantrao Kāsi, evidently an officer who happened to encamp at the village, on learning that the Bhils who had captured the fort of Lonara were in the village, demanded their surrender. The villagers sent word that they would pay Rs. 500 or 1,000 to Balwantrao rather than surrender the Bhils. Therefore Balwantrao, with the consent of the Kāmnavisdār, attacked the village. In the fight that ensued some of the Bhils were killed, while some were wounded. The rest were taken away by the villagers to the homes of Raghunathrao Dhōndōji and Govind Cimnāji, who were probably influential persons in the locality. The Kulkarni also joined them and they all fired on the forces of Balwantrao and at nightfall they allowed the Bhils to escape. As Balwantrao reported all these facts to the government headquarters, Raghunath and Govind were ordered to be arrested and their houses were attached, while the watan of the Kulkarni was also likewise confiscated. As this Kasbē belonged to Ahilyabai Holkar, the whole case was reported to her. This shows that during the Pēśwās the central government itself meted out punishment to offenders who were not under its immediate jurisdiction and the action taken was duly reported to the administrators concerned. Moreover disciplinary measures were taken against those who abetted themselves with outlaws and law-breakers like the Bhils, through the means of imprisonment, and confiscation of private property.

The Rights (Haks) of Bhils.

This principle of confiscation was also applied in a similar manner to the rights or haks of the Bhils. These privileges were evidently granted to the Bhils as one of the means of keeping them contented and these rights were withdrawn whenever the government found that the Bhils created trouble. In Khandesh the Bhils once raised an insurrection in the year A.D. 1789-90 and captured the fort of Kanhēra, but an army was despatched

against them and the fort recaptured. Those Bhils who had fought against
the government fled and later begged, through Balaji Bhikaji and Bāji Nara-
yan Mahdaji Anant, that the haks of the Bhils from the villages, as agreed
to by the Peśwa Bājirao, which were held back, might be continued to
them. If these were regranted they promised to do police duty of the villages
and refrain from creating any mischief in future. Consequently an agree-
ment was obtained from the Bhil Nāyaks to the following effect:

(a) The Bhils would abandon their residences (haṭṭis) built in the
forests and on mountains.

(b) They would live in the villages and do the police duty. (gāmu
gannā jāgal karāvi)

(c) They would receive their rights (haks) as usual.

(d) They would henceforth possess no sword or gun.

(e) They would use only arrows while on patrol duty in the Ghats.

(f) They would wear round their necks a packet bearing the seal of
Government.

(g) Any Bhil wearing no such packet was to be punished.

Forty-seven copies of this order were issued to 9 Mahāls, 26 parqaṇās
in Khandesh and to 17 parqaṇās above the Ghats.¹

But the uncontrollable Bhils were hardly able to abide by their own
agreement. Once more in A.D. 1793-94 they rose in revolt in Khandesh and
Nāro Krṣpā, the Sur Sūbhā again attacked them. Subdued and cowed down
the Bhils yet once again offered to adhere to their former agreement to tie
round their necks the sealed billets of lac (lakhecē lakhoṭe bāndhūn), to leave
the hills and do the stipulated police duty as watchmen in the villages. Their
offer was again accepted and their haks were restored to them on their as-
surance that they would cause no further disturbance any more. If any
tax was recovered on behalf of this expedition against the Bhils, the Sur
Sūbhā was ordered to take this to the State account.² These measures reveal
how the Peśwā government was always ready for a compromise with the
ever recalcitrant Bhils with whom depredation had become a second nature
and this conciliation was achieved mainly through the employment and the
disarming of the Bhils and the attachment of their rights and their property.

The Results of Conciliation and Repression.

These conciliatory and repressive measures of the Peśwās do not seem
to have had any of the desired beneficial effects on the irrepressible atro-
cities of the Bhils. In fact any disturbance of the peace was invariably
attributed to the Bhils, although the culprits might have been some one
else and the officer in charge had to explain the facts to the government.
On A.D. 20-3-1775, Naro Ganesh explained to the Government at Poona that

---

¹. Selections from the Peshwa Daftar, 36, (172), p. 144.
the Bhils and not his men were responsible for harassing the people. The result of this administrative inquiry is not known, but in the next year there occurred another outrage. Gawajya Bhil of Kasba Khèl in pargana Manikpunga attacked and plundered some of the villages in that pargana. He was subsequently arrested by the Kāmavisdār of the place and imprisoned in the fort of Dhoḍap. The government ordered that if the complicity of Gawajya was proved beyond doubt he was to be beheaded. From this case it may be seen how the Marāṭhā rulers tried to conduct an inquiry even into the outrages of an outlaw Bhil, who once proven guilty beyond doubt, was given the worst punishment, obviously as an exemplary measure.

Even beyond Khandesh the Bhils became objects of terror to well-organised armies. Mahārāja Madhōji Bhōnsē in A.D. 1778 warned Col. Goddard that, as soon as he crossed the Narmada and plunged into the interior, he would be confronted with “impregnable passes, bad roads and thousands of Bhils, ready to attack his men from the hidden caves of the mountains.” Likewise Mahādji Sindhia requested the Fēswā in A.D. 1778-79 that the fort of Juga situated on the bed of the Narmada in the taluka of Hande might be granted to him in order to enable him to put down the Bhils who were infesting the territory along the Narmada. His request was duly complied with and Naro Ballal was directed to hand over the fort to him. Nevertheless this trouble did not cease, for in A.D. 1779 Beniram Pandit, an English spy, wrote about the Bhil disturbance in that part of the country. As the route beyond Hosangabad was full of steep hills and dangerous passes, he informed his employers that numerous Bhils and other wild tribes had been stationed there “by the Poona ministers” in order to check the progress of Goddard on his march to Bombay. This commander was therefore informed that he would do “well to encamp on the bank of the Narmada” until a fresh plan for his future operations was decided upon. It is worth noticing here how some of our countrymen sold their souls to foreigners for a mess of pottage by betraying the secrets of their own people who were laying down their lives in the defence of their motherland.

In spite of the warnings of hirelings, allies and the various precautions taken by the Marāṭhā government, the Bhils continued their ravages in the nineteenth century as well. It was recorded in A.D. 1802-03 that they formerly used to receive some grain from the villagers for guarding their villages. When their rights or haks were withheld from them for some unrecorded reason, the Bhils revolted and blocked the passes. Then once again the old practice of sending armed contingents to the disturbed locality was revived and 300 Gārdis were sent to Abāji Mahādēv for putting down the

3. Calendar of Persian Correspondence, (1930) V, p. 249.
4. Ibid., p. 262.
5. Ibid., p. 262.
Bhils and orders were issued to continue to the Bhils their rights as before.\textsuperscript{1} In A.D. 1804 many of the men of Brigadier General Monson, flying pell-mell in the face of Holkar's army were drowned in crossing the Chumblee, but the most trying experience to the sepoys, says Grant Duff, of all that they endured was the loss of many of their wives and children. These were in some instances left on the opposite bank until the very last moment and in this helpless state were "in view and within hearing of their husbands barbarously murdered by Bheels from the neighbouring hills, who were in the interests of Holkar."\textsuperscript{2}

Such was the power of the Bhils during this period that the English general Wellesley wrote on the 2nd of August 1803 to the Governor of Bombay the following warning: "The whole range of mountains is in the possession of Bheels, whose exertions would prevent the invasion of any party of marauding horse. This fact points out the necessity of cultivating a good understanding with and encouraging the Bheels, so as to attach them to our cause....I cannot conclude this letter without requesting that you will urge the gentlemen at Surat to keep on terms with the Bheels: these appear to be a race of the same description with those who inhabit the hills in all parts of India. By conciliation, and refraining from our interference with their concerns, they will prove our best friends, and contrary line of conduct will make our worst enemies: it must not be expected that we should involve ourselves in the affairs of these Bheels, or press them for tribute."\textsuperscript{3} These shrewd words of advice reveal the wise lines on which Wellesley based his policy of dealing with wild tribes like the Bhils when he was about to declare war against Sindhia in Gujarat, especially as the Bhils were the subjects of this Marāṭhā ruler and any rash interference with them might have frustrated all his plans.

Like the English the Marāṭhās too were endowed with keen foresight for once again they tried their old policy of conciliation when dealing with their own fiery people, the Bhils, in A.D. 1804-05. The result was a spell of peace between the Bhils and the Pēśwā. In this year Dattu Näyaka Bhil entered into agreement with Narasimha Khandērāo promising to give up their predatory habits and to live peacefully as loyal subjects of the Marāṭhā government. They were accordingly informed that if they abided by their promises they would in no way be molested.\textsuperscript{4} Despite all this their ravages were reported again in A.D. 1806. Balaji Laxman, the Diwān of Viṭṭal Narsing Vin-cukar was appointed with "fullest powers" Sar Subhedār of Khandesh and Buglana and a body of the Pēśwā's infantry, under 'Manohurgeer Gosaeen,' was dispatched to support him.\textsuperscript{5} But such appears to have been the state

\textsuperscript{1} Satara Rajas' and Peshwas' Diaries, V, (165) p. 171.
\textsuperscript{2} Grant Duff, A History of the Marathas, II, p. 373.
\textsuperscript{4} Satara Rajas' and Peshwas' Diaries, V, (168) p. 172.
\textsuperscript{5} Ibid.
of these provinces that they were never restored to order under the administration of the Pēswās. “Holkar’s ravages had been “followed” says Grant Duff by various plunderers and the Bheels who, till 1802 A.D. had lived intermixed with the rest of the population, betook themselves to the mountains and carried on precisely the same system of plunder as is now practised by the brigands of Italy and Spain.” This observation of Grant Duff was quite correct for again in A.D. 1805-06 there was yet once again a rising of the Bhils, near the fort of Khaira and near Ramnagar. Narsing Khanḍerāo and Manohargir were sent with an army to put them down. The officers of certain forts and Vikramshah, Rajē of the sansthān of Jowar and Ruijē Rānā of the sansthān of Rāmnagar, two Kōji chieftains, were also directed to send forces to their assistance and to co-operate with them. It is apparently to this outbreak that Grant Duff alludes when he says that there was an outbreak of the Bhils in A.D. 1806.

These Bhils continued to wreak havoc by assisting marauders and adventurers as before. Dāngalia Trimbakji, confined in the fort of Thāna in Salsette, effected his escape on the 12th of September 1816 A.D. Grant Duff says that he “confided his safety to the Bheels, Ramoosees and Mangs and resided chiefly in the hills about Nassuck.” In the next year (A.D. 1817) several Bhils and Bedars (Ramosis) were engaged by Dānglia Trimbakji in the service of the Rāja of Satara and in the camps of Sindhia, Hōlkar and Amir Khan. Receiving this support of Hindu rulers between whom and the English there was little love lost during this period, the Bhils did not spare white people, if they could help. On the 5th of November 1817 it was reported that two white women were abducted by the Bhils who thrashed one of them while the other died.

The Bhils after A.D. 1818.

After the fateful year A.D. 1818 there appeared to be a change in the life of the Bhils. Captain Briggs was appointed an agent for effecting a settlement with the Bhils in Khandesh. Still the Bhils in the mountains adjoining Khandesh continued to disturb the country for some time after the English government was established. In A.D. 1819 the plan adopted for settling them was appropriate waste land for such of them who chose to surrender the bow and arrow for the ploughshare. In spite of all this in A.D. 1822 William Chaplin found that the Bhils were “unsettled and dissatisfied with a Government of order which keeps them within bounds . . . The jungles and hills of Khandesh are still more or less infested by them, not-

4. Ibid., p. 469.
withstanding the very judicious and zealous exertions that have been at various times made to seize or destroy these Banditti. Gang robberies on the highway, and successful forays, in which great numbers of villagers and village cattle are carried off, still evince the turbulent and daring spirit of those half civilised marauders of whom but a scanty portion has yet surrendered the bow and arrow for the ploughshare. The Chiefs seem to have but an imperfect influence in repressing these outrages, though they find no difficulty in exciting a spirit of depredation whenever favourable opportunities present themselves." In A.D. 1822 from the returns of the Collector of Khandesh no fewer than 111 cases of highway robbery occurred during the last three years but the perpetrators of these crimes were not brought to justice. Sir James Outram during A.D. 1825-30 succeeded in forming a Bhil-corps, while their riots in A.D. 1852 and 1857 were easily suppressed.

RĀJADHARMA IN THE ŠAUNAKIYA

By

V. R. RAMACHANDRA DIKHITAR

The Šaunakiya published recently in the Trivandrum Sanskrit Series is interesting in more than one point. It is a treatise on Dharmaśāstra, consisting of two parts, the first part dealing with rituals and the second with the rites of kings, especially the coronation rite. One feels from a study of these two parts that the book as published at present is incomplete and there must be several sections dealing with different topics of the Hindu dharma. What is remarkable about this treatise is that it is a very ancient one. In the second part of the book with which we are concerned at present Šaunaka is seen addressing a certain Āśvalāyana.¹ This reference to Āśvalāyana is indeed very significant. We know of the well-known Āśvalāyana, as the author of the extant Gṛhyasūtra, who is said to have flourished roughly in the sixth century B.C. From the fact that Āśvalāyana concludes his Gṛhyasūtra by saying 'Namaḥ Šaunakāyā, namaḥ Šaunakāyā', the editor of this treatise seems to conclude that the author of the Šaunakiyam was the preceptor of the great Āśvalāyana, and enumerates a list of as many as twenty-two works attributed to his authorship.² It is not possible to agree that one and the same Šaunaka was the author of this and all the other twenty-two works. The style and language of several of these works compel us to the conclusion that all these did not emanate from the same pen. With regard to the Šaunakiyam itself, excepting the accidental coincidence of the mention of Āśvalāyana, and Āśvalāyana's reference to Šaunaka, it cannot be quite readily admitted to belong to such an early century as the sixth century B.C., though there is nothing impossible in this.

Other references in this treatise are equally remarkable. The Itiḥāsa-Purāṇa is mentioned³ indicating the existence of Itiḥāsas and Purāṇas before the composition of this work. The next reference of importance is to the Aitareya-vidhāna⁴, evidently the prescription of the Aitareya Brāhmaṇa on the

1. प्रतिमा वक्ष्यं चैव प्रतिक्रिया चार्चनं तथा।
   श्रणु बुद्धया समायुक्त साख्यायन सुकात॥ २१. २॥


3. इतिहासपराणादीन श्रणुयादि तदनन्तरम ॥ १०. ११॥

4. महानिमेकं कथाम राजनिःस्व विधानं॥
   ऐतरेयविधानोंक झाला सर्व वधाकामम्॥ ४. १॥
   दुधे मुहुर्ते राजानि प्रसुमारोहिते कुरः॥
   ऐतरेयोपास्तेयं श्रवायेपवियोगिने॥ ४. २१॥
abhiṣeka of the king. Again this Dharmaśāstra makes mention of the Vaiṣṇavas and their ālayas or temples as distinguished from those of Śiva. In more than one place the worship of Durgā is prominently mentioned. In this treatise, as has been already said, prominence is given to the coronation rite of the king. The rite was followed as was prescribed by the Aitareya Brāhmaṇa, thus showing that its basis is rooted in the Vedic literature. In this rite of abhiṣecanam, the Purohita finds an honoured place. In fact, in the Saunakīya polity, the Purohita still enjoys the exalted place assigned to him by Kauṭalya and other writers on polity. A Brāhmaṇa of good character, belonging to a noble family and versed in Vedas and Vedāṅgas was to be appointed Purohita for the purpose and fulfilment of Dharma. The term dharmāyāva means all this. The Saunakiya proceeds that a king should discharge all his obligations with the aid of his Purohita. By so doing he ensures progress of his kingdom, stable wealth, and fame here and hereafter. One of the main duties of the Purohita was to perform the consecration ceremony in an auspicious place at an auspicious time. After the ceremony was gone through, the king is said to address the Purohita to bless him and to help him in the peaceful conduct of his administration believing as he did that a rājanya under the guiding hand of a Brāhmaṇa was ever blest. When once the abhiṣecanam was over, the king was hedged with divinity. He was regarded as Indra, the king of Gods. Details of Varṣottānam, of nīrājanam of elephants and of horses, all pertaining to a king are furnished in three different sections 6 to 8. This is followed by a section where a reference is made to naksatradevata pūjā on his birthday (Section 9). What is particularly interesting is that that day was considered as a special day of festivity. That day the king fed all people irrespective of caste. He brought relief to the distressed and freed the impri-

1. वैण्ड्यबिवेकमण्डली नित्याश्रममाधरेत् ।
एतद्विश्ववेदन्त्ति विषयाविविधायस्यमुत्तमम् ॥ 21. 23.
2. 7.15; 13.14; 14.22.
3. भृतवन्तं कुलीनं च बैद्धेदासाशिवकम् ।
ब्राह्मण शुत्यादिराजारिवीयुः पुरोहितम् ॥ 1. 7.
4. पुरोहितेन विशेषा सवेशयः कर्येदै ।
मुग्धिर राज्मिज्ञिः च गीतं च राजस्वो व्रजेत् ॥ 1. 8.
5. मध्ये सुपत्तिनिषिद्धनत्तुरोहितः ।
प्रशासनलिखित्वर्यो तिष्ये वा अवगुणध्वाम् ॥ 1. 13.

See also 18. 2 & 7.

6. बृहस्पतिययांबद्वस्य में द्वीपवनस्य ।
सबी: प्रजाः पालविद्ध प्रसीद्ध भवनाः । मम ॥
ब्राह्मणाधिपो राजनां: सकलं भविष्यते ॥ 2. 6-71.
7. इत्युद्दाध तमक्षवर्त्य गन्धावलियादिभि: कमलाः
विशेषाक्षरारामाणां वैदेशिवेदिभि: ॥ 4. 26.
soned. Some of these details agree with what is said in the Tamil classic *Silapadikāram* of the second century A.D. in its reference to the celebration of a king's birthday when there was a remission of taxes and general release of prisoners.

Thus we see many interesting details relating to certain aspects of ancient Hindu polity in this Dharmaśāstra of Saunaka. If scholars would assign to this composition sixth century B.C., as has been suggested in the preface to this edition, then the controversy centering round the introduction of week-day in India at a later period of the 4th century A.D. could be set at rest on account of its unambiguous reference to *vāra* in more than one place.

1. मोचयद्र दुःखितः सबूँमिलद्वान तुपसत्तमः
   सार्ववर्णिकमनन्यालियात्मिन्दिकारयेत् ॥ 9. 6.
2. Canto XXVII, 1. 234.
THE DATE OF COMPOSITION AND AUTHORSHIP OF
A WELL-KNOWN VERSE IN SANSKRIT

By
HIRALAL R. KAPADIA

It is true that owing to the special mentality of the Indian authors of
the olden days and the peculiar circumstances that have affected the preser-
vation of the Indian literature, we know nothing about the authors of various
works. Even then I am tempted to discuss here the date of composition and
authorship of the following verse:

"श्रेयांति वहुविध्यानि भवन्ति महत्तामपि
अधेवांस प्रश्नसां कापि यान्ति विनयकः: ||"

This verse is to be frequently met with in Jaina exegetical literature, and
that, too, as a quotation. The earliest commentator who has done so (so
far as I know) is the well-known Haribhadra Sūri, the Yakṣimahattarā-
dharmasūnu. He has quoted this verse in several of his commentaries out
of which his commentary on his own work Anekāntajayapatākā may be here
mentioned. There is a wide difference of opinion regarding his date. Some
believe that he died in Vīra Sārvat 1055 i.e. in Vikrama Sārvat 585, while
others believe that he flourished about two centuries later. Whatever view is
accepted, it may be safely asserted that the verse in question is at least 12
centuries old.

In the 12th gāthā of Vīsesāvassayaabhaśa, a splendid work of Jīnabhadra
Gaṇi Kṣamasrāmaṇa, we have as the first caraṇa a "वहुविध्यासेवाय" of
which the Sanskrit rendering is वहुविध्यानि श्रेयांति. This is practically the first
caraṇa of our verse under consideration. It may be mentioned that accord-
ing to the Jaina tradition Jīnabhadra Gaṇi died in Sārvat 645.

In the end I may add that I have not come across any work where this
verse is explained in Sanskrit.

---

1. Nowhere is the author mentioned; only the verse is quoted either fully or
   as a pratikā.
2. See the vivṛti of Āṣuogaddāra, the vivaraṇa of Nāndīsutta, the
   vṛṣṭi (?) of Sūstravārṭasamuccaya.
3. Śilāṅka Sūri who seems to have flourished not later than the 9th century
   has quoted the verse in his commentary on Ayānaṃsūta. Similarly Malayagiri
   Sūri, a contemporary of Hemacandra, the well-known poet, has quoted the
   verse in his commentary on Kammapayadi, Pañcasamgaha, etc.
4. While commenting upon this work Maladāhin Hemacandra Sūri has quot-
ed the first caraṇa of the Sanskrit verse under question.
Under these circumstances I may conclude this note with the following questionnaire:

1. What is the original source of the verse in question?
2. Who is the author of this verse? Is he Jaina or non-Jaina?
3. Is this verse to be met with in non-Jaina literature, and if so, which is the earliest work wherein it occurs?
4. Are there any verses parallel to this in Indian and non-Indian literatures as well?
5. Is this verse explained anywhere in Sanskrit?
A NOTE ON UTKALĀPAYA

By

A. M. GHATAGE

BÖHTLINGK and ROTH have the following note in the First Volume of their Dictionary "ukalāpa (ud+kalāpa) adj. with upraised (spread out) plumage (of a peacock). Ragh. 16.64. Mṛttṣak. 76.3. From this the denominative ukalāpay- to cause the peacock to spread its tail, fig. to bid someone to be proud; to recognise someone’s merits; to pay thanks; (?) vayān sarve vidyāpāre gataḥ | tadupādhyāyamukalāpayitvā svadeśe gacchāma | tathaivaṁ kriyatāmityuktvā brāhmaṇaḥ upādhyāyamukalāpayitvānujñāṁ labdhvā pustakāni nītā pracālitaḥ| Pañcat. 244.24."

In the Verbesserungen und Nachträge to their Vth Volume they add "'ukalāpa, ukalāpay- is according to BENFEY causal of kal- with ud-: it means (1) to take leave of someone (Acc.) Pañcat. 244.25. ed. orn. 53. 15; Vet. in Gott. gel. Anz. 1860. p. 736. (2) to carry the wife from the house of the father to one’s house; Vet. in LA (II) 17.14; Gott. gel. Anz. 1860. p. 736. cp. utkalāpana." M. WILLIAMS and APTE have nearly the same to say on this word.

Many things about this word make one suspicious both as regards its form and meaning. It will be seen that it occurs only in two books the Pañcatantra and the Vetālapaścavicīniśikā, and it is taken either as a denominative or a causal. The form ukalāpayitvā occurring in Pañc. with the termination of the Gerund as tvā in spite of the pre-verb ud would suggest some kind of Prakrit influence. The meanings derived from it, by regarding it as a denominative of ukalāpa are not found in literature and the other two (1) ‘to take leave’ and (2) ‘to take the wife away from the father’s house’ are not agreeing with both the derivatives. Neither do they show any inter-relation between themselves. One is naturally forced to see some kind of misreading or some other confusion as regards the origin of this word. It is evident that the word as used in the two popular books has nothing to do with the noun utkalāpa as found used by Kālidāsa.

Both the Pañcatantra and the Vetālapaścavicīniśikā are popular works and the commonly used recension of the former comes most probably from the Jain sources. As such we should expect that the word is some kind of Sanskritisation of an original Prakrit or Vernacular expression to be found in Jaina writings. In the Bharatājakadvātīniśikā edited by HERTEL we find two places where a similar word is found used : p. 28. An ascetic takes away a few sugar canes from the field of a wealthy person without his permission; but to avoid being called a thief he asks permission of the field itself and himself gives the answer as he wanted. The owner one day catches hold of him and asks him why he has stolen the canes, to which he answers, "ahān
sarvadāpi mukkalāpyaivekṣudāmānī grhitavān” suggesting thereby that he has taken the permission of the field. p. 36. “sacatūrdaśa vidyāh sāṅgopāṅgā adhītya ... tam guruto mukkalāpya svakīyapurāṇ prati cačāla”. From these two places it is clear that the word mukkalāpya is used in the sense of ‘to take permission or leave’ and the second passage closely agrees with the one in Pañc. We can naturally think that both the words are in reality one and the same and the form was originally mukkalāp— with the meaning ‘to take leave’.

About the origin of this word itself we find that Hemacandra in his Deśīnāmālā gives the explanation ‘mukkalamucie saire’ VI. 147. according to which the Deśī word mukkala means both ‘proper’ (ucita), and ‘free’ (svaitra). Dhanapāla further confirms this statement when he states in his Pāñlacchānīnāmālā ‘sacchamāddyā ddāmā niraggalā mukkalā visiṣṭkalayā 13. From this Prakrit word mukkala, a denominative, can be formed by the adding of the usual suffix āve in Prakrit as mukkalāvei ‘to make free, to be free, to do the proper things’ according to the meanings of the original word. It was, it appears, wrongly Sanskritised as mukkalāpayati from which the forms in use were derived. The Prakrit word mukkala continues to live in the modern languages in the form cf mokkalā ‘free’ in Marāthi, mukkalavo ‘to make free’ in Gujarati. From its original meaning ‘to free’ it is easy to see its other meanings, the student at the end of his studies freeing himself from the authority of the teacher, and the carrying of the bride from her father’s house is to free her from the authority of the father who was supposed to be her guardian upto the time, not only till her marriage but till her formal departure from the paternal house.

The Prakrit word mukkala itself appears to be derived from the past passive participle mukka from the Sanskrit root muc to release from a form like *mukna as suggested by Pirschel. The verb mukkāi has given rise to the Marāthi verb mukane ‘to lose’. The form extended with the addition of the syllable la we find used in the Apabhraṃśa verse quoted by Hemacandra vaḍḍapāṇu pari pāvītā hatthiṇ mokkaladoṇa’ “but greatness is obtained by loosening the hand (by giving many gifts)”. VIII. 4. 366.
PROFESSOR JACOB WACKERNAGEL
11th December 1853—21st May 1938.

With the death which occurred on the night of May 21, this year of Professor Jacob Wackernagel, the world loses a great grammarian and linguist and India one of her greatest lovers. Born on the 11th of December 1853, in the city of Basel in Switzerland, Wackernagel started his studies there and later migrated to Göttingen where he had the unique opportunity of studying under Benfey. His father was, for long, Professor of German Language and Literature in Basel. This inherited love of grammar and linguistics carried the young scholar to Leipzig for a term and later to Oxford on a scholarship. He received his doctorate from the University of Basel in 1876. That same year he presented his Habilitationsschrift for the post of Lecturer in Sanskrit and Classical Philology in Basel. Three years later he became Additional Professor, and in 1881 he got the coveted Professorship of Greek Language and Literature in the same University in addition to the Johannes Reuchlin Readership and a Lecturership in the Obern Gymnasium. In 1902 he went to Göttingen as Professor of Linguistics and in 1915 returned once more to Basel in his old capacity. Here Wackernagel carried on his great work of teaching as well as research until 1936 when he retired. His scientific work in linguistics had already marked him out as one of the most eminent scholars of his time, and he was duly honoured with the Rectorship of Basel University during 1890, 1918-19, and of Göttingen during 1912-13. He was also the recipient of many honorary degrees as well as memberships of learned societies. In 1918 he received a volume of studies from his pupils and admirers, entitled Antidoron, as a mark of their esteem and love.

Of the many great works which Wackernagel has left behind him only two need be specially remembered here: his brilliant lectures on Syntax (Vorlesungen über Syntax mit besonderer Berücksichtigung von Griechisch, Lateinisich und Deutsch) and his great work on Old Indo-Aryan Grammar (Althindische Grammatik) of which only three volumes appeared during the lifetime of the author. These two unfinished masterpieces show what a loss Linguistics has suffered by his death.

The New Indian Antiquary started with the blessings of Prof. Wackernagel, but the Editors and Publishers regret that Wackernagel could not see the first number even. It is a personal loss to the New Indian Antiquary which hoped to associate itself with this great Master of Linguistics and Indic Grammar. The Editors, on behalf of the Journal and its many subscribers and contributors, convey their heartfelt sympathies to the members of his family in their great loss. They hope to publish shortly a short biography of the regretted Professor with a portrait in a special issue devoted to his memory. May his great soul rest in peace! and may the thoughts he lived be ever a source of inspiration to all!

*The Editors are thankful to Prof. A. Debrunner for supplying them with brief notes on Prof. Wackernagel's life.
EDITORIAL

With the completion of the first six issues of the New Indian Antiquary we have almost fulfilled our promises to the contributors who had so kindly sent us their learned research papers for the inaugural number or the immediately following numbers. It is necessary at this stage to affirm and reaffirm the aims and objects for which the New Indian Antiquary comes into being and the programme which it is chalking out for itself.

Primarily the objects for which this new journal comes into being are threefold: (a) To preserve all available cultural material in India which is fast disappearing and to present it in the most scientific manner in a permanent form; (b) To create interest in Indian Scholars for their ancient culture and inspire them to approach this study from the modern scientific point of view and enable them to present to the world at large their researches in this direction, and (c) To create a permanent centre in India for an authoritative, scientific and true interpretation of India's great and varied culture through all periods of her evolution. And above all, co-ordinating these threefold objects by the offering of a free medium of expression for all Research Scholars irrespective of nationality by the publication of a monthly journal which will appear regularly supplementing the work of all the other learned journals in the Oriental field.

The absence of a permanent centre in India for cultural studies, like the École Francaise d'Extrême Orient at Hanoi, equipped with a complete Library and all modern instruments of research, will be felt by all true scholars working in the different branches of Indology or Oriental Learning in general. With the best of intentions none of our learned societies, universities or libraries are completely equipped with sufficient material covering every aspect of Indian Culture; besides, there is no Council of the Learned Bodies and Societies to co-ordinate the workings of these individual Institutions to help a genuine research scholar. But even under such handicaps the amount of real research work done in India alone is of a surprisingly large character for which there is not enough scope in the existing research journals published in India or abroad. People may wonder if scholars are impatient beings, unable to brook delays in the publishing of their painstaking researches; but when the delay is coupled with starvation with regard to books, apparatus of research and other modern instruments of research, whatever little energy they
possess is sorely tried. Progress in any subject becomes possible only when there is a quick exchange of results or comparison of notes after due deliberation. All these factors have contributed towards the creation of the New Indian Antiquary. By the offering of a regular medium of expression for scientific papers on Indology much of these difficulties will be lightened.

The New Indian Antiquary cannot of course take the place of that permanent centre which we have in mind. But so long as there is no centre of that type, of which it can properly become the true medium and organ, it can help the research scholars in manifold ways. A medium of research work should also be a meeting place to discuss the many problems which naturally arise in every branch of research; the New Indian Antiquary offers to all such scholars its columns under the title Correspondence. All queries, notes or discussions can be published in these columns and the Editors will act as co-ordinating officers to get scholars working in the same field introduced to one another through this Correspondence. Queries will be answered, as far as possible, by competent scholars in these columns. It is the hope of the Editors that all research scholars, irrespective of their nationality, will collaborate with them in making this section an interesting and live one. The Correspondence section will also undertake to publish accounts of research tours undertaken by individual scholars or by societies, from time to time. We invite all of these to co-operate with us in bringing within the reach of every scholar an account of the progress of such research tours.

Another section that we have in mind is the "Notes of the Month" wherein we hope to publish all such relevant information about the activities of societies or individuals which will form a useful bit of knowledge for other scholars or public bodies. We hereby appeal to all such institutions to keep us informed from time to time of all their activities either by means of communications, notices, etc. or by the presentation of their annual or other reports or both. The New Indian Antiquary hopes to become in this way a substitute for that centre of cultural studies we have mentioned above.

Much of the research done in Indology and allied subjects is not limited to publication in English journals alone. For scholars who are not acquainted with foreign languages it is difficult to keep abreast of all the interesting work done in the different fields in the various parts of the world. And even if the difficulties of languages did not exist it would be difficult to have access to all this research material in any part of the world, with a few exceptions. The New Indian Antiquary, therefore, opens up a section dealing every month with an analytical index of all such research, not confined to learned journals alone, but also taking into account the Proceedings, Transactions, etc. of learned societies, Abhandlungen, Sitzungsberichte, etc., indicating briefly the chief results of such researches. In this connection we appeal again to individual scholars, the Oriental Societies and Oriental Publishers to collaborate with us in keeping this section up-to-date. We request individual scholars to present us immediately on publication with copies of their learned papers with
a brief summary of important new results where possible; we appeal to the Oriental Societies and Publishers to send us copies of their publications in advance so that we may be able to include the results of such researches in time. We also appeal to such Reviews and Journals which occasionally publish articles of Indological interest to send us copies of these articles for making this record as complete as possible. Irrespective of the language in which these studies may be written the New Indian Antiquary undertakes to take into account everything published to make this record unique and absolutely useful to every scholar in the world. We shall consider our efforts as successful if we can establish in this way a perfect contact between scholar and scholar, between the various learned bodies in the world and between the Publishers and Scholars.

Another feature which the New Indian Antiquary hopes to incorporate as soon as the arrangements are completed is to publish review articles by proper authorities, summing up the researches in a particular field during that year. This is a proper complement to the analytical index by synthesising the work of different scholars in each branch by some scholar who is an authority in that branch. By thus taking regular stock of the work done in a given period new lines will be indicated for further research. These review articles will not only be useful to the researchers themselves, but will also serve as a contact between the scholar and the intelligent layman. In this way the New Indian Antiquary will be fulfilling a need stressed by H. H. the Maharaja Gaekwar of Baroda during his address to the Oriental Conference held under his enlightened patronage in 1933.

Finally we shall be publishing regularly as a Supplement to the New Indian Antiquary critical studies or editions of rare works in the Indological field. The scope for these studies is almost infinite and the possibilities of independent publication rare. This unique Mss. treasure deposited in the various libraries of India and abroad needs proper investigation by qualified scholars and in this we are offering an inducement for further research by Indian and other scholars by opening up this Supplement. If sufficient encouragement and financial patronage are given we shall establish an Extra Series of this journal devoted to such studies. In the meantime the Supplement will give the necessary encouragement to all researchers.

The New Indian Antiquary is a growing institution; the features mentioned above and others, which must grow gradually according to the needs felt and created by the scholars themselves, have to be slowly built up with the active co-operation of the scholars themselves. This is precisely what we meant in our Editorial Preface when we said that the new journal will incorporate all that is best in the existing Oriental Journals in the world. All permanent institutions must be slowly and steadily built up and we look towards all true lovers of India's great culture for active help in the various directions mentioned by us, and by sympathetic and generous patronage.
The policy of this journal is to publish regularly all research papers presented in a scientific manner; it will give importance to the visual and other arts which are only just beginning to exercise fascination on the Oriental scholars in India. Special importance will be given to fields not covered by the numerous other research journals published in India or elsewhere. We feel confident that our noble and learned countrymen, no less than the scholars belonging to Asia, Europe or America, patrons of arts and letters, will associate their names permanently with this constructive work on Indology by spontaneous and generous contributions, sympathy and patronage.

S. M. Katre

P. K. Gode
HASTAS

(Being a study of the elementary Hand Poses in Ancient Hindu Dancing according to the Nāṭya Śāstra of Bharata Muni).

By

P. S. NAIDU

Of all the poses of the various Aṅgas and Pratyāṅgas described by the Nāṭya Śāstra, those of the hand are the most important and the most interesting. Gesticulation by the hand has always been one of the most natural means of expression for human emotions. "Its (hasta’s) artistic appeal", says RAJENDRA SHANKAR,¹ "is very great, for with its expressions, hints and suggestions, are the lovely and graceful movements aesthetically blended with rhythm and music, of the body and limbs of the dancer capable of painting with startling vividness all the phases of joy or languors of sorrow." It is not surprising, therefore, that the Nāṭya Śāstra has entered into the minutest details in the analysis of the Hand Poses in order to bring out their aesthetic value and significance.

HASTA AND MU德拉

At the very outset it is necessary to sound a note of warning against the prevailing tendency to use the terms Hasta and MUDRA as though they were synonymous expressions. Not only in the popular articles on Dancing, contributed to the columns of the daily press, but also in some of the papers in the learned journals we find the word MUDRA used where HASTA is meant. The Nāṭya Śāstra tradition will not tolerate this confusion. It is true that both HASTA and MU德拉 refer to gestures of the hand; but the words belong to two utterly different universes of discourse, the former to the aesthetic and the latter to the iconographic and ritualistic. HASTA has a strictly aesthetic connotation. It is the only term to be used when a gesture of the hand in dancing is to be indicated. MU德拉 on the other hand, is used in iconography, and in Buddhistic and Tantric Theology.

In her excellent monograph on 'MUDRAS'² MISS TYRA DE KLEEN, the Swedish artist and traveller says, "MUDRA is a Sanskrit word which means 'seal'. The designation of the ritual hand-gestures by this word originates from a time, when the priests used to pronounce certain mantras, at the

¹. Four Arts Annual, 1935.
². This book was published in 1924 by Messrs. Kegan Paul & Co. It has an interesting introduction by A. J. D. CAMPBELL, the assistant keeper of the Indian Section of the V. & A Museum, London.
same time accompanying the sound by imitating the corresponding Sanskrit characters with their fingers, thus sealing the magic.” Jean Pryzuski writes in his paper on ‘Mudrā’:

“In Sanskrit the word Mudrā.....has frequently the meaning of ‘seal’ and describes the actual seal as well as its impressions.....Mudrā means also mode of holding the fingers (in religious worship or magic rites).”

In the light of these remarks, it would be conducive to clear thinking and expression to use the word Hasta when we wish to signify a hand pose in dancing.

HASTAS

We have pointed out in Tāṇḍava Lakṣaṇam that Bharata deals with the various poses of the hand, as used in classical dancing, under the heading of Šārira Āṅgika. The following table sets forth the relationship between the Hastas and other elements of significant dancing:

**Abhinaya**

(expressive or significant Dancing)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Āṅgika (poses of the body)</th>
<th>Vācika (vocal expression)</th>
<th>Āhārya (costumes, ornament, etc.)</th>
<th>Sāttvika (expression of mental states)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Šārira (body and limbs)</td>
<td>Mukhaja (facial expression)</td>
<td>Ceṣṭā (movement)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Head</td>
<td>Chest</td>
<td>HANDS</td>
<td>Side</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Waist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Legs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. We may note here that Dr. Ananda K. Coomaraswamy says, ‘The term Mudrā (seal) is mainly used in Buddhist Iconography; the term Hasta (hand) exclusively in Hindu Iconography.’ *Ind. Coll.*, Vol. I, p. 3, f.n.
3. “Bharata discusses Abhinaya under four main heads, namely Āṅgika, Vācika, Āhārya and Sāttvika. The first deals with the poses of the body, and the second with vocal expression; costumes, ornamentation and other adventitious appendages to dancing are dealt with under the third division, and mental states and their expression in the fourth. Āṅgika Abhinaya is divided into Šārira (that which relates to the body and its limbs), Mukhaja (that which relates to facial expression), and Ceṣṭā (that which relates to movement). Šārira Āṅgika consists of the poses of the head, chest, hands, side, waist, and legs....”

—Tāṇḍava Lakṣaṇam (by the author of this paper and two others, Madras, 1936), p. 13.
Students of Abhinaya are familiar with the distinction that is usually drawn between Nāṭya and Nrīta, the former indicating a dance whose only aim is to expound a definite theme with all its emotive evolutions, the latter signifying a dance which has no such aim, but merely attempts to please the audience by the exquisitely graceful poses executed in the course of the dance. Consistently with this general distinction the Hastas, or hand poses are classified into Nāṭya and Nrīta Hastas; the former being subdivided into Asānyuta (single-handed) and Sānyuta (double-handed) Hastas.

FUNDAMENTAL KARAÑAS

Before taking up the detailed description of the Hastas, (according to the ninth chapter of the Nāṭya Śāstra), we wish to mention the four fundamental hand movements discussed by Bharata Muni. These are Āvesṭita, Udvesṭita, Vyāvara and Parivarta. The first of these exquisite poses is performed by folding in slowly and gracefully into the palm the four fingers, commencing with the fore-finger and finishing with the little finger. The definition of this pose makes it plain that the fingers are not to be moved in simultaneously. The movement of each finger follows close on that of the preceding, the time intervals being equal. (Fig. I). In Udvesṭita, the fingers folded in in the first pose, are opened out in the same order. (Fig. II). When the fingers are folded in as in Āvesṭita, but commencing with the little finger and finishing with the fore-finger we have Vyāvara (or Vyavṛtta). (Fig. III) : and when the Vyāvara fingers are stretched out in the same order Parivarta is performed. (Fig. IV). In these fundamental poses the wrist makes a graceful curve, either inward or outward, as the case may be. Extensive use is made of these four hand poses in several of the Karaṇas described in the fourth chapter of the Nāṭya Śāstra.

CLASSIFICATION OF THE HASTAS

Bharata divides the hand poses used in Nāṭya into two distinct groups, namely, those in which only a single hand is used, known as Asānyuta Hastas, and those in which both hands are used, called Sānyuta Hastas. Twenty-four Asānyuta Hastas and thirteen Sānyuta Hastas are described in the Nāṭya Śāstra. Nandikesvara's Abhinaya Darpana mentions twenty-eight Asānyuta and twenty-three Sānyuta Hastas. Other minor treatises relating to dancing mention still other figures, but we shall keep to the authentic tradition of the Nāṭya Śāstra.¹

¹ Dr. Ananda K. Coomaraswamy in his edition of Abhinaya Darpanam (Cambridge, Mass. 1917) mentions 28 + 3 Asānyuta Hastas, and 24 + 3 Sānyuta Hastas; while Mr. Manomohan Ghosh in the Calcutta (1924) edition of the same work describes 24 + 4 Asānyuta, and 23 Sānyuta Hastas.

Bharata Saṅgraha (a Telugu work printed in Rajamundry, 1908) mentions 30 Asānyuta and 24 Sānyuta Hastas.
1. **Patāka.**
   Flag. Fig. V.
   The fingers are erect, stretched out fully, and held close together; the thumb is bent and rests against the side of the palm as indicated in the figure.

   (The *Patāka* pose is so called, because, when the hand with the finger formation, as described above, is bent at an angle of 90° to the fore-arm, we get the appearance of a flag staff with its small flag at the top.

   *Patāka* is the foundation for all the other Asaṃyuta Hastas).

2. **Tripatāka. Three Fingers Stretched out in Patāka.** Fig. VI.
   The *Patāka* pose is made first and then the ring finger is bent into a graceful curve.

3. **Kartari Mukha.** Scissor-Faced. Fig. VII.
   The fore-finger in the *Tripatāka* pose is pulled back, so that it faces the back of the middle finger.

4. **Ardha Candra.** Half Moon. Fig. VIII.
   All the fingers (the thumb included) are brought close together and arched gracefully like a bow.

5. **Arāla.** Crooked. Fig. IX.
   The fore-finger is curved like a bow, the thumb is bent and the other fingers are shot up straight.

6. **Sukatunda.** Parrot's Beak. Fig. X.
   When, in the *Araḷa* Hasta, the ring finger is bent like the beak of a parrot, *Sukatunda* is formed.

7. **Muṣṭi.** Fist. Fig. XI.
   The fingers are well folded in so that their tips touch the palm with the thumb resting against the closed fingers.

8. **Śikhara.** Crest. Fig. XII.
   The thumb in *Muṣṭi* Hasta is stretched out erect.

9. **Kapiddha.** Wood Apple. Fig. XIII.
   *Śikhara* Hasta is formed first, and then the fore-finger is lifted up and placed so that its tip touches the thumb.

10. **Khaṭakā Mukha** Crab Faced. Fig. XIV.
   When the curved ring finger is lifted up along with the little finger, this pose is formed.
11. Sūcyāśya. Needle Faced. Fig. XV.

The fore-finger is stretched out in Khaṭakā Mukha.

12. Padma Kośa. Lotus Sheath. Fig. XVI.

Make Sūcyāśya keeping all the fingers wide apart. Bend the fingers slightly and raise them up again. (In this pose not even the finger tips should touch one another.)

13. Sarpa Śīra. Serpent Head. Fig. XVII.

The hand in Patāka (Fig. I) is arched with just a slight hollowing of the palm. (This pose is so called because it looks like the hood of a cobra.)

14. Mrāga Śīrṣa. Deer Head. Fig. XVIII.

The three fingers, the fore-finger and the middle and ring fingers, are bent as in Mūṣṭi (Fig. VII), but the thumb and the little finger are out stretched.

15. Kāṅgūla. Plough. Fig. XIX.

The ring finger in Padmakośa is bent, and the little finger is raised up.

16. Alapadma. Shaking Lotus. Fig. XX.

The fingers are turned askew in the palm without touching one another. (This peculiar skewed movement is to be gone through in such a manner that the finger nails are visible to the audience all the time.)

17. Caturā. Four Fingered. Fig. XXI.

The tips of the thumb and the middle finger are in contact; the other fingers are stretched out.

18. Bhramara. Bee. Fig. XXII.

The middle finger is curved so that it almost touches the thumb; the fore-finger is bent; the two other fingers are stretched out without touching each other.

19. Hamsāśya. Swan Faced. Fig. XXIII.

The thumb and the fore-finger touch each other, while the other fingers are stretched out.

20. Hamsa Pakṣa. Swan Side. Fig. XXIV.

The thumb is bent, the little finger is stretched straight up, and the other fingers are also stretched out.

21. Sāmdāmsa. Tongs. Fig. XXV.

Make Aṛāla (Fig. V) first, and then let the fore-finger touch the thumb.
22. **Mukula.**  **Bud.**  
In the *Hamsāsyā* pose all the fingers are lifted up, held close to one another so that their tips are brought together.

23. **Urnānābha.**  **Spider.**  
The finger should first go through the *Padma Koša* (Fig. XVI) formation, and then they should be bent.

24. **Tāmra Cūḍa.**  **Cock’s Comb.**  
The middle finger is curved so that it touches the thumb, the fore-finger is bent, and the two other fingers are folded in so that they touch the palm.  
These are the twenty-four Hastas described in the ninth chapter of the *Nāṭya Sāstra*. The original definitions were, no doubt, framed in such a manner, that each one followed naturally from its predecessor; all of them taking their ultimate origin in *Patāka*. When we remind ourselves that the professional *danseuse* has to commence her training in her very early girlhood, we realise the importance of simple and natural psychological associations for a tender mind attempting to master the difficult technique of the dance. These simple definitions together with the manner of their arrangement, bear eloquent testimony to the nature of the profound insight of Bharata into the structure of the human mind.

**SAMYUTA HASTAS**

1. **Aṇjali.**  **Salutation.**  
The hands are put in *Patāka* (A. H. 1), and are brought together so that the two palms are in complete contact.

2. **Kapoṭa.**  **Pigeon.**  
When the Aṇjali pose is opened out below, Kapoṭa is formed.

3. **Karkaṭa.**  **Crab.**  
The fingers of the two hands are interlocked with the thumbs touching each other. The interlocked fingers may face the audience or the *danseuse*.

4. **Svastiṅka.**  **X-Like.**  
The two hands in the *Patāka* pose (A. H. 1) are crossed at the wrists.

5. **Khaṭaṅka Vardhamāna.**  **Increasing.**  
The hands in *Khaṭaṅka Mukha* (A. H. 10) are crossed Svastikawise at the wrists.

6. **Utsaṅga.**  **Embracing.**  
The two hands in the *Mṛga Sīrṣa* pose (A. H. 14) are placed so that the right touches the left shoulder-head, the left touches the right shoulder-head.
7. **Niṣāda.** Impregnable. Fig. XXXV.

The fingers of the right hand in *Mukula* (A. H. 22) are covered by those of the left in *Kapiddha* (A. H. 9).

8. **Dola.** Swing.

The two arms are let down loose and free. The fingers already in *Patāka* (A. H. 1) are now released.

9. **Puspapūta.** Flower Vase. Fig. XXXVI.

Make *Sarpa Śira* (A. H. 13) of the fingers of the two hands, with the fingers close together; bring the hands close so that they form a basin.

10. **Makara.** Crocodile. Fig. XXXVII.

The hands in *Ardha Candra* (A. H. 4) are placed one over the other, the palm facing downwards. The little fingers are moved up and down.

11. **Gajadanta.** Elephant’s Trunk.

The arms are crossed in the middle with the hands in *Sarpa Śira* (A. H. 13).

12. **Avāhiddha.** Piercing.

First put the hands in *Sukatunḍa* (A. H. 6) bending them with the finger tips pointing towards the chest; then lower the arms slowly.

13. **Vardhamāna.** Widening.

The hands in *Haṁsa Pakṣa* (A. H. 20) are held first with the palms facing downwards, and then upwards.

The thirteen Saṁyuta Hastas described above are merely combinations of the Asaṁyuta Hastas. Truly has it been said that the *dansuse* who has mastered the four fundamental Karanās and the *Patāka* pose can, without much effort, perform all the Asaṁyuta and Saṁyuta Hastas.
THE FOUR FUNDAMENTAL KARANAS

Fig. I. Āveśṭita.

Fig. II. Udveśṭita.

Fig. III. Vyāvarta.

Fig. IV. Parivarta.
THE TWENTY-FOUR ASAMYUTA HASTAS

Fig. V. Patāka.

Fig. VII. Kartari Mukha.

Fig. VI. Tripatāka.

Fig. VIII. Ardha Candra.
Fig. IX. Arāla.

Fig. XII. Śikharā.

Fig. X. Sukatunḍa.

Fig. XI. Muṣṭi.
Fig. XVII. Sarpa Śīra.

Fig. XIX. Kāṅgūla.

Fig. XVIII. Mṛga Śīra.

Fig. XX. Alapadma.
Fig. XXI. Caturā.

Fig. XXII. Bhramara.

Fig. XXIII. Harisāya.

Fig. XXIV. Harisā Pakṣa.
Fig. XXV. Sarhdarsha.

Fig. XXVII. Urpanabha.

Fig. XXVI. Mukula.

Fig. XXVIII. Tamra Cuda.
Fig. XXIX. Ānjali.

Fig. XXX. Kapota.
Fig. XXXI. Karkaṭa.

Fig. XXXII. Svastika.

Fig. XXXIII. Khaṭakā Vardhamāna.
Fig. XXXIV. Utsanga.

Fig. XXXV. Nişāda.

Fig. XXXVI. Puṣpapuṭa.

Fig. XXXVII. Makara.
THE BRĀHMĪ INScriptions OF SOUTH INDIA

By

C. NARAYANA RAO

Certain Brāhmī inscriptions were brought to light in 1912 in the Pāṇḍya country and referred to in the Epigraphical Report for the Southern Circle in that year. Attention was drawn to them in the Reports for 1915 and 1918. Rao Sahib H. KRISHNA SASTRI, the then Epigraphist, read a paper on them at the first All-India Oriental Conference held at Poona in 1919. Mr. K. V. SUBRAHMANYA AIYAR again read a paper on the same subject at the third session of the Conference held at Madras in 1924. Both papers attempted to conjecture the meaning of these epigraphs. But the attempts were vitiated by two factors: (i.) Certain letters in the epigraphs could not be properly deciphered on account of their non-occurrence in other Brāhmī writings; (ii.) Both of them assumed that there were some Tamil words occurring in them.

Mr. KRISHNA SASTRI’s readings varied from time to time. For example, in the Report for 1915, he read the Śittanṇavāśal inscription as:

\[
\begin{align*}
&\text{e o mi t (u) ku mu ŭh(ū) (ū) ra (?) } \\
&\text{pi jū na tā kā v(u) t(ī) i tē nā ku chi} \\
&\text{tū pō (chi) la īl(ā) gha(?) ra čē(gha) ? } \\
&\text{t(ō) a (su) (?) tā na nā ma.}
\end{align*}
\]

while he changed it in his paper at the Oriental Conference into:

\[
\begin{align*}
&\text{e u mi nā t(u) ku mu tīha (ū)ra } \\
&\text{pi dā no tā kā vu ćī i tē nā ku} \\
&\text{chi tū pō chi la ī lā ya ra čē ya} \\
&\text{tō a tī tā a nā ma.}
\end{align*}
\]

The same is read by Mr. SUBRAHMANYA AIYAR as:

\[
\begin{align*}
&\text{ē ōmi nātu Kumaṇṭhūr piRāntā Kāvuḍi } \\
&\text{Itēn ku Cīṭupōčil ėlāyar ēyētā atithanam.}
\end{align*}
\]

Similarly, there are uncertainties with regard to certain letters in the other inscriptions. Mr. SUBRAHMANYA AIYAR has brought about greater confusion by giving unknown values to certain letters on account of his preconceived notion that they are Tamil inscriptions. This untenable hypothesis about their Tamil character has made Mr. AIYAR to proceed further and make all sorts of changes in the readings to suit his theory. Mr. KRISHNA SASTRI also was not free from this bias and he made the whole lot of the inscriptions a jumble of Prākṛt and Tamil forms.

To my mind, the records appear to be Prākṛtic. There is no warrant for assigning such an early date as the third century B.C. for any Tamil in-
scription. To distort the reading of extant records to fit in them up-to-date modern Tamil forms in records of the third century B.C. is, I beg to submit, to put the unwary on the wrong track.

I do not pretend to be so positive about the interpretation of these records and where two epigraphists like Messrs. KRISHNA SASTRI and SUBRAHMANYA AIYAR differ so widely, it may seem unwise to step in. Yet, I shall try to give my interpretation of the records on the supposition that, because they are in Brāhmī characters and all contemporary Brāhmī inscriptions contain Prākṛt records, these also may be only Prākṛt records. Scholars may accept my interpretation for what it is worth.

Before proceeding to interpret the records, it is pertinent to allude to the general features of the sounds recorded by the letters of the epigraphs. Mr. SUBRAHMANYA AIYAR has summarised them and I shall give them below with such remarks on them as are necessary.

(1) "The varga-prathama's have been generally used." But see Anaiomalai inscription—third letter 'je'; 5th letter du' ; TirupparankunRam inscription. A seventh letter 'ja'; Ariṭṭānapaṭṭi inscription A. thirteenth letter 'dha'; D. & E. 4th letter 'dhi'; Siddharmalai inscription G. 'Dhi'. These are the only places where varga-tryiya's occur, but Messrs. SASTRI and AIYAR differ at these places. What Mr. SASTRI reads as 'je' in the Anaiomalai inscription, Mr. AIYAR reads as 'ku' (!) and 'ja' of Mr. SASTRI in the TirupparankunRam record is read as 'la' by Mr. AIYAR (!). The 'dhi' of the Siddharmalai record G. is read as 'ti' by Mr. SASTRI himself in his original reading as given in the epigraphical report for 1915. What Mr. SASTRI reads as 'da' and 'dai' Mr. AIYAR reads as cerebral 'Ra' and 'Rai' but leaves it as 'du' in certain other places. Thus, there is great uncertainty with regard to the reading of these letters and it seems better to stick to the 'surd' readings until paleographists come to an agreement on this point.

(2) "The Soft consonants, i.e., the Varga-tryiya's are conspicuous by their absence."

This is true, but in spite of this remark Mr. AIYAR leaves 'ja' and 'da' unaltered. See remarks on (1).

(3) "š and ŝ are not met with, though 's' is occasionally found."

's' occurs eight times in these inscriptions. Samskrit 'sa' is represented in these records by 'ca' 'ya' and 'a' except when it is not changed as in the eight places mentioned. I consider this 'ca' from Skt. 'sa' as having a dental affricate value as in Telugu, Marathi and some other modern Indian languages.

(4) "The lingual 'l' occurs frequently."

I and l occur with equal frequency; each of them occurs eight times.

(5) "Almost all the vowels with the exception of ai, au, ō, o, ar, ah are represented." But Mr. AIYAR allows some 'ai's in his readings.
(6) "In the case of combined consonants, the occurrence of short 'ē' and short 'ō' deserve special mention, the two being the special characteristics of the Dravidian alphabets."

Short 'ē' and short 'ō' are not special to the Dravidian languages. They are found in the Prâkâts also. All Prâkâ grammarians are agreed especially on their occurrence before conjunct consonants.

(7) "The aspirates are seldom used: the only two letters that are met with are 'ṭha' and 'ḍha'.'"

Messrs. SASTRI and AIYAR differ as regards 'ḍha'.

(8) "Some symbols which are never found used in the contemporary Aśokan edicts are here employed and the sounds which they represent remain to be determined. This is a factor which at once points out that the language employed in the inscriptions contains in it sounds that could not be represented by the symbols extant in the Aśokan code."

MR. SUBRAHMANYA AIYAR is not sure about what he says in this regard, for he mentions six symbols ṝ,ḷ,ḍ,ṇ,ṭ,ḍ as being peculiar to the present epigraphs, but admits the presence of all of them except ṝ in other Brâhmi records. He does not mention what is the peculiarity about ṝ. It does occur in some other Brâhmi records. So the only letter that admits of any doubt is ṇ which Mr. SASTRI reads as 'ḍa' or 'ḍai' but Mr. AIYAR would have it read as the Dravidian lingual R to suit his theory of the Tamil nature of the records. To my mind, the letter seems to represent 'ṭṭ' for no part of the letter resembles Brâhmi 'ḍa' and varga-trisya's are absent in these records, while the suggestion of a cerebral 'R' value to it is unwarranted.

The peculiarities of the alphabet presented in the epigraphs under discussion have led Mr. SUBRAHMANYA AIYAR to think of Tamil as their language. But if we remember that the same peculiarities characterize the Paisâcî Prâkârt, we should be under no doubt as to the language which these writings register.

I proceed to attempt an interpretation of the records. I take them in the order given by Mr. KRISHNA SASTRI in his paper read before the first All-India Oriental Conference:

1. Marugâlialalai Inscription:
   vē ṇa kō(ki) si pā nā
   ku ṭu pi tā k(ā) (ja) kā na
   cha ṇa ma.

Mr. KRISHNA SASTRI's remarks on this are: "The word 'kōsipâna', if it has been read correctly, may be compared with the Skt. 'Kāsyapānâm', and
'kuṭupitā', which often occurs in these inscriptions, with the Tamil 'Koṭṭu-vittān' "caused to be cut", cf. also Childers: koṭṭēti".

Mr. Sastri is not sure about the reading 'kō'. The equation 'kuṭupitā' = Tamil 'koṭṭuvittān' is gratuitous, especially as he himself recognizes the existence of the Pāli root 'koṭṭēti' in the same sense. There is no warrant for supposing that final 'na' is omitted in 'kuṭupitā'.

Mr. Subrahmanya Aiyar's emendation is—

Vēn Kōsipāṇa kuṭupitā kālakāṅcanam.

This is based on the supposition that 'na' in the epigraphs is a basic letter to suit the Tamil approach to its interpretation. There are certain other suppositions made by him. 'Vēṇa' is emended into 'vēṇ' and is identified with a territorial division now represented by the Travancore State. There is no authority for the statement that the Travancore State was ever called 'Vēṇ'. The equation 'Vēn = "Vēl" is equally unacceptable. The emendation of 'kōsipāṇa' into 'kōsipān' is also not proper. The existence of 'an' as the ending of masculine nouns is a later phenomenon in Tamil, says Caldwell. The insertion of 'n' after 'kuṭupitā' is equally unwarranted. 'p' is a causal particle both in the Dravidian and the Sanskrit languages. As for 'kālakāṅ- canam', Monier Williams' remark that Hēmādri uses this word to denote 'a particular form of building' in the Caturvargacintāmani is the only one that is applicable to this record.

My Interpretation.

If the third letter is to be read as 'kō' the record has to be read as:

vēṇa kōsipāṇa kuṭupitā kālakāṅcanam.

vēṇa = Vaiśyānām; vaiśya = vēssa = vēyya = vēya = vē; 'na' = Skt. gen. pl. suffix 'nām' as in Prākrit; Kōsipāṇa = Kāśyapānām; Kuṭupitā = Kuṭṭāpita, 'caused to be cut'; 'kālakāṅcanam', 'a particular form of building'; 'kuṭāpita' is a past passive causal participle agreeing with 'kālakāṅcanam'; the difference in gender between the adjective and the noun need not give trouble. The agreement between the adjective and the noun is not strictly followed in the Prākrits.

Meaning: "The 'kālakāṅcanam' or building caused to be cut for (or by or belonging to) the people, the Kāśyapas."

If the third letter is to be read as 'ki', as Mr. Krishna Sastri suggests, it should be read as:

"vēṇāki sipāṇa kuṭupitā kālakāṅcanam"

vēṇāki = Skt. Vaināyaki, i.e. a woman follower of the Vinaya or Buddhist doctrine; sipāṇa = Skt. sipānām, 'belonging to the sect of the silpin's or architects or artisans.

Meaning: The 'kālakāṅcanam' or building caused to be cut or built by a woman-follower of the Buddhist Vinaya doctrine, (or a woman whose personal name was 'Vēṇāki' or 'Vaināyaki').

This second meaning seems to me more probable.
II. Anaimalai Inscription.

Mr. Krishna Sastri's reading:—

(1) i vá(m) je ná Ḟu tū u
    ńai yu l(a) p(a) ta na tā nā ē
    ri ā ri ta nā

(2) a tā tu vā yi a ra Ḟam
    Ḟha kā yi pā nā.

Mr. Krishna Sastri's remarks on this are:

'Ívamje nāṉu' is the name of a country; 'uḍaiyu' = uḍaiyan (Tamil word); 'ēri' a tank (Tamil word); 'aritina = Haritānām; 'tātuvaṉi' a weaver. Mr. Sastri is not sure about Ḟu and Ḟai. Of 'l' he says that it is broader than in the ancient inscriptions of Ceylon. He sees a clear dot after 'ta' in 'ta tu vā yi a'. 'pā' in line 2, he says, may also be possibly read as 'pō'.

Mr. Subrahmanya Aiyar's emendation is:

Iva kunrātū urai yuḷnāṉan-a tāṇa
Eri Aritan Attuvāyi Araṭṭha Kāyipān.

In this Mr. Krishna Sastri's (m) disappears; 'je' becomes 'ku' (why?); 'du' becomes cerebral 'Rai'; he is not sure whether 'y' should go with 'urai' or 'uḷnāṉan'; (pā) becomes 'n'; 'tāṇa' becomes 'tāṇa'; 'atātuvaṉi' becomes 'attuvāyi'. All the 'na's are given a basic value. He slurs over the meaning of 'ai' in his own reading 'urai'. He sees in this record the Tamil pronoun 'iva' = these.

My interpretation will be based on the following grouping of the letters in the record:

Ivaku—naṭṭu—tū Uṭṭuyula—pōtana—tāṇa
Eri'aritanā Atāntuvāyi 'a—raṭṭha—Kāyipānā.

I accept the dropping of 'm' after 'Iva' which Mr. Krishna Sastri himself thinks as doubtful. I also accept the change of 'je' into 'ku' for no other reason than that it does not make much difference because it occurs in a proper name, though what exactly the letter is has yet to be determined. I would read as 'ṭṭu' what Messrs. Sastri and Aiyar have read as 'ḍu, (ḍai)' and 'Ru (Rai)' respectively. I do not expect 'd' in these records. I reject the reading 'R' as highly improbable. 'Nāṉu' = country, need not be considered a Dravidian word. It is derived from the Skt. root 'nāt' to wander. 'tū' in 'Naṭṭu-tū' stands for Skt. — 'tah' from; 'pōtana' stands for 'putrāṅpam' or 'pautrāṅpam'; 'tāṇa' for 'dānam'; 'Eri'aritanā' for 'Airāvaṭānām'; 'raṭṭha' for 'rāṣṭra'; and 'Kāyipānā' for 'Kāṣyapānām'. The meaning of the epigraph will be: 'The gift(s) of the sons (grandsons?) of Uṭṭuyula belonging to the Airāvata sub-sect of the Kāṣyapas of the Atāntuvayika-raṣṭra, and (who had come) from Ivaku-nāṉu.'
III. TirupparankunRam Inscriptions.

Mr. Krishna Sastri's reading:

(A) Ė ru k(ō) (tu ra) i jaṁ
  ku tu ma (pi ka) nā pō
  lā l(ai) ya nā.

(B) ch(ē) ya tā ā ya cha
  ya nā nai tu ch(ā) ta nā.

His remarks: ‘Ērukōṭūra’ is a place-name; ‘kuṭumapika’ is ‘kuṭumpika’, Skt. ‘Kuṭumbika’, a husbandman. No remarks are offered on (B) ;—
Mr. Sastri is not sure about the letter ‘jaṁ’ ; it has slight similarity with the Khālsī Aśokan ‘ja’ given by Bühlér ; it is somewhat like the modern Tamil ‘ja’,—the letters given as ‘ya’ in (B) are peculiar, the reading is tentative ;—
‘cha’ resembles the ‘cha’ of the Bhāṭṭiprōle inscription.

Mr. Subrahmanya Aiyar’s emendation:

Ēru kōṭūr Iḷa-kuṭumpikan
Ceytā a Ayçyan Neçdu—Cāṭan.

‘jaṁ’ is changed to ‘ḷa’ ;—‘pōḷālaiyanā’ is omitted in the reading but explained in the note ;—‘naiṭu’ changed to ‘nēḍu’ ;—

Meaning: “Pōḷālaiyan, a husbandman of Ceylon (and a resident) of Ērukōṭūr (caused to be cut) and ‘Ayçyan Neçdu Chāṭṭan made (it).”

My reading.

(A) Ērukōṭūra Iḷa—kuṭumpikanā pōḷālaiyanā
(B) Cēyatā’āya-cayanā nēṭu cāṭanā.

Skt. Ėru koṭīra Simhala—kuṭumbikāṇām Pōḷāl—āryāṇām
caitya-cayāṇām niṣṭhā caityāṇām.”

‘pōḷāsa’ in Uvāvagadasāh occurs as the name of a town ; ‘pōḷāsāḍha’ in the Abhidhānaratāṇḍra occurs as the name of a garden.

Meaning: The establishment of Caityas and groups of Caityas of (to, by) the citizens of Pōḷāl, the dwellers of Ceylon, of Ērukōṭūrā.

IV. Aṭṭāpaṭṭi Inscriptions.

Mr. Krishna Sastri’s readings:

(A) Kā ṇi ya n(ā) na tā si
  ri ya ku a nā dha mā ma
  i tā ṇa ti ṇa chā tūṭhi ya
  nā sā i (ā) kā nā i ā ṇa
  chā ti kā nā tā na tai ya
  chā ti kā nā chē i yā pā
  lī ya.

Remarks by Mr. Krishna Sastri: There is a vertical stroke attached to ‘ṇa’ (second letter) at the bottom like the medial u-sign ; length of ‘nā’
in all these inscriptions is of the Bhaṭṭiprōlu type: ‘chaṭṭhiyānā’ and ‘chāṭikānā’ are variants. ‘Chē’iyā’ = “Chaitya” (?); Paḷiya=Paḷya (?); ‘Siriyaka, Siriyaku, Yakṣaṭikā’ contain the word yaka = Yaksha. See also ‘yākānā’ C. Below.—He does not give his interpretation of the whole.

Mr. Subrahmanya Aiyar’s emendation:

“Kāṇiyan Natā Sirī yaku’an dhamām ita
Naṭīṇ—Cāriyan Sālākān Iḷān—Cārikan
tāntaiy Cārikīkān Cēiya Paḷiıy.”

‘ṭṭhi’ is changed to ‘ri’; ‘ti’ is changed to ‘ri’; ‘i’ ‘ā’ is changed to ‘lā’;—basic values are given to ‘na’ and ‘ya’ as in the rest.—He equates ‘ita’ with ‘ida’, modern Tamil ‘idu’, this; ‘tāntaiy’ with ‘tandēi’, father; ‘sālākān’ with ‘Syālaka’, brother-in-law, or ‘Ṣālikā’, an apartment, a room:—he also brings in a ‘mākan’ perhaps ‘son’, which occurs elsewhere. The meaning he gives to the passage is:

“This is the charity of the glorious chief Śrī-yakṣa karaṇī (by caste). This stone-excavation for a relic-chamber was made by Cārikan, the father of Iḷān-Cārikan and the brother-in-law of Nēḷuṇ-Cāriyan.”

My Reading.

kāṇiyanā natā sirī-yaku’anā dhamāma;
itā naṭīṇa catṭhiyānā sāi’ākānā Iḷāna
catikānā tāna-taiya; catikānā cē’iya
paḷiyya.

Skt. gaṇakānām nāṭhā (nām) Śrī-yakṣānām dharmam;
iddha (Pāli ‘here’) (itaḥ) nartinām sārthavābhakānām
Simhaḷānām śrēṣṭhikānām dāna-dēyam;
śrēṣṭhikānām caitya-pālikā.

“The gift of the prosperous yakṣas, the accountants? the gift of the Śrēṣṭhins or chiefs of the wandering traders of Ceylon who have camped here; the ‘caitya-pālikā’ or relic-monastery of (built by) the merchant-chiefs.”

’nata’ may be a scribal error for ‘nōtā’=Skt. snuṣā=daughter-in-law; see (B) below for ‘nīṭā’.

Mr. Krishna Sastri’s readings:

(B) Ka (ra) ñi ra n(ō) tā si ri ya ka (rū)
(C) cā na tā ri tā na ko tū pi tō nā
(D) (V)e ja a ānī ni kā mā tō ra kō tī (ō rā)
(E) (Ve ja (a) ānī ya ni kā mā t(ā) kō
(pō) ti ra (ya) kā si ti kā a (ri tē) a
sā tā nā pi nā ka ko tū pi tō na

Remarks: In ‘veḷa’ adaiyanikāmā the ‘y’ after ‘ai’ is superfluous, and occurs frequently in Tamil inscriptions after syllables ending in medial ‘ai’. ‘koṭūpitōṇā’ is from the root ekoṭu’. ‘nōtāsiriyaka’ and ‘natāsiriyaku’ are variants.—There seem to be three dots before ‘cha’ after ‘siri-
yakaru' in (B), but it is highly doubtful if they are to be taken so. 'a' and 'ra' at the end of (D) are engraved so close to each other that they may also be read as a broadly formed 'la', (but the text gives 'o' and not 'a'). No interpretation is attempted.

Mr. Subrahmanya Aiyar's emendation:

(B) Karanîra nōtā Sīri yakaru
(C) Cānātāritān koṭupitōn
(D) Veḷ ādai nikāmatōr koṭi'ōr
(E) Veḷ ādaiy nikāmatākō potir yakāsīti
   kā'arītāva Sāttan Piṇāka koṭupitōn

Meaning of (B) and (C)—"Caused to be excavated by the glorious chief Yakān Cānātāritān, a 'karāni' (by caste.)"
(D) "The citizens (or merchants) of Veḷaḍai cut it."
(E) "Yakṣāsitī, the daughter of a citizen of Veḷaḍai caused to be made (this cave) and Sāttan Piṇakkān had it cut."

This interpretation of Mr. Aiyar is on the same footing as the one given by him for (A) above.

My reading.

(B) karanīra n(o)ta siri-yaka-(rī)
(C) cāna tāritāna koṭupitōnā
(D) Veḷa-atṭaya nikāmatākō (pō)tira (ya)kāsīti kā'(rītē)'a
   sātnā piṇāka koṭupitōnā

Notes: Karaṇīra (karaṇa and -īra) where 'karaṇa' has in Prākṛt the meanings 'kṛti, kriyā, vidhāna' (Ṭhānaśasūta 3.1; Surasundarīcarī 4.24); or 'a court of justice' (Upadēśapada, 117); or 'one who does' (Kumāra-palācārita); any of these meanings suits here. '-ira' is a 'matup' suffix meaning 'having'. '-nōta' is from Skt. 'snuṣā'; 'son's wife'; 'nōha' in Mahārāṣṭrī Prākṛt.—'nōta', as Mr. Krishna Sastri suggests, may be a variant of 'nāta', Skt. 'nātha'. 'Sriyaka', Skt. Sri-yakṣa'—'rācina', Skt. 'rājñām', of kings, 'tāritānā' Skt. dāritānām or daridrāṇām, 'of those which have been excavated,' 'of the poor.'—'koṭupitōnā' =Skt. Kuṭṭāpitānām', 'of those which have been cut.'—'veḷa' may be connected with the Prākṛt 'veḷa' Skt. 'viḷāsa', pleasure; or 'veḷa' Skt. 'vidrāka', an excavator (Sūtra-kṛtānīdiryukti, 36), or Skt. 'vaikālika', 'belonging to the afternoon.' (Daśa-vai kalīkāmanīryukti, 1.5 : 2.17):—'attāya', Skt. 'arthāya', for the purpose of—'nikāmatā', a collection of Nāgamas or congregations of merchant guilds.—'kō', Skt. 'kṛtē', 'for the purpose of.' 'tā' is a suffix giving the meaning of 'a collection or congregation'—'pōtīra', Skt. 'putrī', or 'pautrī', daughter or grand-daughter.' 'Yakṣāsitī' may be a proper name or a common name from Skt. Yakṣa-stri, a Yakṣī or a merchant woman (cf. 'Yakṣa', who is always referred to as a merchant.) 'kā'arītē'ā', Skt. 'kāritavati'. 'sātānām', Skt. 'sārthavāhānam' for wander-
ing merchants,'—‘pināka’, Skt. ‘vināyaka’, (Vinayakī) a ‘yakṣa’, ‘yakṣīṇī’, (Paumacarī, 35, 22); ‘koṭūpitōnā’, Skt. kuṭṭapitānām’. (I do not accept the sonant ‘d’ in these records, and so, as elsewhere, I have read it as ‘ṭṭa’.)

The meaning of the inscription will be,—“The daughter-in-law of the king (honorific plural used) who had got this cave excavated and cut, the daughter of Yakṣastri (proper name) a ‘pināka’ or ‘yakṣīṇī’, had this done for all the congregations of wandering merchants as an afternoon (resting place.)

V. Between Kīlūr and Kī Avālavu.

Mr. Krishna Sastri’s reading:

ū pā chā a pō te ṇa ṭu là vō cchō
ko ṭu pā li ī

Notes: All the letters are in an inverted position to one who reads them from below, except ‘ṭe’ and ‘kō’—‘upāchā’a’, Skt. ‘upāḍhyāya’—‘vōccho’, Skt. ‘upāḍhyāya.’ The interpretation of the whole is not attempted.

Mr. Subrahmanya Aiyar’s emendation:

upāchā’a pōtā Neṭula-vōcchō koṭu pāli’i

Note: upācā’a’, Skt. ‘upāsaka.’ Meaning, “This is the cave cut by Neṭula-vōccan, the son of a lay devotee.”

My reading.

upācā’a pōta ṇatṭalā vocchō koṭu pāli’i
Skt. “upāḍhyāya-putraḥ nāṭyakar-ōpāḍhyāyaḥ kuṭṭapitā pālikā (ki o).
“The monastery that the instructor of dancers, the son of the teacher, got cut.”

VI. Karungalakudi Inscription.

Mr. Krishna Sastri’s reading:

(E) ṭh u rā ra a ri ti nā pā li
Note: ‘Eṭhuyarūra’ may be the name of a village.

Mr. Subrahmanya Aiyar’s emendation:

Eṭhu yarūra aritin pāli
“This is the cave of Āriti of Eṭṭiyūr.
My reading is the same as that of Mr. Krishna Sastri.
Skt. “Eṭhuyarūra Hāritānām pāli (ki ?)

VII. Mutṭupatṭi Inscription.

Mr. Krishna Sastri’s reading:

(A) Vi na tai ū ra
(B) Ca i ya ḷa nā
(C) kā vi ya
Mr. Subrahmanya Aiyar’s emendation:
Caiyāḷan Vinataiʿūra kāviy
“This is the cave of Caiyāḷan Vinataiʿūran.” (! ! !)
My emendation is:
Vinataiʿūra caiyaʿa ķena kāviya‘
“The small hollow cave-monastery of Vinataiʿūra.”

VIII. Siddharamalai Inscriptions.

Mr. Krishna Sastri’s readings:
(A) pō ti nā ḻ ra a tā na
(B) ku vi rā a (na) tai ve ya a tā na
(C) ku vi rā a na tai ve (ya) a tā na
(D) ti tō i la a tā na
(E) a na tai a ri ya
(F) ti a na tai (i ra) vā tā na
(G) ma dhi r(ā) a na tai (vi) su vā nā
(H) chā na tā na tai chā na tā na
(J) a na tai ve na tā a tā nā

Note: The frequent occurrence of the groups of letters ‘a ta na’ and ‘a na tai’ is noted. No interpretation of the record is given. Mr. Venkayya tried to explain ‘anatai’ as ‘the dwelling place of the Buddhist saints.’ (How?)

Mr. Subrahmanya Aiyar’s emendations.
A. “Pōtinūra’a tāna” “The gift of one belonging to Podinūr.”
B. Kuvira antai Vey-a tāna “This is the bed of Kuvira and the gift of Vey.”
C. Tiṭayila tāna “The gift of one belonging to Tiṭṭai.”
D. Antai Ari’ati “The bed of Ari’ati.”
E. Antai Irāvatān “This is the bed of Irāvatān.”
F. Matira Antai “This is the bed of one belonging to Madirei.”
G. Visuvān Cānatāntai antai “This is the bed of Visuvān Cānatān.”
H. Cānatān antai “This is the bed of Cānatān.”
J. Vēnatā’a tāna “This is the gift of Vēnatān.”

Where, and how, does ‘antai’ come to mean ‘a bed’? Is it because the inscription is found on a stone bed?

My reading is the same as that of Mr. Krishna Sastri, except that I would read the ‘dhi’ in G. as ‘ti’ with Mr. Aiyar.
A. Pōtinaʿūra’a tānā
Skt. “pōtinaʿūra-sya dānāni” “The gifts of the village Pōtinaʿūra.”
B. Kuvirā’ana tai
Skt. Kubērāṇām déyam, “The gift of the sect called the Kubēras.”
vēya’ā tānā, Skt. ‘vaiśyasya dānāni.’ The gifts of the merchant or
cultivator.”

C. Same as B.
D. From this, the lines run one into another.

D. and E. titōla’a tānā,—‘titō’illa’ may stand for Prākrit ‘tittilla’ meaning ‘dvārapāla, partihāra’, a doorkeeper, messenger, a ‘deśya’ word (Gāhā-
sattasaś, 556), or ‘tittha’ Skt. ‘Trṣṭha’, a congregation of Buddhist monks
and nuns (Viśēśaśvaśyakabhāśya, 1035):—The ‘a’ after ‘titō’illa’ stands for
the genitive singular termination ‘-sya’, and therefore the second meaning
alone suits here.


Meaning: “The gifts made to the congregation of Buddhist monks and
nuns.”

E. and F. ‘ariyati’ana tai, ‘Skt. ‘ārya-strīṇām dēyam’, ‘The gift of
the husband-women.’

F. and G. Irāvatāna Matirā’ana tai, Skt. ‘Irāvatānām mārīṇām dēyam.’
“The votive offering of the mothers of the Irāvata sect.”

G. and H. Visuvānā cānatānā tai, Skt. ‘visvānām jānapadānām
dēyam’. “The votive gift of the people of the all the villages.” Cf. Telugu
inscriptions: ‘nānā-desim-pekaṇḍru’ etc.

H. and J. Cānātānā ana tai, Skt. ‘jānapadānām anyad dēyam.’ “another
gift of the villagers.”

J. Venatā’t tānā, Skt. ‘Vinatāyā dānām,’ “The gifts of Vinatā (or of a
devotee).”

IX. Koṅgar Puḷ’iteṅgoḷam Inscriptions.

MR. KRISHNA SASTRI’s readings:
A. Ku tū ko tū pi tā vā nā ū pā
chā a nā (ū) pā (tū) va
B. Pā kā na ū ra pē tā nā pi
 tā nā i ta tā ve pō nā
C. (Ku) tū kō tā la ku (i) ta tā vi
nā chē tū a t(ā) nā lē nā

No interpretation of the whole is given.

MR. SUBRAHMANYA AIYAR’s emendation:
A. Kuṭu koṭipitāvān Upācā’an upārūvān
“The lay devotee Upārūvān caused the cave to be cut.”
B. Pākānūr-pōtātān Pīṭhān Itātāvē lēn
“This is the cave of Piḍān Itātāven, a resident of Pākānūr.”
C. Kuṭu koṭālaku Itātāvīn Cētu’atān lēn
“This is the cave of Itātāvin Cētu’atān, the excavator of caves.”
My reading is the same as that of Mr. Krishna Sastri, except that I think it is possible that his reading ‘tū’ may be ‘tā’.

A. Kuṭū koṭṭāpitavānā ūpācā’anā (ū pāṭūva: —Skt. Ūpātu’a kuṭū koṭṭāpitavān upādhyāyānām. ”Ūpātu’a had this excavation cut for the treasure.”

B. Pākānā’ura pēt (ā) tānā piṭānā itātāve pōnā
Skt. “Pākānā’ura vṛddhānām dānām piṭākānām hitārthāya pō (prō?) tānām.” “The gift of the elders of Pākānā’ura for the good (welfare, upkeep) of the ‘baskets of books’ (the collections of the sacred Buddhist scriptures) of the boys or pupils (the collection of sacred books or scriptures which have been displaced, or got confused in arrangement).”

C. kuṭū kōṭālakau itātāvi nā-çeṭṭa’a tānā lēnā.
Skt. “kōṣṭham kōṣṭhāgara-krītē hitārthāya; Jñāna-śrēṣṭhasya dānām layanam.”
“The apartment for the benefit of the library; the cave, the gift of Jñānaśrēṣṭha.”

X. Alagarmalai Inscriptions.

Mr. Krishna Sastri’s readings:

A. Mā ta ti (ai) yi pō nā ku la vā nā a (ta) nā a t(ā) nā
B. M(ā) ta ti rai ko (pā) pu vā nī ka nā
C. ya kā nā kō ṇa ti kā nā
D. Kā ṇa ka a t(ā) nā m(ō) ka nā a tā nā a tā nā
E. Sā (ma) mi si nā mi ta ti
F. Ku pā nī ti vā nī (ka) nā na ṇu ma lā nā
G. (vā nī) ka nā yu lā nā ta nā
H. Chi ka tţha mā tţu na tā nā tā ra a nī yā k(o) tū pō tā a va nā
J. A nā ka nā nā

Note: Inscriptions H. and J. are fragmentary, since they do not end with any mark of punctuation. Between (nā’ and ‘mī’ in E. and ‘rū’ and ‘pā’ in F., there is a space for one letter. The group of letters ‘māṭatirai’ occurs in A. and B. —‘vāṇikānā’ is probably to be connected with Skt. ‘vāṇik’ of Tamil ‘vaṇiyan’. No interpretation of the whole is given.

Mr. Subrahmanya Aiyar does not give the first five inscriptions mentioned above, but begins with ‘vāṇikānā’ in F. In the writings omitted, he perceives ‘mattirai’ which occurs several times and the names of two persons who, he thinks, are ‘Poṅgulavān’ and ‘Kūlavaṇika’ ‘dealers in gold and grains respectively. He emends the rest as follows:

Vāṇikan Neḍumalān; —Vāṇikan Yuḷnātan; —Cikaramāran tāṇa; —tāra’nī kuṭupita’avan; aṇkanam.

Of these, the first two, he thinks, are names of persons. The third means: “The gift of Cikaramāran. ‘Cikaramāran’ as a common name, he says, means “the glorious carpenter.” The meaning of the rest, in his opinion, is: “Tārakaṇi caused the cave (?) and the drain (?) to be made.”
My interpretation follows Mr. Krishna Sastri’s readings.

A. mātātiraiy-pōṇa kulavāṇā atanā’ā tānā
Skt. “Mātharaki-putrāṇām [pautraṇām(?), pōtānām(?)] kulapāṇām ādāṇāya [āsthāṇāya(?) āsthānasya(?)] dānāni.”

Meaning: “The gift of the sons (grandsons?) of Māṭharikī, the heads of the guild (kula), for food (for the guild?)”

B. mātātirai-ko pāpu vāṇikānā
Skt. Māṭharikī-krte pāpu, vāṇijām.

‘Pāpu’, I consider, is the Pāśāci Prākṛt form of ‘vāvaya’, a Dēśī word for ‘Āyukta, or grāma-mukhya’, an official, the headman of a village. (Deśī-nāmamālā, 7.55.)

Meaning: “The gift for the guild of Māṭhariki, given by the chiefs of the villages of the merchants.”

C. yakānā kōṇatikānā
Skt. “Yakṣāṇām Gōnardikānām.”

Meaning: “The gift of the merchants (yakṣa’s) who trade in bulls (who belong to the Gōnarda guild; who come from the Gōnarda hill)”

D. (i) kāṇaka’a tānā
Skt. “gaṇakasya dānāni”
“The gifts of the accountant.”

(ii) mōkanā atanā’ā tānā
Skt. “mōksāṇām āsthāṇāya dānāni.”

“Gifts for the institution of states of relief (from pain)”

E. and F. “sāma misinā mitati rupa niitī vāṇikanā naṭṭa-malāṇā.”
Skt. “samaya-misrēṇa maitri-rūpā niytiṇā vāṇijām naṣṭa-malāṇām.”

“The vow in the form of friendship mixed with faith in the ‘samaya’ or ‘Buddhist Dharma’, of the merchants who have their mala’s or impurities of the soul destroyed.”

G. and H. vāṇikānā yulanātana Cikaṭṭha-mātana tānā
Skt. vāṇijām yūtha (-yula)-nāthānām Śrīkaṇṭha (Cikaṭṭha-) māṭṛṇām dānāni.

“The gift of the merchants, the chiefs of the guilds (of the Yula-guild?) of the Śrīkaṇṭha-māṭṛ-gaṇa (Cikaṭṭha-māṭṛ-gaṇa.)

H and J. tāra’apiya kōṭū pōtā avanā’a nākanānā.
Skt. dāraka-gaṇikā koṭṭāpītā avanāya nāgininām

“The beloved of the excavator (had this) cut for the protection of the Nāginis.”

Nāga’s and Nāgini’s are frequently met with in Buddhist literature.
XI. Sittānavāsal Inscription.

Mr. Krishna Sastri’s reading:

E u mi nā t(u) ku mu ātha ū ra
pi dā na tā kā vu ti ī te nā ku
chi ū pō chi la ī ī ya rā che ya
tō a ti ū tā nā ma

Note: ‘nātu’ and ‘ūra’ denote the district and the village respectively. For Mr. Krishna Sastri’s first reading of this inscription and the emendation of the same by Mr. Subrahmanya Aiyar, see beginning of this paper.

Mr. Subrahmanya Aiyar fits in the following meaning into this inscription.

“Citupōcīl Īlayar made this ‘adhiṣṭānam’ (monastery) for Kāvuḍī Iten who was born at Kumuttūr, a village in Eōminādu.”

I would group the letters thus:

E’umi-nāṭṭa Kumutt’hūra -piṭṭānā tā-kā vuṭī itenāku
Citupōchīla Iḷāya-rācheyatō atiṭanāma
Skt. E’umi-nāṭṭa Kumutt’hūra piṭkānām trāṇa-kṛtē vṛddhi-hitēna-
krē Śimhaja-rajyataḥ adhiṣṭānam.

An institution of Kumutt’hūra in E’umināṭṭa from the kingdom of Ceylon for the protection and with the wish of the increase of the Pīṭaka’s (the three baskets or collections of Buddhist scriptures.)

XII. The Uṇḍāṅkal inscription

Mr. Subrahmanya Aiyar brought to light another inscription of this series from the cave known as Uṇḍāṅkal. He gives the following reading of the same.

(1) Antai Pikān Mākan Vēn tāna.
“This bed is the gift of Vēn, the son of Pikān.”

(2) Potilai Kuvīran : Vēn Kūvīra koṭupitān
‘Potilai Kūvīran’ is the name of the occupant of the cave.
“Vēn Kūvīran had it cut.”

In the absence of the impression of the original inscription and from the trend of the emendations of Mr. Aiyar of the rest of the inscriptions discussed above, I fancy the original to be:

(1) a na tai pi kā nā mā ka nā vē nā tā na
(2) pō ti lai ku vi ra nā ku vi ra nā ko ṭu pi tā

Tentative Sāṁskṛt rendering:

“anyad dēyaṃ bhikṣuṇām, mahatām vaiśyānām dānāni ; putraḥ
Kubērāṇām vaiśyaṇām Kubṭrapāṇām koṭṭapita (vā)”

‘Another gift for the Bhikṣuṣ ; the gift of the great householders, the merchants ; the son of the Kubēras, the merchant (householder)—Kubera, had it cut.”
Conclusion.

The above discussion leads us to the following conclusions.

1. Mr. Krishna Sastri had done well in giving us his readings and leaving them there when he could not give a cogent interpretation of the records. But he gave a wrong lead by identifying certain of the groups of letters as Tamil words. He failed to reconcile how Prākrit grammatical forms could be found side by side with those in Tamil.

2. Mr. Subrahmanya Aiyar made a mess of the whole lot of the inscriptions acting on the wrong lead given by Mr. Krishna Sastri concerning the existence of Tamil words. For his purpose of making them appear as complete Tamil records, he took undue and unwarranted liberty with them; he cut off vowels as well as consonants, added others, twisted some more, made wrong grouping of the letters, tried to force meanings into the words he had created, and when he failed to draw any sense out of them, as very often he could not draw, he was satisfied with saying that they are all proper names, names of persons or places.

3. It should be remembered that the inscriptions are in the Brāhmi script. All inscriptions in this script so far discovered have been only Prākrit records. The letters, except for two, in these epigraphs, are very clear and ably deciphered by Mr. Krishna Sastri. The existence of the two peculiar letters in these records should not lead one to suppose that they belong to a non-Prākrit scheme of letters. In fact, in these Brāhmi inscriptions, letters are found in certain of them which are not found in others, and certain letters acquire new and peculiar shapes.

4. The most peculiar feature of the epigraphs under discussion is that they contain a form of Prākrit described by the Prākrit grammarians as Paścāi. The Asokan edicts found at Shāhbazgarh and Mansēhra are considered to register a form of Prākrit which reveals a resemblance to Dardic forms, which Sir George A. Grierson has popularized as representing the old Paścāi dialects, but the present epigraphs are strikingly and more directly representative of the form of Paścāi known to the Indian grammarians.

The Pāṇḍya country, according to these grammarians, is a tract where the prevailing language is Paścāi. These inscriptions conform to their statement in a remarkable manner.
SPECIMENS OF ARTS ALLIED TO PAINTING
FROM WESTERN INDIA

By

M. R. MAJMUDAR

Poetry, music and dancing are inseparably associated with Western India school of painting. It will be interesting to refer here to certain minor arts more closely allied to painting, and more amenable to illustration.

One of these arts is the cutting of paper-stencils, as practised in the Vaiṣṇava temples of the Vallabhaścārya Sect in the north and west of India. These stencils are used in the preparation of temporary pictures upon smooth horizontal surface by means of coloured powders, or they are utilized just to transfer a design on cloth, or on paper or on smooth walls, by pouncing through a pricked or perforated original.

The specimens that are proposed to be introduced through this note are those dealing with the art of letter-writing; firstly in the style of the paper-stencil, and secondly in the style of figure-weaving in silk or cotton fibres.

This paper stencil specimen is No. 1305 of the Oriental Institute Collection, Baroda—acquired as early as 1912. The subject-matter of 10 paper folios of stencil work (Plate I) is the Sanskrit text of the Gitagovinda, done out of devotion and reverence for the Vaiṣṇava lyric of Jayadeva, by a member of the highest section of Brāhmīns in Gujarāt—the Nāgar Brāhmins of Vriddha-nagar—the modern Vadnagar in North Gujarāt.

The calligraphic artist is one Devakṛṣṇa, a resident of Natapadra—the modern Nadiād in Kairā District, Central Gujarat—who was a devotee of the feet of Viṣṇu. The text containing this personal reference to the Brāhmin artist is given on the 10th folio and reads as follows:

“‘इति श्री गी(१०) त्योपरि स्थवर गी(१०) ते समां संपूर्ण। अर्थसङ्ग्रहाः। सन्तप्त वास्तवम्
ब्रह्माचार्य विश्वविद्यालयान्तर्दूषणके देवकृष्णणे स्वयं स्तुतिः। रामायणसंस्कृतम्। श्री। १०।’

(PLATE I)

The size of each of the folios is $9\frac{1}{2}'' \times 4''$ and the rectangle containing the lettering measures $7\frac{1}{2}'' \times 2\frac{1}{4}''$, the remaining space being the margin, left out on all the four sides. It is meant to be read on one side only, like certain perforated designs and paintings.

The fourth folio (Plate Ia) is remarkable in one way, in that it illustrates the use of the copyist's device in cases of usual slips in writing, such as the
interchanging of letters—when the copyist does not erase or waste the paper, but puts the figures 1, 2 over such interchanged letters to guide the reader. Thus, instead of the word प्रवेठ in line 1, folio 4, it is inadvertently cut as प्रवेठ but this he corrects by the use of figures as प्रवेठ. It may be noted that the figures used are not Devanāgari, but are purely Gujarāti. The artist has used stars (•) to indicate either the pauses in, or the completion of a line of the stanza.

The other groups of specimens are the interesting examples of the art of figure-weaving or chequer-patterns in weaving.

These, as a class by themselves, show a higher stage in the process of weaving. Textiles of complex patterns and textures necessitated the more complicated apparatus, that must belong to a later stage in the evolution of the loom.

The weaver, due to the demand of variety, was called upon to furnish articles possessing diverse colourings and elaborate ornamentation. Accordingly, designs are woven as elaborate almost as those of the present day, with dragons, phænixes, mystical birds, forms, flowers and fruits.

The Chinese were the earliest inventors of figured silk-weaving. A scheme long maintained in Syria and Byzantine patterns was that of repeated roundels, within which subjects other than scriptural i.e. secular in nature were wrought, e.g. hunters on horse-back, fantastic animals and birds, singly or in pairs, confronting one another or back to back, frequently with a sacred tree device behind them.

To the influence of the early sporadic weavings that are traced out from China, Byzantine, Venice etc., we seem to trace a distinctive class of work, which was done by inmates of monasteries and convents, as well as their devout ladies in little looms, for use as stoles, maniples, orphreys and similar narrow bands or vestments.1

We have been fortunate to trace similar braids or narrow-bands done by Jaina monks or yatis, hailing from Western India.

Dr. A. K. COOMARASWAMY was the first art-critic to publish such braids in his “Catalogue of Indian Collection, Museum, Fine Arts, Boston, Part IV, Jaina Paintings and Mss, 1924.” One of these braids is dated Sarñvat 1766 (1710 A.D.). It is reproduced here (Plate II) to facilitate comparison with another braid, which is earlier in date and is published here for the first time.

Such cotton-braids were used mostly for tying up manuscripts. The cotton-braids reproduced in Plate II are blue and white, bordered with brownish red.

Plate I
Folios from a paper-stencil copy of the Gitagovinda.
[Oriental Institute Collection, Baroda.]

Plate Ia
The fourth folio of the paper-stencil copy, with a correction.
[Oriental Institute Collection, Baroda.]
The text woven in the braid, reads as follows; the metre is Duhā or Sorathiā Duhā:

पापपर्य परिहरितं, धरितं सुमं पंख पग ।
पर उपयाग विनिमित, कल्याणं मोहिः—मगं इ ॥ १ ॥
सदा अवक्षय (छ) त सितं, जु तारण तरण जग ।
अहिस्ते गुरुची सेवनं, भागिः कर्मेत्रागं ॥ २ ॥

१७६६

मै समुद्रयो निर्घराय, यह जग काचो काचसि ।
एकै रूप अपार, प्रतिबिंबित लक्षियत जगत ॥ १ ॥
संवत रस रस मुनि मही, दत्तायारुपुरा सुम पेत ।
कोर करी भगवू जती, पूज्य नारायण हेत ॥ २ ॥

१७६६

Translation:

"(A Guru) who forsakes the path of sin and sets his foot on the holy path,
Who tells the way of salvation, for others’ good,¹
Whose mind is ever not-wanting,² who is a saviour from the world,
Such a Guru serving, the thief of merit (demerit) runs away."²

(Sarñvat 1766)

"I clearly understood, after examination of this world;
God has but one transcendent form, the world is manifest as (His)
reflection."¹

In Sarñvat 1766, in the holy land of Ūsiārupur
Bhagat(u) Yati made this Kora in honour of the revered Nārāyaṇa."²

Even though, on the strength of the above couplets, the specimen has been classified as Jainia, it is doubtful whether the text can be taken positively to refer to Jainism. The words moṣa[maga [Sansk. Mokṣamārga; Prākrit mokkha magga]; Old Gujarāti mosa (kha) maga], karmaḥage and jati are equally applicable to Hinduism also. Moreover, the Bimbapratimatimbavāda put forward by Śaṅkarācārya is reflected here, which does not appear to be common in Jainism. Nārāyaṇa for whom the Kora is prepared is also a name seldom found among Jainas. It appears, therefore, that the Kora may have been prepared for any yati (a man with self-restraint) and not necessarily a Jainia Yati.

However, the next specimen (Plate III) is decidedly Jainia and has not a shadow of doubt, inasmuch as the lettering shows a clear salutation to the five-fold worthies of the Jaina clergy, the paṇcaparamaṣṭhīn: (1) the Arhat or the worthy Jina; (2) the Siddhas or the free souls; (3) the Ācāryas or the best in conduct; (4) the Upādhyāyas or the preachers of scriptures; and

---

1. This word avañcita is left out in the translation given by Dr. Coomaraswamy.
(5) all the Sādhus everywhere in existence or those who have achieved deli-
verance. These salutations are technically called the ‘pañca namaskāra’ (Sk.
namaskāra, Prakrit namokāro or namukkāro, Old Gujarāti navokkāra or
navakāra).

The woven letters read thus :

नमो अरिहंतारण । नमो सिद्धारण । नमो आयरियाण ।
नमो उवशाराण । नमो लोहे सवभ साहुरण । संवत
1329 वर्ष महाराजा वदि ५ दिने । ग्रहा ।
मनाहिर पाठिक्षका ।

The style of putting mātrā on the left side of the letter, instead of on the
top, mostly found in Mss. copied in the Jainas style and known as pratimātrā,
or prṣṭamātrā is adopted in the present instance. This piece is further
remarkable, because it furnishes information about the calligraphic artist
who wove the braid on the 5th of the dark half of Bhādrapada, in the Sārvat
year 1739 (1683 A.D.). The name of the Jainas clergy (Rṣi) is Manohara.

This strip measuring 11'6" long and 7" broad, has letters woven in
deep red, on a yellow background.

The weaving artist of this as well as the previous braid did not rest
satisfied with the lettering device; he has indulged in adorning his piece with
figures and designs of elaborate ornamentation, more or less of a secular
nature.

This braid (Plate III) shows the designs of the following objects: a
triśūla (trident), a sword, a boat, a palanquin, a fan, a moat, a writing
wooden-board, and a hanging lamp.

The braid noticed above (Plate II) has also the designs of peacocks
seated on a tree, at the right hand corners. The other designs are a svastika,
a jar, a tree, a temple and other floral designs of creepers etc.

The third piece of braid (Plate IV) though measuring only 4' long and
7" broad, at the Baroda Museum, is very interesting in that the subject-
matter of its lettering is purely Hindu or Brahmanical. It contains the
sacred Gāyatrī—a prayer to Sūrya, the lord of glorious light, with the three
Vyāhṛtis. It also contains the twelve-lettered Mantra—(called dvādaśaṅkṣara
mantra), an invocation to Vāsudeva Kṛṣṇa.

The text, contained in the Kora, noted as yajñopavīta in the register
of the Baroda Museum, is written in panels or two lines, and is as under :

“ॐ नमः भगवते
बालपालस्य ।
ॐ भू सुभवः स्वः । तत्सिद्धिविवेंन्यं भगेः देवस्य धि ( धि ) माहि ।
धी यो यो न: प्रचीर्यास्तः ।
ॐ नमः नारायणाय । ओऽ श्रीकृष्णाय नमः ।
ॐ नमः नारायणाय । ओऽ श्रीकृष्णाय नमः ।”
PLATE III
A cotton-braid with woven letters, dated Samvat 1739.

PLATE IV
A braid with Gāyatrī woven in it.
The text just referred to above is sacred to all Varna-Hindus—both Smārta and Vaiṣṇava.

The two specimens that we are now going to notice are not mere narrow strips or braid, but are a sort of letter-weaving on a large scale. The lettering is done in white, the background being deep red.

Plate V shows a cap, big enough to cover the ears fully and the back portion of the head up to the neck. Generally such caps are worn by sādhus and mahants. The cap appears to have been prepared out of a piece of silk-cloth, which has the text of a four-verse Stotra composed by Vallabhācārya (b. 1479, d. 1529, A.D.) called ‘Catuṣṭīlokī’.

The portion of the text from the cap, so spread as to make the back visible, goes after the ‘catuṣṭīlokī-Bhāgavata’, the text of Vallabha’s Stotra, which reiterates the worship of God Kṛṣṇa, with all possible devotion:

“सल्लोक में (भ) जनीयो क्षालनः।
स्वस्मयेव देवों हि नान्यः कापि कदाचन || 1 ||
एवं सदा स्वक्तवेध्य स्मयेव करिष्यति।
प्रेमः सर्वस्मयथं हि ततो निभितं(त)तो ब्रजेत || 2 ||
सदि भ्रोमोकलाओयो एता: सवोमना हृदि।
तत्: किमपरं ह्रूषि वैसकः: कृत्तिस्तिं || 3 ||
अति: सवोमना शक्ति गोकुलितंशाण्योः।
स्मरणे भजनं चापि न त्याज्यितं मे मलि:” || 4 ||
इति काल्माचार्यः।

Vallabha, the expounder of Śuddhādvaita philosophy of Vaiṣṇavism has a large following in Western India, especially in Rajputānā and Gujarāt. It is however not possible to assign the date of the article, which has been acquired by the Baroda Museum from some place in Southern Rajputānā. It must, however, be not less than two hundred years old.

The last mention of a Śaivite specimen completes almost the Hindu pantheon as represented in weaving-patterns. This article in the form of a Gau-mukhī (Plate VI) or a cow-mouth shaped right-angle bag, is used by a devotee to mutter his mantras with the help of a rosary, which is kept in the right-angle bag along with the hand.

The designs in the lettering are the līṅga-yoni device placed as full points, sometimes with a triśūla. The text contains salutation to the various-named Śiva, Pārvatī and Gaṇeśa.

Closely allied in effect to the stencils and the ornamental weaving on small looms is the printing of letters on cloth, just as the cloth with names of Rāma which is known as “Rāma-nāmi” cloth. But we have not come across such a specimen from this part of India.

The cumulative effect of the various specimens noticed in this note is that the complex patterns and the elaborate ornamentation in weaving was prac-
tised as an art of no mean value among the masses, as well as the enlightened clergy, in Western India.
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PLATE VI

A Gau-mukhi (a right-angle bag) with Saivite text woven in it.

[From Baroda Museum Collection.]
KAUTSAVYĀKARĀNA: A DETAILED NOTICE
RECOVERY OF KAUTSA'S AUTHORSHIP

By

SADĀSHIVA L. KĀTRE

The MS entitled Kautsavāyakaraṇa, shortly noticed by me in the October 1937 issue of JRAS (p. 731), comes from the collection of one Bālaśāstri GARDE who lived at Gwalior about a hundred years ago and seems to have been very fond of stocking old or transcribed MSS of works on diverse subjects. A few years ago, however, a considerable portion of his collection was actually immersed into a well by the last surviving lady of his line, possibly in a fit of despair, but, thanks to the timely intervention of some authorities of Gwalior State, the remnant could be rescued and deposited at the Oriental Manuscripts Library of Ujjain maintained by the State.

The MS under question (Accession No. 3576) contains in all twelve straw-paper folios of the size $11\frac{3}{4} \times 6$ inches. Of these, two are covering leaves reading the beginning and the end respectively (viz., "अथ कौतस्याकरण-ग्रामः" and "इति कौतस्याकरण समासम्") of the work on the middle of their external sides. The remaining ten folios contain the text, commencing with the second part of folio 1 and concluding on the fourth line of the second part of folio 10. Each side of the written folios leaves a margin of about $1\frac{1}{2}$ inches on all sides and, with the exception of folio 10th, uniformly contains eight lines of about forty letters each. The abbreviated form "कौसस्यान्" of the title, along with the number of the folio, is noted on the left-side margin of the second page of each folio. The MS is written in dark black ink and in Devanāgarī script and the handwriting, as also the general condition of the MS, is good. Although the scribe's name and age are not mentioned, the MS must be about two centuries old on account of its possession by the said Bālaśāstri GARDE who, under his signature and in a handwriting quite different from that of the scribe of the text, has also added some literary and personal matter, both in Sanskrit and in Marathi, subsequent to the fourth line of folio 10th.

The work consists of four chapters (Adhyāyas), each chapter being sub-divided into four quarters (Pādas). The Sūtras, though not punctuated, are numbered at distances and their sum-total is given at the close of each quarter and chapter. Each chapter begins with "हरिः अः" and each subsequent quarter with "अः". The MS evidently contains only the text without commentary; but, here and there, in margins and above or below some lines, are found subsequently inserted a number of notes explaining or illustrating some Sūtras. A few original readings of the text also appear to have been subsequently emended.
The title “Kautsavyākaraṇa” at once aroused my curiosity, my previous information being that no work ascribed to the celebrated Kautsa has been known to be extant and that our scanty knowledge about him is derived solely from quotations and allusions in his successors’ works. Thanks are mainly due to my friend and teacher Prof. K. Chattopādhyāya of the Sanskrit Department of the Allahabad University who first brought to my notice that the work, despite the difference in title and ascription, was identical with what Whitney published in 1862 (JAOS, Vol. VII) as Atharvaśṛeda-Prātiśākhyā on the basis of a solitary MS in the Berlin Library in the last colophon of which the work was termed as Saunakīya Caturādhāyikā and which also contained a commentary termed as Caturādhyāyībhāṣya. Nevertheless, the discovery of our present MS is not without its own importance, as it still helps us in arriving at a new and important results regarding the work, its authorship, etc.

On a close comparison of our MS with Whitney’s text I was able to trace out a number of deviations in reading and other divergences and also to recover several Sūtras missing in the Berlin MS, as will be found noted in Appendix A below. It is not possible here to comment individually on these divergences. It may, however, be pointed out that in many cases our MS presents readings that appear to be preferable to those in the Berlin MS adopted by Whitney—e.g., i.34, i.94, ii.53, ii.59, ii.100, iii.33, iii.53, iii.55, iv.93, iv.107, etc. Next, in some cases at least, our MS removes the difficulties felt by Whitney on account of the readings in the Berlin MS—e.g., i.66, ii.53, iii.86, iv.65, iv.93, etc. Further, while in some cases (e.g., iii.29, iv.93, etc.) our MS supports Whitney’s emendations of readings in the Berlin MS, in other cases (e.g., prior to i.1; i.25, i.82, iii.60, etc.) it renders them baseless, though sometimes plausible.

The importance of our MS further lies in the fact that it restores several Sūtras missing in the Berlin MS. As noted by Whitney on pages 141 and 177, the scribe of the Berlin MS has distinctly indicated the gap twice by means of a lacuna. In the first case, i.e., after iii.28, the Sūtras recovered are “त्राक्त” and “सप्तसंयमं ” along with the part “त”, already guessed by Whitney, of iii.29 (“न विस्रजनीयः ”). In the second case, i.e. after iii.80, they are “नसय ” “तान्तृत्योऽक्रमं पारंतरत”, “उद्वधात्रत्याविद्वादिनाम् ” and “निमातस्य सः ” (emended as “निमातस्य ”). However, there appear to be three more gaps in the Berlin MS not possibly indicated by the scribe and in two of these cases not even detected by Whitney. The first is after iii.85 where the Sūtra restored by our MS is “प्र मन्त्रम् ”. The second is after iii.86 where the Sūtra restored by our MS is “नमः ”. In both these cases the gap was not detected by Whitney. The third is after iv.93 where the Sūtra restored by our MS is “रध्ययायम् ”. In this case, too, the gap is not possibly indicated by the scribe of the Berlin MS nor was it detected by Whitney on the spot. But Whitney’s note on page 231 (vide Appendix A below) obviously suspects,
as an alternative, the loss of such a Sūtra somewhere in the chapter in the Berlin MS. Our MS confirms this suspicion of WHITNEY and renders unnecessary his alternative conjectures to do away with his difficulty.

A very remarkable feature of our MS is, as will be clear enough from Appendix A below, that it presents as part of the text proper many long and short passages, both metrical and prose, which WHITNEY regards as forming part of the commentary contained in the Berlin MS and, in some cases, as quoted by the commentator from some previous authority—i.e., after i.105, prior to iii.55, after iii.74 and prior to iv.1. We do not know on what grounds WHITNEY allotted these passages to the commentary instead of to the text proper. In fact, there is not the slightest indication in our MS of the text being intermingled with a commentary. On its authority, one cannot but locate these passages in the original text and remark that even if some of them be quotations from some predecessors' works, they are quoted as such by the original author himself. The passages concerned have even been counted as groups of Sūtras in the enumerations of Sūtras found at the close of the respective quarters and chapters in our MS. This is really a very important point necessitating a reinvestigation of the Berlin MS from this point of view.

I may, however, add here that our MS thus incorporates as part of the text proper only the four passages mentioned above. There are many other similar passages quoted by WHITNEY as part of the said commentary which have not at all found place in our MS, e.g., after i.8 (quoted on page 14), after i.10 (quoted on page 261), etc.

If we regard these four passages as part of the text proper, then the work in all explicitly refers once to Śākaṭāyana, twice to Anyatāreya and twice to Śaṅkhāmitri.

I quote below in Appendix B all the colophons in our MS along with the corresponding ones in the Berlin MS as noted by WHITNEY. Each colophon in our MS contains a separate enumeration of Sūtras for each quarter and chapter while the last colophon also notes the sum-total of Sūtras of all the four chapters. The Berlin MS, on the other hand, gives the enumeration in some cases only and, when it does, it carries on the same to the end of the Chapter. The difference in the number of Sūtras, when it occurs, is obviously due to some Sūtras missing in the Berlin MS and WHITNEY's publication and, further, the above-mentioned four detailed passages being treated there as distinct from the text proper.

The importance of our MS from the textual point of view will be clear enough from the foregoing treatment. Yet its outstanding importance lies in its raising the issue of the authorship of the work. Appendix B below will show that the four chapter colophons of our MS describe the work as Caturādhīyikā (= Treatise in Four Chapters) forming part of, or embodying, Kautsavyākarana (= Kautsa's Grammar) belonging to the Atharvaveda.
The title-page and marginal headings, too, all note "Kautsavyākaraṇa" as the title of the work which consequently seems to be based on sound tradition. Our MS thus distinctly points to Kautsa as the author of the work. It may be that the present work forms part of a major grammatical treatise ascribed to Kautsa.

The title "Saunakīya Caturādhyāyikā" is found, on the other hand, only in the last concluding colophon of the Berlin MS. Consequently, the ascription of the work to Saunaka based on this unseized solitary evidence stands on a very weak ground.

Internal evidence also possibly goes against the ascription of the treatise to Saunaka. The Sūtra I.8—

"प्रथमान्तरि तृतीयायानामि धीमहि भूति प्रतिपातं, न प्रति:।"

makes a third-person allusion to Saunaka and refers to a precept of his, of which, as explained by Whitney, the binding authority is denied. It possibly still remains undecided as to which work of Saunaka is cited here. As Whitney says, the Rk-Prātiśākhya, which is traditionally ascribed to Saunaka, cites Gārgya as holding the opinion embodied in the above-mentioned precept of Saunaka, without exclusively identifying itself in decisive words with that opinion. Whichever work of Saunaka might have been meant by our author, the form of the Sūtra quoted above seems to go against Saunaka's authorship of the present work. We little expect that a celebrated author would, in a work of his own, thus exhibit the non-observance of a dictum laid down by himself elsewhere, although it is not unusual to find an author alluding to himself in the third person. It thus seems inconsistent to attribute the present treatise to Saunaka. As such, its ascription to Kautsa is certainly justified on the authority of the colophons in our MS as shown above.

I have, however, not been able to locate in the present work any words or views ascribed to Kautsa in Yāska's Nirukta I.15, Āśvalāyana's Śrautasūtra I.2.5 and VII. 1.19, Āpastamba's Dharmasūtra I.19.4 and I.28.1, Lātiyāyana's Śrautasūtra X.2.9 and Hemādri's Pariśeshakhaṇḍa II. 251. This may lead some scholars to distinguish the present Kautsa from his namesake referred to in the above-mentioned works. However, there is every possibility of the same Kautsa having composed more works than one and of the said quotations referring to his own other works. Even the present work is likely to be, as I have shown above, a part of Kautsa's major work.

At any rate, our author certainly seems to be identical with the Kautsa mentioned by Patañjali in his Mahābāhāṣya III.2.108 "उपस्थितवाः कौतस: पाठनिम् इति" (Kielhorn's edition, Vol. II, page 115, lines 17-20) as having studied under Pāṇini. Pāṇini's influence on our author can be easily detected through the numerous identical and parallel Sūtras in the Aṣṭā-

1. "That the words thus declared to end in first mutes end rather in thirds is Saunaka's precept, but not authorized usage."—Whitney's translation.
dhīyāyī and the present work. These affinities render the identity of our author almost certain with the Kautsa mentioned by Patañjali as a disciple of Pāṇini.

If our author comes out to be identical with his namesake mentioned by Yāska, then it would unmistakably reverse the popular chronology of Yāska and Pāṇini. The said identity, however, is still to be proved and I hope fresh substantial contributions would be forthcoming on this subject from scholars.

Some of Whitney’s other remarks too, in connection with the present work, require substantial modification in the new light. That the present treatise belongs to the Atharvaveda is substantially proved by the colophons of our MS, but the title “Atharvaveda-Prātiṣākhya” Whitney gave to it is no more justified. Another work in three Adhyāyas bearing that title, which Whitney in 1862 regarded as almost impossible to discover, has already been discovered and since published by V. B. Śāstrī at Lahore. Further, the subject-matter of the present treatise entitles it to be called a Vedic Vyākaraṇa rather than a Prātiṣākhya with no less justification than the Vedic portion of Pāṇini’s Aśṭādhyaśī.

### APPENDIX A

*(Deviations in Reading and other Divergences.)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Whitney’s No.</th>
<th>Whitney’s Reading.</th>
<th>Kautsa Reading.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Chapter I</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prior to i. 1.</td>
<td>श्रीगणेशायनम्-हरि: ओम्</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. 4.</td>
<td>अनुकूल खरें: पदः</td>
<td>अथागिरसः:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. 13.</td>
<td>अनुद्धताकर्तचत: पदः</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. 19.</td>
<td>नधो चोपतवस्तःरेशु</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. 25.</td>
<td>कष्टायनामकर्षणः:</td>
<td>नधो चोपतवस्तःरेशु</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. 30.</td>
<td>अङ्गायुनीमा:यमः</td>
<td>कष्टायनामकर्षणः:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. 34.</td>
<td>एकारिकायोविविधतमः:</td>
<td>एकारिकायोविविधतमः:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. The Oriental MSS Library of Ujjain, too, has stocked an old MS of the same work designated as *Atharvaveda-Pārṣada-Prātiṣākhya*.
2. Whitney’s emendation of “अथागिरसः” (Page 245, “The last word is, as I cannot doubt, a copyist’s error for “अथागिरसः”) is quite uncalled for.
3. This is Whitney’s emendation. From his footnote the Berlin MS seems to agree here with our MS.
4. This appears to be an emended reading in our MS.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Whitney’s No.</th>
<th>Whitney’s Reading.</th>
<th>Kautsa Reading.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>i. 54.</td>
<td>पदान्ते च   II</td>
<td>पादान्ते च</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. 66.</td>
<td>लकारस्य रेकः: पादमुर्गितमेव- मादीनाम् 1 II</td>
<td>लकारस्य रेकः: पादमुर्गितमेव- मादीनाम् 1 II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. 68.</td>
<td>योजयातां च II</td>
<td>परोपमानती च</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. 77.</td>
<td>अस्य युजेम् लेम् मे: इति चोदाता: II</td>
<td>अस्य युजेम् लेम् मे: इति चोदाता: II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. 82.</td>
<td>आत्म इवादिविभावित: 2 पर: II</td>
<td>आत्म इवादिविभावित: 2 पर: II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. 85.</td>
<td>पांलुक्मसादीनाम् II</td>
<td>पांलुक्मसादीनाम् II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. 94-95.</td>
<td>सोप्याणिः पूर्वथासांतथा II आन्तवैं</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. 102.</td>
<td>अन्यायास्मच्याने: चतुर्थमेवम् वा II</td>
<td>अन्यायास्मच्याने प्रथमचतुर्थम् मुतम् वा 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. 104.</td>
<td>पूर्वस्वरे संयोजामिचातथा II</td>
<td>पूर्वस्वरे संयोजामिचातथा (Part of the commentary contained in the Berlin Ms.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>After i. 105.</td>
<td>(Part of the Text proper)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chapter II

| ii. 3.        | पदान्ते चायोन: II | पदान्ते वायोन: 4 |
| ii. 15.       | तात्मां समाल्प्ये नवगाहास्य पूर्वस्वस्थान: II | तात्मां समाल्प्ये 5 नवगाहास्य पूर्वस्वस्थान: |
| ii. 16.       | शकाराजामान्यस्तेपापः II | शकार उत्तरे नानायापदेपः II |

1. Vide Whitney’s note on page 48—"It is not in accordance with the usage of our treatise elsewhere to give, in citing a word or phrase in a rule, another form than that which it actually has in the text: we should have expected here पदमुर्गितमेव- मादीनाम्. " Obviously the Kautsa reading removes Whitney’s difficulty.
2. This is Whitney’s emendation. From his footnote the Berlin MS seems to agree here with our MS.
3. This appears to be an emended reading in our MS.
4. This appears to be an emended reading in our MS.
5. This appears to be an emended reading in our MS.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ii. 26.</td>
<td>नकारस्य चतुर्भोगेयधोपेय्यनूः प्यरंतु विस्तुभाषीयः ॥</td>
<td>नकारस्य चतुर्भोगेयः</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii. 32.</td>
<td>अन्त्वोपमेतो होप: ॥</td>
<td>अन्त्वोपमेतो होप: ॥</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii. 47.</td>
<td>एकामण्डिते श्री दिव्यवनान्तस्य ॥</td>
<td>एकामण्डिते श्री दिव्यवनान्तस्य</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii. 53.</td>
<td>अकारोपस्थायोकारोकारे ॥</td>
<td>अकारोपस्थायोकारोकारे ॥</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii. 59.</td>
<td>दीर्घौकलायाधिषु ॥</td>
<td>दीर्घौकलायाधिषु च</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii. 73.</td>
<td>पितु: पितारि ॥</td>
<td>पितुष्टिति ॥</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii. 75.</td>
<td>आयु: प्रयमे ॥</td>
<td>आयुप्रयमे ॥</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii. 77.</td>
<td>परिच: पताती ॥</td>
<td>परिच्छषाती ॥</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii. 82.</td>
<td>सोहे: साह्मुस्य ॥</td>
<td>सोहे: साह्मुस्य ॥</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii. 85.</td>
<td>तत्तानानाधिषु च ॥</td>
<td>तत्तानानाधिषु च ॥</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii. 86.</td>
<td>स्तुत्सत्सपिषु ॥</td>
<td>स्तुत्सत्सपिषु ॥</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii. 87.</td>
<td>नामकरेश्चपकारस्य ॥</td>
<td>नामकरेश्चपकारस्य ॥</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii. 92.</td>
<td>स्त्राहिहििचिनामकार्यवचयावे उनपिं ॥</td>
<td>स्त्राहिहििचिनामकार्यवचयावे उनपिं</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii. 100.</td>
<td>बहिपुष्पमुदिभिविधीति ॥</td>
<td>बहिपुष्पमुदिभिविधीति ॥</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii. 105.</td>
<td>परे: स्तुताते: ॥</td>
<td>परे: स्तुताते: ॥</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii. 107.</td>
<td>असे स्याम प्रत्यत्व: ॥</td>
<td>असे स्याम प्रत्यत्व: ॥</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chapter III

| iii. 3.      | व्यववत्तर्युः ॥ | व्यववत्तर्युः ॥ |
| iii. 6.      | जीवितोपपस्यै ॥ ॥ | जीवितोपपस्यै ॥ ॥ |
| iii. 20.     | रलये ॥ | रलये पूर्वस्य ॥ |
| iii. 25.     | अर्ध लंसधि: परस्वमुः ॥ | अर्ध लंसधि: परस्वमुः ॥ |
| After iii. 28.| (Missing in the Berlin Ms.⁵) | छकारस्य चिप्तवत्तादिखिः पूर्वाः पुरानः ॥ |

3. Vide Whitney's note (page 141) — "Then follows a lacuna in the manuscript, of some extent and importance, since it certainly includes one or more rules ........." The ending "न" of the recovered portion is part, already guessed by Whitney, of the Sūtra iii.29 "न विसर्जनीयः ".

1. Vide Whitney's note. The Kautsa reading agrees with the other Prātiśāhkhyas cited by Whitney.

2. According to Whitney's note, the commentary in the Berlin MS. is here identical with the Kautsa reading.

3. Vide Whitney's note (page 141) — "Then follows a lacuna in the manuscript, of some extent and importance, since it certainly includes one or more rules ........." The ending "न" of the recovered portion is part, already guessed by Whitney, of the Sūtra iii.29 "न विसर्जनीयः ".
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Whitney's No.</th>
<th>Whitney's Reading</th>
<th>Kautsa Reading</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prior to iii. 55.</td>
<td>(Part of the commentary contained in the Berlin Ms.)</td>
<td>(Part of the Text proper)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii. 55.</td>
<td>(Part of the commentary contained in the Berlin Ms.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii. 56.</td>
<td>(Part of the commentary contained in the Berlin Ms.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii. 60.</td>
<td>(Part of the commentary contained in the Berlin Ms.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii. 62.</td>
<td>(Part of the commentary contained in the Berlin Ms.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii. 65.</td>
<td>(Part of the commentary contained in the Berlin Ms.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii. 71.</td>
<td>(Part of the commentary contained in the Berlin Ms.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>After iii. 74.</td>
<td>(Part of the commentary contained in the Berlin Ms.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. This appears as an emended reading in our MS.
2. This is Whitney's emendation. From his note the Berlin MS. seems to agree here with our MS.
3. This appears as an emended reading in our MS.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>After iii. 80.</td>
<td>(Missing in the Berlin Ms. 1)</td>
<td>यहिष्ठवरीभावः कर्गमित्वर्धाताकारस्य विया न विचारे यथः-हिष्ठवरीभाव (??) शुःश्रेयःपदातनविष्णविनित्वं मात्राकारः काठः।</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii. 83.</td>
<td>पूर्णः</td>
<td>नस्य कातिलभत्वत्कारात् उक्तार्य- त्यानी निपतस्य सः (later emended as निपतस्यः।)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>After iii. 85.</td>
<td>(Not found in the Berlin Ms. and not detected by Whitney.)</td>
<td>पूर्णः: प्र मिनाति</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii. 86.</td>
<td>न मिनाति 2</td>
<td>Originally न मिनाति, later emended as न मिनाति:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>After iii. 86.</td>
<td>(Not found in the Berlin Ms. and not detected by Whitney.)</td>
<td>नमः</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii. 89.</td>
<td>पदान्तस्वच्छ्वयुक्तस्य: Pandāntasya svacchvayukto</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii. 95.</td>
<td>पदेनालाभ्यज्ञेन</td>
<td>पदेनालाभ्यज्ञेन</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chapter IV

Prior to iv. 1. | (Part of the Commentary contained in the Berlin Ms.) | (Part of the Text proper contained in the Berlin Ms.)

समासां समासविविधामयादेव यथोवाच च्रेद्वति शालकात:। तथा प्रवश्यामि चतुर्यः पदे नामान्यतोपप्रावत्तिनिपतातानां आहायं यथक्षावाची नाम सचय स्मृतिः प्राप्तं येव उपग्रह्यं निपाताताय सवरस्त्रवत् प्राप्तं प्रायः। यस्मात् नाचार्यानां समर्थे प्रकृतिस्वरूपः। न समांत्रितिमिष्यते नामान्यतें प्रकृति-<ref>
1. Vide Whitney's note (page 177), "Here follows a lacuna, apparently of considerable extent etc."
2. On iii.86 Whitney remarks, "The manuscript reads minānti instead of mināti, and the final repetition of the rule before its successor is wanting." The scribe of the Berlin MS. seems to have erroneously combined into one the two Sūtras "प्र मिनाति" and "न मिनाति".

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Whitney’s No.</th>
<th>Whitney’s Reading.</th>
<th>Kautsa Reading.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prior to iv. 1. (continued)</td>
<td>युमदसर्वनानिन्न दार्शनिति प्रकृतियों का नाम वाक्यरूपों वाले नाम चेत्तायुद्धात्ते। किया: समासो याबाहु: समासाः साधुस्वात्मकः समस्यिते।</td>
<td>स्वरूप गतिरूध्वो वा नाम चेत्तायुद्धात्ते किया: समासो याबाहु: समासाः साधुस्वात्मकः समस्यिते।</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>यार्यानेरुकोलुचोऽक्षति परं प्रकृतिस्वरूपोऽक्षति। आश्वयायं नाम वा तस्मात्स्वरूपोऽक्षति समस्येते। सोर्पसि तु यथा: पूज्ये यथा: परम्परा: उदात्तेष्व तथा समस्येते।</td>
<td>यार्यानेरुकोलुचोऽक्षति। आश्वयायं नाम वा तस्मात्स्वरूपोऽक्षति समस्येते। सोर्पसि तु यथा: पूज्ये यथा: परम्परा: उदात्तेष्व तथा समस्येते।</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>उदात्तु निपितात: त्योऽक्षतेत: कथिरवेत:। समस्येते तथा विविध्यत्तिथिहसो विदेशसम्यकः। नन्दायानो तस्मात्स्वरूपोऽसुर्यस्वामिरुष्टादहरेत। सहेवनेरुकोलुचोऽक्षते।</td>
<td>उदात्तु निपितात: त्योऽक्षतेत: कथिरवेत:। समस्येते तथा विविध्यत्तिथिहसो विदेशसम्यकः। नन्दायानो तस्मात्स्वरूपोऽसुर्यस्वामिरुष्टादहरेत। सहेवनेरुकोलुचोऽक्षते।</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>अनुदेशन चोदांत्स्वाभावो यथा वौच्यते। सहस्रसंग्रहाय: सात्त्रेयाः शतकरो निवेदयोऽक्षति।</td>
<td>अनुदेशन चोदांत्स्वाभावो यथा वौच्यते। सहस्रसंग्रहाय: सात्त्रेयाः शतकरो निवेदयोऽक्षति।</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>अनुदेशन तु गतिरूढऽपूर्ववर्तिकेश्वरी। पूर्ववर्तिकेश्वरी। पूर्ववर्तिकेश्वरी। पूर्ववर्तिकेश्वरी। पूर्ववर्तिकेश्वरी। पूर्ववर्तिकेश्वरी। पूर्ववर्तिकेश्वरी। पूर्ववर्तिकेश्वरी। पूर्ववर्तिकेश्वरी। पूर्ववर्तिकेश्वरी। पूर्ववर्तिकेश्वरी।</td>
<td>उदात्तु गतिरूढऽपूर्ववर्तिकेश्वरी। पूर्ववर्तिकेश्वरी। पूर्ववर्तिकेश्वरी। पूर्ववर्तिकेश्वरी। पूर्ववर्तिकेश्वरी। पूर्ववर्तिकेश्वरी। पूर्ववर्तिकेश्वरी। पूर्ववर्तिकेश्वरी। पूर्ववर्तिकेश्वरी। पूर्ववर्तिकेश्वरी। पूर्ववर्तिकेश्वरी।</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>उदात्तु गतिरूढऽपूर्ववर्तिकेश्वरी। पूर्ववर्तिकेश्वरी। पूर्ववर्तिकेश्वरी। पूर्ववर्तिकेश्वरी। पूर्ववर्तिकेश्वरी। पूर्ववर्तिकेश्वरी। पूर्ववर्तिकेश्वरी। पूर्ववर्तिकेश्वरी। पूर्ववर्तिकेश्वरी। पूर्ववर्तिकेश्वरी। पूर्ववर्तिकेश्वरी।</td>
<td>उदात्तु गतिरूढऽपूर्ववर्तिकेश्वरी। पूर्ववर्तिकेश्वरी। पूर्ववर्तिकेश्वरी। पूर्ववर्तिकेश्वरी। पूर्ववर्तिकेश्वरी। पूर्ववर्तिकेश्वरी। पूर्ववर्तिकेश्वरी। पूर्ववर्तिकेश्वरी। पूर्ववर्तिकेश्वरी। पूर्ववर्तिकेश्वरी। पूर्ववर्तिकेश्वरी।</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>गतिरूढऽपूर्ववर्तिकेश्वरी। पूर्ववर्तिकेश्वरी। पूर्ववर्तिकेश्वरी। पूर्ववर्तिकेश्वरी। पूर्ववर्तिकेश्वरी। पूर्ववर्तिकेश्वरी। पूर्ववर्तिकेश्वरी। पूर्ववर्तिकेश्वरी। पूर्ववर्तिकेश्वरी। पूर्ववर्तिकेश्वरी। पूर्ववर्तिकेश्वरी।</td>
<td>गतिरूढऽपूर्ववर्तिकेश्वरी। पूर्ववर्तिकेश्वरी। पूर्ववर्तिकेश्वरी। पूर्ववर्तिकेश्वरी। पूर्ववर्तिकेश्वरी। पूर्ववर्तिकेश्वरी। पूर्ववर्तिकेश्वरी। पूर्ववर्तिकेश्वरी। पूर्ववर्तिकेश्वरी। पूर्ववर्तिकेश्वरी। पूर्ववर्तिकेश्वरी।</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>नात्त्रहृदविनिर्मत सम्बन्धां च नाम तल नामनोपसर्वतृतिभि समस्येते।</td>
<td>नात्त्रहृदविनिर्मत समस्येते। विश्वाय तल नाम तल नामनोपसर्वतृतिभि समस्येते।</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prior to iv. 1. (concluded)</td>
<td>मामतु प्र ते प्र वामित्वचिमाद्री-न्युदाहरेव. एतद्धाऽदतानादिमस्य तथैव च।।</td>
<td>मामतु प्र ते पुज इश्वरवाद्री-न्युदाहरेव. एतद्धाऽश्चादित्वचिमाद्री-न्युदाहरेव. एतद्धाऽदतानादिमस्य तथैव च।।</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>नामोपसमगतिमिः समस्यादेन कदन च।</td>
<td>नामोपसमगतिमिः समस्यादेन कदन च।</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>बुधमेव य एत वनिमायानि पर्यायायस्येति निदर्शनाम।।</td>
<td>बुधमेव य एत वनिमायानि पर्यायायस्येति निदर्शनाम।।</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>अनुदातो गति सांवः समस्तः स्वरितादिमिः। संस्कारेऽनुष्ठानम्। आचार्येऽति निदर्शनाम।।</td>
<td>अनुदातो गति सांवः समस्तः स्वरितादिमिः। संस्कारेऽनुष्ठानम्। आचार्येऽति निदर्शनाम।।</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>प्रपरिस्थिताय सहस्राधिपतिः।। अस्थायिस्तुरवपा य उपायु-प्रतिविश्वासितः।।</td>
<td>प्रपरिस्थिताय सहस्राधिपतिः।। अस्थायिस्तुरवपा य उपायु-प्रतिविश्वासितः।।</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>एकास्त्रा उदास्ता आद्यादित्वस्थापिते।। अभित्त्वगति उपसमः। कियोऽन्त्रैगतितः।।</td>
<td>एकास्त्रा उदास्ता आद्यादित्वस्थापिते।। अभित्त्वगति उपसमः। कियोऽन्त्रैगतितः।।</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>आशुदाता दशैत्यंशु एकास्त्रा।। विशेषचरितेऽस्याधित्वस्थापिते।।</td>
<td>आशुदाता दशैत्यंशु एकास्त्रा।। विशेषचरितेऽस्याधित्वस्थापिते।।</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>अच्छादनसंहत्वोत्स्तानुगतिरपुरुष: पुनः। कितीवानित्रिपललिहिस्यम् परः। प्रतिमात्जातास्तहास्य—अस्थायिस्तुरवपा य उपायु-प्रतिविश्वासितः।।</td>
<td>अच्छादनसंहत्वोत्स्तानुगतिरपुरुष: पुनः। कितीवानित्रिपललिहिस्यम् परः। प्रतिमात्जातास्तहास्य—अस्थायिस्तुरवपा य उपायु-प्रतिविश्वासितः।।</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

iv. 6. | आश्चर्यभूते पुत्रस्य सिद्धत्व।। | आश्चर्यभूते पुत्र: स्वर्यस्य सिद्धत्व।। |
iv. 12. | अभियुक्त: पूर्वेण।। | अभियुक्त: पूर्वेण।। |
iv. 15. | थानकार्येऽनुष्ठित।। | थानकार्येऽनुष्ठित।। |
iv. 18. | बाकार्यतीच।। | बाकार्यतीच।। |
iv. 20. | तातितिल।। | तातितिल।। |
iv. 21. | उभेयादृश्यम्।। | उभेयादृश्यम्।। |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Whitney’s No.</th>
<th>Whitney’s Reading.</th>
<th>Kautsa Reading.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>iv. 23.</td>
<td>विश्वासनामी ॥</td>
<td>विश्वासनामी ॥</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iv. 30.</td>
<td>वस्त्रमयेश्वरसासुबियाँ ॥</td>
<td>वस्त्रमयेश्वरसासुबियाँ ॥</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iv. 39.</td>
<td>अन्नती विसंमया प्राणमाया चेत् ॥</td>
<td>अन्नती विसंमया प्राणमाया चेत् ॥</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iv. 42.</td>
<td>मिथियोवरणायोमध्यमेन ॥</td>
<td>मिथियोवरणायोमध्यमेन ॥</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iv. 44.</td>
<td>द्विरुक्त चावशेष ॥</td>
<td>द्विरुक्त चावशेष ॥</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iv. 46.</td>
<td>सुभिमिष्कीस्तमेन ॥</td>
<td>सुभिमिष्कीस्तमेन ॥</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iv. 53.</td>
<td>अबतिरत्तपर्ययु ॥</td>
<td>अबतिरत्तपर्ययु ॥</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iv. 65.</td>
<td>मनुरवय ॥</td>
<td>मनुरवय ॥</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iv. 69.</td>
<td>अवृतो वर्णानिश्चितारतन ॥</td>
<td>अवृतो वर्णानिश्चितारतन ॥</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iv. 74.</td>
<td>बालरणापायार्दाः दृश्यदलोपाय-दना बालसिद्धार्योः समापतिः ॥</td>
<td>बालरणापायार्दाः दृश्यदलोपाय-दना बालसिद्धार्योः समापतिः ॥</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iv. 93.</td>
<td>वनियमाधिक्षिण ॥</td>
<td>वनियमाधिक्षिण ॥</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>After iv. 93.</td>
<td>(Missing in the Berlin Ms. ॥)</td>
<td>(Missing in the Berlin Ms. ॥)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iv. 98.</td>
<td>इदममुबासु पदत्वात् ॥</td>
<td>इदममुबासु पदत्वात् ॥</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iv. 100.</td>
<td>दीर्घायार्दीनां च ॥</td>
<td>दीर्घायार्दीनां च ॥</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iv. 104.</td>
<td>बहस्तितीन पूर्ववेदनमः ॥</td>
<td>बहस्तितीन पूर्ववेदनमः ॥</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iv. 107.</td>
<td>पदाध्ययनमंतरिक्षार्दाध्राष्ट्रायां-ध्यमः ॥</td>
<td>पदाध्ययनमंतरिक्षार्दाध्राष्ट्रायां-ध्यमः ॥</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iv. 117.</td>
<td>प्रभृतवाससमायादात्मनां त्रिवर्तन परिहार इत्माध्ये ॥</td>
<td>प्रभृतवाससमायादात्मनां त्रिवर्तन परिहार इत्माध्ये ॥</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iv. 124.</td>
<td>संवादवादनं संहितार्दाचुनम् ॥</td>
<td>संवादवादनं संहितार्दाचुनम् ॥</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iv. 126.</td>
<td>स एकपदः परिहारवाच ॥</td>
<td>स एकपदः परिहारवाच ॥</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. From Whitney's note on page 217 the Kautsa reading appears to be preferable.
2. The Kautsa reading removes the difficulty expressed by Whitney on page 229.
3. Vide Whitney’s note on page 231—"The signature of the section is as follows: 102: Caturthasya त्रिपीयां पादां; so that, unless rule 53 is to be divided into two, or unless the copyist's count is inaccurate, we have lost, somewhere in the course of the second and third sections, one of the rules of the text."
4. Whitney's note on page 235 shows that the commentary in the Berlin MS. takes note of "संहितार्दाचुनम्"
### Whitney’s Reference

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Berlin MS.</th>
<th>Kautsya MS.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>After i. 41.</td>
<td>चतुरायणीकायां प्रथमसायणास्य प्रथम: पाद: ॥ मूर्ति ५१ ॥ एकः चतुरायणास्य प्रथम: पाद: ॥</td>
<td>४९. इत्यवर्त्तमेदे कौस्तुष्ठाकरणे प्रथमायणास्य प्रथम: पाद: ॥ १ ॥</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>After i. 62.</td>
<td>प्रथमस्य द्वितीय: पाद: ॥ ६२ ॥</td>
<td>२९. इति प्रथमायणास्य द्वितीय: पाद: ॥ २.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>After i. 91.</td>
<td>प्रथमस्य तृतीय: पाद: ॥ ९१ ॥</td>
<td>२९. इति प्रथमायणास्य तृतीय: पाद: ॥ ३.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>After i. 105.</td>
<td>चतुरायणीकायां च प्रथमोषणाय: समास: ॥ १२ (१) ॥</td>
<td>१९. इति प्रथमायणाये सतुर्ष: पाद: ॥ ६. इत्यवर्त्तमेदे कौस्तुष्ठाकरणे चतुरायणीकायां प्रथमोषणाय: समास: ॥ १. सूत्राणि ११०.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>After ii. 39.</td>
<td>द्वितीयस्य प्रथम: पाद: ॥</td>
<td>३९. इति द्वितीयायणास्य प्रथम: पाद: ॥ १.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>After ii. 59.</td>
<td>॥ ५९ ॥ द्वितीयस्य द्वितीय: पाद: ॥</td>
<td>२०. इति द्वितीयायणाये द्वितीय: पाद: ॥ २.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>After ii. 80.</td>
<td>॥ ८० ॥ द्वितीयस्य तृतीय: पाद: ॥</td>
<td>२१. इति द्वितीयायणास्य तृतीय: पाद: ॥ ३.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>After ii. 107.</td>
<td>॥ १६ (१) ॥ इति द्वितीयोषणाय: समास: ॥</td>
<td>२७. इति द्वितीयायणास्य सतुर्ष: पाद: ॥ ४. इत्यवर्त्तमेदे कौस्तुष्ठाकरणेन चतुरायणीकायां द्वितीयोषणाय: ॥ २. सूत्र १०७. एक्षः २१७.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>After iii. 25.</td>
<td>तृतीयस्य प्रथम: पाद: ॥</td>
<td>२५. इति तृतीयायणास्य प्रथम: पाद: ॥ १.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>After iii. 54.</td>
<td>तृतीयस्य द्वितीय: पाद: ॥</td>
<td>२१. इति तृतीयायणास्य द्वितीय: पाद: ॥ २.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>After iii. 74.</td>
<td>तृतीयस्य तृतीय: पाद: ॥</td>
<td>४०. इति तृतीयायणास्य तृतीय: पाद: ॥ ३.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>After iii. 96.</td>
<td>॥ १०५ ॥ इति तृतीयोषणाय: ॥</td>
<td>२९. इति तृतीयायणास्य सतुर्ष: पाद: ॥ ४. इत्यवर्त्तमेदे कौस्तुष्ठाकरणेन चतुरायणीकायं तृतीयोषणाय: समास: ॥ ३. सूत्र १२५.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whitney's Reference</td>
<td>Berlin MS.</td>
<td>Kautsa MS.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>After iv. 46.</td>
<td>II ४७ II चतुर्थेष्य प्रथमः पादः II and चतुरायायीमाये चतुर्थेष्य प्रथमः पादः समासः II</td>
<td>२८. इति चतुर्थोपयोगे प्रथमः पादः १.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>After iv. 72.</td>
<td>चतुर्थेष्य द्वितीयः पादः II</td>
<td>२८. इति चतुर्थोपयोगस्य द्वितीयः पादः २.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>After iv. 100.</td>
<td>II १०२ II चतुर्थेष्य तृतीयः पादः II</td>
<td>३०. इति चतुर्थोपयोगस्य तृतीयः पादः ३.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>After iv. 126.</td>
<td>इति शौकीये चतुरायायिये चतुर्थः पादः II चतुरायायीमाये समासमः II श्रीरस्तु II लेखकपाठकौः दुःम्भ मभतु II श्रीचण्डिचाये नमः II श्रीरामः II संवतः १७१४ वर्षं ज्येष्ठ श्राद्व ९ दिने समास लिखितं पुस्तकम् II</td>
<td>२८. इति चतुर्थोपयोगस्य चतुर्थः पादः ४. सूत्राणि १७४. इति चतुर्थो- पयायः ४. प्रो सू ११०. हिं १० सू १०७. तुः सू १२५. च. सू १७४. इत्यर्थविवेद कौश्यकारणे चतुरायाय- विका समासः II सूत्रायायः ५१६ II</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SOME INTERESTING VOCABLES FROM MODERN INDOARYAN DIALECTS

By

BABURAM SAKSENA

A study of the modern Indo-Aryan (IA) dialects does offer not only interesting facts for Phonetics but also for Semantics. I have collected together lists of Awadhī and Mālvi words and from those offer here a few words as specimen.

Awadhī : onahā, kaniyā, kōrā, milā, hālab.

Mālvi : āl, kabīth, kēm, khāṭolā, tāraj, paṭaknā, batānā, banōbast.

_onahā_ 'overcast' is connected with Skt. _avanaddha-_ and bears the same sense even now. The same root is found preserved in _pahna_ 'to shut up, to put in a fold' which is derived from _pra-ṇaddha._

_kaniyā_ 'lap' is a word of the feminine gender and is found particularly in Western Awadhī. It corresponds with standard Hindi _gōd_. The derivation of _kaniyā_ is doubtful. Probably it is connected with Skt. _karna_ 'side' and we may compare with it Marāṭhī _kānī_ fem. 'loop of a rope' (cited under _kānu_, Nep. Dic., p. 86).

_kōrā_ 'lap' derived from Skt. _kroḍa_ is a rare preservation of the ancient word in its actual sense. It is found in Eastern Awadhī particularly and is used in the masculine gender as different from _gōd_ and _kaniyā_ cited above. Professor TURNER suggests the possibility of Nēpālī _kolso_ (Nep. Dic., p. 108) with Skt. _kroḍa._

Milā ‘a person, a man,’ is found in Eastern Awadhī; its origin is obscure. Possibly it has a non-Aryan origin. It is very commonly used by the illiterate people.

_hālab_ ‘to wade, to move’ found in Eastern Awadhī has quite a distinct sense from its Hindustānī correspondent, _hilnā_ ‘to shake, to move’ (intransitive) and _hilnā_ (transitive).

āl ‘pumpkin’ corresponds with Hindustānī _laukī_ and is evidently a derivative of Skt. _alābu_ (Nep. Dic, p. 563, see _lauko_). Like _laukī_, āl is feminine and the two words together make a fine example of the difference in the play of the accent in the earlier stages of the Prakrits.

_kabīth_ 'wood-apple' corresponds with Hindustānī _kaithā_ and is derived from Pkt. _kaviṭha_. Professor TURNER (Nep. Dic., p. 105 under _kaith_) quotes Dakhkini Hindustānī _kavīṭ_, Sindhi _kauṭṭu_ and Marāṭhī _kavāṭh_ which have -t- while other Indo-Aryan languages have _-t_.

kēm ‘the Kadamba tree’ is derived from Skt. kadamba and is the only derivative of the word known so far. The corresponding words in other IA are loan-words from Sanskrit.

khāṭā ‘wife, woman’ is very common in Mālvī. Its derivation is obscure. Has it any connection with khaṭvā; khāṭ-, the meaning being ‘one who occupies the bed or shares it’?

tāraj ‘latrine, Nature’s call.’ The origin is obscure.

pāṭaknā ‘to put’ corresponds with the same word in Hindustānī and Awadhī where it bears the meaning of ‘throwing, causing to fall’. The Mālvī word does not contain any bad tinge and is quite commonly used in the sense of Hin. rakhnā.

bataṅnā ‘to show’, derived from Skt. vārtā ‘talk’, has come to be restricted in this sense in Mālvī although in Hindustānī it still retains the meaning of ‘talking, informing’. The transition from ‘talking’ to ‘showing’, however, is intelligible as giving information entails generally some physical gestures. In a particular idiom in Hindustānī viz., in bhāv bataṅnā ‘to suggest feelings by the poses of dance’, the sense of ‘showing’ is available.

banobast corresponding to Persian band-o-bast ‘arrangement, management’ is restricted in Mālvī to a particular sense. It means ‘the arrangement made to facilitate the coming out in the open of a Purdah princess, involving the emptying of the place and its vicinity of all males’.

māṭī ‘husband’ is peculiar to Mālvī and is widely used in this sense. Its origin is obscure; it is unlikely that it has anything to do with Awadhī māṭī ‘earth’, derived from Skt. myttikā.

If we interest indigenous scholars in the usefulness of collecting vocables of the unwritten dialects of IA, I believe we shall find considerable material of linguistic interest. Incidentally we shall also be able to know how far our spoken, as different from literary, dialects owe a debt to the substratum languages. The written standard languages, most naturally, have been avoiding the loan-words, and what we miss there, is easily available in the dialects. In this respect we Indians ourselves can do a lot, unaided by foreign scholars.
NOTES ON MARĀTHĪ ETYMOLOGY—I

By

S. M. KATRE

In my Presidential Address at the Linguistics Section of the Ninth All-India Oriental Conference held at Trivandrum in December 1937 I had occasion to draw the attention of all Indo-Aryan Linguists to the necessity of studying the different modern Indo-Aryan languages scientifically and incidentally correct the many wrong notions prevailing about Modern Linguistics as applied to Indian Languages. There is so much to be done in this field yet, but at times it is necessary to correct wrong movements which are liable to bring the whole science into misuse by the application of pseudo-scientific methods. It is therefore necessary to review the whole field of Modern Indo-Aryan Linguistics and urge upon the properly trained scholars not only to publish their scientific researches in English but also give the benefit of their specialised knowledge to scholars of each language through the medium of that language itself.

In this series of studies I propose to discuss a few interesting words the history of which is as yet not clear to Marāṭhī scholars. The principles of modern Linguistics must be clearly borne in mind before we attempt to give the etymon of any given vocable. And the history of modern Indo-Aryan is so deeply imbedded in the earlier stages of Indo-Aryan that at times we may even have to go deeply into questions which are not the immediate concern of a scholar of modern I-A. languages. In this sense these studies will not be a regular contribution towards an etymological dictionary of Marāṭhī on the comparative basis, but they will form the source book on the foundation of which any future comparative etymological dictionary of Marāṭhī will have to be built up. They are rather indicative of the methods to be applied thoroughly to every word before any comprehensive attempt in that direction materialises, and as such we may have to discuss the question of principles involved not only in Marāṭhī linguistics but also in the whole field of I-A. linguistics.

To start with the main theme of these studies I shall begin with two words which occur in the brilliant paper of Prof. VELANKAR on “Apabhraṃśa and Marāṭhī Metres”¹, namely ovī and sāki. Prof. VELANKAR has demonstrated beyond any possibility of doubt that all the common Marāṭhī metres are to be traced to the popular Apabhraṃśa metres which were in vogue among the people just before the modern I-A. vernacular came into being. So we may overlook for the present the etymology suggested by RAJWADE and

¹. *New Indian Antiquary (NIA.)* L215-228.
supported by Priyokar of the word ovi from the root ova-nē < Sk. ava-
vāma "to measure off", and consider the purely historical aspect of the
question of deriving ovi from the Sk. ardha-catus-padi. Prof. Velankar has
made out an unimpeachable case for deriving ovi from Sk. ardha-catus-padi
from the metrical point of view, but the linguistic aspect of this question needs
investigation.

It is one of the fundamental principles in modern linguistics to take pro-
per notice of the chronological sequence of all linguistic phenomena; etymology
as such can only be supported if the facts are demonstrable otherwise from
the chronological point of view. For there are many words in the Sanskrit
lexicons which are patently Sanskritisations of Prakrit, Apabhramśa or other
words of a non-Aryan character, and citations of these in no way prove the
possibilities of such derivations. A case in point is the word bhoplā, which
has been identified by the late Mgr. Dalgado with the Portuguese word
abôbra² in opposition to the Sk. lex. word behu-phala-ka; the lexicon giving
this word is of recent origin, and may at first sight appear to be a Sanskritisa-
tion of the Portuguese original. But it has been actually demonstrated that
this word occurs much earlier than the coming of the Portuguese to India³
and therefore gives credence to the etymology of Sk. bahu-phala-ka even if
an earlier occurrence of the Sk. word is not traceable.

Purely linguistic considerations show that the process suggested by Prof.
Velankar involves difficulties which cannot be explained away by rules of
Prakrit Grammar. Although we depend to a large extent upon the orthodox
Prakrit Grammarians for our understanding of Prakrit Grammar, we do not de-
pend upon them for our study of Prakrit Linguistics. The object of the Prakrit
Grammarians like Vararuci and Hemacandra was not to give us a historical
grammar of the Prakrit languages but to give us a practical method of learn-
ing Prakrit with the mastery of Sanskrit; from this point of view there are
many errors of linguistic terminology employed by these orthodox Gram-
marians, since the aspects of phonetics, phonology, morphology or semantics
(concerning ourselves only with the vocables in a sentence and their inter-
pretation outside of Syntax) were not independently studied as a whole.

The Marāṭhi word aut is in the first place connected not with Sk. ardha-
caturtha- but with the form ardha- *turtha; but here we meet with certain
difficulties. Sk. ardha- has given us two forms in Pk. addha- and adṛha-;
if Sk. ardha- in the above compound gives us the cerebralised form as sug-
gested by Prof. Velankar in adṛhuṭṭha- we cannot derive Mar. aut or for that
matter Gujarati ṛṭhu from the OIA. form ardha- *turtha- through the MI-
A. form adṛhuṭṭha; the history of the cerebrals in I-A. shows the untenability

1. NIA. 1. 223 ff.
2. Portuguese Vocables in Asiatic Languages (GOS. LXXIV), s. v.
3. In his note on this word (to be published shortly) my friend Mr. P. K.
Gode gives a reference from Sripati’s Marāṭhi commentary on his Jyotiśaratnamālā.
Sripati flourished about the 11th century A.D. (see Indian Culture 4. 483).
of such supposition. Initially no cerebrals are known to OI-A. in genuine I-A. words; in MI-A. we find initial cerebrals due to cerebralisation (unexplained) of OI-A. words in certain instances. Medially we find the OI-A. cerebrals retained in MI-A. and the treatment depends upon whether they are single intervocalic or otherwise. In Marāṭhi and Gujarati, as in some MI-A. dialects the lateral retroflex \( -l \) has replaced the \( -d \) in several instances. Apart from these changes a cerebral has not suffered such a drastic treatment as the losing of the occlusion characteristic in Mar. \( au \). The cerebralised form \( aḍḍha \) is characteristic of Ardha-Māgadhī and Jaina Māhārāṣṭrī while \( addha \) is the only form known to the other dialects. We have actually the form \( addhuttha \) occurring in Amg.\(^2\) besides the cerebralised \( aḍḍhuttha \). The form \( auṭṭi \) is also quoted from the Sūrapaṇṇati.\(^3\) Probably it is a mislection for \( auṭṭhi \). The Guj. form \( uṭhu \) preserves the original aspirate of the MI-A. and OI-A. stages, while Mar. characteristically loses the final aspiration. But it should be remembered that the form \( addhuttha \) is not directly from Sk. \( ardha + caturtha \), but from \( ardha + *turtha \). Now in the case of the equations given by Prof. Velankar from Sk. \( ardha-catuṣ-padi \) to \( ovi \) the cerebral forms have to be replaced in the first instance by dental forms of Sk. \( ardha \). But the chief difficulty here is the transition of \( *-uṭṭha- \) to \( *-uḍḍha- \) (from Sk. \( *-turttha- \)); this is by no means an easily explained phenomenon, though we have some parallels in \( kaṭṭha- : kṣaḍha- \), etc. No normal historically demonstrable phonetical law can explain this vocalising of a consonant cluster, and the possible stages are of such a nature as to make the whole process untenable. Secondly we have to explain the changes of forms like \( ardha-catuṣ-padi \): MI-A. \( addha-(c)au-ppāi \) through \( addha-(c)auvāi \); we have indeed Hindi \( caupāi \) from Sk. \( catuṣ-padi \). This last will give us in the Apabhṛṣṭa stage a form like \( *ādhauvāi \) or \( āhauvāi \) but nothing beyond. The syncope is possible only at one stage, and we cannot build up hypothetical forms indefinitely on such basis. Hence on the happy analogy suggested by Prof. Velankar himself we have with us a Sk. form like \( ardha- *tuṣ-padi \) (cf. Sk. \( ardha- *turttha \)) giving a MI-A. form \( *addhuvāi \) and an Apabhṛṣṭa form \( *āhuvāi \) with only one syncope. This form may possibly lead to \( *huvāi \) or its Vṛddhi form \( *huvāi \) and yield Mar. \( (h)ovi \) or more popularly \( ovi \). For the forms \( *turtha- \) and \( *tuṣ- \) of Sanskrit we may cite \( tur-īya \) meaning "fourth". This etymology then gets over all the defects of the one given by Prof. Velankar and offers a possible evolution of the form on the historical basis of deriving Marāṭhi metres from their corresponding Apabhṛṣṭa ancestors. But the more natural way of constructing the Mar. word on the same basis, taking into consideration the lamen or defective fourth foot of the metre is to take the original Sanskrit word to be \( apa-pāḍikā \) giving MI-A. words \( *ava-vāi > *o-vāi-ū > *o-vi-ū > Mar. ovi \) regularly.

1. Pischel, Pr. Gr. §291, (p. 201).
2. Ibid., §§290, 450.
3. Pāśa-saddha-mahāṇṇavo, s. v.
The second word that I am about to discuss here is more interesting and involving of some fundamental discussion of I-A. grammar itself. The word sākñi is indicative of a Dvipadi containing 28 mātrās in each of its two lines making a total of 56 mātrās. RAJWADE connected this word with the Sanskrit sākvari indicating a particular Vedic and later classical metre containing altogether 56 syllables. Prof. VEILANKAR disagrees with this derivation on two counts: firstly the similarity between the two metres discussed is only connected with the number 56 and therefore superficial, for the Mar. and Sk. metres have nothing else in common, one dealing with 56 syllables and the other dealing with 56 mātrās; secondly he quotes the authority of PISCHEL to show that no Sk. -r- is lost in MI-A. or the new Indo-Aryan Vernaculars where it is retained as -r- or -l-. As regards the first contention I have no remarks to offer and I agree with Prof. VEILANKAR that since the two metres are unconnected historically or as no historical connection between the two has been demonstrated so far, the derivation appears highly doubtful. But what I intend bringing out in this discussion is that a Sk. -r- need not be retained in MI-A. or new I-A. languages. The question of retention must necessarily depend upon the origin of OI-A. -r- itself. It is in this sense highly interesting to find out what would be the feminine form of sākvan-in MI-A. dialects in opposition to the feminine form sākvari of Sanskrit. A detailed discussion of feminine base formation will be reserved for my basic work on MI-A. comparative grammar. Here I may only mention the point that where OI-A. feminine formations show some PI-E. peculiarities it is not necessary that the MI-A feminine bases should depend upon the OI-A. bases. In this event though Sk. offers a feminine sākvari to the masculine sākvan-, if we demonstrate that the normal formation of the feminine would be a form in MI-A. like sakki, then the case is complete for equating Mar. sākñi with the Sk. sāk-vari through the feminine base formations of OI-A. and MI-A.

This question takes us to the very problem of the alternance r/n which we find in the whole domain of Indo-European grammar. A detailed discussion of the problem with reference to I-E. linguistics will be found in BENVENISTE'S Origines de la formation des noms en indo-eruopéen (Ardien-Maisonneuve, Paris, 1935). I shall only take the relevant forms from OI-A. in discussing this question of MI-A. formations.

In the first place we find in OI-A. certain flexional types in r/n or i/n. From ášan- (áśn- in oblique cases) we have ášri-, catur-ásra-, etc. Similarly Sk. ásthī gives the genitive asthnāḥ; udán- gives us the forms sam-udrá, udrá-, anudrá, etc. Sk. áksi: áks-nā; áṣ-k : ásnāḥ, yákr-t : yáknāḥ; šakr-t : šaknāḥ (whence the Prakritis. Sk. form cha-ga-na) ; áhar; áhnām, etc; grdhr- : grdhnu-; vāsar-, vāsara- : vasan-tā-; údhar : údhnah.

This alternation r/n is also found in certain complex suffixes. Of the formation in * -ser/-sen- we have no purely I-A. examples; for this we have
to go back to the I-E. stage where we find this fairly common.¹ Similarly
for the formation *-ter/-ten- of I-E. we have no purely OI-A. examples, and
only a comparative study of I-E. shows that where Sk. has the -tara/-tana-
suffix the alternation is seen in some of the other cognate languages.²

The third formation in this series is in *-wer/n (or *-mer/n) and gives us
the largest number of examples in OI-A. Vedic snā-vaṇ has a parallel in Avestic
snā-var- on which the Prakrit nhāru and Pāli nahāru are based giving the
various new I-A. forms. In OI-A. we have two allied suffixes -vara- and
-vana-. In this way we get forms like iś-varā- "lord", adh-varā- "feast, sacri-
ifice", it-varā- "going", vy-ad-varā- "gnawing animal", kār-vara- "action",
etc. A more significant alternance is the feminine formation of -vaṇ- in -vari-;
yā-vaṇ-: yaj-vaṇi "worshipper"; jīt-vaṇ-; jīt-vaṇi "conquering"; rta-vaṇ-
: rta-vaṇi "regular, truthful"; pī-vaṇ-: pī-vaṇi "full, strong, swelling"; sāk-
vaṇ-: sāk-vaṇi "strong, powerful, able"; dā-vaṇ-: dā-vaṇi "giver"; sva-dhā-
vaṇ-: sva-dhā-vaṇi "constant, faithful". Similarly we have forms in man-
mara-: āṃsa-: aṃsa-marā- "stone"; ad-man-: ad-marā- "gluttonous".

Thus the question of an alternance of r/n goes back to the I-E. stage and
shows traces even in the same dialect belonging to this group. But while
the feminine formation of -vaṇ/-vari is common to a few forms the more
usual formation in OI-A. is -vat/-vati. Now this suffix becomes -vanta-
in MI-A. but in the nominative singular, forms in -vaṃ are survivals of OI-A.
decension. In the Apabhraṃśa stage such nominative singular forms have
often given rise to new bases. Thus the nominative singular masculine
sakkam may easily give rise to the normal feminine sakkī, or else the reduction
of OI-A. -vati directly give us a form like *vaṇi in MI-A. leading to -vi in
Apabhraṃśa. Hence the Sk. sāk-vaṇ will give rise to MI-A. formations
like *sakki or *sakkaı, yielding Apabhraṃśa forms of the type *sakki or sākki.
Thus there is no linguistic difficulty of connecting Mar. sāki with Sk. sāk-vaṇi
through the simple form sāk-vaṇ.

¹. Benveniste, pp. 100-103.
². Ibid., pp. 103-110.
THE AVIMUKTA-TATTVA OF BĀLAMBHAṬṬA PĀYAGUNḍA

In my search for women writers in Sanskrit, on whom I published some articles in the *Journal of the Mythic Society*, I came across in the Catalogue of the Oriental Library, Mysore (1922), in the section on ‘Māhātmya’, p. 179, a work called *Avimukta-tattva*, (MS. No. C.1054 Devanāgarī 71 folios), said to have been compiled by a lady named Bhavānī—'Bhavānī samgrhīta.' The Curator of the Mysore Oriental Library, Mr. M. S. Basavalingayya, was kind enough to send me extracts of the beginning, end and colophon of this work. From the extracts we learn that this *Avimukta-tattva* on the greatness of Benares is a work of Bālakṛṣṇa or Bālam-bhaṭṭa, son of Vaidyānātha Pāyagunḍa, and I am contributing this note on the work, since the work seems to have remained unknown till now, not having been mentioned in works like Mr. Kane's *History of Dharmaśāstra*, I.

It is well known that Bālam-bhaṭṭa wrote the Bālambhaṭṭi or Lakṣmī-vyā-khyāṇa on the Mitakṣarā and published it as a work of his mother, Lakṣmī. From the 6th introductory verse in his *Dharma-śāstra-sangraha* which he began compiling for Colebrooke, we learn that Bālam-bhaṭṭa had a stepmother named Bhavānī—'Lakṣmisūnurbhavāṇyaṃbāḥ'—India Office Catalogue, No. 1507. We now learn that this Bhavānī was his junior stepmother, that Bālam-bhaṭṭa wrote a treatise on the greatness of Benares called the *Avimukta-tattva* and that this work, he published as a production of this ‘Dvitiya ambā Bhavānī’. I give here the beginning, end and colophon of the *Avimukta-tattva*:

**BEGINNING:** श्रीगणेश्यामः नमः श्रीकल्पमेवाद्य नमः।
अविश्वेक महाके पुरुषांकृष्टाङ्गे।
पराकारणात् (?) भृत्यादिविमुखः तत्त्वमुच्यते॥

यथाः तात्त्वेऽविविधं मृणालयें परब्रह्मवेदितिः।
तत्त्व जावालास्य विद्यादुर्गच्छवितः।
तस्य हि—

**END:**

सर्वसनेन सर्वत्रिभि विविधतिः।
एतानां वद्वतिभि सत्त्ययष्टिः।
वसन्न सर्वंदेहे तेऽह वसन्न समारथेः।

इति श्रीकल्पमेवाद्य अभिज्ञातस्य वेदितिः।
इति श्रीभगवद्गुप्ते श्रीभगवद्गुप्ते।

**COLOPHON:**

इति श्री भगवद्गुप्तेऽपि श्रीभगवद्गुप्तेऽपि श्रीभगवद्गुप्तेऽपि संघित-श्रीभगवद्गुप्तेऽपि।

According to Mr. Govinda Das cited in Mr. Kane’s *History of Dharmaśāstra*, I, p. 462, the time of Bālam-bhaṭṭa is A.D. 1740-1830. In the same place in Mr. Kane’s book, we are told that a Benares Palace Library MS of Acāra-bālambhaṭṭi is dated Saṅvat 1831 (A.D. 1774) and that a Jammu MS of Bālam-bhaṭṭa’s *Uparāṣṭriya-dharmasastras* is dated Saṅvat 1848 (A.D. 1791). This Mysore MS of Bālam-bhaṭṭa’s *Avimukta-tattva* bears an intermediate date, Saṅvat 1844 (A.D. 1787).

V. Raghavan
CORRESPONDENCE

MY RESEARCH IN LONDON

When my friends and sympathisers cheered me by their send-offs in last December, many wondered why I was going to Europe for research in Indian History and more particularly in Maratha History. Certain scholars of high repute wrote to tell me that I should do better working with my small typewriter in one of the Records in Calcutta, Madras, Bombay and Poona, and derive full benefit of the expense and labour involved.

I often wished the Indian Research Societies and Institutions would concentrate more on the collection of catalogues and press-lists than on the publication of records or selections therefrom, despite the propagandistic value such publications possess. I naturally rejoiced at finding the authorities of European archives sparing no effort to secure catalogues and press-lists from every quarter. These are well bound and kept in a separate section for ready references and within the easy reach of the reader. Every country tells her own tale of her contribution towards the advancement of the social sciences and in unravelling the vast treasure of human knowledge and experience of bygone ages. With the help of these sources in India, not only could duplication of labour and expense have been saved but every effort would have presented a distinct advance.

Up-to-date card indexes filed according to authors and subjects serve adequately to guide an ordinary reader. His requirements are often limited to known sources, but the interest of the research worker is not confined only to the main topic of the book. His imagination prompts him to see much beyond what has been emphasized and conspicuously noticed by the author. The research worker, therefore, feels greatly handicapped if direct access to book-shelves also is denied to him. Titles do not generally indicate the subject-matter in detail and are often misnomers. In fact, any cross index, however exhaustively prepared, does not prove adequate or perfect for his needs. But the old depositories in which his interest is centred are so enormously swollen in the course of time that many of them had to find resort to the "stack" system, owing to lack of space and funds for rearrangement. In such depositories, of course, direct access is neither helpful, nor safe from the administrative point of view. This makes the task of the research worker rather difficult. His speculation on the imperfect data does not often meet with the desired result. The system adopted here of index by personal (or Christian) names instead of surnames of Indian authors is most confusing and disadvantageous too inasmuch as all references to these authors are made by surnames. Subject indexes, which minimise the disadvantages in the author-index, are generally neglected because of the necessity for a specialised labour and also because whatever skill displayed is open to criticism.

Amid these advantages and disadvantages, I began my work in the India Office Library and the British Museum—Oriental Books and Manuscripts Library. A closer idea of the nature of the field of research was necessary as any hasty effort of the kind of "first come first served", must prove not only ineffective but futile, particularly in view of the limitations of time and funds within which I have to work. I therefore devoted about two months to finding out the actual field of work from the voluminous catalogues and press-lists maintained here.

Having made my exhaustive notes of all the published and unpublished material available here, a plan for my campaign was an absolute necessity, so that whatever
harvest I reap must prove helpful and at the same time whatever stage it reached it must be self-contained and serviceable. I determined to work on the following principles:

(a) To extract material in the first instance from those manuscripts and publications that cannot possibly be lent out,

(b) To divide the work by periods such as Pre-Shivaji (16th century), Shahaji-Shivaji (1601-1660), Shivaji (1660-1680), Sambhaji (1680-1689), Rajaram (1690-1700) and so on.

(c) To attempt contemporary and direct sources firstly.

(d) To note and index whatever volumes read (every volume selected is gone through entirely).

I restricted myself in the first instance to the 16th and 17th centuries, and had to do my search section by section for various reasons.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SECTION</th>
<th>TOTAL NO. OF VOLUMES.*</th>
<th>NO. OF VOLUMES GONE THROUGH.**</th>
<th>NO. OF VOLUMES TO BE STUDIED.***</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>India Office Library:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Col. MacKenzie Collections:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(a) &quot;1822&quot;</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) Private</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c) General</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orme Collection</td>
<td>262</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sanskrit Collection</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marathi Collection</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>India Office Records:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Danvers Collections:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(a) Dutch Records</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) French Records</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c) Portuguese Records.</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charters and Agreements</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treaties, Contracts and Agreements</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parchment Records</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factory Records</td>
<td>not counted</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **British Museum-Oriental**
| Books and MSS. Library: | | | |
| Sanskrit Section | 2 | 2 | - |
| Marathi Section | 31 | 29 | 2 |
| Hindi Section | 2 | 2 | - |
| Gujarati Section | 3 | 3 | - |
| European Section | 28 | 5 | 23 |
| Persian and Urdu not yet attempted | | 426** | |

While going through the various manuscripts care is taken to compare the published material with them. For this and other reasons about 163 publications had to be gone through. A mention of the following in particular may be of interest:

(1) Catrou's Supplement on Aurangzeb-French-1705.
(2) Valentin's IVth volume: the Great Moguls, Dutch—1725.
(3) Ogilby's History of the Great Moguls-English, 1675.

*Indian History generally. **16th and 17th century.
I have also started compiling a Reference Book for identifying paintings of 16th to 19th centuries. All the identified Dutch, Mogul, Rajput, and other paintings of personages of historical importance are being photographed. The estimate as it stands now numbers no fewer than 1000 of these pictures just to make it a representative collection of what is obtainable in Europe. The sets of cards and pictures published by local Museums are also being collected. Two photographs worth mention are: Shivaji’s Sword at the Buckingham Palace and Tatiya Topi—a minute previous to his hanging.

The Dutch and Portuguese records make a valuable addition to our knowledge, particularly that relating to the 16th century. Their narratives of events on the Western coast provide details of day to day happenings and depict a complete if one-sided picture. Portuguese records describe sufficiently well the relations of the various powers in the Deccan down to the middle of the 18th century. The material is voluminous. I can hardly induce myself to attempt anything but the political side and have to neglect both the economic and industrial aspects.
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VIRABALLĀṆA II

By

S. ŚRIKANṆTA ṢĀSTRI

Vira Ballāḷa's long and glorious reign extending over a period of nearly half a century marks an epoch not only in the political history of Southern India but also in the cultural history of Karṇāṭaka. The Hoysaḷa power that had newly arisen from the ashes of the Chāḷukya Empire had been firmly and truly strengthened by the conquests of Viṣṇuvardhana-Biṭṭiga. But during the reign of his son and successor Narasimha I the Hoysaḷa empire had received a check if not a positive set-back in the attempt at expansion over the whole of the southern peninsula. There is no record of any campaign that was personally conducted by Narasimha who, born in luxury, seems to have contented himself with keeping together the conquests of his father while on all sides the Chāḷukyas, the Chōḷas, the Pāṇḍyas, the Kāḷachāryyas and the Yāḍavas of Dēvagiri strove to dismember the newly formed empire. It was under such circumstances that Vira Ballāḷa assumed the reigns of office.

A. POLITICAL AND CHRONOLOGICAL.

Vira Ballāḷa was the son of Vira Narasimha I and Ėchala Dēvi. The latter is spoken of as "Pāṇḍya mahārājādhirāja Mānabharaṇa Vaiśaṃvaya saṁjñatā" i.e. born of the family of Mānabharaṇa the Pāṇḍya sovereign.¹ Vira Ballāḷa, it might safely be conjectured, must have taken part in his father's campaigns at a very early age for in 1167 A.D., he is already styled "Malaiṛāja rāja" i.e. Lord over Malai.² Perhaps he grew impatient of his father's feeble control and in 1171 A.D. we find him fighting with some of his father's feudatories. By this year he had already acquired the titles "Teṅkaṇāditya, Teṅkaṇa Chakravarti, and Sapta Māḷava Viṣṇuvardhana." His Danḍanāyaka Bīṭharasa defeated the Chengāḷva Mahādēva and built Pālavarapattana though opposed by Chengāḷva Permāḍēva, Bālagudha Nandi Dēva and Kuracheya Udayāditya. In that year we find Vira Ballāḷa at Jayamgoṇḍa Ballāḷapura on the eve of his coronation. Perhaps these early transactions of his are to be interpreted as a rebellion against his father,³ in the early part of the year 1173 A.D. in Taḷiginādu and Kodaginādu. The fact that like his grand-father he was also called Viragaṇiga Viṣṇuvardhana has led a few scholars to attribute some of his achievements to his grand-father and vice versa. He had numerous titles, some self-acquired and others inherited. We have to keep in mind the warning of Dr. Fleet that care should be taken to distinguish

² Bl. 86 Epi. Car. Vol. V.
between the two in arriving at chronological data. For example even before Vira Ballāla conquered Uchhangi, he had already possessed the title Uchhanginātha acquired from Bīṭṭiga. Hence to arrive at the date of the capture of the fort it would not suffice to find out the earliest dated inscription which refers to it. Talakāḍu was probably never taken by him and yet it figures in the list of his conquests because Vishṇuvardhana had already taken it. Keeping these canons of criticism in view, we will try as far as possible to settle the chronology and the political happenings in the reign.

There is some confusion as to the precise date of Vira Ballāla’s coronation even in the epigraphs themselves. Mr. Rice and Dr. Fleet assumed that Vira Ballāla was crowned on July 22nd, 1173 A.D.¹ The inscriptions give us the following dates:—

Vijaya Śrāvaṇa Śuddha 1 Sōmavāra. July 12, 1173 A.D.¹
Vijaya Śrāvaṇa Śuddha 10 Bhānuvāra, Saturday, July 21-25 1173 A.D.³
Vijaya Śrāvaṇa Śuddha 11 Bhānuvāra. July 22, 1173 A.D.³
Vijaya Śrāvaṇa Śuddha 11 Bhānuvāra. July 22, 1173 A.D.⁴
Vijaya Śrāvaṇa Śuddha 11 Bhānuvāra. July 22, 1173 A.D.⁵
Vijaya Śrāvaṇa Śuddha 11 Bhānuvāra. July 22, 1173 A.D.⁶
Nandana Āśāḍha Śuddha 10, Budhavāra, July 3rd 1172 A.D.
Nandana Āśāḍha Śuddha 11, Guruvāra⁷ July 4th 1172 A.D.

The choice of dates lies between July 3rd 1172 A.D. and July 22nd, 1173 A.D. Since the last inscription of Narasimha is dated 1172 A.D.,⁸ it is probable that Vira Ballāla was crowned in the same year, with the support of Tantrapāla Hemmāḍi. (Bl. 86, Ec. V).

Soon after his coronation at Dvārasamudra he began his era of conquests which went on almost uninterrupted to the very last year of his life. The Pāṇḍyas of Uchhangi, Iruṅgōlas of Niḍugal, the Chōḷas of Kanchi, the Kalachuris of Kalyāṇi, the Yādavas of Dēvagiri and the Saḷa chieftains harassed the empire on every side. His first campaign was evidently against the Pāṇḍyas of Uchhangi. In 1174⁹ we hear of a battle at Hālevaḍil in Havaleya Pāḷya. Uchhangi had been in the possession of the Chōḷas for twelve years in the reign of Vira Narasimha¹⁰ and had resisted every effort

¹. Sewell and S. K. Iyengar place the death of Narasimha as early as 1170 A.D. on slender evidence. (Historical Inscriptions of South India).

1. Bl. 118, Epi. Car. V.
2. Hn. 71, Epi. Car. XI.
3. Hn. 119, Epi. Car. XI.
4. Kd. 4, Epi. Car. VI.
5. Kd. 50, Epi. Car. VI.
6. Ak. 71, Epi. Car. V.
7. Sh. 45, Epi. Car. VII.
8. Kd. 66, Epi. Car. VI; Bl. 25, Hn. 154, Epi. Car. V.
9. Hn. 29, Epi. Car. V.
10. Bl. 137, Epi. Car. V.
of the rulers of Hoysala empire to capture it. This formidable fort was under the command of the Pândya, Vijaya Pândya Kâmâdêva.1 One of the inscriptions describes how Vira Ballâla reduced it to dust.

_Chirâ Kâlam ripugal gasâdhya menisirâ Uchhangiyam multidur-
dhara tëjönidhi dhûligöñtéyene Koûdâkama dëvövani _

_Svaranam sandôdeya Kshitiâvaranârâ bhaññârânam striyaram_ 
_turogavrâta mumam samantu piñidam Ballâla bhûpâlakam"_

Dr. Fleet opined that the siege of Uchhangi must be dated later than 1196 A.D. It is also held by some scholars that since an inscription dated 14th March 1177 A.D.,2 mentions Vira Ballâla as staying at Dvârasamudra, it must be inferred that he had not yet set forth on his conquest. And because another epigraph dated 26th September of the same year3 says that he was engaged in his conquests, we must locate the exact date somewhere between the months of March and September. Since the former inscription merely says that the King was ruling in peace and wisdom at the capital, it does not follow that he had not already made some conquests. It is difficult to believe that for five years after his coronation such an energetic ruler of an empire surrounded by enemies, idled away his days at the capital.

The generals who conducted the campaign were Mahâpradhâna Komara Nâgadêva, Virayya and Mâdhava Dañçanâyaka. The hill fort was stormed after a long siege and the Pândya had to submit after the walls were laid in the dust. The Pândya was restored to his possession after his surrender and Vira Ballâla obtained the titles "Giridurgamalla," "Pândya-râja-pra-tishthâpanâchârya" "Pândya-râja-gaja-Kësari" and since the cavalry of the chief was captured on a Saturday he obtained the title of _Sanvârasiddhi_.4 Evidently like Srî Krshnâdêva Râya of Vijayanagara at the siege of Raichore, Uchhangi was taken by Vira Ballâla on a Saturday declared auspicious for war. It is interesting to note that many of these titles belonged to the Kalachûris also. Vijaya Pândya of Uchhangi had been the feudatory of Sôvidêva Râya Murâri and therefore this campaign of Vira Ballâla was primarily directed against the Kalachûris whose power had suffered an eclipse after the death of the usurper Bijjâla.

In 1175 A.D.5 Ballâla attacked Sibî and captured Hânêya Köte which he renamed Vijayagiri.6 In the same year (Ś. 1097) he marched against the Tuḷuva Chiefs in the Mangâlûra and Bâra Kûra districts and took not only the title of _Tuḷuvabalañâladhi_ but also married Tuḷuvala Mahâdêvi who became his senior queen (piñiyârasì).7 She was the daughter of Ahavâditya
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Vira Vikrama II who belonged to the family of the Guttas of Guttal. Dr. Fleet conjectured that she was the wife not of the Emperor but of one of his feudatories named Ballāla son of Simha of Sāntaligē nāḍu. But it is now believed that she was the queen of Ballāla the emperor.

In 1176 A.D.1 Rēcharasa who had the title Vasudhaika-bōndhava abandoned the decaying Kalachūri empire where he had been the prime-minister and accepted office under Vira Ballāla. The emperor made an attack on Tiptur in this year. A great merchant (mahāvadaṇavaṇavaṇa) Devi Setti built a Jaina temple called Vira Ballāla Jinālaya.2

In 1177a (Monday 26th September) Vira Ballāla had gone to Uchhangi to consolidate his conquests prior to the march to the south against Kanchi. It is well known that the Kannada poet Rudrabhaṭṭa in his Jagannātha Vijaya written during this reign gives the title “Rāja-rāja-pratishṭhānirata” to the emperor. Whether this Rāja-Rāja is the second or the third of the name, it is difficult to say. Many scholars hold that it was during the days of Vira Narasimha II that Hoysala intervention in Chōla politics began for the first time, but facts seem to point otherwise. It is extremely probable if not certain that Vira Narasimha’s reinstallation of Rāja Rāja III must be placed during the last years of Vira Ballāla or the first years of Vira Narasimha II. The dealings with the Chōlas began very early in Vira Ballāla’s reign. Uchhangi, as has been already mentioned, had been besieged by Chōlas for twelve years before Vira Ballāla recaptured it. An inscription of 1174 A.D.3 tells us that Ballāla burnt the “Chōlika Kshitiṭala.” Another inscription of 1184 A.D.4 gives the title “Chōla Kaṭaka Sūrēkāra” (plunderer of the Chōla army) to the emperor. A third inscription of 1188 A.D.5 mentions Sāmanta Sōmeyya nāyaka who had the title “Kāḍavabala jaladhi baḍabāṇala.” Evidently the dealings with the Kāḍava Perunjinga must have begun before that date.

However we have no right to assume that Vira Ballāla was contented with merely one expedition into the Chōla country nor can it be assumed that he had no need to retake Banavāse, Pānumāl, Palasikā etc. when they had once been conquered or that since Vira Ballāla was in Dwārasamudra in the year 1177 A.D. he had not yet started on his conquests.

During the comparatively weak rule of Vira Narasimha I, the Chāḷukyas, the Chōlas and the Kalachūris had become powerful. Banavāse had fallen into the hands of the Chāḷukya general Brahma. Uchhangi was in the hands of the Pāṇḍyas. Hānumangal was under the Kadamba ruler Kāmadēva who had deserted Vira Ballāla for the Kalachūrya Emperor. Therefore Vira
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Ballāla had every need to drive out these intruders from the Hoysaḷa empire. The dealings with the Chōḷas must have begun soon after the conquest of Uchhangi.

Dr. Kielhorn in the appendix to the eighth Volume of the *Epigraphia Indica* gives the dates of Rāja Rāja II as 1146-1161 A.D. Relying on this it is believed by some scholars that the title “Rāja-rāja-pratishṭhānirata” given to Vīra Ballāla by Rudrabhaṭṭa must be a reference to Rāja Rāja III who came to the throne in 1216 A.D. on some day between June 27th and July 10th, as before the former date there ruled Kulōttunga III and Vīra Ballāla’s early part of the reign is not contemporaneous with that of Rāja Rāja II. But since the revised dates of Rāja Rāja II have been given as 1146 to 1178 A.D. and because as already pointed out, there is an inscription of 1175 A.D. which refers to the burning of Chōḷa vishaya, it is reasonable to conjecture that about the year 1174 A.D. Vīra Ballāla reinstated Rāja Rāja II. The latter was evidently harassed by Rājadhirāja II who had come to power in 1172 A.D. Thus Vīra Ballāla’s intervention in Chōḷa politics must be located between 1172 and 1178 at which latter date Kulōttunga III succeeds Rāja Rāja II.

The next campaign was against the Irungōḷas of Niḍugal. In 1178 A.D. Vīra Ballāla’s empire was limited on the north by Sāvimalai, in the east by Nangali, and Paḍiyaghaṭṭa, in the south by Kongu and Chēram, Anamalai and in the west by Bārakūr and Ghaṭṭavādi.

In 1179 A.D. (7th April, Saturday) Vīra Ballāla fought with Sankamadeva at Madavalli near Chavuti gaḍaṭa. This Samkama is evidently the Kalachūri emperor who had the title Niśanka Malla and claimed Vīra Ballāla’s homage. Sōvidēva Raya Muraṅi died in 1178 A.D. leaving a fast disintegrating empire to his two sons Sankama and Āhavamalla who by the help of Piriyadandaṇāyaka Kāvanḍa restored the fallen fortunes of the house. This Kāvanḍa styles himself “Kalachūri rājya samuddhaṇa” i.e. the uplifter of the Kalachūri empire. Āhavamalla had effected a distribution of the Kalachūri dominions between himself and his brother about the year 1178 A.D. and this was taken advantage of by Vīra Ballāla.

Sōmeśvara IV of the Western Chāḷukya family who had been supplanted by Bījala and his sons, now strove in his turn to rally round himself the old chieftains who had been staunch supporters of the family fortunes. Foremost among them was the Dandaṇāyaka Brahmadēva of Banavāse who devoted his energies to uphold the Chāḷukya power against the Kalachūrya usurpers. Brahma styles himself “Chāḷukya rājya pratishṭhāpāṇīchārya.” “Kālachūrya Kālāṅala” and “Chāḷukya rājya samuddhaṇa.” Vīra Ballāla however defeated the Chāḷukya forces under Barmadēva or Brahmadēva,
thus setting limits to the Chāḷukya political jurisdiction in the North at Heddore.

In 1180 A.D., we find Kallayya Nāyaka of Gallipāleya fighting the battle of Ummadibavara. On Monday February 9th 1180 A.D.1 Mahāpradhāna Tōya Singayya and Basavayya Nāyaka of Hānūrīgal were encamped at Uddareya Könte and were involved in a fight with the son-in-law of Bankayya Nāyaka.

In 1181 A.D. Vira Ballāla was at Huḷiyera nelavīḍu.

In 11822 Bappadaṇḍāhippa who had the title “Drōhaharatṭa” and founded an agrahāra named Drōhagharatṭa Chaturvēdi mangalam, had won for Ballāla all the region bounded on the North by Perdore, including Malai-nāḍu, Tulunāḍu, Bāyilnāḍu, and Chōlamanḍala. A battle also took place in Kilālaimāṇḍu where the fort Peruvadakkoṭṭai was under the general Adichchandana and his mercenary soldiers.

In this year, on Monday November 9th3 (Śubhaṅga, Mārgaśira śuddha Pāḍyami, Sōnavaṇa) the Chief queen Padmalā presented Vira Ballāla with a son and heir. Thus by 1218 A.D. when Vira Narasimha was formally crowned, he was already thirty-six years old.

Between the years 1183 A.D. and 1188 A.D., Vira Ballāla was at Dvāra samudra evidently preparing for the second expedition of conquest. In 1184 A.D. he lost his queen Chikka Bammalā for whose merit he made a donation.4 In 1188 A.D. we hear of a boundary dispute in “Aggaḍala ayara-valiyagadi” when one Bīḍiga and Amnea died in the fray.5

In 1189 A.D. began the long war with the Yādavas of Dēvagiri who had wrested the northern parts of the Chāḷukya Empire from Sōmēśwara and had penetrated far into the Hoysala territory. The Kāḷachurīs also took the offensive as we find Vira Ballāla encamped at Hāḍideya Kuppa against the attacks of Murāri Kēśava Narasimha, when one Guriya Malla attacked the general Gaṇḍapenḍēra Chenna Kālama Sāhini, the dāṇḍanāyaka of the Kāḷachurī Bhujabala Chakravarti.6

It was in 1190 A.D. that the decisive battles which fixed the northern limits of the Hoysala empire were fought. Vira Ballāla was at first encamped at Hāḷḷīvūr and then at Lokkigūṇḍi. Bhillama had encamped at Hērūr and attacked the Hoysala army with 12000 cavalry and 200,000 foot at Soraṭūr. The year 1191 A.D. usually given as the date of the battle seems to be wrong. Bhillama suffered a heavy defeat on Sunday 23 December
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1190 A.D. and fled from the field of battle leaving remnants of his army to perish, pursued by Vira Ballāla as far as the Kṛṣṇa. An inscription graphically describes the fight.

Sandraghita raktadindavālayādattī mahi chakra mi
nnendingārava doṭīdaṭṭegala beṭṭelleliyum beṭṭeyin
nendingappudu Mārigam hasivadendingappudem bannegam
Kondam Sēnuna Sainyamam bavaradōl Ballāla bhūpalakam

Evadum lakkambaram sutthaneyaraśani sannāhadim panneraśa-
siradaśvaśrēni mēlānikarvanēya maṇi paryānadim tōrkevettai
tare tennondāneyim Sēnuna nōpa balamam nūnki bennatī kondam
Sorāṭurim Kṛṣṇa vēni nadiyatadivaram Vira Ballāla rāyam

A Kannada poet Rājāditya also says:

Madamārāti nṛpālakam bhayadi bengōṭṭōdu tirpalli tā-
nadiyolbiddavu paṇcha bhāge hayashaṭbhāgam disāpaṭṭavā
dudu mūrthbhāge kadarchi vōdíduhu chāṭurbhāge lāyakke san
dudu mikkarunūru vājī sahitam keṭṭōdidam Bhillamam.

By this great victory, the Hoysala empire included within its compass Virāṭarāja nagara, Kurugōdu, Matanga Hill, Guttī, Guttavōjalu, Uddare, Kalaḍi Bandaṇikke, Bājlare, Sorāṭūr, Erambarige, Hālule, Mānuve and Lokkigūṇḍi. Vira Ballāla now claimed to be an emperor, established his own era and assumed imperial titles as “Samasta bhuvanāśaya, Śriptthivivallabha, Mahā-
rājādhirāja, Paramēśvara, Paramabhaṭṭāraka, Pratāpa Chakravarti, Bhujabala Chakravarti, Asahāya śūra” etc. Bhillama was not killed in this fight, as an inscription in the Trikūṭēśvara temple at Gadag dated June 1191 A.D. tells us that at the request of his minister Jaitrasimha, he granted Handi-
gōla in Belvola 300 to the god Trikūṭēśvara. But he died soon after, before the year 1192 A.D., whether actually slain by Vira Ballāla or not it is impossible to say with certainty.

In 1192 A.D. the Yādava Jaitugi or Jaitrasimha now tried to avenge the death of Bhillama and marched on the Kuntalā kingdom to regain the lost possessions and prestige. Lokkigūṇḍi was attacked but Baladeva (Vira Ballāla) defeated and repulsed him retaking Lokkigūṇḍi and marched again as far as Gadag where an inscription tells us that he acquired the lordship of the Kuntalā country from Jaitrasimha. The Hoysala empire now included Nangali, Kongu, Singamalai, Rāyapuram, Tālakāṇḍu, Rodda, Bengiri, Kollagiri, Bājlare, Vajīrūr, Chakragoṭṭam, Uchhangi, Viratānapoḷal, Bankāpura, Banavāse, and Koyyāṭūr. Eragadaṇḍanāṭha was placed in charge of Bana-
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vāse 12000 and Sāntaljge 1000. A battle took place at Sigalnādu when Sigalnāḍāḷwar seized fifty horses near Tumbikere where Murasādi rāyar had encamped. The latter then destroyed Kāvepāleya and marched to Anilaivādi against Sikhkeya nāyaka of Mukkodal in Sigalnādu.

In 1194 A.D., Vira Ballāla was at Bāguliya Nelaviḍu and on Thursday 18th August laid siege to Kurudakōte.

In 1195 A.D. he had reduced Erambarige and encamped there.

In 1196 A.D. he was engaged in fighting Kāmadēva of Hānumgal. Vira Ballāla had his camp at Änekere and his general Sāhāṇi died in battle perhaps at Bālehaḷḷi in Avatur 120 of Talagainādu Koḍgi nāḍu. Kāmadēva had taken up the Kalachūri cause and we find him fighting the Hoysaḷas upto 1204 A.D. There was a skirmish with the people of Kenkere.

In 1197 A.D. Vira Ballāla was at the Haḷjavūr or Vijayasamudra on the banks of the Tunga-bhadra in the course of his northern conquests. His commander Mādhava captured the fort of Ekkalarasa.

In 1198 he was encamped at Kukkanūr-Koppal and made a grant at Muḍgoḍḍa Solapuram.

In 1199 Vira Ballāla was at Lokkigundī when Sindeya nāyaka won the battle of Haṭṭi over the Nilagiri army. One Dāsayya Nāyaka figures as the commander of Valangai forces. In 1199 Sāmantas Lakkeyanāyaka and Mādayyya made a grant to Pampā Virūpaksha.

In 1200 A.D. he was at Huḷiyere neleviḍu after taking the formidable fort of Niḍugal from the Iruṅgōḷa and cutting off the head of one Tailapa. This Tailapa was the son of Ekkalarasa a feudatory of Sankama Kaḷachūri.

In 1202 we hear of a battle at Baniyūr.

On Monday 13th January 1203 A.D. (Śivarātri) Malleyaṇa Daṇḍanāyaka took the fortress of Udareya Kōṭe. In the same year, Yādavas re-com-
menced their war against the Hoysalas. We find the chief queen (piriyarası) Kētala ruling at Hāḷḷavūr in Māsavāḍḍi from Hāḷḷavūr.¹

In 1204 while Vīra Ballāḷa was at Hāḷḷavūr, the nāḷprabhu Bichaseṭṭi died fighting with Noṇamba Nāyaka.²

In 1205 Rāmayya Nāyaka of Chunchuna Kōṭe fought with Eḍavara Rāchayya Nāyaka at Belavūr.³ On Monday 25th April a battle was also fought at Kereya magali.

In 1206 A.D. Vīra Ballāḷa claims to have captured the elephants of Sōmēśvara and his son Vīra Narasimha is mentioned as joint ruler.⁴

In 1207 A.D. (November 5th Monday) a battle took place at Kētana hāḷḷi near Balligāve.⁵

In 1208 A.D. we find Vīra Ballāḷa once more marching on Heddore.⁶

In 1909 he was encamped at Vijayamudra on the banks of Tunga- bhadra on his expedition against the Yādavas.⁷

In 1212 A.D. (8th April, Monday) Singhana was defeated in battle as he was marching on the Kuntala country.⁸ In the same year a few months before (3rd January, Sunday) we find Ballāḷa at Hāḷḷavūr and his queen Padmalā at Hosahadangili.⁹

In 1213 A.D. Vīra Ballāḷa lost the dominions North of Malaprabhā to Singhana Yādava. An inscription of 1214 A.D.¹⁰ gives the title “Sēvuṇa Kaṭaka sûrekārarum”, to Arakereya Bonkeya Nāyaka, Honnalahḷī Mādeya-Nāyaka Kāileyanāyaka, Bāchehalḷī Bōkeyanāyaka, Beḷḷūra Mācheyanāyaka, Mongalāchārya Kasavey Nāyaka, Baragiyana Mācheyanāyaka, Masanēya Nayaka, Koleyadi Nāyaka, ḍhaṇḍa, Marenāyaka, etc.

In 1214 (15th September, Monday)¹¹ we hear that Gujjaras had penetrated even to Dvārasamudra itself where in the Itṭigēṛi, Amityyya, son of Basavadaṇḍanātha and Mēlayya, son of Kāmayya Daṇḍanāyaka, forcing the enemy to retire, died in battle.

In 1217 Basavanta Daṇḍanāyaka was ruling from Kurugōḍu. In this year the expedition against the Magara Kingdom took place. An inscription of 1218 A.D.¹² already gives Vīra Narasimha the titles “Magara rājya diśā-
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paṭṭa,” “Aḍiyama nāyaka gharatṭa,” and “Chōla pratishṭhāpanāchārya.” Therefore all the transactions in the Chōla country must be prior to 1218 A.D. and of course long before the marriage of his son Vira Sōmēśvara in 1234 A.D.

In this inscription Vira Ballāḷa is styled Dakshiṇa Chakravarti i.e. Lord of the South, and was ruling at Dvārasamudra called also Vijayasamudra. His general was Malleyanāyaka of the family of Sambuvārāya (Sambuvārāya Kāḍavarāya Kulānvaya). The dealings with Chōlas in the time of Narasimha and Sōmēśvara are recorded in a Sanskrit work of Sakalavidyā Chakravarti, named “Gadya Karmāmyta.”

It speaks of a ninety days battle between Vira Narasimha and the Magadhā (probably the Magara), Pāṇḍya and Chōla chiefs who had overrun Rāja Rāja III’s territory and imprisoned him at Jayanta mangalam (Sendamangalam). Narasimha took the fort, released the King, marched on Śrīrangam and compelled the Pāṇḍya to acknowledge his suzerainty.

In 1218 Vira Narasimha plundered the Chōla capital. In S. 1139-40 we hear of Sōmēśvara ruling in Chōlika vishaya. That the struggle with the Kāḍava Perūṇjina was even earlier than 1233 A.D. is proved by an inscription of 1222 A.D. which calls Narasimha “Chōla Kamala Kanjapriya” who restored the fortunes of the Chōlas by defeating Aḍiyama, Chēra, Pāṇḍya, Magara and Kāḍava. (Aḍiyama Chēra Pāṇḍya Makarōḍhata Kāḍavaram Kavartegonḍu Chōla noṭtarakkē tandam). Therefore the Makara expedition must be placed in about the year 1217 A.D. when a march on Śrīrangam took place before 24th July. Narasimha captured numerous elephants of the Magara King.

Āneyanāyakange neradāneya nāyakanalladānanem-
binudi yēvudenu Narasimha mahįpati nūrāvudam
ṭāniradetti mūḍaṇa diśāvurdhddhatam poročkī nū
rāneya noṭḍidā Magara nānegalam piṭītandanaśvadīm

Perhaps it is from the capture of the Makara elephants that Ballāḷa assumed the title of Gaḷaṇṭekāra like Prauṇḍha Ďēvarāya II of Vijaya-
nagara.

In 1219 A.D. Vira Ballāḷa had his camp at Nalluru Koppa. The next year saw his demise. Since Vira Narasimha was crowned emperor on Thursday, April 16th (not the 18th) 1220 A.D. the death of his father must have taken place previous to that date probably in the month of March. The attachment and fidelity that Vira Ballāḷa evoked in his followers is probably unparalleled in history. Kuvara Lakshmadaṇḍāhipa and his wife Suggalādēvi had been brought up by Ballāḷa in his palace like his own children without any distinc-
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tion of master and servant. He had honoured them with the "Tōḍara" and a "Gaṇḍapendéra" of pearls. Suggalā was also permitted to wear the "tōḍara" on her left foot. 1

"Jayasimha Kshitipālakange Jagamellam bāṇisal pūṇdu bhā. sheyanā Suggaladēvī koṭṭateradim Ballałabhū pōttama
—priyaputraṅge Kumara Lakśmarathinī nāthangekoṭṭalmanah priyeyā Suggaladēvī bhāsheyanīlā chakram pogaḷvannmegam."  

One thousand of his heroic followers had also vowed to die with him at the death of their lord and sovereign.

Toṛe dāḷdanāṇā̄ śāyade
peragudiṃ toṛedū satavanevēle dalā |
varevevad nemba gaṇḍare
toredar Kali Kuvara Lakshmanaṇāṇati subhaṭar"

"Thinking that he who continued to live even after his master was no more, was as good as a corpse, the heroes followed Kuvara Lakṣma's example and went to heaven."

Thus did the people pay their homage to the qualities of their prince and Master—with their own very lives—a sacrifice befitting a heroic age.

B. ADMINISTRATIVE AND SOCIAL


Of the generals mentioned above Amṛta, Mantri Kallayya, Masaṇayya and Basava are represented as the four arms of Vishṇu1 (Vishnuvardhana Ballāla). Bāhuvali and Bharatamayya as the descendants of Mariyāne, were related to the Emperor by longstanding family-ties from the days of Vinayāditya.2 Dāṇḍanāyaka Narasimha evidently belonged to the defunct Ganga family as he styles himself Nanniyaganga, Ganga-Gāṅgēya, etc., the titles assumed by Būtuga and others. In 1202, he was ruling in Āsandi nelevīdu. Mallayya Nāyaka belonged to “Sambuvārya Kāḍavarāya Kulānvaya.”

In spite of the continuous war throughout the reign, the country seems to have been peaceful and prosperous. The following taxes are mentioned in the inscriptions: (1) Gadhurmbalji, (2) Nīdividīya saddāya, (3) Āneyasēse, (4) Kudureya sēse, (5) Khanava saddāya, (6) Bhāndi gege dere, (7) Kōṭi haḍike, (8) Koṭtigedere, (9) Tōḍaragadyāna, (10) Kuruvaragāniyē, (11) Adikeya sunka, and (12) Maidanāḍa Heggade Kōniyē. Another tax Holeava bālavaṇa is evidently a poll-tax on the paraias. Two measuring rods Bhēruṇḍanagale and Drōhara malla are mentioned.

Foreign trade flourished exceedingly during the reign. The inscriptions mention numerous mahāvadavāvyavahāris who traded in Arab horses by way of Honāvara and other western ports, in pearls of Ceylon and Malabar, Sandalwood, Silks and other luxuries. The Hoysalas like their political leaders—the emperors of Vijayanagara, were forced to import horses from foreign countries. One secret of the success of the Yādavas was their powerful cavalry. Vīra Ballāla felt that proper strengthening of the cavalry would be of advantage to repulse the northern attacks. Some of the merchant-princes mentioned are: (1) Chatta Seṭṭi, (2) Kavadamayya, (3) Rājaśreṣṭhi Kammeta Śri Malliyōgappa, (4) Hoysala paṭṭaṇasvāmi (lord-mayor) Sōvi-Seṭṭi, (5) Gāṇḍanārāyanasetṭi, (6) Vīra Ballāla paṭṭaṇasvāmi Nāga, (7) Māṇikya Bhaṇḍāri Rāmadēva nāyaka, (8) Bāhubali Seṭṭi, (9) Pārisa Seṭṭi, and (10) Vadhavāvaḥāra Dēvi Seṭṭi, etc. The maritime trade-transactions of Chatta Seṭṭi and Dāsaya are thus eulogised in inscriptions.3

Harīdāsābhāṇḍam Vāruṇīgenadisuvam Vāruṇīvastuvam vis-
taradindrāseyolperchisuvanosedu Kauβūri yim dyummamam nō-
dire yāmībābhāgadōl sandi suvaneseva mālīyangalām Samyadindu-
ttaradikkingatuvam nōḍanupama vaṇijam Dāseyam dōshadōram||
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Hariyahayakke tōdenipahēshachayangala nindradantigam | sariyenisirpa dantigalanabhradolinde supauni muttinōl
nereyenisirpa muttugalanaide bahitrade tanda māruvam
dharaniparoldu Hanmaṭada Chaṭṭapā Seṭṭi santatam

Vira Ballāla was fond of reclaiming forest-lands and planning out new towns. He beautified the capital and Arasikere which he made a treasure-town (Bhandāravāḍī). In 1171 A.D., he built Pāḷvarapattana after defeating the Chengāḷva Mahādeva. In 1186, Sachiva Viradēva cut down the forest in Malaināḍu and founded Vira Ballālapura. Vira Ballāla renamed Hallavūr Vijayasamudra and Jayangonda Ballālapura was founded near Arasikere. Hāneyakōṭe was renamed Vijayagiri after its capture. There is also an old local tradition to the effect that while out hunting, Vira Ballāla happened to come across a small hamlet which occupied the place of the present city of Bangalore and founded the nucleus of the city.

C. RELIGION AND FINE ARTS

The 12th century in the History of Kāṇṭāṭaka is of great importance because of the new religions Vira Śaivism, Viśishṭādvaitism of Rāmānuja and Dvaitism of Mādhava that made themselves felt in the lives of the people. Soon after the demise of Basava and Bijjala by 1170 A.D., Vira Śaivism with all the fervour and enthusiasm of a newly formed creed culminated over Kāṇṭāṭaka and all its neighbourhood. The religion of Rāmānuja after the death of Bīṭiga Viṣṇuvardhana took up its stronghold in Mēlukōṭe and brought some of the Emperors to lean definitely towards its tenets. By about 1200 A.D. Mādhvaism also clustered round Uḍupi and other places in the South Kanara districts. Besides these there were of course Jainism, with its centre in Śravaṇa Beḷagola, Advaitism, Kashmir Śaivism, Lākuliśa Pāṇḍupata at Sthāṇu Rudrapura, Balligāmve and other places.

Vira Ballāla is said to have been well-versed in Śaiva tenets and Pālkuṟike Sōma mentions Bhillama and Vira Ballāla in his Gaṇa sahasra nāma.

Vira Ballāla was a liberal-minded ruler and gave equal patronage and protection to the followers of all faiths. From his own hands he made a grant at the request of Dēvaṇa, the son-in-law of Lakshmīmaya, to the Agniśṭhigeyamāṭha at Khāṇḍya. He visited Śravaṇa Beḷagola personally and confirmed all the grants previously made to Gömmaṭa. His queens were free to follow any faith they pleased. His minister Sachivottama Rēcharasa built Sahasra-kūṭa Jina Bimbālaya at Arasiyakere and the Sāntināthālaya at Śravaṇa

1. Ak. 71, Epi. Car. V.  
2. Hg. 20, Epi. Car. IV.  
3. Tk. 45, Epi. Car. VI.  
4. Mlk. 12, Epi. Car. XI.  
6. Epi. Car. II.  
7. Ak. 77, Epi. Car. V.
Belagola. In 1176 A.D., the merchant Devi Setti built Vira Ballala Jinalaya named after the king. Again Vira Ballala Pattanavami Nagarasa made a grant to Gomma and built a dancer’s hall to Parshvanatha at Sravana Belagola. The minister Chandramauli and his wife Achambika made grants to Adhyatmi Balachandra. Kammata Malli Seth who ruled Bandanikke under the suzerainty of Vira Ballala and Amtya Surya Dandanayaka who are described as the devotees of Narayana made a grant to Santinatha Basti at Bandanikke. The four brothers Amrta, Masaayya, Kallayya and Basava not only built the Amrtesvara temple but also the Ekkoti Jinalaya at Vakkalagere. Adigavunda built not only a temple to Adi Mallikarjuna but also a Basadi. Inscriptions mention that the Chatussamayas of Jina, Buddha, Hari and Hara were equally patronised and there was little communal animosity.

The Saiva gurus who figure in the epigraphs of the reign are:

4. Isanasakti, Kalyanaskti, Devendrasakti, Narasimhasakti.
5. Bandarasi.
6. Sadyojatasharya, Raja raja guru Kriyashakti, Vamasakti. (The Kriyasaktis also figure in Vijayanagara history as the hereditary gurus of the first dynasty.)
7. Sovarasipandita, Vamasakti, Amrtaasi, Trilokyasakti, Lokabharaapanjita.
10. Vamasakti, Kalyanaskti.
11. Rechapaskti, Santisasakti.
12. Padmideva, Vama Siva, Deva Siva.
15. Chilukaji, worshipper of Naabeshvara in Henjeru, Somaji, Potaji.
17. Manikadeva of Agastyagotra, Karnatavaya.

2. Sr. Bel. 240, Epi. Car. II.
3. Sr. Bel. 124, Epi. Car. II.
5. Tk. 45, Kd. 30, Epi. Car. VI.
6. Bl. 137; 138, Epi. Car. V.
Of the Jaina gurus the chief are :—

(1) Of the Mūlasamgha, Dēśigaṇa and Vakragachha, Bālachandra, Rāmachandra, Kulachandra, Kanakanandi, Srutakirti Traividya, Nayakirti, Abhayachandra, Viraṇandi, Māghanandi, Vardhamāna, Dévachandra, Rāmachandra Traividya, Nēmichandra, Srutakirti bhaṭṭāraka, Vīnayēndu, Bāla-

chandra, Padmasēna, Jayakirti, Māghanandi siddhāntī, Jayakirti, Bālachandra Paṇḍita, Prabhāchandra, Srutakirti, Māghanandi Paṇḍita, the guru of Ka-

malabhāva—author of Śāntipurāṇa.

(2) Of the Pustaka gachha of the Mūla Samgha :—Gūnbhadra, Nayakirti paṇḍita, Chandra siddhāntī, Nayakirti, Ādhyatmi Bālachandra.

(3) Of the Tintrinīgachha of the Krāṇūrgaya :—Padmanandi, Rāma-

nandi, Munichandra, Sakalabhūshaṇa Traividya, Sakalachandra; Subhachan-

dra Paṇḍita, Sakalachandra Bhaṭṭāraka; Bhānukirti mālādhīkārī, Hemanandi-

vāḍibha Vajrāṅkuṇa.

(4) Of the Dronīla Samgha established by Pūjyapāda :—Śrīpāla Trai-

vidya, Vāsupūjya Siddhāntī; Vajranandi to whom Vīra Ballāla himself gave a grant on December 25th 1192 A.D. Besides, there were (5) Srutakirti of Sangitapura, the guru of Aggaḷa, (6) Gāndavimukta Rāmachandra, the guru of Janna, (7) Munichandra the guru of Gūnavarma, (8) Nandiyogīśvara the guru of Āchaṇḍa.

Of the Architecture of the time we have numerous examples. To men-

tion a few :—(1) Sahasrakūṭa Jinālaya at Arasiyakere built by Rēcharasa, (2) Kaṭṭamēśvara temple at Arasiyakere, (3) Perforated screens of the Chen-

nakēśva temple at Bēlūr, (4) Amṛṭēsvara temple at Amṛtapura, (5) Bāčē-

sva temple at Kōramangala, (6) Porch of Gōvindarāja temple at Kōraman-

gala, (7) Sangamēśvara temple at Sindigaṭṭa, (8) Lakshmi Nārāyaṇa temple at Sindigaṭṭa, (9) Mahālinga temple at Sante-bāchahalli, (10) Pancha Lin-

gēśvara temple at Gōvindana Halli, (11) Kirthi Nārāyaṇa temple at Heragu, (12) Vīra Nārāyana temple at Beḷavāḍī, (13) Chaṭṭēsvara temple at Chaṭṭa-

halli, (14) Śāntinātha Basadi and dancing hall at Śravana Belagola, (15) the temple at Bandāṇnikke built by Kammaṭa Mallidēva with the assistance of the senior queen Abhinava Kēṭaladēvī, and (16) Kēḍarēsvāra temple at Halēbindu attributed to Vīra Ballāla and Abhinava Kēṭaladēvī, etc. An in-

scription makes mention of an eminent architect named Stōṭakāchārya who had surpassed Mayāśura himself.

Education in the vernacular was especially encouraged by Vīra Ballāla. An inscription of 1174 A.D. makes provision for a school of 120 students who were to be instructed in the vernacular at Narasimhadēvapura evidently named after the king’s father.1 Fixed salaries were paid to the teacher Sōvaṇṇa, 20 Mānis (servants) and a cook (Bānisagitti). The students were given

---

1. Sk. 247, Epi. Car. VI.
2. Dg. 105, Epi. Car. XI.
3. Ak. 138, Epi. Car. V.
regular oil-baths and food and clothing. Besides this provision for *Kārṇāṭaka Bālaśikṣa*, there were centres of higher learning of the Jainas at Śravaṇa Belagola, of the Saivas at Sthānakaṇḍupura, and a great University flourished at Balligāmve under the Lakulīśa Pāṣupatas and Kālāmukhas.

Music was also patronised by Vīra Ballāla like his contemporaries Bhilama and Singhaṇa in whose court the renowned Śaṅgīgadeva flourished and wrote his Sangīta Ratnakara (*Ashēḍhyāyi*). Vīra Ballāla possessed the title “Sangīta Prasanga Bhangi Sanga Bharata,” and “Sarvaṇīa Chūḍāmaṇi” which denote his scholastic attainments. The work “Sangīta Chūḍāmaṇi” attributed to a Pratāpa Chakravarti Jagadēkamalla is probably a work of his period.

D. **Literature**

The twelfth century is of outstanding importance in the history of Kannada Language and Literature. The new creeds that had risen from the soil of Kārṇāṭaka all of them, aimed at democratization of philosophy, religion, literature and every department of knowledge. The patronage of the Hōysalas, the Chālukyas, the Kāḷaḥūris, and the Yādavas gave a fresh impetus to the already growing mass of literary creations, that took their origins from religious fervour and the desire to spread the new gospel, ‘clad in the light of a thousand stars.’ The Vīraśaiva religion brought forth numerous *Vachana-kāras* and others who resorted to simple metres like Tripadi, Śaṅgatya, Chāupadi, etc., instead of resorting to the artificial *champu* style that was in vogue amongst the Jaina poets. It was Hariśvara who first took to Ragale and it was Rāghavānka who made the *Skatpadi* popular, though strictly he is not entitled to the credit of having invented that form. We hear of numerous poets chief among whom may be mentioned:— (1) Rājādítya, (2) Nāga chandra, (3) Dēvapāchaṛya, (4) Bāchaṇṇa, (5) Trivikrama Paṇḍita, (6) Aṅgala, (7) Achaṇṇa, (8) Nēmichandra, (9) Kanti, (10) Harihara, (11) Rāghavānka, (12) Kereya Padmarasa, (13) Harihara sūri, (14) Mālayya, (15) Janna, (16) Kallayya, (17) Rudrabhāṭṭa, (18) Pōlajva daṇḍanātha, (19) Kēśavarājachamūpa, (20) Sāraṇa, (21) *Batevarāchāṛya* Sūryaṇa, (22) Rēchaṇṇa, (23) Madanamahēśvara, (24) Mallikārjuna, (25) Sāntinātha Kavi, (26) Pārśva Paṇḍita, (27) Śīṣu māyaṇa, (28) Dēvakavi, (29) Kama-labhava, (30) Guṇavarma, (31) Karṇapārya, (32) Aṇḍayya, (33) Vṛttavilāṣa, (34) Bandhuvarma, (35) Jōbaṇa Paṇḍita, and (36) Pāṣupati. Many of these poets are known to us only from inscriptions they have composed.

The intense religious feeling that underlay the new literary activity could not but be reflected in the works themselves. Thus other faiths came to be criticised rather ruthlessly by the Vīraśaivas and in their turn by Jaina poets like Brahmaṇīva and Vṛttavilāṣa. But this animosity was rather an exception than a rule. We find that Vīra Ballāla patronised all poets without any distinction of caste or creed. Chandramauli who was a Jaina and made grants to Gommaṭēśvara yet patronised the Brahmāṇa poet Rudrabhāṭṭa, the author of Jagannātha Vijaya.
Another characteristic of the literature of the period was a general attempt at purity and simplicity of diction; Grammar and rules of Prosody were made subservient to the contingencies of expression of ideas. Hariśvara expressly discards the meticulous distinctions in the use of Ra, Ra, La, and La. In the Shatpadī, Tripadi and Sāngatyas greater liberties were taken in matters of rhyme and even grammar. The attempts at purism even went so far as to use only tadbhava and deśya words discarding altogether Sāṃskṛta equivalents as in the case of Āṇḍayya in “KABBIGARA KĀVA.” But it was evidently a failure and no such attempt was ever again made. Nayasaṇa in his Dhrāmāṃśa condemns the indiscriminate use of Sāṃskṛta and compares it to a mixture of oil and ghee.

Posagamāṇḍadim vyāvar
nisveṣam saṅṛṣṭiyantena Kannadaṃam chin

tisi kūḍaḷādakkaṇṭa
misukada sakkada manikkuvavanum Kaviya? ||

Sakkada pēḻvode nera
Sakkada mum pēḻge sudda Kannada dōltaṇ

dikkuvade Sakkadangala
Takkude verasalke ghṛtamumam tailamumam ||

However, the Jaina and Brāhmaṇa poets usually follow the old champa style but manage at the same time to maintain a remarkable lucidity of thought and ease of expression as in the case of Nāgachandra in his Pampa Rāmāyaṇa and Rudrabhaṭṭa in his Jagannātha Vijaya, Dēva Kavi in “Kusumāvaṭi Kāvyā” and Nēmichandra in his “Lilāvati” instead of resorting for their material to the old Purāṇic legends, have woven romances from their own imagination and thus trod a slightly different path.

E. CONCLUSION

Thus, Vira Ballāla appears in History not only as a great warrior but also as a cultured sovereign. His titles “Tarka vidyā viśārada,” “Sarvajña chakravarti,” and “Sabdavidyāsāmagra lakṣhāṇa suśikṣa” indicate his vast scholarship in Tarka (logic) and Sabdavidyā (Grammar and Rhetoric). He seems to have had many wives. His chief queens mentioned in inscriptions are: (1) Remmādevi; (2) Baichāla, the daughter of Mādayya Nāyaka; (3) Mahādevi Arasi Bammalā who had the titles “Savātīgandha vārāṇe”, “Abhinava Pārvaṭi”, and “Savatīyara vema sammaṭi,”; (4) Chikka Bammalā (d. 1185 A.D.); (5) Chandalā; (6) Kētalā who had the title “Gandhāvāraṇe piriyarasi”; (7) Umādevi the daughter of Kēsavayya; (8) Piriyarasi Paṭṭamahādevi Chōlamahādevi evidently a Chōla princess whom

2. Cn. 229; 254, Epi. Car. V
3. Hg. 23, Epi. Car. IV.
4. Hg. 20, Epi. Car. IV; Cn. 205, Epi. Car. V.
Vira Ballāla married after his Chōla conquests; (9) Piriyarasi Padmalā who was the mother of Vira Narasimha and a daughter Sōvalā; (10) Tuļuvalamahādēvi; (11) Chikkapatṭa mahādēvi and (12) Abhinava Kētala. The queen Umādēvi bore him a son named Kumāra Paṇḍitayya.

Of the devout attachment which the king and the Royal family evoked in the minds of the subjects, already one instance has been given. Another inscription tells us that when Honnavve, the mother of Mahōpasāyita Hulīvanāda Sāmanta Sīvōdaya Nāyaka, died, her servant Honni voluntarily gave her head to the "hook" and died according to her vow. Similarly we are also told that when the people of Bēvūr slandered the fair fame of the Queen Chōlamahādēvi, her servant Kēlāmalla attacked them and gave up his life. The queen touched by remorse made a grant for the merit of his soul.

Vira Ballāla’s titles, by the end of his reign, ran as follows:—"Samastabhuvaranāśaya, Śri prthivivallabha, Mahārajasākūtya, Paramēśvara, Paramabhaṭṭāraka, Pratāpadhakrapāravī, Pratāpadēva, Yuddharanga Triṇētra, Pratāpa Triṇētra, Bhujabala Chakravarti, Giridurgamalla, Sānivārasiddhi, Kirti Nārāyanā, Konkana śūlēkāra, Chōla Kāṭaka sūrēkāra, Rāja rāja pratishṭhānirata, Paṇḍyāraṇja pratishṭhāpanakāra, Kālachūrya Kālānala, Bhillama dalatala prāhāra, Sālamannayaśeśēkāra, Hulirāya gāṇḍa bhērūṇḍa, Gajabēśēkāra, Sarvajñā chūḍāmāṇi, Saptārdha lakṣha kshitiśa, Sangita prasanga bhangī sangha Bharata, Gajārajananda, Taitugirāhuta dīśāpaṭṭa, Tarkvidyaśivārada-vicchāra nirata, Sabda vidyā samagra lakṣhanā suṣikha Dakshīṇa Chakravarti, Tuļuva balajaladhi baḍābānala, Malaparoluṇgaṇḍa, Kadaṇapračangaṇḍa, Bhujabala Vira Gaṅga Vishnuvardhanā Hoysala Vira Ballōḷādaṇa."

It is a pity that hitherto no coin or portrait of this remarkable sovereign has been found to give us an idea of his personality. An inscription of the second year of his grandson Śōmeśvara tells us that he set up the image of Poysalēsvara (Bhōjēsvara) at Vikramapura or Kāṇḍanūr. Along with this, he also installed at Jambukēsvaram four images named after his grandfather and grandmother (Ballāla and Padmalā), and his father and mother Narasimha and Sōmalā. Perhaps these portrait-statues might still be existing somewhere.

Vira Ballāla was a brave and energetic man impatient of his father's control in his youth. Soon, however, he turned his energies to fight the enemies of the Empire than plunge the country in civil war. He regained the prestige of the Hoysalas which had suffered an eclipse during the comparatively feeble rule of Narasimha I and made himself a foremost power in the South as in

1. Sh. 40, Epi. Car. VII.
3. Bl. 115, Epi. Car. V.
4. Ak. 40, Epi. Car. V.
5. Ml. 12, Epi. Car. XI.
6. Cn. 205, Epi. Car. V.
Kṛṣhṇa against the Yādavas, Kālachūryas and Chāḷukyas, and in the east as in the days of Vishṇuvardhana I. He led the Karnāṭaka army north as far as Kanchi. It was this that enabled his successors, Vīra Narasimha and Sōmēśvara to play with decisive effect with the Chōḷa and Pāṇḍya politics, deposing and reinstating whom they chose. Vīra Ballāḷa was primarily and necessarily a conqueror but at the same time lacked not the superior graces of a cultured man. His outstanding personality among the princes of his day, marked him out as the champion of Karnāṭaka culture. The influx of Kannadigas into the eastern and southern parts began during his reign and continued even in the days of Vijayanagara empire. Thus his reign is of interest as it provides the necessary link in the continuous history of Karnāṭaka Culture.
THE AGE OF JAYATĪRTHA*  

By  

B. N. KRISHNAMURTI ŠARMA  

1. THE LIFE AND WORKS OF JAYATĪRTHA (1365-88 A.D.)  

After Madhva, the next loadstar in the firmament of Dvaita Vedānta and its Literature is Jayatīrtha. He is to Madhva even more than what Vācaspati Miśra was to Śaṅkara. Renouncing the world at a very young age, he devoted himself to the service of Madhva’s philosophy, and within a brief space of thirty years, he raised it to a position of Śāstraic equality with the Advaita and the Viśiṣṭadvaita by his remarkable industry and depth of scholarship. For beauty of language and brilliance of style, for proportion, keenness of argument and fairness in reasoning, for refreshing boldness, originality of treatment and fineness of critical acumen, Sanskrit philosophical literature has few equals to place beside him. Though designated by the unassuming titles of commentaries, his works are first-rate classics in Philosophy, displaying an extreme orderliness, a masterly elaboration and an unchecked progress towards a predetermined effect. But for them, the works of Madhva would never have made headway into the philosophical world. Jayatīrtha is thus a name to be conjured with in Dvaita Vedānta and its Literature. He stands supremely inimitable and belongs to the class of the great makers of style especially of Sanskrit philosophical prose—like Śabara, Śaṅkara and Vācaspati. In point of all-round brilliance there is not one who could successfully hold a candle to him, in Dvaita literature, except perhaps the great Vyāsa-rāya. Even he lacks the elegant diction that is Jayatīrtha’s by right. Small wonder then, that Jayatīrtha has won for himself, the honoured title of “Ṭīkācārya”, par excellence. Vyāsarāya pays him a memorable tribute:  

_Citraik padaścā gambhirair vākyair mānair akhaṇḍitaik |  
Gurubhāvam vyanjayanit bhāti śri Jayatīrthavāk ||_  

(Nyāyāmṛta, i, 4).  

Vādirāja, in his Tirthaprabandha, (iii, 18), pays a similar tribute to the services rendered by Jayatīrtha to the cause of Dvaita Vedānta. So complete has been the domination of Jayatīrtha in Dvaita Literature of the post-Madhva period, that barring a few memorable exceptions, the entire course of its subsequent history has been one of commentaries and super-commentaries on the ṭīkās1 of Jayatīrtha! He has not only dominated the subsequent history of his faith but has also totally eclipsed the past and thrown into the shade everyone of the works and commentaries of his predecessors on the works of  

---  

* This article is part of my History of Dvaita Literature.  
1. His comm. have never been designated “Tippanis” (minor glosses), as we are led to believe on p. 302 of the Viś. Sex. Com. Vol.
Madhva. By his own sheer brilliance, he has driven out of the field the works of Trivikrama Paṇḍītācārya, Padmanābha Tīrtha, Narahari and others, and caused their very names to pale into insignificance, before his.

II. LIFE AND CAREER

Several narratives in the form of "Vijayas", have come down to us of the life of Jayatīrtha. We have the Aṇu-Jayatīrthavijaya purporting to be from the pen of Vyāsatīrtha who describes himself as a direct disciple of Jayatīrtha and we have also a Bṛhad-Jayatīrthavijaya, from the same hand. There is another life of Jayatīrtha by Chalāri Saṅkarṣaṅgaśārya (1700 A.D.). The Satkathā makes use of some stories from these and other sources. We have no inscriptions or other historical documents relating to Jayatīrtha and it is indeed curious that so remarkable a personality should have been left out historically unrecognised by his contemporaries.

III. TWO ALLEGED EPIGRAPHS EXAMINED

I have with me extracts from a couple of c.p. grants purporting to have been issued to J.1 by contemporary rulers and alleged to have been published in the Archæological Survey of India (1928, iv-v, p. 310, JRAS) and IA, XVIII, Ins. 1109,2 supplied to me by a Pandit of the Uttarādi Mutt, at Bangalore. My informant could not however name the source of his information. Further investigations have shown that certain passages in these extracts answer very closely indeed to parts of the published text of the c.p. grant of King Govindacandradeva of Kanouj dated Vikrama Saṅvat 1166 (1109 A.D.) [Indian Antiquary, XVIII, 1889, p. 15, text edited by KIEL-HORN]. But dates make it impossible that the same King could have been the donor in both the cases. It is also curious that the donees in both the cases, though belonging to different centuries.—(there is a difference of 280 years between the dates of Exhibits A and B (1)], have more or less the same titles and hail from the same village! It is plain then that the extracts have been "made up" of promiscuous adaptation from the inscription of Govindacandra and from other sources:

Exhibit No. 1 (Insc. No. 1) A., supplied by S. BHĪMĀCĀR, Pandit, Uttarādi Mutt, Bangalore.

A

(a) Om Paramātmane namaḥ
   Akunṭhotkaṇṭhavaikuṇṭhakaṇṭhapāṭhalaṭhatkaraḥ |
   Saṅrambhāḥ suratārmbhe sa śriyāḥ śreyaseśtu vah ||
   *   *   *   *   *

(c) Sajalasthala- soṣara- pāṣāṇa- girinadi- vanavāṭkāmramadhūka- 
   lohalavanākarordhādaḥ siddhiyutah ............. Saṅvat 1354,
   (1298 A.D.)3 Pauṣyā vadya ravau (15) adyeya Aṣṭākāyāṃ ....

1. J would in the following pages stand for Jayatīrtha.
2. The mixing up of the two sources is amusing.
3. This date is however too early for Jayatīrtha.
(d) Marahaṭṭa-brāhmaṇaṇāya Bhaṭṭakavaḍagrāmavinirgatāya, Āśvalāyana-śākhine, Viśvāmitrakotṛāya, Śrutādhyayanasampanna Brāhmaṇagunacandrāya Sannyastāya Jayatirthābhikhṛtyā Vaisnavāya...

With the above compare the following extract from the text of the c.p. grant of Madanapāla and Govindacandra dated Vikrama Saṃ. 1166 (1110 A.D.) published in the IA, for 1889, p. 15:—

(Govindacandra's c.p. Grant of 1109)

B

(a) Om Paramātmane namaḥ
Akṣuṭhotkaṇṭhavaiakuṇṭhakaṇṭhapiṭhaluṭhatkaraḥ
Saṃrambhaḥ suratārambhe sa śriyāḥ śreyase'stu vaḥ

(b) Pradhvaste Sūryasomodbhavaviditamahāksatravāṃśadvayesmin Utsatraprāyavedadhvani jagadakhilam manyamānaḥ Svayambhūḥ
Kṛtvā dehagrahāya pravaṇamīha manaḥ sūdhahuddhir dhariṣṭrīyā-Muddhartum dharmamārgān prathitam iha tathā kṣatravāṃśa
dvayam ca

(c) Sajalasthala- soṣarapāṣāṇaṅgirinadi- vanavāṭikāmramadhūka-loha
lavanākakarordvādhaḥ sudhīiyutaḥ
(I the illustrious Ranaka Lavapravāha, having duly bathed in the Yamunā at the ghat of the deity Muraittha, here, at Ásāṭikā) Saṃvat 1166, Pausyāvadya (15) Ravau

(d) Bhaṭṭabrahmaṇaṇāya Gūgāputrāya, Rīlheputrāya, Bhaṭṭakavaḍagrāmavinirgatāya, Sāṃkhyaṇaṇaśākhine, Gautamaitathāṅgirasa-trī
pravarāya Śrutādhyayanasampanna Brāhmaṇagunacandrāya, vi
suddhena manasā

It can be seen from the above that Exhibit A has actually reproduced from B sections (a) and (c) wholesale and two or three significant phrases from (d). A comparison of (c)A and (c)B, would reveal another fact that both the grants happen to be made on the same day of the same fortnight of the same month (only the year being different)! It is perhaps needless to point out that the information in (d)A, that J. hailed from the village of Bhaṭṭakavade is against the traditional view which makes him a native of the village of Mangalvedhe, near Pandharpur.

EXHIBIT II

This purports to give additional facts about J. and his accomplishments and mentions a number of ruling Princes contemporary with him:—

(1) Pradhvaste sūryasomodbhavaviditamahāksatravāṃśadvayes'min Utsatraprāyavedadhvani jagadakhilam manyamānassvayambhūḥ
Kṛtvā dehagrahāya pravaṇam iha manaḥ sūdhahuddhir dhariṣṭrīyā-Muddhartum dharmamārgān prathitam iha tathā kṣatravāṃśa
dvyaṁ ca
(2) śākeśvabdasahasrake śatayuge pañcottare nāvatau
Pāṭindrāyudhanāmmi Kṛṣṇarṇapāje Śrīvallabhe daksinām
Pūrvām śrīmad Avantibhūbhṛti nṛpe Śrī Kāmadeve param
Sauryāṃ pād adhimaṇḍalam jayayute Bhīme-Varāhe 'vati

(3) śrīman Madhvamūndracittajalaraḥ dhāmasphurat śīramā-
Rāmapremasamrddhavikṣaṇa-laharyaṃmajnamānaḥ sadā
Dhīmaṃtaniṃ tutsavāmṛtanidhāvārnajjyan santatam
Maunaṃrodya virājate hyatitarām śrīmaṇ-Jayāryābhidhān

(4) Mīmāṁsādvayapāraga Gururasaṃ yāḥ KāŚyāpiye naye
Sāṁkhya cāpratimallānayanidhiḥ tryakṣo'kṣapādoktidṛk
Yaścārvāka-visālamānadanam durvāra-Baudhāṃbudheḥ
Pāṇānandita-kumbhasambhavamunir Dīvāsasāṃ antakaḥ

(5) Yasyātyadhubhutavāhavāhanamahāṣastraprayogādiṣu
Prāvīnyam pravikatthitam prthumati ŚrīKāmadevena ca

The first verse here is found in exactly the same form in the text of Govindacandra’s grant, immediately after the verse: “Akuṇṭhotkanṭhavaikunṭha ………” The opening line of the second verse obviously refers to the year of a certain grant alleged to have been made to J. The date is given as śaka 1295 (1373 A.D.) which is otherwise acceptable for him. Lines 2-4, of the second verse mention (1) Prince Indrāyudha, son of Kṛṣṇa, as the Lord of the Southern kingdom; (2) Kāmadeva ruler of Avanti, as the lord of the Eastern kingdom and (3) Bhīma-Varāha, king of the Sauryamaṇḍala (Surāstra?). But for a sharp variation in the date, this verse is identical with the 53rd verse in the last and concluding chapter (64) of the Aṛiṣṭanemi-pūrāṇa-saṅgraha of Jinasena, who gives the date of the composition of his own work, in that very verse as Śaka 705 (783 A.D.), when there were reigning in various directions determined with reference to a town named Vardhamānapura (identified with the modern Waḍhwān, in the Jhālaṇḍ dr. of Kathiawād), (1) Indrāyudha in the North; (2) Śrīvallabha in the south; (3) Vatsarāja, King of Avanti (Ujjain) in the East and (4) Varāha or Jaya-Varāha in the terri-

The only genuine portions of Exhibit II, thus seem to be the verses 3 and 4 (and 5, if we omit the name of Kāmadeva), which extol the merits of Jayatīrtha, his Śāstraic learning, attainments in riding, archery, etc., which are confirmed by tradition.
IV. Life

From the various biographical accounts of J. we gather that his former name was Dhoṇḍo Pant Raghunāth. His native village is said to have been Maṅgälveḍhe about 12 miles S.E. of Pandharpur. His father—presumed to have been Mahārāṣṭra Brahmin—(others claim him to have been a pucca Karṇāṭaka),¹ was an officer of rank and importance and held the title of Deśpāṇḍe. The Satkathā gives the names of J.'s parents as Raghunāth (father) and Rukmābai (after the consort of Viṭhobā at Paṇḍharpūr). Born as he was with the silver spoon in his mouth, young Dhoṇḍo Pant grew up into a strong and sturdy youth. He was a good rider and an athlete. Early in life he had been married to two wives (cf. Kāṇṭāyugme kamalavadane saivāloke virakṭih).

At twenty came the great turning-point in his life, which was charged with so much consequence to the future of Realism in Indian Philosophy. It was in the course of one of his hunting expeditions, that young Dhoṇḍo Pant came, one summer noon, to the banks of the Candrabhāgā, to quench his thirst. He did not even trouble to dismount his horse, but strode forth into the water, and bending down from on horse-back, put his mouth to the water, and drank. On the other side of the river, sat an ascetic watching the sight. It was none other than Akṣobhya Tirtha. He felt drawn towards the cavalier, called him to his side, and put him certain strange questions which at once flashed up before the youth's mental eye, a kaleidoscopic vision of his past. He was strangely affected and sought to be taken over as a disciple. News of his son's escapade reached the ears of the Deśpāṇḍe, who came down to demand restoration of his son. The attractions of family life failed however to turn the mind of the youth, once made up. In the end wiser counsel prevailed and Dhoṇḍo Pant was allowed to go back to his teacher. He was soon ordained a monk under the name of Jayatīrtha, and learnt the śāstras under him.²

We have already seen that Akṣobhya and Vidyāraṇya were contemporaries.³ The Jayatīrtha-vijaya of Saṅkarṣanācārya, makes J. too a contemporary (younger) of Vidyāraṇya and refers to a meeting between the two. This is supported by the fact that there are no quotations from any of the

1. Paṇḍharpūr was originally within the Kannāḍa country which extended so far as Sholapur. The great Karṇāṭaka poet, Purandara Dāsa, was a native of Paṇḍharpūr. Many old Kannāḍa inscriptions have been found all round the territory, which is now part of Mahārāṣṭra.

2. "Akṣobhyatīrthagurupā śukavat śikṣitasya me || [J.'s G. B. Prameyadiṭpika.]

3. The date of Vidyāraṇya is given as 1302-87. Grants to him have been found dated between 1371-78. If an interval of at least 30 years is assumed between Narahari Tirtha (d. 1333) and Akṣobhya, we carry the latter as far as 1363 in which case, he could not but be a contemporary of Vidyāraṇya.
writings of J. in the Pūrṇaprajña-Darśana section of the Sarvadarśana-saṁgraha (SDS.).

Internal evidence in the works of J. clearly establishes him as having come long after Śrīharṣa, Ānandabodha and Citsukha.²

V. THE WORKS OF JAYATĪRTHA

Over twenty-two works are known to have been written by J., almost all of which have been printed.

1. Tattvasamākhyāna-Tīkā (p)

This is a short com. in 200 granthas, on the first of the ten Prakaraṇas (of Madhva). The contents of the original have already been described in the earlier pages and there is nothing more to be added about the com. The definition of “Tattva” given by the commentator is however of much philosophical interest: “Svarūpa-pramiti-pravṛtti-lakṣaṇa-sattātraividhye paraṇa-pekṣam Svatantram. Parāpekṣam asvatrantram”

2. Tattvaviveka-Tīkā (p)

This runs to 160 granthas and its contents are much the same as of (1).

3. Tattvodyota-Tīkā (p)

The com. has 1500 granthas and it is one of the best-written among the minor works of the author. Under the brilliant exposition of J., the abstruse original assumes a newer light every time. It is a very clever and well-thought-out plea indeed for the dualistic interpretation of “Tattvam asi”, that we have, in —

1. The reference to certain comm. on the bhāṣya of Ānandatīrtha, in the SDS is evidently to the pre-J. comm.

2. J. has quoted several passages from the Tattvapradipikā of Cit., both in his c. on the V. T. N. and the Av. C. Hayavadana Rau, (Q/MS, xxiv, 278-8), places Cit. between 1220-84, on the basis of a couple of inscriptions from Sthīnācalam. There are however, objections to the identification of the donee in these with the Advaitic dialectician. We have not proof that Narasimhamuni was an alias of Citsukha, even though he was certainly a devotee of Nṛśinha. The Citsukha Somajīn of the grant, mentioned as the temple-manager, cannot of course be the ascetic Citsukha. I would however, accept the 1220-87, for Cit. apart from the above epigraphs.
Writing about the untenability of Rāmānuja's interpretation of the "Vāc-cārambhāya-text", J. says well that the example of the "Nakha-nikṛntana" entirely gives away the whole case for a Paripāma-vāda interpretation:—

हं तु स्वयंभूतपलम। मूल्यप्रदायकेषु मृण्याक्तिकं प्रति कारणविस्तारस्ये। न विनिभ्रम्यनं तु, स्वयमणे कार्यस्य कार्यायस्य प्रति तत्तपि नास्ति। किंतु, एकन्तलिहिन्तनविविकारः सः कार्यायस्यं न मवतीति। अति विहारये—नैते दशान्तः। कार्यकारणविचित्रयेति॥ (P. 35 b).

(4) Viśnu-tattva-nirnaya-Ṭikā (p)\(^1\)

This is the biggest of J's comm. on the Prakaraṇas and contains nearly 5120 granthas. He refers to the earlier interpretations of Padmanābha and Narahari (p. 8, lines 16-17), quotes extensively from the Tattvapradīpikā of Citsukha, and repels his attacks on the concept of Bheda (difference),\(^2\) and alludes to certain attempted defences of the Advaitic interpretations in the light of the criticisms of Madhva:—p. 66, 1, 4; p. 92, 1.10.

(5) Māyāvāda-khaṇḍana-Ṭikā (p)

The number of granthas in this work is 175. The author quotes Śrīharaṇa:—

"Taccādvaitam 'Brahmaivedam sarvam' iti śrutysthathena saha aikyam āpannam. Brahmaiva syāt" (Khaṇḍanakhaṇḍakāḥdyya, p. 220, Chouk. 1914) iti (p. 12), and from Ānandabodha the verse "Na san nāsanna sadasan nānir-vācyopi tatḥkṣayat" etc., referring to the cessation of Avidyā as belonging to a fifth order of prediction (pañcama-prakārata).

(6) Praṇaṃcamithyāvānumānakaḥkhaṇḍana-Ṭikā (p)
(granthas 275)

The author explains at the outset that it is incumbent upon the realist to expose the untenability of the doctrine of the unreality of the world; for, unless the world is shown to be real, the definition of the Brahman given in the B.S. i, 1, 2, as the Author, etc., of the Universe, would be a travesty. He quotes from Maṇḍana (p. 5, line 10) the line: "Sarvapratyayavedye ... " (Brahmasiddhi, 20).

(7) Uṇḍhikhaṇḍana-Ṭikā (p)

This com. (granthas 300) is otherwise known as Tattvapraṅkāśikā.\(^3\) It is later than the c. on the VTN. (see reference to Bimbapratibimbavāda, pp. 18 and 37b). In the course of his exposition, J. says that the Advaitin must either give up the idea of Ignorance attacking the Brahman, or else account for it in a rational manner. It is foolish to take refuge in the "durghaṭatva" of Avidyā. He quotes from the Nyāyamukaranda of Ānandabodha (under verse i, of UK.) the passage beginning with "Nanu, sarvam hi yo jānati sa sarvaṁaḥ. Tisraścāsya vidhās sambhavanti ......... pratikṣipatīti".

---

2. Cf. J. p. 48, l. 13; p. 49, 2 and Sit. ii, 164; J. 51, 9-10 and 36, 3-4, with Cit. p. 83 (Bombay).
3. "Evaṁ samāpīta-Tattvapraṅkāśikā-vyākhyo bhagavān Ṭīkākārah.... |" (Vyāsatirtha, Com).
(8) Pramāṇalakṣaṇa-Ṭikā (p)

The com. (granthis 1450), goes by the name of Nyāyakalpakatā. It is a lucid exposition of the original which has been rendered superfluous by the more exhaustive treatment of the same subject in the Pramāṇapaddhati.

(9) Kathālakṣaṇa-Ṭikā (p)

[Granthis 354.] The author gives a clear exposition of the subject of dialectic disputation and throws much historical light on various points. He refers at the outset to three different classifications of Kathā adopted by Śastrakāras :

(1) Eka eva kathāmārga iti Bāhyaḥ (i.e. Buddhists).
(2) Vādavitaṇḍe dve eveti Śrīharṣaḥ
(3) Vādo jālpāḥ, vādavitaṇḍā, jālpavitaṇḍā ceti caturasḥ
   kathā iti Gauḍa-Naiyāyikāḥ ||

(10) Karmanirṇaya-Ṭikā (p)

This runs to nearly 920 granthas and was printed in 1900. The most interesting fact here is that interpretations (of the KN) of Narahari Tīrthā are criticised on three occasions : once at the very beginning of his c. on the opening line : Tatraike āhuragunam brahmeti. Natat yukttam. Śrutiyuktvivrodhāt. Yuktaśabdaḥ śobhanaparyayaḥ. Yathāha Bhikṣuḥ | Tathā ca Yuktivirodhāt na yukttam iti sādhāvīviśiṣṭataḥ ; for a second time on p. 3-4b, on the statement of a syllogism and lastly in connection with the interpretation of the somewhat inadequately worded text : “Vedavākyasya tu vācanikār-tham vinā naivānyo yuyjate.”

SŪTRA PRASTHĀNA

Except the Agu-bhāṣya, J. has left comm. on all the other works of Madhva on the Sūtraprasthāna. Of these, his com. on the AV is acknowledgedly his magnum opus. Next in importance comes his Tattvaprakāśikā.

(11) Tattvaprakāśikā (p)

This is the best known and most universally studied com. on Madhva’s B.S.B. The extent of the work is nearly 8000 granthas. It has completely superseded other commentaries in the field, both earlier and later. While the earlier ones died a natural death leaving not a trace behind them, the TP. of J. has had the honour of not less than eleven commentaries written on it.

A comparison of the TP. with the Sattarkadipāvali of Padmanābha Tīrthā would show that the former follows very closely indeed in the footsteps of the latter. He is familiar with the TD, but passes over things which have been explained therein at some length. He keeps strictly to the original avoiding

---

2. See Bhāvadipa, i, 1, 4, p. 30, 21. The Gautamaśāpa episode is described by Trivikrama at great length ; but it is disposed of by J. and Padmanābha in one sentence.
all digressions and criticism of rival interpretations of the Sūtras, reserved for
treatment in his subsequent work, the Nyāyasudhā.

Anu-Bhāṣya-Ṭikā.

on the Anubhāṣya. That this is by a later hand is clear from one of the opening
stanzas in it :—

Pranamya Nṛharim Madhvamunim Jayamunim tathā |
Vivṛtim hyanubhāṣyasya kariṣyāmi yathāmati ||.

(12) Nyāyasudhā (p)

The Nyāya-Sudhā (NS) is a first-rate classic, a superb controversial treatise and an illuminating com. on the AV., all in one. It is more familiarly
known to Mādhva scholars by the shorter title of ‘Sudhā’ and runs to 24000
granthis. “Sudhā va paṭhāniyā vasudhā va pālanīyā”, is a saying which
attests the universal homage paid to it by the traditional scholars. Its original
name seems to have been “Viṣamapada-vākyārthaviivrtil”, though it is called
by the name of “Nyāya-sudhā”, in the penultimate verse of the last chapter.

II

The views embodied in the bhāṣyas of Saṅkhara,2 Bhāskara, Rā-
manuja,3 and Yādavaprakāśa, on the Sūtras, and in the comm. of Vācaspati,5
Padmapāda,6 and Prakāśatman,7 as well as those of the Sāṅkhya-tattvakou-
mudi,8 the Tattvabindu,9 the Nyāyakusumānjali,10 the Khaṇḍana-khaṇḍa-
khaḍya,11 the Citsukhī,12 the Mānamanohara,13 the Nyāyalilāvatī,14 as well as
those upheld by Gangeśa Upadhyāya,15 Atreyā,16 Sureśa,17 the Bhūṣaṇakāra,18

1. Iyam Nyāyasudhā bhaumair vibudhaiḥ, seyyatām sadā ... 
2. Vol. i. p. 294b ; 195b ; iv. p. 653 ; ii, 1, 6 (adhikaraṇa). p. 295 ; iv. i. adh.
   2 ; pp. 616-17.
3. i, 1, 12 ; Prakṛtyadhiharaṇa, etc., vol. I, p. 197b ; ii, 2, p. 428.
4. iv, 2, adh. 5, p. 647.
6. i, p. 100 ; p. 112b on i, 1, 3.
7. ii, 2, p. 316.
8. p. 89.
9. ii, 1, adh. 4, p. 289. lines 20-6.
10. i, 210 ; i, 1, 31 (p).
11. i, 29p ; p. 40 and 60 (Bhāvarūpājñāna) cf. Cit. p. 82 ; and also cf. i, 1.
   p. 62 with Cit. p. 58-60 (Bby).
12. i, 4. adh. 6, p. 216.
14. See i, 1, p. 96 (Parimala).
16. ii, p. 349 (Parimala).
17. P. 406.
Sriddhara (Nyayakanda), Praasastapada, the author of the Nyayavartikatataparyajika, Vyomashivacarya, are quoted and refuted where necessary in the course of the NS. The doctrines of the Bh\'a\'tha and Prabhakara schools of Mimamsa, relating to the philosophy of propositions and the various views of the Nyaya-Vai\'sesika and Sr\'nikhya-Yoga realists, as well as those of the Buddhists, Jains and Pasupatas, are reviewed and refuted in proper context with a wealth of details. The doctrine of Sphota is criticised in vol. i, 87, seq. The passages of the AV are shown to brilliant advantage by making them capable of meeting a variety of objections. In this respect the NS may as well be said to be a marvel at commentary-making.

It would be no exaggeration to say that in the whole range of Sanskrit philosophical literature, there is not one other work like the original AV or its epoch-making com. the NS. "One does not know what to admire most in this work. So remarkably perfect is it in every way." The style is throughout marvellously sustained. The eloquence is superb, yet absolutely unsimulated. There is no straining after effect as one finds in the Bh\'amat\'i or other works of V\'acaspati, and there is a moderation in embellishment. The author shows himself to be a perfect master in all the four S\'astras (see eulogistic verse already quoted from a supposed Insc.). He discourses on the grammatical and linguistic issues called forth by the exigencies of the context, in defending the Un-P\'aninian usages in the AV and on more important occasions of sutra-interpretation (II. 1, pp. 201-2) and these reveal his penetrating grasp of the subjects concerned. He has laid almost all the leading works of the various systems of thought studied in his days under contribution. His disquisitions on problems of metaphysics, psychology and theory of knowledge show a good deal of insight into things and vast powers of analysis and argument. This will be evident from his masterly treatment of the five "Khy\'atis" (Khy\'ativ\'ada, i, pp. 41-57b), the doctrine of "S\'al\'si" passim (p. 213 ff. and 448-50), Difference (Bheda); pp. 380-82 and of "V\'isesas" p. 356.

III.

It is from the NS, that we learn that some of Madhva's interpretations in his AV had already been called into question by critics owing allegiance probably to the system of Sar\'nikara. One of these criticisms, it would appear, had reference to Madhva's attempt at fixing the import of the term Brahman in

1. i, 4, p. 214.
2. i, 4, p. 214.
3. ii, i, p. 251.
5. For instance, the phrase "Pratyak\'savana pr\'am\'anyam" is pointed against seven different pur\'vapak\'sas (pp. 76-79); and so is the case with "Gauravam kalpane anyath\'a" which disarms five different objections. (pp. 87-89.)
6. C. M. Padmanabha\'car, Life and Teachings of Madhva, p. 197.
7. See my Catuss\'tribh\'asya of Madhva, p. 112-13 (Notes).
the first Sūtra by a process of elimination. J. points out that the critic objects
to the tediousness involved in this kind of procedure, when the intention of
the Sūtrakāra could as well be settled by a reference to the next Sūtra. The
critic is, of course, given a suitable reply. 1

The rules of Pāṇini are frequently violated in the AV and other works of
Madhva. These lapses must have given the critics of the Ācārya many a
vulnerable point of attack. Not only in his NS but in many other works of
his has J. ably defended his master and justified his oddities against all kinds
of criticism. 2 The earlier comm. of Trivikrama, Padmanābha etc., have not
paid any attention to these matters, presumably because such criticisms had
not been made by the contemporaries of Madhva.

IV.

It appears from certain references in the NS that there were other comm.
also on the B.S.B. 3 and the AV 4 besides those of Padmanābha, Trivikrama
and Nārāyaṇa Paṇḍitācārya. Nothing is however known about the com-
mentators. Some of them were perhaps the direct disciples of Madhva
himself.

V

As an instance of the lucidity of J.’s exposition, attention may be
drawn to the following passage in which is set forth the Dvaita view of the
philosophical standpoint and ideology of the Upaniṣads:—

सव्राण्यपि हि वेदान्तवाक्श्यानि असप्रकृतक्षणगुणाकर्म सकल्योगमन्त्रिविवुर्थ एकहरेरब सक्र
नारायणाश्य प्रतिपादयति. हिङ्कु, (१) कालिकृति सप्रवर्तयत्रस्वात्त्यप्रियभरनसविनीन्द्रगौमुदा
गुणविरुद्धतत्त्वामि, (२) कालिकृति अप्रवर्तयत्रस्वात्त्यप्रियभरनसविनीन्द्रगौमुदा
गुणविरुद्धतत्त्वामि, (३) कालिकृति अप्रवर्तयत्रस्वात्त्यप्रियभरनसविनीन्द्रगौमुदा
गुणविरुद्धतत्त्वामि. (४) कालिकृति सप्रवर्तयत्रस्वात्त्यप्रियभरनसविनीन्द्रगौमु
गुणविरुद्धतत्त्वामि, (५) कालिकृति अप्रवर्तयत्रस्वात्त्यप्रियभरनसविनी
नंद्रगौमुदा० तथो व्याकरणे गुणविरुद्धमूलकः: अधसूक्तदेवताश्चातृ: सप्रवर्तयत्रस्वात्त्यप्रियभर
नंद्रगौमुदा० तथो व्याकरणे गुणविरुद्धमूलकः: अधसूक्तदेवताश्चातृ: सप्रवर्तयत्रस्वात्त्यप्रियभर
नंद्रगौमुदा० तथो व्याकरणे गुणविरुद्धमूलकः: अधसूक्तदेवताश्चातृ: सप्रवर्तयत्रस्वात्त्यप्रियभर
नंद्रगौमुदा० तथो व्याकरणे गुणविरुद्धमूलकः: अधसूक्तदेवताश्चातृ: सप्रवर्तयत्रस्वात्त्यप्रियभर

1. The critic seems to have taken his stand on the statement in Saṅkara’s
bhāṣya: अन्त वेद न ब्राह्मणदेशनान जार्यार्थातरमाशश्चित्वम्.
2. See also NS. (Bby edn.) p. 129b: अन्त केवलयथावचारस्त्रावयनति...............  
....etc. (i, 1, adh. 6).
3. Under B. S. i, 1, 23. (TP) J. refers to the view of a certain “सम्प्रदायविद्”
and the view is in direct opposition to that expressed by Trivikrama. Padmanābha
Tirtha and others are silent on this point.
4. See NS. i, 1. p. 38, line 9 and 11, 2, p. 392 line 8—9, and Parimala i, 4,
p. 199, line 22.
THE AGE OF JAYATIRTHA

This is an incomplete com. on the first two pādas of the I chapter of the Nyāyavivarana, which was completed by Raghūttama Tīrtha, in the 16th century. Both the commentaries have been printed and published from Uḍipi.

Upaniṣad-Bhāṣya-Tīkā.

The catalogue of the Gopala Vilas Library (Kumbakonam) and the Mysore O. L. (C 40), mention a com. on the Aītareya Upaniṣad bhāṣya, by J. But this is baseless. The existence of a com. on the Aītareyabhāṣya by Vyāsa-tīrtha, a direct disciple of J., may also be taken to be an indirect proof of the fact that no com. on that Up. has been left by the latter—to which there is moreover absolutely no reference whatever in subsequent literature. However that may be, Mysore C 40 has, on examination, turned out to be nothing more than a Ms. of Viśveśvara Tīrtha’s com. on the Aītareya Bhāṣya.

(14) Saṭṭpraṇa Bhāṣya—Tīkā (p)

(Granthis 500)

This, together with the gloss of Mankāla Ācārya, was printed in 1907. The commentator gives the aksarayojana, of the text besides giving the Bhāṣyayojana with pratikās. It is a lucid and entertaining com. It is quoted by Rāghavendra in his gloss on the TP. II, 4, 13 p; 233b.

(15) Iśāvāsya Upaniṣad—Bhāṣya—Tīkā (p)

This com. (granthis 450) was printed in 1926 with the gloss of Chalāri Nṛśimhācārya, at Kumbakonam. The Advaitic and Viśiṣṭādvaicitic interpretations of the text are severely assailed. Objecting to Śaṅkara’s interpretation of the first verse, J. says that the fact that everything in the world is “covered” by God, is hardly any reason why man should be advised to give up his activity! Were it so, it would equally apply to the uninitiated (ajnāni). There would then be no point in recommending two different courses of action in verses 1 and 2. It would be difficult to extract a Monism from the passage in question as the aḍchādaka and the aḍchādya should obviously be distinct. The use of the root ṛbhuj in the Ātrmanepada, is also against the Advaitic and Viśiṣṭādvaitic explanations.

1. The passage is a running quotation from Śaṅkara’s bhāṣya, by J.
The Advaita and the Viśiṣṭādvaitic interpretations of mantras 8-14, in terms of jñāna-karma-samuccaya, are criticised at length. The Samuccaya- 
pakṣa is dismissed as being opposed to the Śruti: nānyah panthā vidyate' 
yanāya. The view, moreover, that the mere knower of God has to suffer a 
greater share of misery in Sāṁśāra than a mere performer of acts, is both 
arbitrary and illogical. The (Advaitins') idea of Devatājñāna introduced into 
Īśa 11, is alien to the spirit of the Upaniṣads which is mainly devoted to the 
science of the Ātman. Pointed reference is made to the arbitrary way in 
which Śaṅkara explains away verse 14, after prefixing a negative particle 
before the word sambhūti and turning it into asambhūti.3

(16) Rg-Bhāṣya Tīkā : Sambandhadiṇīkā (p)

In this powerful com. on the Rg bhāṣya (granthis 3500) J. gives a lucid 
exposition of the original not only in the light of the authorities cited by 
Madhva, but of other standard works like those of Yāska. He criticises the 
interpretations of other commentators (p. 72b and 76) and indicates the 
Adhyātma interpretation of the āks.

(17) Gītā-bhāṣya-Prameyadiṇīkā (p)

This commentary has been printed twice in Southern India and runs 
to 4000 granthis. It is indispensable to a proper understanding of the original 
whose terseness and brevity are such as to try even the apotheosis of patience 
among men. Following Madhva, and sometimes of his own accord, the com-
mentator draws attention to the interpretations of Śaṅkara and Bhāskara and 
criticises them. These references are thus very valuable to us not only for 
purposes of Gītā-interpretation but also of text-criticism and problems con-
ected with authorship. Till recently, the Vedāntin Bhāskara was a forgotten 
commentator on the Gītā. Thanks however to the allusions to Bhāskara's 
commentary on the Gītā, in J.'s Prameyadiṇīkā, we are now in a position to 
say something about his Gītā-interpretation. It appears from these references 
in J.'s commentary, that Bhāskara was (1) a relentless critic of the G. B. of 
Śaṅkara; (2) that he had at least one Kashmirian reading in VI, 7, which 
was unknown to his brother-commentators like Śaṅkara, and (3) that he was 
probably a Trimūlīyuttirṇa-brahmovādin.3

The commentator illumines many a dark and obscure corner of the text 
and draws out the hidden implications of the all too brief utterances of the 
Bhāṣyakāra, by breathing into them a soul of wit and formidable array of

1. Those who object to Madhva's splitting up of "Sa ātmā tattvamasi" into 
"Atat tvam asi" may as well ponder over this padaccheda, which is even more 
"strained".
3. For detailed information about Bhāskara and his com. see my papers in the 
IHQ, IX. 1933.
details. He is ready with suitable defences of the grammatical lapses of Madhva. The com. of Narahari Tirtha is twice alluded to.

(18) Gitā-Tātparya Nyāyadīpikā (p)

This com. (granthas 3267) on the GT. was printed at Bombay in 1905 with a gloss called Kiranāvali. The style of J. is not so felicitous here as in his other work. The com. contains two new allusions to the Bhāṣya of Bhāskara (II, 16 and III, 17) and clarifies many obscure points.

ORIGINAL WORKS

(19) The Vādāvali (p)

This is an independent controversial tract (प्रकृति) of the author in 500 granthas. It is also known as Vedāntavādāvali and designated Vādamālā by AUFRECHT (i, 119). The author seems to hint that the arguments used by him are a résumé of those employed by Madhva in his Khāṇḍamatrāya, TD and VTN. He attempts a dialectic refutation of the illusionistic hypothesis with all its logical and metaphysical paraphernalia. The famous syllogism: विमत्ति मध्या दस्यलात्, जड्यलात्, परिश्रवत्त शुक्लावसत्—is analysed and refuted in minute detail. The familiar theory of monists all the world over that our senses always deceive us, being merely appearance-interpreting, is effectively challenged and the fitness of sense-knowledge to reveal objects as they are, is vindicated. The following are some of the topics dealt with:

1. Definition of Avidyā and refutation.
2. Proofs in support of Avidyā examined.
3. Definition of Mithyātva.
4. इत्यादि, जड्यालि and परिश्रवतए—hetuś, refuted.
5. The opposition of प्रत्यय to the doctrine of unreality.
6. The opposition of अशुचि to the doctrine of unreality.
7. The self-validity of प्रवेष.
10. सत्यालेतेव प्रतिकृतिकोषवादः

---

1. Cf. i. 30, p. 59 (Madras edn.) परिश्रवारे पुरुषोगामभवानाव and ता एवोपादात् तथसा क्रिया: and II, p. 147.
2. परिश्रवारे पुरुषोगामभवानाव ...... P. 9—10; On क्रुपालि (p. 13); कथा चास्य कलु न शास्त्र शास्त्र p. 30; आदिराज्यामो (iii 4) वेदव: क्रमकारणभवन्ति (III, 36).
3. T. P. L. Cat. (XIV p. 6095) is wrong in saying that this com. has not been printed.
4. See the reference to Viṣṇudharmottara on p. 200.
5. बालुवारपादाकं भवानात ...... (last verse and c. of Rāghavendra on it)
6. Cf. p. 53 of Vādāvali and VTN.
11. Monistic texts reinterpreted: नेन नामादनि; एकबाध्यतीयम् II
12. भेदन्व प्रक्षणामाराते पूर्वप्रक्षण: its refutation.
13. Bheda is धार्मिकत्वप्रति.

The views expressed in the Tattvapradipikā of Citsuka, the Vivaranā, the Nyāyakandali, etc. are quoted and criticised. Citsukha is once mentioned by name (P. 27).

The author says well in the course of his work that there is no point in saying that dualistic texts in scripture are concerned with establishing the phenomenal reality of the world, as no philosopher or layman ever disputed the (phenomenal) reality: व्यर्थं च प्रक्षणं व्यवहारिङ्गत्वप्रतिपादनम्। नहि कथविशिश्वव्रि

ैदिः वा व्यवहारिङ्गत्वप्रकी नामिवतिति। Even the Buddhist is no exception to this rule. Elsewhere he remarks that the censure in असाचमप्रतिं ते

(Gitā XVI, 8) cannot but recoil on the Advaitin and apply to his view of मिथ्ययत as there is really no philosopher worth the name (आहुः) who believes the world to be totally non-existent:—न चात्मकात्मादः अत्यन्तात्मात:। अवत्तात्मानवात्

भुगतानुवादिन सत्यमात:। आहुःत्त्वात्त्वात्त्वातिति। (P. 46b). Citsukha’s argument in respect of नेन नामादनि that it cannot be interpreted in terms of श्लेष्माभिनिये च is done by the Dvaitin, on account of the absence of a “प्रत्यय” there, is directly repulsed:—न च श्रीणि नानांत्र प्रसर्क गविगिर्प्षतं इति केतुः। हन्त तर्भी, लवण्ये

कम्बवाभितिविलयादेंगानालवामिनीपरस्तरस्यम् भुगतानं केव स्याद:। नासाध्यस्य भावप्रस्तयानि

सामायानि भावप्रस्तयानि तदवस्तः। (B. S. i, 3, 2) इस्यादी भावप्रस्तयामावेचि तदवस्तः। (p. 66).

The Vādāvali is thus the earliest large-scale polemical tract of the post-Madhva period, acting in many ways as the forerunner of the Nyāyānta. The Vādāvali-khaṇḍana (Mysore O. L. C 755), is presumably a reply to it.

(20) The Pramāṇa-Paddhati (p)

This is the biggest (granthis 750) of J.'s independent works. It has been published with eight comm. including those of Vijayindra, Rāghavendra, Vedeśa Satyanātha etc., from Dharwar. It is the standard work on Dvaita Epistemology and all questions connected with that branch of Metaphysics. It deals with the nature, scope, and definition of Pramāṇas, their ways of functioning, theories of Truth and Error, the question whether the validity of knowledge is to be viewed as innate (स्वतः) or extraneous (परतः) etc. It is modelled on the Pramāṇayālakṣana but reviews in addition, the epistemological theories in the six systems of Indian philosophy—both orthodox and heretical. It is divided into three Paricchedas or chapters: Pratyakṣa, Anumāna, and Sabda or Āgama.

MINOR WORKS

(21) Padyamālā (p)¹

This is a work on daily worship and is in essence a summary of the method of worship enunciated in the Tantrasārasaṃgraha (of Madhva). It is a very elementary work.

(22) Satāparādha Stotra

This is a minor stotra praying for forgiveness of a hundred sins and delinquencies which a man commits every day.

(23) Adhyātmāmśta Taraṅgini

A work of this name is ascribed to J. in the Satkathā (p. 30), and it is described to be a catechism of the principles of Dvaita philosophy. Nothing more is known about it.

¹ Belgaum.
A LETTER OF MAHARAJA AJITSINGHJI RELATING
THE EMERGENCY ADMINISTRATION OF
MARWAR

By

PANDIT BISHESHWAR NATH REU

On the death of Maharaja Jaswantsingh I, in 1678 A.D. the emperor Aurangzeb annexed Marwar. But after 28 years of continual fight his son Maharaja Ajitsingh re-captured Jodhpur, the capital of the State, as soon as the Emperor Aurangzeb died, in 1707 A.D., in the Deccan. After this his son and successor Bahadur Shah also invaded Marwar and compelled Maharaja Ajitsingh to leave the state administration in the hands of the Mughal officials and to accompany him against his brother Kambaksh. But as soon as Bahadur Shah crossed the Narbada, Maharaja Ajit returned to his capital and driving away the Mughal garrison took the reins of the administration in his own hands.

In 1713 A.D. Emperor Farrukhsiyar, who ascended the throne of Delhi after Jahandar Shah, sent an army under Sayyad Husainalikhan against Marwar. As soon as this news reached Jodhpur, Maharaja Ajitsingh went towards Tilwara in the western part of Marwar for war preparations and sent his trustworthy and loyal noble Chanpavat Thakur Rao Bhagvandas to Jodhpur with a letter containing a number of detailed instructions to be carried on.

This letter will give an idea of the condition prevailing then and the manner in which the affairs of the state were managed at the time of emergency and will also throw light on the administrative qualities of Maharaja Ajitsingh of Marwar.

SOME NOTEWORTHY THINGS OF THE LETTER

The top lines written in Maharaja Ajitsinghji’s own hand-writing run as below:—

“We have sent you as a special favour to serve the country and command you to carry out carefully the detailed instructions issued by us.”

Then there is a royal seal which contains:—

“Glory be to Shri Huzur Chhatrapati, Maharajadhiraj, Maharaja Shri Ajitsinghji Deva.

Hari, Amba, Shiva, Sun and Gaṇesh—may these five deities always be our guide.”
Then there is a mark of approval in his own calligraphy and another three lines which go as under:

"This royal mandate under our own signature and royal seal is issued under the shadow of God."

Translation of the letter.

"By order of the—blessed, adorned with many auspicious qualities, protector of Hindus, emperor, sovereign ruler, king of kings, Maharaja Shri Ajitsinghji and his heir-apparent Abhaisinghji Rao Bhagavandas, son of Jogidas, has been sent to Jodhpur, our capital, as a mark of special favour, to look after all the State affairs and act according to our auspicious command.

1. He should remain at Jodhpur.

2. He should watch over the affairs of Ajmer, Merta and Nagaur, and be observant of Brahmans, Mahajans and Kayasths even if they are reliable, and find out the purpose of the people who leave the place openly or secretly.

3. May God forbid, even then, if any thing untoward happens he should write to us and should not depend on others, but send a messenger or trustworthy man with a written report, which will be submitted to us through Mahasingsh and its reply too will be communicated through him.

4. He should send his reports of current rumours and matters related to the administration with State messengers and the orders from us will always be communicated to him and Mahasingsh jointly.

5. He should always be cautious in his duties.

6. He should, for the safety of the State, keep friendly relations with others, so that when need be they may come to our help from our land and from Godwad, Sirohi and Nagaur.

7. He should stock all necessary things in the fort and mount guns on all strategic points.

8. He should manage the affairs of the fort in such a way that it may stand the siege of the enemy till the time of our arrival. God willing, we hope to reach early on receipt of information, yet it may take at least twenty or twenty-five days.

9. Letters from other officials as well as from you should be sent together.

10. Goyanddas and Dayaldas have been instructed to keep you in touch from time to time and if there will be any objection to their action simultaneous orders will be issued to both of you through them, then you should carry out their fresh instructions.

11. If a Qazi (Law giver), a Mulla (religious preacher) or a newswriter comes from Ajmer on any pretext he should be kept away from the
people of Merta. We shall also issue necessary instructions on such occasions. But such a man should not be allowed to approach nearer and if he comes at all you should not allow him to take possession and refer rations. Moreover if any wicked person dares to approach, you should stealthily get him killed at night by sending twenty or thirty mounted or foot soldiers and then the next morning institute a false search and investigate the matter. Special care should be taken of Bisalpur.

12. Caravans may pass through Gudha but not through Jodhpur. It is our command that it should not come nearer to any town.

13. You should also guard the affairs of Ahmadabad.

14. You should watch the affairs at Udaipur and inform us of the departure and arrival of the people there.

15. If necessary, keep friendly with the people of Ghanerao.

16. Whatever you hear communicate it to the news-writer, so that he may write it to us and whatever you think more important you should write yourself.

17. Take care of customs duty and see whether it has been duly charged on goods imported in Marwar or exported to Delhi. No partiality need be allowed.

18. None should be shown undue favours.

19. If they carry on well, all is for the good, otherwise take them to task according to circumstances.

20. If we censure your work do not lose heart. Whenever we will want to make a necessary change in the policy, we shall send you same instructions through Mahasingh as well as directly, at the same time, and then you should make changes in your management accordingly.

21. Be always confident at heart.

22. You should keep watch on border lands all round the country.

23. You should arrange to send detachments on Deval and Sindhal Rajputs and Raddhara town.”

Dated 5th day of the bright half of Bhadaun, Sarnvat 1771 (3rd September 1714 A.D.) Camp Talwara.”

Reading on the cover—“On account of special favour the titles conferred on you are—our devoted, loyal, trusted, premier and faithful noble, Chief Minister, (Jumdutulmulk) centre of important affairs and (Madarulmaham) the best in the country Rao Bhagvandas.”

महाराजा अजितसिंहजीके स्वरूपसे लिखी पत्रके उपरकी पंक्तियाँ।
तथा अजराह नीवासजसे देसरी ब्रह्मत फरसाय ब्राह्मा कीया है नै नसीहत ब्रीमत्रार फैरि-
सतं फरसावे सो फेम राख कामकण् हुकम है सहीः।
महरका लेख

श्रीहजूर छत्रपति महाराजा बिराज महाराजा श्रीअजीतसिंहजी देव विजयते।

पत्र भेजिए।

(महाराज के दस्तावेज़ों)

“हुक्के”

फर्मान, अलीसंग दसकत खास मोहर खास इनायत पातसाही।

जीत सुभाषी।

(पत्र)

सिद्ध श्रे अनेक सकल सुम ओपरा बिराजमानसंग श्रीहजूरुप अलाप साह छत्रपति महाराजा-बिराज महाराजा श्रीअजीतसिंहजी महाराज कंघर श्रीअमृतसिंहजी देव वचनात तथा निवाजसंग राह राह बन्गालदेश जी० दादोत्तनु, पायतन, मद जोधपुरुं सारी बात रा जानतारे। बासते बींदा कीया सो श्रीहजूर मामारं रैं माफक जाँतो करसी।

बींगत—

१. जोधपुर हीज रैंगी।

२. अजमेर मेहते नामोर खंडवार राज्यी आदमी भावे इतवारी बौंमण साह कायथ सो सावधान रहों। आदमी वाहा के छोरा नींदों हीज सो जाबतो करो।

३. श्रीजी न करै पीण कदाचार काँदै आपेक्षी तो श्रीहजूरुं अरज लिखिनी इंगारे भरोसे न। रैंगो ने कासीद तथा मालबर आदमी भेंडनों ने श्रीहजूर ने अरज लिखिनी सो महासिंहीरा माफपत अरज पोहचे जब इंगारुं हीज इनायत होसी।

४. अरजदास सीरीकार रा कासीद साबे आई करैं ने सुनुं हकीकत लिखिनी नं कंमकर अरज लिखिनी नं श्रीजी हजूरुं पीण पुरामण मेंहे हीज हमेसा इनायत होसी।

५. कौंडकांज मं सावधान रैंगो।

६. कौंड मामले पांच आदमियांसु जी० राज्यी आपेणांसु तथा गोडवां सीरीको नामोर बाला तेंदोरा आबी।

७. गढ ऊपर संची राज्यी नं तोंगो सारे चलावणी।

८. गढ रो ऐसो जाबही राज्यी भे अय पोहंचै जीतैरै कायम रहै नं भे सब हुवां श्रीजी करैं तो आबों तो बेंगा पीण दीन बींस पचीस तो खरा।

९. कामेंट बारीं नाकरों नं मुनतदाओं रहों नं भेंहो लिखिनी।

१०. गोदवारा नं दयालदास नं हुक्क हुवों छै सो बांठुं इसारो सारे करता रैंगो सो श्रीजी ने हुक्क उपर अतरीजी होसी तो हुक्क इंगारुं भे बांठुं इनायत होसी सो इंगारों माफपत ऐं कहै जी० भाव माता करसी।

1 बाहर जाखी। २ ऐसाही मैका आ पडें। ३ जाबाब। ४ इसीको। ५ साही। ६ मेह। ७ अपनीसे। ८ बुझाने। ९ संचय। १० कामजज। ११ तुमहारे। १२ फिरैतह। १३ ऐतराज। १४ होगा।
11. अजमेर से हरिक्षण बहादुर जोयपुर आदमी आवी काजी तथा मुला बालकनवेश तो मेहतावालाओं या जातीय राजनीतिक विभागों में श्रीहरिजुर मुं पीया हुकम इत्यादि होने आया आदेश न "देसी पियलौं" कदसी हात तो डबल बीला हुकम मत देवी ने अवधारणा पीया मत देवी के व्यक्त कोई रीढ़ लेंगे होय तो रत्नाकर बीस तीस अवसर से राजा सो जाय रत्ना पूछे ने मारने परा जाय ने पछि सुहँदे सठी बौद्री चढ़ी जातीय ने सुहँदे तो बोसलड़पुर जातीय रहे।

12. काजेरी सुहार में होम जाय पीया जोयपुरम से बाबी पूछने कोहरी सीहर नजीक नाव।

13. ऐसमाराय रो है जातीय राजनीति।

14. उदाचरु पीया जातीय रहे खबर आई के हुए गये रहे।

15. दान आवी तो पापेशी बालां मुं जातीय रहे।

16. हरीक्टर पृष्ठों से बालकनवेश ने पृष्ठाधी सो लोगी से ने धैर्य तीन लोगी होय सो धैर्य से लोगी।

17. टकेहर पैदा होम ने धैर्य जाते ने चालै के दोली मुं चालै सो के लोगी ने लोगी राजायत लगवाजी जीवा बैम रैमवी।

18. हरीलेह विश्ववीरी न कर।

19. ऐसे रीमें मुं चालै तो मभी बात थी ने नाही तो बैरी बैत माफ।

20. धैर्य हुजूर ने पृष्ठों आवी तो लम्बी बात दोली चक खाम से चालै ने ऐसे कोई हुजूर जाना सो महामिथ सी मारह ने धैर्य दरबार री तरफ दोली एक हुकम आवी तो उप माफ जातीय राजनी।

21. दीमे दूलेरी राजनी।

22. सीवा संदीर्शी जातीय राजनी धैर्यधारी कोछड पृष्ठ रहे।

संध्या १३७२ रा भारतीय सूर्य ५ मुं। तत्रावृ।

19 सुबरनीस। 16 अमे आसें। 15 दीरों। 18 पर। 19 कमी।
20 कमीनाजातकका। 21 भेजन। 22 फैदल। 23 सुवहलो। 24 अशुववण्डकारीदाल।
25 चावा। 26 बाय्यीडाल। 27 राह। 28 मर्जी। 29 धार्मीगा। 30 तुम्हू।
31 दिल्ली को जानन्तो या नगर में जानन्तो सामने पर दुर्गा ली या नाही इसका यथार्थ स्थान पूरा।
32 मुलखद्वा। 33 किसीका। 34 ठीकीर। 35 मृतक के। 36 शिकायत। 37 दिल्लासे के साथ।
38 दिल्लासे-विडिहार। 39 सीमाप्रतिका। 40 चारी तरफ। 41 सीमा। 42 वहाँ।
43 किरो। 44 भेजनी। 45 देवल-राजपूतों पर। 46 सीघल-राजपूतों पर।
47 राजपूते गाँव पर।
50. Champa, one of the younger brothers of Rao Jōdhāji the founder of Jodhpur, was a well known warrior. His eighth in descent Rao Bhagvandas, to whom this letter was addressed, served Maharaja Ajitsinghji during the occupation of Marwar by the Mohamedans. His loyal services had been summarised by the Maharaja himself in the following couplet:

भगवानो जोगाल्ल, सक साहल सिरताजः
कियो बिखो मरुधर मांङ्ग दियो भुंजो कुलवाजः

(i.e.) Bhagvandas, son of Jogidas, who is the leader of all the brave nobles fought the enemies of Marwar and kept the honour of his clan un-tarnished.

His ninth descendant was Rao Bahadur Thakur Mangal Singhji, C.I.E., a noble soul, who served the Jodhpur Darbar loyally and faithfully as a member of the State Council. His eldest son the present Thakur of Pokaran is Rao Bahadur Thakur Chain Singh, M.A., LL.B., (who lately retired from the membership of the Council) and who enjoys the hereditary privilege of occupying the first seat on the right side row of the nobles of Marwar Darbar.
PÂNINI AND THE RK.-PRĀTIŚĀKHYA

By

S. P. CHATURVEDI

The scholastic discussion\(^1\) between Dr. THIEME and Dr. GHOSH on the relation between Pāṇini and the RK.-Prātiśākhya has now reached a stage when it would be desirable to examine it and see if the conclusions reached by GHOSH are unavoidable and the relevant facts cannot be explained otherwise. It is for THIEME to controvert comprehensively the charges and statements of GHOSH, for GHOSH "has no doubt that THIEME will again return to the fray and try to defend his position" (p. 399); what I am particularly concerned with here is to weigh and analyse in detail GHOSH’s "rational and intelligible interpretation" of Pāṇini’s Praghya-Sūtras by examining the alleged anomalies inherent in them. Let it be pointed out at first that though in his second article,\(^2\) GHOSH is ‘really grieved’ to see that he has been accused of condemning Pāṇini’s Grammar and protests that ‘nothing was further from his mind than to condemn Pāṇini’ (p. 388) the whole tenor of his first article\(^3\) indicated nothing but the ‘usual’ condemnation of the ancient Indian Grammarians. I do not know if such statements as "Pāṇ. (1-1-6) has never been understood even by the ancient Indian commentators" (p. 665) "it would reflect no glory on the author of these sūtras" (p. 668), "it is very unlikely that Pāṇini had personal knowledge of the Padapāṭha" (p. 669), "his amazing mistakes, both of omission and commission" (p. 669), "Pāṇini has not only copied the R.P., but he has copied it mechanically, perhaps without even understanding what he was copying (p. 670)", imply anything else. Another point worth noting at the outset is that GHOSH makes explicit statements in his second article to the effect that his chief purpose was not to prove Pāṇini’s dependence on the RP., (p. 399) and that it was not his intention to use the Praghya-Sūtras as an instrument with which to prove P.s posteriority to the R.P., (p. 390); but in his first article, he begins the treatment of the subject with particular reference to the specific problem of the relation between Pāṇini and R.P. and ends with that notorious sentence quoted above. "He has copied the R.P. mechanically and perhaps without even understanding."\(^4\) Thus it is clear

---


that the controversy has resulted in shifting the ground of discussion from the relation between Pāṇini and R.P. to the interpretation of the Pragṛhya-Sūtras and in mitigating, to a certain extent, the sting of attack made by GHOSH against Pāṇini in his first article.

Before I actually begin the examination in detail of the facts brought forward by GHOSH, it would be advisable to put forth in a concise form his main contentions on the subject. GHOSH concludes (p. 388) that 'Pāṇini's Pragṛhya-Sūtras prove beyond doubt that he had actually borrowed these sūtras from the R.P. and that he has borrowed the first part of the sūtra (8-4-67) from the R.P. (III-9). I shall take up the latter conclusion first and examine one by one the chain of arguments, which according to GHOSH leads to it.

1. “Pāṇini (8-4-67)—’Nodātāsvaritodayam’ shows the unmistakable rhythm of a verse foot.” (GHOSH). He ‘particularly stresses’ this point and thinks that the burden of his ‘whole argument hinges on the metrical nature’ of the sūtra. (p. 388)

A serious student of the Aṣṭādhyaśyā knows very well that this so-called unmistakable metrical rhythm can be “traced” in many other sūtras of P. The very first two sūtras viz. “Vṛdhirādaiajadeṅgusaḥ” may be said to form the 2nd Pāda of an Anuṣṭubh metre. One may suspect the first foot of the Anuṣṭubh metre in P. (1-2-46-Kṛttaddhitaṁasāśca) and the second foot in P. (1-1-45-Igyṇaḥ samprasāraṇaḥ; 1-4-100-Tanānāvatmanepadam) and so on. As these instances and many others similar to them cannot be traced to the R.P., it cannot be said that the metrical rhythm of P. (8-4-67) is a sure proof of its having been borrowed from the R.P. The conclusion of GHOSH appears still more implausible when we remember that this ‘metrical’ line is not the monopoly of the R.P. only, but occurs in the Vāj. Prātiṣākhya also. Thus the emphasis and ‘stress’ on the rhythm of the sūtra is a too insufficient evidence to prove its dependence on the R.P.

2. “The Verse-foot, ‘Nodātāsvaritodayam,’ second in the hemistich, occurs more than once in the R.P.” (GHOSH p. 388). We are glad to see that GHOSH is more accurate in his second article than in the first one, where he made a sweeping remark that ‘this Pāda is repeatedly met in the R.P.” But this subtle change in the wording does not improve the matter, for ‘repeatedly’ or ‘more than once’ amounts to only “twice” in the R.P. (III-9; III-12). Of these, the second reference (R.P. III-12), being materially only a re-statement of R.P. III-9, cannot be construed to amount to an independent occurrence. Thus practically the solitary use of the phrase loses much of its force of being a conclusive evidence.

1. IV-143, (published by the Madras University).
(3) “Pāṇini nowhere else uses the term Udaya in the sense of para,” and “in the R.P. the term udaya is regularly used in this sense” (GHOSH p. 38).

Let us consider the latter statement first. The mere employment of the term udaya is not a sure argument in deciding chronological sequence, for other Prātiṣākhyaśīs also use this term. And even in the R.P., it is not “regularly” used; for we have many instances (e.g. I-14; II-10 and many others) where the term para is used. Not only that, but in some places (e.g. IV-6; IV-9) we come across both the terms udaya and para used indiscriminately in an identical sense in the same stanza. In fact, there is much truth in the statement made by GHOSH in his first article that “Both Pāṇini and the Prātiṣākhyaśīs have largely drawn upon a common grammatical tradition, so that even the most striking similarity between the two texts cannot prove the indebtedness of one to the other.” As regards the use of this term by Pāṇini, it is true that this term is nowhere else used by him in the sense of para. It may also be added that in 1-2-40 he uses the phrase ‘udāttasvarītapa’ instead of ‘Udāṭta-svarītodaya’; and this fact should make us think seriously whether the word Udaya in ‘Udāttasvarītodaya’ in P. VIII-4-67 had been used deliberately with some significance or is merely a ‘mechanical copy’ from the R.P. That this term is used not only in the R.P., but also in other Prātiṣākhyaśīs has been shown above. This fact coupled with the consideration that even the R.P. uses this term indiscriminately along with its another synonym ‘para’ and does not define it, leads to the conclusion that it was a technical term of earlier grammarians and that both Pāṇini and R.P. have adopted it from them. In accordance with the dictum ‘Vyākhyānato Viśeṣapratīpatīth naḥi sandeḥāt alakṣayam’, it is for commentators to account for the phrase ‘Nodāttasvarītodayam’ in a way more reasonable and convincing than that of Pāṇini’s inadvertence and mechanical copying as supposed by GHOSH. And from this point of view the explanation of Kāśiīkā for Pāṇini’s use of the word ‘udayā’ as ‘Maṅgalārtha’ is more “admirably consistent.”

But this is not the main and only objection to the theory propounded by GHOSH, viz. “that Pāṇini borrowed the first part of the sūtra (8-4-67) from the R.P. (III-9),” “which is practically identical in meaning with it.” The similarity between P. (8-4-67) and the R.P. (III-9) in meaning and, to an extent, in form is only in the first part of the P. sūtra.

3. CHAṬTOPĀDHYAṆA : IHQ, Vol. XIII, p. 348: “As Saunaka has not defined the term in his Prātiṣākhya, he too may have taken it from his own predecessors,” and “It is interesting to note that Pāṇini has defined the term Aprkta, whereas Saunaka has not, though he has used it in the same sense. One may conclude from this with greater justification than Dr. GHOSH that Saunaka was here-dependent on Pāṇini.”
There is in the R.P. no counterpart of the second portion of the P. Sūtra, viz. "aGṛgya-Kāśyapa-Gālavānām." The addition of this second part as a qualifying clause reveals at once the comprehensive nature of the ā śūtra by referring to the opinion of Gṛgya, Kāśyapa and Gālava. Pāṇini is dealing here with the problem in a general way and his treatment can, with no stretch of imagination, be regarded as borrowed from R.P. GHOSH, too, is not unmindful of the implications of the qualifying clause, for he confesses (p. 389) that 'there is a real difficulty' as regards the qualifying clause. And it was for this reason (the non-identity of the qualifying clauses) that he particularly "stresses" and regards the metrical form of the first half of the ā śūtra as the deciding factor (p. 389). As I have already shown above, undue emphasis on the evidence of the rhythmical nature of the P. ā śūtras leads nowhere and no capital should be made out of such an evidence.

(4) GHOSH apparently seems to see in the R.P. something corresponding to Pāṇini's qualifying clause, for he refers to "qualifying clauses on each side" and even has a lurking suspicion that they might be identical in meaning, though he is forced to confess "that it is impossible to prove" (p. 389). And it was due to the impossibility in reconciling the qualifying clauses on each side that he brings in with emphasis the argument of 'rhythm' in the P. Sūtra. But I must confess I fail to see anything in the R.P. which might be regarded as a qualifying clause to 'Na cet udāttasvaritodayam' (R.P. III-9). On the other hand, Uvvaṭa's comment on the R.P. (III-12) referring to the opinion of 'all the authorities,' clearly shows the absence of any qualifying or conditioning clause in R.P. (III-9). Thus it is clear that the qualifying clause in Pāṇ. (8-4-67) a-Gṛgya-Kāśyapa-Gālavānām has not even the remotest correspondence in the R.P. and the pious wish entertained by GHOSH to see 'the qualifying clauses on each side' reconciled has no semblance of reality.

(5) "The very grammatical structure of the word udāttasvaritodayam is rather anomalous. ...Should it not have been formally udāttasvaritodayaḥ or udāttasvaritodayau," (GHOSH p. 389). It is, indeed, not possible to understand what GHOSH means by his proposed second reading of the phrase, Udāttasvaritodayau (Nom. Dual). Apparently he has misunderstood the paraphrase of the compound by Bhāṭṭojīdīkṣita, 'udāttaparaḥ svaritaparascena anudāttataḥ ' (quoted by him). The above paraphrase practically amounts to 'udāttasvaritau udayau (para) yasmāt saḥ annudāttataḥ ' and Bhāṭṭojīdīkṣita following the well-known grammatical rule, 'Dvandvante śrūyamāṇaḥ padoḥ pratyekam abhisambadhyaḥ ' is quite justified in paraphrasing the compound as above. But GHOSH, not understanding the rationale in the above paraphrase, suggests a form which has no meaning at all in the context, for the compound being of the Bahuvrihi type, is an adjective (Viṣesyaṇighna) and

1. "Sarve eva tu acāryāḥ udāttodayam udattaparāṁ svaritodayaṁ svaritapa-raṁ ca aksaram............"
there is no substantive here in the dual number to be qualified by it. So the compound should never have been 'udāttasvaritodayau'. As regards the first suggestion, udāttasvaritodayah, it is true that it would have been a bit happier reading, for then it should have, very well, qualified the nom. substantive, anudāttah. But we should remember that there is no such word in this or the preceding P. sūtra (8-4-66) and it is only by Vibhaktiviparināma (anudāttah for anudattasya) that the required word, anudattah could have been supplied here. Or by Vibhaktiviparināma one may construe udāttasvaritodayam as a genitive singular qualifying anudattasya. Another plausible solution would be to take the compound as Kriyā-viśeṣaṇa Bahuvrihi. The meaning of the sūtra then, taken in conjunction with the preceding sūtra would be “udāttasvaritaparam yathā syāt tathā udāttātparasya anudattasya sthāne svarītaḥ na bhavati." This interpretation is no doubt "kliṣṭa" but not off the point. But one fails to see any relevancy at all in the other 'kliṣṭa' (?) interpretation (by GHOSH) as a dvandva of the type Pāṇīpādam (p. 389). To take ‘udāttasvaritodayam’ as a dvandva compound of Pāṇīpādam type is as ludicrously absurd as to suggest a reading with dual number, udāttasvaritodayau.

The words, udāṭṭa, anudāṭṭa and svarita, being originally qualifying words, are used in the neuter gender also. In P. 6-1-158; 8-1-18; 8-1-3; 8-1-67; 8-2-100 the word anudāṭṭa is used in the neuter gender; in P. 1-2-32, the word udāṭṭa is in the neuter gender; in P. 8-2-103, the word svarita is in the neuter gender. Hence the use in the neuter gender of a compound qualifying anudāṭṭaṃ (aṅkṣaram) need not make the form anomalous, and ‘drive’ the interpreters ‘to extremities.’ Even if one agrees with GHOSH for a moment that the form should have been ‘udāttasvaritodayah’, recourse to the procedure ‘Vibhakti-viparināma’ is indispensable, for, as shown above, the substantive qualified is anudattasya (coming from the preceding sūtra) and not anudattah. Thus it is clear that……..udayah or……..udayam reading make no material difference and the first suggestion of GHOSH does not improve the situation.

Now coming to the problem of the prāgrhyā sūtra (1-1-16), it is proper to understand first the difference between the traditional interpretation and that offered by GHOSH. The author of the Kāśikā explains it as follows: “The O of Vocative is prāgrhyā according to Śākalya, when a non-vedic iti follows.” GHOSH translates it as follows: “The O of Vocative is prāgrhyā when Śākalya’s non-vedic iti follows.” “A comparison of the two above interpretations will show that the practical difference between the two interpretations is that while according to GHOSH, this sūtra will apply only in the R.P. Padapātha, the traditional interpretation will apply the sūtra in the Padapātha as well as in other non-vedic forms. GHOSH says that his interpretation is a ‘serious departure from the traditional one’; but the net result of this ‘departure’ is that the scope of sūtra has been narrowed down to the Padapātha only. It cannot be assumed even for a second that it was
GHOSH who for the first time interpreted the sūtra with reference to Sākalya’s Padapātha as implied by such assertions of GHOSH as “after many years of thought and study I arrived at the unhappy conclusions” (p. 390) and “the word anāṛśa has to be interpreted in the way I suggested in my first article” (p. 392). In fact, commentators have always understood the word anāṛśa in a sense including Padapātha (anāṛśa = anāśidṛṣṭa = a-Vaidika). This is clear from some of the examples given by them of the sūtra; ‘Vāyo iti’; ‘viśno iti’; cf.: ‘iti śabdāḥ padakāra-prakṣiptatvaḥ avaidikāḥ’ (Bālamanorā on P. 6-1-129): ‘upasthitaṃ nāma anāṛśa itikaraṇaḥ samudāyudvacchidhya padam yena svairūṣena avasthāpyate’ (Kāśikā on P. 6-1-129). The traditional interpretation extends the scope of the sūtra to all non-vedic forms (including of course Sākalya’s Padapātha) and seems to imply that Pāṇini took into consideration other Padapāthas, which did not follow the usage of Sākalya. This conjecture is borne out by the fact that the Padapātha of Sāmaveda does not observe pragṛhyata in such cases and that of the Taṇṭhitṛyasamhitā only under certain specific circumstances.¹ That being so, there is no reason why one should narrow down the scope of the sūtra. But this is actually done by GHOSH merely to show that Pāṇini “had been here borrowing from the Prātiśākhya and borrowing unintelligently.” The assumption that Pāṇini had no knowledge of Padapāthas and that ‘Padapātha is no language at all’ has led GHOSH to make a rather uncharitable statement that “Pāṇini had absolutely no business to mention a phenomenon peculiar to an artificial text like the Padapāṭha.” It is really a surprise that GHOSH still sticks to this opinion despite the fact that CHATTOPADHYAYA has conclusively proved the contrary.² GHOSH’s anxiety to equate P. 1-1-16 with R.P. (1-28a) has also led him to overlook the ‘real and formal’ difference between them. The R.P. makes no mention at all of the condition laid down by Pāṇini, ‘when followed by a non-vedic iti.’ Not that he does not know this difference, (for he says (p. 392) ‘Have I not myself emphasized this formal difference in my first article?’), but in his enthusiasm to make Pāṇini an ‘unintelligent borrower’, he regards that a “real formal difference” (according to CHATTOPADHYAYA³ and ‘emphasized by GHOSH in the first article’) is the same as ‘merely formal’ (p. 392). The simple fact is that Pāṇini (1-1-16) in referring to Sākalya’s opinion desires to deal with Sākalya’s Padapāṭha (for the particular grammatical peculiarity is found in his Padapāṭha) and other non-vedic texts and we need not go for its source to the R.P. which, though recording the teachings of Sākalya and also of his followers,⁴ is ascribed to Śaunaka and not to Sākalya.

But it would be doing injustice to GHOSH if we do not take into consideration ‘the difficulties’ in his way of accepting the traditional interpretation

3. Ibid. p. 346.
4. Ibid. p. 344.
of the prāgrhya sūtras which compel him to seek a "rational interpretation" and for pointing which (the difficulties and anomalies) he was "reprimanded by his teachers for irreverence" (p. 390). According to the traditional interpretation, the word Sākalyasya, means, in accordance with the usual procedure of Pāṇini, 'in the opinion of Sākalya'. The self-raised difficulty of GHOSH in accepting the above interpretation is that the name of the authority 'Sākalya', does not occur at the end of the sūtra, for he believes that 'whenever a pūrvācāra is mentioned in a Pāṇinian aphorism to indicate that the rule concerned is Vaikalpika, the name of the revered one is mentioned only at the end of that aphorism. In the whole of the Grammar of Pāṇini there is not a single exception to this rule' (p. 391). It is really an ingenious argument which GHOSH has advanced in the course of the controversy. The traditional study of the Aṣṭādhayāyi, which is recognized as most thorough and which discusses each and every syllable of the Aṣṭādhayāyi in a very subtle—almost hair-splitting-manner, has not even dreamt of this methodology in the Aṣṭādhayāyi. Let it be stated at first that in the Aṣṭādhayāyi, no such hard and fast arrangement in the order of words is seen.1 If in "Iko yāy aci" (6-1-77), Vidheya comes in the middle and nimitta in the end, we see the order reversed in 'Akaḥ savarne dīrghah' (6-1-101); in 'Ādgunaḥ' (6-1-87), Vidheya comes in the end, but in 'Vṛddhirec' (6-1-88) it occurs in the beginning; the sūtras 'Nipāta ekajanān' (1-1-14) and Svarādinipātātmanavyayam (1-1-37) have a different order as regards the position of the term defined; and so on. Even the particles of negation and option (e.g. na, Vā, Vibhāṣā), which are used in a good majority of cases in the beginning of the sūtras, admit of a different order in their use (e.g. 4-1-22; 7-1-29; 7-1-91; 7-2-38). Thus it would appear that it is futile to deduce any principle from the order of words in the Aṣṭādhayāyi. Even as regards the specific principle propounded by GHOSH, the evidence is not so conclusive as GHOSH thinks it to be, for, besides the exception (Pān. 6-1-127) which GHOSH himself mentions and discusses in the sequel, I may point out for argument’s sake the sūtra, ‘Laṅkaḥ Sākaṭāyanasya eva’ (3-4-111) where the name of a Pūrvācāra has not been mentioned at the end. That the word, ‘eva’ in (3-4-111) is not an integral part of the previous word, Sākaṭāyanasya, is obvious from the fact that the word would be otherwise quite insignificant and that Patañjali and Kāśikākāra assign a quite different function to it. (See Patañjali on Pān. 3-4-110, and Kāśikā on Pān. 3-4-111 and 3-4-116). As regards the Yoga-vibhāga, proposed by GHOSH of the sūtra Pān. 6-1-27, in which the name of the Pūrvācāra does not occur at the end, and which is therefore made, by the ingenious device of Yogavibhāga to conform to his view, there are two points which might be mentioned in passing. Firstly, GHOSH’s device would justify a quite new form ‘cakri atra’, which

is not recognized by any Indian Grammarian. Strangely enough Gosh does not attach importance to this objection, for he asserts that 'Pāṇini's not recognizing a particular case of Pragṛhya cannot prove that it was unknown in the language', and at once quotes 'śyeti akuruta' (Tait. Sarīhiḥ; 5-5-8) and 'Mithunī abhavan' (ibid. 5-3-6) as known examples. But Gosh should wait for a while, before quoting the above forms as pragṛhya-cases, to see whether the forms occur in Śākalya's works, for according to Gosh's own interpretation, the sūtra enjoins pragṛhyatva in Śākalya's opinion. And since Tait. Sarīhiḥ is not written by Śākalya, the citation of the form from the Tait. Sarīhiḥ is to say the least, irrelevant. Secondly, it is difficult to see how he can easily get rid of an anomaly—the redundancy of ca (in the same sūtra)—which was noticed already by Patañjali; for even after the proposed Yogavibhāga, Patañjali's argument for dropping ca, viz. 'Hrasvavidhi-sāmarthyāt na svara-sāndhiḥ kimarthah cakāraḥ,' will still hold good. Thus the yoga-vibhāga proposed by Gosh is too ingenious a device to be accepted and the only result achieved by this step is that the sūtra ' falls into line with the so-called usual (?) procedure of Pāṇini (mentioning the name of Pūrvacāryas only at the end of his sūtras) and similarly between this sūtra and corresponding rules of the R.P. turns out to be complete identity.' (p. 196). Gosh is certainly free to expect such a result, but he should not force it on others.

The second difficulty or anomaly which prevents Gosh from accepting the traditional interpretation of the Pragṛhya sūtras is why Pāṇini should deal with the non-contractability of vocative O in relation to iti only and say nothing as to its behaviour when confronted with initial vowels of other words.' (p. 393). He regards the "specific case of iti following upon a vocative form in O of infinitesimal importance from Pāṇini's point of view" and therefore finds it impossible to resist the conclusion that this is "the most eloquent proof of Pāṇini's direct dependence on the R.P." (p. 393). But as the facts stand, it is not true that Pāṇini is silent as to the general problem of the final O before initial vowels. A reference to the sūtras, Eco yavāyūvah (6-1-78) and Enaḥ padāntādati (P. 6-1-109) will clearly show the behaviour of a final O before a and other vowels. Not only that, Pāṇini goes further, and in the sūtra ' Lopaḥ Śākalyasya' (8-3-19) he refers to Śākalya's opinion, according to which the final O resolves itself to a (by 6-1-78 and 8-3-19) before a vowel other than short a and is not allowed to be joined with the following vowel (by 8-2-1). Thus the forms resulting from a general treatment of a final O before initial vowels are: Vāya iha (according to Śākalya), Vāyaviha (according to other Grammarians); Vāyo'tra (according to all Grammarians when the following vowel is a short a). It is only to account for such specific cases of hiatus as of a Vocative O before iti (which are not covered by the rules mentioned above but are found current e.g. in Śākalya's Padapātha) that Pāṇini gives a particular rule (Pāṇ. 1-1-16). Such being the real situation, it is not "an astonishing error" of omission on the part of

Pāṇini. On the other hand, his treatment of a final O is scrupulously comprehensive, as is seen by his references (Pāṇ. 6-1-122/3) to the condition of O in Go before a short a according to Sphoṭāyana and others. It is really a pity that Pāṇini should be accused of the “error of omission” because he does not give a general rule treating a V vocative O before initial vowels and also of the ‘grave error of commission,’ because he gives rules about the specific cases, which, according to Ghosh, should not have concerned Pāṇini. The former charge—of error of omission—is untenable in view of the sūtras 6-1-78; 6-1-109. As regards the latter charge of error of commission, it would be more charitable to judge Pāṇini from his standpoint, before we arbitrarily narrow down the sphere of his work. A complete grammar, as visualized by Pāṇini should not and did not exclude the Padapātha of Sākalya.

Now we come to certain misstatements by Ghosh on the uṇah ūn problem. He states that ‘the singular behaviour of the particle u in ‘aved v indra’ cannot be explained with the help of Pāṇ. sūtras” (p. 394). Relying on Wackernagel (I. 270 a. p. 320) he thinks that in the Samhitā, u is unchangeable only after a vowel or a y out of i and quotes ‘bhā u anśava’ as an example. And as u in ‘aved v. Indra’ is neither after a vowel nor after a y out of i, he, regarding it as a case of singular behaviour, remarks that Pāṇi’s sūtra cannot explain it. But all his difficulty is due to his misunderstanding (p. 394) the sūtra ‘mayaḥ uṇah vo vā’ (8-3-33). This sūtra he takes as enjoining praṇghyatā of an u (from uṇu) preceded by a maya. And since there is no praṇghyatā of u in ‘aved v indra,’ despite its following a maya (d in aved), he comes to the above conclusion about the insufficiency of Pāṇini’s sūtras. The fact is that the sūtra ‘mayaḥ uṇah vo vā’ lays down the substitution of v for u and the example given by Ghosh as unaccountable is really an example of this sūtra. Thus there is no difficulty at all. Further Ghosh challenges those who maintain that Pāṇini wrote these sūtras after a direct observation of the R.V. Samhitā, to explain in the light of Pāṇini’s sūtras those cases: e.g. bhā u anśava (R.V. 1-461-10); Praty u adāri (R.V. 7-81-1) in which u does not undergo sandhi with a following vowel. But he forgets that the sūtra Nipāta ekāc anāṁ (1-1-14) does easily account for the hiatus in ‘bhā u anśava’ (I-46-10). In this way, both the examples quoted by Ghosh are accounted for by Pāṇi’s sūtras. Instead of making an uncalled for statement that “Pāṇini could not have formulated his sūtras about the sandhi of u after a direct observation of the R.V. Samhitā,” Ghosh should revise his study of Pāṇi’s sūtras and give up the wrong notion that Pāṇi (8-3-3) is ‘the only sūtra, which restricts (?) the sandhi of u with a following vowel.”

As regards the interpretation of the sūtra, ‘Idūtau ca saptamayarte’ (1-1-19), Ghosh makes “a new departure” in regarding the amūrtti of Sākalyasa itau anārṣe absolutely necessary. (p. 397). The traditional interpretation regards this sūtra as unconditioned by ‘Sākalyasa itau anārṣe,’ and the examples given by the Kāśikākāra are, therefore, from both the Samhitā
and Padapāṭha. Technically speaking, it is possible to have examples (of 1-kārāṇa type) from the classical Sanskrit also, as is clear from the following statement in the Tattva-bodhini commentary, “Vātaprami atra, yayī asakta iti udāharane sati api ukārāntasya laukikodāharanābhāvāt ubhayoḥ api vede eva udāharoḥan uktam.” The traditional interpretation clearly knows that the examples from the Padapāṭha are within the proper sphere of this sūtra; otherwise it would not quote ‘priyāḥ sūrye priyo agnā bhavāti’ as a counter-example, if the word īdūṭau’ is dropped. It is quite immaterial whether agnā, in the above is made pragṛhya or not, because there is no possibility of its being joined in sandhi with bhavāti. So the only significance of giving agnā as a counter example lies in the fact that agnā will be followed by iti in the Padapāṭha (cf: ‘ihāpi padakāle iti śabda-prayoga-prasāṅgaḥ sa ca anistāḥ’; Tattvabodhini). Still the Pāṇinīyas insist on making this sūtra unconditioned by ‘Sākalyasya itau’ merely to account for the hiatus in the Saṁhitā examples [Gaurī adhiśritāḥ (R. V. 9-12-3); tanū ṭtvye (R. V. 10-183-2)]. Ghosh is not justified in taking these examples on a par with other hundred examples ‘non-contraction of vowels in which is determined in the R. V. Saṁhitā wholly by the exigencies of metre.’ He should note that the written Saṁhitā text does not join in Sandhi ‘Gaurī and tanū’ with the following vowels, as it does in the ‘other hundred’ cases. Unless Ghosh explains the difference in the treatment (in the written Saṁhitā text) of the two types of cases—one, not joined in sandhi and pronounced separately in the Saṁhitāpāṭha, and the other, joined in sandhi but pronounced separately in the Saṁhitāpāṭha, he is not right in assuming that Pāṇini did not take into account the former type as special cases of pragṛhya. We should consider the question on the basis of existing facts. And if Pāṇini is later than the redaction of the present Saṁhitā text, there is no reason why Pāṇini should overlook the apparent pragṛhya cases in the Saṁhitāpāṭha.
MISCELLANEA

ĀRJUNĀYANAS: PRĀRJUNAS

The Allahabad Pillar inscription of Samudragupta (1. 22) refers to a host of tribes—Mālavas, Ārjunāyanas, Yaudheyas, Madrakas, Abhiras, Prārjunas, Sanakānikas, Kākas, Kharaparikas, and other (tribes)—that obeyed the imperial commands and paid all kinds of taxes. It has long been correctly surmised that all these tribal states were located along the north-western, western and south-western fringes of the north-Indian kingdom of Samudragupta. Of these, the Mālavas, Yaudheyas, Madrakas and Abhiras are more or less well-known; but very little is known about the other tribes.

The names of the two tribes, Ārjunāyanas and Prārjunas seem apparently to have some connection with the name of the Epic hero, Arjuna, though it is not certain. The Allahabad Pillar inscription connects the Ārjunāyanas with the Yaudheyas which is significant, inasmuch as the Adhiparvan (95, 76) of the Mahābhārata gives the name of one of the sons of Yudhiṣthira as Yaudheyā, so that the epic connection of the Yaudheyas and the Ārjunāyanas may not be altogether without foundation.

The author of the Bhārat Samhitā also connects the Ārjunāyanas with the Yaudheyas and locates both the tribes in the northern division of India. Prof. Ray Chaudhuri locates the Yaudheyas in the Bharatpur State of Rājputānā (Political History of Ancient India, 4th edition, p. 458); the Ārjunāyanas may have also occupied the northern territory of the country. The Ārjunāyanas are also known from coins, but as their provenance is not known, they do not give any clue to their geographical location.

The Prārjunas must have been the same people as the Prārjunakas mentioned in the Arthasastra of Kauṭilya but it is difficult to locate them with any amount of certainty. Vincent Smith locates them in the Nārasimhapur district of the Central Provinces (JRAS, 1897, p. 892), but a more plausible location is Nārasimhagarh in Central India (IHQ, Vol. I, p. 258), inasmuch as the three other tribes—Sanakānikas, Kākas and Kharaparikas—also seem to have occupied regions more or less within the bounds of Central India. The Udayagiri Cave inscription of G.E.82 mentions a Mahārāja of the Sanakānika tribe. Udayagiri is just two miles to the north-west of Bhilsa, ancient Vidiśā. The Kākas are mentioned in the Mahābhārata (VI, 9, 64) where they are associated with the Vidarbhas who were a well-known people occupying tracts of territory in what is now known as the Central Provinces. The territory of the Kākas is sometimes identified with Kākūpur near Bithur (Bombay Gazetteer), while Smith suggests an identification with Kākanāda near Sānci (JRAS, 1897, p. 892-99). The Kharaparikas are not elsewhere mentioned in inscriptions or literature; but Prof. D. R. Bhandarkar finds a probable identification of the tribe with Kharpura mentioned in the Bāṭhīhāgarh Inscription of the Damoh district of the Central Provinces (IHQ, I, p. 258; EP. XII, p. 46, v. 5).

B. C. LAW

MS. No. 623/VIṢRĀM(1) AT THE B. O. R. I. POONA

Having found the several remarkable differences between the text of the Yogavāśiṣṭha utilized by Ānandabodha Yati for his commentary Tātparyapraṅkāsa and that which appears to have been utilized by Gauḍa Abhinanda for his abridgement called Yogavāśiṣṭha-sāra or Mokṣopāya-sāra or Laghu yogavāśiṣṭha, which have been
noted at considerable length in my paper on "Further Light in the Date of the Yogavāśīṣṭha,"1 and come to the conclusion that there must be at least two different recensions of that work, I had been making efforts to get a copy of the one utilized by Gauḍā Abhinanda which must presumably be an earlier one. One of them was to examine the several MSS. at the Government Oriental MSS. Library at the B. O. R. I. Poona, which had some connection or other with that work. One of those which I examined was MS. No. 623 forming part of a collection transferred to that library from the Viśrāmbāg, Poona, where, I believe, the Peshwa's collection of MSS. had been preserved. The label on the wrapper thereof described it as "Yogavāśīṣṭha-Nirvāṇa-prakaraṇa with Ṭikā" and gave the name of the author of the work itself as "Vasiṣṭha" with a query in brackets and that of the commentator as "Bhāskara-karaṇṭha." This latter name was quite unfamiliar to me till then because it did not appear in AUFRECHT's Cata. Cata. as that of one of the persons who had written commentaries on the Yogavāśīṣṭha. That was the greater reason why I dived into that bulky MS. which contained 207 folio pages each having a size 6" × 10½" and written over within red marginal lines marked on all the four sides. The character used therein was the Devanāgāri and it was written throughout very legibly and was free from any repelling faults. The Sarga-colophons therein were easily distinguishable because they had been written thoughtfully either in red and black ink used for each alternate word occurring therein or in one ink only leaving the space for every alternate word blank as

इ श्री स्भु के विचि या मो पा टी या.......समै: §

I hoped to find this to be a complete MS. of the commentary of Bhāskara-karaṇṭha on at least the Nirvāṇa-prakaraṇa of the Yogavāśīṣṭha but on a cursory glance I found that the very first folio page therein had been marked 694 and commenced with only a portion of the commentary on verse 1 of Sarga 195 of that Prakaraṇa and that the last folio page therein marked 901 ended with an incomplete sentence of the commentary on verse 1 of Sarga 270 of that Prakaraṇa. All the same it was a remarkable MS. and I took some notes on examining it in the hope that they might be useful some day in future. That day has by chance come sooner than could reasonably be expected.

The importance of the MS. was in my eyes considerably heightened when, reading Dr. K. C. PANDEY's recent publication "Abhinavagupta, An Historical and Philosophical Study", I came across at p. 153 thereof remarks to the following effect about Bhāskara-karaṇṭha, the author of Bhāskari, a gloss on the Iṣvarapratyayabhināvimārṇini of Abhinavagupta, namely that besides the above, this writer was the author of (1) a Sanskrit translation of Lālāvāk, a Saivite work in the old Kāśmīrī written by a woman in the 14th century; (2) a commentary on the Yogavāśīṣṭha consisting of one lac and ten thousand verses (? graniḥas) according to his own statement in the Introduction to the Bhāskari, only a few fragments whereof were now left with his present descendant and which presented a Saivite interpretation of the text (as opposed to the Vedāntic interpretation expounded by Ānandabodha) and (3) Hāresvarastava and also found on the same page a short genealogy commencing with the commentator, in which the last descendant named Viśvēśvara was said to be still living. It is quite likely that the Bhāskara-karaṇṭha, the author of the commentary of which MS. No. 623 of Viśrāmbāg (1) collection at the B. O. R. I. forms part is identical with the author of the Bhāskari who also wrote an extensive commentary on the Yogavāśīṣṭha and whose seventh descendant now living has fragments thereof. True, the said MS. points to the existence of a commentary by that author on a recension of the Yogavāśīṣṭha in which the Nirvāṇa-prakaraṇa had more than 269 Sargas, not sub-divided into two parts as in the printed edition but

1. Poona Orientalist, April 1938 pp. 29-44.
that by itself is proof of there being in the time of this author such a recension of the work in Kāśmir. That time must be about the middle of the 18th century A.D. as, according to Dr. Pandey, the author's seventh descendant is still living. My visit to Kāśmir in the summer of this year has further revealed the existence of such a recension of the work in Kāśmir even in the middle of the 19th century. In the Prince Pratapsinh Public Library at Srinagar there is a complete MS. of the Yogavaiśīṣṭha in the Sārādā script prepared in S. 1920 (A.D. 1863-64), very well preserved in a strongly bound book-form as all MSS. Sanskrit, Arabic and Persian, usually are at all places in Srinagar where MSS. are preserved. With the kind help of a Kāśmīrī Paṇḍit named Nilakanṭha Bhaṭṭa, I was able to ascertain that the work of which that was a copy had in it all the six Prakaraṇas which are found in the printed N.S.P. recension, that the total number of Sargas therein upto the end of the sixth was 704 as against 658 in the printed edition, that it had also a seventh Khila-prakaraṇa made up of 14 Sargas and entitled "Yogavaiśīṣṭha-Nānā-praśnāḥ" but that this Prakaraṇa had been added after the final colophon of the work containing a note as to there being 704 Sargas in all, out of which the sixth chapter alone comprised 373 (? 374), that these 374 had not been sub-divided into two parts the Pūrvārdha and Uttarārdha as in the printed edition and that they did not contain any corresponding to Sargas 127 and 128 of the Pūrvārdha in the printed edition which, as noted by me in my said paper on "Further Light on the date of the Yogavaiśīṣṭha" have all the characteristics of a finale. I also noticed during the process of comparison that the said MS. contained several entirely new Sargas in several chapters and several new stanzas in many Sargas. I could therefore conclude that it was evidence of the existence in Kāśmir of the Devadūtokta Saṁhitā having probably an extent of the full 32,000 stanzas mentioned in the colophons to I, I, II, III, IV, V, VI/1 & VI/2 and in II, 17 of the printed edition which as a matter of fact contains only 29,289 stanzas including prose passages cut up at intervals to which had been superadded a Khilaprakaraṇa of 14 Sargas at a subsequent stage. When this could have been done could not be ascertained then and cannot be ascertained even now because, so long as the remaining fragments of Bhāskarakaṇṭha's commentary whose existence in the possession of his living descendant has been vouchsafed by Dr. Pandey, are not examined, it cannot be ascertained whether that prakaraṇa was or was not in existence in the middle of the 18th century and so long as the other separate MSS. thereof namely Hpr. 2, 172 and 10, 2423 and 2442 (Khiḷā Mokṣopāyāḥ) noticed by Auferch in his Cata. Cata. are not examined it cannot be ascertained which could be the earliest date of composition of this superaddition. But this is only by the way. For the present I want to emphasize the importance of the MS. at the B.O.R.I. as likely to lead to the discovery of the full text of a commentary of a Śaivite Kāśmīrī Paṇḍit of the 18th Century on the full text of the Devadūtokta Saṁhitā of 32000 stanzas which Ānandabodha claimed to have obtained and commented upon but had not obtained and commented upon, provided the other existing fragments in the possession of the commentator's living descendant are, as the result of some negotiations, carried on through a proper channel, brought over to Poona to take their place with the said MS. and a transcript of the abovementioned MS. (No. 8771) at the S.P.P. Library, Srinagar in the Devanāgari character prepared by a careful Paṇḍit knowing the Sārādā script thoroughly, is also obtained on approaching the proper authority through the proper channel. Till then the fragment of the MS. of Bhāskarakaṇṭha's commentary on the Yogavaiśīṣṭha must remain as evidence of the existence in Kashmir in the middle of 18th century of a recension of that work differing in material respects from that commented upon by Ānandabodha Yati, so far as the contents of the Nirvāṇa prakaraṇa are concerned.

P. C. Divanji
SIMHALA IN CENTRAL INDIA

We adduced an evidence in the Abori. (Vol. XIX, pp. 84ff) in support of Mr. Kīne’s theory, locating Rāvaṇa’s Lāṅkā in Central India. We have since lightened upon another evidence in the Kalkī-purāṇa.

The Kalkī avatāra was born as a son of a Brāhmaṇa, named Viṣṇuyāsas, in the village of Sambhala. He, with king Viśākhayūpa of Māhiṃśatī and others vanquished in war Kali, the Buddhists at Kikaṭa, the Śakas, the Yavanasa, the Barbaras, the Mlecchas, the Kambojas, the Taṅganas, the Khasas, the Cinas, the Savaras and others. He married Padmā, daughter of king Brhadratha of Simhala. This country is described as an island in the sea, inhabited by Brāhmaṇas, Kṣatriyas and others. The capital of the kingdom is named Kārumati. Princess Padmā obtained a boon from god Śiva that she would get Viṣṇu as her husband, and anybody other than her husband looking at her with lustful eyes would be turned into a woman. Owing to this boon to her, which was but a curse to others, all the princes who attended her svayaṃvara were turned into women and lived with her as her attendants.

The princess heard about Kalkī from his favourite parrot and fell in love with him. She was everyday expecting the arrival of Kalkī. One day she became very disconsolate. She could find pleasure in nothing. She was finding fault even with the cool and pleasant breeze from the Revā (Narmādā), pregnant with water particles and scented with pollens, as:

Revā-vāri-parisnītāṁ parāg-āsyāṁ samāgatam |
Dhṛta-nirāṁ rasagatāṁ nīndantim pavanaṁ priyam || 6

Kalkī-purāṇa II, ch. 2.

This clearly shows that the capital Kārumati of this island of Simhala must have been somewhere in Central India, in the vicinity of the river Narmādā. It is worth noting here that this Simhala was inhabited by the four Varnaś. Can the same thing be said of Ceylon?

It is further said that after the marriage of Kalkī with Padmā, Kalkī directed the princes, who were turned into women and served Padmā as her attendants, to bathe in the Revā and they at once got back their former state, as:

Tāḥ striyo’pi tamāloka sansprīya caraṇ-āmbujam |
Punah puṇistvān samāpannā Revā-snānātt tad-aśayeṇa || 18 || Ibid. Ch. 3.

The village of Sambhala, the home of Kalkī, seems also to have been in Central India. The name of Sambhala occurs in an inscription found in the district of Dāmoh in C.P. It says that one Vijayasirin of Viśvamitra-gotra, son of Harisārāya, fought with Chitoda and Delhi, drove away the Gurijaras and the Gonds and founded Sambhala, as:

Jo Cittodaha jujhi (jjhī) au jin Dhili (lī) dalu jitta |
So supasamāsahī rahāhakai Harisārāa tīa sutta |
Khedia Guja (jja) ra Gomdai kīya adhi (dhi) an māra |
Vijayasirinā kīta SAMBHALA hu paūrīsa kohā sansārā ||

Dāmohā-dīpaka, p. 11.

We have seen that the island of Simhala is described as surrounded by sāgara (sea). It is not uncommon to describe lakes as sāgaras. In Bengal big Bis are sometimes called as samudra and sāgara, such as Dhol-samudra, Hurā-sāgara. In the district of Sylhet there are many Hāös. It is a corrupt form of the word sāgara. In the rainy season these Hāös look like so many seas. The name Saugor of the district of Saugor may have something to do with sāgara. The name of the capital of this Simhala is given as Kārumati. It is worth looking into if any such place exists or existed in Central India.

JOGENDRA CHANDRA GHOSH.

1. Sambhala is generally identified with Sambhal of the Moradabad district, U.P. The Pāg Sam Jon Zan places both Sambhala and Lāṅkāpuri in the country of Udḍi- yāna, containing 500,000 towns. (WADDLE, Lamaism, p. 182; IHQ., Vol. III, p. 745).
NOTES OF THE MONTH

The History Week at Kamsheet to be held in honour of Rao Bahadur G. S. Sardeusai between the 2nd and 6th of this month is an informal meeting of advanced research workers and younger scholars for a discussion of problems, exchange of ideas and organising a co-ordinate plan of research. We take this opportunity of wishing R. B. Sardeusai a very useful and long life of further activities in the field of Marāṭhā and Indian History where he was one of the pioneer workers.

Before the commencement of this History Week two volumes of papers, one in English and the other in Marāṭhā, will be presented to Rao Bahadur Sardeusai at the hands of Dr. M. R. Jayakar, Federal Judge, on the 1st of October 1938 in commemoration of the distinguished services of Rao Bahadur Sardeusai to the cause of Indian History for over forty years. This function will take place at Bombay on behalf of the Sardeusai Memorial Committee with Mr. B. V. Jadhav ex-minister of Education, Bombay, as chairman, and Mr. S. R. Tikkar as Secretary. On behalf of the New Indian Antiquary we convey our heartfelt greetings to Rao Bahadur G. S. Sardeusai and all organizers of the proposed functions. Eminent scholars like Sir Jadunath Sarkar are expected to attend and take active part in the deliberations.

With the advance in research in any particular branch of Indic studies it becomes necessary to bring together from time to time all scholars working in the same field, and of recent years the growth of such conferences, whether formal or informal, augurs well for Indology in India. The present organization is the first of its kind, being a purely informal meeting, held for the purpose of honouring R. B. Sardeusai and designing ways and means for the continuation of the good work which he started and to which he has devoted the greatest part of his life. Apart from the different discussions arranged at this gathering in the shape of Comptes rendus of the actual work so far done in Indian History but not yet published—in itself a very useful guide to the problems of further research on a planned basis—there will be a discussion on the evolving of a practical scheme of collaboration in historical research, apportionment of work among individual scholars and learned bodies in order to avoid overlapping and such other wastage, and creation of a permanent central exchange house for historical research workers in India. The last day of the Conference will be devoted to the discussion of finding ways and means and evolving a detailed plan for (i) co-ordinating historical research in the Bombay Presidency, (ii) foundation of a modest historical library as the centre of a “Summer School” at Kamsheet, for advanced workers, (iii) creation of an endowment fund for assisting the publication of approved fruits of research or original sources, selected by an expert committee, and (iv) drawing up a list of helpers and workers and the lines in which they will respectively render aid to others and conduct researches themselves.

Among the many things needed for a proper research in Marāṭhā history for which R. B. Sardeusai has himself edited the voluminous selections known as Peshwe Daftar, an index of all proper names with reference to the printed volumes should be emphasised. These modern instruments of research should be supplied with every volume published giving us the original or primary sources of history, and this indexing should be done on the most up-to-date lines, giving every aspect of research requirements.

We have no Dictionary of Place Names in India on historical basis with reference to Indian literature, inscriptions or other sources of history. This is also a badly needed work which should be attempted on such a co-ordinate basis for the whole
length and breadth of the country, taking all languages and all sources into consideration, and every place, small or great, which has had a name. The existing geographical dictionaries are absolutely insufficient from this point of view.

Work of the type suggested above can only be a national work and should figure prominently in an All-India Conference like the History Congress or the All-India Oriental Conference. With the increasing research in every domain of Indian History these primary instruments of further research should be within the reach of all scholars in a short space of time.

The second session of the Indian History Congress will be held at Allahabad this month on the 8th, 9th and 10th. The value of these Congresses and Conferences cannot be over-estimated. Scientific historiography in India is only of recent growth, and the mass of primary sources is so great that unless a co-ordinated effort on national lines is organised the full value of these sources cannot be realised. The first Congress was held at Poona in June, 1935. Now after three years the second session has been organised at Allahabad under the very able general President Prof. Dr. D. R. Bhandarkar, assisted by Sectional Presidents like Rao Bahadur K. N. Dikshit, Dewan Bahadur Dr. S. Krishnaswamy Iyengar, Prof. D. V. Potdar, Dr. Balkrishna, Dr. Surendra Nath Sen, Mr. R. P. Khosla and Mr. Sita Ram Kholi.

The objects of such conferences should be two-fold: (a) to give the necessary stimulus to all research scholars by exchange of thoughts, ideas and frank discussions of problems and difficulties for further research work on an organised basis, and (b) to bring within the reach of the educated masses the results of such researches in a popular and easily digestible form. The main difficulty in India and abroad connected with research is the absence of a central organisation which is the depository of all research plans, programmes and actual work done from time to time in the different parts of the country or even other countries. Much waste results in this fashion. It is in order to eliminate all such waste and offer sage advice to all interested scholars that these Congresses and Conferences should co-operate to build up a central body of co-ordinating officers, representing the different branches of Indology. The New Indian Antiquary offers a medium for such organisation with the willing co-operation of all scholars truly interested in Indology.

The popularisation of serious research in history may best be done by intelligent organising of museums, exhibitions and popular excursions by scientific societies, inviting the intelligentsia to collaborate with them in these excursions. Although each Conference or Congress arranges its own excursions they do not filter through and excite the interest of the general body of the intelligentsia. Our Museums need re-organisation on a scientific basis; we have, for instance, no museum giving us the evolution through the centuries of the various items of dress or ornaments. Each of these has its own interest, not only for the accredited scholar, but also for the man in the street. In these days when we are thinking in terms of the usefulness of cultural studies for the nation as a whole on a productive basis, it is necessary that results of these painstaking researches should be presented to all people who are not scholars in an interesting manner. We have no doubt that these Congresses and Conferences will achieve these results in a short while by organising such co-ordinating efforts.

The Second Session of the History Congress is organising a Historical Exhibition dealing with the historical evolution of painting and sculpture, archeological discoveries, old manuscripts, historical documents and other articles of historical importance such as letters, wearing apparel, etc. Excursions have been arranged to Kausambi, Bhita and Allahabad Fort, Khusru Bagh, Museum and Jhusi. We wish the Congress every success in its noble efforts.
With the recent appearance of the first part of the critical edition of the *Udyogaparvan* under the able editorship of Prof. S. K. De of Dacca University, the ninth fasciculus of the magnificent Critical Edition of the *Mahâbhârata* opens out. The last 20 years have marked a silent but effective organisation at the Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute in Poona under the direct supervision of the General Editor, Dr. V. S. Sukthankar, for critically editing for 'the first time the greatest epic in the world from all available MSS sources which are of a significant character. This stupendous work has now been in progress for two decades, and we have already with us the first volume, *Adiparvan*, edited by Dr. Sukthankar himself, the *Virâgaparvan* by Dr. Raghunath Vira of Lahore, and this first part of the *Udyogaparvan* by Dr. De. With the completion of the second part now in press, we shall have more than a quarter of the entire work in print in the critical edition. Other volumes in the series are either completed or under completion by different gifted scholars. The *Sabhâparvan* was to have been edited by the late Prof. Winternitz of Prague, but his death cut short the hope of all Indologists of associating his name actively with this great achievement for the institution of which he was indirectly responsible.

We are glad, however, that the Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute secured the co-operation of a very gifted American Indologist, Prof. Franklin Edgerton, now in Poona, working on the final points of his edition of the *Sabhâparvan*. Prof. Edgerton is Professor of Sanskrit at Yale University and has numerous works to his credit, from the text-critical to the linguistic fields. He has under preparation a lexicon and grammar of what he calls "Buddhist Hybird Sanskrit" which will be one of his major contributions to Indian Linguistics. Under his able editorship we can be sure of maintaining a high level of scholarship and international co-operation for this Critical Edition, thus fulfilling in part at least the original hope of the European Committee which first gave definite shape to this idea of a Critical Edition.

As a recognition of this greatest of all achievements, in the Indological field, of this century so ably realised by the General Editor Dr. Sukthankar, firstly by his unrivalled edition of the *Adiparvan* and secondly by the exercise of such wonderful control on the subsequent volumes of this series, the American Oriental Society, at a meeting held in Philadelphia on April 19 this year, elected Dr. Sukthankar as one of its honorary members. This is the second time that an Indian Scholar has been thus honoured, and it is a matter for gratification that one so intimately connected with the illustrious name of the late Prof. Sir Râmakrishna Gopâla Bhandarkar should now succeed him to this honour.

The editorial work on the *Sabhâ- and the Vana-parvans* is now completed, bringing the entire project to more than half its extent, but the greatest handicap appears to be the absence of funds for printing the text. We appeal to all Indian princes, merchants, scholars and private individuals or public institutions to aid this huge undertaking with ample funds for printing individual volumes. Subscriptions towards the cost of printing, subscriptions to a number of sets or donations are required to bring this work to completion, marking India's greatest achievement in the whole field of Indology.

* * * * *

The first report of the Bombay Field Club since its inception on the 25th September, 1936, is now ready and indicates a very promising beginning in the right direction. The aim of the Club is to bring into cultural contact people interested in the study of Art, History and Archaeology and to endeavour to promote the study of India's national cultural heritage. The Club is also endeavouring to provide opportunities for training in observation and description of historical remains and other works of Art on a scientific basis so that records may be intelligently kept by
members pursuing investigations in their homes and districts. To fulfil these objects the Club organised excursions to Elephanta Caves, the ancient Temple at Parel near Vajrēsvāri, the Historical Forts of Cheul, Korlai and of the Angrias, and to the Maṇḍapēsvāra Caves and Memorial Stones-Palais at Eksar. A committee has been appointed each for (i) examining the possibilities of carrying on excavation at the ancient Buddhist centre Sopārā near Bassein, (ii) to prepare an up-to-date photographic record of the sculptures and inscriptions at the Kanheri Caves near Borivli, and (iii) to conduct exhibitions of photographs, etc., of places of Historical or Archaeological interest.

Already the third committee organised a well attended and highly interesting exhibition of photographs of archaeological and historical remains on novel lines in the Town Hall, Bombay, between 10th and 25th September, in aid of the King Emperor’s Anti-Tuberculosis Fund. Such exhibitions, apart from the humanitarian views encouraged by the sponsors, create genuine interest in the minds of the people by bringing home to them “the glory that was Ind” and reminding them of the past achievements as a spur to future action and present organisation.

The Bombay Field Club is working at present as part of the University School of Economics and Sociology activities. The fourth aim of the Club is to “establish similar Field Clubs in other parts of the country which would work in co-operation and co-ordination with the Bombay Field Club.” It is hoped that these activities of the Bombay Field Club may spur the other centres of learning in India to organise similar activities in this field. Archaeology in India is greatly handicapped for lack of funds, but we think the greatest handicap is the ignorance of the people themselves. If all India realised the greatness of her past cultural achievements and particularly the remains of archaeological and historical importance the Government would not have difficulty in properly equipping their Archaeological Department with the needed funds and the impetus to work. Archaeology should not become a specialised branch, for its interest is more universal than that of any other branch of research.

As to the publication of the results of such research as is carried on by such Field Clubs or is proposed to be carried out, the New Indian Antiquary offers its pages to all alike without any distinction.

The Membership fee of the Bombay Field Club is limited to Rs. 3 only per annum; it can be compounded by paying a Life Subscription of Rs. 100 or more. Donors and Patrons have to contribute a sum not less than Rs. 250 or Rs. 500 respectively. Students become members by paying an annual subscription of Re. 1 only. All donations and subscriptions have to be paid in advance.
REVIEWS


The product of the French Indologists in the field of Vedic studies has been surprisingly small hitherto in comparison with their work in the other fields. The author of this small translation is the first of a band of scholars belonging to a new generation whose research in the Vedic field needs no introduction to any Vedic scholar. It is therefore all the more interesting that this short work is an indication of the progress that is now likely to be realised in the French speaking countries within the Vedic field, linguistic as well philological, with a thoroughness that is characteristic of German scholars. The net result of such a procedure is a happy combination of French clarity with German thoroughness, giving us perhaps a higher approach to the many problems of Vedic scholarship.

Prof. Renou has given us here 44 hymns from the _Rgveda_, 24 hymns from the _Atharvaveda_, four citations from the _Kausikasūtra_, two hymns from the _Vājasa-neyisaṃhiti_, one each from _Maitrāyaṇisaṃhiti_ and _Taittiriya-brāhmaṇa_. Each hymn is preceded by a short introduction to the subject of the poem or prayer. In the brief introduction the translator has given general ideas of Vedic literature and their subsequent effect on Hindu thought from the earliest to the modern times. The work is addressed to the intelligent Frenchman who wishes to understand the literary and philosophical contributions of the Vedas to Hindu and World thought. The author is in the happy position of eschewing linguistic and philological problems connected with the hymns, though himself an accredited linguist, and the result is very readable and accurate. The get up of the book leaves nothing to be desired. It is one of the best introductions to Vedic literature that have appeared within recent years.

S. M. K.


The present series of a well-known journal deserves every encouragement from all lovers of Indo-European culture. The inaugural number of the New Series opens out with an editorial from Prof. Günther entitled Neue Zeit—neues Ziel, wherein he explains the full significance of the objects of the new series. The second paper is of an archaeological interest dealing with stone figures from Val Camonica. The third is by E. Winkler on the Linguistic Thought of the French scholars, and, the fourth deals with the problem of research connected with linguistic minorities on a statistical basis. There follow short notes and Book Reviews. The journal is bound to exercise great influence in the furtherance of research in the field of I-E. culture from all points of view. The Editorial Board consists of Prof. Günther, supported by R. von Kienle, H. Kuéen, W. Porzig, K. Stegmann von Pritzwald, L. Weiserber and W. Wüst, ensuring a steady conducting of the journal. We wish the New Series every success under such able editors.

S. M. Katre.
Die Lehre der Jainas nach den alten quellen dargestellt von WALther Schubring.
Grundriss der Indo-Arischen Philologie und Altertumskunde, Band III, heft 7. Walter

The present work requires more than a passing notice. It differs from all the
earlier attempts to deal with Jainism and its philosophy, both popular and scholarly,
in that the author uses a method differing from them all in treating his subject. As
the title itself indicates, he has confined himself to the old sources of Jainism which,
from the perusal of the book, appear to include the Ardha-Māgadhī canon and the
early works dealing with it and probably ending with the compendium of Umasvātī,
even though later works in Sanskrit and Prakrits are occasionally used and mentioned.
In the field thus chosen, the author has made an attempt to be exhaustive so far as
it is feasible. Naturally no detail is left out as being insignificant in order to deal
with the general problems in greater details. All the facts the books afford are
painstakingly collected and properly arranged, making the work a storehouse of facts
and naturally in its exhaustiveness the work stands unique and unsurpassed. One
is simply amazed to imagine the labour spent by the author in arriving at this re-
sult which shows the present state of Jain studies and their results in the most
systematic manner, particularly when we consider the facts like the imperfect nature
of the editions of the canonical books, absence of concordances, lack of monographs
on individual works and other similar helps. Another healthy feature of the book is
the greater attention paid to the sources themselves than to later discussions about
them, though they are not unduly neglected.

The collecting and co-ordinating of facts thus culled out from the canon is
obviously on the model of Umasvātī, his predecessor in this systematisation of the
canonical doctrines. There is, however, some amount of doubt as regards the historical
implications of this method followed by him. It cannot be said that the author
has neglected to take note of the heterogeneous nature of the sources and the diver-
sity displayed by them. In fact the author is one of the best workers and critics
in this field. But putting facts from different books of the canon and later works
on a given topic often produces the impression that the whole system was so full
and complete from the very beginning.

Besides the treatment of Jain philosophy in all its branches the author has also
dealt with many other topics connected with Jainism with more or less fulness. He
devotes his introductory chapter to a brief history of Jain studies, a welcome feature
of which is due notice taken by him of Indian workers in the field. The concluding
sections of the chapter deal briefly with the different languages used by the Jain
writers, and he appears to favour the view that their Sanskrit should be admitted as
a peculiar dialect not to be judged by the classical standard. More exhaustive and
of greater importance is the problem of Jain History dealt with in the second chapter,
where the author begins with a description of their mythical history up to Mahāvīra
and then a historical account of the founder and his successors. The concluding por-
tion of this account is necessarily brief and the whole of the chapter appears to leave
in the background the history of the Digambaras. Then follows a detailed descrip-
tion of the canon, much of which is schematic and uninteresting to read. The author
himself is conscious of the sketchy nature of the bibliographical account of the non-
canonical works at the end and expressly states that it is to be regarded as anything
but the history of the literature. But in spite of the fact that it falls out of the
topic of the book it will be of great use to those who are working upon the history
of Jain literature.

The scope of the book does not allow the author to go into discussion of all the
problems that he has touched, and in some cases he has given us the results dog-
matically stated. The relation of the Pinda Nijjutti to the Ayāranijputti is not very
accurate and the alternative tradition is neglected. The statement of the dates of the
early Digambara writers like Samantabhadra and others will not be easily accepted. In spite of some limitations, which are all more in the nature of the subject-matter, the work stands out as a unique production in the whole range of the Jain studies and speaks volumes about the author’s command of the subject and the years of labour spent on it. It is certainly a thing of satisfaction that the work in the series originally standing on the name of Leumann should be brought out by his pupil, and the long delay after which it has appeared has only enriched it.

A. M. Ghatage.

__Founders of Vijayanagara by S. Srikantaya; Mythic Society, Bangalore City. 1938, pp. vi + 174. Price Rs. 5 or 10s. Size 5½" × 8½". __

Vijayanagara, that 'forgotten empire' is now being remembered with all zest by Indian Scholars. Numerous books and critical articles, written by competent scholars like Dr. Saleatore, Dr. Venkatasubbiah, Prof. Ramayya, Rev. Father Heras and others, have thrown abundant light on the past glory and unique history of that Hindu Empire which stood as a bulwark of Hindu Culture and Civilization for about three centuries.

A bewilderling mass of data bearing on the history of the Vijayanagara Empire now made available needs to be properly synthesised for the use of people who live, move and have their being in the culture fostered and preserved by the rulers of the Vijayanagara Empire and for this purpose the book under notice is admirably suited as it is an outcome of the author's special lectures delivered before the Anna-malai University in 1930. For those who have no patience to read the ponderous volumes of specialized research Mr. Srikantaya's manual will give a bird's-eye-view of the problems that agitate the minds of the researchers in the Vijayanagar history at present.

The study of ancient Indian Polity has been latterly engaging the attention of Indologists. The springs of political action that brought forth into existence and prominent relief this glorious empire need to be studied minutely not only by historical scholars but by students of political science who are likely to give a new orientation to the lifeless mass of facts dug out from inscripional and other sources pertaining to this bright patch in the panorama of Indian history.

According to Mr. Srikantaya Hindu faith underlying the origin and establishment of the Vijayanagara Empire was not born of any attachment to any particular form of Hinduism. It was a comprehensive movement embracing all forms of Hindu faith including the prevalent forms of Jainism and other religious faiths of a nonescript character. The combined weight of this faith preserved the independence of the Hindu dharma against the onrush of the proselytising Muhammadan and provided it a peaceful home. The old Hindu temples and Muths provided powerful social and economic centres, fostering a spirit of love for country and religion in the people of the Karnataka country in the fourteenth century long prior to the development of national idea in Europe.

The reasons that led to the rise and fall of the Vijayanagara Empire have a lesson of their own for all future empire-builders and present empire-holders. Macaulay's defence of the Church in his History of England has an analogy for the defence of the Hindu faith that moved the whole framework of the Vijayanagara Empire in the Middle Ages but we must grow wiser by experience and guard against pit-falls by not allowing our religion to get the better of our duties to our fellowmen, which alone can tend towards national unity, if not world unity, the dream of all political philosophers.

P. K. Gode.
Concepts of Riti and Guṇa in Sanskrit Poetics in their historical development.

The concepts of Riti and Guṇa in Sanskrit Alāṃkāra literature have never before been treated so systematically or exhaustively as in the present work, approved for the degree of Ph.D. of the Dacca University. The concept of Rasa drew the greatest attention of the students of Poetics and it came to be regarded rightly as the very soul of Poetry. Bharata, the oldest writer on Dramaturgy, used this prominently in his treatise. But it took centuries after him to be admitted in the realm of Poetics. Before the literary critics realised the importance of Rasa they busied themselves with the concepts of Riti and Guṇa. It is therefore very interesting to read in the pages of this book the historical development of these ideas.

It is noteworthy that the first concept that came to be formulated was not that of Guṇas or excellences but of Doṣas or defects. Bharata first treats of Doṣas and then defines Guṇas as the vipāryayas of the former. Whether we interpret vipāryaya-vatva as viruddhatva or abhāvata the Guṇas do not stand prominent, as they deserve to, as independent entities. The early writers Bhāmaha and Daṇḍin occupied themselves with Alāṃkāra and Riti and treated of Guṇas as subservient to Riti. Nor did they define clearly the boundaries of Guṇa and Alāṃkāra. In Daṇḍin’s scheme Guṇas are also called Alāṃkriyās while the poetic figures of speech proper are described as Sādhāraṇa-alāṃkāra-jātām. These early writers had collected together a number of peculiarities in poetry which made or marred its beauty and were struggling hard to classify and co-ordinate them. No unanimity of opinion was to be looked for in this nebulous state. Thus what was denounced by Bhāmaha as sasandeha doṣa came later on to be greeted by Māmata as Śleṣālāṃkāra. The famous opening verse of Kumārasambhava, viz. astyuttarāsyaṃ dīśi devatāmā provides a telling instance regarding the confusion of classification that prevailed. This verse has been cited as an instance of no less than four guṇas, Śleṣa, Mādhurya, Arthavyakti and Saukumārya. Vāmana regarded the guṇas as of dual character pertaining to word as well as its sense, thus increasing their number which in the hands of Bhoja rose up to twenty-four. Confusion was worse confounded when Bhoja, besides regarding the twenty-four guṇas as belonging to word and sense added to the number a set of new guṇas which though originally defects are transmuted into excellences under certain circumstances. That defects cease to be defects under certain circumstances was apprehended as early as Bhāmaha who showed that repetition lost its character as a defect when the speaker was swayed by emotions of fear and sorrow. Here was the germ of the idea that defects and excellences become what they are only in connection with emotions or sentiments. That excellences are more important than figures of speech had been made clear by Vāmana who declared that the former were constants while the latter variables. But it was left for the writers of Dhvanyāloka to weave the different elements into a harmonious whole and assign to each its proper place in the body poetic. In their scheme the sentiment occupied the position of the soul and excellences were intimately connected with them. This aspect of the excellences rendered feeble their connection with word and sense and the corrective came from Jagannātha who maintained that the excellences were properties of Sabda, Artha, Rasa and Raganā.

The concept that arrested greater attention was the concept of riti. When and how the different mārgas or ritis came to be formulated and how they came to be identified with certain localities is a subject on which, in the absence of material, no opinion can be hazarded. It is unfortunate that no works prior to Bhāmaha have as yet come to light. We are left with the curious phenomenon that the first writer Bhāmaha who refers to ritis starts by roundly condemning their distinction between Vaidarbhī and Gaudī; says he:

मौदियमिद्वेदमिति वैदमिति क्योऽपि।
गतानुगतिक्यायाराजानुक्तिवेदमेकययं।
But the territorial names not only continued to be used but were added to. This Vāmana recognized a third rīti Pāṇcāli while Bhoja added no less than three more: Lātiyā, Avantikā and Māgadhī. This multiplicity of number made it increasingly difficult to define their boundaries. Nor did the territorial nomenclature pass unchallenged. Kuntaka in particular takes cudgels against the practice of regarding the rītis as rooted in the soil of different territories. Literary style, he protests, can never be chained to a locality even as a social custom like marriage with a cousin is:

न न विशिष्टरीतिग्रुप्तलेख काथकरणं मातृकेयमभविविवाहवत्तौ देयभाषोत्त्वाय व्यवस्थापितवाय

Hence he repudiates the old nomenclature Vaidarbhī, Gauḍī, etc., and styles his rītis, Sukumāra, Vicitra and Madhyama, the elegant, the ornate and the mixed. According to Daṇḍin and Vāmana the styles were differentiated from one another by the presence or absence of excellences. In the opinion of Rudraṭa the differentiating criterion consisted in the presence or absence of compounds. As a result of the two views the excellences came to be closely associated with compounds, ojas in particular being regarded as dependent on long compounds. The writers of Dhvanyāloka cleared the issue by showing that the excellences depended entirely on Rasa and were independent of compounds as also of choice of letters. These latter made for what they called Saṁghaṭanā or arrangement of words and letters which should not be confused with excellences. Thus the different concepts came to be disentangled and defined and we feel obliged to Dr. Lahiri for the detailed account he has given us of the vicissitudes of these concepts through long centuries from Bharata to Jagannātha.

D. K. Kelkar.

CORRECTIONS

P. 280, read epi Indikēn for epi Indikēn
P. 344, (middle of page) read In 1923 for In 1918
THE FIRST SERMON OF THE BUDDHA

By

N. AIYASWAMI SASTRI

The Wheel of Law, Dharmacakra, is considered to be the first Sermon delivered at Benares by the Buddha just after obtaining the perfect Enlightenment, samyaksaṃbodhi. There have been several versions of the Sermon in different languages, Pāli, Sanskrit, Tibetan and Chinese, etc. The Pāli version is found in the Suttapiṭaka (Sūnyatā-Nikāya, Vol. V, pp. 420-424) as an independent Sūtra and in the Vinayapiṭaka, (Vol. I, pp. 10-12) as a part of the Mahāvagga. There are two versions of it in Sanskrit, one forming part of the Mahāvastu (ed. E. Senart, Vol. III, pp. 330-335) and the other of the Lalitavistara (ed. S. Lefman, pp. 416-418). It has, at least, five versions in Tibetan; 1, Dulva IV, ff. 64-67; 2, Dul. XI, 69-72; 3, Mdo. XXVI, 88-91; 4, Mdo. XXVI, 431-434; 5, Mdo. XXX, 427-432. We have, at present, two translations in Chinese, one made by An.shu.kao of the Eastern Han dynasty, A.D. 25-220 (Nanji No. 657), and the other by I-tsin, A.D. 710 of the T'ang dynasty, A.D. 618-907 (Nanji No. 658). The Tibetan version contained in Mdo. XXX, 427-432, Dharmacakrapravartanasūtra, according to its colophon, is a direct translation of the Pāli version; whereas the version in Mdo. XXVI, 431-434, Dharmacakrasūtra is a translation of some independent Indian treatise of that name. The translation found in Mdo. XXVI, 88-91, is a part of the Abhinīṣkramanaṇāsūtra and other two versions contained in Dul. IV, 64-67, and XI, 69-72 are also parts of some other treatises of the Vinaya class.

A careful and critical study of all these versions enables us to classify them into three main classes:

I. The Tibetan version in Mdo. XXVI, 431-434, Dharmacakrasūtra together with that in Dul. XI, and the Chinese version of I-tsin.

II. The version in Mdo. XXVI, 88-91, Abhinīṣkramanaṇāsūtra together with that in Dul. IV.

III. The Pāli version and its Tibetan translation. All other versions in Sanskrit and Chinese may be brought under this class.

The following parallel analysis of their contents will show the main differences that have been found in each class of the versions:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CLASS I</th>
<th>CLASS II</th>
<th>CLASS III</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>....</td>
<td>I. Two Extremes and a Middle Path.</td>
<td>I. Ditto.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>....</td>
<td>II. The necessity for delivering the sermon twice by the Buddha.</td>
<td>....</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>....</td>
<td>(See VIII below.)</td>
<td>II. Description of the nature of the Four Truths.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I. 12 Aspects of the Four Truths.</td>
<td>III. Ditto.</td>
<td>III. Ditto.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II. Buddha's advertising of his Enlightenment.</td>
<td>IV. Ditto.</td>
<td>IV. Ditto.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV. Deva's exclamation at hearing the Sermon.</td>
<td>VI. Ditto.</td>
<td>VI. Ditto.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V. Naming of the Sermon. (III. b.)</td>
<td>VII. Ditto. (V. b.)</td>
<td>VII. Naming of Kauṣṭhīna as Ājñāta-kauṣṭhīna. (Omitted in the Chinese). (II.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>....</td>
<td>VIII. Description of the nature of the Four Truths. (As a separate Dharmaparyāya).</td>
<td>....</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>....</td>
<td>IX. Awakening of the Spiritual Eye.</td>
<td>....</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
It is clear from the above analysis that in Class I, the Sermon, in words of the Buddha, contains mere enumeration of the Four Truths into twelve aspects and declaration of Kauṇḍinya's awakening and nothing else. In Class II we find besides the above, the Buddha speaking of the two extremes to be avoided and a middle course to be resorted to, and also describing the nature of the Four Truths in a separate Dharmaparyāya as though he was pressed to do so by his disciples; while in Class III we see that even that description has been incorporated in the Sermon itself.

It is very difficult to answer the question how such differences arose out of the one version of the Sermon which has been supposed to be delivered by the Buddha. I assume, however, that those differences might have been in vogue from the time of the Buddha himself and formed three modes of preaching the Sermon by the Buddha on different occasions. There is no lack of evidence to show the possibility of the above assumption. For, the Buddha is said, in the Mahāvastu, to have preached the Sermon four times; while in the Abhinīñkramanāsūtra he is reported to have delivered it twice. 1 Is it not possible, therefore, that he did so not on one occasion only, but on different occasions? If we take it for granted, it is equally possible that the forms of preaching of the Sermon have been at variation on different occasions.

I, therefore, consider it probable that the three different versions, in main, have been in vogue from the time of the Buddha himself, though they have been modified in later periods, with some additions and omissions.

But M. Feer, on the other hand, who has translated the Tibetan versions into French and also compared them with the Pāli and Sanskrit versions, has given expression to the opinion that the Dharmacakraśūtra is only an extract from, and mutilation of, the Pāli version. This opinion seems to be based on the assumption that the originals of the Buddhist Canon were in Pāli and all similar treatises in Sanskrit, etc. were only reductions of the Pāli works. Recent discoveries and researches have proved it certain that such an assumption is no more valid and the Sanskrit and other Buddhist works may also be of independent origin and equal antiquity.

In the following pages I have made an attempt to render into Sanskrit the five Tibetan versions which I have grouped into three main classes as above described, and published them in order together with the English translations of the two Chinese versions. As there does not exist much difference between the versions in Mdo. XXVI, 431-434 and Dul. XI, 69-72, only the former is rendered into Sanskrit in full, minor differences contained in the latter being noted in the footnotes together with the Tibetan equivalents of the important technical terms. Similarly in the case of Mdo. XXVI, 88-91 and Dul. IV, 64-67, only the former is rendered in full and small variations of Dul. are given in the footnotes. With regard to the Tibetan translation of the Pāli version, I have translated it into Sanskrit, not into Pāli,
because Pāli is not so familiar as Sanskrit to the Orientalists in general. I have added to my Sanskrit translation of this version comparative notes showing all the differences between the Pāli and Tibetan versions. The Pāli and Chinese versions differ widely from each other almost in every respect and I have noted in the footnotes only very important differences between them.

For the originals of the Tibetan translations, I have made use of the Xylographs of Narthān Edition of the Kanjur preserved in the Adyar Library and for the Chinese translations, the Tripitaka in Chinese of the Taisho Edition.

*धर्मचक्राणुग्रहः*

|| नमः स्वेंशाय ||

I. एवं मया ढूँढम्। एकतामन् समये भगवान् बुद्धो वारणस्याः बिहरति सम ् शङ्खिवदने ।

(२) इसे हुःकमार्यसत्यमिति मे ् भिखवः पुर्वमातुरेतु धर्मम् योनिशो मनोकाराकाशुसुरपादि।

शान्त विधा, बुद्धः ् शोभिषुरपादि। (३) अर्थे हुःसमुदयः (४) इसे हुःकमार्यसत्यमिति भिखवः पुर्वमातुरेतु धर्मम् योनिशो मनोकाराकाशुसुरपादि।

(५) तत् इसे हुःसमुदयः प्रहत्यमभिजानामः भिखवः पुर्वमातुरेतु धर्मम् योनिशो मनोकाराकाशुसुरपादि।

(६) तत् इसे हुःसमुदयः आभिष्मन्यम प्रहत्यमभिजानामः भिखवः पुर्वमातुरेतु धर्मम् योनिशो मनोकाराकाशुसुरपादि।

Kanjur, Mdo. XXVI, ff. 431b, 4-434a4. The beginning of this translation runs as follows: Rgya gar skad du | Dharmaakraśutra | Bod skad du | Chos kyi hkhor loi mdo | This translation agrees with that found in the Dulva XI, ff. 69b, 3-72a, 3, where it simply begins: समावणूः बुद्धोः वारणस्याणुग्रहद् समावणूः बिहरति सम।

1. draṃ sroṅ smra bai=ṛṣvacana. So also Dul. XI. M. Fee says that smrava is a translation of vadana. See J.A. 1870, p. 392. The Mahāvastu has both *vadana* (Vols. I, 322, 324, 330; III, 330, 333, 337) and *patana* (Vol. III, 323, 328) Rṣipatana is explained there thus: क्रुणोदेग पतिता क्रुणपिनम्। (Vol. I, 357).

2. ri dags kyi nags = mṛgavāna. So also D. XI. Its alternative form is mṛgadāya. The Mahāvastu has both. Mṛgādāya is explained there thus: मुग्नायां धाश्यो दिशो मुग्नायोत्क्रुणपिनम्। (Vol. I, p. 366).


4. D. omits me.

5. tshul bshin yid la pyas pa na=ṣikāre, or ṣkurvatāk.

6. = rtogs pa.


8. =nas mhon par śes pas. D. XI omits ṇas.

IV आयुम्नार, कोन्दिन्यो धम्माता26 इति 27अन्तरिसकाठा आदम्यादावाग्यिता सम।  
शोकमुदीर्द्वाग्यिता सम28। मारियाः। भगवत बाराणस्य29 कुलिवर्ते मुग्दम्य विपोवर्ते धार्मिकार्यो धर्म-  
थर्य को 30प्रवर्तितम्भाकर्मणें धर्मिकार्णव या ब्राह्मणव या देवेन या मारेण या ध्रुवणा या केनानि  
लोके सहम्भवें 31 बहुजनहि यात्रा बहुजनादोक्काम्यै देवेनानि मनुष्याबाबाइयो ह्यताय सुखाय ।  
देवकायां अभिमन्युवे असुरकायां हस्त्ये इति । अन्तरिसकाठाणां शाल्बु धुपां नमाः।32 वस्यः  
शाल्महाराजीकराः 33 वस्यिता: देवाः।34 यामा35स्पुतिया36 विमानभाषाः।37 परमितवसत्तवत्तो देवाः।38  
तेन कणोग39 तेन लघुणें 40 तेन सुहुत्त्वें 41 तेन कणोग39, तेन कणोग40 तेन सुहुत्त्वें 41 धातु। ब्राह्माथोंक  
शाल्महाराजबायिता सम। ब्राह्माण्यिता।32 देवाः अपि39 शाल्महाराजबायिता सम। शोकमुदीर्द्वाग्यिता सम।  
मारियाः ।  भगवत बाराणस्यामुग्दम्य विपोवर्ते धार्मिकार्यो प्रवर्तित कदापि  
प्रवर्तित पांचमिकणें धर्मिकार्णव या ब्राह्मणव या देवेन या मारेण या ध्रुवणा या केनानि  
लोके सह धम्मेण  
बहुजनहि यात्रा बहुजनादोक्काम्यै देवेनानि मनुष्याबाबाइयो ह्यताय सुखाय ।  
देवकायां अभिमन्युव्यक्ते असुरकायां हस्त्ये इति ॥  
V भगवत बाराणस्यां कुलिवर्ते मुग्दम्य विपोवर्ते।41 धार्मिकार्यो धर्मथों  
45सहम्भव प्रवर्तितम् । अतोलव्य धम्मपर्यायं धर्मथोंप्रवर्तनाग्यितम् अपिवचनं।46 प्रायत्यें ॥  

धर्मथोंसूचुं संपूर्णम्  

| D. XI, आयुम्नार, कोन्दिन्यो धम्माता आशाते। |
| 26. D. XI, आयुम्नार, कोन्दिन्यो धम्माता आशाते। |
| 27. = sa blai gnod sbyin rnams. |
| 28. = sgra sgrags par byed de | ....... shes pa dbyaṅs sgrags so | D. XI, शाल्मुदीर्द्वाग्यिता सम। शोकमुदीर्द्वाग्यिता सम। = sgra phyun shiṅ dbyaṅs rjes su bgrags pa. |
| 29. D. XI, अस्याः बाराणसार्याः। |
| 30. Ibid., added anudharma- chos daṅ hthun pa. |
| 31. chos daṅ hthun par, lit. dharmānulomāyena. |
| 32. = nam (m)khah la rgyu bai gnod sbyin. D. XI, bar snāṇ la spyod pai |
| 33. = rgyal chen bshi poi rigs | D. XI, chalumahārājāka dēnā: = rgyal chen bshi pai lha rnams |
| 34. = sum cu rtsa gsum poi lha | D. XI omits deva = ............ gsum pa rnams. |
| 35. = kthab bral D. XI, ...... ba rnams. |
| 37. = hphrul dgah. D. XI, ...... ba rnams. |
| 38. = gshan hphrul dbaṅ byed kyi lha rnams. D. XI omits deva- byed kyis. |
| 39. = skad cig de. |
| 40. (?)-thāṅ cig de. |
| 41. (?)-yün tsaṃ de | D. XI? ...... yud tsaṃ de. |
| 42. = tshaṅs rigs kyi lha rnams. D. XI ...... rigs pai ...... |
| 43. D. XI omits api. |
| 44. Ibid., lan gsum gyi bar du bzlas te. |
| 45. =chos daṅ lden. D. XI, chos daṅ hthun pa. |
| 46. D. XI omits अविवचनं प्रायत्यें। |
THE FIRST SERMON OF THE BUDDHA

THE WHEEL OF LAW*

thrice-repeated and spoken by the Buddha

(Buddhabhasita triparivarta dhammacakrasutra.)

I. Thus have I heard. The Blessed One (Bhagavan, Po chia fan) once stayed in the Dear park in the Rṣipatana at Benares (po lo ni). Then the Blessed One addressed five Bhikṣus (pi ch'u) saying:

O Bhikṣus, the concentration of the mind in conformity with the principle (yoniṣo manasikāra) upon dharms that have been heard, that this is a misery, a Truth of Saints (dukkham āryasatyam) can give rise to the eye, knowledge, illumination and Enlightenment. (bodhi).

O Bhikṣus, the concentration of the mind in conformity with the principle that this is the cause of misery, a Truth of Saints (dukkhasamudaya āryasatyadharma), putting an end to the misery (dukkhanirodha āryasatyadharma) and Path leading to put an end to the misery (dukkhanirodha-mimi pratipat āryasatyadharma), can give rise to the eye, knowledge, illumination and Enlightenment.

O Bhikṣus, the concentration of the mind upon dharms that have been heard, that this misery, a Truth of Saints is a dharma which I understand as "to be known" (evam parijne-yam) can give rise to the eye, knowledge, illumination and enlightenment.

O Bhikṣus, the concentration of the mind, that this cause of misery, a Truth of Saints, is a dharma which I understand as 'to be removed' (evam prahātavyam) can give rise to the eye.

O Bhikṣus, the concentration of the mind, that this putting an end to the misery, a Truth of Saints, is a dharma which I understand as "to be realised" (evam sāksātkartavyam) can give rise to the eye.

O Bhikṣus, the concentration of the mind, that this Path leading to put an end to the misery, a Truth of Saints, is a dharma which I understand as "to be practised" (evam abhyasitavyam) can give rise to the eye.

O Bhikṣus, the concentration of the mind, that this misery, a Truth of Saints, is a dharma which I understand as "it has been known to me" (evam jñātam) can give rise to the eye.

O Bhikṣus, the concentration of the mind, that this cause of misery, a Truth of Saints, is a dharma which I understand as "it has been removed by me" (evam prahiṇam) can give rise to the eye.

O Bhikṣus, the concentration of the mind, that this putting an end to the misery, a Truth of Saints, is a dharma which I understand as "it

* This translation is based on the Tripitaka in Chinese, Taisho Ed. Vol. II, No. 110.
has been realised by me” (evam sākṣākṣeyam) can give rise to the eye

O Bhikṣus, the concentration of the mind . . . . , that this Path leading to put an end to the misery, a Truth of Saints, is a dharma which I understand as “it has been practised by me” (evam abhyasitam) can give rise to the eye . . . .

II. If, O Bhikṣus, I did not understand the thrice-repeated twelve aspects of the Four Truths of Saints, and I could not obtain the eye, knowledge, illumination and Enlightenment; then I could not part from the gods, demons, Brahmans, śramaṇas (sha-men), brāhmaṇas and all other worlds, my mind not being separated from defilements and obtaining deliverance; and I could not claim that I obtained the Supreme Enlightenment (anuttamabodhi).

Because, O Bhikṣus, I understood the thrice-repeated 12 aspects of the Four Truths of Saints, and was able to obtain the eye, knowledge, illumination and Enlightenment, I am parted from the gods, demons, Brahmans, śramaṇas, brāhmaṇas and all other worlds, my mind being separated from defilements and obtaining deliverance; and I am able to proclaim that I obtained the Supreme Enlightenment.

III. When the Blessed One was speaking this Dharma, the Āyusmān Kauṇḍinya (Kiao ch’en ju) and 80 millions of gods received the Spiritual Eye (dharma caksus) free from passions and defilements (virajam vītamalam). The Buddha addressed Kauṇḍinya: Have you realised this Dharma or not? He replied, I have realised, O Blessed One. Have you realised or not? I have realised, O Sugata. Because Kauṇḍinya has well realised the Dharma, his name will be Ājñāta Kauṇḍinya (Ājo-Kiao ch’en-ju). Ājñāta is one who well realises the objects (artha).

IV. At that time Yakṣas (yao ch’a) dwelling on earth, having heard the Buddha’s preaching, voiced a great voice, addressing men and gods, O Benevolents, you should know that the Blessed One stays in the Dear park in the Rṣipatana at Benares and widely preaches the Wheel of Law, thrice-repeated and into 12 aspects; hence gods, demons, Brahmans, śramaṇas, brāhmaṇas and other world will greatly flourish and all those who move in the plane of Brahmans (brahmaśāripaṇas) will quickly reach the peaceful and deep plane, Nirvāṇa; and men and gods will flourish and asuras will perish. All the gods of heaven (antarikṣa) and four Mahārājikas heard and knew the address made thus by those Yakṣas. So also (did) mutually the gods of the six kāma world within a moment and also made their voices heard within a moment up to the gods, brahmans. All the brahmans having heard it, again uttered the words widely spread as before.

V. Therefore this Sūtra is called a Wheel of Law thrice-repeated (trīparivarta-dharmacakrasūtra).

Then five Bhikṣus, men and gods, having heard the preaching of the Buddha, were rejoiced and revered (it).
I. अथ महान् पवित्रायाने सिः सिः[.

II. महान् पवित्रायाने सिः सिः[.

[ *Kanjur, Mdo. XXVI, ff. 88b-91b, 4. This translation agrees with that found in the Dulva IV, ff. 64a, 5-67a, 7.*]
III. अथ भगवान् पवित्रायणां मिश्रताहाँ।

(१) इति दुःखमयायसमिति मे सिखाय: पूर्वमात्रतेपुर धर्मेण योनिषो मनसिकारस्तः२१ चछु-क्षुद्रादिः। ज्ञाने विवा, युक्ति: वैक्षिण्यादि। (२) अथ दुःखसमुद्भावः। (३) अथ दुःखिनिरोधः। (४) इति दुःखनिरोगायणां प्रतिपद्ध२२ इति मे सिखाय: पूर्वमात्रतेपुर धर्मेण योनिषो मनसिकारस्तः चछु-क्षुद्रादिः। ज्ञाने विवा युक्ति: वैक्षिण्यादि। (५) ततः चछु-दुःखमयायसमिति परिश्रयोमिहैतमानानामिः२३ इति मे सिखाय:। (६) ततः चछु-दुःखसमुद्भावध्येयसंग्रहः प्रतिपद्धयोएव अर्थायन्त्र प्रायोगिकतमानानामिः इति मे सिखाय:। (७) ततः चछु-दुःखिनिरोधः प्रतिभायन्त्र अर्थायन्त्र प्रायोगिकतमानानामिः इति मे सिखाय:। (८) ततः चछु-दुःखनिरोगायणां प्रतिपद्धायः अर्थायन्त्र प्रायोगिकतमानानामिः इति मे सिखाय:। (९) ततः चछु-दुःखमयायसमिति परिश्रयोमिहैतमानानामिः इति मे सिखाय:। (१०) ततः चछु-दुःखसमुद्भावध्येयसंग्रहः प्रतिभायः अर्थायन्त्र प्रायोगिकतमानानामिः इति मे सिखाय:। (११) ततः चछु-दुःखनिरोधः प्रतिभायः अर्थायन्त्र प्रायोगिकतमानानामिः इति मे सिखाय:। (१२) ततः चछु-दुःखनिरोगायणां प्रतिभायः अर्थायन्त्र प्रायोगिकतमानानामिः इति मे सिखाय:।

IV. यथावत् भिक्षाः: एवं चछु-दुःखसमुद्भावध्येयसंग्रहः। न ज्ञाने, न विवा न युक्ति:। न ततः चछु दुःखसमुद्भावः। न ततः चछु दुःखनिरोधः। न ततः चछु दुःखनिरोगायणां प्रतिपद्धायः। न चछु दुःखसम्यक्यायणां प्रतिपद्धायः। न विवा न युक्ति:। न चछु दुःखनिरोधः। न चछु दुःखनिरोगायणां प्रतिपद्धायः। न चछु दुःखसम्यक्यायणां प्रतिपद्धायः। न चछु दुःखनिरोधः। न चछु दुःखनिरोगायणां प्रतिपद्धायः। न चछु दुःखसम्यक्यायणां प्रतिपद्धायः। न चछु दुःखनिरोधः। न चछु दुःखनिरोगायणां प्रतिपद्धायः। न चछु दुःखसम्यक्यायणां प्रतिपद्धायः। न चछु दुःखनिरोधः। न चछु दुःखनिरोगायणां प्रतिपद्धायः। न चछु दुःखसम्यक्यायणां प्रतिपद्धायः। न चछु दुःखनिरोधः। न चछु दुःखनिरोगायणां प्रतिपद्धायः। न चछु दुःखसम्यक्यायणां प्रतिपद्धायः। न चछु दुःखनिरोधः। न चछु दुःखनिरोगायणां प्रतिपद्धायः। न चछु दुःखसम्यक्यायणां प्रतिपद्धायः।

V. तत्समानम् धर्मसृष्टिः। उक्तो आयुष्याः: कृष्णस्येक्षणमाधिकाराः। अथ भगवान् आयुष्यस्य धर्मसृष्टिः। आज्ञानिः धर्मसृष्टिः। सर्व भगवान्। आज्ञानिः धर्मसृष्टिः। सर्व भगवान्। आज्ञानिः धर्मसृष्टिः। सर्व भगवान्। आज्ञानिः धर्मसृष्टिः। सर्व भगवान्। आज्ञानिः धर्मसृष्टिः।

VI. आयुष्याः कृष्णस्य धर्मसृष्टिः इति अनार्थायाः। स्रोतस्य अर्थायाः। भगवान् धर्मसृष्टिः कृष्णस्य धर्मसृष्टिः। आज्ञानिः धर्मसृष्टिः। सर्व भगवान्। आज्ञानिः धर्मसृष्टिः। सर्व भगवान्। आज्ञानिः धर्मसृष्टिः। सर्व भगवान्। आज्ञानिः धर्मसृष्टिः।

21. Lit. *sikāre, or *kurvatāh.
22. = sādū bshāl kḥog par kḥo bai lam.
23. = nās mṇōn par šes pas.
24. D. IV reads sabrahmakād omitting the word māra.
25. Ibid., समारकात् समारकात्।
26. = nēs par byaṅ ba daṅ idan pa | D. IV, निस्त्रुतः विवुचः।
27. = Kau nītī nyā | D. IV, Ko hu di nyā.
28. Ibid., dharma is omitted.
29. Ibid., आयुष्याः कृष्णस्य इति कृष्णस्य इति etc.
30. = sgra sgrogs par byed do | ...... shes dbyaṅs bsgrots so.
VII. भवत्ता वारणसारनिष्ठिन्दे स्मावदे तिपिटकः द्वादशार्थं चमचके सहस्रमें प्रवृतितम्। अतोत्तर धर्मपर्यायः धर्मचक्रप्रवृतिनिमिति अधिवचनं प्रख्याते।

VIII. अथ भवत्तार्थैर्विद्याय ३३००: पञ्चवर्ग्यानः मिश्रणान्तः। इमानि भवः: चतवालं-सत्याः। कतमानि चतवारि। हुःचतमास्यस्यम्। हुःसूवस्यस्य: हुःलनिरोपः हुःलनिरोधगामिनि च प्रतिपद्य आयस्यस्यम्। जातिः हुःप्रत्यक्षम्। जरा हुःक्रमः। व्याविधुःक्रमः। मरण हुःक्रमः। द्वितीर्विन्यासोऽऽ् हुःप्रत्यः। अद्वितीयस्यन्यानि ३५ हुःप्रत्यः। गदिः प्राधिन्तत न लम्बते। तदपिः ३७ हुःक्रमः। संस्कृतेऽऽ् ३८ पांचापादनक्रमः हुःक्रमः। तस्य परिष्ठा आयस्यादिकर्मः मायभावित्ततः। कल्पनूःसूवस्य आयस्यस्यम्। कुणा पौर्णविकी। नवनिर्मृगधार्यस्य तत्थ। तत्तत्वाभिवृद्धिः। कतमहुःलनिरोपः आयस्यस्यम्। वा कुणा पौर्णविकी। नवनिर्मृगधार्यस्य तत्थ। तत्तत्वाभिवृद्धिः। कतमहुःलनिरोपः आयस्यस्यम्। तस्य एवारादस्याः प्रहःणः। लायः। ४५ श्रवे। ४५ निरोच उपस्यस्य: शमः।। तस्य साधकात्मान्वर्त्तात् आयस्यादिकर्मः मायभावित्ततः। कल्पनूःलनिरोपः आयस्यस्यम्। तस्य आयस्यादिकर्मः मायभावित्ततः। सम्महः। सम्महः साधकात्त्मान्वर्त्तात्। सम्महान्वर्त्तात्। सम्महायः। सम्महः स्थिति। सम्महः समाधि।। अय-भेद मायभावित्ततः।

IX. अतिमसूत्रे धर्मपयाये उक्ते आयुमतः। आज्ञात्नीण्यभवः ४७रूपावनामाक्षालिन्न विमुक्तम्। पञ्चवर्ग्यानः मिश्रणामशेषायाः धमेपूः ४८ विरजे बौद्धः धर्मचक्रहृदभूत

---

31. Read lha'i ris for—rigs in the Xyl. with D. IV.
32. This phrase is repeated thrice. D. IV repeats twice.
33. (?)-lan gnis su yan.
34. = sdo 'pa dañ brol ba.
35. = mi sdo 'pa dañ phrad pa.
36. = gañ hrod pa btsal te ma rniad pa.
37. D. IV omits tsh.
38. = mdor na.
39. = yan srid pai sred pa dgañ bai hrod chags dañ ldan pa de dañ de la mRon par haod pa ste.
40. Read sDom bya bai phyir for sDom bai phyir.
41. D. IV, mRon par dgañ ba = abhini. indi.
42. = bō ba.
43. = bsa.
44. = zad pa.
45. = hrod chags dañ brol ba.
46. (?) = nub pa.
47. = len pa med pa.
48. D. IV omits dharmesu.
नम आयर्तनन्याय

I. 1. एवं मया श्रुतम्। एकस्मिन् समवे भगवान् भारारस्या विहरति सम श्रुतिपतनेन सृष्टिवृध्दीः।

2. अथ भगवान् पवनगीयान् मिक्षुरानन्यायाः। द्रविमानवन्ति मिक्षव: प्रशिक्षनेन न सेवितवन्ती।

3. योक्ते कामसुवाल्योगोऽ| मानसे ऋषिन:। श्रुत्यजनानानन्यायान्यसंहिताय। य आसमकमाध्यमालय: योगोऽ| हुःकोदनासंहिताय। क्षितिजयोऽ| एतत् मिक्षव: अनाती द्रविमानवति। तै नोपक्रमणीयोऽ| मिक्षमा प्रतिपदा तथायतेनिषिद्देनोक्ता सृष्टिकरणि श्रामानिमि उपरस्मिन्न अभिमायनोक्ती निवायणवाचही संस्कर्तेति।

4. कत्मा मिक्षव: प्रतिपदा तथायतेनिषिद्देनोक्ता सृष्टिकरणि...संस्कर्तेति। मिक्षमा प्रतिपदा आयोध्यायिको मार्गि। तथवं अधी। ( १ ) सम्यकः हस्ति ( २ ) सम्यकः संदर्भः ( ३ ) सम्यकः बाह्यः ( ४ ) सम्यकः क्रियाविधाः ( ५ ) सम्यकः श्रवणात्मः ( ६ ) सम्यकः स्थिति: ( ७ ) सम्यकः सार्थनिर्धारिति। इत्य मिक्षमा प्रतिपदा तथायतेनिषिद्देनोक्ता सृष्टिकरणि...संस्कर्तेति।

II. 5. हुः अवरुप्तायोऽ| हुः सार्वम्। जरा हुः सार्वम्। व्यक्तिविश्वासम्। मरण हुः सार्वम्। अनुस्रायः। ( १२ ) संयोगोऽ हुः सार्वम्। विश्वायिकायोऽ हुः सार्वम्। यदिः प्रार्थितं न संभवेत तत्त्वी हुः सार्वम्। संक्षेप्येण पर्याप्तात्मकस्य हुः सार्वम्।

* Kanjur Mdo. Vol. XXX, ff. 427a, 5—432a, 3. The beginning of this translation runs as follows:—

Rgya gar shad du | Dharma tsa kra pra bartana Sūtra | Bod. skad du | chos kyi hhhor lo rab tu bskor bai mdo |

In the colophon it is said that this translation was prepared from the Pāli version of the Sūtra. This Sūtra is edited in the Samyutta Nikāya by L. Feer and in the Vinayapitaka by Oldenberg.

1. = drañ sroñ lhun ba.
2. = ri dags rgyu bai gnas.
3. = lha sde.
4. = bos te bkah stsal pa.
5. = na míparo = gnas par mi byao.
6. = hdod pa rams dañ | bde ba la shen pa.
7. = mi rigs.
8. = lus dup pa dañ | hbral ba.
9. = bsngs par bya ba ma yin pa, lit. अप्रशास्त्र.
10. = hjug par mi byao.
11. = yañ dag par hjug go.
12. = mi sdug pa dañ phrad pai sdug bsñal.
13. = sdug. pa dañ bral bai sdug. bsñal.
14. = gañ hdod pa btsal ste ma rñed pa.
6. तुः खल्क वनरमिसवो दुःखसमुद्र आङ्गरसत्यम्। या15 तुः वाशा पृष्ठमिसवो नम्नदमाघ-
गता तत्र तत्त्रसनिन्दनि। तत्था वामृनुषां16 विम्भवार्या विवाधरम्।

7. तुः खल्क वनरमिसवो दुःखमिरोट्या आङ्गरसत्यम्। यस्त्राविविधाया: अशोप्तुवादा: विरागः-
िरोधः: व्यायः: प्रतिभिकशी17 मुक्ति: सुप्रियावन्त्रत्या:18।।

8. तुः खल्क वनरमिसवो दुःखिनिरोगार्थि निरीक्षायं, आङ्गरसत्यम्। अस्यामेवायोऽशाखाको-
माणि। तत्था वास्तुक्त्य: देहि:....सम्भु: समाधि:।।

III. 9. तुः दुःखसमायसय [मिति] मिसव: पूवरमातृहें ध्येये चक्षुस्पदादि। जान्मुद्यादि।
प्रहोदरादि। विचोदरादि। आलोक उद्रादि। तत्था खल्क खल्कमसिनिरोगासिंहसिंह धर्मेष्या [मिति] मिसव:
पुरुषामातृहें ध्येये चक्षुस्पदादि।....आलोक उद्रादि।।

10. तुः दुःखसमुद्र आङ्गरसत्य [मिति] मिसव: पूवरमातृहें ध्येये चक्षुस्पदादि।....आलोक उद्रादि।
तुः खल्क खल्कमसिनिरोगासिंहसिंह धर्मेष्या [मिति] इदे मिस्व: पूवरमातृहें ध्येये चक्षुस्पदादि।....आलोक उद्रादि।।

11. तुः दुःखिनिरोगार्थि आङ्गरसत्य [मिति] मिसव: पूवरमातृहें ध्येये चक्षुस्पदादि।....आलोक उदरादि।
तुः खल्क खल्कमसिनिरोगासिंहसिंह साधारणविन्य [मिति] इदे मिस्व: पूवरमातृहें ध्येये चक्षु-
स्पदादि।....आलोक उद्रादि।।

12. तुः दुःखिनिरोगासिंहसिंह निरीक्षायं निरीक्षायं भावमित्या [मिति] इदे मिस्व: पुरुषामातृहें ध्येये चक्षु-
स्पदादि।....आलोक उद्रादि।।

IV. 13. एवसिमानि मिस्व: उच्चन्ते चउविवाहि आत्मसत्यानि। एवं निरिचित् ध्रुवशाली29 यथायुमुः30 जान्मुद्यां सुविशीवं [वास्तुं] मिस्व अवधारम्31। न [वास्तुं] सदेखाकारो-
कार, समारकार, साधारकार, साधमकार, साधिकार: सदेशसमुदिकोह्यात्तु: समथुक: संबोधिमिगि-
संबद्धोत्योमुः32।

14. तुः खल्क वनरमिसव एव चतुः आङ्गरसत्य एव निरिचित् ध्रुवशाली यथायुमुः जान्मुद्यां सुविशीवं वास्तुं33 [अमूहुं]। ततो मिस्व: सदेखाकारो लोकांने समारकार, साधारकार साधमकार साधिकार सदेशसमुदिक समथूः संबोधिमिगि संबद्धोत्योमुः [ये] प्रतिष्ठ्यचयम्। इदुः ध्रुवशालिमुदयमुः पूर्ण-विहुक्ति: आत्मानशेषस्तुपुनमेवपादां34 नित्याम्।।

15. = gaṅ sred pa hbyuṅ ba can daṅ | dgah bai hdod chags daṅ ldan pa daṅ |
de daṅ de la mñoṅ par dgah ba na (ni ?) |
16. = hdod pai sred pa daṅ | hkhör ba la sroṅ pa daṅ | hkhör ba daṅ bral ba
la sred pao |
17. = so sör bsgyur ba
18. =groṅ ba shum po med pa = muṇuñapalatena |
19. = ram pa bcu ghis po.
20. lit. यथाभूता = ji ltar gyur pa rams.
21. = na spangs te.
22. (?) = gshan med do ||
23. Read ji srid for ji ltar.
24. = yaṅ srid pa len pa med pa.
V. 15. एवमत्रोच्धावानं। पवकर्गिया भिक्षुं भगवतो भाफितमभावनं। एवं तस्मिन् ब्यासकर्रणे वयं न 35 अयुक्तत: कौशिक्यम् 36 बिरजं वीतमसं धर्मचक्रवर्तपदि। वल्किवलसमुदयमेऽ तस्मां निरोधिष्ठद्वैत ।

VI. 16. [ एवं ] प्रवतितं धर्मसंवकं भगवता। प्रवतितं त्र भूम्य देवता: 37 लुतिशास्यमन्व श्रुतनन्त। इदं भगवता दारास्यामुपितं सुभावारी विहरता सत्तारभिवर्ततं धर्मसंवकं प्रवतितसंव 

17. तत सूर्यां देवाना शस्य भुवा चंद्रमान्यविजे देवस: लुतिशास्यमन्वय श्रुत। इदं भगवता ... ... लोके।

18. चंद्रमादहरणां मेवाना स्तुतिसंवद्य भुवा श्रवणीशा 39 देवा स्तुतिशास्यमन्वय श्रुत। इदं भगवता ... ... लोके।

19. श्रवणीशानां देवाना स्तुतिसंवद्य भुवा या रा 30 देवा: लुतिशास्यमन्वय श्रुत। इदं भगवता ... ... लोके।

20. या रा देवाना स्तुतिसंवद्य भुवा तुषिता 31 देवा: लुतिशास्यमन्वय श्रुत। इदं भगवता ... ... लोके।

21. तुषितानां देवाना स्तुतिसंवद्य भुवा निमाणरता 32 देवा: लुतिशास्यमन्वय श्रुत। इदं भगवता ... ... लोके।

22. निमाणरतानां देवाना स्तुतिसंवद्य भुवा परमितवकर्ततां 33 देवा: लुतिशास्यमन्वय श्रुत। इदं भगवता ... ... लोके।

23. परमितवकर्ततानां देवाना स्तुतिसंवद्य भुवा ब्रह्माःकर्ता 34 देवा: लुतिशास्यमन्वय श्रुत। इदं भगवता ... ... लोके।

24. अथ तेन क्रक्रणेन तेन शुद्धतं 35 यवन्त् ब्रह्मोऽकों शार्द्दूलयुद्धस्थलं 36। अयन दससहस्र: ब्रह्मोऽकों समक्रमण 37। संप्राक्रमिन 38। संप्राक्रमित 39। अयनमाद्युत 40 अयनक्षमा 41 अयनमाद्युत्ती लोके एवमन्तन। लोके वेत भूतु प्राण्यं 43 धर्मदेवानां भुवा स्तुतिशास्यमन्वय।

25. (?) = tshun tshod.
26. = kau di nya.
27. = bstod pai sgra.
28. = rgyal chen ris bshii lha rnam.
29. = sum cu rtsa gsum gyi lha rnam.
30. = hhab bral gyi lha rnam.
31. = dbang ldan gyi lha rnam.
32. = hphrul dgai lha rnam.
33. = gshan hphrul dba’i byed kyi lha rnam.
34. = tsha’i ris kyi lha rnam.
35. = yud. tsam.
36. = khyab par gyur te.
37. = yan dag par gyos so.
38. = yan dag par rab tu gyos so.
39. = yan dag par rab tu ldeg go.
40. = bag yod par gyur.
41. = ya mtshen du gyur.
42. = sna’i bar gyur.
43. = tsha’is pas chos bstan pa thos nas lha rnam ra’i gnas su so’i no |
VII. 25. अथ बहु भज्जिताश्च निविद्याय ातलत्वेऽक्षिणिन्याय। आश्रुतात्वेऽक्षिणिन्याय।

tasmādādhyāyā, कौन्तिक आश्रुमनन्तरात्मा हृदत्त नामाभ्यम्॥

|| धर्मचक्रप्रवर्तनस्तु संपूर्णम् ||

Comparative Notes

In this section, I propose to note all the differences between the Pāli version (= P.) of the Samyutta-Nikāya and its Tibetan version (= T.) of the Kanjur Mdo, XXX.

Para. 2. P. begins this para: तत्र बो भज्ज। P. has आमान्त्रिति for T. आमान्यान्त्रि। P. reads मे in the place of T., हृदत्त ते after न सैन्यत्वा।

Para. 3. The first Extreme in P. is कौन्तिक कामसुक्कितकावतौणियोऽसे कामसुक्खायोऽसे: of T. P. has गत्वा for T. मातृपुरुष, and प्राप्तत्वानिर्देश्योऽसे अन्तःसंधाति for T. प्राप्तत्वानान्तरं-संधितात्।

P.: अन्तःसंधाति for T. अन्तःसणान्तरंसंधिताति।

P.: एते ते भिक्षु उभे अन्तः अनुप्रक्ष्यम for T. एते भिक्षु: अन्तः द्वारात्ति। तौ ते प्रह-कर्मणियाः।

P.: अभिमंडलत्वात् for T. अभिमंडलनोक्ता, और उपसामय अभिमाय संघोच्राय for T. उपसमायः अभिमायसंघोच्राय।

Para. 4. The same difference with regard to Madhyamā pratipad noted in the para 3.

P. has सेवयार्थम् for T. तपस्या अति।

Para 5. P. adds पि after जातिः जरा, व्यापी: मरणम् and प्रहोपदन्त्सन्त्वा: and also adds after मरणे पि हुक्ख, सो कर्मदेवदुहूः दृष्टान्तस्यायययम् पि हुक्खा which is omitted in T. This omission is also corroborated by some Singhalese and Burmese Mss.

44. = ched du brjod pa ched du brjod de.
45. = kun şes pai phyir kau di nyao |
46. = kun şes pa rnam kyis kau di nyao, lit. आहारी: कौन्तिक।
47. The colophon of this translation runs as follows:

बुद्धासने स्वरत्तायोऽसे: पिंटकीऽसे: सृजित्यस्ति: स्वरत्तायोऽसे: गुह्खप्रक्ष्यमन्त्रे

रेरितस्ति रेशोद्वजचारः बष्यध्याया कौचिवसंस्कारानी दक्षिणाय विशिष्टत्वांजोऽसे हरे

सिद्धिनिर्देशः श्रीमानकुलार युज्यात्सत्त्वाय संभवित्वर्ताय सिद्धित्वसात्

श्रीत्रीय सुढूरतत्र लोकावशायासंचाल्नागुरुवध्वजर्मभीत्रं निर्माणायायावशे

महानिद्वीपोऽसे [ हरे सृज्यः] परशुः प्रवेशः प्रुथू निर्गतां। मुरिते खण्डसुवर्त्व महत्॥

a = mi phyed pai | b = gisug lag giis le | c = dkar phyogs kyi zla ba hphel
d = bsku | e = dpa gtsal | f = bskyi phyogs kyi zla ba hphel
e = dpag | l = shus te giin la phab pa |
Para 7. The explanation of the third truth is somewhat different in P. It runs thus: यो तत्सा वेद तथाय असेसबिरामानिरोधा चाणो परिनिर्माणो मृति अनाल्यो, T. has: कल्याणिकार्या अर्शेनुषु थाया: विराग: निरोक: लया: प्रतिपरिप्तित्वत: मुक्तिसुचासानलयत:। For the last word P. has simply अनाल्यो which means doing away with (the desire, त्रुण). But T. has instead सुचासानलय which means 'not having indolence in regard to doing away with the desire'. Therefore according to T. the energetic activity preliminary to doing away with the desire is also a part of this truth.

Para 9. P. has अनुसंहतेयु चमंभू for T. अनुसंहतेयु wherever this phrase occurs.

At the end of this para P. adds: परिज्ञात नित्ते मे मिस्तिने पुजने अनुसंहतेयु चमंभू उद्पादि॥ पे॥ अल्पो उद्पादि॥

Para 10. Similarly at the end of this Para P. adds: पहिल नित्ते मे मिस्तिने पुजने etc.

So also at the end of Para 11, P. has: स्वीकृतत्व नित्ते मे मिस्तिने पुजने etc. and also at the end of para 12 P. adds: महवित्ति मे मिस्तिने पुजने etc.

The four additions in P. at the end of paras 9–12 above noted are very important and to be taken into account in making 12 aspects (ाकारास) of Dharmacakra complete. It is curious how T. has omitted those portions without which the aspects (ाकारास) will be only 8.

Para 13. This and the following sections in T. seem to be defective. Yet I have put them into Sanskrit as amendable as possible. P. begins this para: यस किव प्रे मे मिस्तिने चमंभू चतुरु अरिसमेयु अद्ययनुपातीत प्रांतिन्ते चतुरुरिचानायमसत्ति, T. has अहिरि for T. असंगम नं स्पैसि. The sentence नेव तत्त्वा etc. of P. is differently represented in T. In P. it runs: नेव तत्त्वा मिस्तिने सत्त्वा के लोके समारके संत्राके सस्त्रण भाषणाय प्रांति संदेवमुस्तान् अनुतरं सम्मारस- वोधिसमंदुवो ति पवशावित्व। In T.: न [तत्त्व] संदेवकात्...सत्त्रणात् प्रजायात: संदेव- मुस्तात्: अनुतरां सम्मारस-वोधिसमंदुवों आभूष।

So the meaning of this sentence according to T. would be like this: When I have not acquired (lit. left) the real and pure insight [into the four truths] thrice repeated and into the 12 aspects I am not a saintly person who realised the highest wisdom and became differentiated from the ordinary world of gods, etc., but in P. the sense is quite different: When I have not acquired the real and pure insight, etc., I do not proclaim to the world of gods, etc., that I realised the Highest Wisdom.

Para 14. It is better to read यन्त्र: for यन्त्र in T. with P.; the word अहि is omitted in T. P. and T. agree in putting the words, संदेवक, etc. into locative case with same variation as noted above in para 13. The last sentence of this para in P. differs widely from the same in T. as follows: अवाश्य पनि मे देस्त्वाल उद्पादि, अनुषष्या मे चेतोतिच्छुलित अर्व अवित्ता जाति नविद्गुणे पुनम्भितो ति।
Para 15. अत्मना of P. is omitted in T. P. has भवन्ते for T. अस्तीत्वे. This word is tentatively suggested for Tib. word त्शुन tshod which means literally "measured this side" (tshun=tshur= this side, tshod=to measure, estimate, etc.)

Para 16. P. begins: एवं पवित्रिते च पन भगवता धम्मचक्रे etc.

P. omits the following words in this and subsequent similar sentences, paras 17 and 18: स्नेति, बिहरता, अप्रवाहितं and अन्योऽन्.

Paras 18–23 = 18 in P. These sections in P. are in an abbreviated form thus: चतुर्महारजिकानां देवानां सदैव मुखा तावतिसा देवाय यामा देवा तुसिता देवा नियमाणरता देवा रत्नविनियमतिन्तनो देवा ब्रह्माकायिका देवा सहस्रनानासिकम् etc.

Para 24. = 19 in P. P. adds तेन बलेन after तेन श्लोक. the last sentence of this para in P. runs as follows: अप्रमाणो च उद्दिते अविग्नो तोके पातुर्वोसि अतिक्रमणां देवानां देवात्माश निन्दित। But T. has it: अप्रमाणदृश्य आविग्निभूत अविग्नानो तोके पुष्टि एवंमेतरूपां लोके निन्दित। लोकेनेवं निस्तेषानां द्वारभन्तो त्वनानां द्वाराय ध्वसनासिकम्। Thus, according to T. the sūtra is spoken of in this sentence as delivered by God Brahman and his audience were gods; there is no such statement in P. Both in P. and T. the sūtra is said at the outset to be spoken of by the lord Buddha.

Para 25 = 20 in P. The udāna in T. seems to be defective. It has simply आज्ञात्वक्रियकोण्ड्रय। आज्ञात्वक्रियकोण्ड्रय। Whereas P. has a better reading: अज्ञात बल भो कोण्ड्रयो आज्ञाति बल भो कोण्ड्रयो नित। But the other Tibetan versions have represented a similar statement fairly. See para 3 in the Dharmacakrasūtra and para 5 in the Abhin dispensasūtra.

The last sentence in P. goes इति हिंदे आयस्योऽकोण्ड्रय आज्ञातकोण्ड्रयो ऐवं नाममहोसीति।

**TURNING OF THE WHEEL OF LAW**

(Dharmacakrapravartanasūtra.)

I. Thus have I heard. The Buddha once was sitting under a tree in the Dear park at Benares [pololai]. At that time there were a thousand Bhikṣus and many gods of heaven, and the entire assembly stood around Him filling up in the sky. Then the Wheel of Law of Nature came up flying and was revolving just in front of the Buddha.¹ He, putting his hand upon the Wheel, said: Stop! Formerly I traversed numberless births and deaths (lit. going and coming), had names and shapes (nāmarūpa) transformed and was put into immeasurable miseries. Now my greedy mind has stopped,

---

¹ This translation is based on the Tripitaka in Chinese, Taisho Ed. Vol. II, No. 109.

1. Cp. Lalitavistara, ed. S. Leffman, p. 415, where it is said that the Wheel of Law was presented by Bodhisattva Sahacittopradakraratin. Pāli and Tib. entirely ignore this legend.
defiling passions are removed, organs are made motionless, life and death are arrested and there is no more the transformation in the five paths of life. Then the Wheel stopped.

Thereupon the Buddha said: O Bhikṣus in the world there are two kinds of falling on extreme actions (antacaryāpātana). Those pupils who practise the path and depart from the family ought not, to the end of their life time, perform them. What are those two? I.—To care for worldly enjoyments (kāmarāga) without pure purpose. II.—To have an attachment for personal loving affairs (ātmakāmābhinivēsa) and not to be able to advance spiritually.\(^1\) Therefore give up extreme actions which may not lead to the Buddhism and Arhanthood. If they, O Bhikṣus, do not care for worldly enjoyments and have attachment for the personal loving affair; they may take to the middle way. The Tathāgata well awakened and possessed of the insight (cakṣus) and wisdom, and passing away from the two Extremes attained Nirvāṇa. What is the middle way? It is to practise the path of eight right actions, viz., right belief (samyak dṛṣṭi), right resolve (samyak saññikalpa), right speech (samyak vacana), right conduct (samyak caryā), right living (samyak ājīva), right effort (samyak vyūyāma), right mindfulness (samyak smṛti) and right concentration (samyak samādhi).

II.—When,\(^2\) O Bhikṣus, I had not originally heard the Path, then I understood that the misery is a Truth, and received in single thought the eye (cakṣus), contemplation of the mind, insight into a real knowledge (pra-jñādārśana) and Enlightenment making my mind free from what is cherished.

And understanding that the cause of misery, and putting an end to misery (duḥkhasamudāyanirodha) are Truths, I received the eye, etc. So also the Path,\(^3\) a Truth (mārgasatya).

III.—What is called misery? Birth and death are called miseries, disease, misery, to lament for or to get angry for a sadness (sokaparidevaprati-gka), misery, association with what is disliked, misery, separation from

\(^1\) The second Extreme, according to the Pāli and Tib. 'is habitual practice of self-mortification'. But the Chinese has instead 'attachment for the personal loving affairs (ātmakāmābhinivēsa)' which hardly differs in substance from the first Extreme, 'to care for worldly enjoyments.' If we, however, take the word, ai in the sense 'to hate' etc. as it is sometimes used in that sense in the phrase like ai shen meaning pratigka in Sanskrit; we may have it something like ātmapratispratigkha. But ai is not used usually in that sense.

\(^2\) Pāli and its Tib. after describing the two Extremes and a middle course, speak of the nature of the Four Truths and then explain their twelve aspects; but the Chinese here, unlike the Pāli, tells us that the Buddha obtained the eye, etc. on clearly understanding the dharmas. And then it describes the nature of the four truths and then again gives some details in somewhat different manner how the Buddha gained the eye, etc. But in neither place does it describe the twelve aspects of the Four Truths in clear terms, as the Pāli and other versions do.

\(^3\) Read in the text tao, mārga for chin, nirodha.
what is beloved, misery, to long for a thing which is not obtained, misery and in main, to take five skandhas and enjoy luxuries is also misery.

What is called the cause of misery? Because of following desire (trsṇā) there is again happiness. To remain in greed and joy without separation and to cherish desire for matter and non-matter (rūpa-trsṇā arūpa-trsṇā-prārthana), these are causes of misery.

What is called stopping of the cause of misery? To know that from desire there appears again what is happy; no sexual pleasure should be thought of; not to ponder over all (pleasures) other than sexual; to give them up and not to brood over them again; such is the stopping of the cause of misery.

What is called the Path fit for fetching the stop of the cause of misery? It is to practise the Path of eight right actions, viz. right belief, right resolve, right speech, right conduct, right living, right effort, right mindfulness and right concentration. This is the Path fit for fetching the stop of the cause of misery, a Truth.

IV.—Again, O Bhikṣus, this misery is Truth, cause of misery is Truth, stopping the cause of misery is Truth and the Path fit for fetching the stop of cause of misery is Truth. When ancestors of the old had not heard these Dharmas, then I obtained the eye, vision, meditation, insight into the real knowledge and Enlightenment making my mind free from cares. When teachers living here had not heard these Four Truths, then I obtained an eye for Path, meditation of the mind, real knowledge (prajñā) and Enlightenment making my mind free (from cares). When those living yonder could not have heard these Four Truths, even then I obtained the eye, meditation, real knowledge and Enlightenment making my mind free (from cares).

V.—These are the Four Truths which being thrice-repeated will make up twelve aspects. Acquiring a knowledge thereof but impure, I would not give it to the whole world, gods and men, (even) if Brahma or demon or śramaṇas and brāhmaṇas wished. Having cognised for myself the inner realisation, I practised moral acts and concentration, obtained deliverance by means of the real knowledge (prajñāvimukti) and succeeded in obtaining the vision of knowledge (jñānadhṛśti) that these are four final (Truths), this birth is last one and there would be no more birth, and having gone beyond the world for ever there would be no more grief (śoka).

VI.—When the Buddha said this, the talented Ājñāta Kauṇḍinya (? ājo chu lin) and others, and 8 crores of gods gave rise to the Spiritual Eye which is free from passion and defilements. Those thousand Bhikṣus having removed their defilements (āsrava) and freed their minds, all became Arihans

1. pen tsai hsi = pūrvavastha?
2. ling tsai szu = atrastha śāstr.
3. tsai pi = tatrastha.
4. According to Suñ ed. 80 crores of gods.
(Alohan) and understood that whatever things have an origin, they all turn out to be liable to the destruction.

VII.—The voice of the Wheel of Law, presided over by the body (of the Buddha) and thrice-repeated—, all divine world living on earth heard it spread throughout. It proceeded at first to the 4 divine kings, then to tao li gods (trayastrimśā devā), tou shu gods (tusitā devā), gods of unselfish joy (paranirmitavaśavartidevā) and nirmāṇaruta gods.¹ The voice was heard within a moment everywhere upto the sphere of Brahman.

Then the sphere of the Buddha, three thousand millions of suns and moons and two thousands of heaven and earth all greatly trembled.

This (Wheel) presided over the body of the Buddha was commenced at Benares and hence the Supreme Wheel that has never been preached before, was preached.

Accordingly gods and men immeasureable in number followed this and obtained the Path. The Buddha having spoken this, all gods were rejoiced.

¹ Note that the Chinese has nirmāṇaruta for nirmāṇrata of the Pāli.
Inference in Dvaita Vedānta

By

P. Nagaraj Rao

Section I.

Inference (anumāna) is the second instrument of valid knowledge. The word 'anumāna' etymologically means 'secondary proof'. The data for inference are derived from perception and verbal testimony. The whole of the dialectics of Indian philosophy is based on inference. No other instrument of knowledge has been more elaborately discussed in Indian epistemology than 'anumāna'. Jayatīrtha meets the criticism levelled against the necessity of inference. The commentators of Jayatīrtha, particularly Janārdhana, answer the criticism levelled by the Cārvākakas against inference. The answer is not different from the one put forward by the Nyāya school.

"The materialist (Cārvāka) explains our faith in the validity of inference as due to the established associations we observe, which are purely psychological, and have no logical certitude." We cognise a pervasion, and on the basis of its truth arrive at an inference. Pervasion and its validity are basic to inference. Pervasion depends upon observation, and is necessarily restricted to a few particular facts. Such limited observation does not entail us to reach a universal conclusion. "Granting that observation can comprehend all present instances, even then it should be admitted that there are others which are remote in time, and therefore lie beyond the possibility of investigation." A general pervasion is only tenable as far as investigated cases are concerned and it does not hold good of the uninvestigated. Thus pervasion is vitiated. This, in short, is the criticism put forward by the Cārvāka. His criticism stultifies his own position. The conclusion that inference is not valid is itself the result of inference, and points to a conviction that in this particular case at least the relation of vyāpti holds true. Hence the necessity for the recognition of inference as an independent means of valid knowledge.

Further, inference is criticised on the ground that it has no specific function to discharge. The cognition of the pervasion includes the knowledge of the thing to be inferred. Thus the thing to be inferred is known prior to the inferential activity. Hence the futility of inference.

Jayatīrtha criticises this view as follows: Pervasion gives only in a general way the relation between the probans and the probandum. The cogni-

1. Pramāṇapaddhati, p. 181; Cf. Outlines of Indian Philosophy, pp. 189-90, by Hiriyanna.
tion of the pervasion of the smoke by fire does not exactly and specifically tell us the appropriate place in which the pervasion is present. Inference specifies it. It helps us to establish the *probandum* in a suitable place. Hence inference is not futile.\(^1\)

Inference is ‘defectless reasoning’.\(^2\) It results from the cognition of pervasion and the knowledge of the presence of *propans* in a place, time, etc., appropriate to the mode of pervasion.

Madhva accepts that the knowledge of pervasion (*vyāpti-jñāna*) and of the presence of the *propans* in the subject (*paksadharmatā-jñāna*) are necessary for ‘anumāna’, but his definitions of these two terms differ from those of the Nyāya school. The ancient Nyāya school defined *vyāpti* as ‘śādhyā-bhāvavadavṛttitvam’, i.e., pervasion consists in the non-existence of the *probandum* in every place where the *propans* does not exist; e.g., in the inference of fire from smoke, the lake is the place where we see the *vyāpti*; there is the non-existence of the *probandum* (fire) in the lake, and there is also the non-existence of the *propans* (smoke).

This definition of *vyāpti* is negative, and it is an amplification of the concept of ‘avinābhāva’. This view of *vyāpti* is called the ‘pūrvapaksavyāpti’. The later Nyāya school found that this view of *vyāpti* is not applicable to all valid inferences; e.g., quality (*guna*), existence (*sattā*), because it has generic attribute (*jāti*). The non-existence of the probandum, viz., *sattā*, is inconceivable anywhere. So the later Nyāya school abandoned the first definition of *vyāpti*, and redefined the concept of *vyāpti* as the ‘existence of the probandum and the propans in the same locus.’ This definition of *vyāpti* is called ‘siddhāntalakṣaṇa’. It is objected to by Jayatirtha on the same ground, namely inapplicability. The *siddhāntalakṣaṇa-vyāpti*, is not applicable to certain valid types of inference. For example let us take the following inference: “There is the flight of a bird in the sky, because we perceive the shadow below.” The above inference is valid. In the inference the probandum, i.e., “the flight of the bird” is in the sky, and the propans, i.e., “shadow” is down on the earth. Hence the final definition of *vyāpti* is as follows: ‘pervasion is the relation between a probandum and a propans; the probandum (characterised by a particular space and time) cannot be known without the propans (characterised by a particular space and time); and pervasion is not the presence of the propans and the probandum in the same locus.’

*Paksadharmatā* is defined by the Nyāya school as ‘presence of the propans in the subject (*Paksavṛttitvam*)’. This definition of *paksadharmatā* is non-pervasive with reference to certain valid inferences. For example in the following inference ‘in the uplands there is rain, because there is the flow of water in the river of the lowland’, upland is the subject (*paksā*) and the

---

probens, i.e., ‘the flow of water in the lowland rivers’ is not present in the subject. Hence the Nyāya definition of paksadharmaṇa is non-pervasive with reference to the valid inference instanced. So Madhva defines the term paksadharmaṇa in such a manner as to make it applicable to all valid inferences. The definition is as follows: ‘the presence of the probans in an appropriate place (i.e., ucitadesavittitvam). This appropriate place is sometimes the subject and at other times it is other than the subject. There is no restriction to the effect that it should always be in the subject (pakṣa).

The Nyāya definition of vyāpti is not to be interpreted so narrowly as Madhva does. The ‘unity’ that we have to conceive in inference is a ‘logical unity’. It is a ‘pervasive unity’. All the suitable places are to be considered as the subject (pakṣa). The presence of the probans and the probandum in the same locus is not to be literally understood. There is no case in which the probandum and the probans are absolutely in the same locus. In the well-known inference of fire from smoke, smoke is found above the surface of the mountain, and fire is found on the surface. The only possible objection we can raise against the second definition of vyāpti of the Nyāya school is that the word ‘samānādhikarana’ (existence in the same locus) does not obtain in any place.

Madhva’s definition of vyāpti is not in any way a great advance on the Nyāya view. It is merely an elaboration of the Nyāya view with some technical safeguards.

Pervasion depends upon the nature of the attributes that enter it as relata. (1) There are some attributes that have reciprocal pervasion, e.g., things that are prohibited by the Vedas are sins, and sins are those things that are prohibited by the Vedas; (2) there are certain attributes that have no reciprocal pervasion, e.g., wherever there is smoke there is fire; but there may be no smoke wherever there is fire; (3) there are certain other attributes that are never found together, e.g., ‘wherever there is horiness, there is no cowness.’ There can be no pervasion between such attributes as there is no relation between them. (4) There are certain other attributes that are found sometimes together with an object, and at other times found elsewhere, e.g., the capacity to cook is found in men. The capacity to cook is found in women also. Manhood is found in non-cooks. There can be no pervasion between such attributes.¹

Pervasion by its mere existence cannot give us inference. Pervasion has to be cognised. The cognition of the probans and the mode of the pervasion are the essentials of inference.

The modes of pervasion are nine-fold: (1) The pervasion that exists between two relata that are in the same place and time, e.g., the pervasion between taste and colour; (2) the pervasion between two relata in the same locus, but at different times, e.g., the pervasion between smoke and

¹. Pramāṇapaddhati, Chap. II, Sec. 2, p. 177.
fire; (3) the pervasion that exists between two relata that are at the same
time but in different loci, e.g., the pervasion between the rise of the star
Kṛttikā and the appearance of Rohini; (4) the pervasion that exists between
two relata that are in different times and different places, e.g., the pervasion
that exists between the flood in a river and in the lowlands and the rain
in the uplands; (5) the pervasion that exists between two relata that are in
the same place the first of which is occasional while the other is permanent,
e.g., the pervasion that exists between gravity and weight; (6) the pervasion
that exists between two relata in the same place one of them being per-
manent and the other occasional, e.g., the pervasion between body and death;
(7) the pervasion that exists between two relata where one of them is pre-
sent only in a particular area and the other is present all over, e.g., the per-
vasion of 'conjunction' by 'substances'; (8) the reverse of the previous
mode and (9) the pervasion that exists between two relata which are limbs
of one whole, e.g., the pervasion between the two pans in a balance.

All the three instruments of knowledge (perception, inference and verbal
testimony) give rise to the cognition of vyāpti. The pervasion of smoke by
fire is perceptual. A certain individual sees smoke and fire together in a
kitchen and begins to deliberate as follows: Are smoke and fire together
in the kitchen alone, or do they exist together in all places at all times?
Does either of them exist without the other? With such doubts he sets
forth to investigate the pervasion of smoke and fire. He repeatedly observes
the pervasion of smoke by fire. He also observes the non-existence of fire
always going together with the non-existence of smoke. There are some
places where there is fire without smoke. The relation of smoke with fire
is conditioned by an adjunct (upādhi), namely, wet fuel. The contact of
wet fuel with fire is co-extensive with the presence of smoke, but is not co-
existent with fire. The presence of wet fuel and its contact with fire
causes smoke.

The investigator then questions as follows: Is there any adjunct that
is responsible for the presence of fire where there is smoke as in the above
case? It cannot be an uncaused relation. The investigator examines the
kitchen to find out if there is any adjunct responsible for presence of fire
where there is smoke.

He then examines the attributes that pervade both fire and smoke.
The attribute (knowability) is common to fire and smoke. This quality
cannot separate fire from smoke. There are certain other attributes that are
absent from both. The quality of being a kitchen is absent from both. This
quality too cannot separate fire from smoke. The wet fuel in contact with
fire can separate smoke from fire and not fire from smoke. It cannot do this,
because it is not as pervasive as fire.

If we are to adduce the non-existence of fire where there is smoke, we
want such an adjunct which pervades fire and does not pervade smoke.
Such an adjunct is not seen because it does not exist. So the investigator
comes to the definite conclusion that there is no external adjunct which could prove the non-existence of fire where there is smoke. The cognition of the relation between smoke and fire is perceptual, and it is determined by three factors: (1) Repeated observation of the co-existence of the probans and the probandum, (2) the non-cognition of the inconsistency of the probans, and (3) the certain knowledge of the non-existence of any external adjunct. After certain cognition that the pervasion of the cognised smoke by fire is natural we are able to infer even in other places where we see smoke. This in short is the manner of pervasion.¹

SECTION II.

Jayatirtha classifies inferences as follows:

I. (1) Inference from effect (kāryānumāna) e.g., the inference of fire from smoke; (2) inference from cause (kāraṇānumāna) e.g., the inference of rain from the dense clouds that gather above us; (3) inference from something other than cause and effect (akāryakāraṇānumāna) e.g., the inference of colour from taste.

II. (1) inference of perceptual objects (drśṭānumāna) e.g. the inference of fire from smoke; (2) inference of non-perceptual objects (sāmānyato-drśṭānumāna) e.g., the inference of the existence of the sense organ of sight from the cognition of colour.²

III. (1) Inference that helps us to prove our argument (sādhanānumāna) e.g., the inference of fire from the cognition of smoke; (2) inference that helps us to refute an argument (duśanānumāna) ; (a) the inference that helps us to cognise the defects in arguments and (b) hypothetical argument (tarka).³ Hypothetical argument is used as an auxiliary to valid inference. The Nyāya school brings it under invalid knowledge (anyathātajñāna), but still regards it as aiding valid inference. When we state a particular inference, if the opponent argues that the probans used in the inference is ineffective to establish the probandum, we make use of the hypothetical argument to establish the pervasion; e.g., when we state the familiar inference of fire and smoke, the opponent argues that the probans smoke exists, but it does not prove the probandum fire. Such a doubt is called aprayojaka sāṅkā. It takes the following form: in the above inference 'let there be smoke (probans), there need be no fire (probandum).' We make use of the hypothetical argument to refute such a question. The hypothetical argument takes the following form: If there were no fire then there could be no smoke.' The hypothetical argument takes up the deduction of the opponent, namely, the non-existence of fire, and from it is deduced the non-existence of smoke which is not acceptable to the opponent.

¹ Pramāṇapaddhati, Chap. II, Sec. 4, p. 176.
² Pramāṇapaddhati, Chap. II, Sec. 8, p. 199.
³ Ibid., Chap. II, Sec. 9, p. 203.
The characteristics of the hypothetical syllogism:  

1. The pervasion of the deducer ($\text{āpādaka}$) by the deduced ($\text{āpādya}$). In the above hypothetical argument the non-existence of fire is the deducer. It is the pervaded ($\text{vyāpya}$) and the non-existence of smoke is deduced. The non-existence of fire is pervaded by the non-existence of smoke. In an hypothetical argument the pervasion of the deducer by the deduced must be a settled factor. If it were not so the same old doubt about the ineffective nature of the probans to prove the probandum would arise. It is only to answer such a charge that the hypothetical argument is stated, and hence the necessity for the established nature of the pervasion in the hypothetical argument.

2. It should not be liable to be refuted by any counter hypothetical argument.

3. The deduced must be unacceptable to the opponent; e.g., the non-existence of smoke is not acceptable to the opponent, because he perceives it.

4. The hypothetical argument must culminate in the contrary of that against which the argument is directed. This is technically called 'Viparyaya paryayasāna': e.g., there is the smoke, then there is fire. Without this step the hypothetical argument is not complete.

5. The argument must be of no help to the opponent. It must not be favourable to him.

Hypothetical argument is valid, according to Jayatīrtha, and it is treated as a type of inference in Madhva's epistemology.

The third trait of an hypothetical argument, i.e., 'occasioning the unacceptable' is of two kinds.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occasioning the Unacceptable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1) Abandoning the valid.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2) Abandoning the perceptually valid.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3) Abandoning the inferentially valid.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(4) Abandoning the argument established by verbal testimony.</td>
<td>4. Infinite regress; when we have an unsettled non-established cause; e.g. A is caused by B, B by C, C by D and so on.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(5) Assuming the invalid.</td>
<td>5. The mere occasioning of the unacceptable:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(6) Assuming the perceptually invalid.</td>
<td>(i) Occasioning the abandonment of the perceptually valid.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(7) Assuming the inferentially invalid.</td>
<td>(ii) Occasioning the abandonment of inferentially valid.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(8) Assuming the argument that is opposed to verbal testimony.</td>
<td>(iii) Occasioning the abandonment of the argument which is proved by verbal testimony.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Jayatīrtha, after classifying inference, examines the two types of pervasion put forward by the Nyāya school, viz., (1) positive pervasion (*anvayāyāpatti*), the pervasion of the probans by the probandum, and (2) negative pervasion (*vyatireka vyāpti*), the pervasion of the non-existence of the probandum by the non-existence of the probans. The example of a positive pervasion is ‘what is knowable is nameable, like the pot.’ There is no negative form for the above inference, because we do not have an example for the negative pervasion, namely, ‘that which is not nameable is not knowable.’ Everything in the world is nameable, so we cannot have an example which is not nameable.

The negative pervasion is pervasive of the subject term and it has no positive instance; e.g., all living bodies have souls, because they have life, negatively like the pot. The pervasion is as follows: ‘Wherever there is the non-existence of souls there is the non-existence of life as in the pot.’ There is no positive pervasion for the above inference, because all living bodies are taken as constituting the subject term. Such a subject term exhausts all soulful beings. There are certain inferences which admit of both the types of pervasions, e.g., ‘this mountain has fire, because it has smoke (positive instance), like the kitchen, and (negative instance) like the lake. The negative pervasion is stated as follows: ‘Wherever there is no fire, there is no smoke, as in the lake.’

Jayatīrtha is of opinion that there is no need for the negative pervasion, and he admits only the positive pervasion. The inference wherein negative pervasion is made use of can be proved on the basis of positive pervasion itself. Then how is it that there is acceptance for it found in the Śāstras? Even

---

according to the Nyāya school the negative pervasion is of no use in the establishment of a positive factor. Further, in the negative pervasion the pervaded and the Paksadharmaṇa occupy different loci. In a negative pervasion the pervasion is present in fire, and the smoke is the nirūpaka i.e. the pervader, and the paksadharmaṇa is found in smoke. The Nyāya school establishes the validity of the negative pervasion through a series of links. The examples cited above for the negative pervasion can be established by a positive pervasion itself. It takes the following form: 'wherever there is life, there is soul'. If the place where we point out the pervasion cannot be known by perception, then we establish the pervasion by the inference, which takes the following form: 'Being alive is pervaded by being soulful, because it is the counter correlate of the non-existence of (that) e.g., the pervasion of smokeness by fire.' The pervasion is as follows: 'Wherever is the counter correlate of the non-existence which pervades the non-existence (of that) (probandum) is pervaded by that (proban).'

Madhva’s criticism of the negative pervasion is not profound. It is too formalistic. It would be more natural and scientific to accept the negative pervasion than to express two really negative ideas in the garb of a rigid and tortuous positive pervasion. It is in such places we see the extreme formalism of the syllogism in Indian logic.

Inference is further divided into two kinds: (1) inference for one’s self and (2) inference for others. (1) Without any teaching from another, if one cognises the probans with the help of the memory of the pervasion it is an instance of inference for oneself. (2) If our cognition of the pervasion depends on another’s teaching, it is an instance of inference for others. Inference for others is put in the form of a syllogism. The Nyāya syllogism has five members. They are (1) the thesis set down in a proposition i.e., pratijñā e.g., ‘this mountain has fire’; (2) the probans, i.e., hetu. It is the sentence that states the probans, and ends in ablative case e.g., ‘because it has smoke’ (dhūmāt); (3) the example (udāharana). The example is sometimes positive, and sometimes negative. If the pervasion is positive, we have a positive example, and if the pervasion is negative, the example is negative; e.g., in the familiar inference of fire from smoke, we have both the pervasions, so we have both types of examples, (i) the kitchen, (ii) the lake. (4) The fourth member is called ‘upanaya.’ The probans which is made out to be invariably concomitant with the probandum should be specifically known to be present in the subject. Such a cognition ‘upanaya’ gives e.g., ‘like the kitchen this mountain fire pervades smoke.’ (5) The restatement of the pratijñā (thesis) asserting a reason is called nigama i.e., conclusion, e.g., ‘therefore the mountain has fire.’

The Bhāṭṭa school recognises only three members: (1) pratijñā, (2) hetu, (3) udāharana or (1) udāharana, (2) upanaya and (3) nigama. The Buddhist accepts only two members, udāharana and upanaya.

1. Pramāṇapaddhati, Chap. II, Sec. 18, p. 230.
Madhva finds no intelligibility in restricting the number of members that should go into a syllogism. He is of opinion that there should be no restriction or artificial specification that there should be three or five members only. The syllogism is used to convince and make the opponent understand our argument. The number of members depends on the understanding capacity of the opponent. If the opponent understands the inference by the statement of the mere probans, other members are then not necessary. Why then the rule that there should be five members? Hence the restriction is meaningless.

**Section III**

*Defects of Inference with special reference to the vulnerable points in a debate.*

Inference is defined as ‘defectless reasoning,’ and defects of probans are those factors which prevent us from having valid cognition and sometimes give us uncertain and erroneous cognition. They can broadly be divided into two kinds: (1) defects relating to meaning, and (2) defects relating to speech. The two defects relating to meaning are (1) contradiction (*virodha*) the absence of the capacity to co-exist; and (2) incongruity (*asaṅgati*) absence of expectancy. The two defects of speech are (i) omission of the essential (*nyūna*), stating only a part of the essential statement and (ii) overstatement (*adhika*) where the expectancy is satisfied even otherwise, without the need for this statement.

‘Contradiction’ is of two kinds: (1) the contradictions that are common to a debate arising in laying down the four corners of (i) discussion, (ii) question, (iii) establishment of one’s own position, and (iv) refutation of the opponent; (2) the contradiction arising in the inference itself.

‘Contradictions that arise in the inference’ are three in number: (1) contradictions of thesis (*pratijñāvirodha*), (2) contradiction of the probans (*hetuvirodha*), and (3) contradiction of example (*ārṣṭāntavirodha*).

‘Pratijñā-virodha’ is of two kinds: (1) contradiction of what is settled by valid knowledge (*pramāṇavirodha*) and (2) contradiction of one’s own word (*svavacana-virodha*).

‘Contradiction of what is settled by valid knowledge’ is of two kinds: (1) contradiction of the comparatively stronger *pramāṇa* (*prabalapramāṇavirodha*), and (2) contradiction of the equally strong *pramāṇa* (*samabala-pramāṇavirodha*). The strength of a *pramāṇa* depends upon two factors: (1) the numerical strength, (2) the natural strength (that which is the source of subsistence for others and is incapable of being construed as having some other purport).

*Prabalapramāṇavirodha* is divided into three kinds: (1) The contradiction by the perceived strong *pramāṇa*, (2) the contradiction by the inferred strong *pramāṇa*, (3) the contradiction by the verbally strong *pramāṇa*. 
Samavalapramāṇavirodha is also divided into three kinds: (1) the contradiction by the perceived equally strong pramāṇa, (2) the contradiction by the inferred equally strong pramāṇa, and (3) the contradiction by the verbally cognised equally strong pramāṇa. The contradiction by the inferred equally strong pramāṇa is of two kinds: (i) contradiction by the same inference, (ii) contradiction by another inference.  

'Svavacanavirodha' is of two kinds: (1) accepting a conclusion conflicting with one's school of thought (apasiḍḍhānta) and (2) quibbling, which is of three kinds: (i) the contradiction between the words in a sentence, or between intermediary sentences uttered by one's own self, (ii) contradiction in one's own action (svakriyāvirodha), and (iii) contradiction of one's own principles (svanyāyavirodha).

The contradiction of Hetu is of two kinds: (1) the non-establishment of the probans (asiddhi) and (2) non-pervasion (avyāpti).

The contradiction of example is of two kinds: (i) defect in the probandum, and (ii) defect in the probans.

Each of the three defects, Asaṅgati, Nyūna and Adhika is also of three kinds: (1) Pratijñāna-asangati, (2) Hetu-asangati and (3) Drṣṭānta-asangati; (i) Pratijñānyūna, (ii) Hetunyūna, (iii) Drṣṭāntanyūna. (1) Pratijñā-adhika, (2) Hetu-adhika, (3) Drṣṭānta-adhika. In addition to the four defects, Madhva mentions two more: (1) the acceptance of a disputed fact (sahāvāda) and (2) the non-utterance of certain words which ought to be uttered in order to make our meaning intelligible to others (anukti).

All the twenty-two vulnerable points put forward by the Nyāya school are brought under these six defects: (1) Virodha, (2) Asaṅgati, (3) Nyūna, (4) Adhika, (5) Sahāvāda and (6) Anukti.

In a debate when the protagonist with unchecked pride checks the pride of the opponent, such a checking is called defeat (nigraha). The causes of such defeat are called vulnerable points (nigrahaśāhāna). By the term 'checking the pride' we mean the failure of the twofold resolve namely, to establish one's own position and to refute the opponent's. The following points do not constitute a nigrahaśāhāna: the disputant falling into a fit, becoming mad for a time, being not able to answer immediately on account of the clouded nature of his thoughts, or forgetting to state a point in time, but brings it to his mind later.  

The vulnerable points of a debate (nigrahaśāhānas) are twenty-two in number as enumerated by the Nyāya school.

1. Giving up what has been stated as the probandum is Pratijñāhāni, e.g., when one declares that the mountain has fire, because it is an object of cognition, if we point out that the probans is inconclusive, he turns round.
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and says then ‘let the mountain have no fire’. This vulnerable point is included in ‘sanhvāda.’

(2) Adding adjectives to the probandum part, which was first stated without any qualifications is called Pratiṣṭāntaram, e.g., ‘sound is non-eternal,’ when such a statement is made the critic points out that dhvanyātmaka sound is accepted to be non-eternal. Hence, the defect of proving the already established (siddhasādhana). At this juncture the man who made the first statement adds the word vayātmaka to the subject. Such a process of qualifying the subject avoids the defect.

Here we must ask the question: Is the previous debate continued, or is it a fresh debate? It cannot be the continuation of a previous debate. Once we prove a point, or point out the defect in the opponent’s argument the debate comes to a close. It is useless to add words or adjectives after the end of the debate. Thus Pratiṣṭāntaram proves to be not a vulnerable point at all.

(3) The contradiction that arises between the words or sentences uttered by an individual is called Pratijñāvirodha, e.g., My mother is barren.

(4) Denial of one’s own words is Pratijñāsāmnyāsa e.g., a certain individual says, ‘Fire is not hot.’ If the critic points out that it is opposed to perception, then he turns round and says, ‘I did not say so.’ This gets included in pramāṇavirodha.

(5) Modifying the probans part which was first stated without any qualifications is Hetvāntaram, e.g., a certain individual declares, ‘Sound is non-eternal, because it is cognised by the senses.’ When such an inference is stated the critic points out that it is inconclusive, and the individual then qualifies his probans by adding the words, ‘while possessing a genus.’ This defect is dismissed as not a vulnerable point as ‘Pratijñāntara’.

(6) Stating a fact not useful for the present but having a syntactical relation is called ‘Arthāntara’ e.g., ‘sound is non-eternal, because it is an object of cognition’. After stating this he adds “Hin root + tun suffix = Hetu. This gets included in ‘Asangati”

(7) The use of a meaningless word is called Nirarthakam e.g., sound is non-eternal, because it is ka, ca, ṭa, ta, pa, etc. This gets included in Anukti.

(8) The use of such words which are significant and understood by judges, and which the opponents do not understand even when uttered thrice

---

1. Pramāṇapaddhati, Chap. II, Sec. 25, p. 265.
3. Ibid., sec. 27. p. 270.
4. Ibid., sec. 28. p. 271.
5. Pramāṇapaddhati, Chap. II, Sec. 29, p. 272.
6. Ibid., Sec. 30, p. 274.
7. Ibid., Sec. 31, p. 275.
is the defect 'Avijñātārtham' e.g., this which is the cause of bearing up the daughter of Kaśyapa is conjoined with that which has the same name as the vehicle of the son of the three eyed; because it possesses its flag. The above inference, when stated in ordinary intelligible terms comes to this. 'The mountain has fire, because it has smoke. This gets included under Anukti'.

(9) The use of such words which have a meaning but no syntactical relation is called 'Aparārthakam' e.g., the hearth where sacrificial fire is kept, the skin of a sheep, ten pomegranates, and six cakes. This comes under 'Anukti'.

(10) The reversal in the order of the statement of the members of a syllogism is called 'Aprāptakālam' e.g., because it is made, sound is non-eternal. This is no vulnerable point at all. There are valid usages to that effect in Sāstras e.g., 'Because it generates fruitful activity, Pramāna is not inconstant to the object.'

(11) Omission of such words that are necessary to be uttered is called 'nyūnam' e.g., the mountain has fire, like the kitchen.

(12) The use of 'such' words which have syntactical relation but are not repetitive, but whose function has been achieved by other words is called 'Adhikam' e.g., the mountain has fire, because it has smoke, it has luminosity.

(13) Repeating without any purpose one's own words whose meaning has been understood is called Punarukti, e.g., the mountain has fire, the mountain has fire. This gets included in Adhika.

(14) A certain statement is made by one of the disputants which is understood by the judges and it is restated by the disputants and the judges and it is capable of being articulated. After all this, if the other disputant hiding his ignorance continues to answer without closing the debate, the defect is called 'Ananubhāṣānam.' It is of five kinds: (1) arguments such as the following: 'What the disputant said is this,' (ii) restating a part of the defect pointed out by the opponent, (iii) abusing the opponent, (iv) mistaking the case, (v) silence. The first three kinds get included under Nyūna, and the fourth and the fifth under Anukti.

(15) The ignorance of the meaning of words uttered thrice by the disputants, and understood by the judges is called Ajñānam. It is included in Anukti.
(16) The ignorance of the reply to the question put by the disputant is called 'Apratibhā'. This is included in Asaṅgati.¹

(17) Cutting away from a debate by giving some excuse is called 'Vikṣepa', e.g., it gets included in Anukti.²

(18) Deducing the acceptable is called 'Matānujñā'. This comes under Anukti.³

(19) Failure to point out the vulnerable point when it should be pointed out is called Paryanuyojyopekṣaṇam. This comes under Anukti.⁴

(20) When a particular vulnerable point has not arisen, asserting its presence, it is called 'Niranuyojyānuvyogaḥ'. It is of four kinds: (i) pervasion (Chala), (ii) quibbling (jāti), (iii) Ḥanvyadyābhāsa, (iv) aprāptakālagrahaṇam.

(21) Defeating the proponent's point in a debate by interpreting the words used by him in a sense other than the one intended by him is called chala. e.g., a certain individual asked the cow (gām) to be brought. The servant said it was impossible to bring it, taking the word to mean earth. This was not the intended meaning, so it is a case of Asaṅgati under which it gets included.

SECTION IV

Jāti

(False Reasoning or Futile Argument)

Such of those objections of an opponent that have not the necessary efficacy to refute the proponent's argument, though they are agreed upon by both the disputants, are called 'Futile objections' (jāti); their general characteristic is serf-contradiction. The Nyāya school enumerates 24 types of jāti. All these are generally directed to score a victory over the proponent in case he is not alert enough to see through the futility and falsity in the objection.

1. Refuting the proponent's argument with an inference which has no pervasion is sādharma-sāma (i.e. where the argument rests on the strength of similarity), e.g., Proponent: 'This mountain has fire because it has smoke, like the kitchen.' Opponent: 'Let the mountain have no fire, because of its similarity to lake, 'in respect of possessing substancess.'⁵

2. Vaiḍharmya-sāma: Where the argument proceeds on the ground of some dissimilarity: e.g., 'If the mountain has fire because of its being dissimilar to the lake in respect of possessing smoke then let the mountain

¹ Pramāṇapadhi, Chap. II, Sec. 40, 286.
² Ibid., Sec. 41, p. 287.
³ Ibid., Sec. 42, p. 288.
⁴ Ibid., Sec. 43, p. 289.
⁵ Pramāṇapadhi, Chap. II, Sec. 45, to 68.
have no fire, because of its being dissimilar to the kitchen in respect of possessing the attribute ‘being a mountain’.

Here we shall have first to point out that there is no pervasion in the opponent’s argument. If the opponent declares that only some similarity and dissimilarity are useful for an inference, and not pervasion, then we shall have to point out that his argument also can be refuted by a counter argument based on some similarity or dissimilarity without the need of any pervasion. The principle enunciated by the opponent that some similarity or dissimilarity is enough for inference refutes his own inference; hence Madhva classes it under ‘Contradiction of one’s principles (svanyāyavirodha)’.

3. Deducing some unaccountable qualities in the probandum on the strength of their presence in the example, using the same probans used by the proponent is called Utkarṣasama, e.g., ‘If the mountain has fire as the kitchen which has smoke then let the mountain have cooking vessels also as the kitchen.’ Here we must point out to the opponent that his inference has no pervasion. If the opponent declares that what is necessary for an hypothetical inference is the fact of ‘being together and not pervasion, the Siddhāntin’s reply is that the opponent’s argument gets refuted by a similar argument which merely takes into account ‘being together’ and not pervasion. This futile objection can come under (svanyāyavirodha) ‘Contradiction of one’s own principles’. The principle of ‘being together’ as the cause of inference enunciated by the opponent cuts his own inference.

4. According to some, deducing the non-existence of some admitted attributes in the subject is Apakarṣasama. e.g., If sound is non-eternal because it is produced, like the pot, then let sound be not an object for hearing, because it is produced like the pot. Here we must ascertain the purpose of the opponent’s argument: if it be to establish his point, i.e., the eternal nature of sound; then there is the defect of establishing a thing not desired. The fact that sound does become an object for the sense of hearing is accepted by the opponent. Hence the defect of Arthāntara (establishing something other than what is desired). If it be an argument to refute the proponent, then it is not different from Utkarṣasama. The difference that Utkarṣasama deduces a positive attribute, and Apakarṣasama deduces the non-existence of an admitted attribute does not count much. According to Udayana, Apakarṣa-sama consists in ‘deducing the non-existence of the probans or the probandum on the ground of the absence of certain things found together with it.’ e.g., the mountain has no fire, or it has no smoke, because of the non-existence of the cooking vessels which were found together with smoke and fire in the kitchen. Here we reply, if it be an argument to establish the non-existence of the probandum, then it is a case of counter probans (satpratipakṣa). If it be an argument to disprove the non-existence of the probans, then it is not established. If it be an argument to deduce the non-existence of the probandum, it is not difference from sādharmyasama and
prakaraṇyasama. And lastly the opponent’s objection has no pervasion. If the pervasion be not accepted by him then it is a case of ‘contradiction of one’s own principles.’

5. Varnyasama according to some ‘is objecting the example as not having been proved, on the strength of the non-proved nature of the subject (pakṣa).’ It is not so. If the objection directed against the example be the result of a doubt then the objection is valid. If it be raised for mere fun, then it is a case of undue extension. If the proponent further urges that the example is unproved on the ground of the presence of the same probans in the subject and example, then this Jāti is not different from Utkarṣa-sama and Sādhyasama.

Udayana defines Varnyasama as follows: ‘Deducing the non-established nature of the example on the strength of the existence or non-existence of the probans characterised as non-established etc., considered in relation to the subject alone’. The case is argued as follows: Is the probans present in the example the same as the one that is in the subject? Then the probandum in the example also has to be proved as in the subject. If the probans present in the example be other than the one in the subject it has to be proved afresh.

The Siddhāntins are of opinion that the mere presence of the probans in the example is enough to vouchsafe its validity. There is no necessity for the probans in the subject to be present in the same form in the example also. If the opponent insists on the presence of the identity of the form of the probans also, then it has to be included as a case of contradiction of one’s own principles (svanyāyavirodha).

The inference of the opponent too can be refuted on the same ground namely ‘that the probans present in the example is not in the same form as it is found in the subject.’

6. Deducing the established nature of the probandum in respect of the subject on the strength of the established nature of the probandum in the example is according to some Avarṇyasama. If the deduction be made in the belief that the probandum has been established in respect of the subject, it is a valid inference. If it be otherwise, it has no cause. If the deduction be based merely on the strength of co-existence, it is Utkarṣasama itself.

Udayana defines it as follows: Deducing the established nature of the probandum in the subject on the strength of the presence or absence of a probans for which, in the example alone there are such forms as being established, etc., e.g., if the same probans (smoke which is present in the kitchen) as related to an established predicate is present in the mountain, the probandum as in the example is established in the subject. If it be not so the probandum ceases to be a probandum since there is no probans to prove it. The Siddhāntins point out that in the opponent’s inference we can deduce the same defect; i.e., the probandum in respect of the subject is established
as in the example. The very principle adopted by the opponent cuts his own argument. Hence the inclusion of this jāti under Svanyāyavirodha.

7. Deducing the inconstancy of the probans and the probandum on the strength of the inconstancy among certain attributes is according to some Vikalpasama: e.g., the attribute 'producibility' is found in the pot as well as in the colour of the pot, but not in its colour. On the same ground let certain things that are produced be eternal. If it be a mere doubt, it is an answerable question. In that case the proponent has to indicate the absence of any adjunct. Further if the opponent holds that his arguments are there to refute the proponent, then we will have to ascertain whether the inconstancy among the attributes is in the probans or in the example. If it be the probans, it has no pervasion. If it be in the example there is the non-statement of the probans (Nyūna).

Further it proves to be non-different from Pratidṛṣṭāntasama. If the opponent does not approve that pervasion is necessary for an inference, we have to point out that his inference also can be refuted by another inference. Thus it proves to be a case of svanyāyavirodha.

8. Deducing the non-established nature of the probandum in the example as in the proposition is called the sādhyasama. If the argument be stated in order to find out the disputed nature of the probandum, then it is valid. If it be a mere objection, it has no cause or justification.

Udayana defines Sādhyasama as follows:

'Deducing the incapacity of the probans in proving the probandum on the strength of its incapacity to prove the subject as qualified by many attributes.' We have to tell the opponent that pervasion and Pakṣadharmatā (presence in the appropriate place), in the Madhyva sense of the term are necessary for an inference. If the opponent holds that they are not necessary, we have to point out that his argument can also be refuted by another inference which has no pervasion and no pakṣadharmatā. Thus the very principle enunciated by the opponent cuts his own argument; so it is included in Svanyāyavirodha.

9. Deducing the ineffective nature of the probans when refuting its relation with the probandum is called Prāptisama. Deducing the same by refuting the non-relation of the probans with the probandum is (10) Aprāptisama. e.g., if the cognition of the smoke gives rise to the cognition of fire after getting related to it, then it follows that the cognition of smoke must have existed, because it is possible only for existence to get related. Hence there is no origination, because the fire cognition is already there. If the proponent holds that the cognition of smoke gets related with fire and then gives rise to the cognition of fire, no other type of relation exists between the cognition of smoke and fire excepting the relation of cognition and the object of cognition. The smoke cognition has for its content fire also. Thus there is cognition of fire already established. If it be contended that the probans gives rise to the cognition of probandum without getting related to
it, we should reply that there is no instance like that. Fire does not burn a stick without getting related to it, nor does a lamp illuminate an object without getting related to it.

The Siddhāntins’ reply is ‘That the probans gives rise to the cognition of the probandum by being related to its potency. The relation is not one of Svarūpasambandha (sui generis). Thus there is no undue extension. As for manifestation, the object of the cognition of smoke is not mere smoke, but smoke as related in the pervasion. If the opponent does not agree to it, it proves to be a case of Svanyāyavirodha. In the inference used by the opponent we have to ascertain whether the probans gives rise to the cognition of the probandum getting related or not. He can be accused of the same defects alleged by him.

11. Deducing the fallacy of infinite regress is called Prasaṅgasama, e.g., when the familiar inference of fire from smoke is stated the opponent questions thus: ‘What is it that originated the mountain? What originated that which originated the mountain?’ Thus it leads to infinite regress. Here we must answer, since an established thing has a definite ground, there is no cutting at the roots. If the opponent does not agree to this, we will have to point out that his inference also can be refuted by the same fallacy. Thus it is a case of Svanyāyavirodha.

12. Some are of opinion that refuting with a counter example is called Pratidṛśṭāntasama. It is not so, because Sādharmyasama also has the same function, e.g., If sound be non-eternal, because it can be like the pot; then let it be also eternal, because it can be like generality (Sāmānya). Here we will have to point out that the probans is inconstant.

Udayana defines ‘Pratidṛśṭāntasama as follows: ‘Deducing one of the two, namely Satpratipakṣa or Bādha on the strength of a counter example alone without a probans’ e.g., If the mountain has fire because of the example ‘the kitchen’, then let the mountain have no fire because of the example of the lake.

It is a case of the omission of the necessary limb (Nyūna). The probans is not stated here. If it be contended that the probans is not necessary, then we will have to include it as a case of Svanyāyavirodha. The opponent’s inference also can be refuted by another inference which has no pervasion.

13. Deducing the non-established nature of the probans by pointing out its absence in the subject prior to its origin. e.g., before the origin of the mountain as there was no smoke in it, it proves to be a case of partial non-establishment. Here we must point out that the absence of the probans from the mountain prior to its origin is no defect at all, because the mountain is not the subject before its origin. If the opponent does not agree to this, the same objection can be levelled against his inference. So it proves to be a case of contradiction of his own principles.
14. Deducing doubt merely on the ground of some common attribute in the presence of the determining factor is called Sāṁśayasyasama, e.g., if the mountain has fire, because it has smoke, like the kitchen, then a doubt arises, because of the common attribute that is present in the kitchen and lake namely ‘Substanceness’. Here we must answer that a doubt results only in the absence of a determining factor aided by common attribute. In the present case there is the determining factor, so it is not doubt at all. If the opponent says that the presence of the determining factor is no obstruction to doubt, then we shall have to urge that doubt can be deduced in his argument also on the same ground formulated by him. Thus this jāti gets included in contradiction of one’s own principles (svanyāya-virodha).

15. Refuting with a ‘counter inference’ is Prakarāṇasyasama’ e.g., if sound is non- eternal, because it is produced, then let sound be eternal, because it is the object of the sense of hearing. If the counter inference be stated in the belief that it has all the necessary limbs of an inference, then it is a valid answer. If it be otherwise, it is not different from ‘Sādhyasyasama’.

Udayana defines Prakarāṇasyasama as follows: ‘Confronting the opponent with an argument which is accepted to be not stronger than that of the proponent.’ It is not different from Sādhyamyasama. There is no need for treating it as a separate jāti. If this be not accepted, it has to be treated as a case of Svanyāyavirodha.

16. Deducing the ineffective nature of the probans by refuting the possibility of its origin before the probandum or after it or simultaneously with it is called ‘Ahetusasyasama’. The probans in its origin is not prior to the probandum, because it cannot be probans in the absence of the probandum. The probans could not have originated after the probandum, because without a probans we cannot have probandum. The probans and the probandum could not have simultaneously come into existence, then we should be unable to distinguish which is the probandum and which is the probans. Here we must answer that the probans originated prior to the probandum and that the probans gives rise to the cognition of the probandum by its own potency and does not depend on any other external factor. As for manifestation the probans gives rise to the cognition of the probandum in all the three modes above mentioned. The difference that marks off the probans from the probandum is that the one is known and the other unknown. If the opponent does not agree to this, we can deduce the same defects in his inference. Hence it is included under contradiction of one’s own principles. (Svanyāyavirodha).

17. Deducing the fallacy of presumption is called ‘Arthāpattisyasama’ e.g., If the mountain is said to have fire, we will have to presume from this that other objects have no fire. Here we will have to point to the defect; i.e., ‘lack of the probandum’ in the example. Further when something is unintelligible the assumption of what will make it intelligible is called pre-
sumption. There is nothing unintelligible in the above example, so there is no need for the deduction of presumption. If the opponent holds that the mere contrary of what has been stated is itself presumption, the same defect can be alleged against the opponent’s argument, namely, the deduction of presumption. So it proves to be a case of contradiction of one’s own principles.

18. To construct an argument with a probans which is an attribute other than that adduced by the proponent, and to deduce there-from non-distinctness from all things possessing that attribute is called ‘Aviśeṣasama,’ e.g., if the mountain has the particular attribute fire on account of this similarity to the kitchen in respect of possessing smoke, then let all existent things be eternal because of their similarity in respect of existence. If the opponent does not agree to this, then we can deduce the same defect in his inference; so his own principle cuts at the root of his inference. Hence it is included under the ‘contradiction of one’s own principles’ (svanyāya-virodha).

19. Confronting the proponent with the intelligibility of reasoning afforded by two opposed probans is called ‘Upapattisama’ e.g., If the non-eternity of sound is proved by the probans ‘Producedness’ then the eternality of sound too can be proved on the strength of the probans non-touchability. This jāti is not different from ‘Śādharmyasama jāti’.

Udayana defines upapattisama as follows: ‘Confronting the proponent with a mere general statement to the effect that he has also a probans to prove his point.’ If the probans stated by the opponent be valid, then it is a valid answer. If it be not a valid probans, the defect has to be pointed out. So it is no jāti at all.

20. Deducing the ineffective nature of the probans on the ground of the perception of the probandum in places where the specified probans is not found is called ‘upalabdhisama’ e.g., the probans smoke is ineffective, because we find fire in some places where there is no smoke e.g., the red hot iron ball. As there is no supporting ground this is no jāti at all. It is a case of Hānyādhyābhāsa.

Udayana defines ‘Upalabdhisama’ as follows: ‘Superimposing some restrictive sense as the purport of the proponent’s statement on the basis of his statement, and then resolving the restriction into alternatives and refuting them’ e.g., when the proponent says that the mountain has fire, the opponent asks ‘has the mountain alone fire, or has the entire mountain fire. It cannot be the first because in the kitchen also there is fire. It cannot be the second because there are some places in the mountain where there is no fire.’

Here we must say that superimposing some restrictive sense other than the one intended by the proponent is a case of perversion (chala).
21. Deducing contradiction in such attributes of the subject as cognition by supposing their existence or non-existence in themselves as loci is called ‘Anupalabdhisama’, e.g., if we say that cognition is found in cognition because cognition also is cognised like the pot, then cognition becomes non-cognition. If we say that cognition is not found in cognition, then also it becomes non-cognition. Here we must reply that the cognitive nature of cognition which is dependent on the object does not lose its cognitive nature whether it exists in itself or not. If the opponent does not agree to this, we can urge the same defect against the cognition in the opponent’s argument. So this is a case of ‘Svanyayavirodha’.

22. Deducing the destruction of the subject being qualified by a particular attribute analysed into two forms namely the ‘that’ and the ‘not that’ is called Nityasama, e.g., when we say sound is non-eternal, the opponent asks us whether non-eternity is eternal or non-eternal. If it be the first the subject becomes eternal, and if it be the second, by the very destruction of non-eternity, sound which is qualified by it becomes eternal. If the purpose of such an argument be to deduce the unintelligibility of the proponent’s argument, it is a valid answer. If the intention be to refute the existence of the subject as so qualified he must state his own proof at the beginning. If the opponent does not agree to this, we have to point out that in his argument also we can find the same defect. So it gets included in the ‘Contradiction of one’s own principles’.

Deducing the attributes of probandum in all other objects possessing an attribute other than the proponent’s probandum is called Anityasama e.g., if sound is not eternal, because it is produced, then let every object be non-eternal, because it is existent. This jāti is not different from Aviśesasama. The Siddhāntins are of opinion that it should not be treated as an independent jāti.

23. Confronting the opponent by deducing the doubtful nature of the probans is according to some ‘kāryasama’ e.g., sound is non-eternal, because it emanates after some effect. The opponent asks: Is the emanation of sound after some effort a case of manifestation or origination? This is a valid answer if it be adduced with a view to prove that the probans is otherwise accounted for.

Udayana defines ‘Kāryasama’ as follows: ‘refuting the proponent’s argument by pointing out the non-established nature of one of the three (1) subject, (2) probandum, (3) refuting what is imagined by one’s self to be the probans, e.g., when the proponent says that sound is non-eternal, because it is produced, the opponent replies that producibility of the probans is not established. The opponent then suggests a probans namely ‘emanation with some effort’ and he subsequently refutes it by pointing out that it is otherwise accounted for. This is a case of perversion (chala).
SECTION V.

Hetvābhāsa (fallacies of the probans).

The twenty-second vulnerable point in the Nyāya list is Hetvābhāsa. Jayatūrtha fully states the ancient Nyāya classification of the fallacies of the probans, and then points out their subsumption under the six defects of inference already noted.1 There is no unanimity of opinion about the number of fallacies. Kaṇḍāda accepts only three. The names of Hetvābhāsas are not the same in all Nyāya works. Gautama mentions five Hetvābhāsas: (1) Savyabhicāra, (2) Viruddha, (3) Prakaraṇasama, (4) Sādhyasama, and (5) Atitakāla. Of these the first two are identical with those given by Annambhaṭṭa, the author of Tarkasaṅgraha. Prakaraṇasama is that which leaves the conclusion doubtful, and the probans there proves the probandum of both the proponent and the opponent. This is not different from the defect ‘counter probans’ (Satpratipakṣa). Sādhyasama hetu is that probans which is as doubtful as the probandum and is the same as (Asiddhi). Kālāṭita is not different from the sublated (Bāḍhita). Some of the ancient Nyāya writers have added Anadhyavasita, as a fallacy. Sarīkara Mīśra has identified it with Anupasamaharin; therefore it comes under Anaikāntika.

Jayatūrtha enumerates seven types of fallacies according to Nyāya: (1) the non-established (asiddha), (2) the contrary (viruddha), (3) the non-conclusive (anaikānta), (4) the non-determinate (anadhyavasita), (5) the adduced out of time or sublated (kālāṭayāpadiṣṭa), (6) the counter probans (satpratipakṣa) and (7) the similar to the context (Prakaraṇasama).

Of these seven we have already pointed out that ‘anadhyavasita’ is a case of anupasamaharin. Prakaraṇasama is not different from satpratipakṣa. Kālāṭayāpadiṣṭa is another name for ‘Bāḍha.’ Thus we find Jayatūrtha’s enumeration is not essentially different from the five fallacies of Annambhaṭṭa.

A valid probans has five characteristics: (1) it is present in the subject and (2) the example; (3) it is non-existent in the counter example; (4) it has a non-sublated probandum and (5) it has no counter probans refuting it. In the positively and the negatively concomitant probans all the five characteristics are necessary to ensure validity. In the probans whose concomitance is merely positive or merely negative, four of the above mentioned characteristics are enough to ensure validity. The merely positive probans has no negative instance, and the merely negative probans has no positive instance. The absence of a few of the above mentioned characteristics forms cases of the defects of the probans.

I. The cognition of the non-existence of the probans in the subject constitutes asiddhi. It is of four kinds: (a) non-establishment of pervasion

1. Pramāṇapaddhati; p. 351, Janārdhana’s commentary.
(vyāpyatvāsiddhi) (b) non-establishment of the locus (āśrayāsiddhi) (3) non-establishment of being in the subject (svarūpāsiddhi) and (d) non-establishment of the valid cognition of this probans (etatpramityasiddhi).

Ia. 'Vyāpyatvāsiddhi' is of two kinds: (1) having no relation to the probandum, e.g., everything is momentary, because it is an existent. As the probans in the above inference has no positive or negative pervasion it gets subsumed under the defect Ayuṣāpti i.e. non-pervasion. (2) Having a relation conditioned by an adjunct (upādhi). The adjunct pervades the probandum, and does not pervade the probans: e.g., In the following inference, cruelty in Vedic sacrifices is sinful, because it is cruelty, like the cruelty to a Brahmin. Here the adjunct is 'scriptural condemnation'. The adjunct pervades the probandum i.e., sinfulness. 'Wherever there is sinfulness there is scriptural condemnation'. It does not pervade the probans i.e., cruelty. In the subject 'Vedic sacrifices' there is the non-existence of the adjunct. The adjunct is the pervader and the probandum is the pervaded. From the non-existence of the adjunct in the subject we can deduce the non-existence of the probandum on the ground that the absence of the pervader leads to the absence of the pervaded. The non-existence of the adjunct is the probans that proves the non-existence of the probandum. The counter inference takes the following form: Sacrificial cruelty is not sinful, because it is not condemned by scriptures, like eating. Those cases where we cognise the adjunct before the debate get included under the defect non-pervasion (Ayuṣāpti). Those inferences where we cognise the adjunct after the debate get included under the defect (Samabala-pramāṇavirodha), because the counter inference is as valid as the proponent’s inference.

Ib. The non-establishing of locus (Āśrayāsiddhi) is of two kinds: (1) the non-existent locus e.g., the horns of a hare are sharp, because they are horns, like the horns of a cow. The example for āśrayāsiddhi stated here is intermixed with defects like 'contradiction by valid knowledge', so it is no defect of probans at all. As soon as we state the proposition ‘the horns of a hare are sharp’ we cognise the defect that it is opposed to pramāṇa. From this defect namely contradiction by pramāṇa the defect of the probans is derived. So the independent defect to be pointed out here is a contradiction by valid knowledge. Hence it is no defect of the probans. (2) proving the established, e.g., stating before the thiest the following inference which proves the existence of God according to the Nyāya school: ‘The world and other objects have an agent, because they are produced. This gets included in Asaṅgati, because it sets out to prove that for which there is no expectancy.’

Ic. The non-establishment of being in the subject is of many kinds e.g., sound is non-eternal because it is an object of the sense of sight. This is a case of non-establishment through a different locus (Vyadhikaranaśiddhi). It is not a defect according to the Siddhāntin. Non-establishment through a futile substrate is subsumed under ‘Adhika’.
Id. Non-establishment of the valid cognition of this probans (etatpramitiyasiddhi)\(^1\) e.g., mistaking steam as smoke. This gets included in Avyāpti (non-pervasion).

II. The existence of the probans in the subject and in the negative instance is the defect Viruddha, e.g., sound is eternal, because it is produced. This is subsumed under the defect non-pervasion (Avyāpti), because it is related to the non-existence of the probandum.

III. The probans existing in the subject, in the positive instance and in the negative instance is called non-conclusive (anaikāntika) e.g. sound is eternal, because it is an object of knowledge. This also gets included in non-pervasion, because it is related to the probandum and its non-existence.

IV. The probans which is found in the subject alone and is not efficient to prove the probandum constitutes the defect non-determinate (anadhyavasita). They are of three kinds: (1) that which has no negative or positive instances, e.g., all things are non-eternal because they are existents, (2) that which has both the instances e.g., the earth is eternal, because it has smell, and (3) that which is present only in the subject e.g. sound is nameable, because it has soundness (śabdatva). This defect gets subsumed under (Avyāpti).

V. The presence of a probans in the subject along with the probandum which is sublated by another pramāna is called Kālātyayāpadisā: e.g., fire is not hot, because it is a substance. The probandum gets sublated by our perception of heat in fire. This gets included in prabalaṃpramāṇavirodha.

VI. The probans which proves the probandum of both the opponent and the proponent is called prakaraṇasama, e.g., the world which is under dispute is mithyā, because it is seen. Some are of opinion that there is no such probans. This is subsumed under the defect samabalaṃpramāṇavirodha.

Unlike the treatment in early Nyāya works the fallacies of the subject and the example are treated by the Siddhāntins separately. The fallacies of subject are cognised by the mere statement of the proposition. The fallacies of subject are included under Svākriyāvirodha or Svānyāyavirodha, e.g., my mother is barren; the object of knowledge does not depend upon the means of knowledge. As the fallacies of the example are cognised after the cognition of the probans, they are treated as separated fallacies. Madhva recognises two fallacies of the example: (1) lack of probandum (sādhyavaikalya): e.g., Manas is non-eternal because it is corporeal, like the prime atom. The 'Atom' i.e., the example has no 'non-eternality' (2) lack of probans (sādhanaavaikalya) e.g., Manas is non-eternal because it is corporeal, like activity. In 'activity' i.e., example there is the non-existence of the probans, i.e., corporeality. The defect 'lack of probandum' in an example makes the example the negative instance where the probandum should not exist. Thus it proves to be a case of the non-conclusive or contradictory. The defect 'lack of probans' gets included in Vyāpyatvāsiddhi.

---

1. This type of Asiddhi is not found in Nyāya classification.
JAINISM UNDER THE MUSLIM RULE

By

KAMTA PRASAD JAIN

The invasions of the Mohomedans on India began since the eighth century A.D. and as ambitious foreigners, they had little chance at the outset to get settled in the country. Rather they came with the desire of plunder and murder. They did so and returned full with camel-loads of wealth. Their inhuman atrocities filled the hearts of Hindus with fearful hostility. But with the times, the mutual feelings changed. Muslim invaders settled in India and decided to rule as Indian kings. We find Babar instructing his son Humayun in the following remarkable words:—

"O Son, the kingdom of India is full of different religions. It is incumbent on thee to wipe all religious prejudices off the tablet of thy heart; administer justice according to the ways of every religion."

The wise teaching of Babar prevailed and this paved the way for forming friendship with Hindu rulers, which was cemented by marriage contracts later on. Hindus heaved a sigh of relief and along with them Jainas also found an opportunity to observe and give full play to their predominating religious feelings, though after great suffering and sacrifice. In this respect the remarks of Prof. Helmuth von Glassenapp are justified and it is true that mutual relations between the Jainas and Mohomedans were friendly also.

Mohomedans first attacked Sind and they found it full of people called Samans. The ruler of Sind at the time was also a follower of Samanis, who observed the vow of Ahimsa minutely and had great confidence in their astrological predictions. No doubt the term saman or śramaṇa equally stands for Jaina and Buddhist ascetics. But independent evidence proves the existence of the Jainas in Sind up to 15th century A.D. Jainas are also more

3. Der Jainismus, p. 65.
5. Elliot, ibid., pp. 158-161.
6. That the Jainas used the term धर्म and prior to the Buddhists is also conclusively proved by the fact that the latter (Buddhists) styled themselves 'Sākyputtiya-Śramaṇas' as distinguished from the already existing Nigyantha Śramaṇas."—Buddhist India p. 143. Hence the term Śramaṇa is rightly applicable to the Jainas. Al-Badaoni has mentioned also the Jain ascetics by the term 'Śramaṇa' when he wrote that they along with Brähmaṇas had great access to Akbar the great. (Lowe, Al-Badaoni II, p. 264.)
famous for their vow of Ahimsa and knowledge of astronomy. The remarks of the Mohamedan writers about the people of Sind that "the infidels do not slaughter animals, nor do they eat flesh, fish or eggs"; are rightly applicable to the Jainas. Hence it is most probable that the people whom earlier Mohamedan invaders first encountered were Jainas and they treated each other with a compromising spirit.

It was the nudity of the Jaina saints, whom Suleman found in a good number in India, which specially attracted the attention of these Mohamedan invaders. It is said about Sultan Mohammad Ghori that he at least entertained one of them, since his wife desired to see the chief of Digambaras.

During the latter period of Khilji, Tugalaq and Lodi kings, Jainas seem to have been so much predominant as to be successful in attracting the attention of a king like Allauddin Muhammadshah Khilji. He was by nature cruel and implacable and his only care was the welfare of his kingdom. He had no consideration even for Islam and disregarded the provisions of the Muslim Law. Yet he was a just king and ruled with a good heart but a severe hand. Consequently his subjects were more loyal than ever. During his reign grain, clothes and other necessities of life were cheap, the dealings of bazaar people were honest and the roads were safe in all directions. Even without the patronage of the Sultan many learned and great men flourished. It is said that the two Brahmanas by name Ragho and Chetan had great influence on Allaudin and instigated him in religious matters. They beguiled him against the naked Jaina saints also. The Sultan summoned one of them. There was no learned Digambaracarya at the time in northern India. So the Jainas ran to South India and succeeded in inducing Acarya Mahasena to come over to Delhi to defend the Jaina Faith. Mahasena appeared before Allauddin and held religious discussions with his adversaries. The Sultan bent his head before his profound learning and asceticism. A Digambara Jaina by name Purapacandra of Delhi was a friend of the Sultan and it is perhaps through him that Allauddin came into touch with a Digambaracarya. Svetambara Jainacarya Ramacandrasuri was also honoured by the Sultan. In 1297-1298 A.D. Allauddin conquered the whole of Gujerat.

1. ELLIOT, loc. cit., p. 97.
2. Taking of meat and fish had never been prohibited among the Brahmins and Buddhists. See my Hindi book 'भगवान महानेत्रको आहिसा' (Delhi).
3. ELLIOT, loc. cit., p. 6.
4. Indian Antiquary, Vol. XXI, p. 361.—"The wife of Muhammad Ghor desired to see the chief of the Digambaras".
10. Der Jainismus (Berlin), p. 66.
and it seems probable that he was the Mohomedan king who met Srutavīra Swāmī, the Digambara saint of Alakesvārapura and Bharavaccha.¹

During the Tughalaq reign, the Jainas enjoyed much freedom, since more than one king of that line are reported to have entertained the Jaina Gurus. Sūra and Vira, the two Jaina chiefs of the Prāgvāṭa clan, were the ministers of Ghyasuddin Tughalaq.² Besides, it is evident from the Padmavati Basti stone inscription of Humsa in Mysore State that Sultan Mahmud or Mohommada entertained the Karnāṭaka Jaina Guru named Simhaṅkārti.³ Prof. B. A. Saletoṅe has identified this king with Mohommada Tughalaq. He writes that “The only ruler who satisfies all these conditions was Muḥammad Tughalaq, who ascended the throne in A.D. 1325 and reigned till A.D. 1351. Dr. Ishwari Prasad, correcting the erroneous nature of the statements made by modern writers on Indian history concerning that ruler, has amply shown that Sultan Muḥammad Tughalaq was the most learned and accomplished of Muslim kings who sat on the throne of Delhi since the Muslim conquests; that he was well versed both in Islamic and Aristotelian philosophy; that he loved to argue with philosophers; that theologians and rhetoricians were afraid to dispute with him because of his extraordinary gifts of intellect; that he showed great regard for the religious susceptibilities of the Hindus; and that till A.D. 1337, when Fakhruddin usurped the governorship of Lakhnauti and made himself an independent prince, Bengal continued to be under the protection of Sultan Muḥammad Tuglaq. There is nothing strange in Simhaṅkārti having won renown in the court of Sultan Muḥammad Tuglaq. He may have been only one of the many philosophers invited by that accomplished Sultan to Delhi”.⁴

The next Tughalaq king who followed in the footsteps of his predecessor was Sultan Firozshāh Tughalaq. He, too, was famous for his learning and philanthropy. He assigned 36 lacs of tankas for learned and religious men and about 100 lacs in pensions and gifts to the poor and needy.⁵ This liberal-minded Sultan, also, invited Digambara Jaina saints and entertained them at his court and palace. It was for the sake of the queen of Firozshāh that the Jainācārya put on a piece of cloth to hide his nakedness and appeared before her clothed. Although he took prāyaścitta for this, his

---

1. ‘अलक्षेप्युपत्तावरुपचन्दनगरे राजाधिराजपरमेश्वर यवन-राज-किरोमणि महम्मदपत्तशाह सुरस्यासमस्या पृणोदिलितिनिपाततारस्वप्रयासास्वेत्तोक्त श्री शुत्रिष्टिस्मानाम।’—ऋण-सिद्धान्तमार्कर, मा. १, किरण २—३, गृ. १५।
Allaudin was known also as Muḥammad Shah.

2. Somacaritragañi, Gurumārakñākara, quoted by Dr. B. A. Saletoṅe in the Karnāṭaka Historical Review, Vol. IV, p. 86. i.n.

3. “.........Ṣrimad Dilli-pure .... muda Suritrānasya mārdkṛteḥ nirjityāsū sabhāvamanam jinaṅgurum Baudhādi-vādi-vrajam śrī-ṃuṅtārakṛnno Śīrṅha-Kirtī-muni ra ḍhayaṅk-viḍā-guruḥ).”


undue liberty, the example set by him was soon adopted by his followers and the sect of Bhaṭṭārakas, with their clothed Yatis came into existence.¹ The Jaina poet Ratnasékhara was honoured also by Sultan Firozsháh.² Further it is reported about this Sultan that he invited many Brähmanas and Seoras to read the inscription on the pillar of Aśoka, which he got removed to Delhi from the village Khízrabad.³ The Jainas in the Punjab side are called Seoras even to this day. So the Seoras invited by the Sultan were no other than the Jainas. These facts are enough to point the great influence which Jainas wielded during the Tughlaq regime.

During the period between A.D. 1526-1761, the kings of the famous Sura and Mughal dynasties ruled over India and the Jainas were fortunate to enjoy the patronage of some of them.

Among the Sura kings, Sikandara Sultan, who was on the throne of Delhi in A.D. 1554, honoured the Jaina Guru Viśālakirti of Karnāṭaka. It is probably due to this patronising spirit of the Mohamedan rulers which they showed towards the Jaina Gurus that the naked Jaina saints freely moved all over India during the period, as is evident from their mention by Marco Polo,⁵ Tavernier,⁶ Bernier⁷ and Mallik Jayasi.⁸

Now turning to the Mughal period of Muslim Rule, we find Jainas enjoying much more liberty than they had ever enjoyed before. The naked sect of the Jaina ascetics was also influential to such an extent that it attracted the attention of Abul Fazal, who mentioned it in his “Ayeen-i-Akbari”.⁹ The modern town of Bairat in Jaipur State was the centre of the Digambara Jainas at the time. Sāhu Ṭoḍar, a Digambara Jaina of Bhatāniyā Kola was the Mint Officer under the Imperial Service of Akbar.¹⁰ This Sāhu Ṭoḍar patronised the Jaina poet Rājamalla of Bairāṭ who had spoken highly in

---

2. Der Jainismus, p. 66.
5. "Some Yogis went stark naked, because as they said, they had come naked into the world and desired nothing that was of this world."
   —Yule’s Marco Polo, II p. 366.
6. "These fakirs ordinarily travel in troops each of which has its chief or superior . . . they go perfectly nude . . ."
7. "I have often met, generally in the territory of some Rājā, bands of these naked fakirs.
   —Bernier, Travels in the Mogul Empire, p. 317.
8. Mallik Muhammada Jāyasi was in service of Shershāh and he wrote the famous Hindi classical poem "Padmāvata", in which he refers to naked saints.
(2.60).
10. नानाधृतसारदक्षः—‘योंसालुटोड़रः मुखः’।
    —जम्मूत्सारदक्षिण (बम्बई) पृ.७-९.
favour of the great emperor and informs us that Akbar abolished the ‘Jazia’ tax and prohibited the sale of intoxicants. And if we believe the Jesuit missionary Pinheiro, we must say that Akbar followed the sect of the Jains. No doubt he showed great kindness and patronage towards the Jains and their Gurus. Sri Hiravijaysuri, Vijayasena and Jinacandra of the Svetambara sect enjoyed power and had much influence over him. The Jaina principle of Akinsa greatly influenced the character and religious policy of Akbar. He issued Firms to the Jains for stopping cruelty and killing of animals at many a sacred Jaina place. The above-mentioned Jainacaryas were honoured also by Emperor Jehangir, who conferred the title of “Yuga Pradhana” on Jinasintha the disciple of Jinacandra. The Digambara Jaina poet Benarsidas, it is reported, was favoured by Shâh Jehan, whose son Muradbux, while governor of Gujarat, showed great kindness to Johari Sântidasa of Ahmednagar. Aurangzeb appointed this foremost Jaina jeweller of Gujarat as one of his Darbaris. Although Aurangzeb was famous for his bigotedness, yet it seems that the profound learning, unpolluted piousseness, natural simplicity and the vigorous feeling to do good to mankind at large of the Jaina saints so much affected the heart of the despotical emperor that he was inclined to entertain and honour their chief. It is obviously the reason which made the contemporary Jaina poets to shower praises on this sovereign.

1. ‘मुमोच छल्के तथ जेटियानिविन्ह स याबृदोधररूपराधस्।
धराथ नव: सरितापते पव: यश: शशी धीमुखरणस् व॥ २७॥

2. ‘He (Akbar) follows the sect of the Jains.’

3. ‘... the Jain holy men undoubtedly gave Akbar prolonged instruction for years which largely influenced his actions; and they secured his assent to their doctrines so far that he was reputed to have been converted to Jainism.’
—Smith, Jain Teachers of Akbar.

8. “(The Jaina) Acharyas ... by their character, attainments and scholarship ...... commanded the respect of even Muhammadan sovereigns like Allāuddin and Auranga Padusha (Aurangzeb).” Studies in South Indian Jainism, II, p. 132.

9. औरज़ाह बलीको राज, पायो कवित्तन परम समाज।
चक्विनिस्व जानमें भयो, फेरत आनि उदवे हो गयो॥
जाके राज परम सुख पाय, करी कथा हम जिन गुन गाय।”
—कवि विनोरीदास
In South India too, the relations between the Muslim rulers and the Jaina were not altogether hostile. Even Hyder Ali, the bigoted Muslim king, granted villages to the Jaina temples, though owing to the oppressive nature of the government the great festivals at Sravanabelagola and other places were stopped.\(^1\) It is reported about the king of Bijapur that he was a friend and ally of the Jaina queen Bhairavadevi of Gerossapa.\(^2\)

It is a fact that the greatest number of Jaina temples were demolished and innumerable images were destroyed during the Mohamedan invasions, but it is equally true that the greatest number of the Jaina temples and images were constructed and sanctified during this period. It is strange to note that in Vikrama Sārivat 1533 and 1548 one devout Jaina by name Jivarāj Pāpārīval got thousands of Jina images consecrated and sent them to every temple in India.\(^3\) These images are found almost in all the Digambara Jaina temples even to-day.

Thus the outline of the situation and condition of the Jaina during the Mohamedan Rule proves to be a promising field of research for the scholars.

---

2. BUCHANAN, *Travels in the districts of Kanara and Malabar*.
THE BHĀGAVATA-PURĀṆA

By
RAJENDRA CHANDRA HAZRA

The Bhāgavata is the most popular of the extant Purāṇas. It belongs to the Bhāgavatas and is divided into 12 Skandhas or books dealing with cosmogony, genealogies, myths, legends etc. It also contains a few chapters on smṛti-matter, viz., III, 30 on the results of actions (karma-vipāka), VII, 11-13 and XI, 17-18 on the duties of the castes and āśramas, and VII, 14-15 on funeral sacrifices and holy places.

It has been held by the Śāktas that the Bhāgavata is not a Mahāpurāṇa as the Vaiśṇavas claim. But these Śāktas themselves are not unanimous about the identity of the ‘Bhāgavata’ named in the lists of ‘eighteen Mahāpurāṇas.’ Some of them say that it is the Kālikā-purāṇa which, on account of its treatment of the birth and exploits of Bhagavati, is called ‘Bhāgavata.’ Some, again, claim that it is the Devi-bhāgavata. It is, therefore, necessary to see which one is the real Mahāpurāṇa.

An examination of the Nibandhas shows that the authors of these works are all in favour of the Bhāgavata (i.e. Vaiśṇava Bhāgavata). Narasimha Vājapeyin, a noted Nibandha-writer of Orissa, disapproves the claim of the Kālikā-purāṇa to be the ‘Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇa’ by referring to the opinion of Lakṣmīdharā. The verses quoted from the ‘Bhāgavata’ by Ballālasena, Madhvācārya, Govindānanda, Raghunandana, Gopalāhata and others, are very often found in the present Bhāgavata but not in the Kālikā-purāṇa or the Devibhāgavata. Of these two latter Purāṇas, or rather Upapurāṇas, the Kālikā has been quoted by Aparārka, Ballālasena, Madhavācārya, Madanapāla, Śūlapāni, Govindānanda, Raghunandana and others with the express mention of its well-known title; whereas the name of the Devibhāgavata has not been mentioned in any of the numerous Nibandhas we have examined.

The superior position of the Bhāgavata over the Devibhāgavata is further established by a comparison of their contents. In the Bhāgavata there is no mention of the Devibhāgavata nor is there any attempt to prove its superior position, but in the Devibhāgavata (Vaṅga, ed., I, 3, 16) the Bhāgavata has been included among the Upapurāṇas obviously with a view to establishing its own claim to the position of a Mahāpurāṇa. Further, in the Bhāgavata, Śuka, son of Vyāsa, is presented as given to complete renunciation of the world from his

1. In the following pages the Vaṅgavāśi edition has been used.
2. aṣṭādasēbhyās tu purāṇaṁ yat tu dvṣyate | vijāṇidhvaṁ muniśreṣṭhās tad et ebhyo vinirgataṁ | vinirgataṁ samudbhūtam | yathā kālikā-purāṇādīnī lakṣmīdharah | evam ca sati bhagavatyā idaṁ bhāgavataṁ iti kālikā-purāṇaṁ bhāgavata-padenoktam iti ye vadanti te nirastāḥ |—Nītyācārapradīpa, pp. 18-19.
childhood. But the author of the Devibhāgavata probably saw that an ideal character like Śuka might instigate others, having much less indifference, to renounce the world and thus disturb the discipline of society. Hence he painted Śuka in a quite different colour in the Devibhāgavata. Here Śuka, who is about to give up the world, goes to Janaka at the request of Vyāsa. Janaka convinces him that it is highly necessary to pass through all the stages of life before taking up Sannyāsa; otherwise the real taste of worldly enjoyments remains unknown and the mind is not strengthened. Consequently, Śuka gives up the idea of renunciation and repairs to his father’s hermitage to live with him. All the above evidences taken together make it likely that the Bhāgavata is the real Mahāpurāṇa.

As to the date of the Bhāgavata, scholars are generally of opinion that it is a very late work not earlier than the 9th century A.D. But such a late date cannot reasonably be given to the Purāṇa. It has been said above that the verses quoted by Ballālasena (in his Adhutasaṅgara), Madhvācārya, Raghunandana, Gopālabhaṭṭa and others from the ‘Bhāgavata’, are very often found in the present Bhāgavata. In his Smṛti-candrikā (Mysore ed., Vol. I, p. 3) Devaṇabhhaṭṭa gives a few verses containing the names of the eighteen Mahāpurāṇas including the ‘Bhāgavata’. Ballālasena names a Bhāgavatapurāṇa in his Dānasāgara (India Office Ms, fol. 3b). That the Bhāgavatapurāṇa mentioned in the Dānasāgara is the same as the present Bhāgavata is proved by the following evidences. On fol. 3b of the Dānasāgara Ballālasena says that he did not draw upon the ‘Bhāgavata’ because it did not contain any chapter on gifts. As a matter of fact, the present Bhāgavata contains no chapter on this topic, whereas in the Devibhāgavata there is one, viz., IX, 29. Hence the Devibhāgavata is not the ‘Bhāgavata’ which Ballālasena means. As Ballālasena quotes in his Dānasāgara a number of verses from the Kālikā-purāṇa by expressly mentioning its title, this Purāṇa also cannot be meant by the name ‘Bhāgavata.’ Further, Ballālasena names with derision those Purāṇas which were influenced by Tantricism. But he expresses no such feeling about the ‘Bhāgavata.’ Hence it is sure that Ballālasena means the present Bhāgavata, which is, therefore, to be dated not later than 1050 A.D. Ānandatīrtha Madhva wrote a well-known commentary on the Bhāgavata. He also draws upon the Purāṇa in his Bhāṣya on the Bhagavadgītā. In this Bhāṣya (ed. Viśṭhala śārmā, Bombay, p. 7) he quotes from the ‘Nārāyanāṣṭākṣara-kalpa’ a verse which mentions the Bhāga-

1. C. V. VAIDYA, JBBRAS, 1925, 144 ff.; BHANDARKAR, Vaiṣṇavism, Śaivism and Minor Religious Systems, p. 49; PARGITER, Ancient Indian Historical Tradition, p. 80; FARQUHAR, Outline of the Religious Literature of India, pp. 229 ff.; WINTERTNITZ, Indian Literature, Vol. I, p. 556; and so on. WILSON, MACDONELL, COLEBROOKE and BURNOUF placed the Bhāgavata in the 13th century A.D.
2. bhāgavatāt ca purāṇām brāhmaṇa caiva nāraṇīyam ca | dāna-vidhi-sūnyam etat trayaṁ iha na nibaddham avadhaṁ ||
3. In his Brahma-sūtra-bhāṣya also Madhva quotes verses from a ‘Bhāgavata-tantra’ and ‘Bhāgavata.’ But these verses are not found in the present Bhāgavata.
vata as a work of Vyāsa, and in another quotation from the ‘Nāradiya’ the Purāṇa is called a Viṣṇu-veda (see Gītā-bhāṣya, p. 152). In his Madhva-vijaya (IV, 49-52), Nārāyaṇa Paṇḍitācārya, son of a direct disciple of Madhva, informs us that textual problems relating to the Bhāgavata already began in Madhva’s time. The great teacher Rāmānuja also was not unacquainted with the Bhāgavata.1 Alberūni, in his account of India, gives two lists of Purāṇas. About one of these lists he says: “Another somewhat different list of Purāṇas has been read to me from the Viṣṇu-purāṇa. I give it here in extenso......... Brāhma, Pādma, Viṣṇu, Śiva, Bhāgavata i.e. Vāsudeva..............”2 The use of the term ‘Vāsudeva’ with reference to the Bhāgavata shows that Alberūni means the (Vaiṣṇava) Bhāgavata, and that claims were already made by other works to be known as Bhāgavata. Hence the date of the Bhāgavata preceded that of Alberūni by such a long period of time that the position of the Bhāgavata had already become enviable. Hence the date of the Bhāgavata cannot possibly be later than 800 A.D.

A few verses are found quoted from the ‘Srimad-bhāgavata’ in Abhinavagupta’s Gṛṭṭhı̄tha-saṁgraḥa, a commentary on the Bhagavad-gītā. But these verses, which tally with Bhāgavata II, 1, 3-4 and XI, 20, 17, are not reliable; because in an old Ms written in Śāradā characters they are found not in the running text of the commentary but on the margin. Hence it may be that these verses were written by some one on the margin of his Ms but were later incorporated into the text by the scribes who copied from this Ms.3 Abhinavagupta’s mention of ‘gajendra-mokṣaṇa’ also need not be taken to point to the Bhāgavata, because chapters on ‘gajendra-mokṣaṇa’ are found in other Purāṇas also. For instance, Vāmana-p. 85 and Viṣṇudharmottara I, 194 deal with ‘gajendra-mokṣaṇa.’ The verse quoted from the ‘Bhāgavata’ in Gauḍapāda’s Uttaragītā-bhāṣya (ed. Vāṇī Viḷās Press, Srirangam, p. 66; Bombay ed., p. 27) is also equally doubtful. In a Ms4 which appears to preserve an older version of the Bhāṣya, this verse is not found. How the text of the Bhāṣya was corrupted with later additions and alterations is shown best by a quotation from a Tantra occurring in another Ms5 of the same work. It is to be noted that no quotation from any Tantra is found in the printed editions or the other Ms referred to above. Hence it seems that the verse under consideration is spurious.

In spite of the little help rendered by the doubtful verses mentioned above, the Bhāgavata does not seem to be a late work. A comparison, so far as

2. SACHAU, Alberūni’s India, I, p. 131.
4. No. 4504, Dacca University Ms Library. This is a Bengal Ms written in Bengali characters.
5. No. K 558E, D. U. Ms Lib. It was copied at Benares and brought from there by post. This Ms also is written in Bengali characters.
theology is concerned, between this and the Kūrma-p. shows that the Bhāgavata is earlier than the Viṣṇu Kūrma-p., which was, unlike the Bhāgavata, much influenced by the Sākta ideas. The date of the Viṣṇu Kūrma-p. is to be placed between 550 and 650 A.D. So the Bhāgavata cannot possibly be later than 600 A.D. Thus we get the lower limit of its date.

It has been said that the Viṣṇu-p. is earlier than the Bhāgavata. The latter contains the biography of Kṛṣṇa which is here given in much greater detail than in the Viṣṇu-p. and in the Hariyamśa. Hence it seems to be later than the Hariyamśa also. The latter being dated about 400 A.D., the Bhāgavata cannot possibly be earlier than about 500 A.D. Thus the date of composition of the Bhāgavata falls in the sixth century A.D. It is highly probable that the Purāṇa was composed in the former half of this century.

4. There are also other evidences which confirm the above date of the Purāṇa.

Viz.,

I. (i) The two verses of the Māthāra-vṛttī (on Iśvarakṛṣṇa’s Śaṅkhya-kārikās 2 and 51), which, as B. N. Krishnamurti Sharma has pointed out in Annals of the Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute, XIV, pp. 216-7, have their parallels in the Bhāgavata-p. (I, 8, 52 and I, 6, 35), do not appear in Paramārtha’s Chinese translation of the Vṛttī. So, the text of the Māthāra-vṛttī is doubtful and cannot, therefore, be used to assign the Bhāgavata to a date earlier than that of the Vṛttī.

(ii) The mention of the Tamil Vaishnava saints in Bhāgavata XI, 5,38-40, and of the Hūnas as accepting Vaishnavism in Bhāgavata II, 4, 18 and II, 7, 46 shows that the Bhāgavata cannot be earlier than the last quarter of the fifth century A.D.

II. (i) Nārādiya-p. I, 96 gives the contents of a ‘Bhāgavata’ which agree with those of our present Bhāgavata.

(ii) In its incomplete list of the Mahāpurāṇas the Bṛhad-dharma-purāṇa (ASB ed., 25, 20 f.) names, in place of the ‘Bhāgavata,’ the Mahābhāgavata which is a clear protest against the supremacy of Kṛṣṇa in the Bhāgavata.

(iii) ‘If the Govindaśākta be a genuine work of Śaṅkara, as the sixteenth century Bengal Vaishnava writer, Jiva Gosvāmin, thought and as Belvalkar and others of this day think, Śaṅkara must have known the Bhāgavata.’

(iv) ‘While the author of the Purāṇa appears to be familiar with the “Ajātavāda” doctrine, he does not know the “Anirvacanīyatā” doctrine posited by Śaṅkara.’

(v) In the chapter on Balarāma’s pilgrimage in Bhāgavata X, there is no mention of Puri which is said to have been known to Śaṅkara and Rāmānuja.
The date of the smṛti-chapters of the Bhāgavata is most probably the same as that of the Purāṇa itself. It is not, however, possible to say anything definitely. If they are interpolated, they have been connected with the original parts in such a way that it is very difficult to separate them.

The inclusion of the Buddha in the three lists of the incarnations of Viṣṇu need not disprove the above date. These lists differ from one another in length as well as order. So they can never be the works of a single hand. Of these three, those given in Bhāgavata I, 3 and VI 8 are undoubtedly spurious. The remaining one also does not seem to have belonged originally to the Bhāgavata.

It can hardly be denied that the Bhāgavata has been revised and emended at times. But the emendations have been made so carefully that it is very difficult to find them out. The mention of Tulasī, Tantra, the ten characteristics of a Mahāpurāṇa, etc. may be due to these revisions and emendations.

The view put forth by Amarnath Roy in BSOS, Vol. VIII, 1935-37, pp. 107 ff. that the Bhāgavata has been influenced by the Kārikās of Gauḍapāda seems to have a very weak basis, because the philosophical ideas, words and similes found common to the Bhāgavata and the Kārikās are of a general character and might as well have been derived by the former from works used by Gauḍapāda as his sources. The use of old terms and ideas is not at all exceptional with the Bhāgavata. Other Purāṇas also are found to have derived words, ideas and similes from very ancient sources.

Even if the influence of the Gauḍapāda-kārikās on the Bhāgavata could be proved finally, it would hardly affect the date to which we have assigned the Purāṇa, the date of Gauḍapāda himself being more or less debatable. Barnett (JRAS, 1910, pp. 1361 f.) and Jacobi (JAOS, 1913, pp. 51f.) place Gauḍapāda not later than 500 A.D.

Matsya-p. (Vaṅga. ed.) 53, 20-21 describe the ‘Bhāgavata’ as follows:

yatṛādhikṛtya gāyatrīṃ varṇyate dharma-vistarāḥ
vṛtrāsura-vadhopetāṃ tad bhāgavatam ucyate ||
sārasvatasya kalpaśya madhye ye syur naṛottamāḥ
|tad-vṛtāntodbhavaṃ loke tad bhāgavatam ucyate ||

This description does not agree fully with the contents of the present Bhāgavata which begins with the Gāyatrī and contains the story of the killing of Vṛtra but does not refer to the Sārasvata Kalpa. On the other hand, it is said in Bhāgavata II, 8,28 that the Bhagavat declared the Bhāgavata to Brahmā in the Brahma-kalpa. So, it seems that there was an earlier Bhāgavata which was the prototype of the present Bhāgavata and from which chapters have been retained in the latter. It is most probably this earlier work which is mentioned in Viṣṇu-p. III, 6, 22, Kürma-p. I, 1, 13, etc.

1. See Bhāgavata I, 3, II, 7 and VI, 8.
### APPENDIX

Verses quoted from the 'Bhāgavata-p.'

or 'Bhāgavata' in

1. **Adbhutasāgara**
   (ed. Benares)
   of Ballālasena,
   **Bhāgavata-p.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>p. 354</td>
<td>= I, 14, 16a.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p. 355</td>
<td>= III, 17, 5.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p. 378</td>
<td>= I, 14, 16b.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p. 410 (twice)</td>
<td>= III, 17, 7; I, 14, 18a.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p. 426</td>
<td>= I, 14, 20a.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p. 481</td>
<td>= I, 14, 20 b-c.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p. 625</td>
<td>= I, 14, 13b.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p. 642</td>
<td>= I, 14, 19b.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p. 643</td>
<td>= III, 17, 13a.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p. 645</td>
<td>= I, 14, 19b.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p. 653 (twice)</td>
<td>= III, 17, 11b and 10.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p. 654</td>
<td>= I, 14, 12b-13a.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p. 658 (twice)</td>
<td>= III, 17, 9; I,14,12a.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p. 709</td>
<td>= III, 17, 13.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p. 710</td>
<td>= I, 14, 15 and 17b.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p. 712</td>
<td>= III, 17, 4.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. Madhvācārya’s commentary on the **Bhāgavad-gītā**, **Bhāgavata-p.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>p. 64</td>
<td>= I, 2, 30b.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p. 152</td>
<td>= I, 2, 11b.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p. 410</td>
<td>= III, 5, 46-47.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p. 439</td>
<td>= VI, 4, 48a.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p. 444</td>
<td>= XI, 5, 48; IV,21,47; VII, 10, 15b-17a.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p. 470</td>
<td>= XI, 19, 36a.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p. 472</td>
<td>= III, 20, 49b.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p. 546 (twice)</td>
<td>= III, 26, 10; II, 2, 31a (second half).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p. 550</td>
<td>= I, 17, 20a.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p. 664 (twice)</td>
<td>= VIII, 6, 10b; XI, 28, 17b.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. **Haribhaktivilāsa**
   (pub. by Gurudas Chatterjee & Sons, Calcutta)
   of **Gopālabhaṭṭa**
   **Bhāgavata-p.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>p. 21</td>
<td>= I, 2, 23.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p. 412</td>
<td>= I, 6, 34.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p. 557</td>
<td>= I, 18, 13.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pp. 574-7</td>
<td>= I, 1, 2; I, 3, 40-42a; I, 3, 45; and I, 7, 6-7.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p. 581</td>
<td>= I, 2, 17.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p. 583</td>
<td>= I, 2, 18.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pp. 590-591</td>
<td>= I, 1, 19 ; I, 18, 14.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p. 592</td>
<td>= I, 18, 10.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pp. 607-8</td>
<td>= I, 5, 22 ; I, 6, 35.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p. 675</td>
<td>= I, 1, 14.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p. 703 (twice)</td>
<td>= I, 5, 17 ; I, 2, 6.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p. 707</td>
<td>= I, 2, 7.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p. 710</td>
<td>= I, 7, 10.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p. 110</td>
<td>= II, 1, 6.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pp. 577-8</td>
<td>= II, 1, 9-10.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p. 584</td>
<td>= II, 3, 17.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p. 586</td>
<td>= II, 3, 12.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p. 587</td>
<td>= II, 2, 37.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p. 673</td>
<td>= II, 1, 11.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p. 690</td>
<td>= II, 3, 24.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p. 706</td>
<td>= II 2, 33-4.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p. 708</td>
<td>= II, 3, 10.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p. 731</td>
<td>= II, 4, 18.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p. 120</td>
<td>= III, 9, 25. The verse ‘deva prapannārtihara’ is not found.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p. 374</td>
<td>= III, 24, 31; III, 9, 11b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p. 506</td>
<td>= III, 25, 23.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p. 556</td>
<td>= III, 7, 19.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p. 561</td>
<td>= III, 9, 10.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p. 583</td>
<td>= III, 6, 36.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p. 587</td>
<td>= III, 25, 34.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p. 588</td>
<td>= III, 5, 46.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p. 591</td>
<td>= III, 5, 7.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p. 593</td>
<td>= III, 32, 19.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pp. 594-5</td>
<td>= III, 9, 7; III, 5, 14; III, 13, 50.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p. 616</td>
<td>= III, 9, 41.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p. 668</td>
<td>= III, 33, 7.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p. 675</td>
<td>= III, 9, 15.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p. 711</td>
<td>= III, 15, 25.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p. 718</td>
<td>= III, 25, 32.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p. 734</td>
<td>= III, 2, 23.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p. 1064</td>
<td>= III, 9, 25.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p. 119</td>
<td>= IV, 20, 29.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p. 547</td>
<td>= IV, 31, 22.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p. 551</td>
<td>= IV, 9, 12.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p. 552</td>
<td>= IV, 30, 35-37.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p. 557</td>
<td>= IV, 24, 57.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p. 558</td>
<td>= IV, 9, 11.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p. 567</td>
<td>= IV, 22, 11.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p. 568</td>
<td>= IV, 22, verses 7, 10, 13 and 14.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p. 584</td>
<td>= IV, 23, 12.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p. 644</td>
<td>= IV, 21, 31; IV, 31, 14.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p. 705</td>
<td>= IV, 11, 30.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

&c. &c.

Gopālabhaṭṭa has quoted numerous verses from the other Skandhas also; and these verses are almost all found in the extant Bhāgavata.

The 'Bhāgavata' verses quoted by Raghunandana and others also are in the majority of cases found in the present Bhāgavata, but it is needless to enlist them here.
ABHILAŚITĀRTHACINTĀMAṆI AND SİLPARATNA

By

G. H. KHARE.

The late Mr. T. A. GOPINATHRAO, in the appendix C to the first volume (IC) and appendix B to the second volume (II B) of his monumental work Elements of Hindu Iconography (EHI) often quotes passages from SİLPARATNA (SR) and an anonymous work added to it and described as Silparatnasāmyyo-
jite kasmiṁścit granthे (MSR). Even in the body of his book he refers to this work as 'a manuscript added at the end of Silparatna whose name is not known.' This very remark also appears at the end of the 'list of the important works consulted' which Mr. GOPINATHRAO has given at the beginning of the first volume of his work.

From the above remarks it is evident that Mr. GOPINATHRAO did not know the exact name of the work which he found added to Silparatna.

Fortunately while going through the first chapter or adhyāya of the third part or prakaraṇa of Abhilaśitārthacintāmaṇi (AC), in connection with the iconographic descriptions of deities, the resemblance of some passages from AC to those from the 25th paṭala or chapter of SR and extracts of MSR given by the late Mr. GOPINATHRAO struck me so much that I was tempted to compare all the passages from the former with those from the two latter works. As a result of my labour I found that out of the forty-five descriptions of images which occur in AC thirty-five coincide with those found in SR and MSR so literally that they must be reckoned as identical.

In order to illustrate my point I give below a detailed comparative table of the parallel passages from the above three works.

---

2. Mysore Oriental Library edition part I; the Gaekwad's Oriental Series edition is not useful for our purpose as the published part does not contain the chapter which I am referring to.
3. For this purpose I have used the Trivandrum Series edition of Silparatna and for the passages from MSR, I have relied on Mr. T. A. GOPINATHRAO'S work.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Icon</th>
<th>Abhilasitartha-Cintamanî</th>
<th>Silparatna or Ms. Added to Silparatna</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No. of verse in which the description begins.</td>
<td>No. of verses devoted to the description.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Visnu (24 varieties)</td>
<td>726</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>&quot; (with 8 hands)</td>
<td>733</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Vamana</td>
<td>735</td>
<td>1½</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Rama</td>
<td>737</td>
<td>½</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Nyaraha</td>
<td>738</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Narasinha</td>
<td>742</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Trivikrama</td>
<td>751</td>
<td>2½</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Matsya incarnation</td>
<td>753</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Kurma</td>
<td>754</td>
<td>½</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Brahma</td>
<td>754</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Mahadeva (with varieties)</td>
<td>759</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Ardhanarisvara</td>
<td>772</td>
<td>6½</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Umahesvara</td>
<td>779</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Harihara</td>
<td>785</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Kartikeya</td>
<td>792</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Vinayaka</td>
<td>799</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Kasyayanî</td>
<td>803</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Indra</td>
<td>811</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Agni</td>
<td>815</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Yama</td>
<td>820</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Niriti</td>
<td>823</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Varuna</td>
<td>825</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Vayu</td>
<td>827</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Kubera</td>
<td>829</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Isâna</td>
<td>832</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>7 Mothers</td>
<td>835</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Viresvara</td>
<td>837</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Srî</td>
<td>838</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Icon</td>
<td>No. of verse in which the description begins</td>
<td>No. of verses devoted to the description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Nāga</td>
<td>842</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Asura</td>
<td>844</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Dānava</td>
<td>845</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Piśača</td>
<td>848</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>Vetaḷa</td>
<td>849</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>Kṣetrapāla</td>
<td>850</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>Madana</td>
<td>852</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>Sūrya</td>
<td>858</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>Candra</td>
<td>863</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>Maṅgala</td>
<td>865</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>Buddha</td>
<td>867</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-41</td>
<td>Guru &amp; Śukra</td>
<td>869</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>Śani</td>
<td>871</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>Rāhu</td>
<td>872</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>Ketu</td>
<td>873</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>Graha (general)</td>
<td>874</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The above table clearly shows that out of the 45 headings, comprising 148 verses, under which various images have been described in AC, as many as 35 items of 107 verses are almost similar to those in SR and MSR, and not less than 94 verses are identical ad verbum. Thus one can judge for oneself how much one source must have drawn upon the other.

Now we know that the authorship of AC is ascribed to Cālukya Someśvara of Kalyāṇa and its date of composition is said to be Ś. 1051 (A.D. 1129). On the other hand the date of Śrīkumāra, the author of SR, though not settled finally, lies somewhere in the latter part of the sixteenth century of the Christian era. So we must conclude that it is Śrīkumāra who has borrowed from AC; perhaps the author of MSR also might have

made a free use of AC; but I cannot be too certain in this respect as the MSR is not before me.

One advantage which we can have from the above comparison is to restore superior readings for unintelligible or inferior readings from all the three works. I wish to show here how that can be done successfully. For this purpose I can cite not less than fifty examples. But as the space at my disposal would not allow me to do this, I must content myself with giving only a few but typical ones.

**Narasimha**

| AC | नीलोतपलुष्मिन्ति-च्याम् |
| SR | नीलोतपलुष्मिन्ति-च्याम् |

Here the reading of SR is absurd as it carries no meaning. Dala is the exact word which gives us the right meaning.

**Brahma**

| AC | कृष्णाचिन्तकरेवच्चम् |
| SR | कृष्णाचिन्तकरेवमौर्यम् |

Here SR certainly gives a superior reading; for it mentions the paint which is to be applied to the image of Brahma. The description of AC is defective inasmuch as it does not refer to any kind of paint.

| AC | दक्षिण वर्तम हस्तं तथायं खुबवर्णयत्र |
| SR | दक्षिण वर्तम हस्तं तथायं खुबवर्णयत्र |

Here the reading of AC is undoubtedly better, as subha, the reading of SR, is meaningless. If we are to accept the latter reading a question will arise as to what article one of the two left hands of Brahma should be shown to hold.

| AC | विभाण च पुरे वेदान पुरवानहस्त विन्यसेतु |
| SR | विभाण च चतुरो वेदान पुरवानहस्त विन्यसेतु |

Here the latter reading is apparently better. The former one includes two words purah and puratah meaning one and the same thing and hence one word is redundant. Moreover the word caturah taken with vedan gives a better meaning.

**Harihara**

| AC | शंकचकमहो भुजी |
| MSR | शंकचकमहादायरी |

Here the former reading is the correct one; the latter unnecessarily mentions a mace as the third article as two hands cannot be easily shown to hold three objects, and further no text on iconography supports such a representation.
IŚĀNA

AC  जयमण्डलभूषणम्
MSR  जयामण्डलभूषणम्

Here the reading given by AC cannot be accepted as we know of no ornament or ornaments called Jayamāṅgala or jaya and maṅgala worn by Śiva on his body; while the attribute jatāmaṇḍala-bhūṣāṇyaṃ befits quite well to Śiva.

SŪRYA

AC  द्वैदुर्मण्डलनामानी
SR  द्वैदुर्मण्डलनामानी

Here the former reading is the correct one. No other text, except SR. gives Cāṇḍa as the name of one of the two attendants of the Sun god.

KETU

AC  भूमिवाहसवें
SR  भूमिवाहसवें

Here the latter reading, as it gives the number of hands which an image of the planet Ketu should be shown to have, must be reckoned as superior.

I have cited here only a few examples. There are many absurd readings out of which I give here only five which may be found interesting.

ARDHANĀRĪŚVARA

AC  देवस्य दक्षिण पादम्
MSR  वामस्य दक्षिण पादम्

VINĀYAKA

AC  पार्श्वे सिद्धिकुब्धिभ्यो अत्सतात्राज्ञानान्विताम्
MSR  पार्श्वे बुद्धिकुब्धिभ्यो अत्सतात्राज्ञानान्विताम्

ŚRĪ

AC  सीमन्ते विघ्नतीं शीर्यें
MSR  सीमन्ते विघ्नशीर्यो

MĀṅGALA

AC  वामी श्रुतगदाधरी
SR  वामी श्रुतगदाधरी

ŚANI

AC  वरदं वाणसुवक्षम्
SR  वरदं वामसुवक्षम्
RAGHUNANDANA’S INDEBTEDNESS TO CAṆDEŚVARA

By

BHABATOSH BHATTACHARYA

Raghunandana was a Bengal digest-writer of the 16th century and Caṇḍēśvara was a Mithilā digest-writer of the 14th century, and I have stated elsewhere¹ that one of Caṇḍēśvara’s works, viz., Suddhiratnākara, exercised great influence on the Bengal School of Hindu Religious Law, as it is quoted more than twenty times in Raghunandana’s Suddhitattva. Now I am going to show that not only the Suddhitattva but also other works of Raghunandana abound with quotations from the works of Caṇḍēśvara.

(1) Gṛhastharaṇākara and Prāyaścittatattva.

Here I shall first prove my point by comparison of the Gṛhastharaṇākara of Caṇḍēśvara and the Prāyaścittatattva of Raghunandana. Though Raghunandana’s works have been often printed both in Bengali and Devanagari characters, the Gṛhastharaṇākara of Caṇḍēśvara² has been critically edited by the late Mm. KAMALAKRISHNA SRIMITIRTA and published in 1928, in the Bibliotheca Indica. Mr. P. V. KANE in his History of Dharmaśāstra, Vol. 1, published in 1930, makes no mention of the printed edition in his treatment of Caṇḍēśvara but refers to it summarily as “a large work in 589 pages” in the Appendix A, p. 539. Mr. KANE in his learned paper on Kalivarṣya makes a mention³ of the work Gṛhastharaṇākara but not of its printed edition, when referring to a quotation from the Brahma-purāṇa by Raghunandana in his Prāyaścittatattva as quoted by Halāyudha, Śūlapāṇi and Gṛhastharaṇākara. The same scholar in his Marathi work Dharmaśāstraricāra⁴ devotes some ten lines on p. 166 on the Gṛhastharaṇākara while describing the requisite duties of a Hindu householder (Gṛhastha) in the chapter entitled Cāra-āśramāṃcem-Samksipta-varṇana (or a short description of the four stages of life).

The quotations of the works of Caṇḍēśvara in the Prāyaścittatattva of Raghunandana are four in number, of which two are specifically from the Gṛhastharaṇākara and two from Ratnākara generally. Of the two specific quotations from the Gṛhastharaṇākara one on p. 229 is the same as referred

---

2. For a detailed list of the published works of Caṇḍēśvara, vide p. 139, Ibid.
4. Published from the Mauj Printing Bureau, Bombay, 1936.
to by Mr. Kane in his paper on Kalivarja and occurs after a text of the Brahma purāṇa which is found mentioned on p. 294 of the printed Gṛhaṣṭha-ratnākara after the very text of the same; the other on p. 224 is the mention of a quotation from Devala by Gṛhaṣṭha-ratnākara which is found on p. 189 of the printed Gṛhaṣṭha-ratnākara with the name of Devala after it as "इति देवलचन्द्र ." Of the two other quotations from Ratnākara generally I have succeeded in identifying one on p. 223 which is nothing but three lines of Devala from four such of the same quoted on p. 168 of the Gṛhaṣṭha-ratnākara.

(2) Kṛtyaratnākara and Malamāsatattva.

I shall now take up the case of Kṛtyaratnākara and Malamāsatattva. The Malamāsatattva on p. 96, after quoting two texts, one from the Brahma-purāṇa and another from the Brahmaśiddhānta and adding two lines of prose comment, one after each of them, says that the Kṛtyaratnākara is also of the same opinion (Kṛtyaratnākaro'-pyevam). The very texts of the Brahma purāṇa and Brahmaśiddhānta are found in their proper order on p. 81 of the printed Kṛtyaratnākara.

1. दीप्तिकाले ब्रह्मचर्य धारणार्थ कमळोऽः।
   गोव्रामान्तुर्सिपादाः विवाहो गोवर्धनस्थाः।
   नस्यामभिः मया कथी कथयं द्विजातिनिः।
   —इति ब्रह्मपुराणालिपिः।

2. महानिधाते तु विभेदाय मथाम प्रहर्दवयम्।
   तस्यां आर्यां न कलेव्यं कामनामितिकारते।
   —इति देवलचन्द्र।

3. [तदुमं देवलसे—
   भोजने दन्तालमाणि निश्चित्वायाममनवरे।]
   दन्तालसंस्काराये लेवे मन्ये दन्तवत्तू।
   न तत् बहुः कुष्ठावस्तुरवण्येपुनः।
   भवेदश्चन्नमयण्यचू तण्वेश्वद्वायोऽहुः।

4. चैवेच मासि जगदुः ब्रह्मा सर्वसः प्रथमेवहनि।
   छुक्कणे समप्रमुखु तदा सूर्यादेव्य सति।
   प्रकट्यायास तथा कालय गणानाय।
   प्रहाराशीनानि मातानि बस्तारां वस्तराशिपिनू।

5. चैवेच नित्ये सद्यायाने तदानौनं मातागुणमयः।
   सुष्णयाद्व यथायामेव प्रकृत्य दिनेवेद्य।

The first line as read in the Kṛtyaratnākara omits -ritu between varṣa and māsa.

The second line is read a bit differently in the Kṛtyaratnākara thus:

सुष्णयाद्व यथायामेव सम प्रकृति दिनेवेद्य।

MISCELLANY

EPIC IYÅT

In my note on "Epic iyåt and Blends of Aorist and Optative Forms" (JAOS 57, 316-17) I had occasion to point out three instances from the Mahåbhårata [Critical Edn. 1.122.47, 5.19.12 for iyåt and 3.23.12 for iyåma] where the optative form has been used in the definite sense of the past indicative. Two more instances have now been discovered in the Subåparvan. We read in the Calcutta edition of Mbh. 2. 2496:

"Iti bruivan nivavrte bhrratrbih saha Påndavaå
cñarten ca Såkuner måyåm Pårtho dyåtam iyåt punåh"

and this corresponds to the Chitrasåha edition 2.76.6 and the Critical Edition 2.67.5(?). Besides the form nivavrte here, we have vîvïsåb and kathayanti sma in the next verse.

In the same chapter we read [Calc. ed. 2.2507, Chitrasåha 2.76.18 and Critical ed. 2.67.15(?)]:

"Janapravådån subahun śrñvann api narådhipåh
hriyå ca dharmma-sañyogåt Pårtho dyåtam iyåt punåh"

In the next verse we have the form avarttayat, clearly indicating the syntactic value of the form iyåt. It is possible that other forms of this type may yet be discovered.

S. M. KATRE.

1. I am again indebted to Dr. V. S. SUKTHANKAR, the General Editor of the Critical Edition for giving me these references.

2. These references are to the Critical Edition which is being edited by Prof. F. EDGERTON, but the question mark has been added as the numbering is not final.

CORRECTIONS

Vol. I—Dr. S. K. De’s article:

P. 17, 1.25 Read Mîna-påda for Mañi-påda.
P. 18, fn. 1. Read Chintaharån CHAKRAVARTI for P. C. BAGCHI.
Born: Dec. 11, 1853

[Died: May 21, 1938]

THE LATE PROF. JACOB WACKERNAGEL
JACOB WACKERNAGEL*

Jacob Wackernagel was born in Basle (Switzerland) on December 11th, 1853. His father, Wilhelm Wackernagel was professor of Germanic philology in Basle and from him he inherited his interest in scientific research and his inclination for teaching. He was very fortunate in having an excellent college (Gymnasium) in Basle where he enjoyed the instruction of Jacob Burckhardt, the great historian, and of Friedrich Nietzsche, the famous philosopher, then professor of Greek at Basle university.

Wackernagel began his university studies in Basle, then went to Göttingen and Leipzig. At Göttingen he experienced his greatest and strongest impulse from Theodor Benfey, who introduced him to the Veda and lectured privately for him on Pāṇini’s grammar. At Leipzig Ernst Kuhn was of the greatest importance for his future career. He showed him a new way to Indian philology and had great influence on his development and future work. It was Kuhn, chiefly, who encouraged him to start his life-work, the “Altindische Grammatik” (Sanskrit grammar), the field in which he attained to highest distinction.

He obtained his doctor’s degree with a thesis in classical philology and took his activity as a university lecturer (Privatdozent) after publishing a short indological treatise which later on was to form part of the introduction to the “Altindische Grammatik”.

From 1879 to 1902 Wackernagel held the professorship for Greek philology at Basle as successor to Friedrich Nietzsche and in 1902 he was appointed to the chair of Indo-Germanic linguistics at Göttingen as the successor of Wilhelm Schultze. It may well be said that these years passed in Göttingen with colleagues like Franz Kielhorn, Hermann Oldenberg and above all, F. C. Andreas, then the greatest living Iranist, were the most successful and valuable of his career. The collaboration and intercourse with Andreas, a scholar without compeer, made his stay in Göttingen a period unique as well for productive research as for teaching. From all parts of Germany and from abroad young talented students came to Göttingen to sit at the feet of these men.

In 1915, for personal reasons, Wackernagel returned to Basle and there temporarily held the chair for Greek philology. Then from 1917 on he again taught linguistics and Indian philology until 1936, when, well advanced in years and declining in bodily strength, he resigned. During part of 1937

*This short sketch has been kindly prepared by Miss E. Wackernagel at our request from the notes prepared by the late Professor himself two years before his death. We express our thanks to her for this as well as for the gift of her father’s photograph reproduced here as the frontispiece—S.M.K.
he was still able to receive a few advanced pupils in his home to read some
Indian texts of special importance and interest. Teaching and being sur-
rounded by pupils was one of the great joys of his life and although he
was an exacting master he was ever ready for those who appealed to him
for help and advice.

Fortunately WACKERNAGEL was spared a long illness; after a few weeks
of declining health without great suffering he passed away peacefully on the
morning of May 22nd in his 85th year.

During his whole life WACKERNAGEL was closely attached to the univer-
sity of his native town and it was above all the University Library of Basle
on which he conferred his very special care and generosity. Numerous were
his gifts to the library and they enabled it to become an unrivalled instru-
ment of research work for students of classical and Indian philology.

WACKERNAGEL’s curriculum vitae would be incomplete without men-
tioning some of the honours conferred upon him. He was honorary doctor
of the Universities of Geneva, Lausanne and Marburg, a member of the Aca-
demies of Berlin, Göttingen, Munich, Vienna and Rome as well as of the
Swedish Royal Academy of Stockholm and the learned Societies of Lund
and Upsala. On the occasion of his 70th birthday in 1923 a great number
of friends, colleagues and pupils presented him with a miscellany (Festschrift),
“ANTIDORON”, which contains a full list, up to that moment, of all his
publications.
JACOB WACKERNAGEL

By

FRANKLIN EDGERTON, Yale University.

Professor Jacob Wackernagel was practically the last representative of a whole generation of great Indological scholars, the like of whom are not to be found to-day. His published works dealt almost wholly with grammar and linguistics. On the other hand, he by no means limited himself to Sanskrit or even Indic grammar; he was a profound scholar in Greek also, and indeed in general Indo-European comparative grammar. His greatest work, which will certainly not be superseded for many decades, is his Altindische Grammatik, the first part of which appeared in 1896. It is regrettable that he never completed it; fortunately Professor Debrunner, a younger but very able scholar, was enlisted as a collaborator in the third volume, and may be expected, we trust, to bring the whole work to a conclusion. Volume 4 and the second part of volume 2 remain to be published.

This greatest of all Sanskrit grammars shows Wackernagel's characteristics at their best. Unlike Whitney's grammar and most others it is historical as well as descriptive. This feature greatly increased the difficulties of the work, and involved a certain risk, since with the passage of time, some comparative-grammatical theories are bound to become obsolete. It is, however, astonishing how little one finds that sounds antiquated, even in Wackernagel's first volume, now more than forty years old.

Yet his interest in the history and prehistory of the language did not prevent his book from being equally great on the descriptive side. All his work was based on patient, thorough mastery of linguistic facts, illuminated and interpreted by his great coordinating genius. Moreover, he had a vast command of the literature of the subject. In his notes he constantly includes summary accounts of what has been said on points of Sanskrit grammar by writers of the past, both Hindu and Western. One often finds there references to obscure and half-forgotten writers, who nevertheless occasionally prove to have had very shrewd ideas on some points of grammar. His work, therefore, includes, besides all the rest, a sort of history of scholarship in Vedic and Sanskrit grammar, and this is not its least interesting or valuable feature.
JACOB WACKERNAGEL

By

HANNS OERTEL, München

Not far from WACKERNAGEL’s home in Basel at Sankt Jacob on the Birs stands Schloeth’s monument commemorating the death in battle of thirteen hundred soldiers of the Swiss Confederacy, bearing the noble inscription: Am 26. August 1444 starben in Kampfe gegen Frankreich und Oesterreich unbesiegt vom Siegen ermüdet 1300 Eidgenossen und Verbündete...das ganze Heer. “Unconquered, wearied by conquering” Jacob WACKERNAGEL died on May twenty-second 1938 at Basel, his native city, shortly before he had completed his eighty-fifth year. With him died the Nestor and last surviving representative of a great generation of linguistic scholars.

From his father Wilhelm WACKERNAGEL (1806-1869), a pupil of LACHMANN and Professor of Germanic Philology at the University of Basel, he inherited his taste for philological studies. As it was then customary for University Professors to give also instruction in the two upper classes of the Paedagogium (the preparatory school for the University) he had the privilege of having Jacob BURCKHARDT, the distinguished historian of the Italian Renaissance, and Friedrich NIETZSCHE, the famous philosopher, as his teachers in history and Greek even before he entered the University. After two semesters at Basel he went to Oxford, Göttingen and Leipzig to continue his studies. At Göttingen Theodor BENFELD introduced him to the Veda and to Pāṇini, at Leipzig he attended LESKJNI’S courses in Slavic and Ernst KUHN encouraged his plan to write a Vedic and Sanskrit grammar.

WHITNEY’S “Sanskrit Grammar including both the classical language and the older dialects of Veda and Brāhmaṇa” published in 1879 had been purposely confined to an exhaustive but purely descriptive and historical treatment; WACKERNAGEL’S Altindische Grammatik was to be both historical and comparative. The first volume (Introduction and Phonology) appeared in 1896, the first part of the second volume (Noun-composition) in 1905, the third volume (Noun-inflexion, Numerals, Pronouns) in 1930, this last in collaboration with A. DEBRUNNER upon whose shoulders now rests the completion of this monumental undertaking: the second half of the second volume (Morphology) and the fourth volume (Verb-inflexion). The amount of preliminary labour necessary for gathering the bare facts which were to form the basis of this grammar can be adequately gauged only if one bears in mind that even for many of the most important Vedic texts indices verborum were lacking and special investigations such as, thanks to the industry of generations of scholars, are plentiful in the domain of the classical languages were few. Much more than a “sporadic” study of the texts (as WACKERNAGEL,
with characteristic modesty described it in the preface to the third volume) was necessary to furnish merely the data for this stupendous enterprise. Nor is the book simply a manual for reference, but in its exhaustive presentation of the Indic material it gives an historical sketch of the progress of Indo-Iranian and comparative philology which enables the reader to follow the various attempts to solve each individual problem.

From 1881 to 1902 WACKERNAGEL held the chair of Greek at the University of Basel as Friedrich NIETZSCHE's successor. In 1902 he succeeded Wilhelm SCHULTZE as Professor of Indo-European Philology at Göttingen. The thirteen years at Göttingen were the most important in WACKERNAGEL's career. His departure from Basel relieved him of much administrative work connected with town government, church and university which his conscience as a citizen had compelled him to take upon himself, for, following in the footsteps of his father who had been a member of the General Assembly and of the Town Council, he scorned the temptation to retire into an ivory tower. Again, the close association with colleagues like Eduard SCHWARTZ and LEO (both in classics), KIELHORN and OLDENBERG (both in Sanskrit), SMEND, and especially F. C. ANDREAS, then the foremost living Iranian scholar, proved stimulating and made his stay at Göttingen a period of intense scientific productivity. Moreover WACKERNAGEL's skill and enthusiasm as teacher drew an unusually large number of pupils both from Germany and abroad to his classes. For a close combination of research with teaching was characteristic of him. Even elementary courses he did not find irksome and the chief reason for his keen enjoyment of such work was the fact that even the simplest text suggested to him problems. The Chāndogya Upaniṣad speaks of ṛṣetrajñā ye hiranyanidhim upary upari sanaranto na vindanti; WACKERNAGEL had the rare gift of discovering such hidden treasures over which many others unknowingly passed without seeing that here a problem called for solution e.g. the curious fact that the Greek word for 'god' lacks a vocative. What could be more stimulating to a beginner than to realize that the very text he was reading harboured the possibility of important discoveries?

Ungrudgingly WACKERNAGEL spent time and labour whenever he saw an opportunity to assist or direct a serious student; and the same unselfish generosity he showed toward colleagues whenever they appealed to him for help. All of us who approached him must feel lasting gratitude for the readiness with which unstintingly he allowed us to share in the vast storehouse of his wide learning.

In 1915 WACKERNAGEL returned to Basel where for two years he temporarily held the chair of Greek Philology, then from 1917 to 1936 the professorship of Linguistics and Comparative Philology, while even after his retirement from active work he continued to meet students at his house.

Mathilde PROBST's bibliography of WACKERNAGEL's writings from 1876-1922 in the congratulatory volume Antidoron offered to him by his pupils and
friends on the occasion of his seventieth birthday on December eleventh 1923 (1924) shows the wide range of subjects which engaged his attention and, extending over a period of more than half a century, permits us to trace the development of Indo-European philology in its bearing on classical and Indo-Iranian philology from the time of the neo-grammarian movement to the present. Although much of what is contained in the shorter papers has now passed into the fund of common knowledge and the manuals of these opuscula minora will continue to deserve a careful study as models of method in the thoroughness of their workmanship and their lucidity of exposition; to all of them apply the words with which MEILLET greeted the *Altindische Grammatik*: cette rigeur de méthode linguistique, cette exactitude de philologie parfait, cette critique jamais en défaut, cette pénétration toujours présente, cette production exhaustive et de faits et de la bibliographie, que M. WACKERNAGEL porte avec aisance. Published in many and sometimes not easily accessible places they deserve reprinting in a memorial volume.

It is characteristic for all of WACKERNAGEL's comparative work that it is based upon an intimate philological acquaintance with Greek, Latin, Sanskrit and Avestan texts; Homer, the Veda, the Gāthās stood in the focus of his interest, but in the two classical languages and in Sanskrit he extended his reading far beyond these oldest representatives of the classical and Indic literatures. His familiarity with the classics and with Indo-Iranian was that of the specialist. He was competent to fill twice the chair of Greek at the University of Basel and many of his most important contributions deal primarily with Greek problems. It was this penetrating study of the texts which enabled him to treat syntactical and stylistic problems in such masterly fashion. The two volumes of his "Lectures on Syntax chiefly with reference to Greek, Latin and German" were published in 1920 and 1924 (a second edition in 1926 and 1928). In their free lecture form they give perhaps the most intimate picture of WACKERNAGEL's skill as a teacher. They are written in a more leisurely and personal tone than his other works so that those familiar with his manner of lecturing may often detect the very tone of his voice. Entertaining and instructive even to a layman they are full of suggestions to the scholar and repay a frequent perusal. We may perhaps regrettfully speculate on what linguistic science would have gained if time and strength allotted to one human life had allowed WACKERNAGEL to crown his *Altindische Grammatik* by the addition of a fifth volume on Sanskrit Syntax. Let us, at any rate, hope that it may be possible to edit the third volume of the Lectures from his and his students' notes.

The starting point of WACKERNAGEL's investigation is almost always a concrete problem as it presents itself in an individual language during a careful study of the texts; upon this he concentrated the light shed by cognate languages, but the extreme caution with which he ventured into the domain of languages of which he had no first-hand literary knowledge is easily discernible. He based all his comparative work upon an extensive but minute study of the literary remains and imposed upon it the strict canons of the
philologist to the great profit of both branches of linguistic science. Thus it is singularly free from general speculative hypotheses which, however brilliant and seductive, must necessarily remain airy because they lack a concrete background. The methodological warfare of the neogrammarian movement left him undisturbed and he took no part in its often acrimonious and sometimes unprofitable polemics.

Even this brief sketch would be incomplete without a reference to the recognition of Wackernagel’s achievements by the scholarly world. He received the honorary doctorate from the universities of Marburg, Geneva and Lausanne. The Academies of Berlin, Göttingen, Munich, Vienna, Rome and Athens as well as the Swedish Royal Academy and the Learned Societies of Lund and Uppsala elected him to membership; the American Oriental Society and the Linguistic Society of America made him an honorary member.

Wackernagel was a deeply religious character, a patriotic and self-sacrificing citizen, a foe of every kind of pretence and ostentation, a liberal patron of his University upon which he shed the glory of his fame, a noble and always generous friend, an inspiring example to all those who were privileged to know him, withal the best type to the true gentleman and scholar.

In his work he has erected for himself an enduring monument upon which might fittingly be inscribed the words from the book of Daniel: Qui autem docti fuerint fulgebunt sicut splendor firmamenti et qui ad institiam erudiunt multos sicut stellae in perpetuas aeternitates.
SOME BUDDHIST SCULPTURES IN RELATION TO SOME BUDDHIST TEXTS

By

O. C. GANGOLY.

Until recently the evidence of the plastic monuments in tracing the development of Buddhist Literature and in elucidating the many obscure points in the origin and growth of Buddhist Iconography has been severely neglected. FOUCHER was the pioneer in this field and set out to study the lithic monuments of the Buddhists, with the written text in one hand, and the carved stone, in the other. COOMARASWAMY’s series of patient and indefatigable studies of the minulēs of the relative texts, have thrown a flood of light on the history and genesis of Buddhist Sculpture and have recovered for us the exact point of view from which the primitive devotees and worshippers of the Buddha regarded the so-called “decorations” of the Stūpa—which were in fact the current Buddhistic beliefs translated into stone from floating legends and from ancient Pāli texts. Dr. BARUA’s admirable studies of the Bhārhat Sculptures have also demonstrated, how the Pāli Scholar can help towards an accurate understanding of the forms and motifs of Buddhist Sculpture. Unfortunately, the data which the lithic monuments offer do not receive anything like an adequate attention in our research journals.

I propose to consider in this paper a few early Buddhist bas-reliefs and to ascertain their position—in relation to early and later Buddhist Literature.

It is a well-known fact, that the Life of the Buddha, as illustrated on the bas-reliefs at Boro-Budur, is based on the version of the Life, as related in the Lalita Vistara, a comparatively late text attributed to the second century A.D. The Buddha-carita of Aśvaghoṣa probably did not come into existence before 50 B.C. and is probably rightly placed in the first part of the first century A.D.1 Indeed in early Pāli Literature there is no connected narrative of the Life of the Buddha excepting un-connected fragments of particular incidents or anecdotes. Yet, we find that on some of the reliefs at Bhārhat and Sāndhi, a few incidents in the life are illustrated. And at Amarāvatī and also at Nāgārjunikoṇḍa—the Life of the Buddha is related

1. According to BEAL [Introduction, Buddha-carita, S.B.E. Vol. XIX.] Aśvaghoṣa’s epic was translated into Chinese under the title Fo-pen-hing-king, by Fā-làn (to be distinguished from Fā-lin, a priest who died in 640 A.D.) in the year 68 A.D. The original text must have been in existence some time before, say, about the end of the 1st century B.C. Fā-làn’s translation is not listed in the Catalogue of NÑJIO who mentions a later translation by Dharmarakṣa (414-421 A.D.), p. 301, No. 1851.
Fig. 1. Nativity—Nāgarjunikonda, C. 200 A.D.

Fig. 2. Nativity—Gandhāra, C. 150 A.D.

Fig. 3. Nativity—Gandhāra, C. 150 A.D.
with many significant details and incidents. Curiously enough, if we examine these carved reliefs at Amarāvatī, we find they are based on independent legends, and not on the well-known texts. The majority of the Amarāvatī Reliefs (some of which date as far back as the 1st century B.C.) were carved sometime between the 1st and 2nd century A.D. and one would expect that the *Buddha-carita* of Aśvaghoṣa should have furnished a convenient aid to the sculptors ready at hand. But it appears that the sculptors either had no access to this epic or did not care to consult this text or in the alternative, Aśvaghoṣa had not composed his poem when the sculptors at Amarāvatī began to chisel out the “Life” on their *Uṛddhva-pattakas* (upright slabs).

This can be easily demonstrated by comparing

(a) A well-known illustration of the Nativity of the Buddha with the text of the *Buddha-carita*.

(b) An illustration of the scene of the Presentation of the Buddha to the tutelary deity, with the relative texts.

(c) The bas-relief illustration of the story of Nanda with the poem *Saundarananda*.

We will take the subjects *seriatim*.

According to Aśvaghoṣa, at the hour of the birth of the Buddha, Queen Māyā took to bed, contrary to the early legends and contrary to the sculptural representations at Amarāvatī, Gāndhāra and Nāgarjunakoṇḍa.

*Tasmin vane Śrīnati Rāja-patnī
trasūlikālaṁ samavekṣamānā|
Śayyāṁ vitānophātiṁ prapede
nāri-sahasraṁ-abhinandyamānā||

*Buddha-carita*, I, 8.

‘In that glorious grove the queen perceived that the time of her delivery was at hand and amidst the welcome of thousands of waiting women, proceeded to a couch overspread with an awning.’

The sculptors of Amarāvatī and the stone-masons of Gāndhāra did not, therefore, follow the text of Aśvaghoṣa, but faithfully followed the earlier legends, some of which are caught up and secured in the early Pāli Literature. The most typical of this text is the *Acharya-yabhuta-dhamma-suttaṁ* (Majjhima Nikāya, III, 123, p. 122) which states:—

“Yathā kho pan’, Ananda, aṁśa itthikā nisinnā vā nipannā vā vijāyanti, na h‘evaṁ Bodhisattam Bodhisattamāṁ vijāyati; ṭhitā vā Bodhisattam Bodhisattamāṁ vijāyatī”.

“While other women give birth to their child sitting, or lying, it is otherwise with a Bodhisattva’s mother who gives birth *standing erect*”.

Fig. 4. Nativity and Presentation—Amaravati, C. 100 A.D.

Fig. 5. Presentation and Asita's Prophecy—Nāgarjunikonda C. 200 A.D.
This manner of representing the Birth of the Buddha with the Queen-mother standing is, therefore, much earlier than the text of Aśvaghosa. In fact, the text of the Majjhima Nikāya follows a still earlier text, that of the Dīgha Nikāya, where the Exalted One is made to recite the rules and conventions, according to which Vipassi, a former Buddha, takes his birth. “It is the rule, brethren, that whereas other women bring forth sitting or reclining, the mother of a Bodhisattva brings forth not so, but standing. That, in such a case, is the rule” (Mahāpadāna Suttanta, Dīgha Nikāya, XIV, Rhys Davids, Vol. III, p. 11).

Now we find that in a late text (datable not earlier than the 4th century A.D.), that of the Nidāna kathā, the same peculiarity of a miraculous birth and other distinguishing marvels in connection with the Life of the Buddha are repeated. In fact if we place the texts of the Mahāpadāna Suttanta, Acchariyabhuta-dhamma-suttan and the Nidāna Kathā in parallel columns in a scheme of concordance, we can easily trace the geneology of the ideas of the many details connected with the many romantic and miraculous elements of the story of the Buddha’s life, almost related in identical words and phrases. The Nidāna Kathā, though a very late text, derives all its materials from very early sources in Pāli Literature.

Unfortunately, early Pāli Literature has not been able to catch up and preserve all the floating legends which have been growing up and circulating ever since the birth of the Buddha in the fertile imagination of the Faithful and which the learned Patriarchs of the Early Buddhist Church must have woven up and recorded in some North Indian dialects before they were translated into the Pāli Canon.

That many such legends and versions of the Life of the Buddha have not been recorded in the Pāli Canon, but have survived in later versions in Sanskrit and in other languages can be demonstrated by the evidence of the liche monuments.

According to the sculptors who carved some of the slabs at Amarāvatī—which were set up round the path of circumambulation of the stūpa for the devoted pilgrims, after the birth, the Child-Buddha was presented to the shrine of Sākya-vardhana, the tutelary Yakṣa of the Ṣākyas, for obtaining the blessings of the guardian-deity of the family. This is a very important and significant incident in the early life of the Buddha, for the tutelary deity, instead of accepting the obeisance of the Child, himself bent his head in honouring the Child—as He was greater than a god and deserved the obeisance of the gods (Devaclipseva).

This incident does not appear to figure in any of the reliefs from Gāndhāra—and is also missed by Aśvaghosa, whereas it is represented at Amarāvatī and at Nāgarjunakoṇḍa, more than once, and must have been justified by current legends—which have not unfortunately left their records in the Pāli Canon, and is equally missed by the Nidāna Kathā, but is curiously
Fig. 6. Nanda and Sundari—Amarāvati, C. 100 A.D.

Fig. 7. ‘Vision of Paradise’—Nāgārjunikonda, C. 200 A.D.
recorded in Tibetan and Chinese versions of the Life, as also in the Divyā-
vadāṇa. In the latter text we find that Upagupta takes Asoka to visit the
many sacred places associated with the many incidents of the Life of the Bud-
dha and he points to the tribal shrine of Yāksa-Sākya-vardhana to whom the
Child-Buddha was presented: “Idam maha-rāja, Sākya-vardhanam nāma
devakulam. Atra Bodhisattvo jāta-mātra upānito devam-arca-vishya-ti|Sarva-
devatāḥ ca Bodhisattvasya pādayor nipatitāḥ| tato rājaṇa Suddhodanena Bo-
dhisattvo devatānām apaya-yam deva iti tena Bodhisattvasya devātideva iti
nāma-dheyaṁ kṛtam | (Divyāvadāṇa, XXVII, pp. 390-391). It should be
remarked that the Amarāvatī relief illustrating this incident is earlier in date
than this text. Incidentally it proves, that although the Divyāvadāṇa is a
late compilation it embodies legends and materials very much older.

In one of Tibetan versions of the legends, an actor, gives a summary
presentation of the Life, in the course of which, he alludes to this incident :
“When the prince had been taken to pay reverence to the Sākya-God, the
Yakshe Sākya-vardhana, but was received with reverence by him, the Sākya-
Mighty-One, he received the names of Sakyamuni and God of Gods (Devāti-
deva) ” (F. A. Schiefner’s Tibetan Tales, derived from Indian Sources,
Legend of the Sakyā Buddha (London, 1875, at p. 52) we have the Chinese
version of the Life, said to have been translated from an unknown Sanskrit
text entitled Abhinīśkrāmaṇa Śūtra :

In this Chinese version the incident is related as follows :

“At this time, not far from Kapilavastu, there was a Deva temple, the
Deva’s name being “Tsang Chang” (Dīrghavardhana?) at whose shrine the
Sākyas paid unwonted honours; then Suddhodana forthwith took the infant
in his arms to this temple and addressed his ministers in these words, “Now
my child may pay worship to this Deva”. Then his mother (or nurse),
took the child to pay the customary honours, at which time a certain Deva,
called “Abhaya” (wou wei), took the image of the Deva in the temple,
and made it come down and bow before Bodhisattva with closed hands
and prostrate head and addressed the nurse thus, “This prince of mortals is not
called on to worship, but is deserving of all worship; let me adore him, for
to whom he bows down, instant destruction would follow.”

The correct restoration of “Tsang Chang” the name of the Family
deity (Kula-devatā) should be Sākya-vardhana, not Dīrghavardhana.

Anyway, we find in the plastic representations at Amarāvatī (c. 100
A.D.) and Nāgārjunikopaṇḍa (c. 200 A.D.), an early record of this significant in-
cident of the Nativity of the Lord Buddha—which has not even found place
in such a late compilation as the Nīdāna Kathā and which is recorded in the
Tibetan and Chinese versions. It is apparently based on some early legends,
the records of which are now lost in India and some version of which was
probably the basis of the sculptural representation.
Curiously, the Lalita Vistara has included this incident, though with considerable elaborations, variations and additions:—

"Tato Rājā Suddhodanaḥ sva-grhaṃ prabhṛṣya Mahā-prajāpatiṁ Goutamimāmantryaivamāha | Alan-kriyaḥām Kumāro Devakulamupanasyata iti ||
Iī ti hi rājā Suddhodano mahatā rājavyūkha mahatā rājāryāhā mahatā rājāmyuhāvahā kmūramī grhītvā devakulaṁ praviṣati sma||
Samantantara-pratipātaśca Bodhisattvāna daksīṇaḥ-caraṇayaḥ kramaśa-tasmin devakule' the tā acetanyo devapratimāh Tadyathā śiva-Skanda-Nārāyaṇa-Ku vera-Candra-Sūrya-Viśravāṇa-Brahmā-Lokapāla-prabhṛṣayāḥ pratisimāh ||
Savā svebhyaḥ svebhyaḥ śthānebhyaḥ vyutthāya Bodhi-sattvasya kramaśa-stayor nipatanti sma"


In the florid and extravagant version of this late text the name of the Yakṣa, Śākya-vardhana, the original tutelary deity of the earlier versions, has been elbowed out by the crowd of a host of other gods—such as, Śiva, Skanda, Nārāyaṇa, Ku vera, Candra, Sūrya, Viśravaṇa, Brahmā, and Lokapāla.

To take another example, on a comparatively early stele from Amarāvati, the Conversion of Nanda has been illustrated. One of these panels, two of which relate to the story of Nanda, two incidents from the story are depicted—one of which (the left half of the panel) represents Nanda, helping Sundari in her toilette, by putting with his own hand the marks and decorations (viśeṣakas) on her forehead, affectionately holding her chin by the left hand. This differs substantially from the same scene as depicted by the poet Aśvaghōsa in his Saundarananda kāvyam, with all the exuberance and lyricism of his poetical fancy, according to which Sundari makes her lover hold the mirror for her, while she herself paints the decorations on her face:—

"Datvāthā sā darpanamasya haste mamāgrato dharaya tāvadenāḥ |
Viśeṣakam yavadahāṃ karomītyuvāca kāntāṃ sa ca taṁ babhārdā" ||

Saundarananda Kāvyam, Canto, IV, 13.

No sculptor, who was familiar with the beautiful version of Aśvaghōsa, could have willingly refused to depict the same on his stone-canvas, particularly when we know that on one or two of the panels from Nāgārjunikoṇḍa and Goli, the motif of the mirror being held by the gallant lover for the benefit of his lady-love has been used with characteristic effect.

Various discrepancies in many details, in the scene of the Vision of Paradise (Svarga-nidadāna) of the same poem, with the plastic version of the same from Nāgārjunikoṇḍa confirm the supposition that these sculptors were not familiar with Aśvaghōsa’s poem or with the version made use of by the poet. The story of Nanda must have been current in versions other than the one exploited by the poet and which explains the discrepancy between the plastic and poetical presentations. It is quite apparent that the sculptor and the poet had two different versions of the incident or that the
poet or the sculptor took liberties with the details of the story and gave differing versions.

Incidentally, it may be useful to compare the Nativity Scene from Amarāvatī with that from Gāndhāra.

In the Gāndhāra versions of which there are several examples, the Child-Buddha as He emerges from the waist of the Queen is received by Sakka accompanied by another attendant god probably Brahmā Sāhampati, so that only two male personages figure in the representation. In the Amarāvatī and Nāgārjunikonda reliefs,—four devas, not one, spread out the cloth to receive the miraculous Baby. This closely follows the legends recorded in the Pāli Canon:

"When the Bodhisatta issues from his mother's womb, he never touches the ground but is received by the four deities who present him to his mother with these words: 'Rejoice, O Queen! you have borne indeed a lordly son' (Acchariya-abbhuta-Dhamma-sutta, CHALMERS' translation, p. 225). In the Nidāna kathā also, four pure-minded Mahā-Brahma angels came and spread out the 'golden fabric' (cattāro Suddha-citta Mahābrahmano Swaṇṇajālamādāya Sampatia; FAUSBÖLL, Jātaka Text, Vol. I, p. 52). Following the early Hinayānist convention as at Sānchi, the figure of the Buddha is not represented. But the four deities (cattāro devaputtā) are represented holding a piece of white Benares muslin—on which the foot-prints symbolize the child. This representation of the foot-prints which glisten like jewels on the white fabric, seems to recall another passage in the same text—"Just like a jem on Benares muslin, where neither defiles the other because both are pure" (Seyyathāpi, Ānanda, mani-ratanaṁ Kāsike vatthē nikkhit-tam nēva mani-ratanaṁ Kāsikevat tham makkheti nāpi Kāsikaṁ vattham mani-ratanaṁ makkheti). On the other hand, the stone masons of Gāndhāra, in illustrating this scene, followed not the early Pāli Canon, but a later version of the scene, recorded in the Lalita Vistara.

'Then at that time, O! Bhikṣus! Śakra, the Lord of the gods and Brahmhā Sahāpati, came and stood in front. These two (gods) elated with great glory, received the Bodhisattva, covering all his limbs with the glorious kasi fabric' ("Tasmin khalu punar Bhikṣavaḥ samaye Śakro devānām indro Brahmā ca sahāpatiḥ purataḥ sthitābhbhuvaṁ| Yau Bodhisattvaṁ parama-gaurava-jātāu divya-kāsika-vastraṁ sarvāṅga-pratyāṅgaiḥ śmytau samprajñau prati-grhnāte smā"


This is exactly the version which is illustrated in the Gāndhāra reliefs—which were certainly not followed by the artists in the Andhradeśa. As I have shown elsewhere, the sculptors of this latter region did not follow the Gāndhāraan models in depicting the images of the Buddha and of the Bodhisattva. It is impossible to contend in the light of these new evidences, that the school of Gāndhāra had any manner of influence on the works of the
Amarāvatī School, some of which were earlier in date, and some may have been contemporary with the School of the North-West. If the versions of these legends offer any reliable data, (which it may be contended, they do) the Gāndhāran plastic illustrations appear to have followed later and developed versions of the story in which the four archangels were replaced by Śakra and Brahmā. These examples of Gāndhāra reliefs and other analogous specimens were probably executed long after the Amarāvatī reliefs.

According to Keith, (A History of Sanskrit Literature, 1928, p. 493), the Lalitavistara may belong to the period from the second century A.D. Its date must also be later than most of the reliefs from Amarāvatī, which are related to the legends recorded in the early Pāli canon.

It may be justly claimed that in many cases the study of the plastic art can offer useful and sometimes valuable data in fixing the chronology of related texts.
GRAMMATICAL PECULIARITIES OF VARĀṅGACARITA

By
A. N. UPADHYE

The Ms. material of Varāṅgacarita at our disposal is limited, the textual tradition of the poem is unsatisfactory, and now and then we come across plain errors of the copyists. Under these circumstances it is rather premature to note the grammatical peculiarities of Varāṅgacarita. Individual occurrences of striking usages cannot be taken into account, if they are not warranted by metre. Leaving full margin for scribal errors etc., I would note only a few salient points here which, I hope, would be interesting to a student of Sanskrit grammar.

Varāṅgacarita is full of Jaina technical terms many of which with their different shades of significance are not noted in the Sanskrit Dictionaries. The meanings of such words, however, can be ascertained by referring to standard works on Jaina dogmatics and terminology. Some peculiar words which our author uses are: goṇa vi. 15 ‘an ox’, a word of Prākrit origin, so also phulla ii. 73, bhīṅḍa xii. 85 and tumba xxxi. 32. The word maithuna xx. 75 & xxv. 6, which reminds us of Kannada maiduna and Marathi mehunā is unknown to classical Sanskrit in this sense, and barkara xxvii. 17 ‘a goat’ is also rare. addhā xiv. 95 ‘time’ is quite usual in Jaina Prākrit texts.

tiraśca for tiryag xxiv 66 reminds us of Prākrit tiriccha or tiraccha. The author uses sampadā also for sampad see xx. 65, 79 and especially xxv. 40. Words like maṭambha, kheḍa etc. iii. 3 often show a Prākritic spelling.

kriḍakṛtaṁ xxx. 57 is a strange Sanskritisation of kriyagadaṁ = kriyakttam. So most of the above words are either Prākritisms or back-formations. sādama for sadama xxi. 15, mṛdvika for mṛdvikā xxii. 72 and āvahitā for avahitāxxvii. 1 are irregularities perhaps due to metre.

There are some words which attract our attention with regard to their genders: geha M., i. 25, xxi. 38, xxii. 66, 73; krodhottāna M., iv. 68; jāla M. vi. 52; vṛttānta N., xv. 1; akṣata N., xxiii. 64. There are other cases like bhūṣaya M. xiii. 66, cūrṇa M. xxiii. 30, cakra M. xvii. 55 which either agree with the epic usage or are archaisms. pṛṇa xxix. 3 is used in the singular. The superlative tama is suffixed to substantives: vaniktama ii. 13, bandhutama xix. 4 & xx. 37, arthatama xxix. 62; and once the phrase taratama is used like an adjective iv. 114.

---
1. Varāṅgacarita of Jaṭālalami is an important Sanskrit Purāṇic Kāvyam of the 7th century A.D. I have already introduced it to Sanskritists in the Annals of the Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute Vol. xiv, pp. 61-79. I have on hand a complete edition of the Text based on two palm-leaf Mss., and it is in the Press. These grammatical notes form a section of the Introduction of that Edition to be published in the Māṇikachandra D. J. Granthamālā, Bombay.
Once we have Balinah xxiv. 33 Gen. Sg. from Bali; either the author takes Balin (usually Bali) as the name or it is a back-formation from Prakrit. We get the form svasārah xx. 90 for svasāḥ Acc. pl.; kṛtāntakah is used for Voc. Sg. xv. 47. Once gatiṣu for gatiṣu xxiv. 54; we get epic parallels for this, but here it is perhaps due to metre.

Many nouns and adjectives are used with the abstractive sense, even though the necessary abstractive suffix or change is absent. adṛṣyaṛīpā for adṛṣyaṛīpateva xiv. 20, gādha for gādhateva xx. 24, utsukā for utsukateva xx. 76, nirāśra for nirāśratva xxi. 63, ananyakīrti for -kirtīva xxi. 31, nirmala for nirmālya xxv. 45, malimasa for malimatasatva xxix. 98. On the other hand we also have vicīkītsatā for vicīkītsā xxxi. 69, saranyatā for śaraṇa xiii. 15, saṁvākanatā for saṁvākanama xiii. 87, sukha-duḥkhaṇtā for sukhaduhkhā xvii. 30. Then we have a form ārogyatā viii. 53, xxiii. 20 which is doubly abstract.

It passes one's understanding why sometimes the author prefers the strong grade of the feminine form of the possessive suffix vat as in garvaṃvatyaḥ, Viśuddhavantyaḥ i. 59, śrutavantyaḥ xv. 34, cetanāvantyaḥ xv. 37, dhairyaṃvantyaḥ xxviii. 105. If these are not scribal errors, they appear to be contaminated by Prakrit usage. All these cases can be corrected without spoiling the metre.

Our text abounds in various verbal forms some of which deserve our special attention. The Padas, Parasmaipada or Āṭmanepada, may be noted in the following forms. bhartayanti v. 94, also note xviii. 41, 44, 76; ādoḍuḥ xiv. 59 and ādodati xxv. 58; mrīgayāmi xv. 134; prasavanti xxiv. 29; [vi] kṣaratā xxiv. 57. Then forms like lapate iv. 83, jihēṣuḥ xvii. 39, kampat xxix. 13 etc. agree more with the epic usage than with the classical one.

The author shows a decided inclination towards the use of Perfect, though the forms of the Imperfect and Aorist are also used. Perfect is used even for narrating contemporary events (ii. 11), and once it appears to be used even for the first person (xvi. 24). In canto iii, verses 19-25, the author has as if a regular exercise for the practice of forming desideratives for which he shows his fondness like Aṣvaghoṣa. It is a regular habit with him to separate the verb of the perfect from its auxiliary by some intervening word, see for instance ii. 50; xi. 61-2, 85; xiii. 20; xiv. 16; xvii. 56; xix. 7, 19; xxi. 3, 26; xxiii. 3, 8, 17, 71; xxviii. 79; xxix. 25; xxx. 67. At xxiii. 17 the verb has a preposition in addition. Aṣvaghoṣa has some instances of this separation (Buddhacarita ii. 19, vi. 58 and vii. 9); and this practice is sanctioned by Kālidāsa (Raghuvanṣa ix. 61 and xiii. 36). Pretty frequently āsa is independently used as in the Epics, for instance i. 46, xx. 54, xxi. 33, xxx. 27. There is one clear case of double preposition upopaviṣṭa ii. 14, xxiii. 73, and adhyadhiṣṭhita in xxi. 69 may be included in the same category. Upopaviṣṭa is used by Aṣvaghoṣa (JOHNSTON'S Ed. ix. 8) and it is found in the Rāmāyaṇa also (Ayodhyākāṇḍa i. 51).
The author, it appears, has used many irregular forms: karavāmake for karavāmakai xxviii. 84; sasājukh for sasījukh ii. 35; samnidadhuyuk for samnidadhuk x. 63, jaghnikha for jaghnnihika xiv. 51, jhukh for jhukshuh xxv. 15, mamarduḥ for mamarduh xxx. 21; cicetiśavah for cicetiśavah iii. 21, sīsāṃsvavah for sīsāṃsvavah iii. 23; samāśntām for samaśnuvānānām or samaśnuvatahām iv. 114 & v. 95; samaśvihājitum either for samaśvihākayitum or samaśvihaktum xxi. 58; susāḥhayitvā for susāḥhya xiii. 82 and also note aviganyah for aviganayaa xviii. 2. rātvā for rātvā xv. 128, xxii. 20 and parimantkyah for parimathyah xxiv. 56 are rather rare usages; ācāksitam for the usual ākhyātam xix. 73. The author shows a tendency, quite normal according to the epic usage, of having a strong grade for the feminine base of the present participle: bruvantyah v. 61, rudantyah xv. 36, 39 & xix. 44. The form rudanti is used by Āsvaghōṣa (Saundarananda vi. 6, 35 and Buddhacarita ix. 26 JOHNSTON’S Ed.).

Now and then we find that the causal form is used to denote the primitive sense: pariṣayinyaḥ i. 59, atīṣayanti i. 27, vighātyanti iv. 30, todastyanti v. 52, cūṣayanti v. 85, samālāghayantarāḥ viii. 34, pariṣayanti x. 11, bhikṣayanti viii. 28, pratibhaṣayantac xiv. 12, samupāṣayantarāḥ xxii. 42, also nīraṇjitānām xxxi. 41; and sometimes the primitive is used with causal sense: hṛṣevā viii. 22, vyābhāsamanāḥ ix. 38 and śamanūn xxix. 8.

We find that ut-khan is used in the sense of ni-khan v. 48; and gai or ni-gai is used in the sense of speaking, see for instance xvi. 57, xx. 42, 80, 83 and xii. 11. Quite ingeniously the author uses niśāmya and niśāmya ii. 37 with their different shades of meaning. The roots niḥ xiv. 4 and vac ii. 9 & xxii. 53 are transitively used with the cognate Accusative; while some gerunds are standing intransitively for instance anubhīya i. 60, adhirukya v. 83, nigāryā xiii. 1. Assva bhavān is used for āstāṁ bhavān at xx. 31.

In many places the conjunctive ca is not rightly placed, see for instance ii. 2, iii. 36, 47, x. 35, xvii. 57, xviiii. 73, xxi. 9, xxi. 47 etc. Sometimes ca or hi stands at the beginning of a pāda x. 35, xxvii. 56 and xxviiii. 37. At times both evam and ittham ii. 48, xx. 41 and both yadi and cet xvi. 68, xix 180, xx. 25, xxiv. 22, 28 are used. The archaic amā for saha is quite a favourite with the author ii. 57, viii. 44, xxiii, 6, xxviiii. 98, xxx. 34. He shows a tendency of using the pronominal forms of tad etc. at times without any definite purpose and at times like a definite article in English, see for instance i. 4, viii. 36, xi. 65, 72, 75 etc., etc. Often sākṣa is used for ākṣa or upākṣa viii. 1, xx. 27. Now and then ka stands like a svārthē suffix xi. 25, xxi. 30.

The author is in the regular habit of using Sāpekṣa compounds which may be tolerated as the sense is not much obscured. We have many of them scattered all over the text, see for instance i. 39, 46, 53, 69; ii. 1 etc. Pāṇini’s rule āṇāṁ ṛto dvandve is often violated, see for instance i. 59, xx. 5, xxi. 8, xxvii. 60, xxi. 4 and also my notes thereon. Quite freely the author puts the possessive suffixes to Karmadhāraya compounds, see for instance iii. 58, iv. 95, ix. 45, xiii. 25 etc. In some cases he does not use Samāhāra as
required by classical convention: hastyaśvayānī 3.30, padāti-hastyaśvāra-thāh 3.31. We may also note forms savaijayantyaḥ for savaijayantikāḥ xviii. 18 and -netroḥ for -netkayoḥ etc. xviii. 83. About the sequence of words in a compound expression the author is liable to a good deal of laxity, and in this respect he can be compared with his colleagues in Prākrīt literature. Some of the important deviations I have noted in the Notes: see for instance viii. 18, 40; ix. 24; xi. 33; xii. 72; xiii. 1, 31; xvi. 31, 38; xvii. 51; xxiii. 26, 56; xxiv. 49; xxx. 3; xxxi. 73 etc.

The ordinary rules of Sarīndhi are uniformly observed. But between the Pādas a & b and c & d the author, it appears, does not accept that Sarīndhi is compulsory. We find many such cases which are recorded in the Notes. There are a few cases where hiatus is allowed even in the body of a Pāda viii. 39a, xiv. 78d, xvi. 81. There are two illustrations of abnormal Sarīndhi: grāmec + ekaraṭram = grāmaikaraṭram xxx. 45 and sukṣetre + ajiṅaḥ = sukṣetrayaṅaḥ xxviii. 42.

In xvii. 32 Nṛpātmajā Nom. sg. stands for nṛpātmajayaḥ Inst. sg. The classical usage requires that the causals of the roots ad and khād should govern Inst.; but here we find that the Acc. is used instead v. 49, 57. The root hṛ with pra governs Acc., see for instance xiv. 31, xvii. 44, 61, xviii. 70. In i. 8-9 the author has illustrated the use of uṣṇā with Abl., Acc. and Inst. Instrumental is used for Acc. in xxiii. 103 where we usually want vara-cūrṇasvāsān etc. As in the epic usage, apeta governs Inst. viii. 34, xi. 51, xvi. 50. If the reading is correct, it is a novel usage that Dative is used to convey sense of ‘instead of’: Kaścidbhaṭṭāya śriyamesa bhuṅkte ‘he enjoys glory instead of K.’ xviii. 126. Then Gen. is used for Inst. xxxi 86, and for Abl. which is necessary for comparison xvi. 60. Lastly Loc. tasmin is used for Acc. xiii. 63.

The usage of samāna-kartaṇkātva appears to be violated in the use of Gerund vi. 53; also note xv. 126 which needs some emendation as suggested in the Notes.

Among the numerals used by the author the following ordinals in the colophons of those cantos specially attract our attention: ekādaśama, dvādaśama, trayodaśama, saptaodaśama, ekonatinneśātama, trimśatama and ekatrinneśati-tama. Also note caturdaśini for caturdaśa xxx. 4. Some such forms like ekādaśama, aṣṭādaśama and saṣṭama are found in one Ms. of Saundarananda collated by Dr. Johnston for the edition of that work.

Some of the specialities of Jaṭila are the normal usages of the epics; and now and then they are common to Āsvaghoṣa and Jaṭila. I do not claim that I have exhausted all the peculiarities. Some space is devoted to them, along with the emendations of certain corrupt passages, in the Notes at the end. A thorough and statistical study with a better text would reveal many more interesting points. Then alone would it be possible for us to discriminate between archaisms, special features representing a distinct grammatical tradition, writer's irregularities and scribal slips.
THE OLDEST DATED MANUSCRIPT OF THE
DEŚINĀMAMĀLĀ OF HEMACANDRA
DATED SEPTEMBER 1241 (A.D.)

By
P. K. GODE

The Deśināmamālā of Hemacandra with his own commentary was based on the Prākrit dictionary written by Dhanapāla in A.D. 972.1 Dr. Bühler discovered this work and published a notice2 of it from the only MS then in his possession. Pischel edited this work in the Bombay Sanskrit Series (No. XVII, 1880). This edition was based on 9 MSS designated by him as A, B, C, D, E, F, G, H, I. I am concerned in this note with the dated MSS of the work used by Pischel. These are described by him in his Introduction to the Bombay Edition.3 They are as follows:—

(1) A—Sanīvat 1549 (Bikaner MS) = A.D. 1493.
(2) C—Sanīvat 1587 (Ahmedabad MS) = A.D. 1531.4
(3) E—Sanīvat (?) 1575 (Ahmedabad MS) = 1519 (?)5
(4) H—Sanīvat 1628 (Ahmedabad MS) = A.D. 1572.

Pischel states that “In order to ascertain the correct reading” he “was very often obliged to have recourse to etymology.” Where etymology failed him he had “nothing to guide him but the best MS” which, however, “was by no means trustworthy.” Pischel’s first edition has been revised by Principal P. V. Ramanujaswami and published by the B. O. R. Institute, Poona.6 For this edition the editor states that he had seven MSS at his disposal out of which one was a recent copy while three were already made use of for the first edition. The remaining three MSS (designated X, Y, Z) were utilized by him for the second edition (1938). Out of these three MSS only MS Y is a dated copy prepared in Sanīvat 1636 in the month of Phālguna ( = February-March 1580).

---

Vide also Zacharie, Die indischen Wörterbuecher, p. 31.
4. This is the date of the original MS of which the Ahmedabad MS is a copy.
5. The colophon contains the date 1575 which, Pischel thinks, may be intended for the Sanīvat era.
Principal Ramanujaswami regards the text of the Deśināmamālā as "settled with considerable purity" and hence he has "allowed the text to remain as it stood in the first edition."

In spite of the efforts of the two editors of the Deśināmamālā to settle its text the discovery and use of other MSS of the work earlier in point of date will make the assurance regarding "considerable purity" of the text doubly sure and it is the purpose of this note to point out such MSS as are earlier than those used by the two editors viz. Pischel and Ramanujaswami.

The India Office MS of the work is a copy written in A.D. 1881 and is useless for our present inquiry regarding MSS of the Deśināmamālā copied earlier than A.D. 1493 which is the date of the Bikaner MS used by Pischel and which is the earliest dated MS known to the two editors of this work. Prof. Velankar describes three MSS of this work in the possession of the B. B. R. A. Society, Bombay. Only one of these MSS is dated, having been copied in Saaka 1786 (= A.D. 1864). The MSS mentioned by Aufrecht have been already utilized by Pischel and Ramanujaswami. The Oriental MSS Library at Ujjain records a MS under the title "Deśināmamālā (Anekārtha Sanāgraha)" by Hemacandra, but it is not clear whether the MS is one of the Deśināmamālā or of the Anekārthasaṅgraha as the entry in the list of Ujjain MSS is rather ambiguous. This MS also does not bear any date. The Jain Granthāvali records one MS of the Deśināmamālā, one of a vrāti on it called "Ratnāvali" and a glossary called Uddhāra by Vimala. None of these MSS is dated.

The foregoing survey of the dated MSS of the Deśināmamālā reveals to us the following chronology of the available copies of the work:—

A.D. 1493, 1519(?), 1531, 1572, 1580, 1864, 1881.

I shall now record a MS of the Deśināmamālā which appears to me the earliest dated MS of the work. It is deposited in the Saṅghavi Pāḍā Jain Bhandar of Pataṅ and is described by the late Mr. C. D. Dalal in his Descriptive Catalogue of MSS in the Jain Bhandars at Pataṅ. According to

1. Do.—Intro., p. 2.
4. Cata. Catalogorum, i, 262b; ii, 56b; iii, 57a.

"देसीनामाला लिखिता प. ११२; १०” × १५” colophon:
संवत १२९८ वर्ष अशित्रैयां रेखे अवेष श्रीमुक्ते महाराण श्रीदीस्वदेव. ...मं, श्री.तज्ज्वालामुखवित्रे श्रीदीस्वदेवसुरूज्ज्वले देसीनामाला लिखिता। कायक्ष्यातीतमहे, जयंतति..."

The MS of the Deśināmālā copied in A.D. 1241 during the reign of king Visaladeva is a copy prepared 69 years after the death of Hemacandra and hence appears to me to be the oldest dated MS of the work so far known. This MS is also 252 years older than the Bikaner MS used by Pischel and which is dated A.D. 1493. In view of these facts the value of this MS for textual purposes should be the greatest as Pischel found that even the best MS used by him was not at times trustworthy in constituting the text of the Deśināmālā. Students interested in Prākṛta philology should try to procure a photographic copy of this MS from the authorities of the Saṅghavi's Pāḍā Bhāṅgādāra.

1. Vide JBBRAS, xxvi, p. 224—“Hema Candra was born on the full moon of Kartika, Saṅvat 1145 (A. C. 1088). In Saṅvat 1154 (A. C. 1097) he was initiated into the priestly orders; in 1166 (A. C. 1109) he obtained the degree or title of Sūri and died in Saṅvat 1229 (A. C. 1172) at the age of 84.” Vide also pp. 6 and 57 of Life of Hemacandra by Bühler (English Trans. by Dr. Manilal Patel Singhi Jaina Series ed. by Muni Jina Vijaya, Santiniketan, 1936).

2. Vide p. 34 of the Jain Bhandars Catalogue (1937)—This collection belongs to the Laghuposālīka branch of the Tapāgaccha. Neither Dr. Bühler nor Peterson had access to this collection though they managed to get lists of the MSS prepared through agents. Mr. Dalal states that he had a complete access to these MSS and that he discovered many new and important Sanskrit and Prākṛt works, both Jain and Brahmanical supposed to have been unknown or lost hitherto. He also discovered an enormous-bulk of Apabhramśa literature, which is looked upon as the immediate source of many Indian vernaculars.
ON THE ORIGINAL TEXT OF THE AŚṬĀDHYĀYI

By

S. P. CHATURVEDI

The Aśṭādhyaśī of Pāṇini holds an almost unrivalled position in Indian literature. It has thrown into oblivion the earlier grammatical works and has found its place in the list of the Vedāṅgas. Its methodology, scientific treatment and comprehensiveness have made us forget the older vedāṅga texts on grammar, and, being the oldest text on grammar it is the only work referred to as ‘Vyākaraṇa’ the most important among the six Vedāṅgas. Consequently it is invariably included by the Srotiyas in their recitation (Mantra-jāgara), no matter to which Veda or to which Śākhā thereof they belong. Thus, the Aśṭādhyaśī forms an essential part of the vast sacred vedic literature.

But this fact has not been an ‘unmixed blessing’ to the Aśṭādhyaśī, for it is responsible for causing an artificial recitation of the text. The sūtras are read by the Srotiyas not separately but continuously as in Sanhitāpāṭha. That this process of combining sūtras in a continuous reading could never have been Pāṇini’s intention goes without saying, for it strikes at the very root of the Pāṇinian scheme. The different sūtras are laid down by Pāṇini for different purposes. Some give positive injunctions (Vidhisūtras); others are negative (Niśedha); some are used in interpreting a sūtra (Paribhāṣā), others are meant for being handed down in the succeeding sūtras (Adhikāra); others are merely definitions of technical terms (Sanjñā). It would serve no purpose at all and would be only a travesty of facts, if we were to suppose that the sūtras of a pāda (a sub-section of an adhyāya) form one continuous word-group. But as this peculiar way of recitation is found among the Vedic reciters who seldom pay attention to the meaning of the text, there is not much to wonder at it. But the real matter for surprise faces us when we find the commentators taking advantage of the continuous recitation and interpreting sūtras in their own way.

This they did in two ways. Firstly, a variant reading of the final word of a sūtra is proposed to suit a grammatical purpose and the variant is accounted for by its sandhi with the initial letter of the following sūtra.

1. Cf. मूच्छ व्याकरणे स्पृतम् ।
(Pāṇiniya Śikṣā; St. 42)
2. Cf. संज्ञा च परिभाषा च विचिनित्यम् एव च ।
अधिकारोऽविद्यावध विविधं स्पृत्योऽरुपणम् ॥
Thus, the sūtra, 'Sthāne antaratamaḥ' (I-i-50) is proposed to be read as Sthāne antaratame, because the continuous reading of the two sūtras (I-i-50, 51), viz. Sthāne antaratama Uraṇ raparaḥ, can be dissolved as Sthāne antaratame / uraṇ raparaḥ. Secondly, the commentators split the continuous-read sūtras in an arbitrary manner. A sūtra may be split into two sūtras (Yoga-vibhāga) and interpreted accordingly to give wider meaning to the original sūtra. About eight (8) cases of such a Yoga-vibhāga have been suggested in the Mahābhāṣya. The later commentators carry this procedure of Yoga-vibhāga further to other sūtras and have no hesitation in resorting to it. This frequent recourse to Yoga-vibhāga has consequently led to a discrepancy in the total number of the Aṣṭā.-sūtras. According to the author of the Svarga-siddhānta-śandrika, the total number of the sūtras is 3995. Böhltingk gives in his critical edition 3983 sūtras and refers to a post-script in the Manuscript (B) according to which the sūtras were 3896 in number. Tārānath Tarka-Vacaspatti's edition of the Siddhāntakaumudi contains 3965 sūtras. This discrepancy in the total number of sūtras is mostly due to the Yoga-vibhāga procedure. A question may be raised as to why the commentators resorted to it. For replying this question, we have to dive deep into their minds and understand their view-point, before we think of accusing them of 'tampering' with the original text.

We have already seen above that the Aṣṭā. has long since been regarded as a part of the sacred Vedic literature. In his comment, Paññali expressly admits that the sūtras were like Vedas and that great sanctity attaches to them as they were composed by Pāṇini, an accepted authority on the subject. Therefore, the commentators believed that the Aṣṭā. was the standard grammar of the Sanskrit language for all times past as well as future. Consequently, according to them, what was not accounted for by the Aṣṭā. was wrong and also what was held correct must be justified and made to have Pāṇinian authority. It was specially the latter supposition which led the commentators to split sūtras in order to account for the new formations,

1. See Mahābhāṣya on (I-i-50).

"उपव्यया हि तुल्या संहिता 'स्थानेन्द्रततम उर्णपर' इति।"


3. Cf. Siddhānta-kaumudi on (II-i-6; II-iii-71; II-i-4 etc).

4. See section 1, st. 15.

अध्यायायां परिनिधिः सत्वगम्येऽसह ||


6. Ibid, footnote No. 2.

7. On (I-i) छन्दोन्वेत्या एक्ष्याः भवतिर्म ||

and प्रमाणम्भूत आयामाः अक्ष्याः यज्ञेन सूक्ष्मिम प्रियनाश ॥
notwithstanding the consideration whether Pāṇini knew and cared for such forms or not. The formations, which became current, even in the post-Pāṇinian age, were ‘Pāṇinianized’ and no scruple was felt in ‘retouching’ the original text to account for them. Thus, what would be thought, now-a-days, as the deliberate tampering with the text was not only felt unobjectionable but was regarded as quite compatible with the notion of authoritativeness which the commentators associated with Pāṇini’s grammar. Another evidence of retouching the original text is the proposed re-arrangement of some sūtras. The order of the sūtras as given in the Kāśikā-vṛtti, is ordinarily accepted. But Nāgēśabhaṭṭa says¹ that the sūtras (I-i-29;37) should come, according to Patañjali (on I-ii-32), after (VIII-iv-67); while Patañjali, regards² them as coming after (I-ii-40).³ Similarly, according to Patañjali, the sūtras (VIII-iv-58-63) should come after (VIII-iv-52). Besides these re-arrangements of the sūtras, the Aṣṭā. contains quite a good number of variants in reading, interpolations from the Vārttikas and Patañjali’s remarks and additions of one or more words.⁴

The Sūtra, ‘Upadeśe ac anunāsikaḥ it’ (I-iii-2), refers to the dropping of those vowels, which were nasalized (anunāsika) purposely to indicate their indicatory nature (Anubandhāvā). Thus, the letter r of the suffix Saṛ (P. III-ii-124) is elided, but not a of the suffix Sānac (P. III-ii-124). In order to distinguish such indicatory vowels (anubandhas) from other vowels, Pāṇini proposed their nasalization; the suffix Saṛ, therefore, was formally Saṛṇī, but Sānac was not Sānacī. Hence the difference in their treatment. But unfortunately the signs of nasalization are not seen in the present text of the Aṣṭā.; they disappeared before the age of the Kāśikā-Kārās (600 A.D.), who had therefore to give a maxim that the nasalized character of an indicatory vowel is the subject of inference and traditional interpretation (and not of actual observation).⁵ Needless to say, the retention of these signs would have been helpful and made the scheme much easier.

Now, we come to the question if the Aṣṭā. was originally written in an accented form. Though only the texts of the vedic saṃhitās and the Taṅtiriya and Satapatha Brāhmaṇas mark accents, there are reasons to believe that other older vedic works also had originally an accented form.⁶ The same may or may not be true of the Vedāṅga texts, but the fact remains that no available texts of the Vedāṅga works (including the Aṣṭā.) have

1. See Laghu-sabdendushekara on (I-ii-32).
2. See comments on (I-ii-32).
3. "इत्त आर्य नवसवानानां, 'अ अ' इति सुयात्तेन पाठ इति तत्त्वार्थित इत्यय भावेच इति तथावेत श्राः श्रेष्ठं। परस्तु उदात्सनिर्दिष्टसंग्रहः संग्रहं संग्रहं परस्तु पाठ इति स्पष्टं भावेच।"
5. See comment on (I-iii-2).
come down to us in an accented form. The Vedic reciters (śrutiya), however, recite the Aṣṭā in the same monotonous (ekasṛuti) way as the Aitareya Brāhmaṇa (which must have been originally accented like the Satapatha and Taittiriya) and the manner of recitation by the śrutiya gives no help to decide the question. This question whether ṛddha texts were originally accented or not, assumes greater importance in the case of the Aṣṭā. The basis of Pāṇini's grammar comprised the Vedic as well as the classical language; and as important Vedic works were accented, he had to give accent rules¹ in order to make his grammar comprehensive. His treatment of accents (svara-prakriya) is, therefore, an important section of the Aṣṭā and has been regarded fuller and more scientific than that of the section dealing with purely Vedic formations (Vaidiki-prakriya). The technique and fundamental principles of the language being the same, it is but natural that the application of his accent rules should be extended to the classical forms also. That the accents are common to both Vedic and Classical Sanskrit is clear from the fact that Pāṇini does not say that the word 'chandasi' is to be supplied in the accent-rules. On the other hand, the presence of this word in some sūtras (e.g., VI-i-170; VI-ii-119; VIII-i-35 etc.) makes it quite clear that other sūtras are common to both. The sūtra 'Vibhāṣā Bhāṣāyām' (VI-i-181) clearly refers to the optional operation of the accent-rule (VI-i-180) in Bhāṣā (spoken language). That Kātyāyana also did not like to confine the scope of the accent-rules to Vedic Sanskrit only can be inferred by his not introducing any such vārttika as 'Chandasi iti vācyam' in the accent-rules (svara-sūtras). The stanza 'Mantro hinaḥ svarato varṇato vā...is found altered in the Mahābhāṣya (I-i-1-1) as 'Duṣṭāḥ śabdaḥ...'. This clearly shows that according to Patañjali any word—whether Vedic or Classical—was liable to become wrong in accent and bring harm to the user.³ Thus, if we recognize that accents are common⁴ to both Vedic and Classical, it should cause no surprise if Pāṇini's sūtras

¹ See Svāra-siddhānta-candrikā; St. 16-7 of the 1st section

² (Annamalai University Sanskrit series edition, 1936)

³ Pāṇiniyāśikā, st. 52.

⁴ The word Indra-satrugh if accented on the 1st member of the compound will have Bahuvihi compound and mean "whose killer is Indra"; but if accented on the last syllable of the compound, it will have Taṭpurusa compound and mean 'Indra's killer'. This word pronounced in the accents of the Bahuvihi compound brought disaster to the Asuras.
also, like *Sanhitā* texts, bore accent marks according to his *Svara-prakriya*.
\(^1\) We shall begin the consideration of the problem with what the commentators *expressly* say about it.

In his comment on the *Paribhāṣā* ‘Abhedakāh Ṝuṇāk’ (No. 118) Nā�esābhāṭṭa refers to the two opinions of Kaiyaṭa, (i) that the *Aṣṭā* was read as an accented text, that is, the sūtras were recited with three accents; *udāṭta, anudāṭṭa* and *svarita* (*Traisvarya-pāṭha*); or (ii) the sūtras were recited in a monotonous way (*Ekaśruti*) and that no distinction in tone was observed. But Nā�esābhāṭṭa himself does not subscribe to this non-committing opinion of Kaiyaṭa. He asserts that though reciters do not observe the distinction of accents and recite in *Ekaśruti-pāṭha*, it does not follow that the *Aṣṭā* text had no accented form, that particular words in a sūtra may have been given for special reasons\(^2\) in *Ekaśruti*, but the *Aṣṭā* as a whole was handed down by Pāṇini in an accented form (*Traisvarya*).

But there are some difficulties in accepting the above view of Nā�esābhāṭṭa. Firstly, Kaiyaṭa, an earlier writer by 600 years, is not so definite and holds a non-committing opinion.\(^3\) Secondly, granting that the *Aṣṭā* had *Traisvarya-pāṭha* the following questions arise; (i) whether the roots, stems and suffixes occurring in the sūtras, were marked according to their original accents, or they would be governed by the rules of the *Sanhitāpāṭha* (where mutual influencing of accents in different words is allowed). [For example, the roots, *Vada, Vraja* (= *Vad, Vraj* which are *Udāṭta*, by VI-i-162) in the sūtra (VII-i-3) would be marked as such, or the compound, ‘*vada-vraja-halantasya*’ (VII-i-3) will have *Samāsa-svāra* (VI-i-223) viz. *antodāṭta*, and the roots, *vada etc.* will be marked as *anudāṭṭa*. Or (ii) whether *Yat* in (III-i-97) will have stem-accent (Pṛīṣvāra, *antodāṭta*) or the *svarita*-accent by (VI-i-185). A strict adherence to the method of *Traisvarya-pāṭha* will, however, require compound-accent in the sūtra (VII-i-3) and *Yat* in (III-i-97) to be marked as *Udāṭta*, for the word *Yat* in the sūtra does not actually have *t* (as the indicator sign) as required by (VI-i-185); *yat* has *t* (as an *anuvandha*) in the example-formations only, viz. *ceyam, jeyam*. But this explanation does not hold good in the following case.

The heading words (*Adhikāra*), which are intended to be supplied in the following sūtras, are enjoined by Pāṇini to be marked with the *Svariya*-sign (*Svaritena addhikāraḥ*, I-iii-11); e.g. the words, *Dhātaḥ* (III-i-91), *Pratvayah* (III-i-1)—(which are supplied in the following sūtras) should be

\(^1\) Cf. the rules of *Sandhi* given by Pāṇini which are actually applied in Pāṇini’s sūtras (special cases ignored).

\(^2\) The word, *Aiksvāka*, allowed as an irregular formation (*nipāṭana*) by (VI-iv-174), is to be read in *Ekaśruti* to permit two forms; one with *udāṭta* on the first syllable in the sense of ‘Son of Ikṣvāku’ (IV-i-168), the other with *udāṭta* on the last syllable in the sense of ‘born in the country of Ikṣvāku’ (IV-ii-132).

\(^3\) Kaiyaṭa (on VI-1-1) does not only mention the above option, but regards *Traisvarya-pāṭha* as दुर्खचारण
marked as svarita. But a question arises whether the words, Dhātukh and Pratyayāh, being adhikāra-words, will bear Svarita-marks or their original accents (antodāttā); whether the word, Aci in (VI-i-77) should have the Svarita sign, because it is an adhikāra word and is supplied in the following sūtra (VI-i-78) or it should be marked with its own original accent (Ādyudāttā). Really speaking, the rules of Taisvarya-pāṭha will have to be waived in the case of adhikāra words and P. sūtras will have to be marked in two ways, (i) the adhikāra-words in a sūtra to be marked as Svarita, and (ii) the remaining words in a sūtra will have original accents and undergo the mutual influencing of accents as in Saṁhitā-pāṭha. But the present Aṣṭā. text shows not only the absence of Taisvarya, but also of Svarita-signs, which would have indicated an adhikāra. The authors of the Kāśikā-vṛtti expressly state that an adhikāra word is known as such by inference and traditional interpretation and not by actual marking of the svarita-sign, in the same way as we have seen above about the nasalization-sign of an indicatory vowel. The comments of Kātyāyana and Patañjali on (III-i-11) do not indicate that they had before them an accented text of the Aṣṭā. In fact, the word Svarita in (I-i-11) does not appear to have been used in its technical sense (Saṁhāraḥ Svarītaḥ I-ii-31), but merely as an arbitrary sign. It would be preposterous to suppose that Pāṇini desired the adhikāra words to be marked as Svarita in its technical sense and thus cause confusion between the adhikāra-svarita and the real svarita-accent.

A similar confusion is likely to arise as regards the uddātta and anudātta roots in the Dhātu-pāṭha. We know from (VI-i-162) that all the roots are antodātta (i.e. have the last vowel udātta); but for the purpose of indicating whether a root is set or anīṭ, a distinction was made in the Dhātupāṭha, viz. the set roots were marked udātta and anīṭ ones anudātta (Vide, VII-ii-10). Thus, the root jñā (to know) is formally udātta by (VI-i-162), but in the Dhātupāṭha it must be marked as anudātta to indicate that it is an anīṭ root. The only solution to clear off this tangle is to regard the udātta and anudātta lists of the Dhātu-pāṭha as not having the technical udātta and anudātta accents, but some arbitrary sign for indicating distinction.\(^2\)

---

1. On (II-i-11).
2. See a detailed interpretation of the sūtra in Gurupūjakāhumudi (Fest-gabe zum Albrecht Weber) 1896; KIELHORN: 'Svaritenadhihīraḥ'.
4. GOLDSΤUCKER (Reprint, p. 41) referring to this clumsy method of using the same term for indicating two different functions, writes, "Let us suppose that anudātta in the Upađesa does not mean the spoken, but the written accent and the difficulty is solved without the necessity of impugning the ability of the com-
These arbitrary indications of a svarita or anudātta were so clumsy and un-scientific (and almost un-Pāṇini-like) that Patañjali (on I-ii-11) pooh-poohed the idea of the Svarita-sign for indicating Adhikāra and preferred the ever-ready (and at times teasing due to its frequency) recourse to the Paribhāṣa Vyākhyaṇa viśeṣa-pratipattiḥ na hi sandehāt a-laksanaṃ, i.e., “The solution of the special (difficulty) results from explanation, for it does not follow that because there is a doubt there is not criterion to solve it.” (p. 37|8, Goldstücker). Similarly, the anit (so-called anudātta) roots were later1 on put together and classified on the principle of their final consonants. The sūtra, Svaritena adhikāraḥ (I-iii-11) is now to us of no practical utility;2 but the fact remains that this sūtra served its purpose in Pāṇini’s times, when there must have been signs to indicate an adhikāra word. It is certain that these signs had already disappeared in Patañjali’s times, for, otherwise, he would not have thought of assigning to them one after another, three different functions, (i) The Svarita-sign indicates a heading word, (ii) it indicates the limit to which a heading word goes, and (iii) it invests a word with greater strength or efficacy (Adhikāraḥ = adhikān kāryam).3

Now let us consider the internal evidence of Pāṇini on the subject. The sūtra (I-ii-36) gives an option to have Traisvarya-pātha or Ekaśruti-pātha in Vedic literature, implying thereby that even in his times, some vedic works were read with Ekaśruti, an assumption borne out by known facts. This Ekaśruti-pātha should then be still more true of the classical Sanskrit works as testified by the existing texts. So unless we think of Pāṇini as writing consciously and professedly a vedic work, the question of the Traisvarya-pātha in the Aṣṭā. need not arise. The suggestion of the latter commentators4 to interpret the sūtra (I-ii-36) as ‘Vibhāṣa a-chandasi’ and allow option in Bhāṣā (a-chandas) also is on the face of it not required (besides being unnatural and far-fetched) and arises from a misconception. The later commentators, believing in the Traisvarya-pātha of the Aṣṭā. seem to think that the sūtra, ‘Vibhāṣa chandasi’ gives option of having Ekaśruti or Traisvarya to the vedic works only, and the Traisvarya-pātha is, therefore, compulsory in non-vedic works. But then the complete absence of accentuation marks in the classical Sanskrit works remains inexplicable. We should also bear in mind that the Ekaśruti-pātha (and not Traisvarya) is suitable to the employment of the Ślesa figure so frequently employed in classi-

---

1. See Kāśikā-vṛtti and Siddhānta-kaumudi on the sūtra (VII-ii-10).
2. See Kielhorn: Gṛupāṇjakauaumudi, p. 29-32, specially the opening and last sentences.
3. For examples, see Mahābhāṣya on the sūtra (I-iii-11).
cal Sanskrit. Besides Kāyaṭa (see above) does not preclude the possibility of the Ekaśruti in the Aṣṭā. Kātyāyanā’s Vārttikas on (VI-iv-174) about the word Aikṣvāka show clearly that the prevalent Ekaśruti-pāṭha was necessary to account for the required forms. The inference from (VI-i-181) about the prevalence of accents in Bhāṣā (spoken language) would be valid for spoken forms and not a written work like the Aṣṭā. It is only on the supposition that the Aṣṭā was written in Ekaśruti that the commentators can justify their interpretation of the sūtra (I-i-70) in two ways (Taḥ paro yasmāt or Taṭ paraḥ, viz. followed by or following t). Otherwise in Traisvareyapāṭha the accents of the Bahuvrīhi and Tatpurusa compounds being different [vide (VI-ii-1) and (VI-i-223)], the two interpretations of Taparāḥ would not have been at all possible. If some grammarians, desiring to elevate the Aṣṭā to the status of the accented vedic saṁhitās, applied the accent-rules of Pāṇini to his own work and put forth before the vedic reciters an accented text, such a text did not survive long and like the Aitareya Brāhmaṇa, the Aṣṭā also came to be recited in Ekaśruti.

1. Specially footnote 1 of page 147.
2. See footnote 2 of page 146.
4. It is a well-established fact that accents—pitch or stress—play an important part in the spoken languages. Pāṇini’s accent-rules applicable to the Bhāṣā forms also are to be explained in this way. The word ‘Bhāṣā’ used in the sūtras, not dealing with accents, does however refer to both the forms of the classical Sanskrit—written and spoken.
6. See Patañjali on (I-i-50), Kāśikā-vṛtti and all later commentators on (I-i-70).
AUSTRIAN SUB-STRATUM IN THE ASSAMESE LANGUAGE*

By

B. KAKATI

§ 18. Assamese betrays certain peculiarities not shared by any other modern Indo-Aryan language in its usages of the nouns of relationship. These may be grouped under two classes. (i) There are different and specific terms used with reference to the same relation according as he or she is senior or junior in age with reference to the person with whom relationship is indicated. (ii) The same terms of relationship take on personal affixes on the model of verbal conjugations according as the relationship indicated is with the first, the second (inferior or honorific), or the third person.

§ 19. To illustrate:—my elder brother is kakāi, but my younger brother is bhāi; my elder sister is bāi, but my younger sister is bhāni. Similarly my elder sister's husband is bhimnāi but my younger sister's husband is baināi. So also the elder one of two sisters not related to the speaker would be affectionately addressed as āi-kan but the younger one as māi-kan.

It would thus be seen that there are no generic terms in Assamese equivalent to such English words as brother, sister, etc. An English expression like How many brothers are you? would be rendered in Assamese as tomālok bhāi-kakāi kei-jan—How many are you, (including) younger and elder brothers?

§ 20. The personal affixations of the terms of relationship according as they are qualified by different grammatical persons may be best illustrated in a tabular form.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>My:</th>
<th>Your (inferior):</th>
<th>Your (hon.):</th>
<th>His</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Father</td>
<td>bop-āi,</td>
<td>bāp-er,</td>
<td>bāp-erā,</td>
<td>bāp-ek.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother</td>
<td>āi,</td>
<td>mā-ṛ,</td>
<td>mā-ṛā,</td>
<td>mā-k.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elder brother</td>
<td>kakā-i,</td>
<td>kakā-yeṛ,</td>
<td>kakā-yeṛā,</td>
<td>kakā-yeκ.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Younger sister</td>
<td>bhāni,</td>
<td>bhāni-yeṛ,</td>
<td>bhāni-yeṛā,</td>
<td>bhāni-yeκ.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>etc.</td>
<td></td>
<td>etc.</td>
<td>etc.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

§ 21. This phenomenon has not been satisfactorily explained. Sir George Grierson has connected this with the affixed pronouns of the Northwestern languages (JASB. 1895, Part I. p. 347;—quoted in ODBL. p. 165). Dr. S. K. Chatterji differing from Sir George would consider it to be a case of Tibeto-Burman (Boḍo) influence, Boḍo possessing the peculiarity found in the Aryan Assamese (ODBL. p. 165).

* Continued from N. I. A. I. 264.
§ 22. But the Tibeto-Burman (Boô) influence, great as it is in some respects on Assamese, does not explain the phenomenon of affixed nouns of relationship. In the Boô the pronouns are prefixed and not suffixed (e.g. Boô: ā-jā, my father, nām-jā, your father; bi-jā, his father). There are, however, Austric parallels to these Assamese idioms. Speaking of the Munḍa languages, Sten Konow observes “Nouns denoting relationship are seldom conceived in the abstract but a pronominal suffix restricting the sphere of the idea is usually added. Thus Santali: enga-ñ, my mother; enga-t, his mother, but seldom enga, in the meaning of mother alone.” He observes further that “the Munḍa languages belong to that class which possesses a richly varied stock of words to denote individual things and ideas but is extremely poor in general and abstract terms” (LSI. IV pp. 23, 43). These observations throw some light upon the phenomena noticed under §§ 19 and 20.

§ 23. But the personal affixes to the Assamese nouns of relationship are not of pronominal origin nor are they un-Aryan. They can be traced back to Indo-Aryan sources and are pleonastic in value as shown by their uses with other words in Assamese. If the Austric idioms have induced similar formations in Assamese, the formatives are of Indo-Aryan origin. The point of contact between Austric and Assamese in this regard is one of principle. What Sten Konow says about the complex conjugation of the Bihari verb has some bearing upon the present discussion. “The complexity can be explained from Aryan forms but the whole principle quite agrees with Munḍa grammar (Sten Konow: Ibid. p. 10).”

§ 24. The following Assamese plural suffixes may be equated to Austric formations: -bilā-k; -gilā with variants in -gilā-k, -gilā-n; -nglā with variant in -nglā-n; -hāmrā. Here also there are specific differences in their uses: -bilā-k and -gilā with variants are used generally after nouns, cf. Mānuh-bilāk or mānuh-gilā, men. The suffix -nglā or -nglā-n is used only after demonstrative pronouns, cf. i-nglā, si-nglā, these, those. The suffix -hāmrā is used only after proper names of persons and nouns of relationship; cf. Rām-hāmrā, Ram and others; bāpek-hāmrā, his father and others.

The Austric formations to which these Assamese suffixes may be compared are: bilai, in great number (Khasi); bi, ga, many, much: (M. 42); lu, lo, many, much (M. 40); jugoy, many (M. 44); ma-git, how many (W. 78); hamram, abundant, copious (Santali).

§ 25. The final -k, -n in the Assamese Plural suffixes are of Indo-Aryan origin; -k being pleonastic and -n, a relic of the Old Indo-Aryan genitive plural. Thus an Assamese suffix like -nglā-n would represent a fusion of Austric formations like jugoy, lo with Aryan -n.

§ 26. Assamese has a rich crop of enclitic numeratives or definitives. They are post-positional affixes or words which are added to nouns or numerals to define the nature of the object or article referred to. They may be commonly described as articles and have the value of the definite
article "the". Even pronouns other than those of the first and second persons take on these post-positions.

To express the force of the indefinite article 'a' the same post-positional words are used with e- (<eka) prefixed. The formation so constructed may be used either before or after the principal word it qualifies; cf. ekhan kāpor or kāpor ekhan, a piece of cloth; but kāpor-khan, the piece of cloth.

§ 27. The Assamese enclitic definitives are many and various according as they indicate something "broad and flat" "long and flexible" "long and flat" etc.

There are as many as thirteen used in common parlance. The following examples will illustrate the uses of a few:

cālanī-khan, the sieve, (something broad and flat).
pāt-caṭā, the tablet, (long and flat).
dol-gach, the rope, (long and flexible).
kāṭh-dāl, the piece of wood (long but round and solid), etc.

They are used also after numerals: e-khan, one piece; du-caṭā, tini-dāl, etc...... each qualifying something of the nature indicated by the suffix.

§ 28. Most of these post-positional suffixes may be traced to Aryan sources. But the idiom of using them as definitives as in the above expressions is un-Aryan. The enclitic numeratives constitute a characteristic both of the Tibeto-Burman and the Austrac languages. In the Tibeto-Burman languages generic prefixes are commonly used with numerals which follow the nouns. They are many and various according as they qualify "flat" or "globular" things, things standing as trees, etc....... (LSI. vol. iii. part ii. p. 385). But the aboriginal dialects of the Malay Peninsula often annex to their numerals certain words which roughly express the genius or some general characteristic of the things enumerated. The numeral and this numerical co-efficient then go closely together and form an inseparable word-group which may either follow or precede the substantives that represent the things enumerated. (Blagden : vol. ii, p. 775.)

§ 29. Assamese affixes the co-efficient to the numerals like Austric and does not prefix unlike Tibeto-Burman. The suffixed numeral either follows or precedes the substantive as in Austric and does not follow it unlike as in Tibeto-Burman: e.g. du-caṭā kāṭh, two pieces of wood: kāṭh du-caṭā, two pieces of wood or the two pieces of wood, according to the context. But Tibeto-Burman influences may be suspected in the varied nature of the definitives according as the objects qualified are 'flat', 'round', 'broad' etc.

§ 30. The idiomatic parallels and other points of contact noted in the above sections only heighten the suspicion raised in §17. At the present state of our knowledge about the interaction of the Aryan and non-Aryan languages nothing more definite may be hazarded.
PŪRṆAGIRI AND UḌḌIYĀṆA

By

JOGENDRA CHANDRA GHOSH.

According to some Hindu and the Buddhist Tantras, Kāmarūpa, Pūrṇagiri Oḍḍiyāna or Uḍḍiyāna and Jalandhara are the four pīṭhas or sacred centres of importance. But according to the Sādhanaṃāla (Gaikwāḍ Series) Kāmākhyā, Śrīhaṭṭa, Pūrṇagiri and Uḍḍiyāna are the four sacred spots of the Vajrayānists. Of these Kāmākhyā is the same as Kāmarūpa in Assam. Śrīhaṭṭa is the district of Sylhet, formerly in Bengal, but now in Assam. Jalandhara is too well-known. But Pūrṇagiri and Uḍḍiyāna have not yet been satisfactorily identified. We shall, in the present note, try to give some new light towards their location.

1. PŪRṆAGIRI

Dr. P. C. Bagchi says that 'Pūrṇagiri has not yet been definitely indentified.' (IHQ. VII. p. 5). Dr. Benoytosh Bhattacharyya says, that 'Pūrṇagiri is sometimes identified with modern Poona but this is very doubtful, though at this stage it is extremely difficult for any new identification.' (Ibid, Vol. III, p. 744). Dr. Bagchi in his edition of the Kaulajñāna-Nirṇaya of Matsyendranātha (Calcutta Sanskrit Series No III), has appended a copy of the Nityāṅhika-tilakam, which says that Pūrṇagiri-pīṭha was in Dāhala country, as,


Dāhala was the well-known kingdom in Central India ruled by the Kala-churis (Chedis). In the Kālikāpurāṇa (ch. 64, v. 46). Pūrṇaśaila has been placed in the south, probably of Kāmarūpa. The Purāṇa enjoins that god Pūrṇaṭha and the goddesses Sarojā, Sāntā and Damanidevi are to be worshipped here. This last-named may have some connection with the name of Damch of the district of same name in C.P., which in the fifteenth century inscription was called Damanakapura. (Dāmaha-dipaka, p. 85.)

It is interesting to note that this ascetic from Dāhala, in Central India, should be favoured by Vibhīṣaṇa, (probably a general name for the king of Laṅkā) and come to be reputed to be known by the name of Laṅkānanda-nātha. Can it be that there was a Laṅkā in Central India, as discussed by us in the note 'SIṀHALA IN CENTRAL INDIA' (NIA. I. 463)?
2. Udāiyāna.


If Uḍḍiyāna was really outside India, this location must have been long forgotten. The Kumārikā-Khaṇḍa, embedded in the Māheśvarakhaṇḍa of the Skanda-pūrṇa (ch. 39, v. 133) names it as one of the seventy-two provinces forming Bhāratavarṣa (India). It comprised nine lākhs of villages. According to the Pāg Sam Jon Žan it contained five lākhs of towns. (Wadde], Lumaism , p. 182 ; IHQ. Vol. III, p. 745). Both Sambhala and Laṅkāpurī lay in it. We have shown that both these places were in Central India (NIA. I. 463).

According to the Nityāhnika-tilakām (p. 68), referred to above, Oḍḍa-pīṭha was in Pūṇḍravardhana of Gauḍa, as,  


The date of copy of this manuscript is 515 N.S.=1395 A.D. [H. P. Shastri’s Nepal Catalogues (I. pp. 111-12 ; II. pp. 70 and 82)]. This Oḍḍa-pīṭha seems to be the same as the Uḍḍiyāna or Uḍḍiyāna-pīṭha. If so, this goes to support the conjecture of Dr. B. Bhattacharyya. But in the Skandapurāṇa, Gauḍa has been mentioned as a separate country from Uḍḍiyāna.

According to the Kālikāpurāṇa (ch. 64, vv. 43-44) Oḍrā Jālaśaila, Pūrṇāsaila and Kāmarūpa are the four principal pīṭhas of Devī. Oḍrā has been placed in the west, apparently of Kāmarūpa. Here Oḍreśvari-Kātyāyanī and Oḍreśa-Jagannātha are to be worshipped, as,

“Oḍrākhyam prathamaṁ pīṭhāṁ dvitiyaṁ Jālaśailakām | Tṛtiyaṁ Pūrṇapīṭham-tu Kāmarūpana caturthakām ||
Oḍrapīṭham paśchime tu tath-aiś-Oḍreśvarīṁ Śivāṁ | Kātyāyanīṁ Jagannātham-Oḍreśaṁ-ca pratūjaṁet ||

Jālaśaila and Pūrṇapīṭha are no doubt the same as Jālandhara and Pūrṇagiri respectively. Oḍrapīṭha, therefore is identical with Oḍḍiyāna. This Oḍrā again is the same as Orissa. This goes to support the view of Mm. H. P. Shastri, but this identification may be due to the confusion arising out of the similarity of names.
The Kālikāpurāṇa, as has been shown by Mr. P. K. Gode is earlier than Nānyadeva of Mithilā (1097 A.D.) [JORS. Vol. X (1936) p. 293]. There is a MS of this in the Sanskrit College Library, Calcutta, which was copied in Nepal Sanāvat ‘yuga kha suva-nayana’ i.e. 204 N.S. = 1084 A.D. (Des. Cat. of Sans. MSS, Vol. IV, No. 13). So this identification is as old as 1000 A.D. at least. But all are unanimous in placing it in India.

It may be pointed out here that at least four countries in India, well-known for Tantricism, viz., Assam, Bengal, Orissa and C.P. claim Oḍḍīyāna-piṭha. It may be that none of them is original Oḍḍīyāna, which was somewhere outside India and was for want of communication long forgotten. So the Tāntrikas set up this important piṭha in different places to suit their purposes.

The Editors regret to have to announce the death of Mr. GHOSH which took place early in October this year. A biographical note will appear in one of the subsequent issues of the NIA.—S. M. K.]
INSCRIPTIONS OF KATHIAWAD

By

D. B. DISKALKAR

INTRODUCTION

The historical province of Kathiawad, or more properly of Saurashtra attracted the attention of modern scholars as early as 1822 when Major James Tod first unveiled to the world its remarkable and interesting antiquities. Since that time to the present day as a result of continuous search a large number of inscriptions have been discovered in the province. There is probably no part of India of the same small extent which is so rich in its wealth of historical remains as Kathiawad. From a pilgrim’s record consisting of his mere name in a word or two to the long edict of the great Emperor Aśoka, from an obituary notice of a villager who met his death in an encounter with his opponents while rescuing the cattle of his village to the lengthy inscription giving an account of how the Gupta Emperor Skandagupta could get no sleep by his anxiety to protect his vast empire from the invasions of the wild Hūnas, from a modern record of the digging of a well by a pious lady for the use of people and the cattle in a waterless part to the important praśasti recording the repairs made by the powerful Kṣatrapa king Rudradāman to the old and celebrated Sudarśana lake, and lastly from a short record by which a Jain assembly gave the privilege of engraving inscriptions on the Gīrār hill to a mason to the long copper-plate grant by which a princess of the royal family of Valabhi assigned a village or two for the maintenance of a large Buddhist monastery—all kinds of inscriptions on stone and copper and dated from the very early to the very late times have been found in Kathiawad.

Fifty years back the Bhāvanagar State in Kathiawad made a pioneer attempt to collect epigraphical material chiefly with the object of preparing a history of the Gohel family to which the Maharaja of Bhāvanagar belongs by deputing men throughout Kathiawad and Rajaputana. Impressions of hundreds of stone and copperplate inscriptions were collected by them and selections from them were published by the State in three volumes one entitled “Prākr̤t and Sanskrit Inscriptions” and the other “Bhāvanagar Prācīna Šodha Sangraha” and the third “Persian and Arabic Inscriptions” under the editorship of the late Mr. Udayashankar Gaurishankar Ojha. A few more inscriptions of the province were published in the “List of Antiquarian Remains in the Bombay Presidency” by Burgess and Couzens and still some more inscriptions were published from time to time in research journals like the Indian Antiquary by several scholars.
As Curator of the Watson Museum of Antiquities, Rajkot (1919-1929), I had an opportunity of examining the large collection of about 800 impressions of inscriptions made by my predecessors, especially by the late Mr. Vallabhi Haridatta Acharya from every part of Kathiawad. As a result of my examination I found that there are still many useful inscriptions which have not been brought to the notice of the public and that even the inscriptions which were once published require revision. I began accordingly, the work of studying critically all the collections of impressions of inscriptions not only preserved in the Watson Museum of Antiquities at Rajkot, but also in the Archaeological Society at Junagadh, the Barton Museum at Bhavnagar and the Forbes Gujarati Sabha in Bombay. As a result of that I thought it advisable to prepare separate volumes of the epigraphical material of the province according to the periods and topics. The whole material can be divided into two main classes: The first from the earliest times to v.s. 1000 and the other from v.s. 1000 to v.s. 1900. The copper-plates of the Maitraka rulers of Valabhi form a very important material of the first period and I have accordingly prepared a separate compendium of them. Epigraphical material of the second period can be distinctly divided into two sections:—the inscriptions of the Caulukya rulers of Gujarat and the miscellaneous inscriptions of the dynasties that ruled in Kathiawad. As I intend to publish all the Caulukya inscriptions in a separate series the present series has been prepared to contain all the remaining important inscriptions from v.s. 1000 to 1900. It excludes of course the Persian and Arabic inscriptions found in Kathiawad which, though dated in the period to which this series belongs, must be separately dealt with.

This series contains 200 selected inscriptions taken from all parts of Kathiawad. In making this selection attention is paid more towards the historical importance of an inscription than towards its religious importance. A number of inscriptions specially of the Jain religion are not therefore included in this collection.

A full text of each inscription is given and is accompanied by an introductory note giving details of its find-spot, its measurements, its present state of preservation, the place of its publication if any, and its historical importance. The inscriptions are generally intelligible in themselves and I therefore thought it unnecessary to give their literal translation.

Though most of these inscriptions are useful for our knowledge of the history of the province only, they include some which throw important light on the general history of India. Secondly, though the inscriptions are comparatively of a modern date, they are not without an interest and importance of their own. They are undoubtedly a very useful material for preparing the history of Kathiawad from v.s. 1000 to 1900.

The collection contains inscriptions of not only those royal families that once ruled in Kathiawad, of whom very little is known to us for want of sufficient material, but also of those that have been still ruling in some
part of Kathiawad. The chief family of the former class was the Cūḍāsāmās. They ruled some time at Vanthali and some time at Junagadh for more than six centuries—from about v.s. 900 to 1527. It is the last Hindu family to rule at Junagadh. The history of this family is almost entirely lost and the bardic legends differ so much about the names, number and order of the chieftains that implicit confidence cannot be placed on them. A Sanskrit poem called *Māṇḍalika Kāvyā* by Gangādhara is found which gives some account of the family but it is of very little historical importance. A few of their inscriptions give the genealogy of the family, but they frequently differ in the order of succession of the rulers and thereby cause some confusion. Forbes, Burgess, and Gaurishankar H. Ojha took some trouble to fix the genealogy and chronology of the family but could not do so satisfactorily. The present collection is somewhat helpful to us in this respect. It contains at least 23 inscriptions, which on more or less certain grounds can be assigned to the Cūḍāsāmā kings. With the help of the various dates given by them a fairly satisfactory genealogy and chronology at least of the latter half of the family can be prepared. The following kings of the Cūḍāsāmā family are represented in the collection:—Mahipāla I Nos. 25, 26, 28 and 31; Khengār No. 33; Jayasirināha No. 37; Mahipāla II Nos. 38 and 40; Mokalasirināha Nos. 46, 48, 51 and 53; Meligadeva Nos. 64, 65, 66, and 67; Jayasirināha Nos. 68 and 69; Mahipāla III Nos. 70 and 71 and Māṇḍalika Nos. 76, 77 and 80. Some kings of the family are incidentally referred to in a few more inscriptions, e.g. in No. 47. Three kings of the family are found referred to in some Sanskrit Mss. Thus with the help of these inscriptions and the dates recorded in them the latter portion of the genealogy of the Cūḍāsāmā family can be prepared.

Māṇḍalika accession v. s. 1350

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Navaghana v.s. 1362</th>
<th>Mahipāla v.s. 1364</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Khengāra v.s. 1387</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jayasirināha v.s. 1407</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mahipāla v.s. 1435</th>
<th>Satyarāja</th>
<th>Mokalasirināha v.s. 1440</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Māṇḍalika v.s. 1452</th>
<th>Meliga v.s. 1456</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jayasirināha v.s. 1472</td>
<td>Mahipāla v.s. 1486</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Māṇḍalika v.s. 1506</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Though no inscription of the family is found, which belongs to the period earlier than that of king Maṇḍalika mentioned first in this genealogy and with whom the inscriptions generally begin their genealogies we have reason to suppose that the Cudāsāmā family had established their rule in Kathiawad some time before the Caulukyas had established their rule in Gujarat under Mūjārāja the first. For history tells us of very severe fights fought by the Caulukya sovereigns Mūḷārāja and Sidhārāja Jayasinhā with the Cudāsamā kings. The founder of the family was Cudācandra as the Dhandhusar inscription (No. 48) states. An inscription found at Vanthali (see Annals of the Bhandarkar Oriental Institute, Vol. VII p. 171) speaks of a king named Maṇḍalika whose capital at Vanthali was seized by one Jagatsimha, a feudatory of the Caulukya king Viradhava. As Viradhava is known to have lived about V.S. 1288 this Maṇḍalika can be assigned to the same period. He must then be an earlier king of the same name different from the first Maṇḍalika in the above-mentioned genealogy. This inscription can be assigned to about V.S. 1346 and shows that up to that period Vanthali remained in the possession of Jagatsimha’s family. But in a few years after this when the Caulukya rule over Kathiawad was slackened owing to the Muhammedan encroachments Maṇḍalika the first king in our genealogy seems to have seized back his ancestral kingdom of Vanthali. It is but natural therefore that the later inscriptions begin the genealogies of the family with this Maṇḍalika. The family continued to rule up to V.S. 1527 when it was destroyed by the Muhammedans under Muhammad Begadha. The inscriptions show that the Cudāsamās had always tried to resist the power of the Gujarati Sultans of Ahmedabad in their attempt to subdue the Kathiawad peninsula. They also show that the Cudāsamās were the most powerful of the many royal families that ruled in Kathiawad during and after the sovereign power of the Caulukyas of Gujarat over the peninsula.

Another royal family contemporary with the Cudāsamās whose inscriptions are found were the Vājā rulers of Somanātha Pāṭaṇa. Their inscriptions, however, are not of sufficient importance to enable us to write their connected history. The Vājās are supposed to have come from the Rāstrakūṭa stock. The following are the inscriptions of the Vājā kings:—Nos. 35 and 39 refer to the reign of the Vājā king Bhāmara. Nos. 45, 50 and 60 belong to the reign of Śivagaṇa who seems to have been referred to in the Khorāsā inscription of V.S. 1445. No. 62 is the record of Śivagaṇa’s son Brahmadāsa. No. 72 belongs to the reign of a Vājā king named Rāmadeva. No. 17 speaks that a Vājā warrior fell in a fight with the Turuṣkas in Somanātha Pāṭaṇa. These inscriptions show that Vājā kings ruled over the southern coast of Kathiawad at least from Somanātha Pāṭaṇa to Unā and acknowledged the sovereign power first of the Delhi Emperors and subsequently of the Sultans of Gujarat through their provincial governors.

The Khorāsā inscription of V.S. 1445 (No. 47) gives us a very interesting information that two royal families Makvāṇa and Vāghelā had migrated from Mārwād to Saurāstra probably through fear of the Muhammedans.
They entered the services of the Cûḍāsamā kings of Vanthali whom they served very faithfully. The Makvāṇā family originally belonged to the Brahmakṣatri community but was eventually considered to be one of the 36 Kṣatriya families. The Vāghelā family in the inscription which must have been an off-shoot of the great Vāghelā family of Dholkā and Aṇahilapātana had probably first gone to Kâṅkroli in Mârwâd from Gujarāt but had again come back to Saurāṣṭra some time before the time of our inscription.

The Mahuvâ inscription of v.s. 1272 speaks of a Mehara king ruling at Timbâṇaka. He was probably a successor of the Mehar king Jagamal, a feudatory of the Caulukya sovereign Bhima II mentioned in the copper-plate grant of v.s. 1264 found at Timâṇâ and published in the *Indian Antiquary* Vol. XI p. 337. Another Meher family is mentioned in the Hâtasâï inscription of v.s. 1386. In modern times the Mehers are found chiefly in the Porbundar State and not in the part of Kathiawad where the above-mentioned inscriptions were found.

The Rajput families now ruling in Kathiawad are chiefly the Jâdejâs, the Jhâlâs, the Gohels and the Jeṭhvâs. The Jeṭhvâs alone have continued the headship in one individual viz the Râṇâ of Porbundar. In the others several cadets of the reigning houses have established themselves as independent chiefs. It has been the custom in Rajput houses for each son to receive a certain portion of land as his patrimony. Many of the most enterprising younger branches enlarged their borders not only at the expense of their feudal lord and brethren but at the expense of the neighbouring families. In this way kingdoms arose in Kathiawad in course of time until very lately when the advent of the British and their permanent settlement have left no chance for any one of acquiring new territories. All these families have left a number of inscriptions the most important of which are included in this series.

Of the four Rajput families mentioned above the Jeṭhvâs are supposed to be the most ancient. Their origin is veiled in obscurity. No authentic inscriptions of the family of early times are found. But this much can be said that they entered the province before any other race of whom written records exist, except the Cāvâdas and the Cûḍâsamâs. The Visâvâ inscription of v.s. 1262 (No 2) and the Ājaka inscription (No. 3) probably of the same year refer to the reign of a king named Râṇâ Simhâ, who probably belonged to the Jeṭhvâ family, as according to the bards the Jeṭhvâs held that part of Kathiawad at the time. The fragmentary Miyâni inscription of v.s. 1290 (No. 6) refers to the names of a sovereign and his feudatory. The latter was ruling at Manîipur, the ancient name of Miyâni, and might have belonged to the Jeṭhvâ family, since the bards tell us that the Jeṭhvâs had made Miyâni their capital for some years. The Ghumli inscription of v.s. 1318 and the Porbundar inscription of v.s. 1334 mention a governor named Sâmantasimha, who may be identified with the viceroy Sâmantasimha
appointed by the Caulukya sovereign of Gujarat to govern Kathiawad as the Kāntelā inscription of v.s. 1320 states. It seems that the Caulukyas of Anahilapataṇa subdue the Jēthvās and appointed Śāmantasiriha to rule over the south-west part of Kathiawad. An inscription of the time of the Caulukya sovereign Sārangadeva found at Vanthalī and dated v.s. 1346 states that Vijayānanda, a feudatory of Sārangadeva, had to fight against Bhānu, a king of Bhūbhṛtīpalli i.e. Ghumli. There can be no doubt that Bhānu was the famous king Bhāna of the Jēthvā family whose capital, we know, was at Ghumli. The rule of the same king is referred to in the Kansārā (near Ghumli) inscription of v.s. 1347. The next inscription which can be said to belong to the Jēthvā family is the Rāval inscription of v.s. 1375 which refers to the reign of Rāṇā Jaitapāla. The Rāṇāvāv inscription of v.s. 1474 states that king Bhānu, son of Simha defeated the Turks. Nothing is known of this fight. The next inscription which distinctly mentions the name Jēthvā of the family is the Gosā (near Porbundar) inscription of v.s. 1536 which states that Vikamātīti was a feudatory of Fātāshāh Mahamud (Begadh). The Jēthvā inscriptions of modern times are curiously enough seldom found.

The Gehel family, to which the Maharaja of Bhavanagar and the Thakors of Lāthī, Pālitānā and Valā belong, claims descent from the ancient Maitraka family of Valabhi in Kathiawad. It is said that on the fall of Valabhi they migrated to Mewād by the end of the 8th cent. but again came back to Saurāṣṭra in the middle of the twelfth century of the Vikrama era. Tradition says that their leader Sejakji took service with the Cūḍāsamā king of Junagadh. But from the inscriptions it seems that they were first in the service of the Caulukya sovereigns of Gujarat.

The earliest epigraph found in Kathiawad of the Gehel family is the famous Mangrol inscription of v.s. 1202 (Bhavnagar inscriptions p. 158) which mentions that during the reign of the Caulukya sovereign Kumārapāla of Anahilapur there ruled at Māngrol a Guhila king named Muluka, son of Sahajiga and grandson of Sāhāra. Muluka's younger brother was Somarāja. The next known Gehel inscription is of Valabhi Sarīvat 911 from Ghelānā near Mangrol (No. 5). This inscription refers to the reign of the son of Thakur Muluka(ka) perhaps the same Guhila king as is mentioned in the Mangrol inscription of v.s. 1202. The connection of these names with the ancestors of the Bhavnagar family is not definitely known. These inscriptions show that the Gehels were in early times ruling in the south-west part of Kathiawad probably as neighbours of the Jēthvās. There is no epigraph found to show how and when they were forced to go to the eastern coast of the peninsula. The Parmālā inscription of v.s. 1453 speaks of a Gehel king named Pratāpamalla (No. 56) but no details are known of him. In a manuscript of Vīṣṇu Bhakti Candrodaya we find mention of a king named Rāval Sārangji ruling at the port of Ghoghā in v.s. 1469 as a feudatory of the Muhammedan emperor of Delhi. He was probably an ancestor of the Gehel family of Bhavnagar. The Mahuvā inscription of
v.s. 1500 refers to the reign of another Guhila king named Sārangji. The next inscription is from Vartej dated v.s. 1674 referring to the reign of Rāval Dhanājī. Some more inscriptions of the family of modern date are included in this collection.

Next in antiquity comes the Jhālā family. They are said to have entered the province in the time of Solanki Karṇa II. They have now maintained in east Kathiawad and from the parent stem of Dhṛangadhra, besides other small estates, have sprung the independent chiefships of Limbdi, Vankaner, Wadhwan, Chuda, Lakhar and Saelā. The records of this family though many, are comparatively modern. The earliest inscription which can be assigned on sure grounds to this family is found from Pātaḍi, which was the early capital of the Jhālas before they removed to Kuā and subsequently to Halvād. It is dated v.s. 1456. Though it is too much weather-worn, the following names of the kings can be clearly read:—Ramasisinha, Virasimha, Raṇamal, Satruśalya and Jayatkarṇa. Next comes the Jeggedā inscription of v.s. 1518 which gives the name of Raṇavīra and his queen Ramābai born in a Gohel family. Two inscriptions of v.s. 1524 and 1531 refer to Jhālā kings who were bhāyās of the main line. The Candrasar lake inscription of v.s. 1534 removes the wrong supposition that the lake was built by Candrasimhi of the Jhālā line. In fact it was built by a man named Dipacandra as the record states. The Ramapura inscription of v.s. 1538 mentions the king Vāghji of the main Jhālā line. The Kuā inscription of v.s. 1572 (No. 89) refers to the rule of the Jhālā king Rānakadeva. The most important inscriptions of the Jhālā family are the Halvād inscription, of v.s. 1583 (No. 93) and the Kon-dha inscription of v.s. 1663 (No. 110). The former found in a well at Halvād gives a long genealogy of the Jhālā kings from Raṇamal to Mānsimha together with the names of their queens and the latter gives in addition the names of four successive kings who ruled in a branch line but probably independent of the main line. Three more inscriptions of Mānsimha have been found one from Velāvdar of v.s. 1584, the other from Hampur of v.s. 1588 and the third from Halvād recording his death in v.s. 1620. No inscription of his son Raisimhaji, who was slain near Ghantila while fighting with the Dedas is found. Three inscriptions of Raisimhaji's son Candrasena are found, one from Hampur of v.s. 1658, the other from Gāḷā of v.s. 1668 and the third from Halvād of v.s. 1683 recording his death. There are in this collection some more inscriptions of the main Jhālā family of still later period. Some more inscriptions of the several branches of the main family have been included in this series.

Of the Jādejās who arrived late in the province in the beginning of the sixteenth century the inscriptions are comparatively very modern. The Jādejā families that have been now ruling over nearly one third of Kathiawad had originally sprung from the parent stem in Cutch. The Jamnagar house is the main in Kathiawad. Cadets of this house established themselves in subsequent years as independent chiefs and Dhrol, Rajkot, Gondal, Virpur and several minor estates have consequently sprung up. The fami-
lies now ruling at Morvi and Māliā are the direct descendants of the Cutch house.

Though the earliest mention of a Jádejā is in the Jamlā inscription of v.s. 1461 (No. 61) an actual ruler of the family is first mentioned in an inscription of v.s. 1622 found in the village Dahisarā. It mentions the name of Jam Karanji of Dahisarā who was but a bhīyāta of the main Jádejā line ruling at Jāmnagar. The Dhrol inscription of v.s. 1647 which belongs to the time of Jám Śatrulsālya is very important inasmuch as it gives the exact date of the well-known battle that took place at Bhuchar Mori between the armies of Khān Azam, the Gujarāt viceroy of the emperor of Delhi and the army of the Jāmsaheb under the Jám’s son Ājoji and his minister Jāsāji. Another inscription of the time of Jám Śatrulsālya is found at Dādar and is dated v.s. 1669 wherein the Jám is mentioned as a feudatory of the emperor Salim Shah. Modern inscriptions of the Jádejās are found in a large number.

There is a single Paramāra family at present ruling in Mūli in the Jhālāvāḍ prant of Kathiawād. It is not known if the Paramara kings mentioned in the Kherāli inscription of v.s. 1319? (No. 23) were the ancestors of this family. But the Paramāra king Lakhadhiraji mentioned in the Rampurā inscription of v.s. 1538 was undoubtedly an ancestor of the Muli family. The Paramāras are said to have originally held Thān before the Jhālās conquered it but no inscriptions of their family are found at the place.

The Kathis, who have given the name to the peninsula since the time of Marathas, are one of the most interesting races in the peninsula. When and whence they entered the peninsula is uncertain. The cradle of their race is uncertain. They are casually mentioned in inscriptions of other royal families, of comparatively modern period. Except the large estate of Jetpur, Chital and Jasdan there are no Kathi possessions of any consequence in Kathiawād. There are consequently no interesting inscriptions left by this race.

Of the Gaikwād family who were one time the sovereign lords of Kathiawād and to whom nominal allegiance is still paid by several states in the form of yearly tributes we have only two inscriptions found. One is at Lolīyānā dated v.s. 1784 and the other is in Beyt which has lost its date. Both the records belong to the reign of Damāji, son of Pilāji. None of his successors has left any inscription. But at least three inscriptions are found of the famous general of the Gaikwād who subdued the peninsula for his master. He was called Viṭṭhal Rao Bābāji. His records are found at Tarānetar dated v.s. 1867, at Jadesvara dated v.s. 1889 and at Amreli dated v.s. 1873.

The Muḥammedan rulers who in former times ruled over Kathiawad naturally preferred to inscribe their inscriptions in Arabic and Persian and such inscriptions are found in Kathiawād in a large number. But seeing that Sanskrit and Gujarati inscriptions were very commonly used by their subjects they ordered some inscriptions to be composed in Sanskrit and Gujarati for
the knowledge of their Hindu subjects. Sometimes they suffixed Sanskrit or Gujarati translations to their Persian inscriptions.

Though Muhammedan influence was felt in Kathiawad from the very early times since perhaps the Arabs invaded Kathiawad and destroyed Valabhi in about v.s. 825 their permanent connection with the province began since the time of the memorable expedition of Mahmud Gazanvi against Somanatha three hundred years after in v.s. 1180. The Veraval inscription dated v.s. 1320, which is the earliest Sanskrit record containing a distinct mention of the Muhammedans as rulers shows that Mahamud Gazanvi left a governor and a force of Musalmans in Somanatha Pātana on his departure to Gazanvi and that though in subsequent years the Muhammedan element was reduced to insignificance it was never completely effaced. The Somanathā Pātana inscription of v.s. 1355 (No. 17) records that two Vāja warriors met their death at the door of Somanathā while fighting against the Turuškas in 1299 A.D. This gives an exact date of the capture of Somanathā Pātana by Ulugh Khan, the powerful general of Allauddin Khilji. Since that time the Muhammedans began to interfere in the politics of Kathiawad more frequently and successfully. The inscriptions of the Čūdāsamā kings contained in this series constantly refer to their fights against the Muhammedan invaders and though we find from some Persian inscriptions and from the Dhamlej inscription of v.s. 1437 (No. 39) that the southern coast belt of Kathiawad specially to the east of Somanathā Pātana upto Unā was fully under the power of the Muhammedan emperors of Delhi, the Čūdāsamās struggled hard to keep off their capital, the difficult fort of Junagadh. But their inscriptions fully testify that the Muhammedan encroachment upon their power was rapidly growing until in v.s. 1527 their kingdom was permanently seized by the Muhammedans. The Osā inscription of v.s. 1435 shows that a Muhammedan Thanadar was regularly posted at Junagadh whose control the Rao of Junagadh had to obey. The Dhandhusar inscription of v.s. 1445 clearly states that the Čūdāsamā king Mokalasinhha was ordered by the Delhi emperor to shift his capital to Vāmanasthalī, i.e. Vanthali, which shows that the king had lost his power over Junagadh. One place after another was rapidly lost to the Muhammedans. In Gorej near Mangrol there is an inscription of v.s. 1451 of the Čūdāsamā king Mokalasinhha but the next year Mangrol came completely under a Muhammedan Subah appointed by the Gujarāt viceroy of the Delhi emperor Nasratkhān, as the Mangrol inscription of v.s. 1452 shows. The Veraval inscription of v.s. 1462 speaks of a king named Brahmadāsa, son of Śivanātha, evidently a Vāja king as ruling there and defending it against an invasion of the Muhammedans. The inscription of v.s. 1464 at Verāval three miles from Somanathā Pātana mentions that the Verāval fort was built under orders of Muzaffar, the Gujarāt Sultan. The Vanthali inscription of v.s. 1469 refers to a severe battle fought between Raja Meligadeva of Vanthali and the Muhammedans probably under Sultan Ahmed. As stated in the Mandalika Kāvya, Meligadeva defeated and drove away the Thanadar of Ahamed. This is supported by the presence of an
inscription of v.s. 1472 at Vanthali itself. This shows that Meligadeva main-
tained a firm stand at Vanthali against the Muhammedans. Meligadeva’s son
Jayasimha also defeated them at Jhinjharkot (modern Jhangher) as the
Junagadh Revati Kunḍa inscription of v.s. 1473 shows. The Junagadh Upark-
kot inscription of v.s. 1507 of the reign of Manḍālīka and two more inscrip-
tions of the same king which are undated and the Girnar inscription of
v.s. 1519 show that the Cudāsamā king was for some years free from the
troubles of the Muhammedans. But ultimately in v.s. 1527 the powerful
Gujarat Sultan Muhammad Begadhā permanently seized the Junagadh king-
dom of the Cudāsamās and put an end to their long rule. Kathiawad was
completely subjected by this Sultan and all the Rajput families that had been
ruling before as contemporaries of the Cudāsamās had to obey the power of
the Gujarat Sultans as is amply evidenced by a number of inscriptions. When
the Mughal emperors put an end to the rule of the Gujarat Sultans and con-
quered the province all the chieftains of the province had to acknowledge
their power. Inscriptions to that effect are found and have been included in
this series. It will thus be seen that the Muhammedan power over the
province can be divided into three periods. In the first period the early
sovereigns of Delhi, or Yoginipur as it is called in an inscription, held
power over Kathiawad. Of this period only two inscriptions are found (1)
the Avānīa inscription of v.s. 1447 and (2) the Māngrol inscription of
v.s. 1452, both referring to the reign of Nasiruddin Mahamud Tughalak. Of
the second period when the Gujarat Sultans, who ruled at Ahmedabad as in-
dependent kings, held sway over the province, the following inscriptions are
included in the present collection:—

1. Verāval inscription of v.s. 1464, Muzfar I.
2. Pasnāvdā inscription of v.s. 1514, Kutubuddin.
3. Gosā inscription of v.s. 1536, Mahamad (Begoda).
4. Rāmparā inscription of v.s. 1538, Mahamad (Begoda).
5. Kuvā inscription of v.s. 1572, Muzfar II.
6. Sarā inscription of v.s. 1579, Muzfar II.
7. Unā inscription of v.s. 1582, Mahamad II.
8. Veḷāvdar inscription of v.s. 1584, Bahadur.
9. Pālītaṇa (Satrunjaya) inscription of v.s. 1587, Bahadur.
11. Bagasra inscription of v.s. 1604, Mahamad II.
12. Kodidarā inscription of v.s. 1609, Mahamad II.
13. Waḍhawān inscription of v.s. 1613, Ahmed II.

Of the third period when Kathiawad had to acknowledge again the power
of the Mughul emperors of Delhi the following inscriptions are included in
the volume:—

1. Ghoghā inscription of v.s. 1634, Akbar.
2. Satrunjaya inscription of v.s. 1650, Akbar.
4. Unā inscription of v.s. 1652, Akbar.
5. Šatrūnjaya, inscription of v.s. 1652, Akbar.
6. Gālā inscription of v.s. 1668, Jehangir (Salim).
7. Dādar inscription of v.s. 1669, Jehangir (Salim).
8. Ghoghā inscription of v.s. 1672, Jehangir (Salim).
9. Šatrūnjaya inscription of v.s. 1675, Jehangir (Salim).
10. Šatrūnjaya inscription of v.s. 1683, Jehangir (Salim).
11. Mūḷī inscription of v.s. 1685, Shehajahan.
12. Šatrūnjaya inscription of v.s. 1686, Shehajahan.
14. Rajasithapur inscription of v.s. 1701, Shehajahan.

Though with the advent of the Marathas the Muhammedan power over Kathiawad ended and with the advent of the British the Maratha power ended, the Muhammedan power is still represented in the province by the Bābi ruler of the Junagadh state, which is the premier state in Kathiawad. The Bābi family of Junagadh which entered the province and carved out a large kingdom for itself very late in the 17th cent. has left very few records. There is only one record which could be included in this volume. It is the Śimroli inscription of v.s. 1912 of the time of Nawab Bahadurkhanji. There are some petty Muhammedan estates at present existing in Kathiawad at Māṅgrol, Māṅāvdar, Bāṭvā and Dasāḍā but no inscription is found of any of the families which could be included in this collection.

There are some inscriptions in this volume which are of general importance. An inscription of v.s. 1587 (No. 95) from the Šatrūnjaya hill near Palitana is interesting as it gives the names of four successive rulers of Mewāḍ:—Kumbhakarna, Rājamalla, Saṅgrāmasirīha, and Ratnasirīha. The reason for mentioning them is that the last mentioned ruler’s minister Karamsi had built Jain temples on the Šatrūnjaya hill. The Beyt inscription (No. 167) records that a tank was built in Beyt by a servant of the Gaikwad king Damāji, though the island was at that time not in his possession. Another Beyt inscription (No. 187) records that repairs to the Śankha-Nārāyaṇa temple were frequently made by the ruling family of Cutch. The Gopanāthā inscription of v.s. 1750 records that the place was in the possession of a Mahāraṣṭra Brahmachāri from the Deccan long before the Marathas had any political connection with Kathiawad.

Of special religious importance are the Somanāthā Pāṭaḍa inscriptions (Nos. 19-22) in this volume. Unfortunately they are all fragmentary and give us no dates. But they can be said to be an addition to our already scanty epigraphical material of the history of the Lakulīśa Pāśupata school of Śiva worship, which as the Cintra praśasti of v.s. 1343 (Epigraphia Indica
Vol I p. 230) shows had a large monastery in Somanatha Patana. The sun worship was continued in Kathiawad down to a late period. (See No. 36)

This collection is also useful for our knowledge of the history of the Gujarati language. Most of the inscriptions contained in it are in Sanskrit and Sanskrit was the only language used in the early inscriptions. The authors of some of the Sanskrit inscriptions have exhibited great proficiency in the Sanskrit language and literature and poetic genius, though not of a high order. The Somanatha Patana inscriptions of the Lakulisha school, though they are fragmentary (Nos. 20—22), the Div. inscription (No. 29), the Dhandhusar inscription (No. 48) and the Girmar inscription (No. 77) are examples of this.

But from about V.S. 1500 we find Gujarati slowly but steadily taking the place of Sanskrit in inscriptions. In course of time the use of Gujarati in inscriptions grew so much and that of Sanskrit decreased correspondingly that a man who set himself to the task of composing an inscription in Sanskrit which still was held in reverence by the people at least for its use in inscriptions could not use pure Sanskrit forms and merely gave a Sanskrit appearance to the Gujarati inscriptions. Another point may be noted that in later times people did not entertain as much zeal for writing inscriptions as they did in earlier times. In the first period, say from about V.S. 1000 to 1500, we find that the people were very particular not only in engaging the services of a learned Sastri for composing an inscription in Sanskrit but they seem also to have been careful in selecting a good stone which was regularly cut and polished and in employing a competent mason who could perform the work of engraving the inscription carefully and beautifully. But in the latter period from about 1500 to 1900 we find that there is a marked deterioration in the epigraphy of Kathiawad.

The reason for this is no doubt the conquest of the province by the Muhammedans. When the Muhammedan power was firmly established at the beginning of the sixteenth century of the Vikrama era the Hindus not only lost their political importance but their civilization and culture was awfully in danger specially because of the intolerant nature of the victorious Muhammedans. Sanskrit language and naturally the Sastris who studied it began to be less respected and less patronised, and Sanskrit studies accordingly suffered much. Though Gujarati, the language of the people in general, began to be frequently used in inscriptions it was not used in the pure form specially because the majority of inscriptions in later times was used in connection with the memorial stones or pālias as they are commonly called, which were generally composed by uneducated men.

The earliest inscription which has a sprinkling of Gujarati words and which therefore helps us in determining the origin and history of the Gujarati language is the Thān inscription of V.S. 1432 (No. 36). The language is much corrupt and therefore unintelligible but it contains the Gujarati genitive form in कड्डी महाराज. The Nagicana inscription of V.S. 1434 contains the
Gujarati expression:—అంధర చంపయ బాయాడ కచ్చాను గాంధ వేదం విమల మాయ నంది. The Osa inscription of v.s. 1435 contains the Gujarati genitive form in హృదమని మా and the form సాం in the sense of సిద్ in the word కతరిస. In the Phulka inscription of v.s. 1448 the Gujarati expression సంచ మారిదం వంధావడం occurs in the incorrect Sanskrit inscription. The Mesvana inscription of v.s. 1470 contains the expression గాంధ మంచిడా. The Uparkot inscription v.s. 1507 contains some Prakrit expressions. The Khodu inscription of v.s. 1544 contains a large number of Gujarati forms మందా మనిశాసన బహుమార్గ పురాద కరాడి The later inscriptions though they have the appearance of the Sanskrit language are mostly written in Gujarati.

This will show that we can carry back the origin of the Gujarati language at least to v.s. 1300. Though it was in common use among the people they were reluctant to use it in records and a long time must have elapsed before the use of the Gujarati language became so common that a form or two were unconsciously used in inscriptions which were meant to be in Sanskrit language.

What is said above with regard to the epigraphy of Kathiawad applies very well to the Palaeography. The script used in the inscriptions of earlier period was purely Devanagari and some of the earlier inscriptions are fine examples of beautiful script. They are the Mahuva inscription of v.s. 1272, the Ghelana inscription of Valabh Samvat 911, the Veraval inscription of Valabh Samat 927, the four undated Somanatha Patan inscriptions of the first half of the 14th century of the Vikrama era; the Vanthali inscription of about v.s. 1346, the Dhamlej, Badula, Khorasa, Dhandhusar and the Junagadh (v.s. 1475) inscriptions. The Devanagari script used in the earlier inscriptions in this collection retained some forms of the older script. The character was often suppressed by three dots as in old records. The prsthamatras were sometimes used probably to give an ancient form to the characters. In earlier inscriptions there was nothing to distinguish between फ and फ. फ was frequently used for फ.

From about v.s. 1500 Devanagari characters were sometimes given the forms of Gujarati or Bodia characters as they are popularly called, though all along we find a decided preference for the Devanagari script even in the modern inscriptions composed in the Gujarati language. But in comparatively modern inscriptions Devanagari script or rather the Sastri lipi, began to give place to Bodia characters. The result has been that in Kathiawad people cannot write Devanagari without much difficulty. It must be noted here that unlike modern Gujarati characters the Gujarati characters used in inscriptions were often suspended to a line.

No distinct stages can be marked in the script in modern times as they were in ancient times say before v.s. 1000. Consequently we cannot show different stages in which the script underwent any changes and attained the modern Gujarati form. We are only able to say this much that so long as Sanskrit language in its pure form was used in inscriptions Devanagari script was used in its pure form. But from about v.s. 1500 when Gujarati
began to be more often used the characters are seen inclined towards the Bodia form.

The collection supplies some very interesting details about the social history of the province. The specific naming of communities and sub-communities, which seems to have begun in Gujarat in the 11th cent. A.D. began to be very commonly used from the 13th cent. onwards as they are found frequently used in inscriptions of the period. Nāgara (Nos. 2, 16), Gallaka (No. 9) Śrīmālī (No. 10), Osvāla, with its Vaṭaśīyaka sākhā (No. 33), Somapārā (Nos. 34, 58) and Baradā (No. 60) are some of the community names used in the inscriptions. The Khorāsā inscription of v.s. 1445 gives the origin of the Brahmakṣatri families and in the Mahuvā inscription of v.s. 1500 the Moḍha community is said to have derived its origin from the hoof of the Kāmādhenu. The Unā inscription of v.s. 1582 gives the origin of a Kāyastha family from the sage Vālmiki.

The Baṇḍulā inscription of v.s. 1440 shows how high class Nāgara (Brāhmaṇa) girls considered it an accomplishment to be well-versed in singing, dancing and playing at musical instruments.

The setting up of images of persons not regularly possessing religious sanctity seems to have been in use in Kathiawad in the early centuries covered by this collection. The images of rulers in Nos. 2 and 24 and of parents in No. 16 and of a daughter in the Vanthali inscription of about v.s. 1346 (Annals of the Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute Vol. VII, p. 179), are examples of the kind.

Memorial stones or pāḷīṇas, raised in memory of warriors that fell in battle while rescuing the village cattle or fighting against the enemies are a special feature of Kathiawad. In fact the earliest memorial stones found in India are from Cutch and Kathiawad. They date from the second century A.D., from the time of the Kṣatrapas. But for many centuries after this the people of Kathiawad do not seem to have favoured the practice as memorial stones are very rarely found from that time to the 13th cent. A.D. The Lodhrāvā inscription of v.s. 1323 seems to be the earliest pāḷīṇa of the late period and after it a large number of pāḷīṇas are found throughout the province. The pāḷīṇas are in fact the chief material for our knowledge of the history of the province of the three or four following centuries. The inscriptions on these pāḷīṇas, many of which are included in the present collection, very often give full details of the warrior who fell in the battle and thereby went to heaven (No. 50) or attained the abode of the sun-god (Nos. 64-5) or of the god Viṣṇu (Nos. 70, 71) led by the celestial women (No. 52 l. 14).

There are very few references to coins in this collection: the drammas are mentioned in Nos. 7, 21 and 26 and the taṅkas in No. 42 only. Although many inscriptions in the collection record the digging of wells in the waterless tracts for the benefit of human beings, beasts and birds, the amount spent on that account is not generally given though contrary is the practice
to-day in the province. The koris were used in very late period (No. 161). A rupee is mentioned in Nos. 171, 175 etc.

The verification of the dates in the inscriptions which are almost always expressed in the Vikrama Såñvat shows that the calculation of the Vikrama Såñvat in Kathiawad was Kårtikådi i.e. beginning with the month Kårtika as in modern times (cf No. 43). It is worth noting that the details of the date given in the records are generally correct. The Vikrama Såñvat is accompanied by the corresponding Såka Såñvat in some inscriptions. The Valabhi Såñvat is used only in two inscriptions (Nos. 5 and 9).

I have to thank the authorities of the several institutions, the collections of impressions of inscriptions in which I have examined and utilized in this series. I also express my indebtedness to all the scholars who have laboured in the field before me.
CORRESPONDENCE

MY RESEARCH IN EUROPE—II

I have often wondered at why museums and exhibitions could not be made instructive and had puzzled my mind whenever I had occasion to help organise them. I realise that the time within which exhibitions are arranged is generally quite out of proportion to the manual labour and skill at command, and that financial backing is hardly adequate to compensate for the deficiency. This hindrance is, however, experienced more or less everywhere. In fact, every device for education never reaches the stage of completion or perfection. There is, therefore, no reason why one should despair at such common hindrances. Any degree of art or skill employed, with a sound scientific background, must bring at least a measure of success.

I closely observed the art and skill employed by the geniuses in the organisation of certain state, public and proprietary museums and exhibitions. The common drawbacks noticed to some extent or the other, are:

(a) Non-identification of exhibits.
(b) Half-hazard attempts at naming exhibits.
(c) Absence of explanation of exhibits.
(d) Incorrect or improper explanation of exhibits.
(e) Personal sentiment or bias shown both in the selection and in the presentation of exhibits.
(f) Mixing of exhibits of different interests, or placing them in inappropriate corners often on account of limitation of space or similar reasons.

These defects creep in in spite of all the care taken to avoid them.

The educative value of a museum or exhibition depends upon the degree of skillful exertions put in to make it explicit and simple to understand. A mistaken notion, often to be found, is that scholars have a tendency to work more for the approbation of their long-experienced and well-reputed scholars in the field rather than from the point of view of utility, or of those for whom the exhibitions are chiefly intended. Really this is not a defect in any way dishonourable, but the efforts do not meet with the desired results. Planning and laying out of an exhibition to suit the average, or even an ordinary capacity and intelligence, is what should be aimed at. While planning it seems necessary to bear in mind conditions such as the following:

(a) Visitors do not think seriously of the number of exhibits: the scholars, however, do desire to include the number, to their own satisfaction and relief and delight in acquainting their appreciators with all that has been discovered by them.
(b) A large majority have not the least ideas of the objects which the organisers sometimes consider quite common.
(c) The historical background necessary for the understanding or appreciation of exhibits is lacking.
(d) Minds are not trained to derive beneficial knowledge or to understand the utility and artistic beauty or skill achieved in the bygone ages.
(e) A common belief exists among the laymen that proper comprehension of exhibits is beyond the average intelligence.
(f) Visitors view the exhibits from a sentimental point of view rather than from the practical one, and thus do not realise the educative or instructive value; nor do they apply the knowledge gained for practical purposes.

(g) Custodians, as they grow old in service, do not have the zeal to go beyond looking after the safety of exhibits and, therefore, do not help the visitors to satisfy their curiosity or to rouse it by their guidance and information.

Museums and exhibitions are owned by either the State or a society or individual proprietors. In London, exhibitions of art or of one’s own attainments are not rare features. Exhibitions such as “Ideal Home” are an improved and systematically planned out model of a “country fair”. They have been commercialised. Science and technical exhibitions maintained for the training of students or apprentices are kept open for the public. Industrial exhibitions are chiefly places of advertisement and canvassing. The real aim behind all these is, however, to add to the stock of general knowledge not only the existence of so many articles, but to train the mind and eye so that it may kindle imagination and inspire some towards helping evolution of society and human achievements to their next stage of completion or perfection within the minimum time possible.

With a view to satisfy the curiosity of visitors by way of facilities for an easy understanding, and also for their comfortable progress round the exhibits, the arrangements in various museums are so made that:

(a) Each exhibit is placed apart, so that it is viewed without congestion of visitors, thus avoiding eye strain and the tedium of waiting for one’s turn.

(b) No exhibit is kept more than six inches deep from the glass cover, so that no spectral discomfort is felt.

(c) No exhibit smaller than a square or cubic foot in size is placed at a distance more than three feet deep: this distance being lessened or increased in proportion to the minuteness of details, etc.

(d) Colour effects are maintained.

(e) For emphasising details of a particular exhibit, it is placed in a prominent position, so that a closer view is possible.

(f) Where necessary, all sides of exhibits are exposed to view with the aid of mirrors or such other appliances.

(g) Light conditions: There should be neither a diffusion nor a glare.

(h) Exhibits indicate not only their individual interests but the corporate life of the whole group or section.

The greater the skill employed in the presentation of exhibits, the more attractive and instructive do they become. The higher degree of perfection is attained when skill helps to appreciate beauty and utility of exhibits. Some of the technicalities observed to secure this end are:

(a) Presentation of exhibits in their original form. It is more instructive to learn the corresponding relation both in appearance and quality of the article as seen in the olden days and that of the present time.

(b) Showing them with proper perspective: either with an expressive background or with a suggestive word-picture.

(c) Arranging exhibits so as to create individual as well as group or sectional interests, i.e. either by time, event, progress of development, family or stock, culture, art or handicraft, and so on.
Avoiding concentration of all the best objects, irrespective of their relation to each other, at one place simply because they happen to be the cream of the exhibition. They are not really as effective there as they are while in their own group.

Giving more space and prominence to an exhibit whenever its importance or value in the group is to be stressed upon.

Explaining exhibits as far as possible by indicating their age, the place where they were found, use, possession, their importance as cultural specimens, and any other particulars or narration which may have brought them to prominence.

Explaining picture scenes from the artistic and historical points of view and if possible giving contemporary details and prices of the materials used, etc.

Supplementing details by noting the whereabouts of the originals whenever replicas or copies are exhibited.

Ensuring that casing does not obscure the view of the important parts of the objects inside.

Designing ventilators and lights so that no damage through weather conditions is done to exhibits.

Placing at the entrance of every section boards intimating the contents of the section, thus preparing ground for better understanding.

Providing magnifying glasses when demanded.

Placing maps and indicators at the main entrance showing the general contents and the proper direction for an easy and circular round.

Providing resting places with indicators and general lay-out plans in every section, particularly in larger museums.

Preventing entry of all such things as may cause damage even accidentally.

Providing lecture guides.

Exhibiting new arrivals separately for some time.

Arranging special lectures on different sections off and on.

The educative value of a museum can be enhanced only if the knowledge gained carries a permanent impression upon the mind. This can be achieved if the visitors are provided with some means for memorising such as:

(a) Proper catalogues and guide books.
(b) Picture models and copies.
(c) Free use of camera.
(d) Booklets on methods and preservation and presentation of old curios and exhibits, etc.
(e) Facilities for studying exhibits.
(f) Encouragement to persons presenting or giving exhibits for public use.

A mere maintenance of interest in visitors is not an adequate return for the high cost and great labour involved. Every effort should be made to create interest in those who have not visited them, but who could have done so if the exhibition had been properly made known to them. Some propaganda is, therefore, necessary and the effective sources through which this propaganda can be carried on are:

(a) Railways and public conveyance companies: to bring, through their publications, the exhibition to the notice of all such areas as are likely to be interested. Some concessions at such periods of less traffic are helpful.
Local authorities—municipalities, local boards, county councils, etc.—should make it a part of their education propaganda, and advertise such exhibitions by placing notice boards at important streets, and by issuing leaflets.

Schools and educational authorities should explain the sections one by one to children during school hours—one class at a time in charge of two or three teachers.

Leaflets showing special lectures arranged during a month or a year are distributed.

Leaflets showing the timings of several museums, etc. in the province or big cities are issued for distribution.

Agencies arranging for travels of tourists, etc., should advertise such places in their propaganda literature.

Special exhibits should be brought to the notice of the public through talks on radio.

The respective Railway stations should make known to the passengers the existence of such museums in the locality of the station.

Notices of special exchanges of exhibits, and encouragement to those presenting them should be published in newspapers.

Such propaganda is paying to the advertisers and also to the public.

What amounts should be charged to visitors will all depend upon the peculiar circumstances of the exhibitions. As far as possible they should be free, and maintained by public funds.

The details of personal and other items of expenditure, as well as construction of buildings and show-cases and other apparatus, the art of preservation and repair of exhibits, must be left to separate articles hereafter.

A mention has been made in my previous report that photographs are being taken of all the important paintings, etc. concerning India, and on this occasion I thought fit to record the result of my visit to certain museums and exhibitions up to date.

Since my last report of 1st August, I concentrated myself on the study of the General and Factory records at the India Records Office:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Number of Volumes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>To be seen.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>India Office Records:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>General Records:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Court Minutes</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Home Miscellaneous</td>
<td>547</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Factory Records:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Balasor</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Borneo</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Calcutta</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Celebes</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Conimer</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Cuddalore &amp; Porto Novo</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Dacca</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
For comparison and other purposes, 35 publications had to be gone through during the period.

Fifty more photographs of old paintings were taken, and two (one Dutch and one French) manuscripts were photocopied.

Just as an experiment, I photographed the whole Music section at the India Museum in South Kensington Museums. This consists of more than 150 instruments—string, pipe, drum, etc.—in 22 sectional cases. If these cases, as exhibited, could be shown through Magic Lanterns usefully, I intend to attempt other sections from the Industrial and other points of view.

Among the old newspapers, I noticed that (1) *Calcutta Review*—1784, (2) *Bombay Courier*—1793, (3) *Madras Courier*—1795 and (4) *Morning Chronicle*—1795, give some detailed and authentic information of the time. These may be found worth study by those working on Hyder, Tippoo and their contemporary periods.

My impressions of the material I have been collecting, as also about various other subjects pertaining to Indian History will be given as soon as space in my reports permits.

V. S. Bendrey

*1st October, 1938.*

*London.*
MISCELLANEA

A NOTE ON "SUVAṆṆAGIRI"

The Asokan inscriptions found at Brahmagiri, Siddapura and Jatiṅga-Rāmeśvara mention Suvarṇagiri as the seat of a viceroy perhaps under the emperor Asoka. I quote the relevant portions from those inscriptions:

**BRAHMAGIRI**

(S)uvaṆṆagirite ayaputasa mahāmātānaṁ ca vacan(e)na Isilasi mahāhmātā ārogiyaṁ vataviyā hevaṁ ca vataviyā Devānaṁ priye ānapayati...

**SIDDĀPURA**

SuvaṆṆagirite ayaputasa mahāmātānaṁ ca vacanena Isilasi mahāhmātā ārogiyaṁ vata(v)ī(yā) Devānaṁ Piye hevaṁ āha ...

**JATIṄGA-RĀMEŚVARA**

... (mahāmāt)ānaṁ ca vaca(nena) Isi(lasi) ... vata(vi)ya Devānaṁ Piye ...

The word Suvarṇagiri is missing from the inscription at Jatiṅga-Rāmeśvara, but as the three inscriptions are almost identical, it should be supplied in it too.

These are the only Asokan inscriptions in which Suvarṇagiri is mentioned. The portion of the inscription mentioned above means:

"From Suvarṇagiri, by the word of the *ayaputa* and the *mahāmātās*, the *mahāmātas* at Isila are to be told 'health' (are to be enquired about their health) and are to be informed thus : 'Devānaṁ piye orders ...'"

There is a lot of speculation about the location of the Suvarṇagiri of the inscriptions. Hultzsch suggests that it might be Kanakagiri, south of Maski, seventy miles south-west from Raichur via Hutti. This surmise is based upon the fact that there are old gold workings near Maski, and *kanaka* and *svarna* mean the same thing in Sanskrit. Fleet, on the other hand, is of the opinion that it may be Sonagiri near Rājagṛha in Bihar.

Both these suggestions seem to me to be far from the mark. In the matter of proper names, one should not be substituted for another on the plea of synonymity. *Kanaka, Kāncana, bhṛṅgāra, suvarna, svarna, hēman*, and so on may all denote gold but when they form compounds with other words to denote proper names, one should not be identified with another as otherwise it would lead to endless confusion. The name Sonagiri is no doubt a corrupted form of Suvarṇagiri, but there are so many Sonagiris in India that it would be difficult to arrive at a conclusion. One may, however, with some probability fix upon a particular Sonagiri if it is within reasonable distance from Isila in the inscription which must have been an important place existing near about where the present Brahmagiri, Siddapura and Jatiṅga-Rāmeśvara stand. The Sonagiri near Rājagṛha in Bihar is far removed from these places to be of any use in the identification.

Which, then, is the Suvarṇagiri of the Asokan records not far removed from the frontiers of the present Mysore State? I suggest that it may be Dzonnaagiri, a small hamlet near Yerragudi where recently a complete set of fourteen edicts of Asoka were discovered. The currency of these records among scholars by the name "The Yerragudi records" has been unfortunate. It has delayed the identification
of Suvarṇagiri with Dzonnagiri which is far nearer the site of the records than Yerragudi. The reasons for this identification are given below:

(i) Suvarṇagiri must have been a very important place at the time being the seat of a viceroy or a royal prince (if this is what is meant by the word āyaputa) with his advisors (Mahāmātā). Apart from the improbability of Kanakagiri near Maski being Suvarṇagiri, the single inscription at Maski, which is not after all so important except for the mention of the name Aśoka in it, it cannot be given the same importance as Dzonnagiri with its set of fourteen inscriptions which are found only in two more places in India, namely Dhaujīl and Jaugāda.

(ii) Dzonnagiri is commonly associated with the Indian maize (dzonna in Telugu, joḷa in Kannada and dzavari or dzāri in Maṇḍali). The word dzonna is a derivative of suvarṇa and is given to maize on account of its golden yellow colour, in the same way as the name rāgi (Eleusine coracana Pers.) to the grain of that name on account of its red colour. (Skt. ṛāṇī- ṛāga- etc.) Dzonnagiri could not have been given that name after the Indian maize that is grown there, for on that supposition all villages growing the Indian maize have to be given the same name Dzonnagiri. The name Dzonnagiri can therefore be concluded to be a Telugu corruption of the name Suvarṇagiri through the intermediate form Sonnagiri.

(iii) The Maski inscription does not refer to mahāmātās or viceroys, and so Kanakagiri could not be Suvarṇagiri, where not only mahāmātās but also a viceroy is said to have been stationed. Kanakagiri is not even as important as Iṣila mentioned in the Mysore Brāhmaṇ records, where at least mahāmātās are said to have ruled.

(iv) Sonagiri near Rājagṛha in Bihar could not also be the Suvarṇagiri of the Mysore records because, though Rājagṛha is associated with Buddhism, no Aśoka records have been discovered round about that place.

(v) Suvarṇagiri must have been a place situated within reasonable distance of the site of the Mysore records for the officials of Iṣila to be under the control of the viceroy.

It may therefore be concluded, until more convincing reasons are brought forward, that the Suvarṇagiri of the Mysore Brāhmaṇ records is no other than Dzonnagiri, the site of the newly discovered Aśoka records, seven miles from Gutti, an important fortress town in the Anantapur district of the Madras presidency.

I therefore suggest that hereafter the Yerragudi Brāhmaṇ records may be alluded to as the *Dzonnagiri (Suvarṇagiri) records.

C. Narayana Rao

AN EARLIER MS OF THE AVIMUKTA-TATTVA

By way of supplementing the information published by Dr. V. Raghavan in the New Indian Antiquary, Vol. I, No. 6 (September 1938), page 404, I have to note that the Oriental Manuscripts Library of Ujjain (Gwalior) possesses a MS. of Bālam-bhaṭṭa Pāyagund’s, or his step-mother Bhavānī’s, Avimukta-tattva bearing an earlier date. The corresponding extracts from this MS. (Accession No. 402) are:

* A stone inscription in the village Gundala in the Dhone taluk of the Kurnool district (Ep. Rep. S. I. 137 of 1913) records that in S. 1490, Prabhava, Vaiśākhha, śu. di. 10, the Mahāmāndaleśvara Rāmarāja Tirumalarajadeva Mahārāja granted this village to the God Chennarayalu of Gundala durga for worship and festivals. The donor was Tirumala I of the last Vijayanagara or the Chandragiri dynasty.
A NOTE ON SOME ANCIENT INDIAN TRIBES

AUDUMBARAS

The Audumbaras seem to have been an oligarchical or republican tribe mentioned in the Sabhaaparvan of the Mahabharata (ii, 1889) where they are located in the Madhyadesa. The Harivamsha refers to certain descendants of Visvamitra as Audumbaras (XXVII. 1466), but it is difficult to determine their exact relation with the people of the same name referred to in the Sabhaaparvan. The Puranas (cf. Markandeya Purana LVIII, 9) mention a people called the Udumbaras along with the Kapingalas, Kuruvayyas and the Gajahvayas. The last named people were connected with Hastinapur, and the Kuruvayyas must also have had something to do with the famous Kuru people. The Udumbaras must have therefore occupied a contiguous territory. But both Lassen (Ind. Art. map) and Cunnigham (Arch. Surv. Rep. XIV, 115 and 135) seem to locate the Udumbaras, who presumably seem to have been the same people as the Audumbaras, somewhere in Cutch. The Harivamsha (CLXVIII, 9511) mentions a river Udumbara-vati in the South,
while the Mañjuśrīmūlakalpa (Gaṇapati Śāstri's edn. p. 633) mentions a city named Udumbara in the Magadha janapada (Māgadhā janapadāṃ prāpya purē Udumbarākhvaye). Presumably the river Udumbara-vati and the city Udumbarapura were connected with the Udumbara or Audumbara people. The Audumbaras are also known from coins which come chiefly from the Kangra district of the Punjab and which belong to about the 18th century B.C.

Smith Cat. of Coins, P. 160-61).

UTTAMABHADRAS

The first and perhaps the only epigraphic mention of the people called Uttama-bhadras occurs in one of the well-known inscriptions of Saka Uṣavadība which seem to suggest that the Uttamabhadras were an ally of Nahapāna, and consequently they must have had their habitat in Western India.

KĀKAS, KHARAPARIKAS & SANAKĀNIKAS

These three tribal peoples are referred to in the Allahabad Pillar inscription of Samudragupta along with the Mālavas, Ārjunāyanas, Yaudheyas, Madrakas, Ābhiras and the Prājrūnas. These tribes inhabited the regions on the western and south-western fringe of Āryāvarta proper, and it is only likely that the Kākas, Kharaparikas and the Sanakānikas also occupied the same regions. There is, however, no mention of these tribes either in literature or in any other epigraphic record. The Mārkandeya Purāṇa (LVIII, 47), however, mentions a tribe called Kharā-Sāgara-ṛaśī along with the Gandhāras and the Yaudheyas, and the Matsya Purāṇa (CXX, 56) refers to country named Kharapatha. It is difficult to say if the people Kharā-sāgara-ṛaśī, and the country Kharapatha had anything to do with the Kharaparikas.

B. C. LAW.

NA-LO-THO OF THE VIMUTTIMAGGA

In Chapter XII of the Vimuttimagga, Upatissa gives a quotation from one Āyasmā Nā-lo-tho (Nāraḍa). The quotation purports to say:

"Just as in a mountain-forest there may be a well but no rope with the help of which water could be taken out. If at that time there comes a man overcome by the heat of the Sun and fatigued by thirst, and if he sees the well and knows that there is water in it, but still cannot actually reach it, then merely by his knowledge about the existence of water in the well and by seeing it, he cannot satisfy his thirst, so in the same way if I know Nīrodha as Nibbāna and even if I have a perfect yathābhūta-nāṇadassana, I do not thereby become a khiṇāsava Arahā."

This quotation I have now been able to identify with the following passage in Saṁyutta ii. 118 (Nidāna-Saṁyutta, Mahāvagga, 8th lesson, Kosambi) which is ascribed to Nāraḍa:

"Seyyathā pi āruso kantāramagge udapāno. Tatra neva'ssa rajjunā udakavārako. Atta puriso āgaccheyya ghammābhītatto ghammapareto kilanto tasito pipāsito. So

tam udupanam olokeyya. Tassa udakan ti hi kho nanam assa, na ca kayena phusitva vihareyya. Evameva kho avuso bhava-nirodho nibbanan ti yathabhutasammappannaya sudiṭṭhaṃ, na camhi Arahaṃ khipasavo.”

‘The Comparative Catalogue of Chinese Āgamas and Pali Nikāyas’ by Prof. Chizen AKANUMA (1929) also tells us (pp. 48, 194) that there is a whole section corresponding to this section on ‘Kosambi’ in the Chinese version of the Saṃyuktāgama, 9th lesson in the 14th Chapter. It is worth investigating whether the passage in the Chinese version of the Vimuttimagga is word for word the same as in the Chinese version of the Saṃyuktāgama, or whether it agrees only in substance and not in words.**

P. V. BAPAT.

** Since I wrote this, I could investigate this question and I have found out that the passages concerned are not word for word the same but that they agree only in substance.
JACOB WACKERNAGEL

von

ALBERT DEBRUNNER


J. W. durchlief in Basel die Schulen, wobei er am "Pädagogium" noch den Unterricht hervorragender Professoren wie Jacob Burckhardt, Friedrich Nietzsche und Moritz Heyne genoss. Seine Studien machte er ausser in Basel vor allem 2 Jahre lang in Göttingen. Dort machte ihm offenbar Theodor Benfey gewaltigen Eindruck. Das spiegelt sich in einer feinen Würdigung, die den überragenden Forscher ins rechte Licht setzt, ohne seine Schwächen zu verschweigen (Gött. Gel. Anzeigen 1890, 428 ff.): "Ueberall wo Benfey mit seiner Arbeit ernstlich angesetzt hat, hat er entweder fördernd gewirkt oder aber, was noch mehr sagen will, nur darum seine Mitarbeiter nicht gefördert, weil er Ihnen zu weit voran war." (S. 430). Weniger bedeutungsvoll war anscheinend für ihn das einzige Semester, das er in Leipzig verbrachte. Offenbar war seine wissenschaftliche Persönlichkeit schon so stark in ihrer Selbständigkeit geformt, dass ihm die Kämpfe um die "Junggrammatische" Richtung, von denen damals Leipzig widerstande, nichts sagten. In der Tat haben Richtungs-oder Schulkämpfe für seine wissenschaftliche und persönliche Stellung nie etwas bedeutet. So viel ich weiss, hat er sich nur einmal darüber ausgesprochen, nämlich in seiner ersten
Rezension (Lit.bl. f. germ. u. rom. Philol. 6, 1885, 441 ff.), wo er die drei Streitschriften jenes Jahres (Curtius, Zur Kritik der neuesten Sprachfor- schung; Delbrück, Die neueste Sprachforschung; Brugmann, Zum heutigen Stand der Sprachwissenschaft) mit unabhängigem Urteil würdigt; das Schlussurteil über Georg Curtius verdient festgehalten zu werden: "Wir möchten wünschen, dass die bedenklichen Missgriffe seiner letzten Jahre der Vergessenheit anheimfallen und nur die Erinnerung an das lebendig bleiben möchte, worin er in der Zeit, da er auf der Höhe seines Arbeitens stand, wenige seinesgleichen hatte, an die umsichtige Besonnenheit seines Urteils und seine didaktische Begabung" (S. 445). 1875 bestand W. mit einer Disser- tation "De pathologiae veterum initiis" (d. h. über die Lehren der alten griechischen und römischen Grammatiker von den Lautveränderungen) die philologische Doktorprüfung in Basel. Dann begab er sich zu einem Stu- dienaufenthalt nach Oxford. Es war ihm eine grosse Freude, als er 52 Jahre später bei Gelegenheit des Orientalistenkongresses Oxford zum ersten Mal wiedersah.


Soviel über den äussern Lebensgang des Verstorbenen. In der reichen sprachwissenschaftlichen Arbeit, die sich in diesem Rahmen abgespielt hat,
stehen gleichberechtigt nebeneinander das Griechische und das Indische und Iranische. Es kann wohl hier darauf verzichtet werden, zu zeigen, was er auf dem griechischen Gebiet geleistet hat. Aber sein Bild wäre unvollständig, wenn nicht unter Uebergehung der zahlreichen Aufsätze in Zeitschriften und Festschriften wenigstens auf die wichtigsten Sonderschriften hingewiesen würde: Das Dehnungsgesetz der griechischen Komposita (1889), Beiträge zur Lehre vom griechischen Akzent (1893), Vermischte Beiträge zur griechischen Sprachkunde (1897), Studium zum griechischen Perfektum (1904), Hellenistica (1907), Ueber einige antike Anredeformen (1912), Sprachliche Untersuchungen zu Homer (1916), Vorlesungen über Syntax mit besonderer Berücksichtigung von Griechisch, Lateinisch und Deutsch (zwei Reihen, 1920 und 1924; zweite Auflage 1926 und 1928). Nach der Tiefe der Wirkung in der philologischen Wissenschaft steht das Homerbuch oben, nach der Breite der Leserwelt in Wissenschaft und Schule die Syntaxvorlesungen.


Neben diesem Hauptwerk zur indischen Grammatik laufen eine grosse Zahl kleinerer Arbeiten, die dem Indischen teils allein, teils in Verbindung mit dem Iranischen gewidmet sind, und eine besondere Stärke zeigt W. in der Verbindung von griechischen und indischen Sprachtatsachen, wodurch ihm manche Erhellung hin und her gelingt; und auch in den Werken, die sich mit indogermanistischen oder allegemeinsprachlichen Problemen befassen, spielt immer das Indische eine wichtig Rolle. Es kann hier nicht alles aufgezählt oder gar besprochen werden, was ihm die indische Sprachwissenschaft verdankt. Aber das Wichtigste soll erwähnt werden.


"Das Dehnungsgesetz der griechischen Komposita" (s. o.) wird durch den Vergleich mit der ai. Auslautdehnung in der Wort- und Kompositionsfige als indog. erwiesen.

Der gross Aufsatz "Über ein Gesetz der indog. Worstellung" (Idg. Forsch. 1, 1892, 333-436) hat es zwar hauptsächlich mit dem Griechischen und Lateinischen zu tun; aber für das Indoiranische ergibt sich daraus (S. 402-6), dass die indischiranische Neigung, enklitische Wörter an die zweite Satzstelle zu setzen, allgemein indog. ist.


Der Beitrag "Genetiv und Adjektiv" zu den Mélanges de Saussure (Paris 1908, 123-152) verbindet die lat. Genetivendung -i mit der von den ai. Grammatikern cvi genannten Bildung (mithunī-kr- "zum Paar machen", mithunī-bhū- "sich paaren" usw.) Diese Erklärung hat sich bis heute trotz gelegentlicher Bekämpfung siegreich behauptet; gerade die Fälle wie lat. multi facere "hochschätzen", die vom Lat. aus gesehen ganz unverständlich sind, finden als Reste des cvi-Typus ihre schlagende Deutung und bilden damit die stärkste Stütze für W.s These.

Die "Akzentstudien" (Gött. Nachr. 1909, 50-63; 1914, 2051; der dritte Teil behandelt nur Griechisches) beweisen überzeugend den Satz, dass die Stämme auf betontes i, u und r die Neigung haben, den Ton auf ein angefügtes Suffix zu werfen.

Akzentschub und seiner Vrkfixion (kalyāṇīh N. Sg., kalyāṇāh N. Pl.) stimmt ausgezeichnet zu den Regeln des Pāṇini (4, 1, 54 ff.), nach denen Bahuvrīhis, deren Hinterglied eine Körperteilbezeichnung auf -a- ist, eben dieses Feminimum haben (Z. f. vgl. Sprf. 61, 191-197).


Allerdings muss sofort hinzugesetzt werden: der akademische Lehrer steht gleich gross neben dem Forscher. Von der Art seiner Vorlesungen geben ja die beiden Syntaxbände eine lebendige Vorstellung, da sie getreue Wiedergabe von Bekanntem; aber in der unhandbuchmässigen Urgleichheit der Abschnitte und in der lebendigen Darbietung tritt auf Schritt und Tritt der eigenständige Forscher hervor. Aus dieser Bevorzugung der

Der gekennzeichneten Art seiner wissenschaftlichen Persönlichkeit entsprach seine Wirkung auf die Hörer. Ob man nun zu seinen engeren Schülern gehörte oder nur klassischer Philologe die Hauptvorlesungen besuchte, man stand unter dem Bann des Forschers, der mit unbestechlicher Wahrhaftigkeit und gerechtem Abwägen das Richtige sprach, der auch bei sachlich schärffestem Tadel nie verächtlich oder gehässig sprach, aber in Verlegenheit kam, wenn einmal ein Selbstzitat unvermeidlich wurde. Seine volle pädagogische Fähigkeit entfaltete er in den Uebungen; da konnte es peinliche Momente geben, wenn Unwissenheit oder Oberflächlichkeit gar zu krass hervortraten; aber niemand konnte es ihm übel nehmen, weil man wusste, dass er gegen sich selber ebenso ehrlich war und dass er doch voll Wohllwollen war. So hat er schärfste Schulung geboten, aber nicht Schule gemacht, weil er zur selbständigen Forschung anleitete, nicht Theorien vertrat. Es mag noch gesagt werden, dass unter seiner Leitung drei Dissertationen zur indischen und iranischen Sprachwissenschaft entstanden sind: 1) Th. Gubler, Die Patronymica im Alt-Indischen (Göttingen 1903), 2) Eduard Thommen, Die Worstellung in nachvedischen Altindischen und im Mittelindischen (Göttingen 1903), 3) Herman Lommel, Studien über Indogermanische Femininbildung (Göttingen 1912).


A Sanskrit Index to the Chāndogya Upaniṣad *

(With References to other Sanskrit Texts.)

By

E. G. CARPANI

I. a.

122. ANVĀHĀRYAPACANA, m.: the southern sacrificial fire. -nas (nom. sig.): IV, 12.1; V, 18.2.

123. ANVEŠANĀ, f.: searching; investigation. -(nom. sig.): IV, 1.7. (actio quaequendi [BOPP]; seeking for [MONIER-WILLIAMS]; das Suchen, Forschen [CAPFELER].)

124. ANVEṢĀVYA, grdv.: to be sought or found out. -yas (nom. sg. m.): VIII, 7.1, 3—(for eṣa ātmā... satyasāṅkalpo see Ch. U. VIII, 1.5; M.U. VII, 7). -yam (nom. sg. n.): VIII, 1.1-2—(tad anveṣāvyaṁ tad vāva vijñāsitavyam—M.U. VI, 8: eṣa vāva jijñāsitavyo'nveṣāvyah.)

125. AP, f.: water. [Cf. Gr. ἀφός; Lat. am-nis, “a river”, for ap-nis; Goth. apha; Old Germ. aha, affa(-°); Lith. uppa.] āpas (nom. pl.): I, 1.2; 8.4; III, 1.2; 2.1; 3.1; 4.1; 5.1; IV, 3.2; 12.1; 14.3; V, 2.2; 3.3; 9.1; VI, 2.4; 5.2; 8.3; VII, 4.2; 6.1; 10.1; 26.1. apas (acc. pl.): V, 16.1; VI, 2.3; 7.1; 8.3-4; VII, 2.1; 7.1; 10.1-2; 11.1. abhis: (instr. pl.): III. 11.6; V, 2.2; VI, 8.4, 6. adhyas (abl. pl.): VI, 2.4; 8.6; VII, 10.2; 11.1. apāṁ (gen. pl.): I, 1.2; 8.5; VI, 4.1-4; 6; 6.3; VII, 10.2. apsu (loc. pl.): II, 4.1-2; VIII, 7.4.

126. APA, adv.-prep.: away. IV, 1.2.

127. APACĪTI, f.: veneration; honour. -tyāi (dat. sg.): I, 1.9.

128. APARA, pron. a.: other; latter. -rāni (acc. pl. n.): VIII, 9.3; 10.4; 11.3.

129. APARAPAKṢA, m.: the latter half of the month. -ṣam (acc. sg.): V, 10.3. -sāt (abl. sg.): V, 10.3.

130. APARĀJITA, a.: unconquerable. -tā (nom. sg. f.): VIII, 5.3.


132. APAŚYANT, a.: not seeing. -ntas (nom. pl. m.): V, 1.9.

133. APAHAṬAPĀPMAN, a.: free from evil or with evil removed. -mānom. sg. m.): I, 2.9; VIII, 1.5; 4.2; 7.1, 3.

134. APAHAṬATAMASKA, a.: with darkness removed. -kāṁ (acc. pl.): VII, 11.2.

135. APAHATI, f.: removing; destroying. -tis (nom. sg.): VIII, 12.1.

* Continued from NIA I. 187.
136. APAHANTRA, m.: destroyer. -tā (nom. sg.): I, 3.1.

137. APĀNA, m.: out-breathing, expiration (opposed to prāna); "that of the five vital airs which goes downwards and out at the anus" (Monier-Williams). -nas (nom. sg.): I, 3.3; III, 13.3; V, 21.1. -nāya (dat. sg.): V, 21.1. -ne (loc. sg.): V, 21.2. (Cf. B.A.U. III, 9.26; Taitt. U. I, 7; II, 2; Kāṭ. U. V, 3, 5; Munḍ. U. II, 1.7; Pr. U. III, 5, 8; IV, 3; M.U. II, 6.).

138. API, adv.-prep.: even, also. I, 5.5; 10.4; II, 1.2-3; III, 11.6; IV, 15.1; V, 10.10; 24.4; VI, 7.3, 5; VII, 5.2; 8.1; 9.1; 13.1; 15.3; VIII, 3.2; 4.2; 10.1.4.

139. APIDHĀNA, n.: cover. -nam (nom. sg.): VIII, 3.1.

140. APIPĀSA, a.: free from thirst. -sas (nom. sg. m.): III, 17.6; VIII, 1.5; 7.1, 3.

141. APUPA, m.: cake. -pas (nom. sg.): III, 1.1.

142. APRATIṢṬHITA, a.: unixed. -tam (nom. sg. n.): I, 8.6.

143. APRAHMATA, a.: attentive. -tas (nom. sg. m.): I, 3.12; II, 22.2. (Cf. Kāṭ. U. VI, 11; Munḍ. U. II, 2.4.).

144. APRAMĀDA, a.: not negligent. -das (nom. sg. m.): V, 2.8.

145. APRAVARTIN, a.: not flowing forth. -ti (nom. sg. n.): III, 12.9. -tinim (acc. sg. f.): III, 12.9. (Ch. U. pūrṇa aprāvarti = B.A.U. II, 1.5.)

146. APRĀNANT, a.: not breathing in. -nan (nom. sg. m.): I, 3.3-5.

147. APRĀPYA, grd.: not having found. VIII, 9.1; 10.1; 11.1.

148. APRĪYAVETR, m.: one who feels unpleasant things. -tā (nom. sg.): VIII, 10.2, 4.

149. APROCYA, grd.: not having taught. IV, 10.2.

150. APSUMANT, a.: having water. -mān (nom. sg. m.): II, 4.2.

151. ABALA, a.: feeble. -lānām (gen. pl.): IV, 4.5.

152. ABALINAM, m.: feebleness. -mānam (acc. sg.): VIII, 6.4.

153. ABODDHI, m.: non-perceiver. -dhā (nom. sg.): VII, 9.1.

154. ABRAHMANA, m.: not a Brahman. -nas (nom. sg.): IV, 4.5.

155. ABHAYA, a.: unfearful, not dangerous; n.: security. -yam (nom. sg. n. and acc. sg. m.): I, 4.4-5; IV, 15.1; VIII, 3.4; 7.4; 8.3; 10.1; 11.1. -yās (nom. pl. m.): I, 4.4 (Cf. B.A.U., IV, 4.25.)

156. ABHIKĀMA, m.: desire; a.: well-disposed to (acc. -o). -mas (nom. sg. m.): VIII, 2.10. -mās (nom. pl. m.): VIII, 1.5. (See Senart, op. cit., p. 108 f.)

157. ABHITAS, adv.: near, around. III, 1.4; 2.3; 3.3; 4.3; 5.3; VIII, 6.4.

158. ABHINADĐĀKS, a.: blindfold. -sas (nom. sg. m.): VI, 14.1. -sam (acc. sg. m.): VI, 14.1.

159. ABHINANDA, m.: wish, desire. -dās (nom. pl. m.): V, 8.1.

160. ABHINAHANA, n.: bandage. -nam (acc. sg.): VI, 14.2.

161. ABHIPRATĀRIN, proper name (m.); descendant of Kakṣasena. -rinam (acc. sg.): IV, 3.5. -(voc. sg.): IV, 3.6.

162. ABHIVYĀHĀRA, m.: utterance. -rāya (dat. sg.): VIII, 12.4.
163. ABHISĀYAM, adv.: at sunset. IV, 6.1; 7.1; 8.1.
164. ABHYĀSA, m.: hope; hope of gaining. -sas (nom. sg.): I, 3.12; II, 1.4; III, 19.4; V, 10.7.
165. ABHRA, n.: cloud. -ram (nom. s.): V, 5.1; 10.5-6; VIII, 12.2.
-rāṇī (nom. pl.): II, 15.1.
166. AMA-, pron. stem: this, he. V, 2.6.1
167. AMATA, a.: unthought. -tam (nom. acc. sg. n.): VI, 1. 3#; 4.5.
168. AMATVĀ, grd. without thinking (not having thought). VII, 18.1.
169. AMANAS, a.: without mind. -nasas (nom. pl.): V, 1.11.
170. AMANTRĀ, m.: non-thinker. -tā (nom. sg.): VII, 9.1.
171. AMĀ, adv.: at home. V, 2.6.
172. AMĀVĀSYĀ, f.: night of new moon. -yāyām (loc. sg.): V, 2.4.
173. AMUTRA, adv.: there. VIII, 1.6.
174. AMŪLA, a.: rootless; without support. -tam (nom. sg. n.):
VI, 8.3, 5.
175. AMRTA, a.: immortal; n.: immortality; nectar. -tas (nom s. m.): I, 4.5. -tam (nom. acc. sg. n., acc. sg. m.): I, 4.4, 5; III, 6.1, 3; 7.1, 3; 8.1, 3; 9.1, 3; 10.1, 3; 12.6; IV, 15.1; VII, 24.1; VIII, 3.4. 5; 7.4; 8.3; 10.1; 11.1; 14.1. -tā (nom. sg. f.): I, 4.5. -tasya (gen. sg.):
VIII, 12.1. -tās (nom. pl. m. f.): I, 4.4; III, 1.2; 2.1; 3.1; 4.1; 5.1, 4.
-tāni (nom. pl. n.): III, 5.4. -tānam (gen. pl.): III, 5.4.
176. AMRATVĀ, n.: immortality. -vam (acc. sg.): II, 22.2; 23.2; VIII, 6.6.
177. AMOGHA, a.: unfailing; fruitful. -ghās (nom. pl. m.): VII, 14.2.
178. AYA, m.: course. -yās (nom. pl.): IV, 1.4, 6.
179. AYAJAMĀNA, a.: impious. -nam (acc. sg. m.): VIII, 8.5.
180. AYĀSYA, proper name (m.). -yas (nom. sg.): I, 2.12. -yam (acc. sg.): I, 2.12.4
181. ARA (1), m.: the spoke of a wheel. -rās (nom. pl.): VII, 15.1.
182. ARA (2), m.: name of an ocean in Brahman’s world. -ras (nom. sg.): VIII, 5.3. -ram (acc. sg.): VIII, 5.4.—(Cf. Kaus. U., I. 3.)

1. Deussen’s rendering of amā by “Gewaltige” is wrong. See Wackernagel, Altindische Grammatik, III, 533. Cf. B.A.U., VI, 4.20: — अथानामासप्रेमोऽहः सा लक्ष्यमादि सामाधिक्षेत्रादशोऽहमिक्षेत्रा श्रस्तिः -सांध्यो श्रस्तिः, uta tam ōdesam aprākśhā, yena a-śrutaṁ śrutaṁ bhavati, a-matāṁ matam, a-vijñātaṁ vijñātaṁ iti || Cf. Muṇḍ. U. I, 1.3: — कस्मिन्,...विज्ञाते सर्वप्रियं विज्ञाते ...
   cf. also B.A.U. II, 4.5 end, and IV, 5.6 end. See Senart, op. cit., p. 77, foot-note 1.

2. Emblica officinalis; Terminalia citrina Roxb.; Cocculus cordifolius; Piper longum; Ocyumum sanctum, etc.

4. Ayāśya, name of an Anāgiras; cf. RV., X, 108.8. Mystical name of the chief vital air (Monier-Williams).
183. ARANYA, n.: forest. -ye (loc. sg.): V, 10.1.
184. ARANYAYANA, n.: becoming a hermit; hermit life. -nam (nom. sg.): VIII, 5.3.—(Cf. Kaus.U., I, 3.)
185. ARI, a.: devoted; hostile; m.: enemy. See No. 187.
186. ARIISTA, a.: unhurt. -lam (acc. sg. m.): III, 15.3.
187. ARE, interjection of address. IV, 1.3, 5, 7, 8; 2.3, 5.
188. ARCIS, f.: light, flame. -(nom. sg.): V, 4.1; 6.1; 7.1; 8.1. -sam (acc. sg.): IV, 15.5; V, 10.1. -sas (abl. sg.): IV, 15.5; V, 10.1.
189. ARNAVYA, a.: waving; m.: wave, stream, sea. -vau (nom.-acc. du. m.): VIII, 5.3, 4.
190. ARTHA, m.: object; aim; utility. -thena (instr. sg.): V, 11.6.
191. ARDHA, m.: side, part; place. -dham (acc. sg.): V, 3.4, 6.
192. ARVANC, a.: turned towards; coming near or to meet any one. -dk (acc. sg. n.): III, 10.4. -dnas (nom. pl.): I, 7.6, 8.
193. ARHANA, f.: veneration. -nam (acc. sg.): V, 3.6; 11.5.
194. ALANKARA, m.: ornament, decoration. -rena (instr. sg.): VIII, 8.5.
195. ALABDHVA, grd.: without grasping. VI, 8.2.
197. ALPAVID, a.: knowing little. -vit (nom. sg. m.): VII, 5.2.
198. AVADANT, a.: not speaking. -ntas (nom. pl.): V, 1.8.
199. AVABHRTHA, m.: purification by bathing after a sacrifice. -thas (nom. sg.): III, 17.5.
200. AVARAPURUSHA, m.: descendant. -sas (nom. pl.): IV, 11.2; 12.2; 13.2.
201. AVASKIN, a.: not speaking. -kha (nom. sg.): III, 14.2, 4.
203. AVI, m.: sheep. -vayas (nom. pl.): II, 6.1; 18.1.
204. AVIJANANT, a.: not understanding, undiscerning. -nan (nom. sg. m.): VII, 17.1.
205. AVIYATA, a.: undistinguished. -tam (nom.-acc. sg. n.): VI, 1.3; 4.5, 7.
206. AVIYATRA, m.: non-discerner. -tari (nom. sg.): VII, 9.1.
207. AVITTI, f.: the not finding; the not possessing. -tya (instr. sg.): I, 11.2.

1. “Le texte est ici troublé. Je ne puis considérer comme admissible l'interprétation de yathavidhaanaim guruh karmatisesena que suggère Sankara. Il faudrait au moins que toute la locution fût remassée en un seul composé, et cela même serait difficilement admissible. J'ai donc traduit avec l'addition de krtva, introduit par Bohlingk; mais je ne saurais dire que l'altération supposée d'une lecture si facile me semble plausible. En tout cas cette hypothèse implique la correction de atiseena qui ne donne aucun sens en avisesena; mais cet avisesena est lui-même bien faible et bien superflu, et devrait en tout cas beaucoup plutôt porter sur la suite: bref, je ne puis rien faire ni de atisesena ni de avisesena abhisamavaicia” Senart, op. cit., p. 121.
208. AVITTṆA, grd.: not having found. I, 2.9.
209. AVIDDHA, a.: unpierced; unhurt. -dhas (nom. sg. m.): VIII, 4.2.
210. AVIDYĀ, f.: ignorance; spiritual ignorance, illusion. —(nom. sg.): I, 1.10.
211. AVĪDVAṆS, a.: not knowing. -dvān (nom. sg. m.): I, 10.9-11; 11.4-9; V, 11.5; 24.1. -dusām (gen. pl.): VIII, 6.5.
212. AVIŚESA, a.: uniform, without difference (instr. as adv.: in general). -sena (instr. sg.): VIII, 15.1.
213. AVYATHAMĀNA, a.: not trembling. -nas (nom. sg. m.): VII, 4.3; 5.3. -nān (acc. pl.): VII, 4.3; 5.3.
214. AŚANĀYĀ, f.: hunger. —(nom. sg.): VI, 8.3.
215. AŚANĀYĀPIPĀSĀ, f.: hunger and thirst. -se (acc. du.): VI, 8.3.
216. AŚANI, m.f.: thunderbolt; a missile. -nis (nom. sg.): V, 5.1.
217. AŚARĪRA, a.: bodiless. -ras (nom. sg. m.): VIII, 12.2. -ram (acc. sg. m.): VIII, 12.1. -rasya (gen. sg. m.): VIII, 12.1. -rāqi (nom. pl. n.): VIII, 12.2.
218. AŚRVANT, a.: not hearing. -ntas (nom. pl.): V, 1.10.
219. AŚMAN, m.: stone, hard stone, rock. -mā (nom. sg.): I, 2.8 -mānam (acc. sg.): I, 2.7, 8.
220. AŚARVANĪYA grdv.: not to be heard. -yam (acc. sg. n.): I, 2.5.
221. AŚRUTA, a.: unheard; inaudible; unknown. -tam (nom.-acc. sg. n.): VI, 1.3; 4.5.
222. AŚROT, m.: non-hearer. -tā (nom. sg.): VII, 9.1.
223. AŚVA, m.: horse. -vas (nom. sg.): VIII, 13.1. -vās (nom. pl.): VII, 6.1; 18.1.
224. AŚVATARRATHA, m.: chariot drawn by mules (female mules). -thas (nom. sg.): IV, 2.2, 4; V, 13.2. -tham (acc. sg.): IV, 2.1, 3.
225. AŚVATHA, m.: sacred fig-tree (Ficus religiosa). -thas (nom. sg.): VIII, 5.3.
226. AŚVANĀYA, m.: horse-herd. -yas (nom. sg.): VI, 8.5, 3.
227. AŚVAPATI, proper name (m.): Ved. Lord of horses; name of a King. -tis (nom. sg.): V, 11.4.
228. AŚTAMA, a.: eighth. -mas (nom. sg. m.): I, 1.3.
229. AŚṬACATVĀRIṆŚAD, num.: forty-eight. -sat (nom.): III, 16.5.
230. AŚṬACATVĀRIṆŚADAKŚARA, a.: having forty-eight syllables. -rā (nom. sg. f.): III, 16.5.
231. ASAṀVIDĀNA, a.: not covenanting. -nau (nom. du. m.): VIII, 7.2.
232. ASAṀKRT, adv.: not once. V, 10.8.
233. ASAṄKALPAṆĪYA, grdv.: not to be conceived. -yam (acc. sg. n.): I, 2.6.
234. ASANT, a.: non-being; not existing. -sat (nom. sg. n.): III, 19.1; VI, 2.1. -satās (abl. sg.): VI, 2.1, 2.
235. ASAMBĀDHĀ, a.: unconfined. -dhān (acc. pl.): VII, 12.2.
236. ASAMBHEDA, m.: separation. -dāya (dat. sg.): VIII, 4.1.
237. ASAHASRA n.: less than thousand. -reṇa (instr. sg.): IV, 4.5.
238. ASĀDHU, a.: not good. -(nom.-acc. sg. n.): II, 1.1, 3; VII, 2.1;
7.1. -dhunā (instr. sg.): II, 1.2.
239. ASĀMAN, n.: non-Sāman. -ma (nom. sg.): II, 1.1, 3. -mnā
(instr. sg.): II, 1.2.
240. ASUKHA, a.: unhappy; sorrowful.-kham (acc. sg. n.): VII, 22.1.
241. ASURĀS, m.: demons. (pl.): I, 2.2-7; 8.4. -rān (acc. pl.):
VIII, 8.4. -rānām (gen. pl.): VIII, 7.2; 8.5.
242. ASĀU, demonstr. pron.: that, yon. -(nom. sg. m.): I, 3.1, 2;
5.1; 8.5; 10.6; II, 10.5; III, 1.1; 19.3; V, 3.3; 4.1; 10.8; VIII, 6.1.
243. ASTA, n.: home. -tam (nom.-acc. sg.): I, 9.1; II, 14.1; III, 6.4;
7.4; 8.4; 9.4; 10.4; 11.1; IV, 3.1.
244. ASTAMAYA, m.: disappearance, setting. -yāt (abl. sg.): II, 9.7.
245. ASTHI, n.: bone. -(nom. sg.): II, 19.1; VI, 5.3.
246. ASMATKULĪNA, a.: belonging to our family. -nas (nom. sg. m.):
VI, 1.1.
247. ASMADVIDYĀ, f.: knowledge of ourselves. -(nom. sg.): IV, 14.1.
249. ASRĀMA, a.: not stiff; not lame. -mas (nom. sg. m.): VIII,
10.1, 3.
250. AHA, pl. cl.: certainly; surely; of course. VIII, 11.2.
251. AHAJMŚREYAS, n.: claiming superiority for one's self (MONIER-
WILLIAMS). -yasī (loc. sg.): V, 1.6.
252. AHAṆKĀRĀDEṢA, m.: doctrine of the Self. -šas (nom. sg.): VII,
25.1.
253. AḤAN, n.: day. -ḥas (nom.-acc. sg.): IV, 15.5; V, 4.1; 10.1;
VIII, 3.2-3, 5; 4.2. -ḥnas (abl. sg.): IV, 15.5; V, 10.1. -ḥāni (acc. pl.):
VI, 7.1, 2.
254. AḤAM, pron. (I pers.): I. -(nom. sg.): I, 5.2, 4; 8.7, 8; 11.1, 2;
III, 11.2; 15.2; 16.2, 4, 6, 7; IV, 1.8; 4.1, 2, 4; 10.5; 11.1; 12.1; 13.1;
14.3; V, 1.6, 13, 14, 2.6; 3.5; 11.3, 5; VI, 3.2; 9.2; 10.1; VII, 13, 16.1;
24.2; 25.1; VIII, 9.1, 2; 10.2, 4; 11.1, 2; 14.1. mām (acc. sg.): II, 9.1;
IV, 1.5; V, 11.3; 12.2; 13.2; 14.2; 15.2; 16.2; 17.2; VI, 15.1; VIII, 6.4.
255. mā (acc. sg.): I, 10.6; 11.4, 6, 8; 12.3; III, 16.7; IV, 2.4, 5; 4.4; 14.2;
V, 2.6; 3.4, 5; VI, 5.4; 6.5; 7.2; 8.7; 9.4; 10.3; 11.3; 12.3; 13.1-3; 14.3;
15.3; 16.3; VII, 11.3. mayā (instr. sg.): I, 11.5, 7, 9; IV, 1.4, 6. me
(dat.-gen. sg.): I, 10.2, 3, 4; 11.3; II, 24.5, 9, 14; III, 14.3, 4; 16.2, 4, 6;
IV, 2.2; 5.2; 6.3; 7.3; 8.3; 9.2; 14.3; V, 2.1, 2; 3.6; 11.5; VI, 1.7, 3.4;
4.7; 7.4; 8.1, 3; VII, 1.3, 5; 2.2; 3.2; 4.3; 5.3; 6.2; 7.2; 8.2; 9.2; 10.2;
11.2; 12.2; 13.2; 14.2; VIII, 8.1. mat (abl. sg.): V, 1.8-11. mama (gen.
sg.): I, 5.2, 4; 11.3. āvām (nom. du.): VIII, 8.1, 3. vayam (nom. pl.): I, 8.5, 7; II, 24.4, 8, 12-13; III, 17.7; IV, 3.7; 11.2; 12.2; 13.2; V, 2.7. 
as (acc.-dat.-gen. pl.): I, 12.2; II, 1.3; IV, 5.1; 10.4; V, 1.7, 12; 11.1, 6; VI, 4.5.

255. AHAHA, interj. of joy, surprise, sorrow, etc. IV, 2.3, 5.
256. AHIŚMANT, a.: not hurting; harmless. -san (nom. sg. m.): VIII, 15.1.
257. AHIŚMĀ, f.: harmlessness; not injuring anything. -(nom. sg.): III, 17.4.

AHRDAYAJÑA, a.: not knowing the heart. -ñam (nom.-acc. sg. n.): VII, 2.1; 7.1.
259. AHORĀTRA, n.: day and night. -re (acc. du.): VIII, 4.1.

(To be continued.)
A NARRATIVE & CRITICAL HISTORY OF ADEN

By

ABDULLA YAQUB KHAN, Aden.

INTRODUCTION

The annals of Aden are so interwoven and blended with the histories of Yemen, Ottoman Empire, Portugal, and other countries that it has for ages baffled historians to present a harmonious and linked account of its hoary past; mystical decline and fall; squirming rise and growth, and ultimate lift to a position of the highest magnitude in the diadem of the British Empire.

Here I propose to give a synopsis of my history which will be narrated at greater length in this paper, disclosing many facts hitherto unpublished—the fruit of my several years' research in such a place like Aden, where not a single public library exists.

Before narrating the history of the place one point has to be determined—a point which will decide the commercial importance of this port. Aden is a barren place and, situated as it is in the torrid zone, is almost devoid of vegetation. The heat, the poignancy of its atmosphere, the Shamal, and the hot blast during summer, are apprehended for a veritable inferno. It produces nothing worth naming, and entirely depends on Yemen for its vegetable, fodder and fire-wood, on India for its grain and cereals, on the Far East for its textile fabric, on Europe for luxuries and perfume, and on Africa for its live-stock. But, in spite of all these obstacles and drawbacks, Aden attracted the attention of many nations, like the Himyarites, Romans, Abyssinians, Persians, Portuguese, Egyptians, Turks, Dutch, French, Americans and British, towards its sombre and charred rocks. But why? It certainly possesses no scenery of Venice or Kashmere; has no fertile soil; water—the elixir of life—has to be bought; the heat is just enough for Shams-e-Tabrez to roast his meat. Again why did nations who came to conquer Aden in the past sacrifice a number of their brave and gallant men on the shore of Sira Island? There is one and only one answer to these interrogations. The strategical position and commercial passage it commands midway between Europe and India—a connecting link between the West and East. It was not the captivating or entrancing nature of this burnt chain of hills that gravitated nations from distant climes at a period of history when navigation was in its infancy and the ancient mariners dreaded to pass The Gate of Tears, (Bab-el-Mandeb), and The Sea of Destruction, (Bahr-el-Kulzum); but the quest for a commercial port and a naval base.

Copyright—A. Y. Khan.
I.—Ancient Cycle

The ancient history of Aden is shrouded in mystery. Maneans, Sabaeans and Himyarites, were its masters between B.C. 2000 and A.D. 525. It is probable that the tanks of Aden were built by the Himyarites after the bursting of the dam of Mareb in about A.D. 102(?). The Himyarites were shrewd and enterprising traders and had a profitable intercourse with Jerusalem, Tyre and Sidon,—the Phoenician ports, trading in blue clothes, embroidered work, chests of rich apparel made of cedar and bound with cords procured in Aden. But the occupation of Aden as an emporium was impossible without an adequate supply of water, and as the Himyarites were great engineers of their time, the building of the Aden Tanks, was a simple thing to them in comparison with the stupendous dam of Mareb. The famous Queen of Saba, (Queen Balqis), is said to have visited Aden with her retinue of 1000 boys and girls and a variety of commodities, such as species, gold, frankincense, jewels, spices, algum, as a present for King Solomon.

Nebuchadnezzar, (Bukhtnasser of the Orient), had penetrated to Aden along the coast from the Hejaz in B.C. 574.

The trade in spices and frankincense was of great importance, and about A.D. 110 Aelius Gailus, a general of Egypt in the reign of Augustus, visited Yemen to invade the country in quest of these commodities; but found this to be a myth.

Aden was a flourishing port during the time of the Himyarites (A.D. 40-70) and the Greeks gave it the name of Eudaemon Arabia (i.e. Happy Arabia). The name of the king of Aden was Sherhabin who ruled the neighbouring countries as well. He was an ally of the Romans. The Romans in those days were great navigators and wanted a suitable port for tapping the trade of India and Africa. They established Berenice on the African side of the Red Sea, but when they could not induce traders to carry their shipment of spices from India and raw silk from China they captured Aden and named it Emporium Romanum. Later, when they found it impossible to maintain the place, they destroyed it. Aden remained in a ruined condition for some time, but regained its prosperity in A.D. 342 in the time of Constantine the Great, the King of the Romans, who renewed the old friendship with the King of Himyarites, and sent an embassy to him. This king permitted the erection of a church in the city of Aden for such of the Roman merchants who came to trade at Aden.

In A.D. 525 a religious war broke out in Yemen between the Himyarites and Christians. The Christians sought the help of the Abyssinians. Exasperated the Abyssinians sent an expedition under the command of Aryat, who came to Aden in Roman ships and conquered it. In A.D. 573, Madi Kareb, son of Saif bin D’Yazan persuaded the king of Persia to invade Yemen and Aden, describing the former as a country full of gold. The king sent a Persian army of 3600 strong, most of whom, were felons and malefactors, under the command of Waharz Pir Zada who, after a battle with
the Abyssinians captured Aden in A.D. 573. The Persians ruled over Aden and Yemen from A.D. 573 to A.D. 632.

The first Muslim, sent by the holy Prophet, (P. B. U. H.), as a governor and administrator of Aden, was Abu Musa Ash'ari. He ruled over Aden for a short time. In A.D. 632 Akramah Aboo Sahl was commissioned to quell a revolt and Aden in the same year passed into the hands of the Umayyads.

II.—MEDIEVAL CYCLE

In A.D. 749, the Abbasides took up the reign of the Government of Aden, and appointed Daood Abdul Majid as the first governor of the place. Banu Zayyads then captured it in A.D. 817, and in A.D. 905 it was under the sway of the Karamite Caliphate. After 28 years (A.D. 933) the Imam of Yemen took up its administration, and after the lapse of a century (A.D. 1038), it was in the possession of Zaher Ayyah. In A.D. 1062 the Banu Ma'an captured it. In the 12th century the country was in a great turmoil, and it rapidly changed hands in the following sequence:—Successors of Ibn Omer governed it in A.D. 1137; captured by Bilal Yasir Mohamed, A.D. 1137; treacherously taken by Sultan-el-Mansoor Hatim, A.D. 1137; seized by Imam Mudaaffar, A.D. 1149; governed by Banu Mahdi, A.D. 1159; besieged by Abdan-Naby, A.D. 1173, who resisted the army of Turan Shah; invaded by the latter, A.D. 1173, and ultimately passed on to the Ayyubite Government. When Marco Polo visited Aden in about A.D. 1290, the trade seemed to have revived, so much so that horses were exported to India in large numbers and the Ruler of Aden levied heavy imposts on them. In A.D. 1325 Abdul Hasonali ruled over Aden. The yet to be known Battle of the Arrows was fought in A.D. 1387, and Imad Rabi marched on Aden when there was an earthquake; the famous Arab Lexicographer Ferozabadi visited the place, A.D. 1394, Badrudin rebelled and ransacked Aden treasure, A.D. 1399. About A.D. 1422 we find that the trade of Aden improved considerably and the Emperor of China sent an Imperial Envoy to Aden with a letter and presents for the King of Aden to permit a commercial intercourse between the Chinese and the Arabs. These Chinese brought precious commodities such as rubies, amber etc., for sale in Aden.

III.—MODERN CYCLE

Aden at a later stage passed into the hands of Imams and the most renowned of this line of rulers was Abdul Wahab bin Omer, who, in A.D. 1500, constructed an aqueduct to convey water from Bir Mahit into Aden, and built the Round Tank known to-day as Playfair Tank, situated outside the skirt of the other tanks.

1. A marble slab describing this battle in Himyaritic inscription was found by Commander Haines near the defunct Indian General Hospital at Crater in A.D. 1842.
This painting depicts the seaport of Aden in the 16th century when the fortress was stormed by the Portuguese fleet on the Easter Eve of 1513. It was published in Coloniae in 1572-1617, by Braun and Hogenberg in their wonderful travel book, entitled Civitates Orbis Terrarum in six volumes.

It seems to have been hurriedly sketched from one of the war vessels while the assault was in progress or rather when the Portuguese were advancing towards the rampart, and perfected at a later date. Note the two vessels opposite Seera Island trying to draw near for scaling the hill.

The artist was probably Correa, who accompanied the expedition. He describes the attack on Aden in his work, Correa, vol. ii. Observe the great rampart running in a semicircle from Jabel-el-Mandher—the observatory of the Arabs at that time—to the Manusari Range, rendering the town impregnable from the sea front. (This will be discussed in the chapter "The Portuguese attack on Aden." This wall and many monumental works were built by Abd el Haseb Ali Ab-Dashak, a Muslim settler of Aden, during the time of the Zayyadites sovereignty, (A.D. 1062), and improved upon by Othman Az-

Zanzily, the Governor of Aden, during the reign of Turan Shah the Ayyubite, (A.D. 1173). (This will be discussed in the chapters: The Abbasides in Aden, A.D. 749-1062, The Ayyubites in Aden, A.D. 1173-1400).

The inset Latin text is here rendered into English for the convenience of the reader:

"ADEN, emporium of the most famous name in Arabia Felix, whether congregate merchants from India, Ethiopia and Persia; it is a mighty city, well fortified by its situation and by works, famous for the splendour and number of its buildings, surrounded by a wall and lofty mountains, on whose summits flaming beacons show the port to navigators. Formerly it had the form of a peninsula, but now, thanks to the man's industry, is surrounded on all sides by water."

A sweeping statement. Aden was not an island at the time of the Portuguese attack.

Another painting of a similar nature used by Colonel Jacob for a frontispiece of his book: Kings of Arabia, is a cut from the sketch of Dr. Kirk, and although giving us an excellent idea of Aden as seen at the time by ships approaching from India and other places, most of its details are fantastical and grotesque, and it makes the hills of Aden look like the humps of so many dromedaries. It is true some of the peaks of this chain of mountains were known as "As's Fara." (See Valenza, Travels, vol. ii, p. 13). The number of buildings make the place look like a very big city which was not the case. The rampart, with its gate and other edifices, are accurately drawn. Up to the 16th or 17th century beacons were used by the Arabs for the safe navigation of ships from India and other places. The painting in Col. Jacob's book is not the result of personal observation; but has been derived from descriptions of travellers such as Debaron, Andrea, Corsali and others.

All this time Aden had been an entrepôt through which considerable merchandise such as frankincense, alabaster, spikenard, spices, etc., passed on to India, China, Africa, Egypt and Syria. The discovery of the Cape Route in A.D. 1427, however, diminished its trade temporarily. Immediately after this discovery the Portugal Court became anxious to find a suitable port for its merchant ships and in A.D. 1513 Albuquerque arrived at Aden in command of a fleet; but in spite of his scaling ladders, bucklers and awe-inspiring swords, failed to capture the stronghold. To wreak vengeance upon the enemy for the massacre of his soldiers, he plundered and burnt all the ships that were lying at anchor in the harbour of Sira Island. He was followed by Lopo Soarez, in A.D. 1516; but a stratagem of the Governor of Aden frustrated the plan of the Portugal Court for ever. The Turks and the Portuguese at this period were at daggers drawn for the supremacy of the Red Sea, and the Turks looked upon Aden as the best rendezvous and a commercial haven for the Turkish fleet. In A.D. 1538 the fleet of Suleiman the Magnificent, anchored in the harbour of Aden, and in order to avoid the fate meted out to the Portuguese Lopo Soarez, he decided to meet one trick by another. The Governor of the town was wheedled, and on boarding the Turkish war vessel hanged at the yard-arm. One hundred guns were landed and the place was fortified. The Turks ruled over Aden for more than one hundred years. But the commerce during their regime declined so much that when John Jourdain, William Revets and Alexander Sharpey visited the place in A.D. 1609, they found Aden in a ruined state and contained, according to them, more soldiers than merchants. The merchandise was iron, tin, lead and broad cloth. The Ascension, in which Sharpey and his companions travelled, was the first British ship to visit Aden. In the following year (A.D. 1610), Sir Henry Middleton visited Aden and was given the same treatment as was meted out to Sharpey.¹

The Turkish maladministration in Aden, however, scared away all the traders from the town, and Aden fell into an insignificant port, forlorn and deserted. Meanwhile many of the tribes revolted, compelling the Turks to evacuate Aden and Yemen. Mocha at this time took the place of Aden and acquired the position of a flourishing port of Yemen. On the departure of the Turks, Aden remained under the Imam of Yemen.

In A.D. 1708 the French first visited Aden, and in A.D. 1762 the famous Danish traveller Carsten Niebuhr, visited it and found the trade a trifling one, "for," he says, "the sovereign is never at peace with his neighbours." The export of Aden then was coffee only.

The first American ship to visit Aden was in A.D. 1804 in quest of some convenient place to raise it to a commercial importance; but failed in their endeavour. They, however, bartered piece goods etc., for coffee, gums, frankincense, myrrh and skin.

¹. He was captured and sent in chains to Sanna.
IV.—The British

Perim was occupied by Colonel Murray in A.D. 1799, in order to prevent a junction between Napoleon and Tippoo Sultan; but owing to water difficulties it was abandoned in September the same year. Murray came to Aden and was given a generous reception by Sultan Ahmed, the Chief of Aden and Lahej. In A.D. 1802, a treaty of friendship and commerce was concluded with the Sultan of Aden and remained in force till A.D. 1827. In A.D. 1820, negotiations for the establishment of a coaling station in Aden were begun, and concluded in A.D. 1829, when some coal was landed on Sira Island for S. S. Hugh Lindsay, the first British steamship built in India. Owing to labour difficulties, however, the idea was abandoned. An attempt was made to form Socotra Island as a coaling station but the scheme was not successful.

In A.D. 1837 (the year of accession of Queen Victoria), a ship Darya-e-Dowlah, flying the British ensign, was wrecked near Aden and was plundered by the subjects of the Sultan of Aden. The merchandise was found on sale in the markets of Aden at the time when Captain Haines came for making investigations. The Sultan pleaded ignorance about the misadventure of the ship and the looting of her cargo. Captain Haines demanded a reparation of 12,000 dollars or the return of the entire property of the ship plundered by the Bedouins. The Sultan after a good deal of haggling agreed to restore two-thirds of the goods and executed a promissory note for the payment of the balance at twelve months' sight.

Meanwhile Commander Haines, succeeded in inducing the Sultan to cede Aden in return for an annual subsidy of 8,700 dollars; but at the last moment the Sultan failed to keep up his words and machinated to waylay the Commander. Thus Commander Haines was forced in A.D. 1838 to blockade the town and threatened to bombard it if the Sultan failed to hand it over according to mutual agreement. Finding the Sultan nonchalant, Commander Haines attacked the place in A.D. 1839 and captured it on the 19th January of that year. Aden was the first town to be annexed to the British possession in the reign of Queen Victoria.

The British government built all the fortifications, and from A.D. 1839 to A.D. 1857 several futile attempts were made by the Arabs to recapture the place. In A.D. 1857 Sheikh Othman was added, and in A.D. 1882 it was purchased by the British from the Sultan of Lahej. In A.D. 1868 Jabal Ishan, (Little Aden), was purchased from the Sultan of Lahej. Aden was declared a free port in A.D. 1850. Since then custom duties are levied only on salt, wines, spirits etc.

The tanks were cleaned in A.D. 1874 by the British at a cost of many lakhs of rupees. Several improvements in town building, roads, water supply, sanitation, lighting, etc., have been made.

During the Great War the Turks occupied Lahej on the 3rd July, 1915, and on the 5th July they captured Sheikh Othman; but on the 21st of the
same month they were expelled from Sheikh Othman to the confines of Lahej. On the 11th November 1918 the Armistice was signed and Lahej was evacuated by the Turks. This was the end of the Turkish rule in Yemen.

For about 93 years Aden remained under the administration of the Government of Bombay, and on 1st April 1932 its control was transferred to the Government of India. On April 1937 it was handed over to the Colonial Government.

PART I.

CHAPTER I.

SOME MYTHS

Aden is the traditional site of the Garden of Eden, a distinction which is shared by Ceylon and Yemen. At a remote age, after the expulsion of Adam and Eve, Aden became the abode of Satan and his Jinn.

Cain, after murdering his brother Abel, fled in fear of his father from India to Aden, choosing Sirah as his abode. He seems to have found Sirah dull, and Satan appearing before him, presented him with a lute and other musical instruments, with which he managed to keep himself amused.1 After the lapse of some time the common enemy of mankind appeared again and induced him to become an idolator. Cain and his progeny, therefore, became the first adorers of fire, and the first fire temple is said to have been erected by Cain in Aden.2 Cain lived in Aden for a considerable time and after his death was buried here. His last home can be seen to-day on the barren rim of the Aden crater, south of the Main Pass.3

The Indians say Aden was the prison of the Das Sir, the name of a jinn with ten heads, one of which was that of the deer Dilaeeser. This jinn used to dwell on Jebel Mandher, and disport himself on the sand of Holkat Bay.4

According to the Hindu mythology, the well dug out in the heart of the Sira hill, and known as Bir Heramast, was excavated by a jinn named Hunweet. The cause which led to the accomplishment of this wonderful piece of engineering, was the frustration of the evil design of a powerful but disreputable giant, named Hedith, who stole the wife of Ram Hyder from the province of Oudh and flew with her through the air until he alighted on the summit of Sira Island. Hedith then wanted to change her form.

1. JONES & BADGER, *Travels of Ludovico Di Varthema* pp. 59-60, and an Arabic MS: entitled *Ruh-er-Ruh* by Essa bin Lutf-Allah Sharfuidden.
from that of human being to that of a jinn. This suggestion was strongly resented by the lady. Now Hunweet, the engineer, whose form was that of an ape, was near by, and a witness to this wrangle. Pitying the lady, he tunneled the whole passage from the city of Oojien (the capital of Bikrami, King of Malwa), under the sea until it terminated in the centre of Jebel Sira completing the whole thing in one night. Issuing from the passage, he found Hyder’s wife sleeping under a thorn tree on the top of the hill and carried her home to her desolate husband.\(^1\) It is said that the well was so terrible that no one dared to look into it. Vapour used to come out of it and round about it snakes disported. A long story follows which is omitted owing to its length. It is also related in an Arabic manuscript\(^2\) that the well existed there up to a comparatively recent period, from the bottom of which flames used to issue, and that the end of a rope, let down by way of experiment in the presence of many witnesses, was found to be burnt on being drawn up. There is nothing improbable in this story for the Peninsula of Aden is undoubtedly of volcanic origin and the same igneous agency still occasionally manifests itself among the Zebair islands in the Red Sea, and the opposite coast of Africa.

According to the tradition fire will be emitted from the Sira of Aden on the Day of Resurrection and drive the people of Aden to the place of judgment.\(^3\) Maulana Hason Nizami, a sage of India, interprets the word fire as if it meant “Railway,” and fixed Aden as the place of starting. The line would extend to Syria via Yemen, and would be used for carrying the people to the place of judgment which is to be Syria.\(^4\)

There is some diversity amongst historians about the naming of this town. Some say Aden was so called because the founder named it after his son, whose name was also “\textit{Adan},” a descendant from the tribe of ‘Ad. It is likewise held that the first man who was imprisoned\(^5\) in it bore the name ‘Aden. Ibn Mujawir says, that as formerly Aden contained an iron mine (\textit{M’adan}), people in course of time corrupted the original word into Aden by decapitating the letter ‘M’. \textit{Chesney}\(^6\) is of opinion that this, once celebrated commercial kingdom, was founded by Aden-bin-Senan.

Whoever might have been the founder, the site was happily selected, and well-calculated, by its imposing appearance, not only to display the splendour of its edifices, but also uniting a strength with ornament to sustain the character which it subsequently bore as the port and bulwark of Arabia Felix.\(^7\)

---

4. HASON NIZAMI, Kitab-el-Amr, (Urdu edition), published several years before the inception of the Aden Railway.
5. Aden was a prison of the Pharoahs, but it ceased to be so under the Fatimites.
CHAPTER II.

A Few Legends

Since the early stages of civilization, from the days of 'Ad, Thamud, Jadis and Tasm, to the present day, Aden has been one of the main connecting links in the chain of commerce between East and West. The aim of this paper is to give a picture however inadequate of the ancient splendour of Aden, and the account would be incomplete if glimpses of its ancient fame are not visualised.

Amongst the ancient Arabs, who cruised the sea and built monumental works in Aden and its vicinity, were the 'Adites or the peoples of 'Ad, who were image-worshippers. They are said to have been gigantic in structure, and stature and full of vanity. They lived in Hadramaut, the province adjoining Yemen, and according to tradition were the settlers of the great desert Al-Akhaf or Rub-el-Khali (the Solitary Quarter). Shedad, the son of 'Ad is said to have performed many fabulous exploits; but we have room to mention only one of them—the erection of the magnificent city in the desert of Aden, begun by his father. This city is said to have been built in the vicinity of Aden near the village of Imad. It was adorned with sumptuous palaces and delightful gardens in imitation of the celestial paradise, and to inspire his subjects with a superstitious veneration for him as a god. This superb structure, we are told, was built with bricks of gold and silver alternately disposed. The roof was of gold inlaid with precious stones and pearls. The trees and shrubs were of the same precious materials. The fruits and flowers were rubies, and on the branches were perched birds of similar metals, the hollow parts of which were loaded with every species of the richest perfumes, so that every breeze that blew came charged with fragrance from the bills of these golden images. To this paradise he gave the name of Arem. But divine wrath fell on Shedad on account of his pride and impiety, ere he could step in to see the grandeur of his paradise on earth.

And, if this tale of Shedad’s city be disbelieved, some of the descendants of this extinct race still inhabit Mount Shamsham in Aden in the form of apes! It is said that the prophet Houd was sent to reclaim the tribe of 'Ad, and the people of Mahra in Socotra are descendants from the remnant of the Adites. Once a man named Kolabe, while seeking for camels came upon the beautiful garden or Irem-Dhatul-Imad. He found and brought away a priceless jewel which came into the possession of the first Omayyad Khalif Nourrejaht. Those who embraced Islam by the preaching of the prophet Hound were spared, but the rest were either suffocated by a stifling wind or survived in the form of apes.

It is just possible that a certain gentleman of Aden found kerosene in the vicinity of Shedad’s paradise. But a jinn was the keeper of the source.

2. BENTS, Southern Arabia, p. 131.
of this precious fluid, and as he required a human sacrifice, the prospector was obliged to abandon his project. This exploration in Aden is a twentieth century fable and the story of *The Jinn and the Oil*, is current up to the present day. Since these jinns are not willing to give up the pursuit of Adenites, even in an age when science makes us soar on metallic wings to the borders of heaven, and a voice from the other end of the world rides on ethereal chargers to give us the latest news, the legends of Shedad may not be denounced as absurd.

CHAPTER III.

ANCIENT ADEN

1. Verdant Aden

Long before the dawn of history and preceding the great upheaval of the volcano now extinct, Aden must have been a verdant place full of blossoming trees, with the eye-soothing carpet of grass covering the length and breadth of the present gaunt, lava-covered hills.

Sir Henry Johnston says: "This region of South-western and Southern Arabia ten to fifteen thousand years ago, was probably an even better favoured province than it is at the present day, when it still bears the Roman designation of Arabia Felix—so much of the rest of this gaunt, lava-covered and sand-strewn peninsula being decidedly 'infelix'. It has high mountains, a certain degree of rainfall on them and was antediluvian clothed in rich forests before the camels and goats and sheep of Neolithic and Bronze Age men nibbled away much of this verdure. Above all there grew trees oozing with delicious scented resins or gums."¹

Aden must also have been in the same flourishing condition as that which we find Sir Henry Johnston describing in the case of Ancient Yemen, although Dr. Anderson tells us that the growth of Aden resembles that *Arabia Patrea*, of which it is evidently the extension, yet it is queer how Yemen should be between *Arabia Patrea*, and Aden, when the latter is supposed to be a part and parcel of *Arabia Patrea*. We really doubt very much and are inclined to believe, that this "Cinderella of the East," as Colonel Jacob dubs Aden, must have been an integral part of Yemen, before nature robbed her ancient beauty.²

Even up to the 17th century Aden was so green and its valleys studded with small trees and shrubs, producing beautiful flowers, that it was no uncommon circumstance for the inhabitants of Sheikh Othman,³ to send their

3. A town about 9 miles from Aden proper.
goats and camels to find pasturage amongst the valleys on the west side of
the peninsula when none was procurable in their own district.\textsuperscript{1} How far
Sir Henry Johnston's description of ancient Yemen is applicable to our
infernal "Coal Hole," an appellation given to Aden by Sir R. Burton, is
left to the judgment of the reader. But whatever little vegetation we have
at present that might before long disappear like the primitive dodo on
account of climatic changes of Aden, is the remnant of what was been left by
the havoc of volcanic eruption described in the following chapter.

CHAPTER IV.
ANCIENT ADEN

2. THE ERUPTION OF THE ADEN VOLCANO

In the course of time the never ceasing work of nature wrought an entire
change in the shape and structure of Aden. After years of inactivity the
Aden volcano might have suddenly belched forth torrents of liquid lava and
blown up pieces of rock to distant places several miles around Aden; and most
probably the islets dotting the sea from Maalla harbour upto Little Aden,
are the result of the havoc played by the volcano. Valentia remarks that
the rocky peninsula on which Aden is situated resembles the fragment of a
volcano, the crater of which is covered by the sea.\textsuperscript{2} But this upheaval must
have taken place thousands of years before the destruction of Pompeii.

The configuration and construction of the volcanic walls of the crater
in which the town of Aden is situated, are highest toward the south and east;
but as the ridges of lava all radiate from the crater in these directions, the
lower part of the lip of the volcanic cone must have been where the rocks
are now highest; and some violent disruption must have subsequently over-
thrown the sides of the cone toward the north and east which were originally
the most lofty, and at the same time the weakest, as no floods of lava have
issued forth from them to serve as supports and buttresses to their walls.
The islet of Sirah, to the east of the town, is only a large fragment of the
eastern side of the cone. The volcano must have been submarine in its ori-
ginal outburst, as the stratification around the peninsula and the elevation
of limestone masses, even to the highest parts of mount Shamsham, satis-
factorily show. The whole peninsula must have been raised from the waters
like some of the islands of the Red Sea. Shells, such as are now procurable on
the shore, are found near the summits of some of its peaks. That the volcano
was active in the present geological era, there can be little doubt; but it
must have been long quiescent before it was chosen as the site of a com-
mercial emporium. Abulfeda speaks of a report having come from Mecca of

\textsuperscript{1} Playfair, History of Arabia Felix or Yemen, p. 6.
\textsuperscript{2} Viscount G. Valentia, Voyages and Travels, Vol. ii. p. 86.
fire having been seen bursting forth near Aden, and from the adjacent mountains in A.D. 1253. It was particularly brilliant by night, he says, and sent up large columns of smoke.\(^1\) This notice is however too general and refers to too evanescent phenomena to warrant any conclusion about the late volcanic action in the locality.\(^2\) Dr. Buist is also of opinion that Aden had clearly been submerged and elevated again from the water since the latest period of its activity. Up to the altitude of 500 feet it is thickly strewn with sea-shells mixed with scoriae and volcanic ashes, and in the bottom of the crater and all around the margins of the peninsula are masses of shells and gravel, the same as now prevail in sea around and exactly similar to those in the raised reaches of India and of Suez.\(^3\)

CHAPTER V.

ANCIENT ADEN

3. THE EXTINCTION OF THE ADEN VOLCANO

We now proceed to explain, on the authority of oriental legend, how the volcano of Aden was extinguished. In an Arabic manuscript entitled Tarik Taghhr 'Aden, i.e. The History of the Valley of Aden, by the learned and devout Kazi Aboo-Abdulla bin Ahmed Muhrim, we find that formerly from Kulzum\(^4\) to Aden and beyond the mountains of Socotra,\(^5\) all was dry land, there was no sea and no outlet; but when Dulkarmain\(^6\) in his voyage round the world came here, he opened a gulf wherein the sea flowed until it was arrested near the mountains of Bab-el-Mandeb, whereby Aden was engulfed by water and nothing was visible except the tops of the mountains jutting up into peaks. Then Dulkarmain cut a passage through Bab-el-Mandeb, whereby the water rushed in and filled the whole of El-Kulzum. When the rush was over Aden rose up and the land about it was drained in the direction

---

1. Abulfeda, Annals.
3. Dr. Buist, Physical Geography of the Red Sea, pp. 11-12.
4. This is the Red Sea and not 'Gulf of Seuz,' as Badger puts it in his notes to the Travels of Ludovico Di Varthema, p. 58.
5. Professor J. Stanley Gardiner, describes the new discoveries which have been made by the "John Murray" expedition, under Colonel Seymour Sewell, thus: "Gondwanland belonged to the reptilian period, and was the home, no doubt, of monstrous scaly reptiles... The 10,000-ft. high ridge, which runs south-west towards Socotra, was obviously a continuation of the Aravalli range (in Ajmere, India) and other mountains.
6. A celebrated personage in Oriental History who has been erroneously identified with Alexander of Macedon. He pushed his conquest to the remotest regions of the earth, vanquished nations of colossal stature, and subdued towns whose walls and towers were of brass and copper, so brilliant, that the inhabitants were obliged to wear masks to protect them from total blindness. Chrichton, Arabia, Vol. i, p. 110.
of Ash-Sham (Syria). Kazi Muhrim most probably copied this portion of his narrative from Ibn-el-Mojawar’s work entitled Tarikh-el-Mustabsir, in which we find a further account of the opening of Bab-el-Mandeb. This author writes:

"From the Red Sea to Aden and beyond Jabel Socotra was one united expanse of land...." and proceeds to narrate what has already been described above, adding: "We have proofs of that.—Firstly it is known that the marks which the sea and the waves have left remain visible on the summits of Jebel el-Kar and on the mountain on which is the fort of Takar and Jabel Akhdar. And the second proof is that Shedad bin ‘Ad did not build his Irem Dhat-el-Imad except between Lahej and the Gulf on one side, and Mawya which is on the road to Mafalis on the other, and that side which is toward Jabel Dareena is desert."¹ This shows that the hills were under water and pushed up by the pressure of the cooling surface of the earth, and the geological aspect of Aden shows that the waves did wash the summits of its hills as described by Arab chroniclers. Besides, Wells’s well-known work Outlines of History, and the recent Murray Expedition, throw sufficient light in regard to the physico-geographical condition of Aden during the Pluvial or Lacustrum Ages. Wells says that the Persian Gulf extended very far to the north of its present head, and combined with the Syrian desert to cut off the Semitic peoples from the eastern areas, while on the other hand the south of Arabia, much more fertile than it is now, may have reached across what is now the Gulf of Aden towards Abyssinia and Somaliland. The Mediterranean and Red Sea were probably still joined at Suez.² Whatever truth there may be in the allegorical details of this account, it seems reasonable to conclude that Aden in pre-historic times was joined to Africa, and that the sea which now separates the two continents was formed by the opening of Bab-el-Mandeb. In this we are supported by the theory of Seymour Sewell, the Leader of the Murray Expedition, who thinks that this hypothetical land, known as Lemuria or Gondwana, lying sunk below the mysterious waters of the Indian Ocean, once linked the Indian and African shores of the Arabian Sea, probably in remote ages long before Man made his first appearance. Logical deductions arising out of increased scientific knowledge have all tended to confirm this supposition. Similar fauna have been found on either side of the Arabian Sea.³

(To be continued).

---

THE INTERPRETATION OF YASNA HÄ X.
HOM YASHT

By
ERVAD MANECK. F. KANGA.

(1) Hereafter from here fly away the daēvas and the confrères of the daēvas. May the good Sraosha¹ stay (here)! May Ashi Vanguhi² stay here! May Ashi Vanguhi entertain delight here in this house which is of Ahura and of asha-increasing³ Haoma.

(2) In the first pressing I praise thee with the word, O wise one! when the sprout is caused to be held. In the second⁴ pressing I praise thee with the word, O Intelligent One! when I strike (thee) down with manly strength.

(3) I praise the cloud and the rain which both make thy 'kehrp'⁵ increase on the tops of mountains where thou, O Haoma! hast grown up.

(4) I praise thy mother, the revolving, broad, bountiful earth, whose impulse for production is energetic, O Righteous Haoma! I praise the earth where⁶ thou growest sweet-smelling and brave in the fields; and as the good shrub of Mazdā,⁷ O Haoma! thou art grown up on the mountains.

(5) And mayest thou flourish everywhere. Evidently thou art the fountain of righteousness. Increase thou with my word in every root, in every off-shoot and in every twig.

(6) Haoma grows up when praised. The man who thus praises him becomes more victorious. O Haoma! even the most insignificant prepara-

1. Sraosha. lit. obedience, the obeying or carrying out of the Law of Righteousness which is Law of Ahura. Two Yašt were composed in honour of Sraosha; one is Sraosha Yašt Hādhdokht and the other Sraosha Yašt Vadi i.e. the Greater Sraosha Yašt. The latter is wrongly called Yašt-i-si-shab or Yašt of the three nights. Ervad Dhabhar reads “Sarosh Yašt i sar shab” and translates “Sraosha Yašt (to be recited) at the beginning of the night.” I propose to read thus: Srōṣ yašt dēr šap.” I read dēr (= long) instead of “sar” as read by Dhabhar.
2. lit. the Best Holiness. As a proper name it indicates the incarnation of Piety and the resulting blessings. The word Ashi. lit. means “lot, merit, reward.”
3. Pahlavi version is ahrav-zāk i.e. of holy origin. Skt. version translates ‘muktiyanani’ i.e. having salvation as mother.
4. lit. meaning ‘upper.’
5. kehrpa. ‘celestial body’ as distinguished from tanu-material body.
7. av. “Carānem. acc. of place. Bartholome (AirWb. 581) says doubtful. Pahlavi version kartār (= doer) for av. caranem is influenced by the false etymology of the av. word.
tion of the Haoma-Juice, O Haoma, even the most insignificant praise, even the most insignificant drinking (each) is a thousand-fold smiting of the daēvas.

(7) Contamination created by (the daēvas) at once disappears from this house where he really deposits, where one assuredly praises the origin of Haoma having-healing-properties. (He reveals) health and healing-virtues to his family as well as to his residence.

(8) For, all other intoxications are connected with Anger, of infuriate spear, but that which is the intoxication of Haoma is connected with righteousness and delight.¹ The intoxication of Haoma makes the man active when he adopts² Haoma as a young son. In-a-great-measure Haoma produces health for their bodies.

(9) O Haoma, grant me healing-virtues through which thou art the giver-of-health. O Haoma, grant me victoriousness through which thou art the killer with victory. I shall become thy friend and praiser, (for) the Creator Ahura Mazdā declared the friend and praiser better than the Best Righteousness.

(10) The well-working Lord has created thee active and wise. The Bountiful Lord has established thee in the Mount Hara Baraza agile and wise.

(11) Then from here the holy birds instructed (on this point) carried thee away in different directions, to the Mounts Ishkata³ Upāri-Saēna⁴ to the peaks (called) Stārō-sāra, to away—from the hollow precipice—to the precipices roundabout, to the white gleaming mountain.⁵

(12) Then in these mountains thou growest in various kinds, O Sweet,⁶ golden-coloured Haoma! Thou hast been connected⁷ with health through the delight of good thoughts. Then deviate me from this slandering thought, then turn me away from such plot after plot which stands as wicked utterance.

(13) Obeisance (be) unto Haoma who makes a poor man equally high-minded as the richest one. Homage (be) unto Haoma who makest a poor man equally high-minded when he reaches the aim⁸ of his desire. O golden

¹ Compare Ashi yasht. § 5.
² Pahlavi version explains the word by “take care of”.
³ Av. ishkata in pl. means ‘a mountain-range’ and in sing. ‘a rock.’ BARTH. AirWb. 376. WINDSCHMANN and JUSTI take it in the sense of “ravine.”
⁴ Name of the mountain range; lit. meaning “surpassing (the height of the flight of) an eagle.” AirWb. 398.
⁵ The white gleaming mountains are, according to the opinion of Prof. BARTHOLOMAE, perhaps the Western Hindikūsh and Ghoraband, north of Kabul. vide. AirWb. 398, 1599.
⁶ lit. meaning ‘having milk, juicy, savoury.’
⁷ Perfect 3rd pers. pl. active from vīrāth, to stick to, to be attached to.
⁸ Vaēdhya, locative sing. ‘reaching attainment.’ It is curiously translated into Pahlavi Version “mānpatān mānpat.” i.e. chief of the heads of the families.
Haoma! thou makest him who verily takes a share in the Haoma-juice mixed with Jívám, rich in men, very holy and very intelligent.

(14) Mayest thou not go away from me enjoying at will like a bull banner. Let them go forth inspired with thee and reach them whose activity is energetic. O righteous, asha-increasing Haoma! I dedicate to thee this body which appears beautiful to me.

(15) I throw away the insufficiency (in the offerings for Haoma) of wicked women, deprived of understanding, who intend to deceive the ‘āthravan and the Haoma, and who having deceived (them) disappears. He gives neither a religious teacher as son nor the possession of excellent son to her, who sits down to eat the sacred cake (consecrated in the honour) of Haoma.

(16) Of the five I am, of the five I am not: I belong to good thought, I do not belong to wicked thought; I belong to good word, I do not belong to wicked utterance; I belong to good action, I do not belong to wicked action; I belong to obedience, I do not belong to disobedience; I belong to the righteous, I do not belong to the wicked even up to the time when in the end the decisive battle of the Two Spirits shall take place.

(17) Thereupon spoke Zarathushtra: 'Obeisance (be) unto Haoma created-by-Mazdā; good is Haoma, created-by-Mazdā. Homage (be) unto Haoma! I praise all Haomas: (those) which are on the tops of the mountains, those which are in the depths of the valleys, and also those whose keeping in captivity are in the fetters of women. I pour thee down from the silver saucer to the golden one; I do not pour thee down on the ground as thou art precious in value.

(18) These are, O Haoma! thy Gāthās, these are (thy) laudations, these are (thy) teachings, these are the rightly spoken words, health-bringing, victorious, bringing-opposition-to-enemies and health-giving.

(19) These indeed (are) for me. May they proceed further inspired with thee, may they go swiftly inspired with thee; they drive quickly inspired with thee. Being victorious he praises (Haoma) along with this hymn worthy to be sung.

1. BARTHOLOMAE takes the word in the double sense 'to give a share' as well as 'to take a share.'
2. BARTHOLOMAE takes āsita as adjective nom. pl. from āsit. "enjoying."
AirWb. 338.
3. Imperative 3rd person pl. from Vay, to go with fra-prefix.
4. Past. participle passive. from Vvā to be wanting, to fail. used as a noun.
5. Meaning 'priest.' See Vendidad Ch. XVIII. for the definition of the word.
6. lit. meaning "share, part." then sacred bread used in yasna and other ceremonies.
7. Songs from Vgā- to sing. Psalms of Zarathushtra.
(20) Homage unto the cattle! Obeisance unto the cattle! Word unto the cattle! Victory unto the cattle! Food unto the cattle! Clothing unto the cattle! Agriculture unto the cattle! Fatten her for our food.\(^1\)

(21) We revere the golden, exalted Haoma. We revere Haoma, the renovator, bringing-prosperity-to-the-world. We revere Haoma, warding-off-death. We revere all Haomas.\(^2\) We worship here the Holiness and the Fravashi of the Holy Zarathushtra Spitama.

(That person) among the existing ones of whom Ahura Mazdā, in consonance with the Divine Immutable Law, knows (that he is verily better in acts of worship (and those women) too of whom (Ahura Mazdā knows likewise)—(all such) both men and women do we revere.\(^2\)

---

1. Compare. yašt Varharān. Karda 20; also yasna Hā XVIII. 5.
2. Yenghē Hātām is one of the three holiest prayers of Avesta, and is regarded by GELDNER as a later imitation of yasna Hā LI 22. yasna Hā XXI is a commentary on this prayer.
*GM-SKŌ versus *GM-SKHŌ

By

C. R. SANKARAN

Elsewhere¹ I maintained that the proto Indo-European reconstruction *GM–SKHŌ as the antecedent for the sanskrit Gācchā-mi is an improvement over the reconstruction *GM–SKŌ, for the former easily dispenses with the postulation of the change of ts into cch in primitive Aryan (which is questionable) and also it more easily and conveniently explains the presence of palatal voiceless aspirate stop phoneme ch in Sanskrit gācchāti.

Attention must be drawn to the fact that an independent and striking proof² for the existence of the palatal guttural stop phoneme series in the proto Indo-European speech is furnished by E. H. STURTEVANT in his excellent article “Gutturals in Hittite and Indo-European” who points out that since Hittite shows k for Indo-European חבר, 㮝, and 㮝h, there can be no further doubt that these were stops in the proto Indo-European speech. “Otherwise we shall have to assume either that s became k independently in Hittite and in the centum group of Indo-European or that Indo-Hittite k > Indo-European s > Latin k. Either hypothesis is too improbable for serious consideration.”³

It must also be clearly borne in mind that in the entire satem-group only voiceless non-aspirate as well as aspirate palatal guttural stop phonemes 硌 and 硌h developed into palatal sibilants. Although in Iranian and Balto-slavic languages, we have good reasons to believe that the voiced non-aspirate as well as aspirate palatal guttural stop phonemes were changed into sibilants, yet in Sanskrit 㮝 and 㮝h came to be represented by j and h remaining thus in an intermediate stage of development. One is likely to confuse these with the secondary palatalization j and h of ﳍ and ﳍh.⁴

---

2.  For the earlier proofs, see HERMANN, "ÜBER das Rekonstruieren" in Kuhn's Zeitschrift für vergleichende sprachforshung, Volume 41, pages 38-46 (1907) and Leonard BLOOMFIELD, "Indo-European Palatails in Sanskrit" in American Journal of Philology Volume 32 (1911), pages 36-57.
4.  Primitive Indo-European labio-velars *gʷ* and *gʷh*. “Skt. j & h are each of double origin though the difference in origin discloses itself even in Sanskrit in certain combinations”. Cf. Carl DARLING BUCK, Comparative Grammar of Greek and Latin, page 125, section 144.
The y of the labio-velar as in **gynskhetti,\(^1\) old Indian gācchati should have originally been syllabic in Indo-Hittite according to E. H. STURTEVANT (see his article quoted before, page 228) before another consonant, and in the proto Indo-European speech should have combined with the preceding guttural to form the labio-velar (see also E. H. STURTEVANT, A Comparative Grammar of the Hittite Language, William Dwight Whitney Linguistic Series, Published by the Linguistic Society of America 1933, page 67. Compare also Walter Petersen, "Vowel Assimilation in Hittite" in the Journal of the American Oriental Society, Volume 54, page 163 footnote 5).\(^2\)

I wish to say now that I am more than ever convinced that my hypothesis is a definite improvement over the earlier one, mine being, that the proto Indo-European škh in **gm-škhò became škh > škX' > št's which was then simplified to t's written cch and pronounced as a prolonged t' plus a decidedly spirant glide, compare tacchivah in later times from tacs'ivah, but tacca pronounced tat'la (with much slighter glide) and written without the h, from tat+ca—the c in ca being t' with a slight glide,\(^3\) for there is another evidence that I have quite unexpectedly come across, which I propose to give here and incidentally advance a new hypothesis concerning the combination of dental sibilant and voiceless guttural stop phonemes in Greek, especially in such morphemes like the suffix skho or —sko.

It has been already shown that the antecedent of the Sanskrit chinād-mi in the Indo-European has been assumed to be *škhait — škhaid whence Greek skhid—Latin scid—Lithuanian skid—OHG. scızan and sceidan and scítan. Baltic skiedzint\(^4\) (see Josef Zurbaty, "Die altindische tenuis aspirata

---


See also Holger Pedersen, "Das Indogermanische s im slavischen", Indogermanische Forschungen, Volume V (1895) page 71.


palatalis" Kuhn's Zeitschrift XXXI (1892), page 13). Greek skedánùmi, Avestan scindayeiti, skenda, Lithuanian skédžiu skísti. The assumption that in the theoretical reconstruction, here, there was a voiceless guttural aspirate stop phoneme, has been made, because otherwise there would be a clash with Grimm's Law of Germanic sound-shift.

But one thing is to be noted here. In the Greek forms skhidē and skhízō, we find the accent immediately after the voiceless guttural aspirate stop phoneme. On the other hand, in báskō, Sanskrit ga'çchā-mi, the accent is before the combination of the two phonemes—dental sibilant plus voiceless guttural non-aspirate stop. Similarly we find in the following instances too that the accent invariably precedes the combination of these two phonemes.

aréskō, ehruriskō (beside future ehrurē-sō). In the reduplicated gignôskō didaskō from *didakskō diskos from *dikskos (cf. didakhē) eiskō from *wewikskō láskō from *lakskō ar-ari-skō.

made a present stem of meaning and aspect similar to that of Sanskrit bhindāti. Vide ibid page 173.


   Karl BRUGMANN, Grundriss. I, i; Strassburg (1897) sec. 600.


Cp. also missō from *mig-skō?

But there seems to be an apparent exception in pās-khō (from *path-skō) where instead of the voiceless guttural non-aspirate phoneme we find an aspirate phoneme. But a moment's reflection would convince us that it is the law of compensation that operates here, for the loss of the original dental voiceless aspirate stop phoneme th (in *pathskō) by dissimilation.

See C. D. BUCK, Ibid, section 206, page 152. This primitive Greek *path-skō is itself from *pnhskō < IE *pnhθskō.

See Wright, Comp. Gr. of Greek Language Section 109. P. 69.

Baskaino is a later formation after analogy with onomainō etc. from n—stems Hence is the accent on the penultimate syllable (contrast it with the accent in bīskanos) Cf. J. WRIGHT, Comp. Gr. of Greek. Section 490 page 300. Compare also boskē: boskō.

See the following diminutives also


boskōs, askōs, phōmaskōs and skōus and masculine skōlos oxylene with original accent are some other exceptions. See J. P. Postgate, "On Ancient Greek Accentuation." Proceedings of the British Academy 1926. Volume XI. Page 20. But as against these,
(Cf. ari-phmós—) haliskomai, steriskó. We find the suffix—skó as a secondary addition to a stem ending in a long vowel tinésko, (Doric thnäsko) mimnišsko, thrós Kosovo. ‘A few have inchoative meaning, as géräskó ‘grow old.‘ hëbäskó ‘grow young’ but this force never became dominant as in the corresponding Latin presents—in-scó. An offshoot of this class, with a specialised use which must have started in some particular forms like pháskon from phásko, is represented by the Ionic iterative imperfects and aorists like pheügeskon, phůgeskon.3

iskó from *wik-skó. But in misgó from *mik-skó, —g— for —k is after the analogy of mignúmi, emigén Cp. Latin misceo 3 bósko, géräskó 4 blósko thrós Kosovo ambiskó 5.

See the following glaukiskos, leuksiskos, lukhuiskos tragiskos from trágos, passaliskos from þassalos, meniskos ‘crescent’ from ménoi ‘moon’. oiniskos ‘poor wine’, as we say ‘small beer’. In the following three, the specializing of the original meaning alone is apparent and it is not possible to discover the diminutive signification. It may be that the original diminutive sense might have faded away as in obei-ko for obelós in the sense of ‘spit-shaped pillar’ sphēkiskos from sphēs, spheniskos and lēmiskos.

[See Walter Petersen’s “Greek diminutives in—ion, a Study in Semantics” 1910. Sections 217 and 344, Vide also J. P. Postgate op. cit. page 21.]

5. e-skèda-sa is an exception. The dactyl oxytona ending in aigoboskos is also an exception [Cp. aiskhrológos Wright op. cit. Section 32. P. 14.] skór too is an exception, but it is so because all the monosyllabic neuters of the third declension offer the circumflex if the radical vowel is long or a diphthong e. g. kër, ūr. Vide Jerzy Kuryłowicz “On the Development of the Greek Intonation”. Language Volume VIII (1932) p. 204. Contrast it with iškhs.


Vide. “Formation parelle pour iškhi asphns thématisé en iškhon”.


Compare also Gr. skór gén skatós “ordure”; formes exclusivement a — r — dans Skr. (apa—ava—) skara—, lat muscera, sucera “crotte de rat, de porc”; v. norr. Skarn ags. Scearn “fumier”.

E. Benveniste, ibid. p. 9.

Again in the case of aiskhistos—ístos : (Skr. isisha). Goth-ista- from IE * - is to —, — is — ñi is the suffix. Hence it may not be regarded as a great exception. aiskhos is only an apparent exception for it comes from the proto-Indo-European *aigys—gos= [aigyskos] [aigysgos > *aigys]. See K. Burgmann, Grundriß I. ii. Section 700. P. 625. J. Wright op. cit. Section 109. P. 69. Thus also eskhato from *éghskatos *éghs—gos= *éghs—gos—(See K. Burgmann, Grundriß I. ii Section 744. P. 660) and iškhs from “léghsk < léghsk< where we find the transference of aspiration to the voiceless guttural stop phoneme, by way of compensation for the loss of the aspirate stop phoneme preceding s in the proto-Indo-Euroean speech. In a similar manner, exceptions like Boeotian. hés-kē-đokā thess. es-hikhrēmen [see K. Burgmann, Grundriß I. ii. Section 1018, P. 906] can be easily explained away.
These instances lead us to conclude that normally when 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. Through à posteriori reasoning, since in bāskō (Skr. gācchāmi) bāskēi (Skr. gācchati) the accent precedes the cluster sk, we can safely infer that its antecedent in the primitive Indo-European speech was *gṃ-skhō (instead of *gṃ-skō), for by a special law alone, (that of accent preceding sk in Greek,) the original aspiration of the guttural stop might have been lost, while in Greek skhīzō (Skr. Chinād-mi) since the accent follows skh, the original aspiration (of the primitive IE voiceless palatal guttural stop) might have been preserved in tact.

ēkhō < *seğhe. Contrast it with skhetōs.


1. By cluster is here meant that originally both the phonemes should have belonged to a particular morpheme, say a suffix like sko, and thus the division of it into two separate phonemes is felt to be unreal. In other words, the cluster must have been a compound phoneme. In exactly the same sense, I think Leonard Bloomfield uses the word cluster in his article, “The Stressed vowels of American English” in Language Volume XI. 1935. Pages 97-116.

Compare, “Compound phonemes are combinations of simple phonemes which act as units so far as meaning and word-structure are concerned. Thus the diphthong in a word like buy can be viewed as a combinations of the vowel in far with the phoneme that is initial in yes”.

Vide L. Bloomfield, Language, London (George Allen and Unwin Ltd. 1935) page 90. “A minimum unit of distinctive sound-feature is a phoneme” ibid page 79.

Again “Compound phonemes are sounds resembling a succession of two or more phonemes of the same language, but in some way distinguished from such a succession, and utilised as separate phonemes. Many compound phonemes consist of a stop plus a spirant or other open consonant; phonemes of this sort are called affricates.”

See ibid page 120.
MORE ABOUT MOHENJO DARO

By

REV. H. HERAS, S. J.

After seven years of official silence about Mohenjo Daro, the Archaeological Survey of India has published a report in two volumes on the last four years of excavation work at that place. The Superintendent of those excavations was Mr. E. J. H. Mackay, who is the author of this work. Archaeologists and historians both in India and all the world over will receive these two volumes with great enthusiasm; since they are a substantial contribution to the knowledge of that great civilization which is still shrouded in mystery.

The work purports to continue the one in "three volumes edited by Sir John Marshall entitled Mohenjo-daro and the Indus Civilization" (p. XI), and thus presupposes the general information and the knowledge of the problems ably exposed and discussed in that work by Sir John and his collaborators. This is a mere report of the work of four seasons. Yet the materials discovered during those four seasons are of such great importance that the work of Mr. Mackay will be absolutely needed by all the scholars interested in the history of Ancient Civilizations and especially by those who work in the history of Ancient India.

Mr. Mackay is of opinion that a section of wall discovered during the last season is "a portion of the city wall with a small gateway" (p. 5). Unfortunately the excavations were then suspended and have not since been resumed. This discovery would, if the surmise is correct, be of unusual interest, as it would help to indicate the total area covered by the ancient city. A mound of rubbish discovered during the same season in the northernmost point of the city (p. 1), as far as we are able to judge, seems to suggest that this point was already outside the city wall. The mound consisted of broken pottery, ashes and humus, a circumstance that seems to indicate that the site was destined to receive the rubbish of the city or of a section of it. Such a site would not be within the city wall. Yet the fact that six inscribed seals, of which only one was broken, were found here seems to go against this theory.

In order to substantiate the very probable opinion of the late Mr. R. D. Banerji "that the river (Indus), or a branch of it, washed the city wall",

Mr. Mackay brings forth the evident trade existing between Mohenjo Daro and the cities of Sumer "partly at least by sail", as "seals of Indus Valley workmanship have been and are being found in some numbers in the Sumerian cities" (p. 5). This is a very daring statement which should be studied carefully. There is no doubt that some of the seals discovered in cities of Sumer bear inscriptions in the same characters as those discovered in the Indus Valley. Nevertheless this does not prove that those seals came from the Indus Valley, for signs of that script have been discovered elsewhere in India. Moreover the shape of those seals found in Sumer shows that they do not come from the Indus Valley. All the seals discovered in Mohenjo Daro, Harappa and Chafihi Daro are square seals excepting 19, which are round. (In the volumes under review five round seals only are recorded). Just the opposite happens in Sumer. All the seals are round excepting 3, which are square. This shows that the trade between India and Sumer did not come from the Indus Valley, where the seals were square, but from another Indian site where the seals were round. A few of these round seals also found their way to the Indus Valley; just as a few square seals of the Indus Valley found their way to Sumer. But the bulk of Indian traders going to Sumer apparently proceeded from a site not yet known. The present writer has explained elsewhere what was the probable site from which these traders started.

Mr. Mackay attempts to settle the important problem of the "duration of the city", though one must acknowledge that we have not yet sufficient data to arrive at a satisfactory solution of it. For the upper Mohenjo Daro levels he accepts the date 2,500 B.C. suggested by Dr. Frankfort while studying a cylinder seal of evident Indian workmanship unearthed at Tell Asmar in Sumer (p. 7). Dr. Frankfort, and with him Mr. Mackay, seems to presuppose that the Indus Valley sites are the only sites of this civilization in India. The fact that three cylinder seals only have been found in the Indus Valley (they are described in the volumes under study) seems to point to another Indian site where the seals were cylindrical. Consequently the study of the cylinder seal discovered at Tell Asmar cannot prove anything in connection with Mohenjo Daro until it is definitely acknowledged that Mohenjo Daro was the place of origin of the Indian cylinder seals as well.

As regards the lower levels Mr. Mackay builds an ingenious theory upon a "fragment of a vessel of a greenish-gray stone", the pattern of which is duplicated on a jar found at Susa (p. 7). Putting aside the fact that the

dating of Susa II (to which the fragment belongs) is not yet settled, as Mackay himself points out; the pattern of a fragment of a vase seems to be too flimsy a foundation to build a chronological theory upon. Could not two different artists independently of each other invent the same decorative motive? Moreover the migration of a decorative pattern would presuppose either trade or racial migration. To build a trade theory upon a single pattern does not seem justified. Race migration would seem more likely. Now all such migrations in the East in ancient times have been from East to West. Elsewhere I have shown how the proto-Indians of the Indus Civilization period migrated to Sumer and other western lands.\(^1\) We cannot suppose that the case of Susa was different. In any case the existence of the same pattern in Mohenjo Daro and Susa would, if connected in any way, prove that the Mohenjo Daro pattern must be older than the Susa pattern.

Coming now to the objects themselves found in the course of the excavations, one of the most striking specimens is the clay image of the Mother Goddess illustrated in pl. LXXV, nos. 21-23.\(^2\) The fan-shaped, pannier-like headgear of this image is unique in itself,\(^3\) but seems to be the origin of the voluminous and complicated head-dresses of many clay images found in the Gangetic Valley and in southern Europe.\(^4\) The famous “Dama de Elche” of the Iberian period of Spain, kept now in the Louvre Museum, is still a much later development of this early headgear.

This image is of particular interest, for through it one may understand one of the signs of the Mohenjo Daro script. I refer to sign No. 190 of Sir John Marshall’s sign list. Prof. Langdon describes this sign as “man under sun-shade?”.\(^5\) Nevertheless this indentification is not given as certain. The comparison between this sign and the figure under comment leaves no doubt as to the significance of the former: it is “the Mother”, \textit{Ama}.\(^6\)

Another clay figure brought to light during these operations is of unsurpassed interest. It is a nude male figure illustrated in pl. LXXXIII, No. 8. Other nude male figures have also been discovered. Yet the bow position of the legs, so well marked as to show a definite purpose, makes us compare it with a similar figure found on the representation of a charm or amulet published by Marshall.\(^7\) Sir John thinks that the image represents the Earth

---

2. This image was already published in Mackay, \textit{The Indus Civilization}, pl. I. (London, 1935); Mackay, \textit{Die Induskultur}, pl. 21. (Leipzig, 1938)
3. A similar head-dress but not so developed was published by Marshall, \textit{Mohenjo-daro and the Indus Civilization}, I, pl. XIV, No. 1.
or Mother Goddess. If this figure is compared with similar figures found in Sumerian and Babylonian seals and with the figure of the Egyptian God, Bes carved on the very early magical wand of the British Museum No. 18175, one may easily conclude that it is a representation of the fertility god. The clay image now brought to light by Mackay seems to be the same. Probably this god was also called Bes in the proto-Indian period. Images of a fertility god called Betal are very common all over the Konkan in Western India.

Three small horned faces had already been found in Mohenjo Daro before 1927. Our report shows a number of them found during this second period of work (pl. LXXII, No. 7; pl. LXXIV, Nos. 21, 22; pl. LXXVI, Nos. 1-4). Mr. Mackay supposes that these heads or masks belong to a "horned deity" (p. 266). This is not an unusual danger for students of ancient archaeology, to suppose that all strange and unaccountable figures should be deities. Horns have been a traditional feature in representations of the enemies of man. One of the most famous demons in Indian mythology was supposed to be horned and finally became a buffalo (Mahiśāsura). Horned demons are found in the paintings of the Etruscan tombs at Vulci (320-280 B.C.) Charon, the famous leader of the soul across the Styx pond, is also represented by the Etruscans with pointed ears that look like horns.

A totally new discovery are the three heads with Mongolic features published in pls. LXXVI, Nos. 8, 9 and LXXXII, No. 7. This Mongolic resemblance seems to have escaped Mr. Mackay's notice. He speaks at length of one of these heads, but he only pays attention to the fact that it is double-faced (p. 268). The slit-eyes of these three faces may easily be explained by the intercourse between the proto-Indians and the inhabitants of Central and Eastern Asia across the Himalayan range. This intercourse has continued in the historic period of India as the history of the Kuśaṇas and of Harṣavardhana discloses to us. A Mongolic head of the Gandhāra school has also been recently found in Haḍḍa, Afghanistan, by the French Archæological Delegation. Elsewhere I have shown how a number of signs of the Mohenjo Daro script migrated to China to enrich the proto-Chinese writing.

1. Ibid., I, p. 52
2. Von der Osten, Ancient Oriental Seals in the Collection of Mr. Edward T. Newell, Nos. 177, 192, 206, 217, 221, 226, 261, 267, 329, 651 (Chicago 1934).
3. Cf. Catalogue of the Savantwadi Museum. One of these images, hailing from Goa, is kept in the museum of the Indian Historical Research Institute, St. Xavier's College, Bombay. Another one of a colossal size is lying broken next to a public well not far from the church in the village of Betalbatim (Betalpati = village of Betal) in the Province of Salsette, in Goa.
As regards the symbols found on the seals, one feels bound to pass a few remarks on seal No. 641 which was already published by Sir John Marshall, and which appears enlarged in pl. C, (G). Mackay describes the strange figure carved on this seal as the "solar motif" or "the sun-disk" (p. 339). The comparison between this curious emblem and the sun symbols found on early Cappodocian and Macedonian pottery seems to have inclined our author to take this view. Yet the similarity is not complete. Nor is the stylization of the latter symbols to be expected in such an early representation as this seal of Mohenjo Daro. Elsewhere I have explained how this cryptic representation at first sight is the skin of the unicorn shown on other seals spread to the four winds. The head of the unicorn is represented to the right not skinned as yet; the skin covering the tail is shown opposite, to the left. The skin that covered the legs of the animal is spread like two appendages on each side. What is the meaning of this strange representation? The tribe that had the unicorn as their totem, most probably the tribe of the Minas, seems to have been defeated, and their enemies to publish that defeat represent the totem killed and skinned. It is a trophy of war.

Mr. Mackay has been very wise in studying the remains of Mohenjo Daro in comparison with the remains of other ancient civilizations. The period of proto-Indian history was a period of migrations of nations and civilizations. To study that period with the spirit of isolation and exclusion which we sometimes hear mentioned now in some political circles, would be as erroneous in the study of history as it is suicidal in the actual making of history both racially and socially. In this connection it is gratifying to see in the bibliographical list a number of works referring to other civilizations from all over the world which have been consulted by the author. May I only remark that this list cannot be entitled "Bibliography"? It is a list of authors and titles of books not always faithfully transcribed.

But it is much easier to criticise what is written than to write a work of the importance of the present one. All the above remarks point to minor flaws. Let this be our final conclusion, that this work on the second period of excavations at Mohenjo Daro is a worthy continuation of the preceding one; one, indeed, of which the Archaeological Department of the Government of India and especially its author, Mr. Mackay, may be rightly proud. "Further Excavations at Mohenjo Daro" will always be necessary to all students of ancient archaeology and of Indian History.

NOTES OF THE MONTH

It has been one of the aims of the Editors of the New Indian Antiquary to devote special numbers of this journal to the memory of eminent Orientalists who by their life-long labours in the field of Oriental learning have advanced its cause and who consequently deserve the gratitude of the present and future generations of scholars. The Editors have accordingly devoted the two issues of the New Indian Antiquary viz. the issues for December 1938 and January 1939 to the memory of the late Prof. Dr. Jacob Wackernagel, who devoted his whole life-time to the special study of Sanskrit grammar and produced work of first-rate importance, the like of which was never seen before. Though Wackernagel has immortalised himself by his work it is our bounden duty to pay our humble tribute to his revered memory.

Readers of the New Indian Antiquary will be interested to note that the centenary celebrations of the British conquest of Aden will be celebrated at Aden on the 19th of January 1939. In this connection the Editors take this opportunity of announcing their forthcoming publication The Narrative and Critical History of Aden from the earliest times prepared by A. Y. Khan, the Sub-Registrar of Documents, Aden Colony. Mr. Khan has a keen interest in this subject and has availed himself of every possible source of information bearing on the history of Aden. This history will be published serially in the pages of the New Indian Antiquary and in accordance with this arrangement the readers of the New Indian Antiquary will find the first instalment published elsewhere in this issue. The importance of maps, charts, diagrams etc., in a historical publication has a great value and the present history will have its full share of them as Mr. Khan has spared no pains in procuring them from hitherto inaccessible sources. The total extent of this publication when complete will easily exceed 300 pages.

Hemacandra, the celebrated Jain monk stands unique in the production of literary work in all branches of literary criticism. Though a devout Jain monk he has done much for non-Jain studies and has thus endeared himself to every Sanskritist irrespective of caste or creed. It is only latterly that with the advancement of Sanskrit studies in India and outside the real worth of his works is being appreciated and it is a happy augury that the province of Gujarat in which he lived, moved and had his being for over 80 years as early as the 11th century A.D. should at last wake up to their sense of duty to this Jain polymath by celebrating a festival in his honour after 850 years. The organisers of this festival which took place in Bombay on the 6th of November 1938, are to be congratulated on reviving the sacred memory of this Jain Orientalist of yore and associating with it the opening of the Seth Mungalal Institute for higher Sanskrit studies. This Institute started under the aegis of the Hon. Mr. K. M. Munshi, Home-Minister to the Government of Bombay is symptomatic of the new spirit engendered in India by the advent of the Congress Government. The Hon. Mr. K. M. Munshi, himself a littérateur of note, being mainly responsible for this laudable enterprise, the world of scholars can rest assured that this Institute will be able to give proper account of itself in the years to come and thus become an important feature of national life fostering a spirit of critical research among scholars carrying on research in Sanskrit and Indian vernaculars.
MISCELLANEA

INDIAN ACADEMY OF ARTS AND LETTERS*

At the concluding plenary session of the Ninth All-India Oriental Conference held on December 22, 1937 in Trivandrum, it was resolved upon the recommendation of the Executive Committee and Council as follows:—

"That the All-India Oriental Conference favours the early formation of an Indian Academy of Arts and Letters on lines similar to those of the British Academy, and requests the Executive Committee of the Conference to communicate with other Societies and Institutions interested in the project with a view to exploring the possibilities of its realization at a very early date."

The matter had been the subject of a resolution adopted by the general body of the Indian Philosophical Congress on the 17th December, 1937, and it is well known that it has been ventilated in previous discussions and negotiations from 1933 onwards. In accordance with the terms of the resolution, the Executive Committee begs now to address you, with a view to ascertaining the attitude you would be likely to adopt in regard to the proposal and to learning your personal opinion concerning the matter. The same enquiry is being addressed to a number of societies and distinguished individuals, who may be expected to be interested.

No doubt you would wish to have some statement as to the character and functions of an academy such as it is proposed to institute. Briefly the object of the Academy may be thus stated:

The promotion of the study of the moral and social sciences, including History, Philosophy, Psychology, Religion, Law, Politics, Sociology, Economics, Archaeology, Anthropology, and Philology. A representation of modern creative art and literature is not excluded.

It is of course obvious that most of the subjects are already included in the operations of existing societies. But in the case of other countries it is not found that the existence of special societies for the study of particular branches of learning removes the necessity of a general representation of intellectual interests. An academy serves to encourage co-operation between the different departments of study and help in the formation of synoptic views; and moreover, there are certain advantages attached to the existence of an academy suited to represent the general intellectuality of a particular country or area and to correspond with similar bodies in other countries. There exists, furthermore, an international union of academies, which meets from time to time and discusses questions of general theoretical interest to the civilized world. And finally, a single academy is in a position to give advice to Government upon such matters, when its advice is sought. It cannot but be felt that the influence of Indian thought in the world in general suffers from the lack of a common body, which might enter into consultation with the academies of other countries and be known, like them, as representative of the country to which it belongs.

It should be particularly noted that the idea of the promoters of the project is to have an institution of an All-India character and of an inclusive nature. By this it is meant that the scheme will include in its operation the Indian States and will be run on non-communal and non-provincial lines.

Among the particular activities which characterize the academies of other countries, the most obvious, perhaps, is the publication of proceedings and memoirs, which

* Published at the request of the General Secretary, Tenth All-India Oriental Conference, for the information of all scholars, societies and institutions concerned.

—S. M. K.
are not necessarily different in character and quality from the publications of special societies, but are understood to be in general more substantial or fundamental or recondite.

Moreover, the several academies in many cases issue important series of publications in the form of volumes, patronize great literary enterprises conducted by other agencies, administer funds for the encouragement of learning by special awards and prizes—awards and prizes, which are naturally held in the highest esteem. It goes without saying that the academies from time to time hold meetings for the hearing of lectures and for important ceremonies and functions. Frequently they provide the means for the carrying out of literary and scientific enterprises of a national character which otherwise might be hindered by financial difficulties. By reason of their permanent character and standing they are well fitted to attract donations and endowments for intellectual purposes.

In the case of India it would be possible to name a number of such enterprises which might be fittingly undertaken, but the enumeration thereof may best be left for later discussion. It may be at present sufficient to particularise the issue of an annual bibliography of Indian publications, a work which would probably be of great benefit in extending the knowledge and sale of Indian books, both inside the country and abroad. It might be hoped that for such a continuous work, which would involve the provision of a standing secretariat, a subvention might be granted by governments.

The constitution of the academy would, of course, demand careful consideration. It is practically the universal rule that the members or fellows of academies are a limited number, selected on grounds of intellectual suitability and merit and not as representatives of any organized body or institution—a rule which has been followed in the recent foundation of the Indian Institute of Science. On this important matter, as well as upon all other points raised in this letter, we should be glad to have an expression of your views.

By reason of the difficulty, in the case of so great a country as India, of discussing these proposals in general meetings, it is contemplated that the replies to this letter, to be addressed to eminent persons, learned institutions and societies, should be considered by a small committee who should be empowered to report upon the answers received and to draft, if it seems advisable, a scheme for the formation of the academy, to be submitted for observations to a large committee consisting of distinguished persons and experts to be appointed by the Executive Committee of the Conference, and subsequently, in case of sufficient approval, to make formal application to the Government of India for such recognition as is usual and appropriate in the case of similar bodies.
REVIEW


This work is based upon a Thesis accepted by the University of Allahabad for the Degree of Doctor of Letters in 1931. Many useful additions to the said thesis have been made in the present work.

The work is decidedly the best book of the year on Indian Linguistics. If I were asked to review the whole work in one word, I would use the word RICH, for the book has such a wealth of new phenomena, enormous variations, many-sided details, and copious suggestions, that I do not think of a better word to indicate the precious quality of the book. The style is very lucid and readable, the printing and get-up attractive, and the price, considering the linguistic treasures which the book contains, quite moderate. Another feature of the book is its admirable sense of proportion: it carefully avoids all well-established philological details, and gives only new facts in very short, but wonderfully substantial, chapters. But above all, it gives new perspectives to researchers in the field of Indian Linguistics, and it is particularly this feature of the work for which all workers in this field should be grateful to the author.

A few remarkable items in this great book may now be described:—

(1) For the first time in the history of Indian Linguistics, the work systematically and thoroughly records the phonetic features of an Indian dialect as obtained from the Phonetic Laboratory. The results obtained are very valuable, as I shall presently show.

(2) The Dialectology of Awadhi is the most substantial and thought-provoking portion of the work, and the author must have worked for years and years to collect these dialectical treasures. The most important section of Indo-Aryan Linguistics, in my opinion, is dialectology, for it is our DIALECTS which make India "the linguist's paradise", but it is only patience like Dr. SakseNA's which can reveal that paradise.

(3) The chapter on Intonation (pp. 101-2) gives many new facts. Particularly unusual is the intonation of interrogative sentences: chart 4 represents a considerable fall at the end of the sentence—a very striking, if not amazing, phenomenon.

(4) On p. 75 there occurs an interesting observation, "It (a whispered vowel) has a stronger whisper after a voiced consonant than after a breathed one". Now there are whispered vowels in Kashmiri as well, and on reading this observation of Dr. SakseNA, I tried a Kashmiri speaker for the comparison of intensity of whispered vowels in Kashmiri under similar conditions, and the results obtained by me are almost identical. Cf. Kashmiri:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>After a breathed consonant</th>
<th>After a voiced consonant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>'gurọ titan</td>
<td>&quot;brown&quot; (oblique)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ke th i</td>
<td>of what sort? (i)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j1: t i</td>
<td>&quot;this much&quot; (ii)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The i after voiced consonants was heard more distinctly than after breathed consonants. Here is a confirmation of the above observation that Dr. SakseNA's work "gives new perspectives to researchers in the field of Indian Linguistics".
(5) On pp. 32-33 "General Notes on the Plosives" are very interesting. The faint voice in the initial and final stage of a breathed plosive (p. 32) may perhaps be the germ of vocalization in such a consonant—a vocalization in-the-making.

(6) The observation on p. 33, that "a long consonant is about sixty per cent, longer than the corresponding short one" will be an eye-opener to those who take all long consonants as double consonants.

(7) On p. 28 the observation "[b] is fully voiced and thus slightly differs in shade from English b" is only a specimen of the fineness of phonetic phenomena handled in the book.

(8) The phenomena of complete assimilation (pp. 93ff.) are, comparatively speaking, very unusual, e.g., voiced plosives, instead of becoming slightly devoiced, become breathed before breathed plosives. These phenomena of variations are a valuable addition to the meagre phonetic materials available about Indian dialects.

(9) The chapter on the "Word" (pp. 87ff.) is particularly original, being a scientific and acute presentation of the general structure of the "word" in the dialect.

(10) In grammar the examples from Early Awadhi are very illuminating, showing the gradual change from Apabhramśa to Early Awadhi, and from early Awadhi to modern Awadhi (cf. pp. 132ff.). In this respect Dr. SAKSENA is lucky in securing so much of literary material.

(11) On pp. 110-112 we have the interesting phenomena of "three forms of the nominal stem" used in some of the Eastern dialects, e.g., for "dog" there are used three words: kut: a., kut Δ wa:, kut Δ una. This reminds me of the definite and indefinite adjectives in Slavonic languages.

(12) The statistical method used in the investigation of the forms of the oblique case (pp. 125-26) and of post-positions (pp. 213-214) indicates, with comparative accuracy, the relative frequency and even chronology of various linguistic forms. The phenomena presented are interesting, and the results deduced convincing.

(13) On p. 317 the interesting preservation of Sanskrit khalu in the Awadhi inclusive emphatic affix -u- has been pointed out. This offers an opportunity for further investigation into similar preservation of khalu in other Indo-Aryan dialects.

A few critical observations on this important work seem also to be desirable:

(1) At the end of the work, a general, broad conclusion was expected. For instance a chapter entitled "The place of Awadhi among Indo-Aryan languages"—with special reference to its relative chronology, its relation to the neighbouring languages, its distinctive innovations and the other languages which share them—at the end would have tremendously enhanced the value of the work.

(2) The "Evolution" of a language presupposes a thorough investigation into the Principles of its word-building. Exhaustive study of grammatical terminations has been made, but this important item has been neglected. Only on pp. 110-112 a few interesting forms of the stem [cf. (ii), p. 3 abovc] have been noted. No doubt the word-building of modern Indo-Aryan languages generally offers only a debris of words already formed in Sanskrit and middle Indian, but in every Indo-Aryan language there is a minority of words independently formed out of stems and suffixes which are innovations. An investigation into this item would have further increased the debt of gratitude which linguistic researchers in India owe to the author.

(3) Enumeration of dialectical forms, rich as it is, was not enough. Phonological discussion of these forms, their relative or probable chronology, the deviation...
tions from the expected forms,—a consideration of these and similar items was also expected.

(4) The plan of enumerating the dialectical forms requires considerable improvement. These forms appear to be mixed up in straight lines. It is painful to the reader to study them connectedly. For instance I should follow the tabular method in the enumeration of these forms, e.g., I should thus tabulate the forms given on p. 234:—

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1st pers. sg.</th>
<th>1st pers. pl.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lmp. h/u</td>
<td>B &amp; G. ho : i</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Br. hAw</td>
<td>Fy. &amp; Sl. Áhi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bgh. hɐ̈u</td>
<td>Bgh. hɐ̈I.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

By this plan the reader will discern at a glance the various agreements and differences.

(5) The name of the language “Awadhi” has not been happily selected, for although it is mainly spoken in Awadh, it extends considerably into the Central Provinces, even beyond Jubbulpur. I am unable to suggest a more suitable term, but perhaps “Pūrbi Hindi” would have been a lesser evil, for the particularity of Awadhi will then be eliminated. The author himself says on p. 5, “Thus Awadhi stands between Western Hindi and Behari”. If this is so, then “Pūrbi Hindi” would have been perhaps a more suitable term. And if sometimes Bhojpuri has also been included in “Pūrbi Hindi”, this evil could be avoided by definitely pointing out that Bhojpuri is not to be included in “Pūrbi Hindi”.

(6) About the origin of Awadhi, the author says on p. 7 “we can assume..... that this earlier Ardhamāgadhī was the basis of Awadhi”. From the scanty examples like -i- and -e- (found in Western Hindi as well), it is perhaps safer to say that the basis of Awadhi was Sauraseni, though it bears a few meagre traces of Ardhamāgadhī.

(7) A short explanation of the working of “palatograms”, charts and inscriptions on nasalized vowels (pp. 21-24) was necessary. Though they are too technical for the layman, yet an explanation would have given some idea of these items.

(8) It is not clear on what grounds the author, on p. 23, includes [ɾ] and [ɾh] as semi-vowels. No doubt y, r, l, ù, as they often become weaker elements of diphthongs, frequently emerge as vowels, but this cannot be said of [ɾ] and [ɾh]. The author himself, in a footnote on p. 27 says, “ɾ and řh have been dealt with here therefore, and not as semi-vowels”.

(9) On p. 85 the author lays down an unusual principle of syllabication in his language: “An intervocalic consonant goes with the following vowel to make a syllable and two successive vowels make two different syllables.” This statement requires careful revision. The intervocalic consonant can go with the following vowel necessarily only when that vowel is stressed, as in apā, but in āpa, the greater part of the consonant will go with the preceding vowel. Again, only those two successive vowels can make two different syllables if they are of equal sonority: if their sonority varies, the two vowels will become a diphthong.

(10) The chapter on Vowel Combinations (pp. 81-84) is somewhat disappointing, and is incongruous with the otherwise masterly thoroughness of the book. Thus on diphthongs we have a bare statement: “the two short vowels.... have a tendency to become diphthongs” (p. 83). Such a delicate subject could not be so easily disposed of.

(11) The interesting chapter on Accent (pp. 91-92) would have gained in value if the accent of compound words also had been discussed.
(12) In the treatment of *Ardha-tatsama* words the author on pp. 51 and 55 uses the term “epentheses”, as in dhāryam, dvayam. But it is not a case of “epenthesis” (which is an intrusive vowel brought sympathetically from the end as in Avestan azaiti “drives”, Kašmiri ābār “cloud”) but “Anaptyxis” (or Svarabhakti) which the author correctly gives on p. 64 bhagāt, and 66 grōhoṇ.

(13) As is the custom in all philological works, a hyphen (-) must be placed at the end of every Sanskrit noun or adjective, as kroś-a-, kārya-, to ward off misunderstanding.

(14) The author on pp. 237, 56 derives [h] of ḫāi from -st-, through -tth-, but he has given no parallel examples in which -st- has become [h]. I think Professor Turner (in his article on aekh- in BSOS—Studies in honour of Grierson) has now almost established the fact that this [h] can come only from ks of Sanskrit aks-.

(15) The author’s derivation of the pronouns *uva : ui* (p. 180) is interesting, and more acceptable than the reference to the single Rgvedic form *avoḥ*. [w] and [y] may be prothetic semi-vowels as they often occur in Kašmiri. Some difficulties, however, in the final acceptance of the author’s derivation still remain. There seems to be no phonetic tendencies in Awadhi for a prothetic [y], [w] before [i], [e], [u]; then why did they occur only in these pronouns?

(16) The author on p. 135 derives the instrumental in -en from -ēna. If -āni (p. 132) has become -ā or -Vi, how could the TERMINATIONAL [n] of ēna remain in tact.

(17) The derivation (p. 134) of Early Awadhi oblique plural -nha from Sanskrit -nām is not convincing for although -n does survive in some Indo-Aryan languages (p. 135), whence did the [h] of -nha- come?

(18) On pp. 133-4 the author derives Early Awadhi oblique e.g. -hi from -smin. This is more acceptable than IE. *dhi*, Pāli -dhi, which is far from being productive in Pāli. But the author’s case would have been stronger if he had given some parallel examples in any period of IA, where -mhi>hi, hi.

(19) The derivation of the present part. terminations -āti and -iti from Māgadhi and Ardhamāgadhi nom. sg. in -ē is plausible, but not convincing. For if -ē was the original for the pres. part. mas. nom. sg., why is it not to be found in words like sa : pu (p. 132) and adjectives like bu : ṭh (p. 139)?

And now I must close. With a trembling heart have I ventured to criticize such a comprehensive work of paramount value. It is easy to criticize, but difficult to construct.

As the book is written in a very readable style and is full of interesting information, I suggest that it may be prescribed as a text-book for several University Examinations, as for M.A. (Sanskrit, Hindi) and B.A. (advanced Hindi). Every Library in India will be richer if it treasures this precious book.

*September 13, 1938.*

SIDDHESHWAR VARMA.
DUTCH AND ENGLISH PIRACIES IN EASTERN WATERS
AND THEIR EFFECT ON
THE COMPANY'S TRADE WITH INDIA (1620-1661)

By
J. C. De

I have shown elsewhere * that even academic justification exists for
separation of the period, 1620 to 1661, from other epochs of Modern Indian
History. I have also tried to demonstrate that piracy is to be distinguished,
as far as possible, from privateering; from some plundering acts done in a
state of quasi-war; a state which is discoverable time and again in a history
of the relations between European Powers in the East; from acts done in
a spirit of reprisal, from “adventuring”; and from doings in exercise of
maritime rights under certain circumstances and conditions. “The Law of
the Sea, as then interpreted, classed all men as enemies whose nations were
not formally allied to one’s own.” 1 I have also drawn the student’s attention
to the fact that English, French and Dutch, Berber, Arab and Turk, even
Icelanders and others, kept the Western Waters unsafe for merchantmen
during the period under review. During the preceding period, we find Indian
corsairs also, infesting “the Straits of Gibraltar and the neighbouring coast
of Africa.” 2

By about the beginning of our period, we come across a border-line case
in Eastern Waters, relative to the Portuguese. Qualiś Khán was appointed
as Viceroy of “Lahor”, in 1601. According to Father Pierre du Jarric’s
Chronicle, “the Portuguese had seized a ship loaded with merchandise which
the Viceroy “was sending to Meque without having obtained from them any
safe conduct.” PAYNE remarks, “Even Akbar’s ships which carried pilgrims
to Mecca were obliged to sail under Portuguese licence.” But in spite of the
obvious justification, that of the exercise of the “Sword” of Sea-power—maritме
rights—the act must have been looked upon as one of piracy by the
Khán.3

To take another example. In April, 1623, Hall’s squadron was sent to
seize “Indian Junk”, “Junks of Dábhol, Goghá, Diu and Surat fell by
turns into the net; and one belonging to Chaul, though released, was plun-
dered of nearly “40,000 rials and a quantity of goods.” “On Oct. 3, the
Reformation joined Company, and two days later, Captain Hall anchored at
Swally with eight Junk under his guns”. Van der Broeck points out that
“all the vessels thus captured held passes from the English which were sup-

* In my paper before the Indian Historical Congress at Allahabad, Oct. 1938.
1. Hill in I.A. 1923 (Sup.), p. 50.
2. Osorio II, 290, I.A. 1923 (Sup.), p. 29.
posed to guarantee them against molestation". If he can be believed in, these acts of the English may be regarded as piratical, as the Mughuls of those days considered them to be. But on the other hand, operations of this nature may be viewed in the light of acts of reprisal which a power strong on the sea legitimately does in "compelling compliance" from another power strong on land. This whole episode, which I am inclined to call that of the Battle of the Corals, is as significant a landmark, as the Battle of Plassy is, in modern Indo-British History.¹

Again some of the English express a desire to "the President and Council at Bantam" for a small vessel "in convenient tyme to look out for purchase upon the coast of Sellonna and other places where the Portugese doe trade", in a letter of Jan. 22, 1629. That document also mentions that "by these courses the Dutch do daylie find greate benefite."² The capture of prizes by the Dutch may again be interpreted as lawful acts of war against a rival power, but not so, if the rival was at that time at peace with the mother-country. To take another instance. In July, 1658, news arrived in England "that four ships belonging to English private traders had been seized by the Hollanders, and taken into Batavia as prizes."³ "Three of them" were charged with "trying to enter Bantam", and the fourth with "trading at Indrapura, in Sumatra." The Protector "sent Downing instructions to make a peremptory demand for redress." On July, 27, the States-General determined to restore the vessels and their cargoes under protest.⁴ The English might have felt justified in regarding these captures as quasi-piracies by an organised state. The Dutch on the other hand, argued that the English "had lent gunners to the king of Bantam to assist in the war, and that the ships were therefore lawful prize."

Again, war could be carried on "in the irregular fashion of the Indies." This fashion in Oct. 1630 e.g., "resulted in a completion of the sea-victories by a land-triumph behind Swally."⁵ On Oct. 14, 1630, according to Vain, "the fleet anchored in Swally Hole. About sunset, the Portuguese came in sight." In the land action (according to Warden's account) "about six Englishmen" were "hurt", "but only one, named Baker", "beeing a fate man, overheatein of his bodey and drinkein of colde watear, died, bein not shot at all."⁶

The English assisted the Persians in taking Ormuss from the Portuguese, in spite of the fact that both nations were at peace. Digby, the English ambassa dor had to explain "that the East India Company's servants had acted

---

4. THOMPSON and GARRATT: Rise and Fulfilment of Bri. Rule in India, pp. 18 & 19.
5. Eng Fac. 1630-33, p. 67 et seq. etc.
under compulsion from the Persians.” In any case, Woodcock, the master
of the Whale, “was accused of having gotten an unknown booty at Ormus,
and though he denied this, the Court would not believe him innocent.”1 In
Aug. 1623, the Spanish ambassador complained to King James that the
London had brought home, spoils to the value of 500,000 L (sic.), and
that even the dishes used by the crew were of silver, stamped with arms of
many noble families of Portugal.2 These private acquisitions at least, seem
to be quasi-piratical in nature.

Then again, on the 25th April, 1657, the Society “being about 200
leagues to the south of the Cape of Good Hope homeward bound from Ma-
sulipatam was attacked by the Oranger, a Dutch Vessel” “from Amsterdam
and bound for Batavia.” “The attack was quite unprovoked, and very fierce.”
When the English Captain asked “the reason of such unwarrantable usage,
he was told that at sea it is the custom of the weakest to submit to the
strongest.” “The English ship was then searched for Portuguese goods, but
none being found, some books of accounts and letters directed to men in
Holland were taken.”3

“The Olive Branch commanded by John Brampton” (to discuss details)
“was hindered from going there by the Dutch, who pretended to be at war
with the Javanese. She therefore set sail for Sumatra and arriving near Pulo
Lagundy was compelled to remain in hiding there for fear of the Dutch.”
The Blessing, (according to the “Deposition of Quarles Browne presented
to His Highness” on Jan. 18, 1658.) “bound for Bantam” wished “to
hear news” from that place, and “hailed up sails, intending to go aboard
a large Dutch vessel riding at anchor off Mud Island.” “Although the Bless-
ing was flying English colours, the Dutch ship shot three guns at her—
Coming near Bantam Road she was chased by two more Dutch ships.”4

Quasi-piratical acts of this nature obviously hindered the smooth growth
of the Company’s trade with India.

In committing piratical and quasi-piratical acts, Europeans and Asiatics
seemed to vie with one another in Eastern Waters, during the period under
review. These are of course to be come across frequently during the pre-
ceding period, and “the Calendars of State Papers, Domestic, covering the
reign of William III up to 1696, and the first Volume of the State Papers
Domestic, 1702-1703” e.g., “show that the Indian Ocean was” still infested
with pirates.

There were active Malabari pirates and those at the head of the Arabian
Sea till the 19th century whom the Company’s Marine found it hard to cope
with.5

---

1. Court Minutes, Nov. 19, 1624.
2. E.F., pp. xii, xiii etc., xii n. 1.
3. Court Minutes etc. 1655-59, p. 216 and p. 217.
5. KHAN : East India Trade, p. 210 ; PARKINSON : Trade in the Eastern
Seas, p. 46 and 47.
By the close of the sixteenth century, to take an example, Van Linschoten’s account says, “Two ships laden with ware set saile out of the haven of Chaul in India, that belonged unto certaine Portingalles inhabitantes of Chaul, the owners being in them: those shippes should have sayled to the straites of Mecca or the redde sea, where the said marchants used to traffique: but they were taken on the sea by (two) Turkish Galleys that had beene made in the innermost partes of the straites of Mecca, by Cairo, on the corner of the redde sea, in a town called Sues: the said Galleys began to doe great mischiefe and put all the Indian merchants in great feare.” We also find mention of an encounter in Indian Waters between “two Turkish Gallies that came out of the Straightes of Mecca or the redde Sea” and English ships, by about the same time. The English however “did” the ‘Turks’ “no hurt.” The English also “tooke sixe Foistes of the Malabares, but let them go againe.”

Writing on Sept. 29, 1617, Roe, to take another instance, said, “Some alteration is hapned in the Project of Dabule for that I wonderstand Fearne hath Robbed their great shipp.” Roe’s supposition was however wrong. On Oct. 5, he reported that “two English Rovers” “the Francis and the Lion set out by” Sir Robert Rich and Philip Barnardi “were found in chase of the Queen Mother’s ship returned from the Red Sea, which” English ships of the 1617 fleet “fortunately rescued and brought safe in, (if shee had bin taken, wee had all bin in trouble).” “I had professed to the king,” says Roe on 18th Dec. 1617, “to give him the more feeling of our service and affecction that wee had taken the ships and their Company that offered to robb the Beagams junck.” But “our enemies replied to my face it was a tricke: that we were all thieves.” In a long letter to his “Honourable Freundes,” dated 14th Feb. 1617 (-18) Roe says, “These Seas beginn to be full of Rovers, for whose faults wee may bee engaged.” Referring to the English interlopers, he remarks, “Sir Robert Rich and one Philipppe Barnardo set out two ships to take Pirates, which is growne a common Pretence of being Pirates.” “They missed their entrance into the Red Sea (which was their designe), and came for India, gave Chase to the Queen Mothers Juncke, and but that God sent in our Fleece, had taken and rifled her”. “Barnardo”, he adds, “getts the Duke of Savoyes Commission, but the faces are all English.” “If you bee not round in some course with these men you will have the seas full,” he warns them, “and your trade in India is utterly lost and our lives exposed to pledge in the hands of Moores.” “If you suffer Rovers in these seas, there must be no traders.”

The Arabian Sea had been infested by pirates “at any rate” since “the time of Alexander the Great.” So far as we are at present interested in, we

2. p. 302.
5. p. 480 and p. 481.
may note that as early as Feb. 18, 1620, we find in an English document, "Piracie upon the Mores junckes in the Red Sea will be required of our goods." In this document there are again references to a plan of "intercept(ion)" of "the Holland ships coming out of the East Indies in the narrow seas," and capture of English ships by the Dutch.

A letter of Jan. 3, 1646, e.g. from Swally Marine, says, "We have great occasion to fear the Red Seas will this next year be infested by pilfering men of war." Kerridge and his Council had cautioned Rowe, (on April 9, 1625) the Commander of the Star, on his way to England from Swally, "to be on his guard against pirates or others." Proceedings of the Company on Sept. 18, 1640, record the suggestion that the Crispian "might Voyage to the Red Sea ....... to secure the Company's trade from pirates and other purposes."

In 1615, the Dutch did not think it beneath their dignity to join the Arakan Fleet against the Portuguese.

A letter of 15th Feb. 1617, from "Firando" (Hirado) says, "Last year, the Hollanders sent a fleet of ships from the Moluccas to Manila to fight the Spanish Fleet," which however did not immediately take up the challenge. The Dutch "therefore separated to look out for Chinese junks, of which some say they took and plundered 25, while others say 35." Another of July (from Ball of Bantam), says, "The Hollanders have covered the ocean with their ships from the Arabian Gulf to the coast of China, spoiling and robbing all nations in the name and under the colours of the English." In the month of October, 1619, the Company's ships under the command of Captain Bonner which had taken in their pepper at Tekoo were attacked. "Captain Bonner was killed, his ship was sunk, and the other three ships were compelled to surrender." The Dutch captured in all, eleven ships of the English by about this time. The English had also taken "a richly laden Dutch ship, the Black Lion," "in Bantam Roads." Whatever may be our verdict on these various captures and skirmishes, the Dutch depredations on the Chinese junks possess more than a flavour of piracy. "This event", says Bruce, "checked the indirect trade with China which the factors had been endeavouring to support."

Dutch attacks on Chinese junks are referred to by Brown "under date 26th, May, 1621." The English also captured another junk, but "took the precaution to secure the lives of the men by putting them ashore." Fox, Minors and others speak of various attempts by the English on Eastern shipping. On Sept. 26, 1624, e.g., they "chased a junk into shallow water", and "then drove a country boat into harbour at Danday." The English "boarded her," "but the multitude of people, beate" them "of with stones and

4. Court Minutes etc. 1640-1643, p. 89 and p. 90.
5. CAMPOS: History of the Portuguese in Bengal p. 124.
smale shott.' We must not however forget that Sir Edward Coke had remarked that "pagans were to be treated as perpetual and irreclaimable enemies of Christians." The opinion of the intellectually inferior can easily be guessed. The consideration that public opinion of those days would justify such operations, as we are discussing here, has therefore to be taken into account by us in pronouncing judgment on these. Not only that. A letter from Batavia to Surat, of March 27, 1624, speaks of the existence of a state of war between the Chinese and the Dutch.¹

A letter from Batavia of Jan. 11, 1622 says, "By letters which the Duche have receiveed from Masulapatnam, they have advertisement that their two shippes sent for the Red Sear had taken two riche shippes of Dabule." The Dutch are also reported in a letter to the Company of May 12, 1621, to have "chace (d) a frigat of the Danes, thineking them" (however) "to be Portugales," and surprized a "Frensch" ship (of Beaulien's fleet) "neere Jaquatra." They are also accused of detaining two Japanese ships in Formosa in July, 1630. Tavernier says that the Dutch treacherously killed the English garrison of Taiwan and occupied that place.²

A letter of Jan. 24, 1622, from Surat, says, "The Sampson leavinge her consort in port, gets out to sea, whear awaitinge opporuntuey, she most perfidiouslie surprised five of those junks who believed themselves protecket, of whom one of Diue, another of Cannanore, a third of Kutch, and other two of Dabull." The "Sampsone" was "Englishe." But she was captured in July, 1619, and "retained in compensation for the Black Lion, which had been burnt while in the hands of the English." A Dutch record says that the Governor of Mokha imprisoned a number of Dutchmen on account of "the piracies committed by the Sampson and the Wesp." Swanley's Journal records, "There was a matter of 20 or 30 Duchmen prisoners ashoare which wer taken for the abuses and wrongs that the Sampson and his consort did to the junke the yeare before; which by reporte they being in Mocha Road gave passes to the juncks, and when they came without the Babb, they tooke five of them and killed and hove overbord many of the people. So thes two shippes coming from Bantam, making account to have traded there, after they had landed their goods they tooke there master and men, being ashoare, prisoners, making them slaves." "The Weazopp," (the consort of the Sampson), says a letter of March 17, 1622, "has arrived" "having spent some time on the Coast of Arabia, where she" "hath proved hirselfe as notorious a theefe as his fellow, by the roberrie of two other juncks of Chaule and Diew, the latter yeeldinge only certaine Sindie toyes, horses, etc., of small vallew, but the other inricht with goud and silver to good worth, which proceeded from goods sold in Mocha". "According to report these amounted to not less

². E. F. 1622-23, p. 18; E. F. 1618-21, p. 255; Tavernier iii, 22, I.A. 1924 (Sup.), p. 66.
than 30,000 L. sterling”. A document in the Factory Records, Surat, dated March 9, 1622, says, “Wee perseave the Dutches Wezopps arryvall with her fortunate robeinge”. Another of the same series estimates the value at “27,000 rials”, but admits “ite maye very well bee” more. These piracies affected the English, though indirectly. [It was feared, according to the same letter, that English interests would be “damaged by their proceedings.”] Again in a letter of March 21, 1622, we find, “The other day wee weare called before Mammod Tukeye, the Princes Deuvan” (Diwán) “to the (sic.) answer to the demands of certayne Voras—who demanded but restetucion of 10,000 ryalls of eight which wee had robed oute of a juncke of Choule.” The English “tould them they should goe aske what they had lost of the Hollanders, another nation”. “Whereunto” the Diwán “answered that wee weare joyned as one and that all wee tooke or stroole we shared”. “Wee” “pray you thinke upon some course to make these” Indians “beleve treweth and that our negotiacions be not hindered.” On April 7, Halstead and Hill again wrote from Ahmedabad, “Saffie Cnane and Merza Myna R (ustam?) Chan...in publique sayd wee and the Hollanders weare not one people, and as it playnely appeared traded aparte; what trust their is to any of these greate ones sayeings or doeinge wee pray God wee never experyence”. “Wee certaynely here and are perswayded we shalbe layd hould of on to satisfaxione (of?) the Dutches robberyes”.

The English suspected the designs of the Dutch on Eastern shipping during these years. That letter from Surat of Dec. 10, 1622 e.g. refers to the “sinister intentions” “of the Hollanders”, and anticipated “trouble from their proceedings.” Another letter from Ahmedabad of Feb. 5, 1623, says, “The Dutch” “have noe resolutionn to bee at peace with any, yf voylence and theevinge may produce them profite” But statements of this nature made by a trade rival have to be discounted unless corroborated by other evidence.

In that connection we may note that it was also about this time that the Dutch “had been very roughly handled by the native officials in consequence of their depredations on Portuguese and other shipping trading with Masulipatam. Abraham Van Uffelen, the Dutch Governor, was carried off prisoner, and was so brutally used that he died on Jan. 22, 1624”. But we must also remember that the truce with the Netherlads had ended in 1621, and that “the latter government lost no time in making an attack upon the Portuguese possessions in Macao”. Some of the “depredations” therefore may be justified as acts or quasi-acts of war.

1. E.F. 1622-23, p. 18, and n.; p. 26, p. 61 and 61n. 2; p. 64; p. 58, p. 112.
2. p. 68 and p. 69.
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"In 1643, a Dutch officer named Gayland plundered one of the Courteen ships, The Bona Esperenza, in the Straits of Malacca, and in the same year, another of these ships, the Henry Bonaventure was taken by the Dutch near Mauritius". "Letters of reprisal were given to the Courteen Company by Charles II". The loss of the Bona Esperenza (called Bone Esperanze) in a document of May 29, 1646, was estimated at 75,000 l.¹

"The Dutch" according to a petition of the Company to Parliament, of 14th Nov. 1650, "had committed" "outrages and piracies" upon the subjects of the Great Turk, "in the Red Sea under the English flag for which the Company had to pay 103,000 rials of eight." The Dutch were also accused of taking a great quantity of pepper "forcibly" out of the Endymion, "valued at 6,000 l, in 1649"."²

"In Dec. 1659, Johan, Van Riebeck, Governor of the Cape, discovered a conspiracy among the garrison and settlers to master the fort, kill the chief officials, seize the ship, Erasmus, then in harbour, and turn pirates"."³

These piratical and quasi-piratical activities of the Dutch with the probable exception of those in relation to Courteen's ships, undermined the Company's prestige "in those heathen countries", and destroyed a part of the commercial resources the Company possessed. The Indian authorities sometimes made them responsible for the "Hollander's" actions.

The Company's "representatives complained that" "the Dutch had taken from them...ships and goods to the value of 148,000 l in addition to the loss caused by the burning and spoiling of Factories, estimated at 87,000 l."

They had "seized the ships of the English and treated His Majesty's flag with indignity". "The loss on future trade", wrote the Company to Sir George Downing at the Hague on Sept. 28, 1664," and indignity to the nation were "soe great that we know not how to put a sufficient value thereupon"."⁴

The seizure of Chinese ships by the English and the attack on Ormus have already been noticed. But certain operations of some Englishmen of this period seem to be piratical or quasi-piratical. To take an instance. "In April or May 1628, a small English fleet off Mangalore saw a junk of some 70 tons, bound for Achin attacked by a Malabar pirate. The junk sought refuge with the English, but the latter...confiscated the cargo"."⁵

"King Charles I sent Captain Richard Quail of the Seahorse to the Red Sea with a commission", dated March 19, 1630.

1. I. A. 1924 (Sup.) p. 72; Court Min. 1644-1649, p. x; p. 148.
2. Court Min. 1650-1654, p. 73 and p. 74; Bruce: Annals Vol. 1, p. 447 and p. 448; I. A. 1924 (Sup.) p. 74.
3. Deherain, p. 70; I. A. 1924 (Sup.) p. 74.
4. Court Min. 1664-7, p. v. p. 87, p. 88, p. ix, x etc.
5. Herbert p. 334, I. A. 1924 (Sup.) p. 65.
6. P. 68.
Slade and others aboard the Mary, reported on Dec. 9, 1631, that he had found at St. Augustine’s Bay on 30th May, 1631, "a small shipp named the Seahorse. . . . belonginge to our Kings Majestie and ymmediately sett out by him (one Capt. Richard Quaile commander), as by commission under His Majesties hand and seale appeareth". He had "instruccions alseoe annexed Majesties to goe for the Redd Sea and there to make purchase"¹, "as well as anywhere elce" "of any he could meete with that were not frends or allyes unto His Majestie".

They had to release Quail and his crew because of "the force" of the commission, and because they found "nothinge that he had done" was "contrary to his comission". "I hope", writes Slade to the Company, "what wee have done wil be acceptable to your worshipps, although wee know his ymployment in their parts and upon such designs cannot be pleaseinge, nor hath not bin to any of us". On Oct. 17, the Seahorse was at Swally Hole.²

The same document of Dec. 9, 1631, says, "At our arrivall here at Port Swalley we understood by the President of Capt. Quayls arrivall some 20 days before us, and of his then beinge in the River of Suratt. Wee likewise understood that he had taken two Mallabarrs juncks on the coast of Arrabia. . . . Since his arivall here he hath had great mortallity amonge his people. . . . God send all noe better successe that come out on such designes"³. A (translated) Dutch despatch from "aboard the Amboina" of Dec. 11/21 1631, says, "Her is also arrived a small shipp called by the name of the King of England shipp with a strong commission, the principule comander thereof is called Captaine Quaile". He "came with his comission to our Governor and desired helpe and water from us in spyte of his owne nation, for his company is very sickly". "This capitaine", he adds, "hath bin in the Redd Sea att, Mocha, and from thence hath brought store of ducketts, butt the certainty herof I cannot learne".⁴ On April 24, 1632, President Hopkinson and Council at Surat, wrote to the Company, "Capt. Quaille (under the name of Robin Goodfellowe) hath robd a Malabar that had" their "passe for safe conduct", "for which we have bin impleaded here and must satsifie it, and have paid 100 l. in composition".⁵

In "the summer of 1633, the Seahorse returned to England after" her "marauding cruise in the East Indies".⁶ "The fact that the King should send one of his ships to the East on such an errand", says Foster, "was disturbing" to the Company. Secondly, "it can scarcely be doubted that the experience thus gained of the ease with which Asiatic junkes could be" seized "led directly to the more serious" operations "of Cobb and Ayres a few years

1. = prize
2. E.F. 1630-33, p. 177.
later”. “Quail’s commission”, says Hill, “was wider and more sordid than that granted to Raleigh in 1554”. In any case, the nature of these operations in the eyes of the Easterners of those days must have made them view the Company’s servants with a certain degree of suspicion. The Easterner is not yet ready to distinguish between the English and the Dutch, let alone Englishmen and Englishmen. The Company had to pay 100 l. in compensation.

At the same time, Quail had a commission which satisfied, in any case, Slade, at the end of May, 1631. Secondly, he “made no attempt to molest vessels actually owned by the Mogul”. But so far as he exceeded instructions of his commission or attempted to do so, he was guilty at least of quasi-piracy, though we must again point out that the Law of the Sea (and Public Opinion) were different in those days from what they are to-day.

Shortly afterwards, the Samaritan of 250 tons and the Roebuck of 100 tons obtained a commission, dated Feb. 27, 1635, (succeeding a blind—the commission to Richard Oldfield (Ofield?) master of the Samaritan, “authorizing him to range and discover America”), “made out in the name of William Cobb as commander of both vessels” “to range the seas all the world over” (especially from the CAPE to China and Japan), “and to make prize of all such the treasures, merchandizes, goodes and commodities which to his best abilities he shall be able to take of infidells or of anie other prince, potentat or state not in league or amitie with us beyond the lyne equinoticall, not withstanding our former commission granted to our loyall subject, Richard Ofield”. The Presidents at Surat and Bantam, the Agent in Persia and other servants of the East India Company were ordered to aid Cobb or his successor with “munitons, provisions or men, upon his giving satisfaction for the same”, by a royal letter of the same date. “Captures” and “shares” were all taken into account by the commission. Both vessels were to wear “our collors appoynted for our royal navie”. All English subjects, friends and allies were to help Cobb “in anything” he might “require”.

“When returning”, Cobb was authorised “if necessary” to “claim aid or convoy from any navy or merchant ships”. The terms of the Commission and the letter were therefore meant to cover a multitude of deprivations.

According to an account of the “Proceedings against the Pirates at Johanna”, it was at first decided that Cobb and his crew were not to be arrested, but when it came out that a Diu Vessel had been taken, and “a Surat junk” robbed of “8000 L.” by Ayres, Cobb’s lieutenant, the officers of the Company’s ship, the Swan, decided to take both Cobb and Ayres prisoners. David Jones the mate of the Roebuck, however, had his men “up in armes, their drum beating, their ship well mannd, a fort raised upon the
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side of a hill, where they had planted four great pieces to command the ship, and also some small shot, every man having three muskets ready laden standing by him,” “and all of them binding themselves one to another by their oaths to loose their lives before they would part or surrender the monies.”

The Surat junk was the Taufiqi and the Diu ship, the Mahmud. For obtaining the money which the Mahmudé was believed to have on board, “they continually scourched her and found nothing”. “Then they”, according to a letter of Núr-uddín the captain (Nákhudá) of the Taufiqi “took the nocha and bound and his hands, and tyed match to his fingers which burnt them unto the bones; and then hee confessed where the money lay”. To find more, “they burnt the nocha, boatswaines, the merchants and carpenters until they were neare dead, and then they confest whatsoever they knewe”. Núr-uddín also says, in his letter, “The English rummaged the Taufiqi for seven days, (seven days...The passengers). The passengers for Mokha returned in this ship. The English plundered all on board of money, jewellry, clothes and everything else of value. “Of the money, the captain reserved the one part, halfe the other was devided amongst the generalety, and much the English saylors consealed. Such violence was never done to any Musulman by any Portugall or other English before”. According to his oral narratove, a ship belonging to “Neamun of Arabia” had been plundered “previously” by the English pirates.

The “Journal of a voyage under John Weddell etc.” at the same time, points out that Proud’s action on behalf of the Company against Cobb was regarded in some quarters as piracy. “Cobb”, it says, “had been rifled by the Swan, and the sum of 8,000 l. taken from him by John Proud, master of that ship for the use of the East India Company, his masters”. In any case, Proud was given 100 l. in recognition of “his extraordinary service”. He took away 39,000 rials from Cobb’s Company.

But this is not the end of the story. A consultation held in Surat by President Methwold and others on April 23, 1636, that “fearing further claims the Council decide(d) to send the Blessing to search for and seize the offenders”. In the same document however, they also ordered, “Any Indian junks encountered during the return voyage should be taken possession of” “for the procuring of our liberties in case of imprisonment”. “Capt. Cobbes damned crewe” (according to Methwold’s Diary) however gave the Blessing the slip. The Blessing “arrived at Johanna too late to achieve her errand. For the Roebuck had sailed a fortnight before, bound for the Red Sea”. “And now even this very day”, (Oct. 8, 1636), says

2. p. 197 et seq.
5. E.F. 1634-6, p. 196.
Methwold, "the towne was full of newes (dispeeded heether from Cambeia) that divers shippes were taken in the Redd Sea, amongst others two of Dio ....by......whome it was not certainly related, only the English are most suspected....which is not the least mishife which hath proceeded from this cursed Cobbes Practizes". A consultation was held, and the "unanimous opinion" was that "all was lost in India yf this wicked piratt was not prevented and surprized". The seizures were confirmed by the Captain of Diu. In his letters, "He bitterly complayneth of the continewed robberyes perpetrated by the English that had now againe this yeare in the latitude of Cape Guardefoy taken two shippes belonging to that port". "He advised besides that there was taken a vessell of Pore, which is a port belong-inge to this Kinge, as also a junke belonging to Dabull....and all done by a small English shippe and a boate ; he saith the same shippe that robbed thereabouts the former yeare, assisted with the Samaritans boate, built up higher and accomodated to this wicked purpose". Various devices "which might conduce unto Cobbes surprizall" were thought of, even that of camou-flaging an Indian ship. The Blessing was to go again. "As she was much wormeaten, it was decided that she should carry with her a quantity of sheathing boards and be repaired at Mohilla" where the party of Cobb was supposed to be. Four days before Christmas, the Blessing reached Mohilla, and learned that Cobb was at Johanna. But Cobb escaped, and the Blessing came back to Masulipatam on June 12, 1637. The Roebuck "arrived at Falmouth, early in May, 1637."1

When the Roebuck returned to England in May, 1637, the Company "promptly petitioned for the seizure of gold and silver on board; but only to be put off with a vague assurance of justice." The previous efforts of the Company to secure "justice" had also practically failed. The case against Cobb however "hung on at least as late as 1644."2

The terms of the Commission and of the royal letter, as I have shown above, were very wide. Their seem to be an implication in the Commission itself that the view held in those days was "that there was no peace beyond the line" " (Equinoctiall) ". "In the Treaty of Vervins between France and Spain, 2nd May, 1598, its provisions were made effective only north of the Tropic of Cancer and east of the Azores, beyond which tout serait á la force". Thirdly, "the constant warfare waged against all Christians by the Barbary corsairs, and the fact that hundreds of English captives were living in slavery in northern Africa, would be held sufficient justification for attacking the subjects of any Muhammadan nation with whom" England "had no settled commerce". But the commission seems to contemplate that the ships to be plundered must not be the property of "prince, potentat or state" "in league or amitie with" England3. In this case, the Diu ship

1. E. F. 1634-6, p. 300 et seq.; P. xxix etc.,
2. P. xxi, P. xxii; P. 212, P. 213 etc.; I. A. 1924 (Sup. 70.)
3. E. F. 1634-6, P. xx; I. A. 1924 (Sup.) P. 69; Ind. Off. O. C. 1565.
belonged to "the Guzeratts our friends," and was under the protection of the Portuguese. The Taufiqi had in addition to the protection of the flag of a friendly power, an English "pass". The same reasoning probably holds good as to the other plundered ships.

Charles I himself technically admits this friendship with "the great Mogal" in his letter of January, 1637. He preserves even "a compact" between the two powers, towards the end of the letter. In the same document, he also says that the East India Company's servants had informed him that "an infamous piracie" had been committed "by some called English under English colours". "None that hath not withdrawn himself from our allegiance" dared so offend. "Some supposed to bee their factors" were "with the King's leave" being "prosecuted in the High Court of Admiralty".

The Company, of course, was more than eager to dub these operations as piracies. "On January 6, 1637, the Governor and others presented a petition to His Majesty at Hampton Court Palace". An entry in the Court Book of January 11, says that "the King offered to do anything by letters or otherwise, and gave leave for action to be taken by law." Two promoters of the voyage were prosecuted by the Company in the Admiralty Court. Kynaston (one of them) was actually "arrested and lodged in prison". But the King interfered, told the Sheriffs not to delay, and peremptorily ordered him to be released on bail. (Letter of Windebank to the Sheriffs of London.)

In this very letter, we find mention of "piracies pretended by the Company to have been committed in the East Indies". Charles did not admit that the acts were piracies, unless they were satisfactorily proved in a Court of law to be so. According to him if Cobb and Ayres had "exceeded their commission they were guilty. But the promoters (whether guilty or not?) were to be protected.

Charles at last announced "his intention of hearing the case personally at his leisure". When the Roebuck returned to England in May, 1637, the Company received information that she had brought back thirty to forty thousand pounds of gold and silver. A record of a Court of Committees of the same month says that a petition was to be sent by the Company to the King to seize all the wealth. "Mr. Secretary Windebank" had promised "to present it to the King". No satisfaction however could be obtained. The record of a Court of Committees with the Mixed Committees says that "what was done to the Moors was the work of Jones and Francklyn", and that "Ayres giving a bond of 1,000 l. not to go again to India.

4. nor did he wish to do so.
5. Court Min. 1635-9, p. 269, p. xxii n, etc.
without the Company's consent", it was ordered that "the actions in the Admiralty and the Sheriff's Court" against him "be stayed".\(^1\)

But though the Company is so zealous in prosecuting these "pirates", to take an example, the Company's servants officially ordered the Blessing to seize Indian junks as hostages, on her way back from the Red Sea,\(^2\) thus showing perhaps that public opinion of those days was lenient in its definition of these acts of depredation. But the opinion of a group which had itself suffered the loss was perhaps different.

We may also note here an entry in Methwold's Diary, dated May 11, 1636, which refers to a letter from the Viceroy of Goa, "forwarding attestations taken at Diu of the robbery of a junk of that place by an English ship, and demanding restitution" of a large amount. Dutch documents tell us that "Methwold denied liability, as the robbery had been committed by an English rover, not by the Company's servants; and this is confirmed by the Portuguese records."\(^3\)

Commenting on commissions of this nature, Methwold and Council wrote on May 1, 1636, that "although Kings are gods in some sense, they are men in others", "and that His Majesty's confidence" was "abused."\(^4\)

Methwold's Diary refers to another aspect on February 22, 1637, in pointing out that "the King's junk returned from Mokha, having seen nothing of the pirates." "I am heartily joyfull thereof", says Methwold, "for upon the safety of this junke depended all the hopes wee had of liberty in India".\(^5\)

When news of plunder of the Taufiqi and the Mahmúdí reached the Indian authorities through one of the chief merchants, Mirza Mahmud,\(^6\) Methwold, the President at Surat, was, after some preliminary negotiations, thrust into a dungeon filthy with vermin where he and his companions "were almost suffocated for want of air." "The English goods and money at Surat" and a part of "the stock aboard the ships" were confiscated, Robinson "the chief factor" at Ahmedabad arrested, "the factory placed under a guard," "the caravan stopped," and the Company's goods "in the hands of native brokers at Agra and Tatta" "inventoried and sequestrated."\(^7\) Robinson's frantic letter of April 24, 1636, says, "All this city is full of tumult, curses, exclamations against us before this governor about the junk of Dio".\(^8\) Methwold's narrative of April 30, 1656, which

---

2. E. F. 1634-6, p. 196.
3. Dagh Register (1636) p. 271; E. F. 1634-6, p. 252 and notes; I. A. 1924 (Sup.) P. 70, etc.
5. E. F. 1637-41, p. 2.
6. E. F. 1634-6, p. xxii, p. 197 et seq.
gives a graphic account, says that at one time the Hopewell was suspected. "They doe nowe vehemently suspect the Hopewell to have done the fact."

The President according to a letter to Drake, dated July 4, 1636, was released "after a detention of eight week." But according to a letter of the Factors at Masulipatam to the Company of Sept. 20 1636, we find "Although in this place our persons and estates are free, yet our reputations are equally in thrall by this robbery; and if hereafter the like accident should happen there will be no living for any of our nation in these partes." The Viceroy of Goa also sent "a bundle of attestations with a demand for 117,000 rials of eight in compensation." The large sum that the English had in the hands of Vedor da Fazenda at Goa, it was feared, might "be seized in satisfaction.'

Besides the financial loss, the Company suffered in diminution of prestige, and even at a later date when charges of piracy were brought against some of the English by some Indian merchants, Fremlen says "He (the Governor) fell upon us with the Roebucks depredations."

We may note here that when the Swan was searched by her master, Thomas Steevens, some "stolen goods" were found "in the possession of Thomas Gattaker."

Captain Weddell is accused of seizing certain Chinese junks, but that was done in a fight. But whether Weddell had the right to declare a quasi-war or not is debatable.

"John Darell says that in 1634 the English seized and plundered two ships from the Red Sea belonging to the King of Cananore for trading with the Courteen ships......Treasure (was) taken to the value of thirty or forty thousand pounds."

Weddell was accused by Pero da Silva, the Viceroy at Goa of having "leagued himself with a corsair named Babia who infests the coast of Kanara and robs the small vessels of the Portuguese." The complaint was made to Methwold at Surat, and the threat held out that the Portuguese (could) not be expected to continue the commerce unless "this and other wrongs be righted."

"The intrusion of the interloper's shipping", generally speaking, "into ports where the Company had long maintained factories was", in the first place, "a clear infringement of the rights reserved to the latter in the

1. P. 234.
2. P. 271.
4. P. xxvi etc.
5. E. F. 1637-41, p. 106.
7. I. A. 1924 (Sup.) p. 70; p. 71; Peter Mundy's Travels; Bruce, Vol. I, P. 14 etc.
grant of 1637 to Courteen's Association". One of the employees of Courteen's called the Company "Cockenians", "illegal, monopolistical and by Parliament damnable". Secondly, we have to consider some specific acts of these commanders which look shady. We may consider two examples.

There were several "interloping" vessels in Indian waters by the middle of the seventeenth century, and among these, the Friendship and the Loyalty. The former was commanded by Humphrey Morse who had been "for some years trading from port to port", and the latter by John Durson whose appointment is reported e.g. in a letter from the Company, dated March 24, 1642. Durson is said to be "a most pestiphorous spirit" who took "freedome to abuse" Farren and others "without controyle". He, in exchange for "fayre promises", managed to get his goods exempted from customs duties, thus violating the legitimate interests of the Company. From Basra, Cranmer and Walwyn wrote on September 22, 1645, "Durson brought from" "Bandar Rig" "a slave woman and her child, and forced from another Banyan a parcell of pearls worth some 10 or 15 tomands." "The owners of both were here before the ship to complayne". The Company's servants "advised the Governor etc. that they belonged not to" the "Company". "The factors" subsequently "persuaded Durson to restore the slave woman and the pearls." Again, Durson booked some passengers, declares a letter of November 16, 1645, but left them behind, and "departed at (? mid) night" with money from the passengers and their goods. "At news thereof the Sultan supposed his new entertained friend was no better than a piratt". But, three days later, "a storm in the Gulph" drove him back and he took the passengers on board. Durson had also probably misappropriated some property, including a civet cat. He had given "no satisfaction for an adventure sent by" an Indian personage "to Ormus of the value of 100 pagodas". He, according to a letter from Swally Marine of March 20, 1650, was imprisoned at Mirjan probably "for passing false pagodas". The principal cause of the "betrayal of the factory" at Karwar was "Durson's going ashore at Merge". "This is a great dishonour", says Edward Lloyd, "to the English and likely to be detrimental to their trade in these parts."

This may have had some indirect effect even on the Company's trade. But if Durson's acts were shady, some of Morse's seem to be piratical.

The letter of October 24, 1650, from Surat speaks of how "Morse in the Friendship voyaged from Gombroon to Rájápur where he sold his rúnás to Vagge Shiput". "A dispute ensuing, Morse with some of his crew assaulted that merchant's house, killing natives and wounding many others includ-

1. *E. F.* 1642-45; pp. xxi and xxii; p. 276, n. 3.
ing Bhaja Shivpat himself”. The Governor naturally had to interfere, and Morse and his sailors were arrested. “Money they were carrying off”, was seized, and they were “put in irons”. Morse however escaped, “and wrote not long since to Surat asking for assistance in recovering his men”. “On the 17th news came that after vainly lying in wait for the Bijapur junks returning from the Red Sea, he had attacked and burnt” Jaitapura the port of Rajapura, “though the inhabitants had had time to escape with most of their valuables.”

Another letter of November 19, 1650, says that Morse “in September last seized two Bijapur junks.” It also points out that (according to a letter of October 21), Morse “made prize of a Malabar frigate, though she had a pass”. Morse “hath thus dishonoured us”, continues the letter, “and not only us but the nation and you, by such depredations as will make us odious to these people”. The influential merchant-prince, “Virji Vora” who was much respected by the English, was displeased.

According to a letter from Surat of December 24, 1650, Morse had not “made restitution” to the “Mallavars”. “The President was summoned” “yesterday” “by the Governor who complained that the English deluded the Mallavars by giving passes which really ordered the capture or destruction of their vessels. . . . . . The Governor further declared that unless restitution be made, he must inform the king who would doubtless be highly displeased with the English for disturbing the trade of his port, and would require the Company’s servants to make satisfaction.”

A letter of January 31, 1651, says that even when the Company’s servants “disclaimed all responsibility for the proceedings of Morse”, the Indian authorities “retorted that the President and Council were responsible for all injuries done by Englishmen, instancing the case of Cobb’s piracies and intimating that, if satisfaction were not made, similar treatment might be expected”. The English were forced to threaten in their turn. They had however to promise “to intercede with Morse for the restoration of the captured vessels”. This document incidentally demonstrates the inefficiency of Mughal naval power, a cause which led to the prevalence of piracy.

On the whole, Morse’s “capture of Malabar vessels” “occasioned trouble”, and we may reasonably conclude that growth of the Company’s commercial relationship with India was adversely affected by these injudicious acts.

From almost the first voyages of English ships to India and the Farther East, the harbours and inlets on the coast of Madagascar and the adjacent islands became known to the captains, as places where ships could refit, water, provision or land their sick men”. The pirate ships also, developed regular bases in Madagascar. “While proceeding to or from Eastern Waters”, depots

1. P. xxiv and p. xxv; p. 324 and p. 325.
2. P. 328.
were opened to supply “arms, stores, ammunition, liquor” etc., the first one by Adam Baldrige, “an ex-pirate who had cruised in the Eastern Seas.” “Even before the advent of Adam Baldrige there were other pirates settled ashore at different places,” supplying slaves, provisions etc. He built “a fort and warehouses at the entrance, mounting a number of guns in the former, and enclosing the latter in a strong stockade wherein the pirates could find shelter whilst their ships were being treated, or they were having a spell ashore.”

The Company was perturbed by the activities of these pirates especially when they became bolder and bolder with the passage of time. They describe the pirates as a “scandal to our Nation and Religion, being most of them English, at least four-fifths.”

Innumerable pirates infested the Eastern Seas during the period under review, Portuguese, French, Malabari, Spanish, Berber, Arakani and others. Only a few of them were of English and Dutch origin. All of them however hampered the growth of the Company’s commercial intercourse with India, in various ways, both directly and indirectly. The loss of prestige and the seizure of merchandise were not the only deterrents to smooth commercial development. The Company, for example, had to incur heavy expenses in fitting out their ships “like men-of-war, and manned in man-of-war fashion”. Admiral Richmond is of opinion that “since the early seventeenth century, the armed merchant vessel has never been a vessel capable of meeting any but the smallest type of men-of-war.” He argues that the East India ships had to be armed, “because they sailed in seas infested by pirates against whom they must furnish their own defence.” “Indiamen were built with rows of gun-ports and carried trained gunners as in a man-of-war”. But it is at the same time conceivable that the armament was useful in a fight with the vessels of Indian powers and those equipped in a like manner by European powers.2

POST-VYĀSARĀYA COMMENTATORS
(NON-POLEMICAL)*

By

B. N. KRISHNAMURTI SARMA.

1. LAKŚMĪNĀṬHA TĪRTHA (C. . . . . 1643-63.) †

Lakśmīnāṭha Tīrtha was Pontiff of the Vyāsarāya Mutt, after Lakśmīvallabha Tīrtha. He was the seventh in succession from Vyāsarāya. He was the recipient of two copper-plate grants, one in 1643 A.D. from Tirumala Nāyaka (1623-59) of Madura and another from Srīraṅgarāya III (1642-67), the last of the Emperors of Vijayanagar who had his capital at Penukoḍa, in 1663.

He seems to have been a Pontiff of great influence and remained on the Pīṭha of the Vyāsarāya Mutt, for over twenty years. The exact dates of his accession to the Pīṭha and demise are not however known. He seems to have been a contemporary of Rāghavendra and Satyanāṭha. He lies buried at Srirangam.

His only work is a commentary on the Nyāyāmṛta of which we have a couple of Mss. at the Madras O.L. (R. nos. 1302 and 388b). He gives the name of his preceptor as Yādavendra. His com. on the Nyāyāmṛta is said to be meant for the benefit of average students. One of the Mss. (1302), terminates at the end of the “Ajiñānasya Vācaspatyukta-Jivāśrītattvabhaṅgaḥ”, (Pariccheda I), and runs to over 8000 granthas. On p. 65, of this Ms. is an interesting reference to and quotation from Vijayendra Tīrtha’s c. on the Nyāyāmṛta-Svāminastu. . . . .” (Sāmānyato Mithyātva-nirukti). A fascinating feature of the c. is the lucid and elaborate exposition of several rules of Mīmāṁsā interpretation pressed into service in the course of the Nyāyāmṛta.

* This paper is a part of my ‘History of Dvaita Literature.’
† These are merely the dates of Inscriptions.

1. Cf. क्षभिवंधकयोगीन्द्र गुस्तरमवध्भे।
   (introd. verse in his Nyāyāmṛta. com.) This Lakśmīvallabha wrote a Prabhātapaṇca-kastotra (five verses) which has been printed in the S. M. p. 144.

2. Cf. श्रीव्यासराय संस्काराधिनिविषयमायद्ध श्रीरामनन्तग्राम प्रागुक्तृत न न गोपालकृष्णस्वामि संस्करणे।
   (Yelahanka c.p. of Srīranga-rela, Ep. Cat., Supple. to vols. 3-4, p. 252.)

3. श्रीव्यासरायनन्तग्राम प्रागुक्त न न विजयावुद्धम।
   This is probably the same as the Yādavendra already referred to as the rival of Rāghavendra Svāmin.
2. KUNḌALA GIRI-SŪRI

One of Lakṣmīnātha’s disciples, was Kunḍalagiri Sūri, a powerful writer of the period. He was the son of Konṭubhaṭṭa of Belūr and a protégé of Saundaryya (Sundara) Rāja Panḍita, one of the ministers at the court of Seringapatam. The S. K. makes him a contemporary of Bhaṭṭoji Dikṣita and of Lakṣmīnārāyaṇa Tīrtha of the Vyāsārāya Mutt whom he is said to have met at Benares when he was studying there till his thirtieth year. This is evidently a mistake as Lakṣmīnārāyaṇa Tīrtha was the second in succession from Lakṣmīnātha (Kunḍalagiri’s avowed Guru) and is nowhere referred to by Kunḍalagiri. It is presumably Lakṣmīnātha himself that is meant by the S.K. His successor Lakṣmīpati Tīrtha is also referred to in Kunḍalagiri’s c. on the Nyāya.

Tradition attributes to (Kunḍala) Giri Sūri, a criticism of the Advaitakaustubha of Bhaṭṭoji Dikṣita, modelled upon the Madhvatavidhvamsana of Appayya Dikṣita. This is presumably the same as the “Bhaṭṭoji-Kuṭṭaṇam”, also ascribed to Giri Sūri.

His other works include commentaries on (2) the TP** and (3) NS6 of Jayatīrthe, (4) the Tattvodayota-fikā and (5) the Mbk. T. N. (called Kaṇṭakoddhāra) etc. The most important of them are however, (6) the c. on the Nyāya, of which we have a Ms. at the Madras O.L. (R. No. 861), and another on (7) the Brahmāsūtrabhāṣya of Madhva, entitled Bhāsyārtha-dīpikā of which a fragment containing the I Pāda alone of the I Adhyāya, is available, at the Madras O.L. (D.C. Supple. XXIV, No. 14904). It is given to a good deal of technical discussions of grammatical and other points and quotations appear from the Mahābhāṣya, Kaiyāṭa (p. 46).

THE CHALĀRI FAMILY

Close abreast of Lakṣmīnātha and Kunḍalagiri come four generations of the Chalāri family, distinguished for their solid contribution to the commentary literature of the Dvaita Vedānta. They are: Chalāri Nārāyaṇa, Nṛsinha, Śeṣa and Saṃkarṣaṇa.

1. Lakṣmīnāyeravumāni śānāṁ mām deśīkamābhye

(Giri Sūri, com. Nyāya, Mysore 2192.)

2. Not "Kauṇḍibhaṭṭa as in Madras O. L. Cat. (Des)."

3. Vide colophon to his works : इति सौरवाववर्णक्रमकालानिप्रभाववि-सौन्दरराजः पण्डितमालोकः × × ×

Also : सौन्दरराजसाधारामा पण्डितमालोकः (Sudhā com.)

4. Printed. Mr. Śrikanṭha SASTRI is wrong in giving the name of Bhāṭṭoji’s work as "Dvaitakaustubha-khaṇḍanam" (p. 321, Viṣṇ., Sex. Com. Vol).

** Double stars indicate that the work referred to is not attested by any Ms. or later reference : but only by tradition.


8. This has a total of 6784 granthas.
3. Chalārī Narasimhācārya.

He was the son of Chalārī Nārāyaṇācārya and a contemporary of Satyanātha Tirtha (1648-74) of the Uttarādi Mutt. He was a prolific writer and over fifteen of his works are known, of which some three or four only have so far been printed. Chalārī (reported to be a village near Malkhed), is said to have been the habitat of the family wherefrom it derived its surname. The members of the family were evidently all disciples of the Uttarādi Mutt as is clear not only from the numerous references to the Svāmis of that Mutt in the Smṛtyarthasāgara of Chalārī Nṛśirnha, but also from the fact that his grandson, Saṅkaraśaṇa, was a disciple of Satyābhīmava Tirtha.

Nṛśirnha’s works include commentaries on the TS. (m), (2) the Iṣa and the (3) Praśna Up., (4) the Sadācāra-Smṛti, and (5) the Pramāṇa Paddhati; (6) Saṅgrahārāmāyaṇa; (7) Śivastuti; (p) and Pārijātāpaharana of Nārāyaṇa Paṇḍītācārya; (9) the Dvādaśa-stotra and (10) Yamakabhārata of Madhva. The G. V. L. Cat. mentions also (11) a Brahmasūtrādhyakṣa-dīkṣitraśasangraha (12) Bṛhat-tāratmyastotra and (13) Bhaṭṭo-jī-Śaṅkara-kṛiti-kuṭaraṇam among his works.

Among his major works should be reckoned his com. on the (14) Bhāgavata-Tātparya and (15) the Rg-Bhāṣya-ṭīkā which latter, is undoubtedly, his magnum opus. His (6) Smṛtyarthasāgara, is an independent work on religious law and observances, in four sections (taraṅgas) : Kāla, Āśaça, Āhika, and Vastuṣuddhi (verse 6), dealing with fasts, pollutions, daily rites and purificatory ceremonies.

Nṛśirnha’s gloss on the Rg-bhāṣya-ṭīkā (granthaśa 6200) throws considerable light on many dark corners of the original Bhāṣya and several stiff passages in Jayatīrtha’s com. thereon, furnishing a good deal of useful information of a miscellaneous character as well as critical and exegetic notes upon the hymns of the Rg Veda. He displays profound mastery over the Pāñjinian grammar and the Unādi Sūtras and is well acquainted with the commentaries of Śaṅkara, not to speak of the Nīrūkta and other aids to Vedic interpretation, which enable him to offer suitable justifications for the many deviations of Madhva from the ‘traditional interpretations’ of Śaṅkara and his ilk. One may therefore admit his claim that his work has been the result of a patient study of many interpretative sources. He seems to

1. The G. V. L. Cat. (p. 148) ascribes to him (1) a com. the Mbh. T. N. (2) Adhikaraṅrāthasaṅgṛaha and (3) Jāti-nibandha.
2. Printed, Kumbakonam.
3. MS. Baroda O. L.
4. Printed, Dharvar.
5. Bombay, 1901.
6. For example, in support of his plea that a departure from Yāska is no sin, he cites “Arūpo māsakṛd vrkaḥ” (R. V. 1 7, 23) which in the Pada-pāthā of Śākalya is split into “mā” and “sakṛt” (and treated as two different words) while Yāska reads “Māsakṛt” as a compound.
hint at the existence of critics, who were only too anxious to discredit the line of interpretation adopted by Madhva and pick holes in it, somehow:

अविद्याय वैयाचिक्विहितवृं चूक्तक्षण नात्मः: तत्र मे स्वात्॥ p. 214.

(17) Yet another work of the author is the Sābdika-kanṭhamāni (Jewel for the neck of Grammarians), referred to on P. 11, (i, 2) of his Rg-bhāṣya-ṭippani. There are also two other references to the same work later on (pp. 14 and 29), judging from which the Sābdika-kanṭhamāni would appear to have been devoted to an elucidation of topics like Vedic Accentuation, the seven Svaras, their definitions etc. There can be little doubt that this work, if discovered, would make a valuable addition to the existing literature in Sanskrit, on the subject of Vedic Accentuation.¹

Not the least important fact about Nṛsiṁha’s gloss on the Rg-bhāṣya-ṭikā, is that it gives the date of its own composition which is Śaka 1583 (Plava)²—1661 A.D. This establishes Nṛsiṁha’s contemporaneity to Lākṣmi-nātha, Satyanātha and Rāghavendra.

4. Chalāri Śeṣācārya.

Eleven works have been attributed to Śeṣa, in the G. V. L. Cat. (p 147). These are (1) com. on the Aṇu-bhāṣya; (2) TS; KN; Praśna-Upr**; (5) BT., (6) Tantrasārasaṅgraha**; as well as commentaries on (7) the Vāyustuti; (8) the Madhvaviṇaya (called Mandopakāriṇī (p) and (9) the Nākastotra; (10) The Pramāṇa Candrikā (p.) dealing with Dvaita Epistemology in the course of a small tract meant for beginners, is also a work of the same author; (11) A Nirṇayaratna (alias) Bhyacchalārīya, is also attributed to him by AUFRRECHT, who also mentions a metrical epitome of the Gṛhya-sūtra of Āśvalāyana, by Śeṣa’s father Nṛsiṁha.

5. Chalāri Saṁkarṣaṇācārya³

Śeṣa’s son Sarńkaraṇa, wrote a life of Jayātīrtha in five cantos (Jayātīrthavijaya, Belgaum, 1881) and another metrical biography of Satyanātha Tīrtha (1648-74), entitled Satyanāthābhyudaya, in eleven cantos. Two Mss. of this work are noticed by AUFRRECHT (L. 807 and N.P. ix, 14, Cat. Catal. i. p. 689). The text is preserved in the T. P. L. also (VI, 3740) with a commentary (VI, 3741) by the author’s brother Subrahmanya,⁴ also a

¹. Most probably Bhaṭṭoja Dikṣita, as may be gathered from the title of one of the works (no. 13, P. 120 ante) attributed to Nṛsiṁha, in the G. V. L. Cat.

². Cf. शके निर्विशयेनुसारनिते शाक्तसरे।

³. सांकर्षणाके भूषणाचार्यायं राजसन्धिरः॥

⁴. He does not appear at any time, to have become a Monk. The title of "Tīrtha" which is applied to him by R. Rama Rau, in his paper on "Hinduism under Vijayanagara Kings", (Vij. Sex. Com. Vol. 1936, p. 49) is thus entirely baseless.

⁵. Who wrote a com. on the Maṇiṣmaṇjarī (Belgaum 1890).
disciple of Satyābhīnava (1674-1706), in 3700 granthas. The original is presumably the same as the Satyanāthamāhātyamānyatānakara that has been quoted in the (newly discovered) Koṅkanābhuyodaya of Sāgari Rāmācārya.

6. SATYĀBHĪNAVA TĪRTHA (1675-1706).

To Satyābhīnava, the successor of Satyanātha, we owe (1) a commentary: Durghatābhāvadvipikā, on the Bhāgavata, running to 8160 granthas; and (2) another on the Mbh. T.N. in 3220 granthas (TPL. No. 7898). He was a contemporary of Aurangzeb and of the Kaladi queen Cannamāmbā (1672-98). The Koṅkanābhuyodaya mentions certain Bulls addressed by this Pontiff to the court of Keladi, referring to the Koṅkaṇi-Brahmin subjects of the Queen. Satyābhīnava lies buried at Nātcharkoil, six miles from Kumbakonam.

Almost on every page of Satyābhīnava's c. on the Bhāgavata we find certain criticisms on the B.T. of Madhva repudiated. The determination and persistence with which the commentator pursues the critics of Madhva, show that the B.T. had been severely criticised by some later-day commentator (probably Advaitic) of unknown identity. The commentary itself is not particularly attractive and its only value seems to lie in hunting up the criticisms against the B.T. and repudiating them.

7. RAGHUNĀTHA TĪRTHA (alias) SEṢA-CANDRIKĀCĀRYA (c. 1695-1742) *

Tenth in succession from Vyāsarāya and as one whose greatness is believed to have been prophesied by Vyāsarāya himself, Raghunātha Tirtha occupies a very high place in the affections of the followers of Madhva. To his great learning and saintly life, he seems to have added a good deal of political sagacity and though he could not rise to such paramount height as his illustrious predecessor Vyāsarāya, in the political history of his times, his influence as a scholar and as a Saint were widely felt, for he lent fresh glory and light to the position he occupied as the representative of the Vidyā-

---

4. It has been indifferently ascribed by AUFRÉCHT to both Seṣa and Sarṅkar-śaṇa. (p. 661 and 683).
1. Printed, Dharvar.
3. VI. 273-98.
4. E.g. i, 7, 23 ; i, 12, 53 ; i, 12, 34 ; i, 16, 26, 5 ; i, 19, 12 ; iii, 1, 7 ; iii, 4, 11 ; iii, 8, 19 ; iii, 9, 25 ; iii, 13, 42 ; iii, 32, 43 ; iv, 3, 1 ; iv, 4, 13 ; vi, 2 ; v, 9, 11 ; v, 9, 6, 14, 40 ; vii, 4, 14 ; x, 54, 57 \* x, 90, 48 \* x, 93, 14 \* x, 100, 53 \* xi, 17, 43, xii, 7, 45 \* xii, 12, 34.
5. दशैमो मलतमोऽभवत्।
sirihāsana of Vyāsārya. This is clear not only from the fact that it was he who successfully carried out the task of completing the Tātparya-Candrikā of Vyāsārya, on the same elaborate plan, but also from the regard and recognition which he was able to obtain for himself and his Mutt from far off chiefs as (1) Vijayarāṅga Cokkanātha Nāyaka, (1705-31) of Madura; (2) Vijaya-Raghuṭāthā Setupati Kāttadevar of Rāmnāḍ (3) the townsman of Kāraikkudi, and (4) Kolūr Kanakarāyar.

We have a subsequent grant of the Setupati dated Saka 1638 = 1716 A.D. which is made out in the name of “Lakṣmīnīdhi Tirtha” disciple of Raghuṇātha Tirtha. This may lead one to suppose that Raghuṇātha Tirtha was already dead by 1716. But we learn from other sources that he was living as late as the years 1726 and 1739 A.D. Copies of sannads issued by Kṛṣṇarāja Oḍeyars I and II, of Mysore, to Lakṣmīdhara Tirtha, Pontiff of the Cannapatna Maṭṭha of Brahmayya Tirtha (Mys. Arch. Rep. 1925, Bangalore Dt. No. 2) go to show that Raghuṇātha Tirtha continued to be Pontiff of the Vyāsārya Mutt between the years 1726-39. His demise therefore may be placed a few years later,—about 1742 A.D. No doubt, the mention of “Lakṣmīnīdhi Tirtha” as a successor of Raghuṇātha in 1712—and 1716 requires explanation. The matter is further complicated by the fact that there is absolutely no mention of this Lakṣmīnīdhi Tirtha anywhere in the

1. Cf. the following eulogy of Raghuṇātha, in the Bhāsyadipikā of his disciple Jagannātha Tirtha:—

2. Cokkanātha says in his grant that “whatever dues were being paid in the Madura Kingdom to the temple of Cokkanāthapura, were to be paid to the Maṭṭha also.” (Mys. Arch. Sep. 1912, p. 55), showing the great respect in which he held the “Lord of the Vidyāsirihāsana of Śrī Vyāsārya”:

3. His grant registers in 1707, the grant of certain taxes on the exports and imports of the kingdom, on behalf of the Mutt to its Agent at Ramesvaram (Mys. Arch. Rep. 1912, p. 55).

4. Date 1709.

5. Date 1712 A.D.


7. It would appear from the sannads that in 1726, the properties of the “Cannapatna Mutt of Lakṣmīdhara” were directed to be handed over to the keeping of “Raghuṇātha Tirtha of the Vyāsārya Mutt,” in lieu of which an annuity was settled upon the former. In 1739, Kṛṣṇarāja Oḍeyar II, directs the restoration of these to the Cannapatna Maṭṭha issuing instructions that the annuity that was being paid to the said Lakṣmīdhara Tirtha may now be discontinued. This makes it clear that Raghuṇātha Tirtha was pontiff of the Vyāsārya Mutt, between 1726-39 and for a few years before and after and incidentally that the Cannapatna Maṭṭha was never recognised as a Vyāsārya Maṭṭha.
genealogical tables of the Vyāsārāya Mutt. But we cannot doubt the genuineness of the inscriptions. The only explanation of this puzzle is to be deduced from the tradition preserved in the Vyāsārāya Mutt, that Raghunātha Tīrtha was once very much incapacitated by illness and afterwards recovered and that Jagannātha Tīrtha (his acknowledged successor) himself was obliged to be heir-apparent to the Piṭha for well nigh thirty years thereafter, before he could actually succeed to the Pontificate. The ordination of Lakṣmīnīdhi Tīrtha of the inscription might therefore have taken place during the time of the illness of Raghunātha in or about 1712 or earlier, when the Guru was probably very old—say about 60. The disciple might have done some touring on his own account as Junior Pontiff of the Mutt, when probably he was honoured by Vijayaraghunātha Setupati, as the disciple of Raghunātha Tīrtha. The omission of Lakṣmīnīdhi Tīrtha’s name from the Mutt list can be accounted for by the assumption that he died even during the life-time of Raghunātha Tīrtha, in or about 1718. It was probably thus that Raghunātha came to be finally succeeded by his other disciple Jagannātha Tīrtha as Pontiff of the Mutt. There is a sort of parallel to this in the Yādavendra-Rāghavendra episode referred to in an earlier context.

As tradition gives Raghunātha a fairly long lease of life, we may take it that he was on the Piṭha from 1695-1742 A.D. He passed away at Tirumu-kūḍalu, at the junction of the Kāveri and Kapilā rivers, in the T. Narasipur taluq of the Mysore District, at a distance of three miles from Sosale, the present official headquarters of the Vyāsārāya Mutt.

Works.

Raghunātha Tīrtha wrote six works of which the most celebrated is the Śeṣa-Candrikā, a c. on the TP. of Jayatīrtha, in continuation of the (incomplete) Tātparyacandrikā of Vyāsārāya. He is therefore generally known as “Śeṣacandrikācārya”, in virtue of the brilliant service thus rendered by him in bringing the critico-polemical literature of the Dvaita school, in the sphere of Śūtra-prasthāna, up-to-date.

His other works are (2) a Padārthāviveka** of which nothing more is known than its name (dealing presumably with the categories in the Dvaita system) (3) Tattvaka-(r) nikā; a lengthy c. on the Tantrasāra of Madhva and commentaries on (4) the KN⁵ (5) the Brhatī-Sahasra.⁶ His fairly elaborate c. in 1700 granthas on the Iśāvāsyabhāṣya-ṭikā of Jayatīrtha, has been print-

---

1. He is said to have lived for ninety years.
2. His Parama-guru Lakṣmīpati Tīrtha received a grant in 1690 A.D. from Raṅga-kṛṣṇa Muddu Virappa, at Śrīraṅgam.
3. It was in the days of Vidyāvallabha that Sosale became the headquarters of the Vyāsārāya Mutt in or about 1809.
5. Ms. in private possession.
ed.\textsuperscript{1} Keith and Burnell (\textit{India Office Cat.} ii, 1, No. 4868, Oxford, 1935), dismiss the c. as “a very elaborate and valueless” one “quoting from many recent texts”. But the reference in this c. to the \textit{Śrutaprakāśīkā-Bhāvaprapakāśa}\textsuperscript{2} of Raṅgarāmānuja, is bound to be of value in placing that Viśiṣṭādvaitin commentator before 1700 A.D. The author commands a particularly engaging style and quotes from the various works of Jayatīrtha, from the \textit{Candrikā} (p. 8) and from the c. of Raghūṭama on the \textit{Brh. UP.} (20b). He delights in grammatical discussions and quotes from the \textit{Uṇādis}, the Kāśikāvṛtti (p. 28) and reproduces the discussion on the \textit{Uṇādi Sūtra} V, I, already found in the works of Yadupati and Keśava.\textsuperscript{3}

As many as five Mss. all incomplete, of his \textit{Śeṣacandrikā} are found in the Mysore O. L. A complete Ms. (from ii, 3, 1 to iv, 4) is available in a private collection at Kumbakonam. The work is quoted by Jagannātha Tīrtha in his \textit{Bhāsyadīpikā}, but otherwise, it does not seem to have won as much vogue in traditional circles as might be expected having regard to its peculiar historical and literary interest.

The inherent value of the work is however undeniable. Its exposition is always refreshingly clear and the style forcible and telling. The author quotes from the \textit{Kalpataru}, of Amalānanda, the \textit{Bhāmati}, from Bhāratī-tīrtha, the \textit{Śribhāṣya}, \textit{Śrikanṭha-Bhāṣya}\textsuperscript{4} and Śaṅkara’s bhāṣya (on Yāvadadhikāram iii, 6, 32), as well as from Pārthasārathi Miśra, Vyāsārāya (\textit{Nym.}) etc. The plan of the work and method of exposition\textsuperscript{5} are the same as those of the \textit{Candrikā} and there is obvious imitation of the latter even in the turns of expression: “Ityubhābhyām vyākhyātam tanna/Tikākṣarārthastu . . . .” etc. Raghunātha refers to three earlier commentaries\textsuperscript{6} on the Sūtra-Prasthāna (1) a \textit{Nyāyamālā}; (2) a \textit{Nyāyaratnāvalī} and (3) the \textit{Sambandha-dīpikā} of Trivikrama Paṇḍita’s brother Śaṅkara-cārya. The first two are yet to be traced and identified.

---

1. Bombay, 1907.

2. “एतव्य-‘स्येमा ’स्पष्टितिति श्रुतमकादिकालीकायांवत्तायां भवमकादिकायांस्तद्दम॥” (\textit{MS.} p. 211, I. O. Cat.)

3. नच्छिद्वदेवादिकतुधिष्ठति ‘अदिशुभुवो हत्व’ × × × × मूलकोशीः—“अदिशुभुवो”—इत्येव पाठवैशालव. प्रत्ययों तथा पाठवा व्यक्तित्वात्मा। भाजु- व्यक्तित्वात्मा अदिशुभुवोसामायुवं अदिशुभुवो हृदी पाठवायुवात्मा। निषेधमाये भाजुभाजार्य- व्यक्तित्वात्मा भवमकादिकालीकायांस्तद्दम॥ (P. 56). Raghunātha contends that there is no such prefix as “adi” other than the root.

4. श्रीबल्लु—“कामरामस्तत्व तथा चावतान्त्रिकधीष्मव ’ इत्यप‘ × × × × 

कृष्ण्योपिणिपि . . . . ‘जोशपन्यं नीलकण्ठं प्राप्तं × × × × ॥

(p. 153 Ms.) Śaṅkara reads ‘कामान्तत्व’.

5. In giving the Pūrvaṇaṇa, Siddhānta and other interpretations and lastly the “तिकाक्षरार्थता.”

6. In dealing with the manner of fixing the “Adhikaraṇa”s in respect of B. S. iii, 3, 19-22. अत्र इत्यविचारी को प्राप्तं इति . . . . “तिकाक्षरार्थता” (iii, 3, 22) इत्यं तत्त्ववर्तयमेकानिकत्वं 

× × × हृदी। अपि च न्यायार्थवधावनाओऽस्मतः ॥ (p. 77-8).
8. SUMATİNDRA TİRTHA (1692-1725)

Sumatîndra belongs to the Mutt of Râghavendra, being third in succession from the latter. The Mutt list places him on the Pîtha between 1693-1725 A.D. By his learning, piety and geniality of disposition, he seems to have made a lasting impression upon contemporary rulers of the Tamil country, as epigraphic and literary evidences show. He raised the prestige of his Mutt to such an extent that it came to be called "Sumatîndra (Tîrtha) Mutt" after him,—a designation which is still current.

He appears to have spent a considerable portion of his life as Pontiff at Kumbakonam, Tanjore and Madura. In 1698 A.D. he received from Maṅgamma, Queen of Madura (1689-1706), the villages of Ayirdharma, etc., (Mys. Arch. Rep. 1917, p. 57) and certain concessions in 1699 from Utta-maraṅgappa Kâlākatoļa Vaḍayâri of Payaranippâlayam (Mys. Arch. Rep. 1917, p. 58). His Jayaghoṣanâ, a laudatory poem on the Mahrâtta Ruler Sahaji I, (1684-1710) of Tanjore, affords ample proof of the fact that he was attached to the court of the King and was patronised by him. He spent his last days at Srirangam, where he died in 1725.

Works.

Over a dozen works are known to have been left by Sumatîndra who was both a prolific and a powerful writer. He was however, no mere doctrinaire, but a keen Âlaiṅkârika and a poet. His Vedântic works are five in number:

1. a gloss entitled Bhâvaratnakośa on the G.B. Prameyadîpiκâ of Jayatîrtha and similar glosses upon (2) the Rg.,* and B. S.-bhâsyâ of Madhva and upon the (4) TP* and (5) NS** of Jayatîrtha. (6) A commentary on the Tantrasârâ** is also traditionally ascribed to him. His minor works in the form of Stotras, include (7) the Yogîndra-Târâvali**, which, is in all probability, a laudation in 27 verses* of Sumatîndra's Guru: Yogîndra Tîrtha; (8) the Râma-Târâvali** and (9) the Râma-danâdaka** in praise of the tutelary deity of the Mutt and (10) a Nyśînkhastuti**.

The gloss on the G.B. throws welcome light on many passages in Jayatîrtha's commentary, besides quoting fresh authorities from certain Purâṇas. The commentaries of Narahari Tîrtha, and Padmanâbha Tîrtha are quoted

2. No Ms. has so far come to light of this com.
5. Called "Vâkyârtharatnakośa." No. MS. has been brought to light, [G.V.L. Cat]
7. Cf. Under 'तपाममु' पाठत्व (J) 'तपाममु' बायुदेवसह्यनामस्ये...' (com.).
i.e. in Padma-Purâṇa.
8. Such as Pâdma, Mâtsya.
many times under the names of Prācina-ñīkā and Bhāvaprakāṣikā. Reference is made in one of the opening verses to the author’s teacher Veṅkaṭanārāyaṇa:

भूरमनीययागमतसूत्रायानु ध्रुवयोगीयत्वतिपतितिशास्त्रानु
संततमीपूर्वचतिष्ठतायेवैद्यायायमुत्तरायानु

ver. 8.

The gloss on the Tattvaprakāṣikā (Mys. 1713), is an elaborate though not quite so valuable a commentary. The Mys. Ms. ending with the first Adhyāya of the B. S. runs to 4640 granthas. The author refers to Vyāsarāya, Rāghavendra (ver. 7) and to his own Guru Veṅkaṭanārāyaṇa. Passages are quoted from the Candrikā, the NS and the Tattvapradīpa (p. 99) as well as from the various works of Madhva. Grammatical notes are provided where occasion demands them.

His works on Kāvyā-Alamikara are (11) Madhu-dhārā, a commentary on the Alamikāramanijāri of Sudhindra; and (12) Rasikarāṇijīni, a com. on the Usākaraṇa of Trivikrama Paṇḍita and (13) Jayaghoṣanā.

The text of the Madhudhārā is preserved together with its original at the Tanjore Palace Library.1 It is quoted on two or three occasions in the author’s c. on the Usākaraṇa.2 It appears from these quotations that the original work of Sudhindra contained verses commemorating the deeds of Vijayindra Tirtha,3 and verses in various “Bandhas”.4

The commentary on the Usākaraṇa is a very exhaustive and well-written one,5 teeming with quotations from various standard treatises on Grammar, Poetics, Lexicography, Kāvyā etc. The following are some of the authors and works quoted:

1. Vira-Nārāyaṇa (Sāhitya-cintāmaṇi) pp. 25, 26, 13, 14, 16, 22.
3. Hari Dīkṣita.
4. Dakṣināvartanātha.
5. Rakaṅga, p. 124.
8. Vidyānātha Pratāparudrīya
9. Candrāloka
10. Amaru, 11.
11. Saundaryalakarī,
12. Ratnakośa
13. Rabhasa-koṣā 112.

1. TPL. Cat. X, 5129.
3. यथा—विजयीन्द्रमविनिग्रहः इत्यदारंगमनोम्। एतद्विषतुगृहयम्बो मद्दीयगुहारायो मर्गण्य। (p. 324)
4. वचाक्रमनेन ित्यदारंगमनोम्। (p. 333)
5. Udipi, 1927. The page references are to this edn.
14. Kavidarpaṇa
17. Vāsavadattā
18. Subhodaya (Kāvyā) by Nārāyaṇa Paṇḍitācārya 306.

There are many references to earlier commentaries on the Uṣākaraṇa: pp. 159, 193, 242, 246, 342, and 308.

The (Sumatindra)-Jayaghoṣanā, is a special genre of laudatory Kāvyā, whose definition is given by the author himself:

शैवान्तिगुणवचनां एवेति मुच्छाताम।

इवान्तिगति शब्दान्तः शैवान्तिगो गुणाः।

A complete Ms. of the work in 320 granthas is preserved at the Tanjore Palace Library (vii, 4237). The subject of the composition are the deeds of Sahaji I (1684-1710) of Tanjore. It is divided into five sections: (1) Jayaghoṣanā; (2) Birudāvali; (3) Gāthā; (4) Prasaṅga; and (5) Cātu-Slokas. The "Jayaghoṣanā" is just the title of the first section.

9. Jagannātha Tīrtha (C. 1743-60)*

As already pointed out, Jagannātha seems to have succeeded his Guru Raghunātha Tīrtha, as Pontiff of the Vyāsārāya Mutt only long after his ordination as monk. We have no information about his early life and career. Tradition gives him a long life or nearly seventy years. From the facts already recorded of his teacher Raghunātha, we may presume that Jagannātha was ordained a monk in or about 1718. His date of birth may similarly tentatively, be fixed about 1685 A.D. We may assign to him a Pontifical rule of about seventeen years, between 1743-60. He is said to have stayed at Bhavāni, (near Erode) where he built a Mutt for his use.

He seems to have been an indefatigable writer to judge from his Bhaṣya-dīpiṅkā, a very voluminous but useful commentary on the B.S.B. of Madhwa. He seems to have spent the last years of his life at Kumbakonam where he passed away. His descendants are still to be found at Kumbakonam.*

1. गीतन: प्रत्येकन्यान्तःसत्यमिच्छेदेयायेनितमात।

अन्वितिन्नि पुरान्तिदिन्त्रिक्षमक्षतान।

तत: साधितमभन्ति. साधितमसाधितिति:।

पथमार्थतः सवः जन्त: श्‍रेणुत मद्राच:।

× × × ×

2. उपद्धिगमितिमचित्तमन्नरमात्रयेतान्तरास्त्रका: ज्ञातस्यस्य:।

के लोके नवनतिम भूमयात्तो ज्ञात सोरारसिंह! साधितमसाधितिति जन्त: भो मुच्छातामु मुच्छाताम।

The title of the work should more properly be simply "Jayaghoṣanā" rather than "Sumatindra-Jayaghoṣapā" as in the TPL. Cat.

3. His Tomb is at the Vyāsārāya Maṭha in the Big Street.

4. Sri M. Rama RAU, sometime Secretary of the local Mādhva Association, is one.
Only three works have been traditionally attributed to Jagannātha, two of which have been printed. The third, a commentary on the Rg-bhāṣya-ṭīkā, has not been discovered as yet. Of his two published works, the Sūtra-dīpikā, (p) is in the form of a short Vṛtti on the B. S. (granthas 1630), following the viewpoint of Madhva. It indicates the barest sense of the sūtras and is free from all digression, discussion or explanatory notes.

The Bhāṣya-dīpikā, of Jagannātha is both literally and substantially his magnum opus. It is a gigantic work running to over 19150 granthas. It is a very elaborate com. on the B.S. Bhāṣya of Madhva explaining every word and quotation to be found in it. It takes no notice however of the interpretations of Śaṅkara, Rāmānuja and other commentators. Within the ambit of his own system, the author quotes and sometimes criticises the commentaries of many early writers like Vādirāja, Rāghavendra, Raghūtama and many less important authors (e.g. Śarkara Śrīnivāsa, p. 93). There are numerous quotations from the Tattvapradīpa of Trivikrama, and the Sattarkadīpavali of Padmanābha Tīrtha. The commentator tries, in many places, to reconcile the minor differences in interpretation between the commentaries of Trivikrama and Jayatīrtha. His study of Madhva is so close that attention is drawn frequently to the different interpretations of the same śrutis given by Madhva in his Bhāṣyas on the Upanishads and in such other works as the G.B., the Nyāyavivarana etc. Among the works and authors mentioned by him are:

1. Ānandamālā
2. Viśvēśvara Tīrtha
3. Tattvamaṇḍari of Nārāyaṇa Paṇḍita.
4. Vyāsatīrtha c. on the Upanishads.
5. Nāyacandraḥ
diṣṭa

7. Prameyadīpikā

10. Vādindra Tīrtha (1728-43)*

In 1725 Upendra Tīrtha succeeded Sumatindra as Pontiff of his Mutt. He died early in 1728 and was succeeded by Vādindra Tīrtha, in the same

3. p. 177.
4. ii, 2, 3 (See Tantradīpikā)
5. Pp. 779; 803; 237; 438.
6. ii, 3, 50; P. 728; 1037 and 180.
7. Pp. 237; 138; 250; 333; 378; 381-2 and 396.
8. Jagannātha has an evident partiality for the Tattvapradīpa whose interpretations he supports at all costs against more modern ones and tries to harmonise it if possible with those of Jayatīrtha: See Pp. 387; i, 4, 25 p. 976-7.
9. He is said to have composed a Madhva-Tārāvāla. See also verse 10 of the Guruguṇastava.
10. He could not have been the grandson of Rāghavendra as stated on p. xviii, of the Introd. to the Mysore G. O. L. edn. of the Tarkatāṅḍava (vol. i. no. 74).
year. He is believed to have occupied the Pitha for 22 years and died at Mantrālaya, in Pramodūta 1750. There is evidently some mistake in the year of his demise as recorded in the Mutt lists; for, a grant was made in 1746 A.D. by the Ariyalūr Chief to Vādindra’s successor Vasudhendra (Mys. Arch. Rep. 1917). We may therefore agree to a slight revision of the Pontifical date of Vādindra’s demise and place it about 1743.

Vādindra was the author of the Guruguṇastava, a poem in thirysix sr̥gduhārā verses, composed in praise of Rāghavendra and giving much useful information about his life and works. We have already seen that it ranks as one of the main sources for the life of Rāghavendra.

His other works are said to be (2) a gloss on the Tatvodyota; (3) a Madhvāryā; and (4) and a Viṣṇusabhbhaṅgaśikharini.

11. SATYADHARMA TIRTHA (1798-1830)

Satyadharma marks practically the close of the History of Dvaita Literature, in the traditional sense of the term. He is the last of the Pontifical writers of the Mādhva school and a contemporary of Sujanendra Tirtha of the Sumatintra Mutt (d. 1836), to whom is ascribed a Candrikādūṣaṇa-bhūṣanam, in the Mysore Arch. Rep. 1917.

Within the Uttarāḍi Mutt itself, there was a lull in the religious and literary activities of the Svāmis, during the 18th. century, which was only temporarily relieved by Satyavijaya Tirtha (1726-37), for a brief space of time. After Satyābhinava we have really no writer of outstanding merit among the Pontiffs of the Mutt until the dawn of the nineteenth century. The first and in another sense, the last also of the writers of the old school, to meet the eye, in this century, is Satyadharma Tirtha.

LIFE

According to the S.K., Satyadharma was a contemporary of the Peshwa Bāji Rau II (1795-1818) and of his adviser Ghordaṇa who is said to have honoured him with presents at Poona. He was also the contemporary of Dewan Purniah of Mysore and the Svāmis Vidyāvallabha and Vidyākānta of the Vyāsarāya Mutt. He is said to have patronised Kāśi Timmanṇācārya and other distinguished Pandits of the 19th century. He died at Hoṭehoon-nūr in the Mysore territory, in 1830 A.D.

1. Printed in the S. M., Belgaum, 1923.
2. G. V. L. Cat.
3. G. V. L. Cat “Candrikābhūṣanam” would appear to be the more proper title for the work.
4. His disciple Varakheḍi Timmanṇācārya was a powerful commentator and controversialist. His c. on the VTN (no. 8064) Gaṭapāṇcādana (8134) and Sudhaṅnārāṃbhāṇyākhaṇḍana (8136) are to be found in the TPL.
5. The seventh and last of the Peshwas who surrendered to the English in 1818.
6. Said to have been a Mādhva Brahmin and a disciple of the Mutt.
Some ten works have been attributed to Satyadharma. His (1) gloss on the TS has been printed at Bombay. It refers to a host of earlier authorities like (1) Sattattvaratnamalā, (pp. 33, 40); (ii) Rōṭī-com.; (iii) Satya nanda Tirtha (p. 35b); (iv) Paṇḍuraṅgi-com. on NS (34b) and quotes from the Laghuśabdentuśekhara, the Siddhāntakaumudi and its com. Subodhini. His com. on (2) the VTN année and the (3) Sanatsujātiya are not available. His (4) tiṣṭpaṇa on the Bhāgavata is in the form of a complement to that of Yadupati (Sk. i-5 and 7) and Sk. VI-XII. A private Ms. of his (5) com. on the Udyoga-Parva of the Mbh. is reported. (6) His Nityasanāṁśāraṇalingabhaṅga is a theological tract refuting a schismatic view that even the Nityasanāṁśārin-souls, have to undergo the destruction of their "liṅga-deha". (7) The Rāmāṁtam and (8) the Gaṇgālahari are evidently Stotras composed by him. His most outstanding contribution however is (9) a useful and running commentary on the Vālmiki Rāmāyana Kāṇḍas ii-xi., extracts from which have been published by T. R. Krishnacharya, in his edition of the Epic (Bombay 1910). In this commentary, the author is found to refer to Nāgoji Bhaṭṭa’s Sabdendu-śekhara (V, 48, 12) and to another important work of his own entitled “Bhāṣya-dīpikā-Yuktivāt yā,” which, is presumably a refutation of the Bhāṣyadīpikā of Jagannātha Tirtha and written in defence of the interpretations in the commentaries of Raghūttama Tirtha, Sarkarā Śrīnivāsa, Satyanātha and other writers belonging to the Uttarādi Mutt, which have on their own merits been rejected by the author of the Bhāṣyadīpikā.

1. Commentator on the Candrikā. Author, a Svāmi of the Uttarādi Mutt for a brief interval of time after Satyanātha (d. 1674).
2. Yādupatyaśeṣaprāṇi, Printed, Dharwar.
3. G. R. Savanur, Dharwar.
5. इति प्रकटस्तः भाष्यदीपिकायुक्तिवायामस्मतत्त्वात् विद्वेषोदितिः (V, 48, 12). The “Vātyā,” is probably another (and shorter) title of the same work. It cannot certainly be a commentary on the Advaitakālānala of the layman Nārāyanācārya, as reported in the G. V. L. Catal. (Kumbakonam).
A WORK ON PROSODY BY MÍŚRA JAGANNÁTHA, 
CALLED "CHANDAHPÍYЎŠA" AND ITS 
PROBABLE DATE

By

P. K. GODE

AUFRECHT\(^1\) records only one MS of a work on Prosody called the "chanda
hpíyúša by Jagannátha, son of Ráma. Peters 5, p. 194." This MS is identi
cal with No. 450 of 1892-95 in the Govt. MSS Library at the B.O.R. Institute, 
Poona. It is dated Sanivat 1849 = A.D. 1793.\(^2\) This date of the copy\(^3\) 
gives us, therefore, one terminus to the date of this work. The author de
fines the scope of the work in the following few verses at the commence
ment of the work:—

"न्यायन्यायकरणादिशालभमिं संस्कृत्यमेवारित हि
प्रायः प्राक्षणमुद्धीते: मुक्तिमिहादंतु मात्रेयमः।
श्रीकुश्तमस्रावद्वाय हुमति श्रीववे मणा धीमतां
सत्त्वं हुष तधवं ख्यु पुनस्तस्थ यारं हुषे॥ १॥
सालंकार्यो विदेशयारिव बच्छायाब्युमं बुधान
स्तकालवः यश अश्रुकुशलकः कार्यं मरं धीमतां।
धन्दः शाखारिथशर्वा खरु भवेत्त्रोपुष्करा यति
चन्द्रोभिवीरहन्नायर्यशनानेत्रप्रकाशय।॥ २॥
सुपुरं समर्द्धायमात्रामिह वै कर्णे न कःः शक्या
तत्सभाष्यमतंशुशरीरत्नचा स्वयमः पौरोषोऽशः।
मात्सर्यो परिवारे तस्मात्कम्भिग्रहनयमान्यायारातः
तथायंत्रालक्षणो विपुल्स्थार्थेऽद्विनमः॥ ३॥
शुद्धायामभवप्रभासिलविषये: वेद्यत्सुमिन्नावविवि
देक्ति मुनिचार्यविविधिता जहाः: अध्याद्वादांभाः।
स्थु: उपज्ज्युणाय दश्कि कथाने किम् गुनयुतोभिद्वा
व: सत्त्वं वंदेतं सम्पत्ति विश्वस्तु मनवते॥ ४॥

1. Catalogus Catalo. III, 41a. There is another MS of Chandahpiyūṣa at Ulwar 
(Vide Peterson's Cata. of Ulwar MSS, 1892, p. 46 Extract 238).
2. Folio 48 of MS No. 450 of 1892-95—
"इति भैयम् संवतं १८४९ कालिकमासे श्रृवक्षे सस्मयो तिथि घीप्रति॥ इदं पुस्तकः॥
उद्यो वहादुरसिंह॥"
3. Mr. Krishnamachariar in his History of Classical Sanskrit Literature 
(p. 911, Sec. 1102) refers only to this B. O. R. Institute MS viz. No. 450 of 1892
95. No information about its date of composition or the author is found in this 
History.
The author makes the following references to previous writers and works in this work:

1. "महाभाष्यकालिकमुखानां नारायणानां"—fol. 2, 33, 38,
2. हल्लयुधमहत्पिंजलमुखानां—fol. 2,
   5 (महाभाष्य), 9, 22, 24, 26, 27, 28, 33, 35, 37, 38, 39, 41,
   45, 46,
3. पाणिनिः—fol. 3,
4. महामाण्ड—fol. 3, 4, 42,
5. काव्यप्रमाण—fol. 4, 5, (सासु उल्लासे—7), 11, 41,
6. अमर—fol. 4,
7. गोवेन्द—fol. 4,
8. श्री—fol. 4,
9. श्री—fol. 4,
10. उत्तरंकर—fol. 4, 27,
11. शेतुकारभास्कराच्छं—fol. 5, 32, 39, 43,
12. वामकर—fol. 5,
13. काव्यालंकारुण—fol. 5, 8 (काव्यालंकारस्त्र वामकरतमा),
14. बुंधकौड़ीक्कमारायणोऽ—fol. 6,
15. महाशेष्याबल्योऽ—fol. 6,
16. इति नारायणार्थप्रेमेष्योऽ—fol. 9, 24, 33, 19 (इति नारायणोऽ बुंधकौड़ीक्कमारायणोऽ नादेव) 22 (इति नारायणोऽ बुंधकौड़ीक्कमारायणोऽ नादेव) 42, 29 (नारायणार्थ), 32, 33
17. भव—fol. 9, 41,
18. "महाशेष्याबल्योऽ प्रमादं एव"—fol. 10,
19. काव्यकालिककरण—fol. 11,
20. श्रीसत्तानांक्षोऽनुष्ठोऽ—fol. 11,
21. पिंजलमते, fol. 25, 27, 28, 29, 35, 40, 41, 42, 46,
22. केदारावर्य, fol. 28,
23. काल्मुकस्तोतरणे—fol. 36,
24. केदारावमंदादीनां—fol. 40,
25. वामननारायणोऽ—fol. 41,
26. "उत्तरंकरवामकरस्त्र प्रमादं एव"—fol. 45,
27. हल्लयुधमहत्पिंजलमें—fol. 45,
We have already stated that the date of the MS under analysis viz. A.D. 1793 is one terminus to the date of our author. The other terminus can be fixed on the basis of the references noted above.

Miśra Jagannātha criticizes some of the commentators of Vṛttaratnākara of Kedārabhaṭṭa (fol. 45—“इति नारायणप्रभापे उदेक्षणयो” folios 9 and 24). References to this commentator of the Vṛttaratnākara will be found under item No. 16 in the above list of references. According to AUFRECHT Nārāyaṇa Bhaṭṭa composed his commentary on the Vṛttaratnākara in 1545 (A.D.). In view of this date for Nārāyaṇa the date of our author can be fixed between two limits viz. A.D. 1545 and 1793. We must now try to narrow down these limits.

We have seen above that our author refers to the views of “Setukāra Bhāskara” in no less than four places (see item No. 11 above). We presume that this Setukāra Bhāskara is no other than Hari Bhāskara, the author of a commentary on the Vṛttaratnākara called the Vṛttaratnākaraṣetu composed in A.D. 1676. If this presumption is correct the limits for the date of our author get narrowed down to A.D. 1678 and 1793.

It appears to us from the foregoing evidence that Jagannātha flourished most probably in the second half of the 18th century, say, between A.D. 1750 and 1793.

Our author Jagannātha in the following six verses occurring at the end of the work records some information about himself and his family:

1. For date of Vṛttaratnākara vide my notes in the Annals of the Bhandarkar Institute, Vol. XVII, pp. 185, 397.
3. AUFRECHT: Cata. Catalo. I, 597b. Haribhāskara completed his Padyāṁṭatarāṅgini on 12th June, 1673 i.e. 3 years earlier than his Commentary, Setu, on the Vṛttaratnākara (Vide my article in Cal. Ori. Journal, Vol. II pp. 33-35). Mr. KRISHNA-MACHARIAR in his History of Classical Sans. Literature (1937) p. 388, f.n. 4 states that the Padyāṁṭatarāṅgini contains 380 quotations from various Vaiṣṇava authors. Vide AUFRECHT's article in ZDMG XXXVIII, 544-7. Haribhāskara mentions many poets by name in his Anthology among whom Paṇḍitārāja (= Jagannātha Paṇḍitāraṇya mentioned in the Rasikajivana of Gadiḍhharabhaṭṭa) is included. The genealogy of this author is as follows:

पुष्येतम > हरि > आपाजी > महंकर (alias हरि) surnamed अभिन्नोत्तरी of कालपद्म.
Verse 2 quoted above informs us that Jagannātha was born of Subhadrā, the daughter of Harikṛṣṇa, from Rāma, the son of Vidyādharā. His wife was Gopālī. His guru’s name was Buddhimat (गृहाधिपति) who was famous at नीलामोहितमु (=Benares) [verse 4]. The parentage of Jagannātha, may be represented as follows:

विवाहर हरिकृष्ण (मातामह) ।
|                                    |
|                                   | राम × सुभद्रा ।
|                                   | जगन्नाथ × गोपाली (दबिता)
As Jagannātha had his guru at Benares it may be reasonable to conclude that he was a resident of Benares at least for some years of his life. In two places on folio 41 of the MS of the Chandakpiyūsa our author refers to महाराज in the expression "महाराजविशेषोपयम्", but it is difficult to draw any conclusion from these remarks regarding the native place of the author or the province to which he belonged. On folio 45 there is a reference to 'वाहकि चक्रवति विद्वान्:—"कैन भाति रक्षिते विस्त अव खवो मुरारे त्यत्र भायाकवि चक्रवति विद्वारिते दिये etc. This Bhaṣākāvi may be the Hindi poet Bihari Lal who flourished at the court of Jaisingh of Jaipur (A.D. 1603-1663) about whom we find the following appreciation in the Imperial Gazetteer:—

"Sūrdās had many successors, the most famous of whom was Bihari Lal of Jaipur, whose Sat saityā or collection of seven hundred detached verses, is one of the daintiest pieces of art in any Indian language. Bound by the rules of metre each verse had a limit of forty-six syllables and generally contained less. Nevertheless each was a complete picture in itself, a miniature description of a mood or a phase of nature, in which every touch of the brush is exactly the needed one and not one is superfluous."

Our author criticizes "मन्जरीकार" (fol. 10) when he states:—

'मन्जरीकारस्य प्रमाद एव.' He also refers to मन्जरी on folios 2, 33, 38 and 6 (मन्जरीसमावल्यो:). If this मन्जरी is identical with छन्दोमन्जरी of Gaṅgādāsa we have the following information recorded by M. Krishnamachariar about him:—

"Gaṅgādāsa was the son of Gopāladāsa of Vaidya caste. In six chapters he describes in his Chandomaṇji the varieties of metres and illustrates them by verses in praise of Kṛṣṇa. He also wrote Acyutacarita, a poem of 16 Cantos and Dīneśa Carita in praise of the Sun. His father wrote a play, Pārijātharana".

INSCRIPTIONS OF KATHIAWAD*

By

D. B. DISKALKAR

DUDANA

No. 1] v.s. 1258 [5-4-1201

This inscription is said to have been found in the village Dudanā near Koḍinār, in south Kathiawad, but is at present missing. A copy of it was found in the Bhavanagar Museum.

It opens with the date Friday, the second of the bright half of Vaiśākha of v.s. 1258 and records the name Kṣemasimha of a king and of Tejanāyaka his provincial governor (desādhipati).

Text

1 सं १२५८ वर्ष धन्य श्रृङ्ग २ छुके | राज ॥ श्री कृष्णसिद्ध ...
2 देशाखिंचिपियोैतेजनायक...मातृ किका पिता मुनीा—चंद...

VISAVDA

No. 2] v.s. 1262. [20-1-1206

This inscription was found in a niche of the temple of Siddhanātha Mahādeva at Visāvdā in the Porbandar State. It measures 9½”×8”.

It records that Vikramāditya(?) caused an image of Rāṇa Vikramāditya to be set up in the town of Visāvdā in the reign of Rāṇa Siha on Friday, the 10th of the bright half of Māgha of v.s. 1262. The inscription was written by Vaijāka of the Nāgara Brāhmaṇa community and was engraved by the mason Jalhaṇa.

Text

1 सं १२६२ वर्ष मास छुड़ि १० छुके
2 अयेह वीसावादायामे राज श्री
3 सीहराये राजश्री विक्रमित्येन
4 राज श्रीविक्रमादित्यमुद्त: कारा
5 पिता ॥ नागरजातिय ब्राह्मण (ण)
6 वैजाकेन लिसितत ॥ ति(ि) ल्यक
7 तुजालितवेन एवा मूर्तिः (;) प्रतिता
8 प्रशस्ति: सुरक्षिता [इ] ति [1*]

* Continued from Dec. 1938, issue p. 590.
AJAK

No. 3] v.s. 1262. [10-3-1206

This inscription is engraved on a pillar originally found in the village Ajak of the Junagadh State, but now preserved in the Watson Museum at Rajkot. The inscribed portion, measuring 1'5" x 1'3", is much worn out. Above the inscribed portion is engraved a lotus flower.

The only legible portion in the inscription is the date, Friday, the 14th of the dark half of Phāgaṇa of v.s. 1[2]62, the name Bhūtāmbili, (modern Ghumli), of the capital of a ruler named Sinha and the name Ajagi of the village where the inscription was found.

Text

1 सं 1262 वर्ष फागण व 14 धृतेश्वर ध्रो |
2 [भूताम्बिल्या...राज] धर्म सिद्धांति |
3 पत्नी ध्रो [नागा] दितवे आजगिम्यामे... |
4 to 11.............

MAHUVA

No. 4] v.s. 1272. [5-6-1216

This inscription is engraved on the pedestal of an image in a Jain temple at Mahuvā, a sea-port town in the Bhavanagar State. It is said that this image was originally brought from the Siyāl Beṣ and set up in the Jain temple at Mahuvā. The inscribed portion is beautifully engraved and well preserved.

The inscription was once published in the Revised List of Antiquarian Remains in the Bombay Presidency by Cousens.

It opens with the date, Sunday, the fifth of the dark half of Jyeṣṭha of v.s. 1272 and records that in the reign of the Mehera king Raṇasimha at Timbāṇaka (modern Timāṇā in the Bhavanagar State, five miles north of Talājā the whole (Jain) saṅgha caused an image of Mahāvīra to be made. It was consecrated by Hariprabhasūrī, disciple of Saṅtiprabhasūrī of the Candra-gaccha.

The Meher king Raṇasimha was probably the successor of the Meher king Jagamāl, a feudatory of the Cauḻukya sovereign Bhima II, mentioned in the copper-plate grant of v.s. 1264 found at Timāṇā, and published in Indian Antiquary, Vol. XI, p. 337.

Text

1 ओ | संवत् 1272 वर्ष ज्येष्ठ वर्ष 5 रवि [९] अवेष | |
2 दिन्याले मेहराज धर्मार्थसिद्धांतपति सम |
3 स्तवचने धर्म महाविरचिय कारित्व प्रतिचित्त |
4 श्रीव्रत्रज्ञाचार्य श्रीशाक्तिप्रभुरितिः |
5 श्रीनान्तिप्रभुरितिः | |
GHELĀṆĀ

No. 5] Valabhi Samh. 911. [24-8-1229

This inscription was originally found in the Kāmanāṭha Mahādeva temple near the village Ghelāṇā, six miles to the east of Māngrol but it cannot be traced now. From its impression in the Rajkot Museum it seems to measure 1′ 4¼”×14”.

It was once published in the Prakrit and Sanskrit Inscriptions of Kathiawad on p. 160.

It records that Rāṇaka Raṇa..., son of Thākur Mūlū granted an Āsana-patṭa for the worship of the god in the Bhṛgu maṭha on the fourth day of the bright half of Bhāḍrapada (?) in the Valabhi Samh. 911.

Text

1 ॐ [1] श्रीमदब्लमोसवत् ९१९ वर्ष [भाद्रद ?] श्रै दि र श्रैके प्रत्ययजनक ठ. मुद्दे-सल रणकरण...

2 श्रीसुमुदे देवसुर्जन्य आसानपद: प्रदत्:

MIYANI

No. 6] v.s. 1290. [9-11-1234

This inscription is engraved on one of the southern pillars of the temple of the Nilakanṭha Mahādeva at Miyāṇi, a very old sea-port town, about eighteen miles to the north-west of Porbandar.

The inscription is considerably worn out thereby causing the great loss of the names of the local ruler and of his sovereign. Beyond its date Thursday, the second of the dark half of Kārttika of v.s. 1290 on which the Maṇḍapa of the Mahādeva temple was built and the old name Maṇipur of Miyāṇi nothing useful is preserved.

Text

1 ॐ विकमसवत् १२९० वर्षं

2 कार्तिकबदि २ गुरावयोह

3 श्रीमणिपुरे ् ् ् ्

4 ् ् ् ्

5 ् जयराज्ये महारा

6 ् देवमलिप्ति भो

7 ् मंडप (: ) कारित:

8 हरकब्भवधवित्वा

9 सदेह (: ) चाहैन लिखितं || मदे

10 श्री:
JASDAN
No. 7] v.s. 1292. [February 1236

This inscription is engraved on a stone pillar in the western wall of a masjid called Kālu Pir in Jasdan, the capital of a third class State in Kathiawad. The inscribed portion which is much worn out measures 1'2"×11". The date is however quite legible.

The inscription seems to record a monthly grant of six drammas by a king probably named Jayasimhadeva towards the building of Sahajigapur on the seventh day of the dark half of Māgha in v.s. 1292.

Sahajigapur in the inscription is the old name of Sejakpur about 20 miles south-west of Wadhwan. It is now an insignificant village, but the ruins of old temples, especially of the Navalaka temple, show that it was once of considerable importance. Tradition goes that Sejakji the founder of the present Gohel family of Bhavanagar received a holding from the Rā of Juṅagadh, which was named Sejakpur afterwards. The king mentioned in the inscription might be a Cudāsamā king of Jungadā named Jayasimhadeva.

Text

1 सं १२९२ वर्ष माप व 2 ति [ ७ ] दिने [ छुके ? ] श्री... 3 प्रदे......[ महीप— 4 ति ] श्री [ जय ! ] सिंहदेवन 5 मासं प्रति द७०: पद ६ श्री 6 सहजिजपुरकरण 7 शासने प्रदेशार्थं 8 द्राक्ष सर्वरिपण पालनीया

WADHWAN
No. 8] v.s. 1301. [December 1244

This inscription was found near a very old well situated to the east of the Candrarāvīśa garden in Wadhwan. The inscribed portion, which measures 12"×11", has above it engraved a Śiva liṅga. It is in a bad state of preservation.

The only points of information that are known are a portion of the date viz., bright half of the month Pauṣa of v.s. 1301, the old name Vardhamāna[pura] of modern Wadhwan, the name Candrasingji, probably of a king of Wadhwan, and the name Mehetā Soma of his minister. The object of the inscription seems to record the repairing of the temple of Siddheśadāva.

The temple might have been originally built by or in honour of the great Caulukya sovereign Siddharāja Jayasimha, who subdued Kathiawad after a severe fight with the local chiefs in about v.s. 1171.
VERAWAL

No. 9) Valabhi Sarh. 927.

[19-2-1246]

This inscription is engraved in beautiful letters on the pedestal of a fine image of Govardhanadhāri (i.e. Kṛṣṇa uplifting the Govardhana hill) built up in the eastern wall of the temple of Harasiddhi Mātā in Verawal, now an important port in Kathiawad at a distance of 2½ miles to the west of Somanāṭha Pāṭaṇa. The inscribed portion measures 12" in length and 3½" in breadth.

The inscription opens with the date, Monday, the third of the bright half of Phālguṇa in the year 927 of the Valabhi Sarvat. It then mentions that Gandhika Jojā, son of Seth Mūlajoga by his wife Mādhā, caused together with his wife and sons, an image of Śrī Govardhana to be set up in Devapattana, which is another name of Somanāṭha Pāṭaṇa.

The expression सकलराजार्धीस्युः is sometimes found in the inscriptions of the Caukulkya rulers of Anahilavād (cf. Ind. Ant. Vol. VI, pp. 191, 194, 196, 199, 201, 203 and 205; Vol. XI, p. 71). The reigning king of Anahilavād at the time of this inscription was Visaladeva, who succeeded in seizing the throne from the Caukulkya king Tribhuvanapāla, the successor of Bhima II, just at the time of this inscription. He had not well established himself and his name, therefore, might not have been given in the inscription.

Text

1 ॥ ॥ श्रीमूलभिवर्षपत्र ९२७ वर्ष फाल्गुन प्रार्द्ध ॥ सोमे ॥ अवेश श्रीदेवपालने ॥
2 सकलराजार्धीपुरुष गादकर्ताव्य श्रेष्ठ मूलजोग मयै श्रेष्ठ भाऊ तथा छ ॥
3 त गंदिक्रोजा मया तेजस तथा ययता दितोस पुन जसदेव दुर्गीय पुन ॥
4 जसपाल प्रस्तुत:ः श्रीगोविषेषनूसिल (ः) नमस्तनरार्धिस्य स्वपयेषसे पूज्यानां श्रेयो ॥
5 भिन्नदेव स्वभवत्या कारापि ॥ सूक्तं विशेषदेवपुन सूक्तं राश्वेन चतितो ॥ ६ ॥

1. Read प्रार्द्धितमः:
GIRNAR

No. 10]  

v.s. 1305.  

[17-4-1249

This inscription is engraved at the base of the statue of Pārśvanātha, in the central part of the Vastupāl Tejopāl temple on the Girnar hill. The inscribed portion, which is in a good state of preservation measures 2½' in length and 1½” in breadth.

It records that Sāmantasimha and Salakṣasimha, younger brothers of [Mahaṇa], sons of Padmasimha by his wife Prithividevi, and grandsons of Cāhadā, residents of Pattana and belonging to the Śrīmālī community caused an image of Pārśvanātha to be set up for the religious merit of their parents on Saturday, the first half of Vaiśakha of v.s. 1305. The consecration ceremony of the image was performed at the hands of Jayāndandasūri, disciple of Mānadevasūri, disciple of Pradyumnasūri of the Brhadagaccha.

The Pattana mentioned in the record is Aṇahilapatana the capital of the Caulukya sovereigns. Salakṣasimha and Sāmantasimha were influential officers in the Caulukya Court and were afterwards appointed governors of Saurāstra successively as may be seen from an inscription of v.s. 1320 found at Kāntela in the Porbandar State. More details of their genealogy are given in the following inscription.

Text

1. || || ॥ संवत १३०५ वर्ष वैशाख शुद्धि २ ज्योति स्वर्णतमावलय स्वर्णभालीय २० चाहुपलक सह पदार्थिपुष्ट २० पूजितविदेशी अंगज [ महणा ] नुज महा । स्वर्णभालीय ॥

2. || तथा महामालयभीसलिहरिचिन्हार्याः सान्यासर्नारिचिन्हार्याः स्वर्णभालीयनमणिप्रतिक धातु वर्णमात्राय वर्णमात्राय वर्णमात्राय वर्णमात्राय वर्णमात्राय वर्णमात्राय ॥

GHUMLI

No. 11]  

v.s. 1318.  

[7-3-1262

These two inscriptions, of the same date, are copied from two of the many pāliṣas (?) lying near the Rāmapur gate of Ghumli, which was once the capital of the Jethvās, but which is now completely in ruins in the Barḍā hills.

Both the inscriptions refer to the date, Tuesday the 15th of the bright half of Phāلغuna of v.s. 1318 when there was an eclipse of the moon. The first inscription mentions the name of Mahāmanḍalesvara Śrī Sāmanta, who was most probably the same Sāmantasimha, as the viceroy over Saurāstra of the Caulukya sovereign Visaladeva. From the Kāntela inscription of v.s. 1320 we know that he succeeded his brother Salakṣa to that post. The first inscription records the name of a man born in the Cāhamāna family and the second inscription of a man belonging to the Cāpotkaṭa, i.e. Cāvḍā family of Wadhwan. It is not sure whether these inscriptions record the deaths of

1. Mahanasimha was the eldest son of Padmasimha.
the persons or record donations made by them on the occasion of the lunar eclipse.

Text

1 II 70 II सं १३१८ वर्षें फारा छुद १५
2 भौमे प्रहणपूर्वः महामंड
3 देन्धर भी साम्पत चड्योणसह
4 रिमाणमूलीक (?) महाका
5 चे चाहुपाढळावेळे सेते
6 आभासु १० ? आसामको...
7 ...

(2)

1 सं १३१८ वर्षे पालु
2 न छुदि १५ भौमे वो बदवाण [वा]
3 सत्वीय चावोलक्षणातीय
4 सामतेहुि तुण्राकस बो

GIRNAR

No. 12]

V.S. 1319. [18-4-1262]

This inscription is engraved on the pedestal of two small images at the feet of the Tirthankar image engraved on a pillar in the east wall of a Deri on the way to the Hathi Pagalā on the Girnar hill. It measures 8”×6½”.

The first two lines give the date of the record, viz., Tuesday, the 13th of the dark half of Caitra of v.s. 1319. It refers to the reign of a king whose name is very unfortunately lost but who was probably of the Cūḍāsamā family. The fourth line gives the old name Revatagiri of the hill.

Text

1 संक्ति १३१९ वर्षे
2 चेत्र वदि १३ भौमे
3 थी...राज्ये रे
4 हठगिरि महाप्राप्ते
5 ...

LÄTHODRÄ

No. 13]

V.S. 1323. [12-1-1266]

This inscription is engraved on a pālia standing at the entrance of the village Läthodrä. The inscribed portion measures 17½” in length and 8” in breadth.

It refers to the date, Tuesday, the fourth day of the bright half of Māgha in v.s. 1322 and the rule of Mehatā Pāla (Pāla) over the Saurāstra Mandāla. The inscription further records the death of a warrior, named Thā-
kur Plavanga (?) at the village Lāthiudrā, which was in the possession of Seṭh Rāja Vānā? appointed by the viceroy.

The viceroy over Saurāṣṭra, named Pāla, i.e. Pālha is probably the same as is mentioned in the Bharāṇā and Girnar inscriptions of the Caulukya sovereign Arjunadeva dated v.s. 1327 and 1330 respectively and in the Āma-raṇa inscription of Sāranga-deva of v.s. 1333. The Caulukya sovereign by whose orders Pālha in our inscription was governing Saurāṣṭra was Arjunadeva, but his name is not mentioned here.

**Text**

No. 14]

**PORBANDAR**

v.s. 1334. [12-9-1277

This inscription is engraved on a stone slab fixed in a corner of the temple of Padmānī Mātā in the Khārvāvād in Porbandar. The inscribed portion, most of which is worn out, measures 1'9'' by 1'6½''.

The record opens with the date, the 14th day of the bright half of Āśvin in v.s. 1334, when Porā was governed by a Pañcakula, appointed by Thākur Pālha and Thākur Sāmanta-simha. The names of some other officials in Porā seem to have been given in the record. As its latter portion is too much worn out the object of the inscription is not clear.

Pālha and Sāmanta-simha are most probably the officers of the Caulukya sovereign, Sāranga-deva, appointed to rule jointly over Saurāṣṭra. They are both mentioned in that capacity in the Bharāṇā inscription of v.s. 132[7] of Arjunadeva published in the Poona Orientalist Vol. III.

**Text**

1 ॥ ब्रह्मल ॥ संवतः १२३२ बष्यं साधि च भैरवे
2 ९४ (वीं १) पोरायें ठौ श्रीपाल्ह [ठौ]
3 श्रीसामालससिंह पादनां महं स्री फ़-
4 [सीह] प्रति पंचकु ल्ला [सी] पल्ल [शी ?]
5 देवसीह प्रथि समस्त
6 उपविवि स्वस्तवौको—
7 खर—हरा—हम—
8 तात् या प्रतितिसं श्रवणि
9 तात् पक्ष—गुरु—
10 तात् जल्लम्मी परम
11 तात् नवपर—
12 ... ... ... ...
13 ...... मूलकेवन II
14 — — जेन लिपित II

KANSARI
No. 15] v.s. 1348. [26-2-1291

This inscription is engraved on a Kārtistambha standing near a temple in the village Kansāri near Ghumli in the Barḍā hills. It measures 12½"×8".

The record is dated Monday, the 11th of the dark half of Phālguna in v.s. 1348 and refers to the reign of Rāṇaka Bhāṇa, who must be the well-known king Bhāṇa Jēṭhvā whose capital at Ghumli was invaded by Jām Bāmanīajī of Sindh in about 1313 A.D. (See Kathiawad Gazetteer, p. 625). The old name of Kansāri seems to be Sorasagrāma.

Text

1 संवत् १३४८ वर्ष फागुण वंदे ११ सो
2 मे राजक श्रीभाणराजे मेघदोउ
3 राज ० । ० । ० । राज भारा
4 मल की तोस्ससमे राहिया ?
5 । । । बौजह । ।
6 । । । दापिता...

WADHWAN
No. 16] v.s. 1350. [8-10-1293

These two inscriptions are engraved on the pedestals of two images in two niches in the famous Mādhā vāv at Wadhwan.

The first inscription gives the date Thursday, the 8th of the bright half of Kārtika in v.s. 1350 and records the name of Sīḍhu, son of Thākur Soma of the Nāgara community.

The other inscription gives only the name of Taṣamādevī, daughter of Soḍhala, of the Nāgara community.

It seems that Sīḍhu and Taṣmā are husband and wife. The building of the well is popularly attributed to Mādhava, the Nāgara minister of the last Caukulka-Vāghelā king, Karna II. It may be suggested that Sīḍhu and Taṣamā were the parents of Mādhava and their images were set up by him in the well built by him in v.s. 1350.

Text

1 सं. १३५० वर्ष कालिक सुदे ८ गुरी नामर
2 झालीय ठौ श्रीसम्मुत II महें श्री सीधु
2
1 नामशंगालीय महें श्रीसेवाद
2 लखुता महें श्रीतपमादेशण II
SOMANATH PĀṬAṆA

No. 17

[6-6-1299]

This inscription is engraved on a memorial stone lying in the public library in Somanātha Pāṭaṇa. The inscribed portion measures 1’ 4” × 8”.

It records that on Saturday, the seventh of the bright half of Aṣāḍha in v.s. 1355 two Vājā warriors fell at the door of the Somanātha temple while fighting with the Turuṣkās when they had invaded and destroyed the town.

This invasion of the Muhammedans was most probably the one undertaken by Ulugh Khan, the General of Alaūddin Khalji of Delhi. From the Kāṅhaḍādeva prabandha we know that he had plundered Somanātha (Guj. Gaz. p. 229). Our inscription gives the exact date of the incident.

Text

1 संवत् १३५५ं वधेत्र्य जयते दृश्या त्रिनी [तृ]  
2 कै भेंगे सोनी बा जान मालूम दे  
3 ह बा जान पदमल भाते देशा [ठ] सी  
4 ह श्रीमानाय दारी तुदु हात्वा  
5 मुत्  

GIRNAR

No. 18

(Date missing.)

[13th cent. A.D.]

This inscription is built in the eastern wall of a deri facing to the south on the left side of the path to the Ĥāthī Pagalā on the Girnar hill. It was beautifully engraved but a considerable portion of it, especially in the middle has now become illegible. The left hand upper corner of the stone is broken away. The inscribed portion measures about 1’ 5” in height and 10” in breadth.

This inscription was formerly published by BURGESS in Antiquarian Remains in the Bombay Presidency, p. 351.

The inscription records that there was in Śrīmāla family a minister named Udayana, whose son was Cāhaḍa. He had seven sons. The first of them named Kumārasisinha was a treasury officer of the (Caulukya sovereign) Kumārapāla (of Anāhilapātana). The second son was Jagaisinha. The third was Padmasinha, who by his wife Prithividevi had four sons—Mahaṇasimha, Sāmantasimha, Salakṣaṇa and Teja and a daughter named Sumatā.

A connected information of the further portion cannot be obtained. It seems that Sāmantasimha made a pilgrimage to several sacred Jain places and built a Jain temple on the Girnar mountain, the consecration ceremony of which was performed by Devasūrī.

Vijaya simhasūri composed this prāṣasti and Haripala engraved it.

It may be noted that the brothers Sāmantasimha and Salaksanasisinha are mentioned together with their parents in the Girnar inscription (No. 10) and in the Kāntela inscription of v.s. 1320. Udayana whose descendants they
were, is a famous figure in Jain chronicles. He was intimately connected with the Caulukya sovereign Kumārapāla, and his Jain preceptor Hemacandra.

Text

1. प्रभो मानं बभा
2. समसुपलवपर
3. [भो] मालवशसमणप्रकाशििः
4. प्रभराजात्यापोदयन हयादितं
5. चाहृदनामाषिः। श्रेयः। पदं मन्त्रिविपुर्वभूव
6. सर्वभव्यः निमलक्षमधुक्कः। ४ तथोः: सस
7. चोद्माः। अजयंत पुत्तः: सस्मोऽत्रादत्तकलचाः। ५
8. [पात्कु] मालवशमाािः कोणागराधिकारवः। कुमारसिंहः: प्रभोऽऽ
9. [रम] पुशः: सर्वः। ६ जगन्तिस्विसुरारण्यं पदार्शिः: श्रयः। पदः। ततो जयंत
10. पात्कैो धीपिंगः। [भीमसेती रष्ट] ६ अम्बः। भीमसिंहिद्विष्टा प्रभुविद्वीदीि
11. सहायमुः।! श्रीमद्धारसिंहः [साम्मित्] सिंह साहास्थजीतानन्नवः। अथ सुम
12. लम्मुपमाः साङ्गवे सुधे दिवे प्रहृंदे—यः। जयंतिकहानिलगानामभूमी
13. तां च सीतादवः। ९। अम्बः। सामंतसिंह
14. देशेषु मुहज्जातः। १०।।
15. अणहिपुरवसलाक
16. विहितज्ये
17. मभः
18. सिङ्घाणीः। १२।।
19. वकुलकाजालः
20. भावांजिनिहित
21. लोकः या संपर्वः
22. विषयं तेजाधः
23. लक्षणमाणी
24. छात्रायमु
25. नन्देश् येन वा
26. नन्दे पेशावालः
27. प्रस्तादतः। २०।।
28. वसे ब्राह्माध्व
29. महात्मिन्धः तीथ्य-तिंगः
30. विकृत्तु
31. विभूषितः। १८।।
32. विभूषितः
33. नवुरे च नवुरे च
34. नवोऽ च नवोऽ
35. विभूषितः:।
36. विभूषितः:।

(To be continued)
Born: March 11, 1863.  

His Highness Maharaja SAYAJIRAO GAEKWAR  
Senakhaskhel, Samsher Bahadur,  
G.C.S.I., G.C.I.E., LL.D.

[Died: February 6, 1939.]
HIS LATE HIGHNESS SHRIMANT SAYAJI RAO
GAEKWAD OF BARODA

We feel it our painful duty to record the sad demise of His Highness Shrimant Sayaji Rao Gaekwad, G.C.S.I., C.I.E., L.L.D., which took place at Bombay on the 6th February, 1939. Few men in this world are born to rule and fewer still are those who can rule with integrity, sagacity and foresightfulness. His Highness was one of these fewer men who, during the sixty-three years of his enlightened and progressive rule, have left an indelible mark on every aspect of life, not only within the confines of his State but in the whole of India, so much so that the name of his Highness has become a household word in India in all matters affecting the progress of entire Indian nation in the fields of social, educational and political reform. To be remembered as the “Father of his people” is the highest honour that could be conferred on a Ruler by his subjects and it is a matter for pride that India owned his Highness as her distinguished son on account of his complete identity with Indian aspirations and achievements during a long and benign rule of more than three score years.

It is difficult to assess adequately and fully the value of the consistent and continuous patronage given by His enlightened Highness Shrimant Sayaji Rao to the advancement of learning. His Highness looked upon knowledge as the key to all progress, material or spiritual, and considered it as his primary duty to provide this key to his fellow-beings by founding numerous educational institutions within his own State and helping liberally those founded by others outside his State. The village Library movement and the network of libraries maintained and conducted by His Highness for the benefits of his subjects are a typical example of the late Maharaja’s strenuous efforts to fight out the devil of ignorance from his jurisdiction. Indologists should be particularly thankful to Shrimant Sayaji Rao for the vision and foresight displayed by him in starting the Gaekwad’s Oriental Series twenty years ago. This Series already owns about a hundred volumes published or projected at a cost of no less than a few lacs of rupees. The Series coupled with the Gaekwad’s Studies in Philosophy and Religion which already owns a few published volumes shows in an ample measure the versatility and catholicity of academic interests which characterised the endeavour of Shrimant Sayaji Rao towards the promotion of Oriental learning. Such work of permanent value to the resuscitation of Indian Culture, Philosophy and Religion is bound to bring forth increasing and everlasting reputation to this departed patron of Art and Learning.

Some parts of Gujarat are rich in historical and archaeological antiquities and in spite of the work of Burgess and others no serious attempts had been made to carry on systematic exploration of these remains and the
preservation of those that were already known. With a view to look after
this activity Shrimant Sayaji Rao started about four years ago a Depart-
ment of Archaeology under the guidance of Dr. Hiranand Sastri, the retired
Epigraphist to the Government of India. The valuable work done by this
Department is now too well known to need mention here. The creation of
this Department is highly creditable to His Highness in view of the fruitful
nature of the work and the possibilities of many useful archaeological dis-
coveries that are indicated by the finds now discovered by this Department.

With the revival of the country-wide interest in ancient manuscripts in
the last quarter of the 19th century, the late Maharaja lost no time in collect-
ing and preserving thousands of manuscripts in the Central Library, Baroda,
which he had organized on up-to-date lines with a view to infuse a love
of knowledge among his subjects. Subsequently this collection was housed
in the Oriental Institute, Baroda, founded and maintained by the State with
a special Director in charge to act as the Editor-in-Chief for the Gaekwad's
Oriental Series. This arrangement has proved extremely beneficial for the
promotion of Oriental Studies as the manuscripts in the Gaekwad collection
are sent on loan to other institutions in India and outside for the use of
individual research workers in Indology.

The services of Shrimant Sayaji Rao towards the promotion of knowl-
edge in all fields are too numerous to be included in this short tribute to
his love of learning and the learned in all countries including his own, and
we feel confident that his name and fame, which have now captured the
hearts of his countrymen, will shine with added glory like that of Bhoja
the Great of yore. We are also confident that His Highness Maharaja Pra-
tapsinha, who has now succeeded to the gāḍī as the 'inheritor of a great
renew' will not only adorn it but will add to this great renown in the years
to come as a worthy successor of his illustrious grandfather.

S. M. Katre
P. K. Gode
EDITORIAL.

With the present issue the New Indian Antiquary completes its first year. The Editors desire to express here their heartfelt thanks to the scholars who have contributed their learned papers to the pages of the New Indian Antiquary and patronised it by becoming subscribers; to the subscribers, individual as well as institutions, who have stood by us in this difficult task; and to the Publishers and Printers whose self-sacrificing activities in this connection are beyond all praise, deserving of full recognition by the nation as a whole. It is time that individual scholars, public and government institutions, as well as the Princes of India should now come forward and give a token of this recognition by greater patronage and ensure the steady growth and development of a unique Indological Journal whose objects were already set forth in our September Editorial. We are thankful to the enlightened Government of His late Highness Shrimant Sayajirao Gaekwad of Baroda for the first magnificent move in this direction, and we feel confident that the same royal patronage will be continued in a wider and more intensive manner under the rule of H. H. Shrimant Pratapsinh Gaekwad.

* * *

A word of explanation seems to be necessary about the title of the journal. We have had a host of enquiries about a contradiction in terms connected with the words New and Antiquary as applied to India. In our editorial Preface to the first number we specially mentioned the meritorious service rendered to the cause of Indology by the Indian Antiquary in recognition of which the new journal was to be called the New Indian Antiquary. But the word New has even a deeper significance. It represents the new spirit, manifesting itself in various activities, which has come to stay in India. We are passing through a period which makes it vitally necessary for India to put together all her cultural resources in a scientific manner and evolve out of these a practical as well as spiritual movement which shall bring out the best elements of humanity. The New Indian Antiquary is but one phase of this multifaced movement, attempting to raise India and Indian Studies to international status by organizing new features and creating a modern school of researchers who shall interpret her kaleidoscopic civilization and culture with a scientific understanding of her pulse. In order to make the task of the researcher easier we have made arrangements to publish as a regular feature of the New Indian Antiquary, an authoritative ANALYTICAL INDEX of all Indological papers and books appearing month after month; SURVEY ARTICLES and INDOLOGY IN CURRENT LITERATURE will be the necessary concomitants of the Analytical Index.

To achieve this unique object we have organized an International Editorial Board to take the charge of conducting the journal on these new and authoritative lines. Among the eminent scholars who will thus collabo-
rate with us are: Prof. Dr. Albert Debrunner, Bern (Switzerland), Prof.
Franklin Edgerton, Yale University (United States of America), Prof. Dr.
J. Gonda, Utrecht (Netherlands), Prof. Dr. Vittore Pisani, Rome (Italy)
and Prof. Louis Renou, Paris (France). We expect to include these regular
features before the end of the second volume, as the preliminary work will
involve some time.

Thus within the compass of a single journal, the research scholars
will find all the material vital to their own day to day work. The intelligent
layman will find in the series of Survey Articles first hand information on
the different aspects of Indology summarised by master scholars in popular
language, taking into account all the published research data within
a specified period. We take this opportunity to remind all those concerned
with Indian Studies in one form or another to co-operate with us to make
these features successful. For the New Indian Antiquary is Indian in con-
ception and international in its scope, and is, therefore, eminently qualified
to serve every scholar and every institute of which it can reasonably become
a live organ. Intellectual co-operation is one of the necessities of world-
culture, and India with her immortal genius to make all good things her
own, should pave the way to this end.

We are now looking forward to years of useful activity. Already the
volume of Indian and Eastern Studies in honour of Prof. F. W. Thomas,
C.I.E. has been published as an Extra Series of the New Indian Antiquary.
Within the next few months another volume will be added to this series by
the publication of Indian and Iranian Studies as a presentation volume to
Sir E. Denison Ross. Thus within eighteen months of its birth the New
Indian Antiquary presents to the world one complete volume of over 800 pages
and two smaller volumes of 350 pages each in addition to the usual monthly
numbers of the second volume. That this has at all been possible is due to
the happy co-ordination between Printer and Publisher on the one hand, and
the Scholars on the other. In the name of India’s great culture and greater
future we fervently appeal to all to patronise this new movement by sumptuous
donations and subscriptions. The continuation of the tradition built up by
the New Indian Antiquary is a national charge, and it would be a shame to
the nation as a whole if a journal, built upon the spontaneous feelings of com-
radeship between scholar and scholar in the whole world, should fail to evoke
sufficient interest in the learned circles like our Universities, Oriental or Asiatic
Societies and Governments to make it self-supporting. But the new spirit which
is now at work in every department of our national activities should recognise
these movements and sponsor them or support them with all its might. And
we have confidence, in view of India’s increasing status, that this support will
not be wanting.

S. M. Katre
P. K. Gode
THE TEXT OF THE LAGHU YOGAVĀSIŚTHA.

By

P. C. DIVANJI

Introductory Remarks. I. Nature of Problem. II. Materials Collected for Solution. III. Evaluation of the Materials; 1 (a) Nature of Contents of Sarga 44 as Appearing in the First Printed Edition; (b) Contents and Extent of the Commentaries; (c) Contents of the Mss. of the Work and Commentaries thereon; (d) Possible Inferences; (e) Conclusion. 2. (a) Contents of the Other Two Additional Sargas: (b) Ms. Evidence as to their Genuineness. IV. Final Conclusion and Suggestion of Lines for the Preparation of a Revised Edition of the Text. Closing Remarks.

INTRODUCTORY REMARKS.

The work, the contents of the text thereof have been discussed in this article, is at present more widely known by the title thereof given in the caption, which distinguishes it from the Bhārat Yogavāsiṣṭha or Yogavāsiṣṭha Mahārāmāyaṇa, a printed edition whereof is available with the commentary thereon of Ānandabodha Yati. Its original title however appears from the old Mss. thereof and of the commentaries thereon to be Vāsiṣṭha Rāmāyaṇa. The third alternative title by which it is referred to in itself is Mokṣopāya-sāra, that of the original work itself being Mokṣopāya. Still other alternative titles by which it is referred to in South Indian Catalogues of Mss. are Yogavāsiṣṭhasāra, or succinctly Vāsiṣṭha-sāra, Vāsiṣṭha-sāra-samuccaya and Jñāna-Vāsiṣṭha. The first of these titles is also given to a Ms. of the work of one Kavindrācārya Sarasvatī in the Catalogue of the Prācy Grantha Sarigraha of Ujjain and to most probably the same work with the commentary of Mahīdhara in the Catalogue of the R. A. Society of Bengal, Vol. V. That is a very small work, written quite independently of the plan of the original, in 10 chapters containing in all stanzas varying from 208 to 229. It is therefore easily distinguishable from the work in hand which has the same six chapters as the parent work.

2. I had an occasion to consider the contents of the Laghu Yogavāsiṣṭha of Gauḍa Abhinanda when I penned my article on “Further Light on the Date of the Yogavāsiṣṭha”2, which was a sequel to a paper on “The Date and Place of Origin of the Yogavāsiṣṭha”3 read before the seventh session of the Oriental Conference at Baroda in December 1933 and embodied my

---

1. The title of Ātmasukha’s commentary on this work is Vāsiṣṭha-candrikā and the expression “Vāsiṣṭha-vivarana” occurs in the colophons to almost all the Sargas in the commentary of Mummadīdeva. In Sarga 44, 32 of the first Nirpaya Sāgar Press edition thereof, which is the same as VI.16.31 in the second edition, it is stated that this work is spoken of everywhere with admiration as the Śāra of the Mokṣopāya and that name occurs in all the colophons of the Sargas thereof.
2. Poona Orientalist, April 1938, pp. 29-44.
conclusions that Gauḍa Abhinanda, who had made the said abridgement, seemed, from the several data mentioned therein, to have made use of an earlier recension of the Yogaśīṣṭha than that known as the Devadūtokta saṃhitā, which Ānandabodha Yati has commented upon, that whether he was identical with the author of the Kādambari-kathā-sāra or with that of the Rāmacarita, he could not have lived earlier than 900 to 950 A.D.¹ and that therefore even though he may have made use of the Devadūta recension, so long as we do not know in which particular year of the 10th century he was born and in which particular year he died, the fact of his having made use of that recension which contains a distinct reference to King Yaśaskaradeva of Kāśmir, who according to the Rājataraṅgiṇī ruled over that province from 939 to 948 A.D., does not militate against the conclusion that the said recension could not have come into existence earlier than the second quarter of the tenth century because it is quite possible that he may have been born in either the first or the second quarter of that century and may have lived upto an advanced age, by which time the said recension may have been out and available to him and he may, looking to the disinclination of people to study that extensive work, have abridged it in order that the teaching inculcated therein may be accessible to people in a handy form.

I. Nature of the Problem.

3. Amongst the materials then available to me, there was an edition of the abridged work published by the Nirṇaya Sāgar Press, Bombay in Śake 1810, Sarvāt 1944 (A.D. 1888) and four. Mss. of the work and the commentaries thereon by Åtmasukha and Mummaḍideva at the Sanskrit Library, Baroda. As on the one hand the printed edition contained in all 51 Sargas, some of which had been left unnumbered and two of which bore the same number, as no commentary appeared under the last 3 of those Sargas and as two Sargas appeared to occur even after that entitled “Śāstra-grahaṇa-phala-nirdeśaḥ” (Statement of the Fruit of Studying the Treatise) and as on the other the two last Sargas seemed on a comparison of their contents with the corresponding portion of the big work to contain copious extracts from Sargas 127 and 128 of the Pūrvaṅga of the Nirvāṇa-prakaraṇa and as the same two Sargas were found even in the oldest paper Ms. of the work at the Baroda Sanskrit Library,² it was a puzzle to me as to what must have been the real extent of the work as originally composed by Gauḍa

¹. Sten Konow having identified him with the former in his “Essay on the Life and Writings of Rājaśekhara” forming Part III of his edition of the Karpū ramaṇjari, as translated by C. R. Lanman (Harvard Oriental Series No. 4), placed him in the middle of ninth century and other European scholars like Winternitz accepted that view.

². This is Ms. No. Ic 12810 at that library. Though some of its folio pages are entirely missing such as Nos. 21-22, 189-99 &c., and though some of those that are there are injured at places, it can be definitely stated from the remaining portions of the last two folio pages, Nos. 203-04, that the Ms. had been completed in Sarvāt 1656 (A.D. 1600).
Abhinanda and therefore I was on the look-out for materials which would enable me to solve it.

II. MATERIALS COLLECTED FOR SOLVING IT.

4. Since the publication of my said article in the *Poona Orientalist* I came across a second edition of the work purporting to have been accompanied by the same commentary *Vāsiṣṭhacandrika* by Atmasukha, pupil of Uttamasukha, published only last year by the Nirṇaya Sāgar Press. It did not appear from the Preface thereto that the learned Śāstrī who had edited it had availed himself of any additional manuscript materials while preparing a press copy thereof and yet when its contents were compared with those of the preceding one some differences between the two could be noticed. It was a source of satisfaction to me to find that an attempt had been made to remove the discrepancies that existed in the numbering of the Sargas. Unfortunately however I cannot congratulate the learned editor on his achievement in that respect because while on the one hand there was no Sarga left unnumbered and no two Sargas bore the same number as in the first edition, owing to the inclusion of the four unnumbered ones in that relating to the episode of Śikhidhvaja in the Sixth chapter, which is supported by several Mss. of the text and of the commentary of Mummyādeva, and to the exercise of proper care in the numbering of the Sargas, there was on the other hand the adoption of a separate serial order for the Sargas comprised in each chapter e.g. Sargas 1 to 3 in Chapter I, Sarga 1 instead of 4 in Chapter II, Sargas 1 to 9 instead of 5 to 13 in Chapter III and so on, which, so far as my investigation went, did not seem to have the sanction of any old Ms. either of the text alone or of any of the two commentaries alone or of the former with any of the latter. Further as the result of this new method of enumeration the total number of Sargas came to 46 out of which 43 preceded that setting forth the fruit of studying the work and two succeeded it. This did not render any help in arriving at a definite conclusion as to the exact extent of the text as originally fixed by Gauḍa Abhinanda himself because the commentary such as it was, extended only up to the 43rd Sarga entitled “Yogasaptabhūmikopākhāyāna” and did not contain any remark at its end as to the work having ended there, because there was not a distich in any of the 34 stanzas comprised in Sarga 16 of the Nirvāṇa-prakaraṇa (44 according to a continuous serial order) which could be deemed to have been imported from the big Yogavāśisṭha and because the occurrence of two additional Sargas, having 58 and 84 stanzas respectively, large numbers out of which could be easily identified with stanzas occurring in Sargas 127 and 128 of the Pūrvārdha of the Nirvāṇa-prakaraṇa in the big work as printed by the N. S. Press, could not be explained on any reasonable ground. Ordinarily the fact that the commentary ended with the 43rd Sarga should have served as a good ground for holding that the work as originally composed and as known to the commentator must have ended there but it could not in this case because in the first place, it was possible that though the Sarga as to the fruit of study may have been composed by the
author and have thus formed part of the original text, the commentator may not have known of its existence or may have omitted to comment upon it in view of the fact that it contained no part of the exposition of the doctrine embodied in the big work and secondly, because the full contents of the commentary of Ātmasukha, pupil of Uttamasukha, entitled Vāsiṣṭhadandrikā, which the label on the cover of the book, the title on the title-page and that at the top of every alternate page in the body of the work throughout from p. 3 to 851 announced as having been printed below the text, were themselves unknown. On a comparison of the two editions it appeared distinctly that in none of them had the full text of the said commentary been printed below the text of the work but in both the commentary that had been printed below the 4th to the 6th chapters ending at the 43rd Sarga in the first and the 15th of the 6th chapter in the second was not the one which, from the announcements above-mentioned, we would expect to find but that of Mummāḍideva, son of Allāḍasūri alias Allālasūri, entitled Sansārataraṇi. Therefore the only conclusion which, I thought would be justified by the printed editions, was that the latter commentary ended with the 43rd Sarga. But even that conclusion did not seem to be unimpeachable because ordinarily the end of a work in Sanskrit is indicated by a distinct remark to that effect following a statement of the full name of the author and that of his Guru, if he was a recluse, and that of his father, if he was a householder, but in this case there was neither such a complete colophon at the end of the commentary on Sarga 43 nor such a remark following it. I therefore felt the necessity of considering in details the contents of the three Sargas, following the end of the commentary of Mummāḍideva on Sarga 43, and those of the commentary itself and also that of collecting as many Mss. of the work and the two commentaries thereon as I could and of obtaining such and so much information about others as the scholars, to whom it was within easy reach, would be kind enough to place at my disposal. I am glad to be able to acknowledge my indebtedness in that respect to Mr. P. K. Gode of the B. O. R. I. Poona, Dr. V. Raghavan, Member of the New Catalogus Catalogorum Committee, Madras, Mr. G. Sadasiva Murti, Hon. Director of the Theosophical Society’s Oriental Mss. Library, Adyar, Mr. R. B. Kak, Chief Secretary to the Government of Kāśmīr and Jammu and Prof. P. P. S. Sastri, Curator, Government Manuscripts Library, Madras. The materials and information which they had the courtesy to place at my disposal have added considerably to my knowledge.

1. In order to be convinced of this one has only to compare the colophons to I. 1, 2 & 3; II. 1; III. 1 to 4 and 7 to 9, which contain both the names of the author and that of the commentary, and even those to III. 5 & 6 which contain that of the latter only, on the one hand, with those to IV. 2 to 5 which contain the names of the author and the commentary and even those to IV. 1; V. 1 to 5; VI. 2 & 15 which contain the latter only, on the other.

2. No discussion is necessary as to the contents of the first 43 Sargas and their division into chapters as appearing from the printed editions because all available evidence points to their correctness, apart from the wrong numbering in the second edition above-mentioned.
of the vicissitudes through which this work seems to have passed and I am glad to be able to offer a plausible solution of the problem which, in the light of my limited knowledge derived from the printed editions and the four Baroda Mss. referred to in the article in the Poona Orientalist above-referred to, seemed to be almost impossible of solution.

III. EVALUATION OF THE MATERIALS.

1. (a) Nature of Contents of the Phalanirdeśa Sarga.

5. Taking up first the Sarga containing a statement of the fruit of studying the work, it has been numbered 44 in the first printed edition thereof. Between it and that numbered 16 in the Nirvāṇa-prakaraṇa of the second edition the only difference is that stanza no. 19 in the former having been omitted from the latter, the total number of stanzas therein is 34 instead of 35 as in the former. These stanzas must be considered in two parts, namely the first four together with the remark "Vasiṣṭha uvāca" preceding them and the subsequent thirty-one preceded by the remark "Vālmikiruvāca." The second group must again be considered in several subsidiary parts owing to the difference in the nature of their contents.

6. Now the first four stanzas, preceded in the second edition by the remark above-mentioned, represent Vasiṣṭha as comparing the poet to the Creator, opining for the reasons given therein that he has excelled Him and further referring to a calumny by certain contemporaries of the work metaphorically called "the ocean of the nectar of the grace of Hariharārya" and in view of the poetical and philosophical merits mentioned therein, extolling it as one worthy of study by all seekers of the truth and as a means for attaining purity and peace of mind. If this "Hariharārya" was a Guru of Ātmasukha, author of the Vāsiṣṭhayacandrīkā, as stated by Aufrecht, it is impossible that either Vālmīki or for the matter of that, Gauḍa Abhinanda should have made Vasiṣṭha utter these stanzas because in that case the name and work of that man could not have been known to any of them and there was no reason for any of them to set forth the merits of such a work in the Laghu Yogavāsiṣṭha. Even if "Hariharārya" was another name of Vālmīki, as I believe, still Gauḍa Abhinanda, who in that case could be the author of those stanzas, could not have placed them in the mouth of Vasiṣṭha because he cannot be believed to have forgotten that it was not Vasiṣṭha who had been reciting a work of Vālmīki but it was Vālmīki who had been re-producing in his own language a discourse which was alleged to have occurred between Vasiṣṭha and Rāmacandra. Even if those stanzas had not been preceded by the said remark, as was the case in the old edition, still they seem quite out of place as preceding the 31 stanzas introduced by the remark "Vālmikiruvāca" and beginning with that in which the sage says that while the sage

1. For the word "Prasahya" in the beginning of this stanza in both the editions, which does not seem to me to yield an intelligible sense to the stanza, I prefer to read "Prasṛtya" and to construe the stanza as above.
(Vasiṣṭha) was so saying the day passed away, the audience having bowed to the sage left for a bath. &c., which connects the 31 stanzas with the preceding Sarga, not with the praise of the work contained in the first four stanzas. There are amongst those 31 also some in praise of the work and therefore if those which appear as the first four had been found anywhere else they would not have seemed so incongruous as they do in their present setting in the printed editions. But in none of the Mss. examined by me are they found anywhere else except as immediately following the colophon to the 43rd Sarga.

7. As for the said subsequent 31 stanzas they are in the first place introduced by the remark "Vālmikiruvāca"; secondly, the first of them states that after the day’s recitation was over the audience left the place on that day and re-assembled on the next day and the six subsequent ones narrate that after the recitation lasting for 18 days was over and Rāma had expressed his gratitude to Vasiṣṭha, the latter by the exercise of his spiritual power invoked the gods who had come to listen to the discourse and made them manifest to Rāma, that the Yakṣas, Gandharvas, Siddharṣis, Vidyādharas and Mahoragas (literally meaning big serpents) who are meant by the term "gods," having become manifest, Rāma bowed to them, and that being pleased they in turn bowed to both the teacher and the pupil and eulogized the discourse between them as imparting highly elevating knowledge. Upto this stage the stanzas appear as if they had been taken from the original work. That they are not found to have been extracted from the said work as printed is quite a different matter, for, if not in the printed recension thereof, they may be in any other older recension, whose existence is pointed at by other data. But at any rate the speech of Vālmīki must be deemed to end there for the next stanza speaks of the Siddhas having heard at Ayodhya, and brought down the work to Kāśmīr out of compassion for the inhabitants of that province, a statement which appears inappropriate in the mouth of the original author. The next two or three stanzas, according as the first or the second printed edition is borne in mind, relate how Rāma discharged his royal duties after he had listened to the teaching of Vasiṣṭha. These stanzas again, like

1. I believe the reading "Snātum samākrātamuni pranātir jagāma" of the second line of the stanza to be faulty as it yields no sense and prefer to read "Snātum sabbhā krātamunipranātir jagāma" which fits in with the context. I also believe that to be the third line instead of the second because it is so in the big work wherein this very stanza occurs very often, e.g. see III.14.86, 22.33, 41. 69, 70, 84.


5. The printed editions have the reading "Ayodhyāyām stutvaitat" which ill-accords with the previous statement that the Siddhas were among those who had heard the discourse which had taken place at Ayodhya. I therefore prefer to read "Ayodhyāyām śrūtaitat" which yields the sense above-mentioned. Cf. also Yogavāsīṣṭha VI I. 128.77.


the first four, seem to be quite out of place in this context for they are preceded by the narration of a tradition as to how the Yogavāsiṣṭha had found its way into Kāśmīr and followed by a statement in 16 stanzas as to the merit of the work in the abridged form. Those 16 again seem to form a compact series because the first four mention the qualifications of the persons to whom the Śāstra should be taught and the disqualifications of those who should not be initiated into its teaching,¹ the next two explain the reasons for that restriction, which are that the work embodies the teaching imparted by Maheśvara, by the Goddess, and even by Viṣṇu to Nārada and other sages and that it is the nectar extracted from the ocean of milk known as the Mahārāmāyaṇa, whose other name is Mokṣopāya,² the next six set forth the effects which a study of this work and a reflection over its teaching is likely to have generally on the minds of all who read it and particularly on those of persons of dull intellect, on those of persons with a slightly refined intellect and on those of Yogis;³ the next three state as the reasons for that optimismistic view that Vasiṣṭha is believed to be the highest knower of the meaning of all the Āgamas, that this work is praised everywhere as the Sāra (quintessence) of the Mokṣopāya (the work known by that name i.e. the Yogavāsiṣṭha), that there is no other treatise than it which would be a source of salve to the lacerated heart of one bereft of his beloved objects &c., that this Śāstra is verily a full moon who has risen from the Cidākāśa,⁴ is a treasure-house of joy, has good phases, contains abundant nectar, is one from which radiates the splendour of poetic sentiment and which has a light which has dispelled darkness,⁵ and the last winds up the whole encomium by setting forth the merit accruing from a steadiness of the mind achieved even for a single moment while reflecting on Brahma.⁶

8. It thus appears on the one hand as if the stanzas in this Sarga had been put together on being collected in groups from various sources, and on the other as if most of them at least had been composed by Gauḍa Abhinanda himself in order to set forth the merit of the work. It would not therefore be proper to discard this Sarga as a spurious one and it is necessary to examine the other available evidence.

(b). Extent and Contents of the Commentaries.

9. One remarkable circumstance against the existence of any Sarga in the text as composed by Gauḍa Abhinanda is that the commentary of Mūn-

4. The phrase “Śāstrāṁ nurāṇānandānidiḥ” occurring in stanza 34 of the first edition and 33 of the second seems to be meaningless and makes it impossible so to construe the whole stanza as to make it yield an intelligible sense. If instead of that the phrase “Śāstrāndurūṇānandānidiḥ” is read in its place, it, when split up into the words “Śāstrānduḥ” and “Ānandānidiḥ” makes the whole stanza yield the sense given above.
5. Op. Cit. 31 to 33; First edition 33 to 34.
maḍideva is found to end at Sarga 43. But from that circumstance alone no inference as to the genuineness or otherwise of the Sarga in question can be drawn because that of Ātmasukha is found to end even with the 13th Sarga. But there is another more weighty circumstance also pointing to an adverse conclusion and that is that Mummaḍideva has, in the commencement of his commentary on each of the latter 3 chapters, mentioned the number and names of the Ākhyanās (episodes) therein, that there is invariably one Sarga to each Ākhyaṇa,¹ that in his introductory remarks before his commentary on the Nirvāṇa-prakaraṇa he says that it contains 15 episodes, namely, those of Bhuṣuṇḍa, Devapūjā, Bilvaphala, Śīlā, Arjuna, Satarudra, Vetiṇa, Bhagīratha, Śikhidhvaja comprising three subsidiary ones of Kīrāta, Cintāmaṇi and Gaja, Kaca, Mithyā (-puruṣa), Bhṛugī, Ikṣvāku, Vrādhha, and the Bhūmikās, that consequently there must according to him be not more than 15 Sargas in that Chapter and as upto the end of the 5th Chapter there are 28 Sargas only according to all available evidence, the Nirvāṇa-prakaraṇa as composed by the author must, according to Mummaḍideva, be ending at the 43rd Sarga. If that was so, there could not be a 44th Sarga in this work as composed of 35 or even 31 stanzas, known to Mummaḍideva. If he had known of any such, he would have said in the above introductory remarks that the Nirvāṇa-prakaraṇa had 16 episodes. True, “Sastraṃgraṇa-phalanirdesāḥ”, which is the title of that Sarga found in the printed editions only, is not an episode strictly so-called. But in the first place this title is not found in the Devanāgarī Ms. of A.D. 1600 at Baroda or in the palm-leaf Mss. at Adyar or in the Devanāgarī Ms. of 1683 at Baroda, though an additional Sarga without number is there. Secondly, that is not a valid reason for negativating the above view because though the titles of the last Sargas of the Upaśama and the Nirvāṇa are “Jīvanmuktasya ākāśa-gamanādyabhamvah” (Non-migration of the Soul of the Jīvanmukta to the Sky &c) and “Yogasaptabhūmikā” (seven Stages of Yoga) respectively, which two are not episodes strictly so-called, they are included in the category of Ākhyanās in the said two chapters by the commentator. I therefore feel myself on solid ground in recording a conclusion that he did not know of the existence of any Sarga after the 43rd, composed by Gauḍa Abhinanda, whether as containing 35 or 31 stanzas. That circumstance would have been sufficient to justify a finding that the work as composed by Gauḍa Abhinanda must have ended at the 43rd Sarga, had there been as usual a closing remark at the end of this commentary on that Sarga. But there is none such. Moreover Mummadideva, son of Allādasūri, or Allālasūri, appears from his name to be a South Indian. It is possible also that there was a very wide gap of some centuries between his time and that of Gauḍa Abhinanda. For these two reasons it seems possible that this commentator may not have come by a complete Ms. of the work when he wrote his commentary thereon, and if that was so, it is easily intelligible why his commentary though not extending beyond the 43rd Sarga, does not contain a closing remark at the end of the

colophon to it. The problem before us cannot therefore be satisfactorily solved until a fairly large number of old Mss. is critically examined, which I now proceed to do.

1 (c). Contents of the Mss. of the Work and the Commentaries thereon.

10. Amongst those which have been so examined, there is one in the Devanāgarī character at the Sanskrit Library, Baroda, namely No. l.c. 10561, which contains the whole of the 44th Sarga consisting of 35 stanzas exactly as in the first printed edition. It bears the date Phālguna Śuddha 8th, Saturday, of the year Saṁvat 1739 (A.D. 1638). This no doubt bespeaks a high antiquity for the belief that the work did contain the Sarga in that form. As against that however there are two palm-leaf Mss. in the Grantha character at the same library, namely Nos. l.c. 6394 and 9809, which are apparently complete and yet stop at the 43rd Sarga, where the commentary of Mummaḍideva ends. Between these two extremes there are two other groups of Mss., one of which contains only the first four stanzas after the 43rd Sarga and the other only the subsequent 31. In the first fall Mss. Nos. 280–1892–95, 177/1884–87 and 72/1882–83 in the Devanāgarī character at the Government Mss. Library at the B. O. R. I., Poona. The first two are complete so far as the Nirvāṇa-prakaraṇa is concerned and while the former of them is dated Saṁvat 1661 (A.D. 1605) the latter is dated Śaka 1596 (A.D. 1674). The last does not bear any date and has in it the commentary of Mummaḍideva on the last three chapters tacked on to that of Atmasukha on the first three, as in the printed editions. Independently therefore it is not of much value but it does serve to corroborate the testimony afforded by the first two Mss. which bear definite dates and contain the same commentary on the Nirvāṇa-prakaraṇa. Here then we have Mss. which point to the conclusion that between the years 1605 and 1674 there prevailed a belief that there were the first four stanzas known to some students of the work as attributed to Gauḍa Abhinanda but not as forming part of or constituting an additional Sarga. In the second group fall three Mss. namely No. l.c. 12810 in the Devanāgarī character at Baroda and Nos. 40 H. 18 and 30 B. 2 at the Theosophical Society’s Library at Adyar, Madras, the first in the Grantha and the second in the Telugu character. The dates of the two latter are unknown but they are on palm-leaves while that of the first is definitely Saṁvat 1656 (A.D. 1600). Although we may not believe that a palm-leaf Ms. must necessarily be older than A.D. 1600, although it is so in the case of Jain Mss. in Gujarāt, the latest available palm-leaf Ms. being of Saṁvat 1498 (A.D. 1441-42), according to the Praśāstisāṅgraha, p. 2 in Gujarati of the Appendix thereto, the said two palm-leaf Mss. can be availed of for supporting the conclusion pointed at by the Baroda Ms., which is that ever since A.D. 1600

---

1. Ms. No. 9465 at the Tanjore Sanskrit Library noticed in the Tanjore New Catalogue by P. P. S. SASTRI also seems to be in the same category as it is stated to end with the 43rd Sarga.

there were students of the work who had reason to believe that the work did contain an additional Sarga though not commented upon by Mummađideva and that it had, to their knowledge, been made up of the subsequent 31 stanzas introduced by the remark "Vālmikiruvāca." That reason can be no other than the existence in their time of older Mss. of the work containing the said stanzas either arranged exactly as they appear in the first printed edition or in a scattered condition like the first 4 stanzas.

1 (d). Possible Inferences.

11. One result then of this scrutiny of the available Mss. is that ever since A.D. 1600 and most probably also since a date earlier than that there prevailed a belief that besides the 43 Sargas known to and commented upon by Mummađideva, the work did contain one additional Sarga at least and that it was the one relating to the statement of the fruit of studying the teaching of Vasiṣṭha to Rāma supported by that of a tradition as to the divine origin of that teaching and as to its having been put in the form of a treatise in his own language by the sage Vālmiki and by that of another as to how the said treatise had found its way into Kāśmir. Another result thereof is that acting on that belief the scribes of those Mss. had made attempts to find out the whole of the contents thereof but some had not succeeded in getting any of the stanzas contained therein, some had got the first four only and others the subsequent thirty-one in groups of 5 to 16, 17 to 19 and 20 to 35, some of those who followed the latter put all the thirty-one stanzas together and some of them even assigned the number 44 to the Sarga made up of them and lastly, one coming after those of the two later groups collected together the two groups of stanzas and put the first immediately above the second without giving any thought to the question whether it could or could not have been there in the text as originally composed by the author. But what can be the reason for the existence of such fragments of that Sarga in the old Mss.?

12. One possibility is that the commentator Ātmasukha who, from his name and his Guru’s name and from the fact of his having referred to the temple of Viśvanātha at Benares,1 appears to be a North Indian Sannyāsī may have composed the first four stanzas which are found only in some of the Mss. in the Devanāgarī character and may have appended them to his commentary in order to wipe off the blame attached to the work by some of his contemporaries and that Mummađideva, who from his name and that of his father appears to be a South Indian householder, may have composed the subsequent 31 stanzas in order to glorify the work of a Kāśmirī Pandit on which he had exerted his brain. This possibly however does not deserve a serious consideration because so far as the first four stanzas are concerned, if Ātmasukha may have composed and appended them to his commentary, the whole of that commentary to which they may have been appended should have been

---

1. Introductory stanzas 3 and 4 at the commencement of his commentary on the work, at p. 1 of the N. S. P. edition, 1937.
available in a Ms. form but as a matter of fact not only in the printed editions but also in Ms. No. 10561 at Baroda, which is dated Sarñvat 1739 (A.D. 1683) and in No. 72 of 1882-83 at Poona, which does not bear any date, this commentary is to be found upto the end of the third chapter only. In Mss. No. 2157-59 at Jammu even that on the third chapter is incomplete. Mummaḍideva too, who was a South Indian householder, can be the least expected to have composed the subsequent 31 stanzas because they contain a statement of a tradition as to how the big Yogavāsiśtha had found its way into Kāśmīr and because all those stanzas do not seem to form a compact group though 20 to 35 thereout do.

13. A second possibility is that the scribes of the old Mss. themselves may have composed and appended the two groups of stanzas to the copies of older Mss. made by them. This too does not deserve much consideration because the nature of the contents thereof above-stated and the poetic flavour present in the first four and some of the other 31 exclude it.

14. A third possibility is that those old scribes may have copied them out as they may have found them in still older Mss. although they may not have believed them to form parts of the work of Gauḍa Abhinanda, because of their anxiety to preserve them from oblivion. That the scribes in those days were in the habit of doing so is apparent from Ms. No. IC. 6394 at Baroda which after the colophon to the 43rd Sarga contains certain stanzas which, on a comparison, are found to have been taken from the VairāgyapraKarana of the Brhat Yogavāsiśtha. That is also a fact generally well-known to scholars who have studied Pothis which contain copies of one or more complete works and fragments of others, a typical example of which fresh in my memory is that of Ms. No. 8771 at the S. P. P. Library, Srinagar, to which I had drawn the attention of scholars in my article on “Ms. No. 623 Vishram (i) at the B. O. R. I. Poona” published in the NIA for October 1938 at pp. 460-62, which contain some stanzas covering one folio-page even after the 14 Khila-sargas following the end of the Nirvāṇa-prakarana. That possibility too is however excluded in this case because the subject-matters of the stanzas show that the scribes of the old Mss. must have copied whichever of these stanzas they had found in still older Mss. for the sake of rescuing them from oblivion, not because though they believed that they were unconnected with the work but deserved to be rescued but because they believed that they were valuable fragments of a lost portion of the work as originally composed by Gauḍa Abhinanda himself and that therefore they particularly deserved to be rescued for the benefit of posterity.

I (e). Conclusion.

15. Was this belief correct is therefore the question to which I address myself last. After a mature consideration I have come to the conclusion that it was. True, we cannot believe that Gauḍa Abhinanda, who has been acclaimed in most of the colophons to this work as not only a sound philosopher but also as an eminent poet and who has been acknowledged
as such by his contemporaries and successors mentioned in my said article in the *Poona Orientalist* for April 1938, could have been so illogical and devoid of a sense of propriety as to have composed and arranged the 35 stanzas in the way in which they are found in the two printed editions and the Baroda Ms. of A.D. 1683, or even the subsequent 31 stanzas in the way in which they are found in the Baroda Ms. of A.D. 1600 and the two palm-leaf Mss. at Adyar, Madras. A more plausible conclusion therefore is that he must have composed not one Sarga containing either the 35 or the 31 stanzas but must have composed three Sargas after the account of the philosophical discourse was over and that the 35 stanzas now available consist of three groups preserved out of a larger number of those contained in them. This conclusion is supported by the fact that Atmasukha having stated in his introductory remark that this work contained 6000 stanzas and the total of those in the first 43 and even the three additional ones occurring in the printed editions, being 5013 only, there is a possibility of some stanzas having been completely lost. Another fact supporting it is that the first printed edition gives the number 48 as that of the last Sarga of the work, presumably on the strength of an old Ms. and that number would be made up if after the 43rd there are 5 additional Sargas instead of 3 as in the printed editions. Now, if these stanzas are fragments of three such Sargas it remains to be ascertained which the remaining two could be.

2 (a). *Contents of the Other Two Additional Sargas.*

16. As to the 43rd Sarga which relates to the statement of the seven stages of Yoga contains extracts from Sarga 126 of the Nirvāṇapārvardha of the *Bṛhat Yogavāsishtha* right up to its end. Therefore, if in the time of Gauḍa Abhinanda there was an earlier recension of that work which contained beyond that Sarga only two more i.e. the 127th and 128th Sargas of that half of the Nirvāṇa, as appears to be the case from several other data mentioned in my said previous articles on the date of that work, there could not be more than two Sargas even in the *Laghu Yogavāsishtha* between the 43rd and the three Sargas of which the stanzas above-considered formed parts. A comparison of the contents of the Sargas entitled "Bharadvājānuśāsanam" and "Śrī Vasiṣṭha-Rāmacandrasaṁvādaḥ," printed last in the N. S. P. editions with those of the said two Sargas in the original work shows beyond the possibility of a doubt that Gauḍa Abhinanda must have compressed those very Sargas of the original work as found in the recension before him into those two Sargas of his abridgment because VI|1. 127. 1 of the former corresponds with a slight variation in readings with VI. 45. 1 of the latter, some of the following stanzas in both e.g. nos. 11, 13, 15, 20, 27, 28, 30, 31, 35, 38, 39, 46 and 52 are word-to-word the same in both, the others with the exception of no. 48 in the latter also correspond to certain stanzas in the former with some variations and the second line of no. 58 in both is the same and similarly although VI. 46. 1 to 5 of the *Laghu* correspond to VI|1. 127. 59 to 63 of the *Bṛhat*.
extracts from Sarga 128. I onwards of the latter immediately follow in the *Laghu*, nos. 46 to 54 in the former are word-to-word the same as nos. 55 to 63 in the latter, the same is the case with nos. 58, 68, 70, 75, and 78 to 82 in the former, the corresponding stanzas in the latter being nos. 67, 95, 97, 103 and 106 to 110 and all the others too in the former have corresponding stanzas in the latter with some variations right up to the last, namely no. 111, the only stanza in the former not found to have a corresponding one in the latter being no. 84, which says that “In this Vāsiṣṭha there are six chapters named respectively Vairāgya, Mumukṣu-vyavahāra, Utpatti, Sthiti, Upaśama and Nirvāṇa.” I therefore feel convinced that there must be these two Sargas only between the 43rd and that the contents whereof have been discussed above.

2 (b). *Manuscript Evidence as to Their Genuineness.*

17. But it is a point for consideration whether there is a sufficient ground for including even these two Sargas in a critical edition of the work because besides the printed editions they are as yet found in only one Ms. namely No. IC. 12810 at Baroda out of those which I have examined or got examined for myself by kind friends and because even in the latter they are found copied out after the remark that the work ends there, which follows the Sarga above-considered in which there are the subsequent 31 stanzas. I have considered it and come to the conclusion that they are entitled to a place in a critical edition of the work because we cannot believe that Gauḍa Abhinanda could have been so forgetful or wanting in a sense of propriety as to omit to draw extracts from the Sargas in which the introductory episodes had been appropriately wound up and because even though these Sargas of the *Laghu* are found in one Ms. only besides the printed editions, that is the oldest dated Ms. yet found and on a comparison with the first 43 Sargas, they seem to have been made up of extracts drawn on the same lines as the others.

IV. **FINAL CONCLUSION AND SUGGESTION OF LINES FOR THE PREPARATION OF A REVISED EDITION OF THE TEXT**

18. Thus on a careful consideration of the contents of the two printed editions of the work, the commentaries of two commentators so far as they are available and more than one dozen Ms., 6 out of which are palm-leaf Ms. and four of the paper Ms. out of which are of dates ranging from A.D. 1600 to 1683, I have been of opinion that if any Research Institute or Society of Oriental Scholars or any University having an Oriental Research Branch or any enterprising firm of cultured publishers or any such individual publishers agrees with me in the view that even works like this in which the philosophical element preponderates, deserve to be re-edited on collecting and collating all the available Ms., with suitable foot-notes as to other *variae lectiones* and an Introduction setting forth the facts as to how the various Ms. had been acquired and dealt with and how the results embodied in the edition had been arrived at and in another a summary of the teaching contained in the work,
the contribution which it had, in the opinion of the editor, made to the development of religious or philosophical thought in India and the place which should consequently be assigned to it in a History of Indian Philosophy, and includes this work in the programme of the works\(^1\) to be so re-edited, I would recommend the adoption of the following lines for the revision of the text of the \textit{Laghu Yogavāsiṣṭha} namely:—

1. The Vairāgya, Mumukṣu, Utpatti, Sthiti and Upaśama Prakaraṇas should be re-printed as they are in the N. S. P. edition 1937, subject to such minor alterations in stanzas and colophons as a collation of the Mss. may seem to justify, with comparative foot-notes as to readings but the Sargas therein should be re-numbered as Nos. 1 to 3, 4, 5 to 13, 14 to 18 and 19 to 28 respectively, as they are found to have been so numbered in all Mss. without exception.

2. Sargas 1 to 15 of the Nirvāṇa-prakaraṇa should be similarly revised and re-printed but the numbers thereof should be altered into 29 to 43.

3. Sargas 17 and 18 as they are in the said printed edition should also be similarly revised and re-printed immediately after No. 43 with the relevant colophons and assigned the numbers 44 and 45 and a note should be added at the end of the latter, agreeably to the contents of stanza 84 therein, that the extracts from the original \textit{Yogavāsiṣṭha} ended there.

4. Thereafter should be re-printed stanzas 5 to 15 and 17 to 19 re-arranged as follows:—

\begin{quote}

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>पद्वारिष्ट्वा</th>
<th>सर्ग: 1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>वाल्मीकिहरू</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>इत्युत्सनामः मुनाः दिवसे श्रद्धाम</td>
<td>सार्वतनासतविधेवं दत्तमिनो श्रद्धाम</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>स्मार्त तद् सम्मुनिप्रणवितस्तामाबम्</td>
<td>इत्यमालक्ष्ये च रविकरौर्ख्यसहायमां</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>अयादुधि सति दिवसानिविद्धं सर्गिर्गम</td>
<td>गोङिन्द्र मन्त्रलुमिनता सह रामचित्र</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>हितम भक्तममोमोग्नधवलस्त्रे</td>
<td>निवर्ततवारिष्टविवरणत्वपूर्ण: 2 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
\end{quote}

1. \textit{The Bhrat Yogavāsiṣṭha} also deserves to be so re-edited in view of the observations made by me in my three papers above-referred to. I have also called attention to the necessity of settling the text of the \textit{Pañcadaśi} in a paper on the “Problems of Pañcadaśi” published in the Annals of the B. O. R. I. Vol. XIX Pt. III. The \textit{Rāmāyaṇa} of Vālmiki and the \textit{Bhāgavata Purāṇa} are two other such works which stand in need of revision for several reasons.

2. Vide foot-note 1 at p. 702 \textit{supra}. 
तस्मान्ये कल्पतत्यमुनि
प्रसूतसंस्थ्य पपति श्रवित: ।
संतुष्टगीर्भज्ञानमुनि
मुक्तकालदर्शिताप्रपूणाः ॥ ३ ॥

प्रबुद्धेनाथ रामेन्द्र संपूर्वयामिन्तो मुह: ।
माधविन्दुसमेतेन प्रणामयामिहितो मुलि: ॥ ४ ॥

व्यासाद्वृजो भगवान्तः संरथयिमदं मन: ।
विष्णुर श्रीसां शान्तं संजातमविकारे मे ॥ ५ ॥

स्वर्गात्लं परम: संर्वदेवदाहितो मुह: ।
मोहाध्याकविवास: संर्वतेभ्यं श्वासमिति ॥ ६ ॥

तत्तत्त्वात्सी मुनिना रामायण समस्तित: ।
अधुम्मयामात: देवा: आहुर श्रकटीहिता: ॥ ७ ॥

यथा वर्षंब्रमधुरविधयमयास्सर्वौरागत: ।
रामेन्द्र प्रणात्वेदमुख: संतुष्टमानसा: ॥ ८ ॥

भुद्दामा माहित्वित्व ज्ञानमेतमहेऽदयम् ।
अंग्लेकयमेहतिर्भव: भवन्ती प्रणात्वेदमयम् ॥ ९ ॥

भवहृत्वं स्वास्य भवतत्व महाद्वमन: ।
मिथ्यं संवादमहि ज्ञानमेतमहेऽदयम् ॥ १० ॥

अस्ततयं स्वयं विषुमान्तुपो रामनामस्य ।
शिशुं संसारमात्सर्वस्मयम्याणेन वैपिति: ॥ ११ ॥

× × × ×
× × × ×

अष्ट स्वार्मिक कार्यां क्षतरत्वो गतवधात: ।
निमोमो निमो रामो निममो जनको यथा ॥

श्रीमुं विनिर्वीणे स्वधीने नामामुज्ञानः ।
तथास्य राज्यभूमिः न चेतो राज्यतेऽवांमयम् ॥

1. These are stanzas nos. 5 to 7 in the printed editions.
2. These are stanzas 9 to 15 in the said editions.
3. This is stanza 8 therein.
4. These lines of crosses indicate that some stanzas are believed to have been originally in existence but are now missing. It is for that very reason that the subsequent stanzas have been left unnumbered.
नात्य भूतितो भातिच्युत भवमोक्षिनः।
यथा जान्तिक्षमाधिक्षकतांसहस्रेः।१

× × × ×
× × × ²

इति श्रीकृष्णगीतिरस्तिः। यात्रायं महामहोपाध्यायोऽर्थाद्विविष्णुस्वरूपार्धिवासित्र्य-रामायणमोक्षोपसापसारोऽवेदम्। देवप्रकटायरुपयायम्। नाम पृथ्विज्ञाताऴरुपयायम्। सर्गस्य लघःं। सर्वस्य लघः। सर्वस्य लघः। सर्वस्य लघः।

5. Next to it should be printed the following fragment of Sarga 47 that is available, namely :

सत्तचत्तवारिदा: सर्गः।

× × × ³

तत् सिद्धायोऽक्षमायं दृष्टिवेद्विद्वारातितमः।
कालीराजमणंसति सम्बुतानमुक्तम्। ॥

× × × ³

× × × ³

× × × ³

× × × ³

प्रभृत्यै पृथप: सृष्टि यत्कालसाधतानम्।
बादी वाम्मी कविवायों रामानंदि सृष्टित चुजः। ॥

निन्द्विति ये हरिहरांप्रकाशुपालिचि
स्थच्छन्दस्वरणसचित्वालचित्तायाः। ॥

निन्द्विति ते जलनिधि वाहिश्रविपन्नते
स्त्रां समातवतोपि तराजः॥

मन्त्रमयवृद्धिपिं द्विजराजमेक-मथापि नैव जलविश्रविमलीकृति।
स्मुद्रेष्यनं हरिहरां। कुपायुक्तस्य
प्रवाहमितविपहुमपि द्विजानाम्। ॥

1. These are stanzas 17 to 19 in the first edition. The last has been omitted from the second.
2. Vide foot-note 4 supra.
4. Vide foot-note 5 at p. 702 supra. This is stanza 16 in the said editions.
5. Vide foot-note 4 at p. 711 supra.
6. Vide foot-note 1 at p. 701 supra.
6. Lastly, the revised stanzas 20-35 should be reprinted in the following order which is the same as that in which they are found in the first printed edition and should be renumbered as follows:—

अष्टग्रांतिः: सर्गः: ।
शाल्य तिढः विचाराः वे सर्वाः: सत्त्वाः: सतस्वधाराः: ।
तेषाम् तथा। मनान्मकर्षण्य महाभाषणक वेच्छा ।
सर्वाः सर्वाः सर्वाः सर्वाः सर्वाः सर्वाः सर्वाः सर्वाः ।
सर्वाः सर्वाः सर्वाः सर्वाः सर्वाः सर्वाः सर्वाः सर्वाः ।
हृदयस्मानममनामसाधृणां महाभाषाः ।
निन्दकानामिदं शाल्यं रहस्यं न प्रकाश्येत् ।
पूर्व नाराधितो चैन भवानिन्दुकेवरत: ।
हरित्रेष्वा रविवापि न लभेदमधुतः ।
महास्थ्रेष्ठं यत्रसङ् वेच्छा वेच्छा विष्णुः ।
सुन्दरीं नायोदीं नायोदीं तत्वां ज्ञानसाधारं ।
महास्थ्रेष्ठं यत्रसङ् वेच्छा वेच्छा विष्णुः ।
सम्मतपि विचारेण क्षमायाति दुःखातः ।

1. These are stanzas 1 to 4 in the said editions.
2. Vide foot-note 4 at p. 711 supra.
3. The second distich of the first line of this stanza in the printed editions reads:—"Matiścedasti vaḥ śubhā." The word "vaḥ" therein which would be equivalent to "yusmākam" does not seem to fit in in the context. I therefore prefer to read "vai" in its place. Similarly the first word of the third distich there is "tadi-dāriṃ." Thereout 'tat' is not the correlative of 'cet' in the first line. I therefore prefer to read "tadedārīṃ" which is made up of "tadā" "idam" out of which the first is the correct correlative of "yadā" = "cet."
This re-arrangement is tentative only. It may have to be revised again if any fresh materials justifying its revision may come to light in the meanwhile. It is also possible that even without such materials some other re-arrangement may suggest itself to some other student of the work. I invite such suggestions and will be very glad to re-consider the above in their light.

**Closing Remarks.**

19. It has already been stated that it has so far been discovered that this work had been commented upon by two persons, Ātmasukha, pupil of Uttamasukha, a North Indian Sannyāsin and Mummaḍideva, son of Allāda-sūri or Allālasūri, a South Indian householder and that *Vāsiṣṭhacandrikā*,
the commentary of the first, has yet been found up to the end of the Utpatti-prakarana, Sargas 1 to 13, only and Samsāratarani, that of the second, up to the end of the 43rd Sarga in the Nirvāna-prakarana. It has been ascertained from several data that the latter did not extend beyond that Sarga even as originally composed. It is possible that a complete Ms. of the former may yet be found. From a list of Mss. kindly supplied to me by Dr. V. Raghavan of the Madras University, I also find that there is a Ms. of a third commentary on this work by another South Indian Sannyāsin named Rāmendrayamin at Adyar, Madras and probably another copy of the same at the Government Oriental Mss. Library, at Madras, as the name of its author given in the list is Rāmabrahmendra Yogin, disciple of Upendra Yogin. I have yet to gather sufficient information about him. It also appears on a study of the fragment of Ātmasukha’s commentary which has been published that he was aware of the existence of at least one previous commentator. As regards his own date I have been able to ascertain so far only this much that he cannot have flourished earlier than the middle of the 11th Century A.D., as he has quoted Kṣīrasvāmin, the author of Amarakośodghatana, the earliest known commentary on the Amarakośa, several times and that commentator has been ascertained to have flourished not earlier than the above period. But Ātmasukha has also quoted several other named and unnamed writers. I have yet to ascertain whether any of them is later than Kṣīrasvāmin and if so, how much, so that the terminus ad quem of his own date can be brought down as nearer as possible to A.D. 1683, the date of Ms. No. IC. 10561 at Baroda, which is the earliest Ms. containing his commentary on the first three chapters which I have yet come to know of. Lastly, I have also to ascertain as accurately as possible how much earlier than A.D. 1605, the date of Ms. No. 280 of 1892-95 at Poona, Mummaļideva, palm-leaf Mss. of whose commentary are available in abundance in the Grantha and Telugu characters, could have flourished. For these reasons I cannot offer any suggestions at present as to how to print any commentary below the text. Looking to the title of this article, it would also be beyond its scope to do so. I therefore reserve my full observations with regard to the commentaries on the work and my suggestions as to how to print one or more of them, for a subsequent article.

1. N. S. P. edition, 1937 Pp. 98, 120, 129, 136, 270 and 273 where there are quotations in verse and prose explaining some of the technical terms occurring in the text. Vide also p. 78 where there is a mention of another way of construing the stanza II. 1. 11 which is said to have been adopted by “kecit” (some).
2. Introduction to Kalpadrukośa (G. O. Series No. XLII) p. XVIII.
TWO MALAYALAM PHONEMES

By
L. V. RAMASWAMI AIYAR

I

The "spread-contact" dental nasal and the "point-contact" alveolar nasal are two different phonemes in Malayalam and in Old Tamil. Modern Tamil (both when it is spoken and when old texts are read) does not have this phonemic difference, since the value given for the sounds is (except in the group \( \tilde{n}d \) where the "spread-contact" value is preserved for the nasal on account of the \( d \) following) that of a "point contact" alveolar \( n \), though correct writing distinguishes the symbols for \( \tilde{n} \) and \( n \). In Kannada and in Telugu, neither the linguistic tradition nor the modern colloquial evaluation recognizes any such phonemic difference; and in both these languages the value given for what is called the \textit{dantya} \( n \) is that of a "point-contact" pre-alveolar or alveolar, except in the groups \( \tilde{h}th, \tilde{n}d, \tilde{h}dh \) where the \( \tilde{h} \) may be regarded as a subsidiary member of the phoneme \( n \). Among non-literary Dravidian speeches, Tulu (spoken in its native habitat, viz., South Canara) resembles in this respect Kannada and Telugu. Nor does any of the other non-literary Dravidian speeches evidence the phonemic difference, so far as one can judge from the available accounts of the sounds of these speeches.

II

The "spread-contact" dental of Malayalam is produced by the spreading of the tip of the tongue (and the portion of the blade, immediately behind the tip) on the upper teeth and the roots of the teeth (Fig. 1).

The "point-contact" \( n \) is produced by the contact of a considerably reduced area of the tip or the blade of the tongue on the alveolar region. (Fig. 2).

The fundamental difference between \( \tilde{n} \) and \( n \) both in phonation and in acoustic appeal is due to the "spread-contact" phonation of the former.

1. The symbols used in this paper for the transliteration of unique Tam.-Mal. sounds are the following:—
   \( \tilde{n} \) the "spread-contact" dental nasal.
   \( n \) the "point-contact" alveolar nasal.
   \( \tilde{t}, \tilde{d} \) the "point-contact" alveolar plosives.
   \( \tilde{t} \) the palato-cerebral trill.
   \( \tilde{l} \) the voiced retroflex continuant.
   \( \mu \) the lip-normal back, closed vowel.
   \( n \) is transliterated in this essay without any diacritic mark whatsoever, in illustrations or forms taken from languages in which there is no phonemic difference between \( \tilde{n} \) and \( n \).
and the considerably reduced area of occlusion in the production of the latter.

Thus in the sound-stock of Malayālam there are two distinct series of homorganic sounds:—
1. The "spread-contact" plosives $t$ (voiceless), $d$ (voiced) and the "spread-contact" $n$ (homorganic with $t$ and $d$).
2. The "point-contact" stops $t$ (voiceless), $d$ (voiced) and the corresponding nasal $n$.

---

**Fig. 1.**
"Spread-contact" denti-alveolar

**Fig. 2.**
"Point-contact" alveolar.

---

III

The following pairs of words would illustrate the phonemic difference between the sounds under reference.

**MALAYĀLAM**

$tahē$ ‘even by (or after) having given’.
$tanē$ ‘alone’, ‘even self’.
$eṁē$ ‘even thus’, ‘even so’, etc.
$ennē$ ‘me’ (accusative, with final vowel lengthened on account of semantic emphasis)
$eṁēl$ ‘but’, etc.
$ennēl$ ‘by me’.
$munēl$ ‘three days’.
$munnēl$ ‘chief person’.
$tinnēn$ (Old Mal.) ‘he ate’.
$tinnēn$ ‘for eating’.
$mahhan$ (from IA manda) ‘dull-witted fellow’.
$mahhan$ ‘ruler’, ‘king’.
$mānhyam$ (from OIA māndya) ‘sluggishness’
$mānnyam$ (from OIA mānya) ‘land exempt from tax, given as a mark of honour’.
OLD TAMIL

ainiy ‘that dog’.
ainiy

enilam ‘which land’.
enilam ‘my land’.

Though doubled or long sounds alone are involved here, one cannot refuse to give recognition to the phonemic difference, since it is the difference in the phonation of the sounds concerned that determines the meaning.

Again, it may be noted that the phonemic difference is revealed in forms affected by sandhi (external and internal). Within the so-called “pure” bases, verbal and nominal, the sounds ī and ū occur (in Old Tam. and in Mal.) only in clearly marked-off contexts. In Old Tam., ī occurs in initial positions, as an absolute final in two old words poruṇ and verin, and medially in the group īd; while ū occurs as an absolute final, medially as a short and a doubled or long sound, and in the group ūd. In Mal., owing to the evolution of forms, there are a few variations: poruṇ and verin of Old Tam. are non-existent; the old groups ūd and īd changed to ḫī. Apart from these variations, the rules of Old Tamil regarding the contexts in which ī and ū occur, hold good for Mal. also.

IV

1. Tolkāppiyam, the Old Tam. grammar, marks off the difference between ī and ū in unequivocal terms:—

aṇṇhaṇaṁiyā paṇṇmudāṇmaruṇingānuṇiparaṇdu meyyuraṇoṭṭa-t-lām inidu pirakkum ta-gāra na-gāram. (Tolkāppiyam, Eluttadigāram, 93).

“When the terminal portion of the tongue, after being spread out, comes in full contact with the upper portion of the (upper) teeth adjoining the aṇṇam¹, the sounds t and ī are produced.”

aṇṇar iṇṇiṇā-v-ṇṇamottā rahabānakāṇīy iraṇṇum pirakkum. (Tol. El., 94)

“When the terminal portion of the tongue is raised and made to touch the aṇṇam, then t (r) and ū are produced”.

The expression iṇṇuṇi paraṇdu in the description of ī makes the chief difference between the two sounds sufficiently clear.

2. Colloquial forms in Middle Tam. inscriptions show indiscriminate interchange of ī and ū:—

(i) ī instead of the correct ū in instances like the following:—vaṇigaṇ and kērālaḥ [SII, I, p. 90]; ippoṇ and eludinēṇ [ib., I, p. 116], eh makkal [ib., I, p. 113], etc.
(ii) ū instead of the correct ī:—vāluḷakku [ib., I, p. 113], inda [ib., I, p. 92], iṇṇoṇaṇār [ib., I, p. 92]; etc.

¹. The word aṇṇam in Tamil grammars covers the entire region on the mouth-roof extending from the tooth-flesh to the soft palate.
So numerous are the instances of such a "confused" mixing-up of \(n\) and \(\tilde{n}\) in the Middle Tam. colloquial forms that one can safely infer that in the colloquials the difference between the two sounds had become obliterated.—In literary writings, however, the traditional differentiation of symbols has always been kept up.

3. On the other hand, in Malayālam, though the Ārya eḻuttu used only one symbol for denoting \(n\) and \(\tilde{n}\), the difference in the sound-values was never lost sight of.

3. The old commentary in the fourteenth-century grammar Līlātīlakām gives accurate descriptions of the two sounds and emphasises what in modern linguistic terminology may be called the phonemic difference between them:—

\[\text{Bhāṣāyāmimāvarthabhēdakau, yatā́ "kāṛga ṇāvīl" "kān kuṇāvīl" ityādi . . . . tasmād bhāṣāyām anayorarthabhēdassiddaḥ.}\]

\[\text{Sthānābhedopysti—ṅakāraṣya dantaḥ sthānam—karaṇam tu jihvāya vistāraḥ—ṅakāraṣya mūrdhā—tatra jihvāgrasyōṇnatiḥ—sanskṛte ētam bhēdamaprayōjakıkṛtya dantuṣahitanāsisīkābhāvatvamēvēktam.}\]

\[\text{athāḥsthitamēdārthabhēdāvāsaṣyāllā-ayōrīva ṇa-ṇayorbhāṣāyām bhēdo-sūṭī.}\]

V

The evaluation of Sanskrit \(n\) in Tamil

To-day, Sanskrit \(n\) is everywhere given the value of the "point-contact" alveolar \(\tilde{n}\) of Tamil in the Tamil country, when Sanskrit texts are read or when Sanskrit words are used:—\(n\)āmaskāra, \(\tilde{n}\)āma, \(n\)iyama, svāpṇa, \(n\)atna, vighna, \(\tilde{n}\)aya, \(\tilde{n}\)umēṣa, \(\tilde{n}\)ayava, prāpṇātī, etc.

Old Tam. adaptations of Sanskrit words generally show (in the Mss. now available) the symbol for \(n\) when the sound occurs initially or in the group \(\tilde{n}d\), and the symbol for \(\tilde{n}\) when the Sanskrit sound occurs in other positions. In other words, the Dravidian principle of the occurrence of \(n\) and \(\tilde{n}\) has been followed in the adaptation of Sanskrit \(n\).

The \(n\) of Sanskrit words used in Middle Tam. inscriptions is represented more or less in the same way as in Old Tamil when Tamil characters or vāṭṭēluttu symbols are used.

When, however, the granthākṣara script is used (for reproducing Sanskrit forms and passages containing sounds for which there are no

1. Modern phoneticians may not completely approve of these two illustrations as bringing out the phonemic difference in view of the fact that in actual utterance there are other differences also:

\(\text{Kānga ūvīl 'see in the tongue';}\)

\(\text{Kān kuṇāvīl 'see in the dream';}\)

The first difference is that while in the former there is a subsidiary accent on the \(\tilde{a}\) of ūvīl, in the latter the subsidiary accent falls also on the \(a\) of kuṇāvīl; further, while in the former the-g-of kānga is completely voiced, the \(k\) of kuṇāvīl in the latter is only partially voiced.

2. The "confusion" between the symbols for \(n\) and \(\tilde{n}\), consequent upon the use of the "point-contact" alveolar value for all \(n\)-sounds (in the colloquials of Middle Tamil), also affects the spelling of the adaptations of Skt. words met with in these inscriptions.
symbols in Tamil script and in vaṭṭeḻuttu), the only symbol for \( n \) which the granthāksara script has and which in shape is the same as that used for Tam. \( h \) is employed in all positions to represent Sanskrit \( n \).

**VI**

The evaluation of Skt. \( n \) in Kērāla.

Though a few divergences exist here, the general principles guiding the differentiation of the two values are (as shown below) fundamentally those regulating the occurrence of \( h \) and \( n \) in Old Tamil.

1. The value of a “spread-contact” \( h \) is given to Skt. \( n \) in the following contexts:
   (i) in the initial positions, as in \( īrāryaṇa, hiyama, īśī, āmāskarā, \) etc.;
   (ii) in the groups \( īt, īth, īd, īdh, \) as in \( āhta, graṅṭha, niṁna, aṅḍha, \) etc.;
   (iii) in all consonant groups in which \( n \) forms the second member (of the group): \( ghn, gn, th, pn, mn, śñ, sñ, \) as in \( vighna, ṅagha, yathā, svapna, niṁna, praśna, śēka \) etc.;
   (iv) in instances involving “composition” or “compounding,” in which the second constituents are felt as “separate entities”:
      (a) all compounds of words and forms in which the second member has initial \( n \), as in \( śrīnヴィṣa \);
      (b) compounds in which the final \( d \) of the first constituent meets the \( n- \) of the second constituent, as in \( tāṅṇayana (tad + īṇana) \) where the value \( īn \) is given for the sandhi-produced group;
      (c) in prefixal “composition” those instances in which the second members (containing initial \( n \)) are felt as separate entities, as in \( upaṅṇayana, amukāsika, āṅṇayana, dūrṇayana, durhimitta, \) etc.;
      (d) \( naṅ \) compounds in which \( a \) is followed by words with initial \( n- \), as in \( āṁti, āṁtiya, \) but not when \( an- \) is followed by the initial vowel of the following word, as in \( anāvaśya, anāḍi, anāvadhi, \) etc.

2. The value of a “point-contact” alveolar \( n \) is given to Skt. \( n \) in the following contexts:
   (i) in internal medial positions whether the sound is short or long, as in \( dāna, anēka, jaṇana, maṇusya, anna, chinna, bhīna \) etc.;
   (ii) in final positions, as in \( rājan, balavān, \) etc.;
   (iii) in groups \( ny, n, nm \) in which \( n \) is the first member, \( nṛyā, anṛyā, anṛyesāna, unṁāda, \) etc.;
   (iv) in those instances (involving prefixal “composition”) in which the second members (containing initial \( n- \)) are not “felt” as separate entities, as in \( vinīsa, saṁṛṣa, unṇati, viṇṇayaka, saṁṛṣaddha, saṁṛṣiṣṭa, aṁṇa \).

Lilātilakam advert to some of these peculiarities of the Kērāla evaluations of Skt. \( n \) through a Skt. couplet cited in the commentary on Sūtra 7 of the second Śilpa of the work:—

\[ \text{nākārasya nākāravāṁ nākārēṇa yutasya ca āhaṇyēṇa yutam tadvat padādau ca sthitam vinā.} \]
Though this couplet does not envisage all the peculiarities pointed out above, it does indicate some of them. The commentary adds the following significant observations also in this connection:

*asya nyāyasya colūśu nyabhicāradarśanāt*,—a statement that goes to show that these Kērala peculiarities were absent at that time in the Tamil evaluation of Skt.

One may roughly state that wherever the Skt. *n* is initial or is felt by the speech-consciousness as having the value of an initial in a separate entity, the “spread-contact” *ṅ* is used; and in other contexts (except in *ḥt*, *ḥth*, *ṅdh* and *ṅd*, of course) the value of a “point-contact” alveolar is given. Analogy and phonetic factors may also have played a prominent part in this process of differentiation.

The rules therefore ultimately resolve themselves into the fundamental principles guiding the evaluation of Skt. *n* in Old Tamil, the variations being local (perhaps owing to the influence of the Nambūdiris, the earliest Āryan settlers in Kērala and the earliest custodians of Āryan learning in this part of India).

*Līlātilakam* adverts to the fact that the peculiarities in the evaluation of Skt. *n* are in no way inherent in Skt: *uṭcāraṇabhēdastu kākatāliyāḥ—ēvaṃvidhavyavahāramūlamēva.*

**VII**

**Sanskrit n**

The phonemic difference¹ pointed out for Mal. and Old Tam. does not exist in Skt. or in any other stage of Indo-Āryan.

The precise character of the production of OIA *n* may have varied with different periods and different speech-areas.

---

1. Such a phonemic difference has also not been recorded for any Indo-European speech, though different varieties (classified according to the regions on the mouth-roof, and the portion of the tongue-blade involved in the contact) exist in different European languages today. **Jespersen (Lehrbuch der Phonetik, p. 34)** has noted the following varieties: what he calls ‘post-dentals,’ produced on the back surface of the upper teeth, occurring in most Romance languages and Slav speeches; varieties, occurring in French, in which one variety is similar to that described above and the other is produced on the region covered by the teeth and the teeth-flesh; a slightly retracted sound occurring in North German and in Dutch, in which the region of articulation is exclusively the teeth-flesh; the English (and South German) alveolars; and the “cacuminals” appearing after *r* in Swedish words.

As for the precise nature of the original Indo-European sound, while Jespersen suggests that “Man greift wohl nicht fein in der Annahme dass diese Aussprache (i.e. the very first variety mentioned above) in unserm ganzen Sprachstamm die ursprüngliche gewesen ist,” **Brugmann (Kurse Vergleichende Grammatik der IG.—Sprachen, p. 34)** finds it difficult to make any suggestion in this direction, as could be inferred from his statement: “In den älteren Sprachen ist die genauere Bestimmung der dentalen Lauten nach diesen drei Unterabteilungen (i.e., interdentals, post-dentals and alveolars) meist sehr schwierig.”
The Skt. grammatical treatises deal generally with the ta-varga as a homorganic group and have (so far as I know) not treated about the sound-value of \( n \) separately. So far as the point of articulation on the mouth-roof is concerned, while Pāṇini describes the group as “dantya”, some of the Prātiṣākhyaṣ (Ṛg-Veda Prātiṣ. and Taittiriya Prātiṣ.) regard the group as dantamūliya”. As for the portion of the tongue involved, the Taittiriya Prātiṣ. and the Śukla Yajuḥ Prātiṣ. refer to the “jihvāgra.” The Adbhūtavēda Prātiṣ. uses the expression “jihvāgram prastirṇam”.

It is difficult to make out from these descriptions whether and how far the varieties of phonation were of the “spread-contact” dental type or of the “point-contact” alveolar type.

The word “dantamūliya” is interpreted by Dr. S. K. Chatterji as meaning “alveolar”, and he makes the following observations regarding the sound-values of the OIA ta-varga at p. 243 of his “Origin and Development of the Bengali Language”:—“\( t, th, d, dh \), according to the evidence of the Prātiṣākhyaṣ, were ‘dantamūliya’ or alveolar sounds (like \( t \) or \( d \) of English) and not interdental (like the Italian sounds) which they are now. \( n, l \) have always retained their alveolar sounds.”

Prof. Wackernagel, on the other hand, objects to the interpretation of the word “dantamūliya” as “alveolar” (Altindische Grammatik, I, p. 177, §152):—... die ai. Dentale, die nach R. Pr., 1, 19 (45), T. Pr., 2, 38, an der Zahnwurzel (dantamūla-) gesprochen wurden, also postdentale Laute waren, heute aber interdental gesprochen werden... Der Ausdruck dantamūliya darf nicht auf alveolare Aussprache gedeutet werden, da R. Pr., 1, 20 vartṣya ‘alveolar’ im Gegensatz von dantamūliya braucht.” It is difficult, however, to find out whether and to what extent vartṣa differed from dantamūla and similarly vartṣa itself from barsva.

I may also observe here that no inference\(^1\) can be drawn regarding the actual sound-value of Skt. \( n \) (i.e. whether it was of the “spread-contact” dental type or of the “point-contact” alveolar type) from the adoption in the south Indian granthāksara script of a symbol for Skt. \( n \) which corresponds (in shape) to the Tamil symbol for the “spread-contact” \( ṇ \), or from the statement of the grammar Naṅpūl (sūtra 150)\(^2\) that \( ṇ \) (along with some other sounds) is peculiar to Tamil, while what is represented by the symbol for \( ṇ \) is common to Tamil and Sanskrit.

---

1. Nor do I attach any value to the view that the Naṃbūḍiris’ evaluation of Skt. \( n \) in the west coast represents one genuine type of OIA pronunciation.

2. The Naṅpūl sūtra runs thus:—ca-yā-la-e-ovum wyirmeyum uyirálaballía-c-cārbum tamiḻ, pira podave.

It has to be noted that long before the time of Naṅpūl, the difference in the sound-values of \( ṇ \) and \( n \) had become obliterated. What is contemplated here is only the symbolic differentiation between what is called tannagaram ‘the \( ṇ \) that goes along with \( t \), and \( r \) (\( ṇ \) a ṇ n garagam ‘the \( n \) that is associated with \( l \) (\( d \)), evaluated as \( l \) to-day when short and intervocal.
I do not think that the precise sound-value of Skt. \( n \) need have been envisaged here. Since the symbol for Tamil \( \hat{n} \) is associated with \( t \), and since the Skt. has also a sound \( n \) in \( ta-varga \), the one has been likened to the other purely from the point of view of association; and since the "point-contact" alveolar \( \eta \) of Tamil is associated with the unique alveolar stop of Tamil, this \( \eta \) has been differentiated as "unique" in Tamil.

VIII

\( n \) in N I A

Hindi, Bengali, Gujerati, Sindhi and Panjabi evaluate \( n \) as a point-contact pre-alveolar or alveolar. I have heard native speakers use only this value for \( n \) (except of course in the groups \( nt, nth, nd, \) and \( ndh \)). Marathi, however, gives a "spread-contact" dental value for \( n \), which value is particularly conspicuous in stressed positions and in the phonation of long or doubled \( nn \), though in medial unstressed positions and finally the value tends to be somewhat that of a "light contact" type.
INScriptions of Kathiawad*

By

D. B. DISkalkar

SOMANATHA PATANA

(Date missing.) [13th cent. A.D.]

(Probably of the first half of the 14th cent. v.s.)

This inscription is engraved on the pedestal of a black marble image built up on the western wall of the Gauri Kunda in Somanatha Patana. The inscribed portion containing very beautiful letters measures 2½" in length and only 3" in breadth.

It is broken in its right hand side so that a portion at the beginning of each line is lost. The year when it was engraved is missing but the other details of the date viz. the month and the day are preserved.

The object of the inscription is not clear. Possibly the temple of a goddess was repaired by Jayata, son of Somasimha. The mention of the names of Gandha Para Brhaspati, his wife Uma-devi, who was the daughter of Gandha Para Virabhadrtra in the third line leads us to believe that the inscription belonged to about the middle of the fourteenth century of the Vikrama era. For Gandha Para Virabhadrtra is mentioned in the Veravala inscription of v.s. 1320 (Prakrit and Sanskrit Inscriptions of Kathiawad, p. 224) and in Nana's first prasasti at Kodinor of the same period (Indian Antiquary, Vol. XI, p. 103, v. 29). Gandha Para Brhaspati and his wife Uma-devi are mentioned in the Somanatha Patana (or Cintra) prasasti of v.s. 1343 (Epigraphia Indica, Vol. I, p. 208 ff.). The Brahm's temple at Puskara mentioned in the record deserves to be specially noted.

Text

1...चेत... 2 तथा भायो महं 3 महं गजसीहुनुः
...रतनमूलिति  सुद्दरसुलुता महं  महं सोमसीह मूर्ति:
चउलादेवीमूलिति:
4 तथा भायो महं 5 नाय आहसुनु 6 तथा भायो नायन-  
साहाय सुलुता महं  नाय तेजपाल वीका ता नाय-  
सीतलदेवीमूलिति:  मूर्ति:  पान मूर्ति:

1 ... बचें चेत सुलिदि २ वृणि आशा शकि (ः) औषुङ्खात गीत्या (ः) चिरकाराराजमा-  
चाससहुः

2 ...... खुत पंडितविजयार्थि:योपिदङ्कल्पीभिन्निपुंसुत्थार्यः मनस्य चिरकालं चिरकारारण-  
प्रसत्त्वाः?

*Continued from p. 696 of Feb. issue.
SOMANATHA PATANA

No. 20 [Date missing.]

This fragmentary inscription, originally found in Somanatha Patana, is now preserved in the Junagadh Museum. The letters are very beautifully and almost correctly engraved. The inscribed portion, as far as this fragment is concerned, measures 13½" in length and 8½" in breadth, but the original stone seems to be about double this preserved one. The left hand portion of the inscription is intact.

Unfortunately the preserved portion of the inscription does not give us much useful information. The names श्रीलोकप्रभाशि, धर्मराशि, and गंगरूपुरस्तिति mentioned in the record show that it is a Lakulisa inscription like the preceding one and can be assigned to about v.s. 1343 to which the abovementioned Cintra prasasti of गंगरूपुरस्तिति belongs. It may even be suggested that the letters घरप्पें preserved in the 26th line of this inscription are a portion of the name घरप्पें of the poet who composed this inscription. In that case he is identical with the poet घरप्पें who composed the Cintra prasasti. The mention of the destruction of the city of Dhara in l. 25 is important. What town is mentioned in l. 2 is not known.

Text

1. ककायं म
2. रुपेविष्मिन श्र
3. वाराश्रिष्टिहैथेनै
4. लावण्यवल्लभेताः राजा
5. तथायत: कुल्हिताभिमित्तवतः ला-साँ-
6. पेन बरसंती पितरेशमिन निन्ने दिने सा बुध
7. सर्वोवाच्यशान्तपानस्वतस्वाभावी श्रीसोमनाधि
8. ब्याह्मित्वजैलोकपराधर्मस्ते धर्मराशिः १५. दुम्ध्यो सो
9. विनाश: दुस्मनानाधिकत ताज्जवराशि । धर्ममी
10. दनोदित्येवं द्वीनाहिन्दवतात्र जराशि धर्ममी
SOMANATHA PATANA

(Date missing.) [13th century.]

No. 21

This inscription is engraved on a large black stone slab built up in the wall of the entrance gate of Somanātha Pādana. Like most other inscriptions of the Cañuluka period it is neatly engraved but a considerable portion of it is deplorably worn out in the middle. The inscribed portion measures $2\,\text{ft}\,8\text{\"} in height and $1\,\text{ft}\,8\text{\"}$ in length.

Owing to its bad state of preservation the record does not give us useful information. Its first three verses are devoted to the praise of the god Śiṣa under the name of Candresvarā. Therī Viṣṇu in his boar incarnation is praised. In the eighth and ninth lines a king is mentioned, whose name is missing, but who seems to have defeated the king of Māylvā. In the thirteenth line an ascetic evidently of the Lakulīsa Pāșupata sect, named Vidyārāśī is mentioned, followed by the description of a matha of Khaṇḍesvara. In the 16th line Oṅkārarāśī and in the 18th line a town named Bhāilavāmi is mentioned. The further two lines record the building of the fort of Vijāpur. The temples of Vaidyanātha, Karkeśvara and Karkeśvarī are next referred to. In the 28th line a fort and in the 29th line a matha is said to have been built. The 30th line records the laying out of a garden. In the 34th line a yearly grant of eight drammas and in the 36th line a yearly grant of sixteen drammas is said to have been made. In the 38th line the ascetic, Oṅkārarāśī,
is again mentioned, and the 40th line records the name of Gaṇḍa Virabhadrā, to whose time the inscription seems to belong. It was composed by a pupil of the poet Satānanda. The 41st and 42nd lines seem to give the date of the inscription, which, however, is lost in the damaged portion.

Gaṇḍa Para Virabhadrā mentioned in this record is the same as is mentioned in an inscription of v.s. 1320 found at Verāl (Indian Antiquary, Vol. IX, p. 241; line 9) and in another inscription of about the same period, found at Kodinar (ibid., p. 103, v. 29) and in No. 19 published above. This inscription can therefore be assigned to the same period.

The god Candresvara praised at the beginning of the inscription was most probably the same whose temple now stands in a ruined condition on the way to Triveni in Somānātha Pātaṇa.

The town Bhāilāsvāmi mentioned in the 17th and 18th lines is no doubt the old name of the modern town Bhilsa in Māḷvā in the possession of H.H. the Maharaja Scindia (see Ann. Rep. Archaeological Survey, W.C. Poona for 1913-14, p. 59.).

Text

1 ॥ न ॥ अः नाम: शिवाय ॥ अम्सता [ छुरले ] माहे आस्त्रापरिवृत्ता तत्वा । मूर्ति गंगा बहुनोस्तु क [ लया ]
2 ॥ ॥ [ ना ] य मुर: शिवः ॥ ॥ कल्याणकुक्रिरकारकेवम्बोदनविकुञ्जकारिता
3 ॥ अपर ह ॥ ॥ ॥ श्रीश्रीश्रीश्रीरंजनराजसुनिबोदनविकुञ्जकारिता
4 ॥ भगवान् ह ॥ ॥ ॥ ॥ कृतविशिष्टजयाः देवताितिरस्तु। ॥ ॥ हा विषय भुव
5 ॥ नेषु ॥ ॥ थे वार्तालयं शिवाय सम्भवते। कृतविशिष्टजयाः देवताितिरस्तु। ॥ ॥ भगवान् ह ॥ ॥
6 ॥ न ॥ ॥ जयति धनवति ॥ ॥ [ विषु ] [ पावान्ति ] [ पुष्पासमु [ सूर्योपासन ] 
7 ॥ मासासाद ॥ ॥ [ विषु ] [ पावान्ति ] [ पुष्पासमु [ सूर्योपासन ] इति
8 ॥ इतस्सुधाराः ॥ ॥ [ वार्तिनिधि ] [ नदनानिरारम् ] [ श्रीमानुप् समाप्ति
9 ॥ [ विषु ] [ पावान्ति ] [ पुष्पासमु [ सूर्योपासन ] इति
10 ॥ श्रीमानुप् समाप्ति [ विषु ] [ पावान्ति ] [ पुष्पासमु [ सूर्योपासन ] इति
11 ॥ [ चिक्रार्म ? ] ॥ ॥ [ वाल्ला ] [ पुरो स्थानवरे विश्वेष्टब्राह्मणो वेदार्थम्
12 ॥ सिद्ध जयन्ति ॥ ॥ यमनिन्यमुयुगे धीमानकारिता
13 ॥ त: ॥ पुष्पासमु [ सूर्योपासन ] इति [ वाल्ला ] [ पुरो स्थानवरे विश्वेष्टब्राह्मणो वेदार्थम्
14 ॥ सिद्ध ॥ ॥ श्रीमानुप् समाप्ति [ चिक्रार्म ? ] [ वाल्ला ] [ पुरो स्थानवरे विश्वेष्टब्राह्मणो वेदार्थम्
15 ॥ मंद ॥ ॥ यमनिन्यमुयुगे धीमानकारिता
16 ॥ द्वाकाराशि ॥ ॥ श्रीमानुप्लावत्तमो श्रीमानुप्लावत्तमो श्रीमानुप्लावत्तमो
17 ॥ कृष्ण ॥ ॥ वाल्ला ॥ ॥ श्रीमानुप्लावत्तमो श्रीमानुप्लावत्तमो श्रीमानुप्लावत्तमो
18 ॥ कृष्ण ॥ ॥ यमनिन्यमुयुगे धीमानकारिता
19 ॥ कृष्ण ॥ ॥ यमनिन्यमुयुगे धीमानकारिता
20 ॥ कृष्ण ॥ ॥ यमनिन्यमुयुगे धीमानकारिता
21 ॥ कृष्ण ॥ ॥ यमनिन्यमुयुगे धीमानकारिता
22 ॥ कृष्ण ॥ ॥ यमनिन्यमुयुगे धीमानकारिता
SOMANÄTHA PÄTÄNA

No. 22]  
(Date missing.)  
[13th century.

This inscription is engraved on a large black stone originally discovered in Somanätha Pätaña but at present preserved in the Watson Museum at Rajkot. The surface of the stone is finely polished and the characters are engraved very carefully and beautifully. A considerable portion of the inscribed stone in its right hand side is broken and lost. In its present condition it measures 1' 2 3/8" by 8 1/4".

No connected information is obtained from this fragment. In its fifth line a RÄTHODÄ family and in the sixth line the holy place DEVAPÄTANA, i.e. Somanätha Pätaña, where the inscription was found are mentioned. The word सिंहनराणि[पति] mentioned in the eighth line evidently refers to the great Caulukya sovereign Siddharåja Jayasimha. The names Sohi, CHODAKA, and VÄČCHIGA occurring in the 9th, 15th and 18th lines respectively are evidently of the members of the family, possibly the Räthoda family, which seems to be described in this inscription.

The name वाच्छिन्न is also mentioned in the inscription No. 19.
SUTRAPADA

No. 23] v.s. 1357. [1301

This inscription is found in the sun temple, now in a bad condition, situated at a short distance to the south of the village Sutrapada in the Pataca Mahal of the Junagadh State. It measures 7" × 9".

It records that (the temple of the sun?) was built by Vayajaladeva Butha in v.s. 1357. This Vayajaladeva was probably a Vaja king of Somanatha Pataca.

Text

1 सं १३५७ वर्षें ।
2 २० वर्षे ।
3 जनवर्ष बुध
4 टाकते वा
5 राणिता
SATRUNJAYA HILL (?) (PALLITANĀ)
No. 24] v. s. 1371 [20.1. 1315

The exact find spot of this inscription is not known. It is copied from the edition of Prachinagurukrohandas published in the Gaikwad Oriental Series. It is probable that the inscription was engraved on the pedestal of one of the images placed in one of the Tunkas on the famous Satrunjaya Hill.

The inscription records that Saṅghapati Desala set up an image of Rāṇaka Mahipāladeva inside the temple of Adinātha, on Monday, the fourteenth of the bright half of Māha in v. s. 1371.

Rāṇaka Mahipāladeva was probably the Cūḍāsamā king also mentioned in the Mangrol inscription of v. s. 1375 and the Hathasni inscription v. s. 1387 published below. He might have been converted to Jainism. This is an instance of a royal image set up in his life time.

Text

संवत् १३७१ वर्ष माह मृदु १४ सोमेषु......

राणकभ्रमहिपालदेवमूर्ति: संवतित्रियदेवलेख कारिता भौज्याविदेशब्रह्मणे॥

MANGROL
No. 25.] v. s. 1375 [7.1. 1319

This inscription is found in the famous Soḍhaḍī vāv in Mangrol. The inscribed portion measures 7½ feet by 9 inches.

It records that Soḍhala of the Moḍha community caused the well to be made on Sunday the 15th of the bright half of Pauṣa in v. s. 1375 (7.1.) during the reign of Raul Mahipāladeva, who must have belonged to the Cūḍāsamā family of Junagadh. Watson thought that he was possibly a Goheh chief as the title Rāval is a Goheh one (Cf Kathiawad Gaz. p. 543). But it may be said that the title Rāval is applied to the Cūḍāsamā kings also—Cf. the Osa inscription of v. s. 1435 and the Uparkot inscription of v. s. 1507 published below.

Text

1 वं १३७५ वर्ष पीत शुद्धि १५ वाराह भ्रमहिपालदेवराजे
2 मोहहळी वली ? सोहितेः अस्यवेदगोष्ठ अ. वापी कारापिता॥

RAVAL
No. 26] v. s. 1375 [1318-19

This inscribed stone is fixed in the eastern wall of the town Rāval in the Nawanagar State. It is 20 miles from Porbandar.

The inscription refers to the reign of Rāṇā Jaitapāla, who was governing the Bhūṭābīli (i.e. Ghumli) manḍala in v. s. 1375. In his time Jye (Jethvā ?) Alaṇa, son of Vijala caused a well to be dug in the village Rāvali at the cost of 1044 drammas.
HATASNI

No. 27

v. s. 1386. [3.7. 1329]

This inscription was originally found in Hātasni, a small capital town of a separate tribute paying state, on the bank of the Setrunji river in the Goldevād prānt. It is at present preserved in the Barton Museum at Bhavnagar. The stone is broken into four pieces but nothing important has been lost. The inscribed portion, which, however is in a good condition, measures 1'6" by 1'.

This inscription was once published in the Indian Antiquary Vol. XV p. 360.

The record opens with a verse in praise of Bhārates i.e. the goddess of learning. Then is given an account of a royal family of the lunar race. In that family was born a king named Sangāra (i.e. Khengār) in whose family was born Yaṣodhavala. He was married to Priyamaladevi born of the solar race. They had three sons—Malla, Manḍala and Meliga.

From the fifth verse description is given of another royal family named Vākhala belonging to Mehar race, in which a chief named Nāgārjuna was born. He was an ally of Manḍalika. Nāgārjuna's son was Mahānanda, who by his wife Rūpā, daughter of Manḍalaraṇja had a son named Tepaka. King Mahiśa had appointed Tepaka to rule over Tāladhvaja (i.e. Talajā in Bhāvanagar state.) Tepaka had four sons. He wished to dig a well named Tepāvapī after him, just as his uncle in Junagadh had dug a well named Sangavāpī after him, and instructed Kuntarāja born in the family of Vallāditya and descended from Sūrya-Vikala, to act accordingly. As instructed by the Meher chief he caused a well to be dug on Monday, the seventh day of the bright half of Āśāḍha in v. s. 13[8]6, the Samvatsara being Bhāva.
The connection of the family of Jasadhavala, with the family of ｻﾍﾟｶказал to be that ｻﾍﾟｶказал's mother Rūpā was the daughter of Maṇḍala or Maṇḍalika who was son of Yaśodhavala. The kings Maṇḍlika (v. s. 1316-1362) and Maḥiṣa (i.e. Mahipāla) (1364-1387) mentioned in the record are most probably Cāḍāsamā kings of Junagadh, the latter being the son of the former. It may be noted that inscriptions of Mahipāla of v.s. 1371 and 1375 are published above. The Mehera family of Talajā seems to be an old one and the Mehera chief Jagamāla and Raṇāsirirha mentioned in the Timāṇā plates of v.s. 1264 (I. A. XI. 337) and the Mahuva (Timāṇā) inscription of v.s. 1272 (No 4 above) seem to be the ancestors of ｻﾍﾟｶказал. For Timāṇā is only five miles from Talajā.

Text

1. अँ विरंचिद्रनासादेशी जस्तु भारती। वस्साः: प्रसादमासाद मूहोतिपर विवाहार्थे [II *] १
2. श्रीसी्वेशी्भुवि्सुरसिरः क्षमावताः मांडनमार्दिलाः। तेषां कुर्य पुण्यहले वरिष्ठः
3. श्रीगारार्तानाः [II] २ जस्सकीवल्लकुलनामाः। तस्य वर्षोऽद ज्ञेः सकलगुणपतिवाः रूप-
विश्वासीवृत्तिः। प्रयम्म।
4. श्री अले देशी रूपाः स्वनाव स्वजयसुभुतदुः।[II *] ३ यशोधरसे
5. देवस्य सुभवे। नतनारोऽवरान् वाकिः कुण्डः कुण्डः क्रिया। महामंडलमेंढिगारः
6. [II *] ४ अत्यांते् बालबरबाबोऽक़ं
7. नगाज़ूनो नाम वमुः वीरः। श्रीमंडलीकुलः सहायकारः [II *]
8. सुत्तस्यः मः
9. हांतः: संजाती मरणीऽद येन कृः जातसारं जयः: पूर्वजः मुदा [II *] ६ झुटां
10. मंगा (ड़) तमास्यः
11. श्री श्री श्री श्री श्री श्री श्री श्री श्री श्री श्री श्री श्री श्री श्री श्री श्री
12. [II *] ७ रावक् प्रकृत्तस्य चतुर्मित्तस्याः: समं। चम्बुथिरिं ज्ञाता ठेपकस्य महापरम्
13. [II *] १० कारः
14. याम्ब महावाणी सर्वज्ञतुतुपासी। [II *] अगाधे निज्जेः देशे कुर्तराजः ततोशवावीत
15. [II *] ११ वकः
16. दियकुरे सुभवेक्रिया। मन्वायोऽवः:।।।। माबं पत्तापनैं जीवद्विनिविलि [ना] कारितं संगवारिवृत्तिः ठेपाक्षाः प्रकारः [II *]
17. [II *] १२ यथा
18. [II *] १३ में
19. [II *] १५ हरेन समाजेऽन्द्रमुिः। कृ को नराः। कारितायांस सहसार वापी जम्बसेहरा
This inscription was found near a well in the compound of a Jain deśasāra in Div, a small island in the south of Kathiawad. A considerable portion of it is pitifully worn out but fortunately the dated portion is intact. The inscribed portion measures 2' in length and 1' 4" in breadth. The characters are beautifully engraved.

From the first to the tenth verse the portion of the inscription is mostly lost except for a few letters in the first line. The record opens with the word Arhain, which together with the word Saṅgha in the concluding portion of the inscription lead us to suppose that it is a Jain inscription. The word गोपिकर meaning Krishna that remains of the opening verse probably used to denote the Jaina mythological conversion of Neminath with Krishna in the first line expressive of the praise of Krishna (Gopīvara) deserves to be specially marked. The few letters that are visible from the eleventh to the thirteenth verse seem to record thus. There was a viceroy named Devapāla in the Pāvavā family. He had five sons. The name of the third son only viz. Munja is visible in the record. His son was Jhanjhaṇa, who had four sons Sajjana, Bhima, Sānjaṇa and Bilhana.

The names of two ministers, Pralpalika and Jhaṭacchilpa are further seen. After them the name of a minister named Mundhā is given. His son was Śoma. Then from the further portion it is seen that a woman named Lalitādevī was the wife of a minister named Selaṇa. They had four sons. An account is further given of Śoma. His wife was named Śṛṅgāradevi. From her he had four sons and a daughter. Two of the sons were named Kelha and Hāra. A third one was named Ālāda. He seems to have defeated the king of KOTINAGAR i.e. modern Kodinar. No connected information can be obtained from the further portion which is too much worn out. In the concluding portion of the record the date is given, viz, the tenth day of the bright half of Māgasar of v.s. 1393, and the name Pandita Sarvajña of the poet who composed the record. From the word Saṅgha preserved in the last line it seems that the object of the record was pertaining to a Jain monastery.

Text

1 ॥ ॥ अहँ ॥ यो गोपिकरमाहः मिः…….…….मेयः मे दशावात्तरः……

([The portion from the second to the ninth line is hopelessly worn out.])

1. अखंड.
10 स्य तस् गुर्वाममातमः मागातु...रामिन-पु बेद...पु। वं
11 आत्माशासी वेशं प्रामांकषामा जमित विजयते शारदाश्रीनिवासः। 11 अरिम-नवं शुम्भनविदिते शुद्धवर्तुष्करः...तपति
12 इहिष्पौऽस्य प्रचारार्थविश्वाम नियतं वर्षति विस्तः चांदुकेनाराम सेतुः। 12 विश्वजनुपरि [ पाषाणा्] यहो देवपाल...पति
13 कल्याणः। 13 तस्...तनया विनयादवा पांढवा इव तु पंच ब्रम्हुः। कौशवः
14 तद्। सुमजाभिया। सचिवस्तुतियो निजान्याभक्तरण ब्रम्हुः। 15 शांतस-प्रणयमनसः। प्रश्चक्विविवेयम्भृतौ।...तु
15 इह। आचार्यानीसः। कथाओऽद्वारात्वमा अता। सदयमन्त्रातः। 17 इह। अखलीककार्तिक्षा [ मंगल्यी]...तु
16...देवपुष्यां जातो। सुधा। ( जा?) भक्तेन सचिवेन। सोमः। सक्तकलावान् पुष्यां
17 अरिक्षियोऽस्य प्रयोऽविच्छिन्न। मोहियोऽस्य पुष्यान्येव।...तु
18...तः श्री सोममन्त्रीवरः। 20 कौना राजनान्यायालारः। वेतनस्य भक्तिवतः।
19 विभिन्ननविनयः [ सल्ला्] सामान्य राजष्ठोः [ सेते]। 29...
20 इह। देवपुष्यांगानं विविधारं यो भक्तिस्तरण महतात्। 22 ततोअवऽद्यकुमारवशीपीपीः देवमध्यमान्।
21 कता। 25 ज्ञे...अथो नंदकदारले। श्रेष्ठसत: कैलाशिनिरहुरासाह्यात: पुष्यभुमि-देवादिः। 26 स्याहा...पराक्रमियः कौनै...प्रभः
22 यानार्यि...। 27 जानार्यि सति विही: नुसारी मुनि। महतात्। 27 जानार्यि सति विही: नुसारी महतात्।
23 चोर्तेःसति।। तस्य नासुनिष्ठो यस्य स्याहा...सौराष्ट्रायः।। आराद्याः। मुक्ती...कृताः कृताः दक्षिणरासाह्यात: पुष्यभुमिदेवादिः। 29 ये...कोडितरागेवसिंहितः...दण्डे न
24 गरे भ माया दराः। 30 सत्ते नासुनिष्ठो तीर्थाः मुक्ताः गोपेश्वरः श्रीमति। यत्राविशिष्ट विमानेवहताः जीवार्दनावा एव सः। 31 समुपातः जनवि [ यं ] परि...तादृ...
25 सारस

26 मल्लार

27 या। 35 य
No. 29]

DATE NOT KNOWN

This fragmentary inscription was found in the compound of the Adisvara Mahadeva temple situated in the west of the village Adpokar. It measures 16"×15".

It records the death of Kânhâda déva while fighting with the army of Rânâka Mañâdâlîka for the cause of king Vayajaladeva. If the King Vayajaladeva in this record is identical with Thâkur Vayajaladeva mentioned in the Sûtrapâdî inscription of v.s. 1357 this inscription can be approximately assigned to that period. King Mañâdâlîka mentioned in the record must be the Cûdâsâmâ King who lived from about v.s. 1316 to 1362.

Text

1 .......तीय पा...
2 भीमीमायुतक...
3 राजश्रीकान्हिन्देव.
4 स्व मेलवारी ? राणक
5 भीमंडलीरीख सैन्ये
6 न राजराजो भीमयज
7 लदेवहेतो: प्राणयम:

No 30]

DATE LOST

This fragmentary inscription is built up in a wall outside the southern door of the Neminâtha temple on the famous Girnar hill. The letters are neatly engraved but the latter portion of each line being cut away the full purport of the record is not known. The inscribed portion now measures 8" by 7".
The year in which the record was incised is lost. The inscription refers itself to the reign of a king named Mahipāla, probably of the Cudāsamā family of Junagadh. Now there were at least three kings bearing the name Mahipāla who ruled in the family. The first ruled from v. s. 1364-1387, the second from 1452 to 1456 and third from 1506 to 1527. I think the King Mahipāla in this inscription was probably the first of the three. The object of the inscription seems to record the building of a temple, probably of Neminātha by Vayarasimha together with his wife and children. The Jain preceptor’s name at whose hand, the consecration ceremony was performed is probably Muni-simha.

Text

1 /// (१) /// स्नित्त श्रीश्रीति .............
2 /// नमः श्रीनमिनाथाय ज ............
3 /// वषें पालुषुं छुदि ’५ गुरौ ’ श्री .........
4 /// तिलकमहाराजश्रीमहिपाल, .............
5 /// बायदीश्वराजव फौहों सुत ता .........
6 /// दुद्ध सात साइवासात मेथा। मेथा ....
7 /// ज सुदा श्रीदी गांगी प्रस्तुति ........
8 /// नाथारामद (:) कारित (:) प्रति ......
9 /// इसुरितप्रेम श्रीमुनिसिंह ......
10 /// ........,कल्याणाव, ........

AMRELI
No 31] DATE MISSING [?

This fragmentary inscription was found in the town Amrelli. The right hand portion only of the record is intact but that on the remaining three sides is broken away. In its present condition it measures 6" by 5½". The letters are very beautifully engraved.

The fragment gives no useful information. In the 7th line, the word Saurāstra and in the 8th line the names Visaladeva and Duṅgarsiha are seen. It may be noted that there was a Gohela king named Dungarsi, successor of Mokheraji, an ancestor of the Maharaja of Bhavnagar.

Text

1 /// दं विश-द्रीन ......
2 /// नागण्य्युज्युदसचमु
3 /// राजसंर्वसश्री
4 /// निरलवमेकमकमम
5 /// रे गत देवराज श्रीसणीपशा
6 /// रीणगण्यनिलक्ष्मिक प्रवाह
7 /// द्व भाहरभास्कर श्रीसोरा
8 /// वीसलदेव श्रीस्स्वरसीह भाम
MANGROL

No. 32. [10-5-1346.

This inscription is incised on the pedestal of the caturviriṣṭi jinaṇaṭṭa in Māṅgroḷ.

It records that during the reign of king Khengār, his minister Jhājha, belonging to the Osvāl community of Ambarnagar (Jaipur? in Rajputana), caused to be made at Girnar a Caturviriṣṭi Paṭṭa on Wednesday, the 5th of the dark half of Vaiśākha in v.s. 1402.

The king Khengār in the record was the Cūḍāśama king of Junagadh, who was afterwards, as the Muḥammedan historians state, defeated by Muḥammad Tughlak, the emperor of Delhi in H. S. 750 (about v.s. 1406). His fortress of Girnar was reduced and he was forced to pay a tribute to the Emperor (Bombay Gazetteer, History of Gujarāt p. 231).

Text

1 से १४०२ वर्ष बैतासवजुड़े ५ चुपे उदयाधराय अंबरसारवासत्त्व वद्यती, यत्रायो तु दुर्बिरस्तत्त्वयते नागृप्रभुतत्ततानां व
2 भद्युङ्गावलावङ्गावलावाणान प्रदेशीस किन्तु राजविलायराजविलायरेष्वत्रातात्त्वरतिपति [ साहा पदमसी ]
3 चतुर्विशालित्वः कारितः...सुदरिमिः । श्री...प्रभुदरिमिः । श्री ।

KHERALI

No. 33 [5-2-1351 ?

This inscription is built up in the northern wall of a well situated in the east of the village Kheralī at a distance of four miles to the west of Wadhwan. Owing to its bad state of preservation it cannot be fully deciphered. The inscribed portion measures 3' by 1'.

The first part of the inscription seems to record the digging of a well by the minister Karanā of the Paramāra king Jagaddeva who was ruling at Brahmapura.

The second part gives the name Vejaladevi wife of the Paramāra king Jagaddeva, who was son of Maṅgaladeva.

About the Aśādhādī Vikrama Samvat used in inscriptions see Indian Paleography by G. H. Ojha, p. 170, and Ind. Ant. Vol. XVIII, p. 241.

Text

1 [श्री] वरिक्त श्रीजेयो मंडलायुद्धश्य । श्रीः । व [वा] पुरे । परमार मुकुटवशः श्रीजणेव
2 परमार [तस्य विजयः] परमारः स जयति भुवि । श्री राजा परमारः ॥ ॥ श्रीमहकमो-विकारी । हत्यपुष्पमाण [वः]
3 —भोजिवः [वेंस] तिलकः स जयति मंद्री स कर [णः] करणः ॥ ॥ अविसुरुषपद [प्रातिः]-समेते [परमा] र श्री [जगवः]
SOMANĀTHA PĀTAN

No. 34] v.s. 1423.  [13-1-1367.

This record is engraved on the pedestal of the Sarasvatī image placed in the north-west corner of the new temple of Somanātha built by Ahilyābāi Holkar in Pātana. The inscribed portion measures 6" × 5".

It records that the image (of Sarasvatī) was set up by Purushottama, son of Rājagana of the Somapara community on the 12th day of the bright half of Māgha in v.s. 1423. It may be noted that the denomination Somapara of the community was known as early as the 14th century A.D.

Text

1 संतु 1423 वि माध मु
2 दी 12 सोमपराँतती
3 राजगणसुत
4 पुष्पोत्सव मूर्ति कारा
5 पिता।

SOMANĀTH PĀTAN

No. 35] v.s. 1432.  [9-3-1376.

This inscription is engraved on a stone pillar standing near a Masjid to the south of Verawal gate in Somanāth Pātana. Below the inscribed portion is engraved the indecent figure expressive of an ass-curse. The inscription measures 1'. 6" × 1'. 3".
It opens with the date, Friday, the first day of the dark half of Phālguna of v.s. 1432 and refers to the reign of the Vāja king Bharama. The object of the record is not clear but it seems that a grant of money was made by all the masons of the place to build a temple.

The king Bharama in this record is probably identical with the king of the same name mentioned in the Dhāmlej inscription of v.s. 1437 published below.

**Text**

1 संवत् १४३२ वर्षं फाग [ण]
2 वर्ष १ चुरैः अथ [र] जा
3 धी भरम राये अमह
4 पुष्जा समस्तसूर्वचारा
5 घां दानं प्रसादे मुख [मू]
6 व्यापारे साहय ॥ कृत ॥

**THAN**

No. 36.

v.s. 1432. [28-4-1376]

This inscription is engraved on a stone fixed in a platform near the sun-temple on the Kandola hillock near Thān. The inscribed portion measures 3 ft. in length and ½ ft. in breadth. The language is very corrupt so that the meaning of the record is not quite clear.

It seems to record that the sun temple was built by Sīha, son of Būtāda Lākhā, on Monday the ninth of the bright half of Vaiśākha in v.s. 1432. In the concluding portion the Mahārāja of Kandolā (?) seems to have been referred to.

**Text**

1 [ उ नमः धी सूर्] यशस संवत् १४३२ वर्षं बैसाष चुरै ९ सोमे
2 बुट्टड लयापौर्ण पुज्र सीह कारापिंतुष्की उपदर्शी इत्य काठी सम
3 बोगरि पलीताण काठीविण दुग्म्यः (?) देव कंडोछ महाराज सी

*(To be continued.)*
A NOTE ON THE KĀYASTHAS

By

P. V. KANE, Bombay.

A good deal has been written on this subject and heated controversies have raged as to the origin and the status of Kāyasthas in mediaeval and modern Hindu society. The writer of this note has no axe to grind and his own inclination is that it is high time that in all matters, particularly in the application of modern Hindu law, not only the Kāyasthas, but all Hindus were treated as dvijas. Even the High Courts are not unanimous on the position of Kāyasthas. Parties to litigations are interested in opposite theories and the result is that courts often give contradictory decisions. In the following paper an attempt is made to bring together a few pieces of information culled from ancient literature, smṛtis, nibandhas and inscriptions.

The Calcutta High Court held in Bholanath v. Emperor\(^1\) that the Kāyasthas of Bengal were as a rule to be treated as Śūdras. But in Asita Mohan v. Nirode Mohan\(^2\) the Privy Council left the question whether the Kāyasthas were Śūdras open. On the other hand in Tulsi Ram v. Bihari Lal\(^3\) and in Ishwari Prasad v. Rai Hari Prasad\(^4\) the Allahabad and Patna High Courts respectively held that the Kāyasthas were not Śūdras but were dvijas (probably Kṣatriyas).

The word Kāyastha does not occur in the ancient Dharmasūtras of Gautama, Āpastamba, Baudhāyana or Vasiṣṭha, nor in the Manusmṛti. In the Vīṃḍharaṁsūtra\(^5\) (which is comparatively a later sūtra) a public document (rājasāksika lekhya) is a document written in the royal court or office by a Kāyastha appointed by the king and attested by the hand of the superintendent of that office (VII. 3). These words suggest that the Kāyastha was only an officer, but there is nothing in them about Kāyasthas being a caste. Yājñavalkya I. 332 says\(^6\) ‘the king should protect the subjects from the harassment of cāṭas (rogues), thieves, bad characters, desperadoes and the like and particularly of Kāyasthas’. The comment of Viṣvarupa (as printed)

---

1. 51 Cal 488 (where the Calcutta High Court went so far as to hold that a marriage of a Kāyastha male with a Dom female was valid).
2. L. R. 47 I. A. 140 (at p. 145), on appeal against the decision in 20 Calcutta Weekly Notes 901 where the High Court of Calcutta had held that Bengal Kāyasthas were Śūdras.
3. 12 All. 328.
4. 6 Patna 506; vide also 7 Patna 245.
5. राजापौर्वकेष्ठपात्रवर्जित तद्यथावर्जितविशिष्ट राजसाधुकृष्णम्। विण्यामेंसूर्या VII. 3.
6. चाटात्कलहावर्जितविशिष्टानिधिम्। पीथयमानक्रमः प्रजा रक्षकवक्षेठविशिष्ट विशेषतः। याज्ञवल्क्यस्मृति I. 332 (336 in the मिताक्षर).
is partly corrupt here. He says ‘Kāyasthas are rāga (?) and others; some say they are scribes’. The Mitākṣarā says that the Kāyasthas are accountants and scribes, they are the favourites of the king and very cunning! Aparārka explains Kāyasthas as ‘officers who are in charge of the (collection of) taxes’. So Yājñavalkya and his early commentators do not describe the Kāyasthas as a caste, but rather as officials of the king. Uśanas1 (Anandāśrama ed.) is not clear about the origin of Kāyasthas, but as he mentions the Kāyastha among the forty castes that he describes, it must be supposed that he treated the Kāyasthas as a caste. Uśanas (35) refers to them in the most uncomplimentary terms by saying that the first letters of Kāka (crow), Yama and Sīhapatī (carpenter) were taken together to form the word Kāsyatha, which indicates the embodiment respectively of the greed, the cruelty and the paring (characteristics of the three). In the Vedavyāsasūrya2 (Anandāśrama ed.) the Kāyasthas are mentioned as a subdivision of śudras (I. 10-11) along with potters, barbers and others. So in the opinion of these two smṛtis the Kāyasthas formed a caste.

Brhaspati3 quoted in the Smṛticandrikā and other digests speaks of the gaṇaka and lekhaka as two persons who were to be associated with the Judge in a Court of justice, who were both to be proficient in grammar and lexicography, expert in calculations and in various modes of writing (alphabets). The Smṛticandrikā explains that both gaṇaka and lekhaka were to be dvijas. The same Smṛtikāra4 as quoted by Aparārka (p. 600) says that the gaṇaka was to calculate (or count) the money and the lekhaka was to write the judicial decision or proceeding. So Brhaspati at least regards the lekhaka as an official only.

In accordance with this rule of Brhaspati we find in the trial scene of the Mrčchakatika (IX Act) a śreṣṭhin and a kāyastha associated as assessors or jurors with the judge. It is most probable that Kāyastha here means the lekhaka of Brhaspati, since the judge asks these two to write down the first part of the trial5 and the Kāyastha replies ‘it is written’. In the Mudrārāksasa also one of the characters is the Kāyastha Śakaṭa-dāsa, about whom Cāṇakya is made to say ‘that he is a Kāyastha matters little’.6

---

1. काकाशालिङ्ग यमाकौण्ड व्यपरदर्श इन्तनम्। आयुर्वारण संग्रह कायस्थ इति निर्देशत्॥ खासनसमृति V. 35.
2. वर्षकी नामिती ग्राम आशाण चल्म्मकारकः। बधिकै गिरिवायास्मालाकारकुदुम्बिनः॥
   एते चालने व बहः। दुर्गा भिन्नः। चक्रमूँ:॥ बद्वस्मसमृति V. 10-11.
3. तथा राजां गणकेर्कार्क सर्वविविधाय नार्तिः॥ शब्दान्विधानात्वतःस्मृति। गणकुकशाक्षां हृदाँ नागालिङ्गिः।
   कान्ति गणकेर्कार्कौ॥ इति॥ स्मृतिचरित्रिका (ed. by Gharpure) व्यवहारः।
4. गणके गणवेष्ठिः लिखेंत्या च लेखकः॥ बृहस्पतिः in Aparārka 600.
5. भै: अक्षिताकथा न मंगलेय व्यवहारपद प्रादेवमभिलिपिताय। सृष्ट्रकामिक IX।
6. कायस्थ इति खण्डी मानता॥ सुद्वराक्षस I.
From the above we may say that in the first centuries of the Christian era the Kāyastha was a mere scribe though in some parts of the country (as shown by Uśanas and Vedavyāsa) the Kāyasthas also formed a caste.

In the Harṣacarita King Harṣa is presented with a fresh golden seal by the village akṣapataṇika (keeper of records) surrounded by all the karaṇins (officials). Here there is no mention of a Kāyastha, but only of Karaṇin i.e., Karaṇika. This word Karaṇika occurs frequently in the inscriptions as denoting the lekhaka of copperplate or stone charters e.g. E. I. vol. 20 p. 37-40 (there is a karaṇika Svāmidatta in the Nālandā stone Inscription of Yāsovarmadeva); E. I. VIII p. 158 (grant of Govindacandra’s son dated Vikrama 1203, likhitam...Karaṇika-hakkura-sri vivikena-iti); E. I. vol. 12 p. 10 at p. 17. In the Sukranitisāra (chap. 2. vv. 120-121), which is a late work, it is said that the king should appoint six officials in a village one of whom is a lekhaka (the modern kulārī). So even here the lekhaka is an official and no indication is given as to his caste.

Though numerous officers are mentioned in the inscriptions of the first five or six centuries of the Christian era the Kāyastha is hardly ever one of them. One of the earliest inscriptions where the word Kāyastha occurs is the Kanaswa Inscription of Śivagaṇa dated in Mālava era 795 (i.e. 738-39 A.D.) where the Kāyastha was Raupaka, son of Gomika (I. A. Vol. 19 p. 56 at p. 59). Vide E. I. Vol. XI p. 149 (Narapatanam plates of Vīra-hasta dated Śake 967 where the Sandhivigrahi Dhavala is described as Grāma-Śaśānaka Kāyastha), I. A. Vol. VI p. 192 (grant of Mūlarāja dated Saṅvat 1043), E. I. Vol. 10 at p. 79 (Balera plates of Mūlarāja I dated Saṅvat 1051 where the lekhaka is Kāyastha Kānācana) for other early references to Kāyastha.

Bühler in E. I. vol. II p. 254 says about Lajūka (occurring in the 4th pillar Edict of Aśoka) that ‘Lajūka (Lajijuka) was an old name of the writer caste which is later called divira (dabir) or Kāyastha’. When scholars whose reputation deservedly ranks very high indulge in conjectures or speculations, great harm is done. What they only put forward as a hypothesis or mere conjecture is often seized upon by subsequent and less famous writers as an irrefutable proposition. The great scholar’s brief dictum, quoted above, can be challenged at least in three respects. There is hardly any evidence to show that the Lajūkas in Aśoka’s edict formed a caste. Probably they were no more than officers of the Imperial Maurya Government. Further the word literally means ‘rope-holder’ i.e. a survey officer. In the Kuru-dhama Jātaka we have a ‘rajījuka’ or ‘rajjugāhaka ammacca’ (vide Fick’s work ‘Social

1. तनस्थित्व चाप्य ामान्त्रभाष्टकभ: सत्कर्तिराणिपिरकोऽ: ‘करोज्ज देतो विसंस्थभाषाभवै-वन्यवातम: शास्त्रादानाग, इतिविवाचय द्वारामिभिमलप्रवेंतो हास्यमयी सुद्धास्छिनिये। हृद-चरित VII 2nd para. करविनू, or करविन गो म a ‘writer of documents, a clerk’.
2. साहित्यासायत: चैव ामान्त्रायानिम्ब च। माहारं तु: तु: ते लेखक च चूहंकप: II तूक्ष्यां पन्नं च परिवर्ततं तथैव च। पद्मेतिनिष्योक्तये ागे अंगे पुरे पुरे II तूक्ष्यांतितिरसात अ. 2. 120-121.
organization &c.' and translated by MAITRA pp. 148-149). Divira was not a special caste in ancient times. The word corresponds to Sanskrit *lipikara* (the formation of which is taught by Pāṇini III. 2. 21),1 which according to Amara means only *lekhaka*. In the Gupta Inscription No. 27 (Khooh plate of Mahārāja Jayanātha dated Gupta Sarīvat 177) there is a grant of an agrahāra village made by the king for increase of his own merit to Sarva-vāḍha, a *divira* of the Sāsātaneya (gotra?), to his son Gaṅga who was a bhāgvata and to the latter’s two sons. Gifts as agrahāra were made in ancient India only to brāhmaṇas (and not to any other caste). So the donee though described as *divira* must have been a brāhmaṇa. Similarly in a grant of the Valabhi King Śilāditya I dated Gupta-Valabhi Sarīvat 290 there is a ‘chief of diviras’ by name Candrabhaṭṭī, who was a minister for peace and war’ (I. A. Vol. 19 p. 239). If we consider the name only, it looks very probable that this man was a brāhmaṇa. Vide also E. I. vol. XI. p. 174 at p. 180 for the word *divirapatī* prefixed to *Vatrabhaṭṭī*. These considerations make it very doubtful whether *divira* was a caste (as asserted by BÜHLER).

In the third place, there is very little evidence to show that the caste of *diviras*, even if it once existed, was identical with the caste of Kāyasthas. On the other hand the *Rājatarangini* (VIII 131) mentions them separately ‘courtesan, Kāyastha, divira and the merchant, being all deceitful by nature, are superior to a poisoned arrow in that they have been trained under a teacher’s advice.’ That a brāhmaṇa held the position of a Kāyastha is vouchsafed by the same work (VIII. 2383) ‘About that time (i.e. in the reign of Jayasimha 1128-1149 A.D.) there died by strangulation that rogue of a Kāyastha, the brāhmaṇa Śivaraththa who had been a great intriguer’. The *Rājatarangini* (IV. 175) speaks of grāma-Kāyasthas (village scribes). This only shows that in the village organization there was a scribe, just as *Sukranitisāra* stated there should be one and just as in modern times we have *kulkarnis* in the Deccan, the latter being generally brāhmaṇas. The *Rājatarangini* is very bitter against the Kāyasthas and handles them very severely (vide V. 180-184).

Therefore it would be more in accordance with the evidence to say that a Kāyastha was originally an official entrusted with state or public writing work, that he generally abused his office and got rich thereby, that the office was held sometimes at least even by brāhmaṇas and that in some territories it might have been held by a separate caste. There are analogous instances of this kind. In Bengal there is a caste of Vaidyas, while there is no such caste in the Deccan where vaidyas (physicians) are found among several castes including brāhmaṇas.

---

1. Vārtika 3 यवनलिपि on Pāṇini iv.1.49 shows that in Kātyāyana’s day (about 300 B.C.) Yavana-lipi was well-known as Yavanāni (Mahābhāṣya, ed. by KIELHORN vol. II. p. 220).
MISCELLANEA

A SHORT NOTE ON THE LOGICAL ANALYSIS OF THREE PROBABLE STAGES IN THE EVOLUTION OF COMPOUNDS IN THE P.I.E.³ TONGUE.

In my paper "The Double-Accented Vedic Compounds" (Madras University Journal, 1936, pp. 85-6) I pointed out that there should have been two phases of the karmadhrāraya compound formation—the determinative phase and the descriptive phase in the pro-ethnic period. I am now inclined to think that it is worth while to subject these two phases to a logical analysis, on the lines indicated below.

The determinative karmadhrāraya stage may be denoted as the crude substance—attribute stage when a thorough grasp of the relational concept could not have been reflected in the speech of the P.I.E. Community. It was at this period the P.I.E. compounds like *épi-dhā to- (Skt. ápi-hita-ś) and *ápa-qiti-ś (Skt. ápa-citi-ś) should have been formed.

Subsequently, the P.I.E. community should have come to grip with the relational concept and the descriptive karmadhrāraya phase in their speech indicates a progress in their thought also, synonymous with the progress in their speech. This stage, from a strictly logical point of view, may be called the two-termed-relational stage.

The stage of the epithetised compound-formation (through mainly the transmutation of the descriptive karmadhrāraya compounds) indicates yet another probable stage in the progress of the thought of the P.I.E. community, which again may conveniently be called the three-termed-relational stage, from a purely logical point of view.

The above brief logical analysis may help us to realise the mutual interdependence of thought and speech even in the far distant prehistoric times and may also go a long way to justify the attitude of some of the modern psychologists who look upon thought as being typically little more than invisible and inaudible speech-activity.²

Madras.

C. R. SANKARAN

ABHILAŚITĀRTHACINTĀMANI AND ŚILPARATNA

In my article 'Abhilaśitārthacintāmani and Śilparatna' published in the New Indian Antiquary Vol. I, No. 8, I have clearly shown that SR (Śilparatna) and MSR (a manuscript added to the Śilparatna) have borrowed profusely from AC (Abhilaśitārthacintāmani). In support of that view I wish to cite here one more instance.

The late Mr. T. A. GOPINATHARAO has quoted, on text page 117 of the 2nd volume of his work Elements of Hindu Iconography, a passage of 26 lines from MSR which describes the icon of Mahādeva. This extract is completely identical with the one in AC—(3-1-759-772) which is also of the same length and describes the image of the same deity. Both the passages help each other in restoring the corrupt readings, filling up the lacunae from AC and making the passage perfectly intelligible on the whole.

Poona.

G. H. KHARE.

¹ Primitive Indo-European.
THE ABHILASIYARTHASANTA-CINTAMANI AND THE SILPARATNA

In Vol. I, No. 8, pp. 529-533 of the NIA, Sri G. H. Khare points out, on the basis of the sections on iconography, the fact that the Silparatna (SR) of Sri-kumāra (TSS edn.) is indebted to the Abhilasīyārthasanta-Cintamani (AC) or Maṇa-sollāsa of Cāṇukya Somaśvara of Kalyān, compiled in A.D. 1129. He says: "As a result of my labour I found that out of the 45 descriptions of images which occur in the AC, 35 coincide with those found in SR...". p. 529. "So we must conclude that it is Śrīkumāra who has borrowed from AC..." p. 531. And Sri Khare has also drawn attention to 'the one advantage which we can have from the above comparison', namely, the restoration of 'superior readings'.

I may be permitted to mention in this connection that as early as December 1933, I wrote an article entitled Some Sanskrit Texts on Painting in the IHQ (IX 4, pp. 898-911). There I dealt with, besides other texts, these two texts, the AC and the SR, and on the basis of the sections on painting in the two, not only stated the indebtedness of Śrīkumāra to Somaśvara but reconstructed also some of the corrupt passages in the text of the SR as offered in its TSS edn. on the basis of the corresponding passages of the AC. See pp. 904-907, IHQ, IX. 4. I stated there, in addition, that Somaśvara's AC was the source of Basava's Śivatattvaraṇākara as well.

The knowledge of Somaśvara as the source of Śrīkumāra and the reconstructions of the corrupt passages in the latter on the basis of the former enable us to understand and translate the painting-chapter in the SR in a very much less defective manner than Dr. Coomaraswami was able to in the Sir Austosh Memorial Volume, Part I, pp. 49-61.

Madras.

V. Raghavan

BHĀVASAMGRAHA AN ANONYMOUS TREATISE ON HOROSCOPY COMPOSED AFTER A.D. 1587

The Government MSS. collection at the Bhandarkar Research Institute, Poona contains a rare MS1 of an astrological work named Bhāvasamgraha. It is a work on horoscopy and deals with results of the combination of two or three planets in a horoscope. The description of the MS is as follows:—

Size 12 in by 5½ in.; 14 lines to a page; 38 letters to a line; country-paper; Devanagari characters; old in appearance; hand-writing, clear, legible and uniform; complete.

The contents of the work are:—राशिस्वर्यं: fol. 1; राशिद्वस्त्रयवोजनं fol. 2; बषेप्वेशन्याशभुवं 4b; राशिवर्तं 6a; मेश्वश्वशंक्र; भुधावल fol. 12a-14a; अरुलभवविचारं 16a-16b; राज्योगम 16b-18a; राज्योगा प्रभं औ विवं 18a-18b; शालिनिण्यं 18b; विद्यांहलक्रण 21b; सामान्तविवंचारं 22a-22b; तुतुविवंचारं 23a-24b; दण्डविवंचार 24b; तूतियभवविचारं च: चतुर्भवविचार: 28b-29b; पञ्चमाविवंचार: 29b-31b; पञ्चमाविवंचार: 31b-33b; सातमाविवंचार: 33b-35b; अठमाविवंचार: 35b-37b; नवमाविवंचार: 37b-39b; दशमाविवंचार: 39b-40b; एकादशमाविवंचार: 40b-42b; व्यवस्थाविवंचार: 42b-43b; etc. Then begin the dāsās of different planets such as the चंद्रदश, भुमदश, शुगुदश, and so on.

It will be seen from the contents that the main portion dealt with is the dāsās भव विचार or explanation of the results of the existence of planets in the twelve respective places in a horoscope.

1 MS. No. 493 of 1892-95.
The work does not contain the name of the author. From the list of authorities quoted, however, it appears that the author must have been a learned man. In the work he has consulted about thirty-two authorities, a list of which is given below:—

1. उक्ष 3, 23(a)
2. उत्तरनंत्र 26, 28(a)
3. केशवाचक 3(a)
4. चणदेशरण 24(b), 27(a), 33(b), 37(b), 38(b) etc.
5. चुडामणि 40(a)
6. जीर्णताजिक 21(a), 23(b), 26(a), 27(b) etc.
7. ताजिकतिलक 31(b), 38(b).
8. ताजिकमूरण 12(b), 15(b), 18(a), 29(a), 43(a)
9. ताजकरसमाला 5(b)
10. ताजिकसार 12(b), 15(b), 23(a), 30(a)
11. तेजसिंह 24(a), 25(b), 27(b), 28(b)
12. मैत्रेक्ष प्रकाश 4(a)
13. दीपिकाय 4(a)
14. दीप्ताकंडकों 16(a)
15. मणिव 15(a), 17(b), 18(a), 24(b), 26(b) etc.
16. चुरावल्य 4(b)
17. वाक्वल्य 3(b)
18. यादव: 7(a), 11(b), 18(b), 24(a), 27(a), 28(b), 8(b) etc.
19. रत्नाल्य 6(a)
20. वर्षोंत्र 18(b), 25(a), 25(b), 26(a), 27(b) etc. composed in A. D. 1587
21. बलंतरज 3(a)
22. वामनताजिक 1(b); वामनेन 25(a), 30(a), 34(a)
23. विणयायल 4(b)
24. शोनक: 3(a)
25. संवात्र 5(b), 12(b), 21(b), 22(a), 33(a)
26. सत्यचारेमल 22(b)
27. समरसिंह 5(b), 6(a), 12(b), 23(b)
28. समरसिंहदीपिकाय 6(b)
29. चुरावल्य 22(b)
30. हयानसिंह 29(a), 34(b)
31. हिस्स क 24(b), 25(b), 27(b), 28(b)
32. हिस्सदीपिकाय 15(a).

In the above list there are a few works whose dates are known. Among these there is one work viz., वर्षात्मक (No. 20) which enables us to get one terminus

---

for the date of the present work. The Varṣatantra was composed by Nilakaṇṭha in Saka 1509, i.e. in a.d. 1587. I have been able to identify (from a MS. of Varṣa-
tantra No. 440 of 1895-98 col. 39 Vol. 10) one verse quoted in the Bhāvasaṁgraha from the Varṣatantra. The verse read as under:—

Fol. 25-a

विनाशिपि जनमिन बीतगोदी जीवो यदय व्यपतिस्वसानाः
तदा धनशी सक्तेदिप वर्ष करैशर फल वनप्रवृत्थाँसि: || 1 11

It, therefore, naturally follows that the author of Bhāvasaṁgraha has quoted the above verse from Nilakaṇṭha’s Varṣatantra which was composed in Saka 1509 or a.d. 1587 and this fact leads us to conclude that the present work viz., Bhāvasaṁgraha was composed sometime after a.d. 1587.

Poona.

M. M. Patkar.

A NEW SENDRAKA GRANT OF SAKA 577.

Recently during my visit to Dhuilia, through the good offices of Mr. B. V. Bhat, B.A., I.L.B., pleader, the Secretary of the Rajwade Samshodhana Mandala, Dhuilia, and Mr. G. R. Padalkar of Chalisgaon (East Khandesh), I secured for decipherment one copper-plate grant for which kindness I thank both these gentlemen heartily.

The charter consists of two plates woven into a circular ring, contains on their three sides in all 28 lines of writing in characters which we may call the prototype of the Kanarese script and the language is Sanskrit prose.

The details of the date as given in the record are Saka 577, the cyclic year Āṇanda and the third day of the bright half of the month of Māgha. According to the common Southern system of reckoning, the cyclic year Āṇanda falls in the current Saka year 577; but in the absence of more data, I am unable to verify the details.

The record belongs to the well-known Sendraka family of which three members are mentioned here, viz. Bhānuśakti, his son Adityaśakti and his son Nikumbhaśakti. In all the records that have come to light hitherto, the name of the last member was spelt as Nikumbhaśakti i.e., with a short a in bha and we were unable to split the word rightly. But here the a of bhā is clearly long and we can easily split the word into Nikumbha and Allasakti meaning Allasakti of Nikumbha. In the Kasare grant1 we actually get the name Allasakti. This last-named king Nikumbhaśakti, while camping near a lake in the vicinity of the austerity-grove at Kāyāvatāra, with a view to gain merit for himself as well as his parents, granted the village Sushihākholi, lying to the South of the hill Bāruvāṇa and included in the Nāndipurādvari district, to a brāhmaṇa Bhogika, the son of Nannaswāmi, of the Ātreya gotra and the resident of the village Praktāngara. The grant was written by one Mātrdatta, with the consent of Devadinna, the minister for peace and war, for which he was instructed by the grandissimo Vāsava. Both Devadinna and Vāsava figure in these very capacities in the Bagumra2 and the Kasare grants.

I am unable at present to identify either the village granted to the brāhmaṇa or the village of his residence; but I can say something about Kāyāvatāra and Nāndipurādvari. The former is referred to in another grant found at Nausāri3, which is later in date and issued by a Gūjiya king Jayabhaṭa III. The editor of

1 An unpublished grant in the possession of the Bharata Itihasa Samshodh-
haka Mandala, Poona.
2 Indian Antiquary, Vol. XVIII, p. 268.
the grant was inclined to look upon "Kāyāvatāra" as the Sanskrit name of Kāvi (Jambusar-Broach). Dr. A. S. Altekar of Benares, in his monograph on the History of Some Important Ancient Towns and Cities in Gujarat and Kathiawad by oversight assumes the place-name to be "Kāvyāvatāra" instead of "Kāyāvatāra" and opines that this Kāvyāvatāra is the same as ancient Kāpiṣñī or modern Kāvi. But both of these scholars seem to be in the wrong. Kāvyāvatāra must be identified with the modern Kārwān near Dabhoi in the Baroda state. For this is the very place that was sanctified by the residence of Lakulīśa, the pioneer exponent of a Āśāva sect. The same is referred to in the Ekalingaji inscription under the name Kāvyāvaroḥana, in the Cintra prāsasti and Vāyupurāṇa under the more simplified form Kārōhana, in Līṅgapurāṇa under its variant Kāvyāvatāra and in the local māhātmya of Kārwān under the corrupted form Kāyāvirohana. But as Kāvyāvatāra and Kāvyāvaroḥana mean one and the same thing, Kāvyāvatāra cannot be any other place than Kārwān. It is interesting to note that there is also a very large and holy tank at this place as stated in the present record. The place name Nandipurāṇdvīr occurs in the Jethwai plates of the Rāṣṭrakūṭa queen Śilamahādevī which is dated in Saka 708. The editor of the grant has left this place unidentified; but I think that it should be identified with the modern Nandurbār (West Khandesh) which seems to be a place of great antiquity.

By comparing this record with the Bagumra, Kājwān (Mundakhede) and Kāsāre grants, we come to know that the former does not supply us with any new information beyond what is already stated above. But as the latter are the only three grants of the Sendraka family that have come to light up to now, and this is the fourth one, it has got its own importance as such.

Poona.

G. H. Khare

A NOTE ON CAUTHAI: ITS MEANING AND LEGALITY

In the Journal of the University of Bombay, Vol. VII, Part I, pp. 94-107, Mr. R. N. Sāletore, M. A., has written an exhaustive note on The Significance of Cauthai in Marāṭha History. His conclusion that "the term Cauthai cannot be interpreted to mean only a military levy, but it must be remembered that it was also a well-known civil charge recovered from several sources of State interference" (p. 107), receives support from a quarter which has been till now outside the circle of sources utilized by writers on Marāṭha history. I am referring to the Kannada sources for Marāṭha history which are being edited and translated by me. One of the Kannada writers who has written a good deal about the Marāṭhas is Kavi Lingaṇa. In his work called Keladintpavijayam, while describing the will which the Emperor Auranzeb made soon after the latter's Wankheda campaign, Lingaṇa says the following:--That the Mugal Emperor as a mark of favour to Sāhu, the grandson of Sivāji, wrote a caudāī firmān to the effect that Sāhu was fully entitled to collect one part out of the four parts of the wealth (i.e., taxes in money) from the territory which was his own; and that this caudāī was thenceforward to be the legal levy which the Marāṭhas could always demand from their subjects.
(.....āreyar-ereyanāda Sivājīya pautranāda Sambājīya putranāda Sāhu-rājaṅe tān-alva dēsā-kōsaṅgalol tanage barpa-arthadoḷ catur-āṁśadoḷ-ondu-bhāga-dhana-
maṁ kumbudendu caudāyiyāīa paramāṇam baresi koḍaltad-ādiyāging-āreyarge caudā-
yiyā-arthamaṁ komba paddhatiy ādudu-intu niyāma.)

Lingana's narrative, as shown elsewhere by me, is of much value of Marā-
tha history. He lived in A.D. 1750 but completed his work between the years
A.D. 1763 and 1799. The above statement from the Keladinpavijayam is doubly
important:—Firstly, it confirms the conclusion arrived at by Mr. R. N. SALETORE
concerning the civil nature of the term cauthāi; and, secondly, it affirms that it
was the Emperor Aurangzeb who legalized the exaction of the cauthai in the
Marātha dominions of king Sāhu. What the Emperor Aurangzeb in his last mo-
ments, out of affection for Sāhu, had legalized, his son and successor the Emperor
Bahadūr Shah confirmed and continued. This explains why King Sāhu received
the cauthai as "a person", as Dr. SURENDRANATH SEN puts it; or why that
Marātha ruler "begged it from the Moghul Emperor Bahadur Shah", as
Mr. SALETORE asserts (p. 99).

Poona.

B. A. SALETORE.

MADHUSŪDANĀNANDA

On p. 427, AUFRECHT'S C. C. mentions among the works of the celebrated
Madhusūdana Sarasvati, a work called 'Rājām pratibodha'. On p. 503, ibid.,
the work is referred to by a single MS of it. In his article on Madhusūdana
Sarasvati, his life and works, in the ABORI, VIII, ii. p. 158, Mr. P. C. DIVANJII
took 'Rājām pratibodha' as a work of Madhusūdana Sarasvati on Arthaśāstra.
The only MS of it noted by AUFRECHT being in the BORI, Mr. S. N. TADPATRI-
KAR submitted in the same volume of the ABORI, pp. 331-4, the results of his
examination of the MS. He revealed that the work was not on Arthaśāstra, that
it was 'stray notes on different topics', that in the first of its two parts, the work
criticized the five makāras and that the colophon to the latter part professes
the name 'Rājām pratibodha'; that the author was a pupil of one Akhaṇḍā-
nanda and was certainly the celebrated Madhusūdana Sarasvati. Continuing
his study of this subject, Mr. DIVANJII examined the BORI MS. of the
'Rājām pratibodha' and described the work in his contribution in the ABORI,
IX, pp. 313-323. From the extracts given by him from the MS. we are able to
see that the work is in two sections in the main, the first section having two parts.
The first section deals with the 5 Makāras. The colophons call the author
Madhusūdanaṇanda Sarasvati, pupil of Akhaṇḍānanda; and as Mr. DIVANJII says
this author is different from the celebrated Madhusūdana Sarasvati.

On p. 321 of the ABORI, IX, Mr. DIVANJII extracts two passages from the MS.
in the first of which, he says 'there is perhaps a reference to the raids of the
Peshwas' forces.....in the 18th century.....' and in the second of which there
is reference to 'the rule of the Peshwas in Mahāraṇa'. From these two passages,
Mr. DIVANJII concludes that Madhusūdanaṇanda 'could not have flourished earlier
than the middle of the 18th cent.', and hence he was different from the renowned
Madhusūdana Sarasvati.

Mr. DIVANJII notes that the second of the two passages is interpolated at the
top of p. 43 of the MS. Is it not likely that the first passage also is an interpola-
tion? For it seems to me that though Madhusūdanaṇanda was certainly different

1 Lingana, Keladinipujiyam, p. 165. (Ed. R. SHAMA SASTRY. University
of Mysore Oriental Library Publications, Kannada Series, No. 9, Mysore, 1921).
2 See my Marāilha Dominions in Karnāṭaka to be out soon.
3 SEN, Military System of the Marathas, p. 41 cited by Mr. SALETORE.
from Madhusūdana Sarasvatī, he was so not because he was later but because he was earlier.

On p. 320, ABORI, IX, Mr. Divanji extracts the colophons and on the next page, a verse mentioning the residence of the author. The residence is Ratnādri on the Ratnagaṅgā to the north of the Tapatī. And we also learn that one Akhanḍānanda was his Guru. We know of the Akhanḍānanda who wrote the Paṇcaphādikā-vivarana-tattva-dipana and who was, according to the colophons, the pupil of Akhanḍānubhūti and according to the introductory verses, pupil of Anandagiri. (Benares Skt. Series, 1902.) In his preliminary salutation to Anandagiri1 at the opening of the 5th Varṇaka in the Tattvadipana, Akhanḍānanda mentions Ratnācalā as the place of Anandagiri. This Ratnācalā and this Akhanḍānanda appear to be identical with the Ratnādri and Akhanḍānanda mentioned by Madhusūdanānanda. Anandagiri is assigned to the middle or the latter half of the 13th century and his pupil’s pupil, Madhusūdanānanda might have written about the beginning of the 14th century.

Madras.

V. RAGHAVAN.

SĀYANĀ AND THE TEXT OF RGVEDA SAMHITA

In the introduction to the second volume of the Edition of Rgveda with Sāyana’s commentary published at Poona by the Vaidika Samādhana Maṇḍala, it is stated that the traditional recitation of the Sarhātī and the padapāṭha has been followed and that there can be no differences with regard to them. While reviewing the volume in the Journal of the Bombay branch of Royal Asiatic Society, Vol. XII, 1937, Prof. H. D. Velankar has objected to the above statement. He thinks that variant readings in the text of the Rgveda Samhītā are possible and that they can be determined from some sources, the most important among them being Sāyana’s commentary itself. In view of the fact that Sāyana’s Samhītā text differs sometimes from the present Sarhītā, he says, “it cannot always be maintained that he (Sāyana) adopted the different readings of the Rgveda text in his Bhāṣya through negligence and carelessness, this possibility is not wholly excluded.” I find it difficult to share his view. I do not see any reason for the possibility of variant readings. I think that the Sarhītā and pāda text of the Rgveda have come down to us unchanged by means of recitation by learned Brahmans and there is no possibility of the existence of different readings at the time of Sāyana. Different readings are likely to occur in MSS.; but that is not the case with traditional recitation. If there were different readings in Sāyana’s time, why are they not found anywhere at present, and why have not any more different readings occurred since then? We ought to have found a number of different readings, in view of the most distant date of the origin of Rgveda, if we deem them as a possibility. The fact, however, is that there is only one different reading in the whole of the Rgveda: श्रद्धयस्त: or माधवे: (7.43.3).

It may be argued that the Recension of Rgveda Sarhītā, on which Sāyana commented, may be different from the present Sākala recension, and this is why variants are visible in Sāyana’s Sarhītā. If this is a fact, the Sarhītā of that recension ought to have come down to us like the commentary. Oral tradition as well as written MSS. of the Sarhītā would have preserved this recension of the Sarhītā. This was not an impossibility as Sāyana’s date is not so distant when

1 I have assumed that the several names mentioned by Akhanḍānanda, namely, Bodhapthvidhara, Anandaśaila and Bodhaisaila refer only to Anandagiri otherwise known also as Anandajñanagiri. But I must add here that on the Praśasāra ascribed to Śaṅkara, there is a gloss by a Nārāyaṇa who describes himself as the pupil of an Anandaśaila. See Madras Triennial Catalogue, R. Nos. 3451 and 3766.
compared to that of the origin of the Rgveda. The Brāhmaṇas of the recensions other than the Śākala are still found in various parts of India; but the texts of their recensions are nowhere available. If Śāyaṇa had commented on a recension other than the Śākala, we would expect him to mention the same at the beginning of his commentary. It seems improbable that Śāyaṇa commented on a recension which was little known and not on that which was spread and was popular all over India. The MSS. of Śāyaṇa’s commentary are found in all parts of India, a fact which leads us to think that the commentary was of that recension which was spread over all parts of the country. The only recension of the Rgveda which has come down to us is the Śākala recension. The other four recensions mentioned in the Caranaṇavīhāra (Bāśkala, Avvalayana, Śārkṣayaṇa and Maṇḍukeya) were formed, as far as our present knowledge goes, simply by excluding certain hymns, and there is no chance of different readings among them. Therefore it is no use arguing that Śāyaṇa might have commented on another recension of the Rgveda.

In defence of his statement, Prof. Velankar has pointed out some variant readings in the second volume, i.e., Maṇḍalas 2 to 5. Out of them seven are real variants in his opinion. He himself admits two readings arising through oversight. Once we admit the possibility of variants caused by oversight, there is no reason to deny the same in other cases. I must here say that the writer has not quoted all the instances in the volume where Śāyaṇa differs from the Sanhītā text. I shall deal in this paper with instances not dealt with by Prof. Velankar. In order to stress my point, I must quote a few readings from some other Maṇḍalas too. I have divided all the variants in four classes. First I shall quote variants read differently by Śāyaṇa. Thus Śāyaṇa reads: 

1. भ्रमण: for भ्रमणम् 2-5-1, जन्म: for जन्माध्ये 2-6-7, अर्ध्व: for अर्ध्वः 3-4-11, इष्ट for इष्ट: 3-12-5, त्वा for त्वाम् 4-31-7, बच्च: for बच्चम् 6-21-1, पुष्टतम् for पुष्टतम् 6-23-8, मत्येष्टू for मत्येष्टु 6-66-1, विष्णु for विष्णु 7-66-8, देवता for देवता 7-70-4, जारे इष्ट: for जारे: 7-76-3, स्वप्न for स्वप्न: 
2. महोमि: for महोमि 7-88-4, संयमस्क: for संयमस्के 8-24-6, अर्थ: for अर्थ: 8-34-10.

Are we to gather from this that there existed a good number of variants in Śāyaṇa’s time? If we examine all these variants as well as the seven variants of similar nature referred to above, it will be clear that they are only the result of negligence and not of a different recension. Some of the above readings have arisen on account of different solutions of the Sandhis in the Sanhītā. This may not necessarily prove the existence of a different recension. In two cases the stanzas have त्वा and देवता while Śāyaṇa reads त्वा and देवता and explains as त्वा and देवता respectively. It is also very possible in some cases that Śāyaṇa might have purposely adopted different readings for the sake of interpretation, e.g. विष्णु: for विष्णु: 7-66-8, जारे इष्ट: for जारे: 7-76-3, अर्थ: for अर्थ: 8-34-10.

1. भ्रमण: for भ्रमण: 2-1-14, त्वाम् for त्वाम् 2-7-3, अर्ध्व: for अर्ध्व: 2-38-4, अव-वेणम्: for अव-वेणम् 4-24-6, श्रव: for श्रव: 4-28-3, अम्ब: for अम्ब 5-7-10, मत्येष्टू for मत्येष्टु 5-86-5.
3. See Max Müller and Bombay editions. In the Poona edition इष्ट: is adopted on the basis of two MSS. while all others read इष्ट:.
4. Śāyaṇa might have purposely taken विष्णु: since the Anukramaṇa attributes this stanza to Ādityas. The word विष्णु would, however, suit well to the meaning of the stanza if we understand मित्रवृक्ष: by that word in the light of the next stanza.
Secondly, I quote cases where Sāyaṇa divides the words in the Sārīhītā in a different way: वात्रेश्वरिम: for वात्रेश्वरिम: 3:53-21, रेणुकाक: for रेणुकाक: 6:28-4. (This is evident from the explanation of the word by Sāyaṇa) ब्रह्म: मुन्मन: for कृष्ण: रूपम: 7:56-13, जानिमा निसात: for जानिमा निसात: 7:42-2, उक्त्याय for उक्त्यार्य 7:60-11, वाचतर: for वाचतर 7:90-2, कव्यके for कव्यके 7:90-7.

These cases cannot be called variant readings in the strict sense of the term. They do not go to prove that Sāyaṇa's text was different from the genuine Sārīhītā; on the other hand they show that Sāyaṇa had the same text before him and that he read the words differently either for the sake of interpretation or by mistake in course of writing his commentary. These cases exclude the possibility of Sāyaṇa's having used a different recension. In a different recension words would be changed; here they are not changed but divided differently.

Thirdly, there is a good number of cases where Sāyaṇa introduces words not found in the Sārīhītā and explains them. Thus he takes: अन्त्रि: 2:35-13, आ (गतर्म): 2:39-3, ते 3:43-2, न: 3:53-16, वात 7:70-1, विष (उच्छ, उच्छन्ति) 7:77-4; 81-1; 4; मूर्य: 7:92-4, बुधम: 7:93-2.

Now what do these instances show? Since these words are foreign to the Sārīhītā and are explained by him we are obliged to conclude that they are taken as Pratikas i.e. words forming part of the Sārīhītā. But the metre of the Sārīhītā does not admit of the introduction of any foreign words and consequently these cases support the conclusion drawn above that the so-called variants revealed by Sāyaṇa's commentary are due to some negligence on Sāyaṇa's part and not due to the existence of a different recension current in his time.

Lastly some words in the Sārīhītā are neither reproduced nor explained in the commentary: e.g. न: 2:16-7; 6:46-2, आभुः: 2:16-3, पदम: 3:5-6, तत्त्व: 6:47-13. If we propose to find out Sāyaṇa's Sārīhītā text from his commentary, we shall perhaps have to say that these words were not included in his Sārīhītā, a conclusion which is evidently impossible. Sometimes Sāyaṇa does not reproduce the word in the Sārīhītā but gives its regular grammatical form and then explains it. This does not mean that Sāyaṇa's Sārīhītā contained the regular form and not the original word in the Sārīhītā. Sāyaṇa also frequently omits padapūrāṇas, such as हि, तु etc.

From the facts stated above, I come to the conclusion that Sāyaṇa's Sārīhītā text did not differ from the text of the Sārīhītā as preserved at present and that the variant readings of different types in his commentary appear to be the result either of negligence on his part or, to a certain extent, of an intentional change for the sake of interpretation.¹

Poona.

C. G. Kashikar.

¹ One statement would, perhaps, seem to be in favour of the argument put forth by Prof. Velankar. In the commentary on 8.96.14 Sāyaṇa writes: कैरिचिरियामा वो महत शति पठि. Some read महत: instead of शति: However, I do not think that such a variant prevailed in the recitation of the Vaidikas of his time, since it is nowhere found at present. There were many commentators on the Rgveda before Sāyaṇa, and I think some at least of them, known to Sāyaṇa, might have read महत: instead of शति:.
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Abdan-Nabi, 618.
Abdul Hasonali, 618.
'Abdur Razzak, 229, 232.
Abdul Wahab bin Omer, 618.
Abhaṅga, 217, 220.
—ovi-abhaṅga, 218, 219, 221.
Abhaṅga Bhāṅga (Rajwade), 220.
Abhaisinghi Rao, Bhagvandas, 445.
Abhayakaragupta, 10.
Abhicāra-Karma, 5.
Abhilāṣīṭārthacintāmaṇi, 529.
—authorship of, 531.
—date of composition of, 531.
Abhilāṣīṭārthacintāmaṇi and Silparatna,
—by G. H. Khare, 529-533.
Abhilāṣīṭārthacintāmaṇi and the Silparatna,
—by V. Raghavan, 745.
Abhinavadarpāwa, 347.
Abhinavagupta — The Kashmirian —
author of Tantrāloka, 17, 37, 38, 40,
41, 42, 527.
Abhinavā, 346, 347.
Abhinīskṛtramānasūtra—(unknown Sanskrit Text), 473, 475, 476, 550.
Abhiprāyika, 5.
Abhirā (Abhirās), 241, 242, 243.
Abhirās, 460.
Abul Fazal, 519.
Abul Fazal, 322.
Abulfeda, 625.
Abu Musa Ash'ari, 618.
Abbysinians, 617, 618.
Abbysinian Vocabulary—Loan words of
Indian Origin found in the, 34.
Ācāra-Bālambhāṭṭi,—MS of, 404.
Ācārānga, 130, 131, 132, 133, 134, 135,
136, 137.
Achaccharyabhutadhamma-suttaṁ (Maj-jhima Nikāya), 546, 548.
Achambika, 422.
Achārya Mahāsena, 517.
Achārya Vallabhajī Haridatta, 577.
Ad—tribe of, 622-623.
—people of, 623.
Adan, 622.
Addis Abeba, 33.

Aden-bin-senan, 622.
Aden, 31, 32, 616.
— an account of foundation of
(Ibn Al-Mujawir), 31.
—ancient, 624 ff.
—ancient history of, 617.
—a few legends of, 623.
—History of British period, 620.
—Medieval History of, 618.
—Modern History of, 618.
—Some Myths about, 621.
‘Aden, 622.
Aden Volcano—eruption of, 625.
—extinction of, 626.
Ādīparvan, 466.
Ādīparvan of the Mahābhārata, 460.
Adhyātma-Vyākhyāta Tārāgīṇi, 443.
Adhyātmika Balchandra, 422.
Ādi-gāvapda, 422.
Adisesa, 37, 41.
Adites—or the people of Ad., 623.
Aditi, 202.
Aḍi yama, 4188.
Aḍṛṣṭa, 72.
Adulis—the chief port of the Aksumite
Kingdom, 33, 34.
Advaita, 38, 42.
Advaitakaustubha, (Bhaṭṭoji Dikṣita),
668.
Aelius Gailus, 617.
Agaḍadatta story, comparison of pass-
ages from Sanghadāsa and Sāntisūri,
282, 283, 284.
Age of Jayatirtha, the, by B. N. Krishnah-
murti Sarma, 428, 443.
Agniṣṭhitgyaṁata, 421.
Ahanāṅuru, (251), 190.
Aḥvāditya Vira Vikrama, 411.
Aḥvāmalla, 413.
Aḥir Budhnya, 53.
Aḥura, 628.
Aḥura Mazdā, 629, 631.
Aitareya Brāhmaṇa, 338, 569.
Aitareya Upaniṣadabhāṣya, Comm. on by
—Jayatirtha, 439.
—Vyāsatirtha, 439.
Aiyangar S. Krishnaswami, Ravivarman
Kulaśekhara, 147—180.
Aiyar, K. V. Subrahmanya, 362, 363, 364, 76.
Aiyar, L. V. Ramaswami, 110, 117.
---Two Malayalam Phonemes, 716-723.
Añjagi (Modern Ajak), 687.
Ajitsingh, Maharaja, 444.
Ajitasinghji's letter, Translation of, 445, 446.
Akbar, 519, 520.
Akrash Aboo Sahl, 618.
Aṣṭara Vṛttā, 224.
Aṣṭobhya Tirtha, 432.
Aksum, 33.
Aksumite Kingdom, 34, 35.
Aksumites, 35.
Alagamalai Inscriptions, 373.
Alagarmalai Inscriptions, 373.
---Aiyar on, 373.
---Rao's interpretation of, 374.
Al-Akāf or Rub-el-Khalī, 623.
Alankāra Lakṣāna, (by Manbhuka), 176.
Alankārasarasvāsa, 176, 177.
Alankāra, 214.
Alankāradanibha, 75.
Alberuni, 261, 524.
Albuquerque, 235, 236, 619.
Alexander, 189.
---Invasion of India, 254, 255.
Alexander Sharpey, 619.
Ai—Krom, 31, 32.
Allahabad High Court, 740.
Allahabad Pillar Inscription of Samudragupta, 460.
Allaud-din, 159.
Allaud-din Khilji, 517, 695.
Altindische Grammatik—Wackernagel, J. 537 ff, 722.
Amarakosa, 743.
Amaraavati Reliefs, 544, 546, 547, 549, 550.
Amātya Sūtra Daṇḍanāyaka, 42.
Amazonite beads of Ur. ruins, 26.
American Oriental Society, 466.
Amitābha, 23.
Amitayya, 417.
Amṛta, 420.
Amuktamālīyadā (Poem by Kṛṣṇadeva Rāya), 323.
Anahilapatanā, 581.
Anaimalai Inscription, 363.
---Sastri's Reading and Remarks, 366.
---Aiyar's Emendation, 366.
---Rao's Interpretation, 366.
Ānandabodha, 433 f, 461, 462.
Ānandabodha Yati, 460.
Ānandatirtha Madhva, 523.
Ānantaṇḍand, Faṭkās of, 216.
Anātma—Vāda—pre-Buddhistic, 141.
Anderson, Dr., 624.
Andrews, F. C., 537.
Anekārtha Samgraha (by Hemacandra), 559.
Āṅgirasā, 144.
---Kevala, 144, 145, 146.
Angria Brothers, 118, 123.
---Laxmibai, 119.
---Sambhaiji, 118.
---Vessels of, 124.
Āṅguttara-Nikāya, 139, 140.
Anīta, 100.
Anseim, Captain, 121.
antara, 81, 82.
Antaraḡhara—by Bapat, P. V., 81-82.
antarika, 107.
antarayaka, 107.
Anthia, 280.
Antidoron, 538, 540.
Antiochos I, 196.
Antonio de Brito Freire—a Portuguese Captain, 125.
Anu-Bhāṣya-Tīkā, 435, 436.
Anu-Jayaśritāvivāja, 429.
anumāna, 493, 494.
anuprabhāna, 139.
Anurādhapura, 29.
Anuṣṭupā, 499.
Apabhrasa, 17.
---Dohas in, 21, 22, 23.
Apabhrasa & Marathi Metres 399.
Apabhrasā Poets—Their Peculiarities, 215, 219, 225.
Apajiram Dabholkar, 249.
Apa. Metres,—Tālageya Vṛttas (Mātrā Vṛttā), 217, 219, 224.
Apa. Metres,—Varieties of, 221, 222.
Aparārka, 741.
Apaṣṭamba, 386.
Apayoyoja Saṅkā, 497.
Arab? Felix by Bekram Thomas, 24, 624.
Araek eyerya Bonkeya Nāyaka, 417.
Ārati, 227.
Aravely Range,—Pāriyāstra Mt., 243.
Archaeological Department of the Government of India, 637, 641.
Arden, A. H.
Aradhacatuspadi Ovi (Velankar), 217.
Arduha-Māgadhī, 401.
Ardhamāgadhī canon, 130.
Arutnappatti Inscription, 363.
Arrittanpatti Inscriptions, 367, 368.
---Sastri's Readings, 367, 368.
---Aiyar's Emendation, 368, 369.
---Rao's reading, 368, 369.
Arjuna, 460.
Arjunadeva, 693.
Arjunayanas, 460.
Arjunayanas: Prarjunas—by Law, B.C., 460.
Arthagāmbhara, 75.
Art of
---figure weaving, 378.
---cotton braids, 378.
Art of figure Weaving of,—text woven in the braid, 379.
Art of letter weaving, 379, 380, 381.
—last specimen of Saivaite type, 381.
—next specimens, 379.
—two more specimens, 381.
Art of ornamental weaving, 381.
—Printing of letters on the cloth, 381.
Art allied to Paintings from Western India, 377.

Arts
—specimen dealing with art of letter writing, 377.

Āruṇī, Auddālaka, father of Nāciketas, 47, 50, 51.

Ārya-buddha-bhūmi, Vyākhyāna, of Silabhadra, 6.

Āṣānāyā (of Death), 44.


Asat—Three meanings, 317ff.

Asava, 139.

Ashi Vanguri, 628.


Asoka, 150, 189, 519.
—Edict of, 375, 576.
—Inscription found at, 192f, 596.
—Brahmagiri, 596.
—Jatinga-Rāmeswara, 596.
—Siddā pura, 596.
—Pillar of, 519.
—Records of, 596f.
—Rock inscription II, 190.

Assamese, 259, 260.
—Enclitic Definitives, 572.
—Explanation of the word—language, 259.
—personal affixation of the terms of relationship, 570.
—Plural Suffixes equated to Austric formation, 571.
—Post-positional affixes, 572.

Aśṭādhyāyī, 386, 387, 451, 456.
—the original text of, 562.

Asuras, 100.

Aśvaghoṣa, his fondness of forming desideratives, 555, 557.

Aśvalāyana, 386.

Atharvan, 630.

Atharvaveda-Prātiśākhya, 384, 387.

Atirasākh, 83.

Āṭman, 107.

Āṭman (avikṣṭa), 206.

Ātmasukha, 706, 708.
—commentary of, 700.

Ātmasukha, (commentator of Laghu Yogavaisītha), 698.

Āṭreyā, 436.

Aufrecht, 441, 461, 462, 681, 683.
—Cata. cata., 462.

Augustine, 95.

Augustus, 267.

Aurangzeb, 444, 520.

Austric Substratum in the Assamese Language, by B. KAKATI, 259-265, 570, 572.

Austronesian Speech, 30.

Auṭa, 217.

Auṭāthya Gautama, 144.

Avīḍyā, 83.

Avijja, 139, 140.

Avijnāpti, 69, 70ff.
—Corporal, 69f.
—definition of (by Saṅghabhadr and Vasubandhu), 71, 70f.
—Tabular analysis of, 72.
—Three spheres of activity, 72.
—Vaibhāṣīka view of, 70.

Avijnāpti-rūpa, 69, 70, 71, 73.
—Twofold character of, 69.
—Definition of, 70, 71.

Avimukta Tatāvya, 404.
—Colophon of, 404.

Avyakta, 106.

Awadhī word, 397, 398.

Ayasmā Na-lo-tho (Nārada) a quotation from, 599.

Ayeen-i-Akkari, 519.

Ayyubite Government, 618.

Azahar, A.D., 110.

Azes II, 272.

B

Babar, 516.

Bab-el-Mandeb, 626, 627.

Bābī (ruler of Junagadh), 586.

Babylonian Seals, 640.

Bactria, 196, 197.

Badruddin, 618.

Bagchi, Dr. P. C. I.

Bagwell, 124.

Bahadur Shah, 444.

Bāhlīkas (Bactrians), 189.

Bahma-dīja, (Brahma-deya), 246, 247.

Bāhuvali, 420.

Bālambhavati, 404.

Bālāvabodha of Tryambaka, 223.

Balridge, Adam, 666.

Balera plates of Mālarāja I, 742.

Balakrishna, Dr. 465.

Ballalasena, 522, 523.

Balto-slavonic Language, 632.

Bānapābhadra, 74, 75.

Bāṇas, 245.

Banavasi grant, 144.

Bandhuvaram, 143.

Banerji, R. D., 637.

Banian, 34.

Bankot, 123.

Bantu, 27.

Banu, Ma’an—The, 618.

Banu Mahdi, 618.

Banu Zayyads, 618.

Bapat, P. V.—Antaragāra, 81, 82.

Bappadandādhipa, 414.

Barnett, Dr. L. D., date of Gaudapāda by 526.

Baron Staal Holstein, 268.

Barros, 236.
BARUA, Dr., his studies of Bārhut sculpture, 544.
Basava, 420.
Basava & Bijjala, 421.
Basavadiśanātha, 417.
BASAVALLINGAYYA, M. S., 404.
Basavannar Dandāyanāka, 417.
Basavayya Nāyaka, 414.
Bassein, 123, 124.
— the Blockade of, 124.
Batihagah inscription of the Damoh, 460.
BEAL, (Romantic Legend of Sākya Buddha), 550.
Bedars & the Minas, 322 ff.
Belagami Record, 244.
Benarsidas, the poet, 520.
BENFYE, Theodor, 537.
Bengal Tantrism, New phase of, 13.
BENVENISTE, 402.
Bernier, 519.
Bessos, 192.
Bhadarwahi, 110.
Bhāgavata, 522, 528.
— Date of, 523f.
— Divisions of, 522.
— Evidences to prove that the Bhāga-vata Purāṇa mentioned in Dānasīgar is the present Bhāgavata, 523.
— quotations by Ballālasena, Madhava-vācarya, Govindananda, Raghu-nandana & Gopalbhaṭṭa, from, 522.
The Bhāgavata Purāṇa, by Rajendra Chandra Ḍhazra, 522, 528.
Bhāgavadgītā, 59, 523.
— Interpolations in, 62f.
— Persian translation of, 745 stanzas, of, 67.
Riddle of, 67.
— Suddha Dharma Mandal of, 62.
Bhāgavadgītā-pāvan, 68.
Bhāgavata purāṇa, 249 ff.
Bhāgavata-purāṇa, 523, 527.
quotations from, 527.
—in Adbhutasāgara, 527.
— in Madhvācārya's commentary on the Bhagavad-gītā, 527.
—in Haribhaktivilāsa, 527.
Bhāgavata-Tātparya, (Chalrī Narasimhacārya), 669.
Bhairavadevi of Gerossapa, 521.
Bhāma, 74, 471.
BHANDARKAR, Dr. D. R., 460, 465.
BHANDARKAR, D. R., 142 ff.
— A List of the Inscriptions of North India, 142f.
BHANU (King of Bābhritpalī i.e., Ghumli), the same as Bhana, 581.

Bhāgwanlal INTRAJAI, 243.
Bharāṇa Inscription (V. S. 1327), 693.
Bharata Muni, 345f, 471.
Bharatamayya, 420.
Bārhut and Sānci relics, 544.
Bhāskara, 440, 441.
“Bhāskara, Setukāra,” 683
“Bhāskarakaṇṭha”, a commentator, 461.
— Bhāskara, a work of, 461.
Bhāskarakaṇṭha's commentary on the Yogavaisṣṭya, 462.
Bhāṣya, 436.
— Bhāskara, 436.
— Rāmānuja, 436.
— Śaṅkara, 436.
— Yādavaprakāśa, 436.
Bhāṣyadīpikā, (Jagannātha Tirtha), 674, 677, 678.
Bhāṣṭā, 437.
BHATTACHARYA, Dr. Binoytosh, 2, 382, 573.
BHATTACHARYA, Bhobatosh, Raghunanda-nā's Indebtedness to Candēśvara, 534, 535.
Bhaṭṭārakas, 519.
Bhaṭṭojīdīkṣita, 453.
Bhaṭṭoji Dīkṣita — Pañcaviṃśatimata-Samgraha, 146.
Bhaṭṭōji-Kuṭṭanam (Giri Śūri), 668.
Bhavanagara State, 576.
Bhavani, 404.
Bhāvasanīgraha an anonymous Treatise on Horoscope, composed after A.D. 1587 by Patkar, M. M., 745.
Bhayaturāṇopāya, 5.
Bhedābhedā, 207.
— doctrine, 208.
Bherāṇḍanagale and Drōhara malla,— Two measuring rods, 420.
Bhillama, 414f.
Bhīlls, after A.D. 1818, 335.
— Figuring in the traditional history of Rajputana, 322.
— In Maratha times, 323.
— In pre-Maratha times, 322.
— Nayakas, agreement with, 332.
— Paṭṭi, 328.
— Results of conciliation & repression of, 332.
— Rights of, 331.
Bhīls of Maharashtra by R. N. Saletore, 322-336.
Bhīṣmaparvan, 62.
— MSS, of, 67.
— Problem of 1 1/2 Slokas, 62.
Bhoja, 471, 472.
Bholaṅkath v. Emperor, 740.
Bhūṣapakāra, 436.
Bhusuku, (or Rattu), another name of Sāntideva, 7.
Bhūțambili (Modern Ghumli), 687.
Bhāmāti, 437.
Bhīyas, 77.
Biharilal, (Hindi poet), 685.
Bihari verb, conjugation of, 571.
Bijapur Sultan, Ismail Adil Shah, 239.
Bijjala, 411, 413.
Bikrami (King Vikrama of Malwa), 622.
Bilal Yasir Mohamed, 618.
Bills—Samudra & Sagar, 463.
Bindusāra, 189.
Bir Heramast, 621.
Birth of Indian Psychology, by Mrs. Rhys Davids, 77.
Bittiga Viṣṇuvardhana, 421.
Bloc, Jules, 117.
—Sanskrit-et-Dravidien, 117.
Bloomfield, L., 103.
Bodhibhadra, 12.
Bodhibhāgya, 9.
Bodhicaryāvatāra of Śāntideva, the Mahāyānist, 6.
Bodhicitta—work on by Manjūśrī, 17.
Bodo (Tibeto-Burman Languages), 570, 571.
—Prefixes of, 572.
Boethling, 77.
Böhme, 103.
—his “three principles”, 103.
Bombay Field Club, 466f.
Bonaventure, 208.
Brahman, 39, 41.
Brāhmaṇa Cāṇḍaka, 191.
Brāhmaṇas,
—Darola, 145.
—gotraless, 146.
—identified with Ātma, 104.
—Khēduvāl, 141.
—Mahārāstra, 145.
—Madhī, 144.
—Nagar, 145.
—Namurī, 146.
—Para Brahman, 103.
Brāhmaṇa poet—Rudrabhatṭa, 424.
—(author of Jāgamiṇīa Vijaya), 424, 425.
Brāhmaṇaṭtra, II, 2-28, 207.
The Brāhmī Inscriptions of South India by C. Narayan Rao, 362, 376.
Brāhmī Script, 36.
Brāhmī Inscriptions, 362f, 376.
—Discussion on, 376.
—Conclusion from, 376.
Brambodiya Style, 208.
Brahui, 110, 116.
Brhad-Bāṇa, 240.
Brhad-Jayatirathaviyaya, 429.
Brhadgaccha, 691.
Brhaspati, 741.
Brhat Sanhitā, 460.
—the author of, 460.
Brhat Yogavāsiṣṭha, 697, (or Yogavāsiṣṭha Mahārāmāyana), 708.
Brown, W. Norman—A Manuscript of the Sthānāṅga-Sūtra, Illustrated in the early Western Indian Style, 127-129.
Bruce, 653.
Brugmann, K., 181.
Bsām-Ye, Monastery of, 8.
Bstan-hgyur, 1.
Buddha,
—birth of, 546, 547.
—Life of, 544, 551, 553.
—Sermon (First) of, (Parallel analysis of the contents of the versions of), 473f.
—Words of, 96.
Buddha-Carita (Avaghoṣa), 544 f.
Buddha and Māra, 56.
Buddhi, 105.
Buddhism, 138.
Buddhism in the Kāṭhaka Upaniṣad, by Helmhut Von Glassenap, 138-141.
Buddhist Āgama, 20.
Buddhist ascetics, 576.
Buddhist canon, 475.
Buddhists, Sacred books of, 138.
Buddhā Śūtra, 1.
Buddhā Tantra, 1.
The Buddhist Tāntric Literature (Sanskrit) of Bengal, by S. K. De, 1-13.
Dr. Bühler, 142, 558, 742, 743.
Buist, Dr. 626.
Burkhardt, Jacob, 537, 540.
Burgess, 578.
Burgess & Couseens, (List of Antiquarian Remains in the Bombay Presidency), 576.
Burton, Sir R., 625.
Bu-Ston, the Tibetan Historian, 70.
—Chos-hByung of, 70.
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Cāhamāna family, 691.
Caityas, 26.
Cakrapālika, 189.
Calcutta High Court, 740.
Calderon, 58.
Calliope, 273.
Calukyas (of Aṉāhīlpatana), 581.
Cālukya Mālāra, 579.
Cālukya Siddharāja, 579.
Cālukya Somesvara, 531.
Cālukya Viṣṇyāditya, 245.
Camu-dharmāsopaya, 5.
Canaaka of Magadhā, 10.
Cāṇḍesvara, 534.
—Works of, 534.
Candra, 188, 198.
—Candra Gupta, I or II, 188.
—Candravarman, 188.
Candra
—identification of, 188.
—in the Mēharauli inscription, 192.
Candrācāca, 687.
Candra-gomin,
—The grammarian, 5.
—The Logician, 5.
—The Tantric, 5.
Candra Gupta, II, 243.
Candra Gupta—Maurya, 189, 194, 254, 255, 257.
Candrasingi, 689.
Candravarman-Candra, 188.
Cape Route—discovery of, 619.
Cappeler, 609.
Captain Anslam, 121.
Captain Lewis, 123.
Carnatic Rajah, 123.
Capmani, E. G.—A Sanskrit Index to the Chândogya Upaniṣad, 181, 187, 609, 615.
Castraten Niebhr—a Danish Traveller, 619.
Čárvača, 493.
Čāvyācārya, 13.
Catalogue of Gopala Vilas Library, 439.
"Catalogue of Indian Collection, Museum, Fine Arts, Boston. Part IV, Jaina Paintings and Mss., 1924."
COMARASWAMI, Dr. A. K., 378.
Catherine, St. of Genoa, 79.
Caturadhyāyibhāṣya, 384.
Caturādhyāyikā of Saunaka, 384.
Catuspadis, 216, 222.
—Artha, 222.
—Ardhasama, 227.
—Mātrā, 216.
—Vāra, 216.
Catusāloki, 381.
Cāvda family, 691.
Chālāri Nṛṣīṁhācārya, 439, 669, 670.
—Works of, 669, 670.
Chālāri Saṅkaraṣanācārya, 429, 670.
—works of, 670.
Chālāri Śeṣācārya, 670.
—works of, 670.
Chālukyas, 151, 409f, 412, 424.
—Eastern, 154.
—of Kālīyā, 153.
Chandapīyuṣa (Miśra Jagannātha), 681.
Chāndogya Upaniṣad, 77, 541.
Chandōmarjiki, 685.
Chandramauli,—Minister of Vira Ballaḷa, II, 422, 424.
Chandravalli inscription, 241, 245.
Chandravalli record, 244, 245.
Chānhu Daro, 275, 638.
CHAPLIN, William, 335.
CHARPENTIER, J., 286f.
CHATTERJI, S. K., Dr. 110, 570, 722.
CHATTOPADHYAYA, 384, 455.
CHATURVEDI, S. P.,—On the Original Text of the Aṣṭādhyāyī, 562-569.
CHATURVEDI, S. P. Pāṇini and Rk—Pṛtiśākhyā, 450-459.
CHAUDHURI, Prof. Ray, 460.
Chaul, 119, 120.
Choul, 121.
Chēra, 418.
Chēra dominance in South India, 149.
Chēra Kingdom, 148.
—under Rājarāja, 152.
Chengāḷa Mahādeva, 421.
CHESNEY, 622.
Chikka Bammata, 414.
Chimaji Appa, 123.
Chims, 640.
Chinād-mi (Sk.)—Indo-European antecedent of, 633, 636.
Chinese annals, 272.
Chinese Pilgrimage, 1.
Chisen Akunuma, 599.
Chola Chāḻukya struggle, 153.
Chola ascendency, the establishment of, 152.
Chola empire, 154, 161.
'Chola Kamala Kanjapriya', a title to Narasimha, 418.
Chola Kingdom, 150, 151.
Chola Mahādevi, a queen, 426.
Cholas, 409 f, 412.
Christovão de Figueiredo, 235 f.
—embassy de Figueiredo, 236.
Cintra Prāsasti, 586 f.
Citsuļka, 433, 434, 442.
—Tattvapradipikā of, 434.
Citsuļki, 436.
Cittappa, a forgotten Sanskrit poet of Bhoja's Court. by E. V. Vira Ragha- vacharya, 300-316.
Cittapa’s Date, 301 f.
Cittapa—References to, in Telugu Literature, 302 f.
Cittapa, Verses of, gleaned from the anthologies & works on “Sāhitya”, 304-316.
Classical Marāṭhi Poetry, 219.
Cobb, Captain, 657, 658, 659, 660.
Cobb and Ayres, 657, 658, 661.
COKE, Sir Edward, 653.
Colombo (= Kolaba), 120.
Cōlāmamandala or Cormadel, 276.
Cōlās, 275.
COLEBROOKE, 404.
Comm. of—
—Vijayiṇḍa, 442.
—Rāghavendra, 442.
—Vedēśa Satyanātha, 442.
Commodore Lewis, 118.
Commodore, 124.
Concepts of Riti and Guna by P. C. LAHIRI (Reviewed by D. K. KELKAR), 471.
Conversion of Nanda (Amarāvati reliefs), 557.
Correa, 235 f.
Cosmos Indicolonus, 34, 35, 36.
COUSENS—Revised Test of Antinomian Remains in the Bombay Presidency, 687.
CROISSET, 280.
—Histoire de la Littérature Grecque, 280.
Cūdāsamā family 578, 579, 580, 692.
—Cūdāsamā King, 730.
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Dāhala (Country), 573.
DALAL C. D., 539, 560.
DALGADO, Mgr., 400.
Dalmeyda, Prof., 280.
Damanakapura, 573.
Damanidevi, 573.
Damascente, 103, 213.
Dānāṣīgrāma Ballalena, 523.
Dānāśīla, 11.
Dancing of Ancient Hindus, 345.
Dancing, 346.
—Elements of, 346.
Dānḍānayaka Brahmadeva of Banavāse, 413.
Dānḍī, 74, 75, 76, 214, 471, 472.
'Dantamāliya'—Interpretation of, 722.
Dante, 204.
Daud Abdul Majid, 618.
Dāsarānaprakāśa, 223.
Dāsavaīkālika, 130-137.
Dās, Govinda, 404.
Date of composition and authorship of a well-known verse in Sanskrit—by Hiralal R. Kapadia, 340-341.
'Date and Place of origin of Yoga-vaśiṣṭha', (A paper read before Orien-
tal Conference, Baroda, 1933), 697.
Dayaladas, 445.
Death, 43-48, 52, 53.
—Progeny of, 44, 45.
—Sacificial animals of, 44, 45.
—duties of, 44, 45.
Debrunner, Albert.
Debrunner, Prof. 539.
De, J. C., Dutch and English Piracies in Eastern Waters and their Effect on the Company's Trade with India (1620-1661), 649-666.
De, Prof. S. K., 214, 466.
De, S. K.—A note on the Gauḍi Riti, 74-76.
De, S. K.—The Buddhist Tantric Literature (Sanskrit) of Bengal, 1-23.
The Derby, 121.
—The Story of its capture, 121 ff.
Desala, Saṅghapati, 730.
Description of Illustrations in the Śvet-āmbara Jain Ms., 128.
Deśigaṇa, 423.
Deśināmāmālā—Bikancer Ms. of, 558, 559, 561.
Deśināmāmālā—of Hemacandra, 558.
Deussen, 77, 106.
Devadūtakta Sanhitā, 462, 698.
Devala, 535.
—quotation from, 535.
Devaṇa, 421.
Devaṇabhāṭṭa, 523.
Devanāgari character, its use in inscrip-
tions, 588.
Devas, 102, 203.
Devendra, 286 f.
Devi Bhāgavata, 522, 523.
Devi Setṭi, 412, 422.
Dhāmlej Inscription, 739.
Dhammapāla, 82.
Dhammālakāṇḍi, 281, 291, 296, 297.
Dhanapāla—Prakrit Dictionary written by, 558.
Dhārā, 725.
"Dharma", 138, 139, 140.
Dharmacakra, 472.
Dharmacakrapravartanasūtra, 473, 484.
—Comparative notes on, 487.
—Translation of, 489.
Dharmacarṣūtra, 473, 476.
—Translation of, 479.
Dharmalakṣaṇa School, 70.
Dharmāṁśa—by Nayasena, 425.
Dharmapāda—also called Gupalārīpāda, 23.
Dharmaprvartanam in Abhinīkramaṇa-
sūtra, 481.
Dharmapāla, 725.
Dharmasūtra of Āpastamba, 386.
Dharmasūtras, 740.
Dharmasāstravīcāra, 534.
Dharmikṣa, 197.
Dhātupāṭha, 557.
Dhondji, 118.
Dhrva Padas or the Sthāyi—traced back to Ardhhasama Catuspadis, 216.
Dhumāli-Tāla, 218, 227, 228.
Dhvanyāloka, 471, 472.
Dialects,
—Iranian, 110.
—Indo-Aryan, 110.
Die Lehre der Jainas, by Walther Schubring, (reviewed by A. M. Ghatage), 469.
Dictionary—Apte's, 82.
Difference between n and n in Mala-
yālam, 717.
Difference between n and n in Old Tamil, 718.
Digambaras, 517.
Digby, 650.
Dignāgas, 128.
Dikṣita, Bhaṭṭoji, 668.
Dīṅḍi, 225 f.
—Dīṅḍī<diaeresis>Dīṅḍīma (Sk.), 226.
Diodotus of Bactria, 267.
Dionysius, 97, 205.
Dīpāṇkara Srijānā, 7, 9.
—Pupil of Jetārī, 9.
Dīpāṇkara Srijānā—his Tibetan title, Atisā, 9.
High Priest of Vikramśila and Onda-
tapuri, 9.
Discussion of the problem of "food", "houses" and "nights", 44-46.
(see Death—Etc.)
Diskalkar, D. B.
—Inscriptions of Kathiawad, 576, 590, 686, 696, 724, 739.
Divākaraṇanda, 11.
Divānji, P. C., 37.
—The text of the Laghu Yoga- 
Vāsiṣṭha, 697-715.
divīra (dabīra), 742, 743.
Divyāvadāna, 550.
Dikshitar, V. R. Ramachandra—Raja-
dharma in the Saunakīya, 337-339.
Doctrines of exemplarism—Vedic and Christian, 55.
Doctrines of Sphoța, 437.
Dgri, 110.
Dohâ—caryāgitiśāstṛ of Kila-pâda, 23, Dohâ-kosā—
—of Krṣṇa, 21.
—of Saraka, 22.
Dośas (or defects) of poetry, 471.
Dramila Samgha, 43.
Drama (Coin), 589.
Dravidian,
—primitive, 116, 117.
—northern, 116.
Dravidian speeches—non-literary, 716.
Dresden period, 58.
Drîṣṭivāda, 287.
Dukkha, 140.
Dukkha saddhā, 140.
Duff, Grant, 325, 335.
Dungarsinha, 736.
Durson, John, 664.
Dutch and English Piracies, in Eastern Waters and their effect on the Company's trade with India (1620-1661).
by J. E. De., 649-666.
The Dutch Fleet, 125.
Dvaita Vedânta, 428.
Dvaita View, 438.
Davitism of Madhva—Religion of, 421.
Dvâyâmasyâyanas, 146.
Dzonnagnir, 597.
Dzonnagni, (Suvaṅṅagni) records, 597.
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Early Western Indian Style of Paintings, —best period of, 128.
Echala Dēvi, 409.
Echo-words, 109, 110.
Eckhart, 87, 92, 95, 98, 202, 205, 207, 213.
Edavara Râchayya Nâyaka, 417.
Edgerton, Franklin, —Jacob Wackernagel, 539.
Edgerton, Prof. F., 202, 466, 536.
Ekanath, 219, 221, 223.
Ekâśrutī—(Same monotonous way of recitation), 565, 568.
Ekâśrutī-pâṭha, 568, 568.
Elements of Hindu Iconography by T. A. Gopinathrao, 529.
Elusium, 102.
Embassy of the Jesuit Fathers, 234.
Emeneau, M. B.
—Echo words in Toda, 109-117.
Empyrean, 102.
Energy ("Shakti"), 60.
English, The, 119, 120, 121, 124.
Ephesiaka of Ephesian History of Xenophon of Ephesus, 280.
Epigraphia Indica, 413.
Epigraphical material from Kathiawad, 577 ff.

Epigraphs, 363.
—General features of the sounds recorded by the letters of, 363.
Ethiopia, 34, 36, 280.
Ethiopian Bible, 34.
Etruscan tombs at Vulci, 640.
Etruscans, 640.
Eucriades, 273.
Eudaemon Arabia, 617.
Eudamus, 255.
Euhydemus, 273.
Evaluation of Sanskrit n in Kerala, 720.
Evaluation of Sanskrit n in Tamil, 719.
"Evolution of Awadhī" by Baburam Saksena, (reviewed by Siddheswar Varma), 645.
Exhibit No. 1, "A"—S. Bhimacar Pandit, supplied by, 429.
Exhibit II, 430, 431.
Exhibition, 591.
—Planning of, 591.
—conditions of, 591.
Exemplarist doctrine, 206.
Extracts from Govindcandra Madanapâla, "B", 430.

F

Fakhruddin, 518.
Farrukhsiyar, Emperor, 444.
Fata Morgana, 58.
Feer, M., 475.
Ferozabad, 618.
Ferrand, 28, 29, 32.
Fick, 742.
Firistah—Account of Firistah, 229, 230, 231, 239.
First Sermon of the Buddha, the, by N. Aiyaswami SASTRI, 473-492.
Firoz Shah, 194.
Fleet, Dr., 409 ff.
Fleet, Prof., 142.
Foucher—the Pioneer in Buddhist Iconography, 544.
Forbes, 578.
Founders of Vijayanagara by S. Sri-Kantayya, (reviewed by P. K. Gode), 470.
Frankfort, Dr., 638.
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Gacchāi (Sk.). —Indo-European antecedent of, 632, 634, 636.
Gacchāi (Sk.), 632, 633, 636.
Gadha Karnāṁrita—by Sakalavidya chakravarti, 418.
Gaikwad (family of), 583.
Gâlâva, 453.
Ganaka, 741.
Gânda Para Brhaspati, 724, 725.
Gânda Para Virabhadra, 724, 727.
Gandapendra Chenma Kâlama Sâhi, 414.
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Gándhāra Reliefs, 545, 548, 551, 552.
Gándhika Jogā, 690.
Gangādāsa, (author of Chandomāṅjari), 685.
Gangetic Valley, 639.
Gangoly, O. C.
—Some Buddhist Sculptures in relation to some Buddhist Texts, 544-553.
Ganguli, Suprakāśa, 382.
Garbe, 63 ff.
Garbhā-pāda, or Garbha-pāda,—popularly called Gābhur Siddha, 23.
Gārgya, 453.
Garrett, R., 127.
Gaspar Chanoa, 235 f., 238, 239.
—Embassy of—Gaspar Chanoa, 236.
The Gate of Tears, (Bab-el-Mandeab), 615.
Gāthās, 630.
Gauḍas, 74, 75.
Gāvula Abhinanda. 460 f., 697 ff., 701, 703, 704, 707, 709.
Gauḍa Mārga, 74, or Gauḍi Riti, 74, 76.
Gaudapāda, 524.
—Gaudapāda n., 526.
—Karikas of—526.
Gaudī, (diction), 74.
—Gaudīya diction, 74.
Gaurishankar, Pt., 110.
Gautama, 138, 513.
Gautama, Indrabhūti, 129.
Geiger, Professor, 138.
Geiger, Mrs., 138.
Ghanakāria, 227, 228.
Ghatage, A. M.—A note on Utkalāpaya, 342-343.
Ghatage, A. M.—Parallel passages in the Daśaīkālika and the Ācārāṅga, 130-137.
Ghatage, A. M.—Review on Die Lehre der Jainas of Walther Schubring, 469, 470.
Gangoly, O. C.—Some Buddhist Sculptures in relation to some Buddhist Texts, 544-553.
Gheria, the Chief of, 121.
Ghori, Sultan Mohammad, 517.
Gosh, Dr., 450, 451, 452, 453, 454-455ff.
Gosh, Jogendra Chandra, Gotra and Pravaras of the Kadambas, 144-146.
Gosh, Jogendra Chandra—Pūrṇagiri and Uḍḍiyāna, 573-575.
Girinagara, 189.
Gītā-bhāṣya-Prameyadipikā, 440.
Gitagovinda, 377.
Gītā, Original, 63.
Gītārhasamgraha of Abhinava Gupta, 524.
Gītā Tātparva Nyāyadipikā, 441.
Glassenap, Helmut von—Buddhism in the Kāthaka Upaniṣad, 138-141.
Glassenap, Prof. Helmut von, 516.
—his remarks on the mutual relation of Jainas & Mohamedans, 516.
Gm-skhō, (Sk. gacchāmi), 636.
Godbole, 227.
Gode, P. K., 575.
Gode P. K. A work on Prosody by Misra Jagannātha, called “Chandahpiyuṣa” and its probable date, 681-685.
Goethe, 58.
Goha, The King of the Bhils, 322.
Gohel family of Bhavanagar, 689.
Gohel family (History of), 576, 580 f.
Gohilote, 322 f.
Gajaventakāra, Daksīna Chakravarti—A title of Vira Ballala, 418.
Gokhale, V. V., What is Avijñaptirūpa (Concealed Form of Activity)? 69-73.
Goldstücker, 567 note 4, 567.
Gotra & Pravaras of the Kadambas by Jogendra Chandra Ghosh, 144-146.
*Gm-Skō Versus *Gm-Skhō—by C. R. Sankaran, 632-636.
Gondopharnes, 272.
Gopalabhaṭṭa, 522, 528.
—quotations from Bhāgavata by, 528.
Gopal Vilas Library—the catalogue of, 439.
Gopicand Legend, 18.
Gopinathrao, T. A., 529.
Gorakṣanātha—disciple of Matsyendranātha, 18.
Gotra, 144.
—Aṅgirasa, 144, 145.
—Vāśisṭha, 144-145.
—Bhāradvaja, 144, 145.
—Gotama, 144.
—Atri, 145.
—Kāśyapa, 145.
—Agastya, 145.
—Vīśvāmitra, 145.
—Jambagni, 145.
—Gautama, 145.
—Atri, 145.
Gotra-pravara-nibandha-kadambam, 144, 145.
Gotra-pravara-viveka, 144.
Governor of Mokka, 654.
Govindacandradeva, King, 429.
Goyanddas, 445.
Grammatical peculiarities of Varāṅga-carita—by A. N. Upadhye, 554-557.
Grandier, 30.
Grassmann, 211.
Gṛhasharattākara of Candeśvara, 534.
gṛma-Kāyasthās, 743.
granthākṣara script, 719, 720.
Grant of Mūlarāja, 742.
Grant of the Valabhi King Śilāditya, 743.
Greek Satraps, 255.
GRIERSON, Sir George, 570.
GRIERSON, Sir George A., 376.
Grimm's Law of Germanic Sound-shift, 634.
Gujarati Language, 401.
——origin of, 588.
——Taking place of Sk. in writing inscriptions, 587.
——usefulness of Kathiawad inscriptions for the history of, 587.
Gupas (or excellences) of poetry, 471.
GÜNTERT, Prof., 468.
GÜNTERT, Prof. Dr. Hermann, Wörter und Sachen (reviewed by S. M. KATRE, 468.
Gupta dynasty, 188.
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HALÉY, 34.
Hallmark of man and religion, A. by Mrs. C. A. F. RHYS DAVIDS, 77-80.
HANDOUI, K. K.
An Indian Prince in a Greek Prose Romance, 280.
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—Pāṇḍya-Chola War, 155.
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Pūjyapāda, 423.  
Pulakesin, I, 244.  
Punar Mṛtyu, 44.  
Punāṭa, 241, 244.  
Punjab—Scene of activities of Candra- 
gupta, 254.  
Paṇmanniru, 276.  
Paṇṇas, 524.  
—lists by Alberuni of, 524.  
Paṇḍacandra of Delhi, 517.  
Paṇṇagiri, 573ff.  
Paṇṇagiri and Uddiyāna, by Jogendra 
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Ramchandra Dīkṣhitār, 337-339.  
Rajadharmā in the Saunākiya—by V. R. 
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Sikṣā-samuccaya of Sántideva, the Māháyaníst, 6.
Silabhadra—the Maháyaníst Scholar, 6.
—friend and teacher of Yuvan Chwang, 6.
Silparatna, 529, 531.
—Author of, 531.
—Date of, 531.
Sínha, 687.
Sínhalá in Central India, 463.
Sínhalá in Central India—GHOSH, Jo­gendra, Chandra, 463.
Sindhi, 397.
Singhána, 417.
Sira hill, 621.
Sira Island, 619, 620, 621.
SIRKAR, Dines Chandra—Kadamba Ma­yúrasarman, 240-248.
SIRKAR, Dr. Dines Candra, 144.
Sittamavausal Inscription.
—AIYAR'S readings of, 262, 375.
—SHASTRI'S Readings of, 362, 375.
—RAO'S grouping of, 375.
Sir Henry Middleton, 619.
Sivakandavarman, 245, 246, 247.
Sivavarman, 247.
Skambha Grk. Stauros, 108.
Skandas—five, 69.
Skandagupta, 189.

Sleša in Bānā—RAGHAVAN, V., 214.
Sleša, 214.
—of Bānā, 214.
—of Dundí, 214.
SMITH, V. A., 188, 193, 460.
Smrititirtha M. KAMALKRISHNA, 534.
Smuticandrika, 523, 741.
Sodhala, 730.
Som, 34.
Solomon, Hebrew Kingdom of, 26.
Somaprabha, 288.
Somapuri, Monastery of, 2.
Some Buddhist Sculptures in relation to
some Buddhist Texts, by O. C. GAN­GOJI, 544-553.
Some interesting Vocabularies from modern
Indo-Aryan Dialects, by Baburam SAKSENA, 397-398.
Some sidelights on Cāpakya, the Great
Chancellor—by H. C. SETH, 254-258.
Somesavará, 413, 418, 226f.
Some noteworthy things of Ajitsinghji's
letter, 444.
Sonagiri, 596, 597.
Sophocles, 58.
Sorasagárama (-modern Kansari), 694.
So ra:—109.
—So: ra language—of the Mundā
group, 109.
Sővidéva Rāya Murārī, 411, 413.
Sou Rojá, 120.
Southern India, Arabia and Africa, by
K. A. Nilkantha SASTRI, 24-36.
South India—Early maritime contacts of,
27.
Specimens of Arts allied to Paintings
from Western India—by M. R. MA­JUDAR, 277-382.
SPENCER, Harold, 109.
—A Kanaressé grammar by, 109.
'Spread-contact', dento-alveolar, 717.
Sphoṭāyana, 458.
Srāja, 51, 53.
Srāj, 51.
Srāmaṇa, 516.
Srātra Sūtras, 144, 145.
Srāutra Sūtra of Āśvalāyana, 386.
Srāvyas, 83.
Sridhara, 223, 437.
Śrīgāra-prakāśa, of Bhoja of Dhārā,
300f.
Śrī Harṣa, 433, 435.
Śrīhaṭṭa, 573.
Śrīkantaya, S.—Founders of Vijayana­gara, reviewed by P. K. GODE, 470.
Śrī Kṛṣṇadeva Rāya, 411.
Śrīkumāra, author of Śilparatna, 531.
Śrīka, 51.
Śṛṅkā, 51.
Śrotriyas (Vedic reciters), 565.
Śrotriya, 562.
Śṛṣṭi, 90.
Śrutaprabāśābhāva-prakāśa (Raṅga­rāpañi), 694.
STCHEBATSKY, Professor, 138.
STEIN, O.—Round the Maharauli Inscrip­tion, 188-198.
Sthāpanācārya, 129.
Sthānāṅga Śūtra, 127, 128, 129.
Sthiramati, 70.
—his commentary on the Pañcasūkhandha, 72.
Strārā-Sāra—peaks, 629.
—Gutturals in Hittite and I. E., 632.
Subhākara, 12.
SUBHĀYdvA, K. V., 117.
Suddha Dharma Mangala of Madras, 65.
—The Bhagwadgītā of, 62, 66.
Suddhi-vajra-pradipa, 19.
Suddhiratnakara of Candeśvara, 534.
Suddhitavat of Raghunandana, 534.
Sūdras, 145.
'Sud, Sod, 'um'lt-a—The common Toda greeting, 110.
Suggaldēvi, 418, 419.
Sujuanendra Tirtha, 679.
SUKTHANKAR, Dr. V. S., 466, 536.
Sūlīkas alīs Solīkas & Čōlikas, 276.
Suleman, 517.
Sultan Shah Rukh, 229.
Sultan Ahmed, 620.
Sultan-el-Mansoor Halim, 618.
Sumatindra Tirtha, 675.
—Works of, 675ff.
Sumer, 638, 639.
Sumerian Seals, 640.
Sumha, 196.
Sundara Pāṇḍya, 160f, 166.
SUNDSTROM, 36.
Supreme Identity, 106.
The Suppression of a disturbance of the Bhils, 326.
Sūra, 518.
Surāṣṭra, 189.
Sureśa, 436.
Susa, 638, 639.
Sūtra, Buddhist, 1.
Sūtras—of Panjīnī, 562.
Sūtrakṛtāṅga, 130.
Sultānipāka, 140.
Sūtrapāda Inscription (v.s. 1357), 735.
Sūtra Prasthāna, 735.
Sutta-vibhaṅga, 82.
Suvannagiri, 596, 597.
Suviśākha—The Pahlava, 189.
Suviśāda-Samputa of Tankaḍāsa, Comm. on the Hevajra-Tantra, 12.
Svagata-metra, 137.
Śvāmi Mahāśāna (Śadānana), 241.
Svargayya vrīta, 219.
Śvara-prakṛtiya, 565.
Śvara-siddhānta-candrikā, 563.
Svatantra Mādhyaṃrika School, 8.
Swanley's Journal, 654.
Syllogism, 500.
—of Bhāṭṭa School, 500.
Sylvan Lēvi, 24, 30.
T
TADPATRİKAR, Kaśmirian, MSS mentioned by, 62.
Tailapa, 416.
Ṭattṛtiya Brāhmana, 564.
Ṭattṛtiya Brāhmana—version of the story of Nāciketās, 46.
Takṣasālā University, 256.
Tamil, 723.
The Tamil Country—The condition of, at the beginning of 14th century, 157.
Tamil Inscription, 362.
Tāndava Lakṣāṇam, 346.
Tāṇḍā, 139.
Tanka (Coin), 589.
Taṅkāsā (or Dāingadāsa), 12.
Tantra, Brahmanical, 17.
Tantra, Buddhist, 1.
Tantras—Hindus and Buddhist, 573.
Ṭattṛrasārasamgraha, 443.
Ṭantric Abhīcāra—works on, 5.
Ṭantric Literature—Buddhist, 1.
Ṭantric religion, 16.
Ṭāntrikas, 575.
Tarik Taght ‘Aden.
—An Arabic MSS., 626.
Ṭarkabhāṣā, a work on logic by Mokṣākara GUPTA, 12.
TARKAVĀCASPATI, Tārānāth, 562.
Ṭāpārya-Candrikā (Vyāsarāya), 672, 673.
Ṭāpāryapraṅkāśa, 460.
Ṭattṛvasamgraha, of Śāntiraksita, 8.
—(—both in Sanskrit and Tibetan), 8.
Ṭattṛvabindu, 486.
Ṭattṛvaprātipāka of Citsukha, 442.
Ṭattṛvapraṅkāśa = Upādhiṅkhaṇḍa-Tikā, 434, 435.
Ṭattṛvasaṅkhyaṅa Tikā, 433.
Ṭattṛvaviveka-Tikā, 433.
Ṭattṛvandyotā-Tikā, 433.
Tavernier, 519.
Tejānāyaka, 686.
Tejāpāla, 560, n. 43.
Tell Asmar, 638.
Tenkaṇādītīya (or Tenkana Chakravarti or Sapta Mālava Viṣṇuvardhana) Titles of Virballāla, 409.
Thākur Pāli, 693.
Thākur-Sāmantasha, 693.
Thānangasutta, 127.
Theravāda, 560.
THIEME, 569-n. 5.
THIEME, Dr., 450.
THOMAS, Ptof., 269.
THOMAS, S., 90.
Tibeto-Burmā, 260.
Tīka-cārya-title of Jayatirtha, 428.
Tilo-pa or Tilakapāda, 20.
Timbōnaka (Modern Timāṅg), 687.
Timrāṅgachāra, 423.
Tip̄ārī Song in Marathi, 216.
Tip̄ārīcana Pali, 138, 140.
Tippoo Sultan, 620.
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- **Tirupparankunrum Inscription**, 363, 367.
  - SASTRI’s reading of, 367.
  - SASTRI’s remarks, 367.
  - AYAR’s emendations, 367.
  - RAO’s readings, 367.

- Tirthaprabandhā—by Vādirāja, 428.

- Titan Father, 50.

- Tithi, 142.

- Tod, 322.

- Tod, Major James, 576.

- Toda, Sanshī rules, 111.
  - Nouns, 110.
  - Sod < Sk. śabda, 110.
  - Sūdī < Sk. sūdhī, 110.
  - Verb formation, 115.
  - Verbs, 114.

- Tolkāppiyam, 718.

- totems, 275.

- Tāya Singayya, 414.

- Trade relations between South India and the Roman Empire, 32.

- Trailokyarṣi, 725.

- Trāi-ṛiya-Pallava, 148, 150.

- Trāisvarya (Accented form), 566, 567.

- Trāisvarya-Pāṭha, 567, 568.

- Travankore State, 147.
  - Extent of territory, of, 147.

- Treaty of Vervins, 660.


- Traibhāngi metre, 216.

- Trīkālēśvarā Inscription, 415.

- Trīvandrum Sanskrit Series, (No. 12), 37.

- Trivikrama, 438.

- Trivikrama Paṇḍitācārya, 429.

- Tryāraṣa-vartma, 144.

- Tukārāma, 220.

- Tulaiji, 118.


- Tulu, 716.

- Tuluvāla Mahādevi, 411.

- Tvaṭr, 54.

- Two Malayāḷam Phonemes, by L. V. Ramaswami Aiyar, 716-723.

- Two Vedantic Hymns, BSOS, VII, 93.

- **U**

  - Udayanagiri Cave Inscription of G. E., 82, 460.

  - Udayana, 507-512.

  - Udayāpura = Udayapura, 251.

  - Uddhāra by Vimala—a glossary to the Desināmāmāḷa, 559.

  - Uddiyāna = Udyāna (Swat Valley), 574.

  - Udhyogaparvan, 466.

  - Ugh Khan, 695.

  - Undāṅkal Inscription, 375.
  
  - AYAR on, 375.


  - Upādhi, 496.

  - Upādhikhaṇḍana-Tikā, 434.

  - Upādhyāya, Gaṅgēśa, 436.

  - UPADHYE, A. N.—Grammatical peculiarities of Varāṅgacaritā, 554-557.

  - UPADHYE, A. N.—Varāṅgacaritā, 554.

- Upākṛti-Tattva, 404.

- Upaniṣā, 140.

- Upaniṣad-Bhāṣya-Tīka, 439.

- Upaniṣads, 58.

- Uparṇāyanas, 522.

- Upatissa, 599.

- Upavasathā, 46.

- Ur, 25.
  
  - Amazonite beads of, 26.

- Uraiypur, 275 f.

- Ordheva-paṭakas (Upright slabs), 546.

- Urdu, 110.

- Uṣanas, 741, 742.

- Utkalāpa, BÖHLMING and ROTH on, 342.

- Uttamabhadras, 599.

- Uttarādhvayana-Tīkā, 281.

- Uttaragītābhāṣya of Gauḍapāda, 524.

- **V**

  - Vācārāmabhāna,—by Rāmānuja, 434.

  - Vācaspati Miśra, 428, 436, 437.

  - Vādi-Nāyāa-Vṛtti-Vipaṅcitārtha of Sāntiraksita, 8.

  - Vādāvali, 441, 442.

  - Vāindhra Tirtha, 678, 679.

  - works of, 679.

- Vādūkas, 190.

- Vāghela (Royal Family), 579 f.

- Vāgīvijāpti, 69.

- Vāhlikas, 193.

- Vaidarbhās, 75.

- Vaidharbhi (diction), 74, 75.

- Vaidiki-Prākṛtyā, 565.

- Vaidyās—A caste of, In Bengal, 743.

- Vaijayaṇti (Kośa) of Yādavaprakāśa, 197.

- VAIN, 650.

- Vaiśampāyana, 63, 66.

- Vaishnava marks in the Jain Paintings, 129.

- Vaiśya Puṣyagupta, 189.

- Vāja (Rules of Somanāth Pataṇa), 579.

- Vājapeya, Narasāṁtha, 522.

- Vajrayāna doctrines, 3, 4.

- Vajrayāṇists—Four Sacred spots of, 573.

- Vajrayāṇist writers, 2.

- Vākāṭaka king Harisena—inscription of, 241-42.

- Vakragaccha, 423.

- Valabhi Sarīvat (use of inscriptions), 590.

- Valenta, 625.

- Vallabhaḥācārya, 381.

- Vallabhācārya Sect, 377.

- Vāmana, 75, 76, 471 f., 524.

- Vamba, 190.

- Vambar Moriyar,—a Maurya upstart, 190.

- Vanapootras (children of the Forest), 322.

- Vanaratna, 12.

- Van dar Broeck, 649.

- Vanga, 196.

- Van Linschoten, 652.

- Van Riebeck, Johan (Governor of the Cape), 656.
Varāṅgacarita, 554 ff.
Varāṅgaracarita—Grammatical Peculiarities—by A. N. Upadhye, 554-557.
Vararuci, 400.
VARMA, Siddheshwar, 110.
Varnas,—four, 145.
Varṇavṛtta, 219.
Varuṇā, 50.
Vāṣa, 206.
Vāṣṭṭha Candrikā, (—Commentary on Laghu Yogavāsīṣṭha, by Atmasukha), 698.
Vāṣṭṭha Rāmāyaṇa (Laghu Yogavāsīṣṭha), 697.
Vāṣṭṭhaśāsana-samuccaya—(Alternative title for Laghu Yogavāsīṣṭha), 697.
Vasubandhu, 70, 71.
—Abhidharmakosā of, 70.
—Bhāṣya on Abhidharmakosā of, 71 f.
—Definition of Avijñapti of, 70-71.
—Pañcaskandha of, 71.
Vasudevahāni, 281, 285, 287.
Vazartmav, title of, 120.
Vedāṅgas, 560.
Vedavyāsa, 742.
Vedavyāsasmṛti, 741.
Veil of Māyā, 58.
—dictum of, 58.
VELANKAR, Prof. H. D., 399, 400 ff., 559.
Velār, 279.
Venkatramasastri, 325.
Verdant Aden, 624.
Vibhishana, 573.
Vibhūticandana, 12.
Vidarbhāṣa, 460.
Vidhūśatras, 562.
Vajra-pāda Sāra-samgraha, 20.
Vidyā, 83.
Vidyāranyā, 41, 42, 432.
—jivanātmaniveka, of, 41.
Vighaṇa-nirāsaka-pramathana-pāya, 5.
Vijayanagara Empire, 470.
Vijayānanda—a feudatory of Sāragadewa, 581.
Vijaya Pāṇḍya-Kāmadeva, 411.
Vijayasena, 520.
Vijayasimha of Viṣvamitra-gotra, 463.
Vijayasimha Sūri, 695.
Vijjā, 139.
Vijnāna, 105.
Vijnāpti, 75.
Vijnāpti—vocal, 69, 70.
Vikramaḥādyā, I, 244.
Vikramāditya—Bali—Indra, 245.
Vikramaṃkadevacarita, 301 ff.
Vimala—the author of Uddhāra glossary to Deśināmamalā, 559.
Vīmāṇavatthu, 78.
Vimuttimagga, 599 f.
Vinayāditya, 420.
Vināḍa—descendant of Viḍūpa, 23.
Vinaya-piṭaka, 81.
Vinayasrimitra, 20.
Vincent Smith, 255, 460.
Vindhukṣaḍa Cuṭkulānanda Sātakarni, 247.
Vipassanā, 139.
Vipassi—a former Buddha, 548.
Vira, 518.
Vira Ballāla, II, 518.
—Administration of, 419 ff.
—Architecture of the time of, 423.
—Characteristics of the Literature of the time of, 425 f.
—Chief Jain Gurus of the time of, 423.
—Chief poets of the time of, 424.
—Chief Queens of, 425.
—Chief Saiva Gurus of the time of, 422.
—Education of the time of, 423 f.
—Political survey of the time of, 409 ff.
—Religion and Fine Arts of the time of, 421 ff.
—Titles of, 426.
Vira Ballāla, II.—by S. Srikanth Sastri, 409-427.
Viradhavala, 579.
Vira Narasimha, II, 412.
Vira Pāṇḍya, 161 f., 166.
Viraṇaghaṇacarya, E. V.—Cittapala, A Forgotten Sanskrit Poet of Bhoja’s Court, 300-316.
Vira Saivism, religion of, 412.
Virasimha, 240.
Vira Somesvararn, 156, 418.
Virūpa-pādenacaturāsīti, 19.
Virūya, Yogīvarah, 19.
Viśākhyāpya, a king, 463.
Viṣāladeva, 560, 736.
Viṣālakirti, 519.
Viṣṇistāvaitism of Rāmānuja, 421.
—religion of, 421.
Viṣṇudharmasūtra, 740.
Viṣṇudharmottara, 524.
Viṣṇugupta, 194, 195.
Viṣṇupāda, 197.
Viṣṇu-Purāṇa, 524, 525, 526.
Viṣṇu-tattva-nirṇaya-Tīkā, 434.
Viṣṇu, 38, 41, 96.
—Three steps of, 96.
Viṣṇuvardhana I, 427.
Viṣṇuvardhana—Bṛttiga, 409 f.
Viṣṇudhīmagga, 81.
Viṣṇuvatipu, 740.
Viṣṇuśvar, 461.
Viśvarāṇa, 442.
Vogel, Prof. 142.
Vonones—Family of, 272.
Vonones of East Iran, 273 f.
Vṛata, 100.
Vṛāyas, 145.
Vṛāyastoma, 145.
Vṛtra, 544.
Vṛttaratnakara, (of Kedārabhaṭṭa), 683.
A work on Prosody by Miśra Jagannātha, called "Chandahpiyūsa" and its probable date, by P. K. Gode, 681-685.

Wörter und Sachen by Prof. Dr. Hermann GUNTERT. A review by S. M. KATRE, 468.

WRIGHT, 280.

—History of later-Greek Literature, 280.

WÜST, W., 181, 468.

Y

Yādavās, 158, 159, 409 f., 414, 416, 417, 420, 424, 427.

Yadgar Beg, 321 f., 239.

Yājñavalkya, 740, 741.

Yama, 43, 49, 50, 53.

Yama’s Paradise, 108.

Yaśaskaradeva, (King of Kashmir), 698.

Yāśaka, 386, 387, 440.

Yaśomitra, 70, 71.

Yaudheyas, 460.

Yavanarāja Tuṣāśpa, 189.

Yemen, 616, 617, 622, 623, 624.

Yerragudi, 596.

Yerragudi, Brāhmī records, 596, 597.

Yesaji, 118, 119.

Yi-tsing, 1.

Yoga, 213.

Yogakṣema, 85.

Yogavāsiṣṭha, 460, 461.

Yogavāsiṣṭhasāra, (an alternative title for Laghu Yogavāsiṣṭha), 697.

Yoga Viñāga, 563.

Yuan Chwang, 1.

Z

Zahon, 34.

—Characteristics of the Literature, of the time of, 425 f.

Zābag (Sāg or Jāvaka), 28.

Zarathushtra, 630, 631.

Zengi Slaves, 27.

Zimbabwe Type, 27.

ZIMMER, Heinrich—Schopenhauer and India, 57-61.
BHOJA'S

ŚRĪNGĀRA PRAKĀŚA

By

V. RAGHAVAN, M.A., PH.D.
CHAPTER I

MANUSCRIPT MATERIAL

This study of mine of Bhoja’s Śr. Pra. is based mainly on the four volumes of the Ms. of the Śr. Pra. deposited in the Govt. Oriental Mss. Library, Madras, R. No. 3252, of which I give a description here.

Vol. One. (I. 39. 52.) containing chapters one to six and a little in the beginning of chapter seven. Pages 437.

Regarding this portion of the Śr. Pra., chapters one to six, I consulted, for choosing readings and filling small lacunae, a press copy of these six chapters prepared by the Curator, Mm. Prof. S. Kuppusvami SASTRI, and the staff of the Madras Govt. Oriental Mss. Library, when they had an idea of publishing the work. This press copy is also deposited in the above-said Library and has been prepared with three Śrītāla Mss. of Malabar. Quotations in this portion have been identified as far as possible. This press copy runs to 555 pages.

Vol. Two. (I. 39. 53.) containing chapter seven from where it was left in the first volume to chapter twelve. This volume runs to 553 pages. Chapters nine (with some omission in the beginning) to eleven are available to us in another copy of this portion of the Śr. Pra. which is a copy from a palm-leaf Ms. in the Library of the Curator for publishing Sanskrit Mss., Trivandrum. [R. 3785. (T. 2. 158.) Mad. Govt. Ori. Mss. Library.] The readings of this duplicate for chapters nine to eleven are not generally good but I used the copy to fill up certain small gaps in the main Ms.

Vol. Three. (I. 39. 54.) containing chapter thirteen (with the beginning wanting) to chapter twenty-three. This volume runs to 408 pages.


The total number of pages of these four volumes of the Śr. Pra. are 1908. (437 plus 553 plus 918.)
CHAPTER II

LACUNAE IN THE MANUSCRIPT (ŚR. PRA.)

ग्रन्थपाता:

VOLUME ONE :

1. Pp. 25-28 and 30-31 : Many lines are lost in these pages.

2. P. 31. Another gap; the section where these two gaps occur treats of Avyaya and its varieties.

VOLUME TWO :

3. P. 398. Two lines are missing.

4. Pp. 400, 401, 403, 404, & 409. Small gaps in the lines. On pp. 403 and 404 no single line is completely available. But gaps marked 3 and 4 can be filled up by a reference to the corresponding portion of the Sarasvatī-kaṇṭhābharana as well as to the other copy of the Śr. Pra., chapters 9-11, which exists in the Library.

VOLUME THREE :

5. The beginning of this Vol., i.e., of chapter 13, is wanting. The portion lost seems to be small; it mentions Śṛṅgāra, i.e., Ahaṁkāra, as of four kinds according to the four Puruṣārthas, giving the Pravṛttis, Vyṛtis, Rītis, type of hero and heroine etc., for each of these four Śṛṅgāras. The gap is no loss for the same topic is more elaborately dealt with again in the further chapters of this volume.


7. P. 210. The section here illustrates the Anubhāvas born of mind and speech (mānasika and vācika). In a hiatus in this section on p. 210 are lost the illustrations of the mental Anubhāvas, Hāva to Gāmbhīrya, and of the vocal Anubhāvas, Ālāpa to Atīdesa. On p. 211 we see the jump from Hāva on p. 210 to Atīdesa. The Ms. itself notes here that one leaf in the original was blank. (अतः मानुष्कायामेकं पुर्तं शुद्धं हस्यते )

8. P. 236. Some part of the illustrations of the thirty-six kinds of emotional glances, Kānta etc., is missing and the Ms. here also says that two leaves in the original were blank. (अतः मानुष्कायां पुर्तद्वयं शुद्धं हस्यते )

9. P. 238. The gap is in the chapter on Dharma Śṛṅgāra and is towards the end of p. 238. In this gap are lost three varieties of physical (Kāyika) virtuous acts; and the illustrations of the first five varieties of Dharma of the Nīvṛtti type along with the enumeration of the ten kinds of Nīvṛtti dharma.
It is in this, the Fourth Volume, that the greatest loss is seen.

10. P. 464. The biggest lacuna in the Ms. occurs here. It is towards the end of chapter 25, and sweeps away the last portion of chapter 25, the whole of chapter 26, and the beginning of chapter 27. Thus the loss is three-fold here.

(a) The portion of chapter 25, which is lost, is descriptive of some varieties of the verbal sources of knowledge through which, first love (Pūrva Anurāga) springs up. The sources of knowledge are divided into two classes, Darśana and Śravaṇa; the former is a certain number of Pramāṇas based on Pratyakṣa; the latter, on Śabda, and comprises Śabda, Aitihya, Śruttānumāna, Śruto-pamāna, Śrūtārthāpatti, and Śrutasambhava. The treatment with illustrations etc. of the five beginning with Aitihya is lost.

(b) The whole of chapter 26 is lost. It is not possible to make out exactly all the subjects dealt with in it. But it can be guessed in general that the lost chapter speaks of some aspects of Pūrva Anurāga.

(c) The first half of chapter 27 is lost. The topics that made up this portion are not known. Where the text begins, we find the treatment of the subjects, Sarīketa and Abhisaraṇa and the colophon says that the chapter as a whole speaks of Abhiyoga.

11. P. 574. There must have been a derangement of the leaves of the original here. The portion refers to the end of chapter 29, devoted to the description of a set of 48 conditions of Love, 'Sending of Messenger' (Dūta Sampreṣaṇa) etc. The whole subject is put under the head 'Dūta Sampreṣaṇādī' which must have been the name of the chapter also. Somewhere, on or near p. 574, this 29th chapter should have ended. The last topics of this chapter of 48 items are Itivṛttākhyāna and Samihitasiddhi. These are almost finished when there occurs the gap in which are lost the end, colophon, etc. of the chapter. A small part of this missing portion is however available, having been misplaced in the middle of the next chapter, pp. 613-4.

12. Pp. 574-578. These pages deal with certain ideas related to Māna. But these do not form the beginning of the 30th chapter, which is devoted to Māna. The real beginning of this chapter has been fixed by me at the end of p. 578 and the chapter runs up to p. 649.

P. 613. The matter between pp. 574-578 should come over to pp. 613-4, where there is a gap and an exchange of leaves with the final portion of the last chapter as pointed out above. Some part of a topic in Māna is also lost in this derangement of leaves.
13. P. 622. A small gap in which are lost the illustrations of the six seats (Sthāna) of Māna, heart etc.

14. P. 678 and 831-4. Small gaps in a few lines on these pages.

15. P. 840. A gap in which are lost illustrations of six of the 64 stages of Love after Pūrva-anurāga-vipralambha.


17. Pp. 915-6. A bigger gap, in the last, i.e., the 36th chapter. In this lacuna have disappeared the illustrations of seven kinds of Anubandhas in the list of twelve Anubandhas of Preman forming the Sampūrṇa and Anubandha stage of Sambhoga. Also the enumeration of the twelve varieties of Prema Pāka forming the fourth stage of Sambhoga named Samyak and Prakarṣa, together with the illustrations of the first eight Pākas, is lost.
CHAPTER III

BHOJA’S AUTHORSHIP OF THE Sr. PRA.

Bhoja\(^1\) has been credited with works in every branch of knowledge, in every Śāstra\(^2\); and when modern scholars see a ‘formidable’ list of works attached to the name of an author, the first step in their research is to doubt and be sceptical about one single author’s authorship of all those works. And when the writer happens to be a king, the general ‘research rule’ is to put those works down as the works of court-poets who suppressed their own names and allowed their royal patrons to become famous instead. It cannot be contended that there were not cases of poets writing works and passing them off as their king’s work; and there were also cases where later and minor writers preferred the suppression of their own names to allowing their works to die and sent their works out as those of a celebrated old writer. The former phenomenon at least, namely, the self-effacing spirit of certain original writers who allow other highly-situated personalities to publish the works as their own, is not peculiar to ancient India and Sanskrit literature; instances can be given from our own research-world of to-day. That apart, even when the above-said two positions are granted, it must be accepted, very

---

1. For Bhoja’s date, see *Epi. Ind.* I. pp. 230-233, Bühler: Bhoja might have assumed reigns of government about 1010 AD. or somewhat later. His Rājāmgāṇika is dated 1042-3 AD. He died sometime after 1062 AD.

2. Ins. of N. I.” Nos. 132 and 133 dated AD. 1055 and 1056 speak of Bhoja’s successor, Jayasimhadeva. Nos. 108 and 110 are Bhoja’s inscriptions dated AD. 1019. (ed in IA. XLI and *Epi. Ind. XI*) and No. 111 is another Bhoja-inscription dated AD. 1021.

According to Ājada who commented on Bhoja’s *Sarasvatikāntābhārana*, Bhoja wrote 84 works and all these were given names which were Bhoja’s own titles, Birudas. *Sarasvatikāntābhārana* and *Srūgāraprakāśa* were also Bhoja’s titles like ‘Rājāmgāṇika’, ‘Samarāṅgaṇāśātradhāra’ etc.

*इह हि शिर्भरोधिनि निविदनिरवचनविवानितांशयासुवृज्ञपार्थलार्शणं मार्गणितं चतुर्दशीर्मिर्मित्यक्षतस्तथूप्यसमजः* श्रीभौजराजः श्राब्दारम्यें etc.” p. 37, *Deś. Cat. of Mss. in Jain Bhandars at Pattan*, Vol. I., Palm-leaves, GOS. LXXVI.

The *Prabhāvakarita* of Candraprabhasūri, N.S. Edn., I., p. 300, verses 75-78, refer to Bhoja’s works in the several branches:

- **भोज्यालकरणं श्रेयं श्राब्दारम्यें**
- **अश्वं हि मालवाधीशो विद्राकाशिरोमिनि**
- **शान्ताल्पार दैवं तरसाख्वाणि निलम्यें**
- **विकितस्य राजसिद्धाँ तत्कालाद्वायनि च**
- **अहुःशाकुनाराम स्वस्मस्मृत्र्द्राकाम्बपि**
- **प्रथातिरिक्तवान्यन्यान्यन्याचूपामणीनिह**
- **विश्रुति चाय सद्यवेष्टविशाश्वं मेघमालया (?)**
learned men among kings there were; and that when we see modern writers like Dr. A. B. KEITH producing ‘very fat’ books on almost all subjects in Sanskrit, besides works on Dominion Law, we can certainly believe that the ancient Hindu system of Education and the old Hindu devotion to Learning did produce giants who wrote a very large number of works, in different branches of Learning.

This general question apart, we shall come to the authorship of the Śr. Pra. of Bhoja. All the writers who have known the Śr. Pra. have quoted it as a work of king Bhoja; and Bhoja as an Ālārīkārika is a very prominent name. The work Śr. Pra., albeit its size, undoubtedly exhibits a unity of authorship, the same kind of mind, with all its merits and demerits, being seen all through. And when one is not prepared to discredit the belief and is not able to disprove the possibility of Bhoja’s vast learning, one can accept that Bhoja himself wrote this Śr. Pra.

But modern research scholars have, as said above, not believed that king Bhoja himself wrote all these works. As for instance, T. AUFRICHT says in his Cat. Cat., before giving the list of works attributed to Bhoja, that it is superfluous to add that not one of these works was written by Bhoja, that they were written by poets of his court and of his time. In his Foreword to Śrī Yadugiri Svāmin’s edition of chapters xxii-xxiv of the Śr. Pra. Mr. A. Rangavami Saravati says less strongly: “The minute analysis of the subject-matter and the selections of hundreds of quotations to illustrate fine shades of emotion as is done in the Śr. Pra. should have been the work of quite a large number of scholars, all working under the direction of a president who in the present case happens to be none else than the cultured sovereign.” (p. vii) ‘Minute analysis’ and ‘selections of quotations’ by themselves do not necessarily presuppose the joint working of a number of authors.

The anthology named Saduktikārṇāmāta compiled by Śrīdharadāsa gives the opening Maṅgala śloka of the Śr. Pra. on Ardhanaṅgīvara—

अन्तर्रेतमकालिकोभवुद्धमात्रामवनमविशिष्टचक्राकारिणाः
काॅन्ताचिन्दव्रबुधुपु: कलिन्त्रप्रलंभकोभमस्वविशि: वसु: भवु: पुरारे: ॥
p. 37. Bib. Ind. Edn., p. 22, Punj. Ori. Ser. Edn. as a verse of a poet named Cittapa¹ who is cited also as Chittapa, Kṣittapa, Chitrims and Chinnama.² Some of the forty³ verses ascribed to this poet in the Saduktikārṇāmāta are quoted in the S. K. A. and the Śr. Pra. Of the many royal panegyrics among these verses, a few are on King Bhoja. The

---

1. This verse is not found in other anthologies including the Sūktimuktāvali of Jhalāna.
Subhāṣītāvalī of Vallabhadeva has a verse mentioning Cittapa as a poet attached to Bhoja (p. 30, ś. 186. Peterson’s edn. 1937: 83; N. edn. Pt. I, pp. 242ff) refers to Cittapa as a poet in Bhoja’s court and as the pupil of Kardamarāja. All these taken together might induce one to accept the conclusion that Bhoja’s court-poet Cittapa wrote the Śr. Pra.

The large number of Cittapa-verses and the proximity by time though not by place predispose one to attach weight to the authority of the Saduktikarnāmṛta but it must be remembered that an anthology as such must not form the determining evidence. The verse in the Subhāṣītāvalī connecting at the same time Bhilhaṇa with Cittapa as poets who sang of Bhoja seems to assume questionable chronology if it means that both of them were in Bhoja’s court. The verse would not contradict the possibility of the two poets being later in time to Bhoja of whom they sang. And the Prabhāvakacarita is after all only a book of tales. Even if the Saduktikarnāmṛta is correct in its ascription of the verse ‘Acchinnamekhalam etc,’ to Cittapa, it is not improbable that Bhoja used one of his court-poet’s verses which was apt as the Maṅgala Sloka when he wrote the Śr. Pra.

Whether king Bhoja wrote the Śr. Pra. or Cittapa or some other poet wrote it for the king, the work is of absorbing interest for its main theory of the new Rasa of Aharīkāra-Abhimāna-Śrīgāra, for the numberless noteworthy points of originality in its treatment of the other topics of Poetics, for the wealth of illustrative literature, (much of it otherwise little known), that is quoted and for the characteristic, if not masterly, mind that is revealed through its whole length. I should now proceed to give an adequate account of these.
CHAPTER IV

SCHEME, SCOPE & CONTENTS OF THE ŚR. PRA.

आतां वस्तुदू वैदर्शयं काव्ये कामपि बकर्ताम्।
प्रवचासंविवाहांकनास्त्रापि कृतंते कथि:॥

says Kuntaka in his Vakrokti Jivita. Writers must name their works in such a manner that the names themselves give the theme and the main idea of their works. Works must be significantly named as Abhijñāna Śakuntala, Mudrā Rākṣasa and so on and not as Rāmābhodya, Rāmacarita and so on. The name Śr. Pra. is not like the name of Bhoja’s other, earlier and very much smaller work, the Sarvasvatikaṇṭākharana. Śr. Pra. is a significant name. The work purports to explain or treat of Śṛṅgāra Rasa. Thus the main part of Bhoja’s huge work, which Bhoja himself thinks as important enough to serve as the basis of the name of the work itself, is the exposition of his new-found theory of the one Rasa of Ahamkāra, Abhimāna or Śṛṅgāra. Besides this Śṛṅgāra of Ahamkāra explained in chapter xi, the lower Śṛṅgāra Rasa of Rati between man and woman is also elaborately treated in chapters xiii, xv-xvii, xx, xxii-xxxvi. Thus the chief subjects of the whole work are the two, major and minor, Śṛṅgāras; and hence is the work called Śr. Pra.

In chapter xi, Bhoja gives the last variety of composition as Sāhitya Prakāśa and says that his own Śr. Pra. is an example of that type. We can take this Sāhitya Prakāśa as another name for the Śr. Pra.; for it is in this word ‘Sāhitya’ that the scheme underlying the Śr. Pra. is found. In chapter i, Bhoja states that Rasa is the greatest element by virtue of which men are called Rasikas, that this Rasa is conveyed to responsive hearts through Drama and Poetry, i.e., Kāvyya, that Poetry or Kāvyya is Śabda and Artha, Word and Sense united. शब्दार्थः सहिताः काव्यम्. Bhoja starts with this foundational definition of Poetry which he borrows from Bhāmaha. These three words, Śabda, Artha and Sāhitya, give us the idea of how the huge Śr. Pra. moves on. The work treats of Śabda, Artha and Sāhitya. In chapters i-ⅱ, which are purely on Grammar, Śabda, Artha and their varieties are treated of. From chapter VII, begins the treatment of Sāhitya or the Relation between Śabda and Artha. This Sāhitya itself can be divided into two parts, the grammatical and the poetical relations; and the grammatical part itself is split by Bhoja into two sets of four, Kevala-śabda-sambandha-śaktis and Sāpekṣa-śabda-sambandha-śaktis. The grammatical relations are eight in number and are:

Abhidhā, Vivakṣā, Tātparya, and Pravibhāga;
Vyapekṣā, Sāmarthyā, Anvaya, and Ekārthibhāva.
To these Bhoja devotes two chapters, vii and viii. The rest of the whole work is devoted to the remaining fourfold poetical relations—Doṣahāna, Guṇopādāna, Alamkāra-yoga and Rasa-aviyoga. These four are, in a way finished with chapter xi, chapter ix dealing with Doṣas and Guṇas, chapter x with three kinds of Alamkāras and chapter xi with Rasa. Chapter xii is on the ‘build’ of the Drama which also goes with part of the contents of chapter xi. The rest of the work, chapters xiii-xxxvi, deal exclusively with Rasas, the fourth and the greatest ‘Śāhitya’ of Śabda and Artha in Kāvya. Thus underlying the edifice of this sky-scraper of Śr. Pra. is the foundation and scheme of Śāhitya, expressed in the three words—

शब्दारूढः सहितौ काव्यम्.

Thus, just as the name Śr. Pra. gives one, from the outside, an idea of the main subject of the work, the words शब्दारूढः सहितौ काव्यम् and the concept of Śāhitya give him on the first entrance into the work, an idea of how the work proceeds with the subject.

The Śr. Pra. is at once a treatise on Poetics and Dramaturgy. Bhāmaha, Daṇḍin and Vāmana mention Drama, but they refer us to other works on that branch of literature and restrict themselves to Poetics. Rājaśekhara’s Kāvyamimānsā, as planned out at the beginning of the first chapter, seems to have dealt with both Poetics and Dramaturgy. Bhaṭṭa Tota’s Kāvyakautuka, as citations from it in the Abhinavabhārati of his pupil Abhinava show, dealt with both. And so also perhaps the Hṛdayadarpaṇa of Bhaṭṭa Nāyaka. But these works are lost. The general tendency of the times was to write special treatises propounding special theories and not comprehensive works dealing with all branches. As a contrast to works exclusively on Poetics, there were works like the Daśarūpaka exclusively on Dramaturgy. Bhoja seems to be the first writer whose work is available to us now, who embraced both branches and wrote in the same work on both. In later times, writers like Viśvaṅātha and Vidyāṅātha followed Bhoja by writing on both, while there were others who followed the model set by Māmāṭa’s Kāvyapratikāśa and excluded Dramaturgy. There were also works modelled after the Daśarūpaka, as for instance, the Rasāṇavasudhākara of Śiṅga Bhūpala, dealing with Rasa and the ten kinds of dramas. Besides being an encyclopaedic compilation, the Śr. Pra. is also a Prasthāna Grantha, a work which appeared for establishing a theory of poetry and poetic appeal and in this respect it resembles in a measure the Dhvanyāloka and the Vakroktijīvita and others; for Bhoja has tried to propound a new Rasa theory in this treatise of his.

It also seems that Bhoja attempted to imitate Bharata whose Nāṭya Śāstra speaks of Poetics also though its main subject is Dramaturgy. For, Bharata wrote in 36 chapters and so also Bhoja; Bharata dealt with Sanskrit language and its grammar to some extent and Bhoja dealt with both more elaborately. It is however strange how Bhoja omitted treatment of prosody which is very closely related to Poetics. Bhoja could have, with greater propriety than digressing into the Śāstras of Pada and Vākya, comprehended within his work the subject of metres. Similarly he could have devo-
tered a chapter to Kavisamaya which subject latterly attained greater importance and appropriated to itself a definite place and a few chapters in many Alāṅkāra works. Kavisamaya and Kaviśīkṣā formed part of the pre-Bhoja work of Rājaśekhara, the Kāvyamānasā. This must also be mentioned regarding the subjects found dealt with in the Śr. Pra., that other topics of Nāṭya found in Bharata’s work could have come into the Śr. Pra. with greater relevancy than grammatical discussions, Vākyā dharmas, Pramāṇa carcās etc.

Some of the grammatical topics can be never left out of Poetics. In the post-Dhvani period, works which followed the Dhvani-mārga began always with the treatment of the three Śabdaśāstra of Mukhyā, Gaṇini, and Vyaṇjana. Bhāmaha, Daṅḍin and Vāmana make slight mention of Śabda, Artha and Bhāṣās in the opening part of their works; and in Bāmaha and Vāmana, we have the last chapter devoted to a discussion of grammatical usages in poetic composition. Topics of Logic were also not excluded and Bhāmaha dealt with them in one chapter, Pratijñā, Hetu and Drṣṭānta, in relation to Doṣas. But none entered into discussions on these subjects and others of Pada, Vākyā and Pramāṇa more fully than Bhoja. A perusal of the notice of the detailed contents of the 36 chapters of the Śr. Pra. which follows, will show everything that is comprehended in this mammoth work of Bhoja. The following analysis with the list of the chapter-names will give a bird’s eye-view of the same.

Chapters I-IV. Śabda and Artha.

Chapter 1. प्रकृत्यादिप्रकाश:}
Chapter 2. प्रातिपदिकादिप्रकाश:}
Chapter 3. प्रकृत्यादिशवृत्त}
Chapter 4. क्रियाद्वृत्त चतुष्टय प्रकाश:}
Chapter 5. उपाध्याय चतुष्टय ”
Chapter 6. विभवभाषादि चतुष्टय ”

Chapters VII-XI Sāhitya; VII and VIII Grammatical part; IX-XI Poetical part of Sāhitya.

Chapter 7. केवलशब्दसंचारः 
{ अभिधा, विवक्षा,
शब्दिक प्रकाश: 
{ तार्किक, प्रविभागः.
Chapter 8. समेकशब्दसंचारः 
{ व्येख्या, सामार्थः,
प्रकाश: 
{ अन्वयः, एकार्थभावः.
Chapter 9. दोषाणांगुणोपपातान 
प्रकाश: 
{ दोषा गुणाथः.
Chapter 10. अनुसारस्येन प्रकाशा:—अनुसारः
Chapter 11. रसावशयोग प्रकाशा:—रस:,
{ हद्यप्रयोगवस्तुभेदः,
{ प्रबन्धे दोषाणांगुणाल्का—
{ रसायन—रसावशयोगादयः
Chapter 12. Mainly on Drama and its features.
{ प्रबन्धाणांगुणधिट चतुष्टय 
प्रकाशा: 
{ सन्याताधिः.
Chapter 13. रतिप्रकाशः
Chapter 14. हर्षिप्रकाशः

With this, a brief treatment of Rasas is finished. Now begins an elaborate treatment of Rasa.

Chapters XV-XVII. Vibhāvas and Anubhāvas of Rati.

Chapter 15. रत्यालम्बनिविभावप्रकाशः
Chapter 16. उद्वीणन " "
Chapter 17. अनुभाव प्रकाशः

Next section in four chapters dealing with the four Śrṅgāras of the four Puruṣārthas.

Chapter 18. चरणवर्जन प्रकाशः
Chapter 19. अर्थ " "
Chapter 20. काम " "
Chapter 21. मोक्ष " " and नायकनायिकाविभागः and नाना नाना गुणा:

Then begins the last and the greatest elaboration of the 'lower' Śrṅgāra Rasa developing from Ratisthāyin, in its two phases of Vipralambha and Sambhoga.

Chapters XXII—XXIII general; XXIV—XXXII Vipralambha and its four varieties; XXXIII—XXXVI Sambhoga and its varieties.

Chapter 22. अनुरागस्थान प्रकाशः
Chapter 23. विप्रलम्बसम्मोग "
Chapter 24. विप्रलम्बान्वथप्रकाशः
Chapter 25. पुर्वनुर्गिरविप्रलम्बप्रकाशः
Chapter 26. " "
Chapter 27. " " अभियोगविधि प्रकाशः
Chapter 28. दृश्विशेष दूरकेलोपवृण्ण प्रकाशः
Chapter 29. दूरसंग्रेषणादि (?) प्रकाशः
Chapter 30. मान प्रकाशः
Chapter 31. प्रवासोपवृण्ण "
Chapter 32. कहलागरेय "
Chapter 33. सम्मोगशीर्दर्थं "
Chapter 34. प्रथमलुरागान्तरसम्मोगप्रकाशः
Chapter 35. मानवान्तरसम्मोगप्रकाशः
Chapter 36. सम्मोगावस्थाप्रकाशः
CHAPTER V

DETAILED NOTICE OF THE CONTENTS OF ALL
THE 36 CHAPTERS OF THE ŚR. PRA.

न  तज् हामं न  तस्मिन्यं  न  सा  विया  न  सा  कहा ।
जावते  यय  काय्यावियांहों  भारी  महानं  करे: ॥

CHAPTER 1

Two Maṅgala Ślokas.

Ten introductory verses which briefly state Bhoja’s new theory of the one
and only Rasa named Aharīkāra-Abhimāna-Śrīṅgāra. A brief note explaining
in prose the same Rasa theory. Drama or poetry present and depict this

Kāvyya greater than Nātya; poet and dramatist greater than the actor.
Definition of Kāvyya; Bhāmaha’s definition accepted; Śabdārthāṁ सहितं काय्यम्
poetry is the Sāhitya of Śabda and Artha. Śabda and its 12 varieties; Artha
and its 12 varieties. Sāhitya, the relation or Sambandha between the two, Śabda
and Artha; this is of two kinds,—grammatical or syntactic relations in two
sets called Kevala-śabda-sambandha-śaktis and Sāpekṣa-śabda-sambandha-
śaktis; poetic relation of four kinds, Doṣahāna, Guṇādāna, Alarikārayoga
and Rasa-aviyoga.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prakṛti</td>
<td>Kriyā</td>
<td>Abhidhā</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pratyaya</td>
<td>Kāla</td>
<td>Vivakṣa</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upaskāra</td>
<td>Kāraka</td>
<td>Tātparya</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upapada</td>
<td>Puruṣa</td>
<td>Pravibhāga</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pratipadika</td>
<td>Upādhi</td>
<td>Vyapekṣa</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vibhakti</td>
<td>Pradhāna</td>
<td>Śamartha</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upasarjana</td>
<td>Upaskārārtha</td>
<td>Anvaya</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Samāsa</td>
<td>Pratipadikārtha</td>
<td>Ekārthībhāva</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pada</td>
<td>Vibhaktyartha</td>
<td>Doṣahāna</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vākyā</td>
<td>Vṛttyartha</td>
<td>Guṇopādāna</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prakaraṇa</td>
<td>Padārtha</td>
<td>Alarikāra yoga</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prabhandha.</td>
<td>Vākyārtha</td>
<td>Rasa aviyoga</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Detailed Notice of the Contents**

*Prakṛtis (Pp. 4-58. Vol. I)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Paripaṭhitas</td>
<td>Sup-pratyayāntas</td>
<td>Nāma (Pp. 9-10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aparipaṭhitas</td>
<td>Tiṅ-pratyayāntas</td>
<td>Avyaya (Pp. 11-31)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paripaṭhita-</td>
<td>Kṛt-pratyayāntas</td>
<td>Anukaraṇa (Pp. 32-34)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>aparipaṭhitas</td>
<td>Taddhita-pratyayāntas</td>
<td>Kṛt (Pp. 34-35)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pratyaya dhātus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nāma dhātus</td>
<td>Dhātu-pratyayāntas</td>
<td>Taddhita (P. 35).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pratyayanāma</td>
<td>Strīpratyayāṁtis</td>
<td>Samāsa (Pp. 35-58)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dhātus (Pp. 4-7)</td>
<td>(Pp. 7-9)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(Pp. 9-58)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In this section there is a large amount of grammatical discussion in the sub-section of Samāsa (Pp. 35-58); Samāsa is defined and its varieties are explained.

*Pratyayas (Pp. 58-61)*

|--------------------------|-----------------------------|---------------------------------|

*Upaskāras (Pp. 61-64)*

|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|---------------------------|

*Upapada (Pp. 64-66)*

3 Kinds

The names of the first and the second are lost; the third variety is Tin-upapada. Each of these three again has six sub-varieties.

With this Upapada ends chapter I.

prasātmanābhāvānāś ca pratyayaḥ durgītiṃ: 1

kamadurapādāvāpi śraddhāsāravāntam 2

anuṣṭubho niṣpātaḥ gataḥ śāntaḥ nityānāthaḥ: 3

karmabhraddhāpic ca sāyoṣām: prakāśitaḥ: 2

n keśeṣaḥ prakṛtiḥ: pravṛtyate n keśeṣaḥ: suparājjanājayasyaḥ: 1

bhavatupādāvāpi śraddhāsāravāntam 2

ītī mahārajaśāhivārājyaśāhivaśeṣāt pravṛtyate: prakṛtyadīprakāśaḥ ca nāma prathamaḥ:

prasātmanā: samāsaḥ: 2
CHAPTER II. Pp. 66-159.

Pratipadika: Three kinds: Vibhaktāvayava, Avibhaktāvayava and Anukarana treated respectively between pages 66-132, 132-133 and 133-34.

Upsarjana: Its treatment ends on p. 112.

Samāsa: p. 113.


This chapter does not seem to deal with the subjects in the order of their enumeration given at the beginning of the work. The following is the colophon:

प्रकृति प्रकाशी श्रेया मिथ्योपस्तारमण्यः: ॥
सिध्धोपद्रातिपदिकामां विभक्तयः: ॥
विध्योपस्तारमण्यः समास इति कौशिकः: ॥
प्रातिपदिकाद्वियः अधानावस्थय उच्यते: ॥

पदमिह तिधिन अतिपाते
विधिमेव हि वाक्यमेव त्रिध्या: ॥
व्यवहृति: बहु शब्दमिश्रना
वदनमिश्रयो: प्रतित्वज्ञ: ॥

इति श्री + + + श्रो प्रातिपदिकादिप्रकाशो नाम द्वितीयः प्रकाश: ॥


Pada: 3 kinds, Kriyā, Kāraka and Upaskāra; each of these three is of six kinds. Pp. 160-191.


Saṃskṛta is of three kinds: Śrāuta, Ārṣa, Laukika. Śrāuta is Mantra and Brāhmaṇa; Ārṣa is Smṛti and Purāṇa; Laukika is Kāvyā and Śāstra.

Prākṛta is of three kinds: Sahaja, Laksita and Śliṣṭa. Sahaja is Saṃskṛta-sama and Deśya; Laksita is Mahārāṣṭra and Śaurasena; Śliṣṭa is Paścācā and Māgadhā.

Apabhramśa is of three kinds: Uttama, Madhyama and Kaniṣṭha. Uttama is Āvantya, Lātiyā etc.; Madhyama is Ābhīra, Gaurjara, etc. Kaniṣṭha is Kāśmīra, Paurastya, etc.

This kind of classification of Prākṛta and Apabhramśa is not available in Vararuci’s Prākṛtaprakāśa. It seems to be Bhoja’s own. Lakṣmīdharā’s Saṭbhāṣācandrikā also has no such classification.
Then, each of these Vākyas is said to be of 11 kinds through Ākhyaṭa:

“तदुद्देत्, समस्तमपि वाक्यायतमाना आह्यातुपिपे: एकादशप्रकारं विप्रते, तथथा–एकाह्यातमम्
अनेकाह्यातमान, आह्यात्मातमान, अनुभावतायातम, विपरितायातम, एकान्तरायातम, समुचितानन्दातम, उद्भन्धुर्हस्मयायातम, अपेक्षायातम, एकान्तरायातम, निरन्तरायातमत्वति।”

Pp. 194-5.

Illustrations for each of these. Pp. 194-5. While illustrating, Bhoja gives 12 kinds; Apeksitākhyaṭa is given as Adhyāṭākhyaṭa and next to it, a new variety, Anepeksitākhyaṭa is given. See separate section on Bhoja and Rājasekhara. These varieties refer to the number and nature of the verb occurring in a sentence.

A discussion follows on the possibility of such a classification of Vākyas into Vākyas with more than one verb. Kātyāyanas’s view is cited that there is no Sambandha between Ākhyaṭas (p. 210) and then the Sūtrakāra’s (Pānini’s) view is cited that Vākya with more than one verb is possible.

“तदेवं काश्यावननं नास्येव आह्यातमय: समबन्धं। सूतकृत्या तु मदेस्त्वेव आह्यातम

The Mahābhāṣya and the Vākyapādiya are also quoted in this section. On p. 220 Bhoja begins to explain that in the cases of sentences with more than one verb, there is no room for the objection of Vākyabheda. The Bhāṣya-kāra is said to agree with the Sūtrakāra.

The above classification is said to be based on Artha. Another classification of Vākyas based on Śabda follows: 3 kinds called Ekavākya, Aneka-vākya and Ekānekavākya. Ekavākya is Sānubhandha and Niranubhandha. Aneka-vākya is Ādyupasānīrtha and Antopasaṃhyta; Ekānekavākya is Sarvanāmayojita and Vibhaktiyojita. These extend up to p. 221.

Prakarana: Pp. 222-228 3 kinds,—Prastuta, Kalpita and Ākasmika. Each is twofold. Prastuta is divided into Aṅga and Varṇaka. Aṅga is part of the story, as for example, the advent of the Brahmacārin into Pārvati’s Āśrama and his talk with Pārvati. “Prakaranaṭhasya kathāśarīratvam.” Varṇaka is a descriptive section, as for example, the description of Pārvati in Canto I of the Kumārasambhava. It is so called because, though an essential part of the story, it is purely descriptive of a person, of a single situation or of a scene. Kalpita is either Sābhāsa or Nirābhāsa. Sābhāsa is the imaginative items which are introduced by the poets but which have their counterparts in history or Purāṇa. E.g. Māgha’s imaginative description of the same evil spirit being born again and again as Hiranyakasipu, Rāvana and Śiśupāla in Canto I of his Śiśupāławadha. Nirābhāsa is purely imaginative details. E.g. description in the Kirātārjunīya of the fight between Śiva and Arjuna. Ākasmika is also of two kinds, Sabhija and Nirbhija. Sabhija is an accidental anecdote coming by the way but which influences the future course of the story. E.g. Aja meeting the Gandharva cursed to be an elephant and getting from him the Astra Prasvāpana, which later helps him to defeat the royal suitors who
attack him. "Agrataḥ Phalopalambha." Nirbīja is an incident on the way which has nothing to contribute to the story. "Agrataḥ Phala anupalambha." E.g. killing of Virādha in Rāghu. XII.

This classification goes up to p. 225.

It is then pointed out that one Prakaraṇa may have many minor Prakaraṇas within it. As for example, the Indumati svayamvara in Rāghu. VI is a Prakaraṇa and within it, the many separate descriptions of the several kings assembled there are minor Prakaraṇas. Similarly a Prabandha like the Uttararāmacarita contains within it Prabandhas like the Garbhanātaka in the last act. This topic ends on p. 228.

Prabandha: It is of three kinds: Padya, Gadya and Miśra. Padya or verse is of three kinds: Akṣaracchandhas (vedic verses), Maṭrācchandhas, and Gaṇacchandhas. All these three again are of three kinds each: Sama, Ardhasama and Vīṣama. Gadya is Vṛttagandhi or Čūrṇa or Uṭkalikā práya. Miśra is Padyapradhāna, Gadyapradhāna or Tulyaratpa. These classifications end on p. 232.

Then follows a long discussion on the definition of Sabda whose treatment in 12 varieties Bhoja now finishes with this chapter. क: पुन: शब्द: ? He has defined it as Prakṛti, etc. in an enumerative manner. There is the other structural definition that Pada is a collection of letters. कविवर्णमूल: शब्द: । Bhoja discusses the issue. Upavarsa is quoted on Sabda and the subject later touches on the doctrine of Sphoṭa. This section closes on p. 237 with the chapter itself ending here.

Thus, with the third chapter ends the treatment of Sabda in the triad, Sabda, Artha and Sāhitya.

The colophon of the third chapter is as follows:

उप: कमाद्वदशमेवदिशः
शब्दप्रयोगमयमातिहितः ।
अधार्थमूूजस्वाश्रितापराश्रितास
Chapter V. Pp. 311-366

This chapter deals with Upādhi, Pradhāna, Upaskārārtha and Prātipadikārtha. The chapter closes with a discussion on Nipātas. The Vākyapadīya is profusely quoted.

Chapter VI. Pp. 366-427


Pādārtha : Pp. 392-407. Jāti, Vyakti and Ākṛti. A long discussion on these three in which the views of Vyādi and Vindhyāvasin are quoted. Most of the matter here is reproduced from the Nyāyamaṇḍārī of Jayantabhaṭṭa.

On p. 424 begins a discussion on Vivarta of the Šabda Brahman; Artha is explained as Adhyāsa on, Vivarta of, or Vipariṇāma of Šabda; the suggested idea or Pratīyamānārtha also is considered as Vipariṇāma among Arthas. Pp. 425-427.

With this, the sixth chapter, closes the treatment of Artha. The next chapter begins Sāhitya.

| विभिन्नत्व घोषणां गृह्य: पदार्थां विपरीतमिति: ||
| महावावीदिकमेव वाक्यार्थन्त प्रकीर्तित: ||
| किम्यथ  व पदार्थार्थवाच्यमुपालितम् ||
| कुर्व  भ भावाणायासन्तपदार्थहलेऽनुमक्ष ||
| वाक्य विशेषणा: प्रत्याव्र:  शास्त्रस्येकता:  किम्यथ: ||
| अन्यायात्विपरीतानामाभिन्नास्त्वत:  तत्साधि ||
| विभिन्नत्वार्थविपरीतमपरस्त्रया व्रतान्तृष्ण मपार्थ मेवादि: ||
| पद्य पदार्थवर्ष वाक्यमोऽर्थ:  भवेतःतोदः  तद्वत:  निहृत्ये तत: ||

इति महा + + छ० प्र० विभिन्नत्वार्थिकतुष्ण्यप्रकाशो नाम पद्य: प्रकाशि: ||

Chapter VII


This chapter begins the treatment of the twelve-fold Sāhitya.

| तत् | भिषजःविवर्ततात्वमेवविभाजनायापि सार्थायामयीयाम। दोषानुसारगृह्यानि कार्यविवरणाय: ||
| श्रावण:  दधि साम्यं  साहित्यिकस्याय: ||

1. Abhidhā: 3 kinds, Mukhya, Gaṇu and Lakṣaṇa.

I  अभिधाः

p. 428.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>मुख्या</th>
<th>गौणी</th>
<th>लक्षणा (Vol. II, pp. 9-18)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>तदावार्थाः पदार्थार्थवाच्यपतिः</td>
<td></td>
<td>गौणित: अन्य्याचारिता</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>जात्रस्वार्तः अत्यन्तार्थिकाः विभिन्न</td>
<td></td>
<td>गौणित: अप्याचारितः</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>भारतः विकृतः विज्ञान</td>
<td></td>
<td>गौणित: विकृतार्थिकः</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>गुण</td>
<td></td>
<td>गौणित: विज्ञानार्थिकः</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>किम्यथ</td>
<td></td>
<td>गौणित: विज्ञानार्थिकः</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>सम्बन्ध</td>
<td></td>
<td>प्रवाह</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Vol. I. of the Madras Ms. of the Śr. Pra. closes here with p. 437 in the middle of Guṇanimitā Gauṇī.

2. Vivakṣā: Pp. 18-21. वाणिज्यिन्—
   (i) अग्रेष्यम्—क्रिया—अस्त्रमथाम्—अन्न विन्यास नासित।
   (ii) अग्रेष्यम्—स्त्रीतितिन्हाश्रम—अर्थप्राधानम्—‘लोकिकानां हि साधुण वाग्यमस्य—
      किरीणा पुनरायनाना वाममयं—जुधावति।’
   (iii) पौरीष्यम्—उपयप्राधानम्—‘विन्यास: कारकाणि भवन्ति।’

Pp. 21-22. 3 verses of general literary criticism bearing on poets’ Vivakṣā.

अस्मवन्ये वस्मवविवृक्ष, अचेतनेनु वैतनवविवृक्ष, अध्याय गुणवविवृक्ष, गुणो धार्मवविवृक्ष,
समृद्धवेजवविवृक्ष, अनुवधे समृद्धवविवृक्ष, अथवा अनुवधे समृद्धवविवृक्ष, सदस्ततोरवजव, सदस्तरवजव,
स्तुत्या नित्यवज, स्तुत्या स्तुतद्वांस, स्तुत्या नित्यद्वांस, स्तुत्या नित्यद्वांस, स्तुत्या नित्यद्वांस।
एवम्मेवनेन्क्षया विवृक्षा विग्रहये। तदेव लोकिकवादः—
“अस्मायपले संसारे कविंद्रे: प्रजापति।
यथासमि रोलते बिचक तत्रेदं परिवर्तते।”

अष्टे—
ठिकमविद्ये दीर्घ अंतिं पी भविद्वं परिवादो।
जह संहारं अ दीर्घ णुविलणे ध्यामो पविः। (Vākpati, the Gaudavahō, 66)

किति—
कवित्सवेन्ये प्राधानपौर्वेष्वर रचना
कवित्सरस्तु स्फाटे कवित्सवेन्तपितरसम।
कवित्साच्य्य शब्द: कवित्सपि तुलाप्राणयिव श्रद्धा—
स्प्रिदि: कवित्सरस्तु कवित्सवेन्तपितरसम।

विवृक्षा
(Pp. 22-31)

काकार्: व्यथा
स्वर: विच्छेद:

प्रकरणादि व्यथा
प्रकरणं, अर्धे,
शिरं, ऋग्विषाणं,
वेसा, काल:

अभिनवादि व्यथा
अभिनव: अथवा,
संहा, श्रदहि, आकारः:

काकः: Pp. 22-25
अभिनवादि प्रशासकः
अनन्ता—अनुगममादगु
नयकाकः: अन्नुकोपप्रायः
कः: etc.

स्वरः: Pp. 25-26
उदात्तादयः
प्रशासकः

निराकारः
भगवान:—
अनुगममादगु
नयकाकः: अन्नुकोपप्रायः
कः: etc.
Then प्रकरणादि तन अभिव्यक्ति; Vivakṣa ends on p. 31.

Tātparya: Pp. 31-42. 3 kinds: Abhidhiyamāna, Pratiyamāna and Dhvanirūpa.

Having spoken of Tātparya and Dhvani, Bhoja takes a few of his own introductory verses in chapter I of his Śr. Pra. on Śiva, Ganeśa and on his new Rasa theory and gives us a model exposition of their Tātparya. The verse अतिविचित्रमेकं etc., is especially commented upon at great length to yield many meanings, including the indication of the scope of the whole work. This goes from p. 42 to p. 54.

Between pp. 55-65 is a Śāstraic discussion on the difference between Upamā and Rūpaka and on Guṇa.

Pravibhāga: Pp. 66-75.

The chapter ends thus:

अभिभा (১) চ বিভিক্ষা (২) চ তাত্ত্ব (৩) চ বিভিন্নতাত
বাক্যঃ কবকালো শব্দসম্বন্ধশক্তি।
বাক্যঃ যাচ সামসম্বন্ধন্ত্রয়া যথা তথামিথক।
ঐস্কার্যঃ যাচ তাত্ত্বিক সহাযত্ব সাধিত।
উক্তায়তসঃ প্রয়োগঃ কমেন কামান্তঃ প্রকাশিতঃ প্রকাশিতঃ।
অসাধ্যায়ঃ বিবর্ণনায় সাধারণে সাধারণে বিবর্ণিতে প্রকাশিতে।

ইতি শ্রী মহা ৪০ প্র ৫০ কেবলতরাবর্ণস্থিতিপ্রকাশো নাম
সত্ত্ব প্রকাশ: সমাস:।
This chapter begins with the treatment of the second set of Sambandhas between Šabda and Artha. The four considered in the previous chapter are called Kevala-šabda-šaktis. The four considered in this chapter are called Sāpeksa-šabda-šaktis and they are Vyapekṣa, Śāmarthya, Anvaya and Ekārththibhāva.

On pp. 84-87 there is a discussion on Guṇa. Then Anvaya is taken up: three kinds of it with sub-classes, Sākta, Vaibhakta and Śakti vibhakti maya. Pp. 87-90.

There is a second discussion beginning on p. 90 quoting largely from the Vākyāpadiya. It pertains to Abhīhitānvyāa-vāda and Anvītābhidhāna-vāda going up to p. 96. On p. 97 again begins the treatment of other varieties of Naiṣedhikī vyapekṣa which ends with p. 98.


Yogatā : Pp. 103-105 : 2 kinds, Mukhyārtha-dvāraka and Jaghanyārtha-dvāraka, with sub-classes.


Ekārththibhāva : P. 130. First is discussed its difference from Vyapekṣa. Pp. 130-131. On p. 131 begins its treatment in all its varieties. Its varieties are three, Vākya-tulyārtha, Vākya-adhikārtha and Vākya-anyaārtha, all the three comprising the various Samāsas, Taddhita, Akhyāta etc. On pp. 131-133, the various kinds of Samāsas are given with illustrations.
On p. 133, under Upameya-samāsa, begins a long discussion on Upamaṇa and Upameya and the Upameya-samāsa, going upto p. 138.


Vākyārtha: P. 142. Bhāvanā, Vidhi and Pratibhā; Mukta, Yugalaka, Sandānītaka, Kalāpaka, Kulaka etc.; Kośa, Saṅghāta; Prakaraṇa called Avāntaravākyārtha; and Prabandha which is Mahāvākyārtha. These are varieties of Vākyārtha or Ekārthibhāva.

The Prabandha is one like Subhadrāharaṇa, Jānakihaṇḍa or Rāmāyanamaṇḍala characterised by five Sandhis, 64 Sandhyaṅgas and the four Vṛttis.

Beyond this Prabandha-mahā-vākyārtha, there is still another and further Mahā-vākyārtha which is the moral (Vidhiniśedha) suggested by the Kāvyā. Following Hari, Bhoja calls this also Sabda-brahman.

With this, the eighth chapter, is finished the grammatical eight-fold relation between Sabda and Artha and with the next chapter Poetics proper begins with the treatment of the four-fold poetic Sāhitya between Sabda and Artha. The chapter ends thus:

उक्तादत्तस्य उक्तादत्तस्य पुनःकालं;
शाल्येषसप्तदशिस्मित: क्रमेण।
तत्स्त एवाद्व वनोवशेषे;
निपदुपोरस्त: परिक्रियायम:।।

श्री महा + + श्रो प्रो सापेक्षराव्यक्तिप्रकाशो नाम अद्यम: प्रकाश:
समास:।।
CHAPTER IX. Pp. 144-265.

This chapter begins with the treatment of the last part of the Sāhitya, Doṣa-hāna, Guṇopādāna, Alamkārayoga and Rasa-aviyoga. These alone are said to secure the Samyaktva of Vākyā. First Doṣa-hāna is taken up and Doṣas are said to be of three kinds, of Pada, Vākyā and Vākyārthā. Bhāmaha and Daṇḍin on Doṣas are quoted. Then follows a grammatical digression as to the real nature of Padas and Padārthas in Vākyā. Bhoja then gives a list of Vākyā-dharmas, forty-eight in number:


These forty-eight are defined and illustrated both from Mīmāṃsā and Kāvyā. The subject extends up to p. 197. On p. 180 there is a discussion on Vākyāseṣa and Śrutārthāpatti.

Pp. 197-8. The discussion on the reality of Padārthas in a Vākyā closes with a long quotation from the Vākyapadiya and Bhoja justifies the treat-
ment of Pada-doṣas separately.

The Doṣas then begin:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Doṣas</th>
<th>Of Pada : 16</th>
<th>Of Vākyā : 16</th>
<th>Of Vākyārthā : 16</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Asādhux</td>
<td>Śabdahīna</td>
<td></td>
<td>Apārthā</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aprayukta</td>
<td>Punaruktimat</td>
<td></td>
<td>Vyartha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kāṣṭa</td>
<td>Apakrama</td>
<td></td>
<td>Ekārthā</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anarthaka</td>
<td>Bhinnavṛtta</td>
<td></td>
<td>Sasarīṃsāya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anyārthaka</td>
<td>Yatibhraśṭa</td>
<td></td>
<td>Apakrama</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apuṣṭārthaka</td>
<td>Visandhi</td>
<td></td>
<td>Khinna</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asamartha</td>
<td>Vyākīrṇa</td>
<td></td>
<td>Atimātra</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apratita</td>
<td>Sarīṃkīrṇa</td>
<td></td>
<td>Paruṣa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kliṣṭa</td>
<td>Garbhīta</td>
<td></td>
<td>Virasa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gūḍhārthā</td>
<td>Apada</td>
<td></td>
<td>Hinopamā</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neyārtha</td>
<td>Āśarīra</td>
<td></td>
<td>Adhikopamā</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Of Pada : 16</td>
<td>Of Vākya : 16</td>
<td>Of Vākyārtha : 16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sandigdha</td>
<td>Unopamā</td>
<td>Asadrśopamā</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Viruddha</td>
<td>Adhikopamā</td>
<td>Aprasiddhopamā</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aprayojaka</td>
<td>Bhinnalinga</td>
<td>Niralamkāra</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deśya</td>
<td>Bhinnavacana</td>
<td>Āśīla</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grāmya</td>
<td>Ślesādi guṇaviparīta</td>
<td>Viruddha</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Definition and Illustration of these on pp. 199-202.</strong></td>
<td><strong>Definition and Illustration of these on pp. 203-206.</strong></td>
<td><strong>Definition and Illustration of these on pp. 207-211.</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The S. K. Ā. is simply repeated here with the difference that while in the former work Bhoja leisurely defines each in a verse and explains each illustration with some Vṛtti, he hurries over this section in the Śṛ. Pra. with brief prose renderings of the definitions of the S. K. Ā.

The Guṇa section begins on p. 211. निर्देशकम् च काब्यम् शरीरस्यस्यः: \( ? \) कामोपकोषयोर्च अवस्यम्। बधुगोपादनम्, अल्पकारयोगम्। Vāmana’s verse on Guṇa and Alamkāra—युवतेः खुर्मा एत्य एस्ता—is quoted. Of Guṇa and Alamkāra, the former is of greater importance. तत्र बधुगोपादनेऽकारयोगम्: बधुगोपादने गरीयः। and Vāmana’s verse on this point यदि महति बधुगुणं एत्य, is quoted. On this point, the S. K. Ā is brief but the Śṛ. Pra. slightly elaborates.

**Guṇas**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bāhya</th>
<th>Abhyantara</th>
<th>Vaiśeṣika guṇas; Doṣa-guṇas</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sabdaguṇas : 24</td>
<td>Arthaguṇas : 24</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The same 24 are Guṇas of both Sabda and Artha. They are:


All the three sets of 24 Doṣas given above in the Doṣa section are shown here to turn out to be Guṇas in certain circumstances. Pp. 223-241.
On p. 242 begins a long discussion on Guṇa-vṛtti and Upacāra-vṛtti with other extraneous discussions also and it extends to the very end of the chapter on p. 264. The following is the end of the chapter:

तदेहदेह दोषप्रायु च गुणोपादानमेव च ।
झालव दुर्विन करिः कालय प्रेस्व चेतो न नन्दित ॥
निःदेहय गुणवस्तय सत्त्वकरेः सत्त्विनितम् ।
ततो वस्तिः शेतस्तव च च स दिवमोदते ॥

इत्यथ दोषप्रतिगृह्यनय गुणानामाद्विजने च विक्रियायंतराः ।
काले यथायथमालक्षितियोग उच्छः तत्रैव वाह्यमयं तं कमशोभिप्पाये ॥

इति श्री महाराज + श्रो प्रो दोषप्रायुगुणोपादानप्रकाशिण्य नाम नवमः प्रकाशः समासितमगमः ॥


This chapter is devoted to Alāṅkārayoga, the addition of figures. अथ अपःर्दोपयु उपासुक्षम च गुणस्थलीर्योऽस्यस्यध्ययन्यि प्राप्तकोशलाकारयोग उत्तरेः।
Some general remarks on the three kinds of Alāṅkāras,—Bāhyā (Sābda), Abhyantarā (Artha) and Bāhyābhyantarā (Udbhaya), with the simile of three kinds of toilet of women.

On Alāṅkāras also, there is no substantial difference between the S.K.A. and the Śr. Pra. The treatment in the latter is briefer and has some minor differences. See Alāṅkāra section and special section on the S.K.A. and the Śr. Pra.

### Alāṅkāras

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bāhyā (Sābda) 24</th>
<th>Abhyantarā (Artha) 24</th>
<th>Bāhyābhyantarā (Udbhaya) 24</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Each has six varieties. Pp. 266-296.

At the end, there are some general remarks on these Sābdā-larṇkāras.

There are some general remarks at the end. Pp. 324-351.
The chapter ends with a praise of Sarīṣṛṣṭī as the greatest Alārṅkāra. Next to it comes Ubhayalārṅkāra, next Arthaalārṅkāra and last Śabdālārṅkāra.

章节十一。Pp. 352-449.

This is the most important chapter of the Śr. Pra. It deals with the last and the greatest aspect of Sāhitya, viz., Rasa-avīyoga. Here it is that Bhoja expounds his new theory of Rasa.

Synthesis of all Rasas in Prema; Śrṅgāra is the only Rasa; enumeration of the 49 Bhāvas which are born of Śrṅgāra; criticism of the ideas on Rasa traditionally handed down. Aharṅkāra-Abhimāna-Śrṅgāra is the only Rasa. Not Rasa from Bhāva but Bhāvas from Rasa. Pp. 352-356.

Three aspects of Rasa, Prakṛṣṭa, Bhāvarūpa and Ābhāsa. Rasāvīyoga in Vākya and Prabandha by the three ways of Doṣahāna, Guṇopādāna and Alārṅkārayoga. Guṇa and Alārṅkāra and Rasa also are only Alārṅkāra and hence Nānālārṅkāra-sarīṣṛṣṭī is the one means of Rasāvīyoga. Pp. 356-7. Daṇḍin is quoted and followed on the point that Guṇa and Rasas also are Alārṅkāra.

Sarīṣṛṣṭī is the only Alārṅkāra; its two varieties, Pradhāna-aṅgabhāva and Samakakṣyatā. There is some grammatical discussion here based on Daṇḍin’s own observations on the Utpreksā verse दियतीव तमोज्जालि etc. pp. 357-365.

P. 365 : Guṇas are also Alārṅkāras. P. 366 : Rasas also Alārṅkāras. The new Aharṅkāra theory of Rasa with three Koṭis,—Aharṅkāra, Rasa and Preman characterised respectively as Pūrvakoṭi, Madhyamāvasthā and Uttrakoṭi ; upto p. 368.

Pp. 368-9. The explanation of the difference from one another of Rasavat, Preyas and Urjasvi on the basis of their etymology ; these three are both Rasas and Guṇas. They are Rasas when they attain climax (Yuktotkāra) and Guṇas when they are not so (Ayuktotkāra). As Guṇas they are called Bhāvika, Preyas and Auriṣṭya. Bhoja takes a verse of Daṇḍin as the basis for this interpretation, Pp. 369-370. Etymological significance of the name Rasavat. Pp. 370-371. Vibhāvas, Anubhāvas and Vyabhicārins are not
Alāṅkāras; they are factors producing the Alāṅkāra called Rasa. P. 372.
Three kinds of Alāṅkāras,—Śvabhāvokti, Vakrokti and Rasokti. Pp. 372-
376: illustration and explanation of the eight Rasavadalaṃkāras according
to Daṅḍin and his illustrations.

Pp. 376-381. Criticism of Bharata's doctrine of four subsidiary Rasas
from four main ones and Bhoja’s view that all the 49 Bhāvas, even in the
state of Prakāraṇa, are alike born of the one Rasa of Alāṅkāra-Śīrṣāra. Cri-
ticism of the view that Rasas are only eight. Four new Rasas pointed out:
Śānta, Preyān, Uddhata and Udātta. The possibility of all Bhāvas becoming
Rasas as held by Rudraṭa accepted by Bhoja. Though Rasa is only one, viz.,
Alāṅkāra, the 49 Bhāvas born of it can be called Rasa in their developed
state which forms the Madhyamāvasthā of the Alāṅkāra rasa.


Pp. 382-385. Explanation with simile and illustration of how Vibhāvas,
Anubhāvas and Vyabhicārins develop Rasa. Pp. 385-386. The various stages
of the developed Rasa,—Niśpatti, Upacaya, Rasa-sāmānyya and Rasa-viśeṣa-
niśpatti. Pp. 386-388. The various stages of Bhāva, Rasa, Ābhāsa, Utkan-
ṭhā, Abhisāga, Nirvṛttī, Utpāda, Abhivṛddhi, Sthairya, Bhāva-viśeṣa, Rasa-
vīṣeṣa and Ābhāsa-viśeṣa.

Pp. 388-410. Nānālaṃkāra-saṃśṛṣṭi, Alāṅkāra-saṅkara and its varie-
ties; Guṇa-saṅkara, Rasa-saṅkara, Alāṅkāra-saṅkara, Guṇa-rasa-saṅkara,
Guṇālaṃkāra-saṅkāra and Rasālaṃkāra-saṅkāra.

P. 389. Two kinds of Guṇas, Sollekha and Nirulekha.

P. 410. Rasāviyoga in Vākya ends here. "सोंडव्य वाक्यविशेषारस: शाब्धिनाम
उकः: ||

Then begins Rasāviyoga of Prabandha through the avoidance of flaws and
the addition of Guṇas and Alāṅkāras of the Prabandha as a whole. Bhoja
thus speaks of Doṣas, Guṇas and Alāṅkāras of larger scope pertaining to the
Prabandha as a whole.

P. 412. Different kinds of Prabandha enumerated.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Prakṣya : 24 kinds</th>
<th>Sravya : 24 kinds</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prekṣya</td>
<td>Sravya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satṭaka, pp. 421-422.</td>
<td>Parvabandha (Mahābhārata) p. 429.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>These are the twelve kinds of Vākyārthāḥbhīnaya.</td>
<td>Kāṇḍabandha (Rāmāyaṇa) p. 429.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Śrīgadita, p. 422.</td>
<td>Sargabandha, p. 429.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Durmallikā, p. 423.</td>
<td>Āśvāśakabandha, p. 429.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bhāṇikā, p. 425.</td>
<td>Śastraśākvyā, pp. 429-430.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rāśaka, p. 425.</td>
<td>(Bhoja’s own Śr. Pra.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nāṭyarāśaka, pp. 426-427.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These are each defined and illustrated with the mention of many rare and lost works. On Daśarūpaka, the first ten types of Drama, Bhoja only reproduces Bharata’s definitions.

Pp. 430-431. Enumeration of the Guṇas and Alamkāras pertaining to Prabandha as a whole. Pp. 431-446. Explanation and illustration of these in three sets as applied to Śabda, Artha and both.

P. 447. In the end is quoted Daṇḍin’s definition of Mahākāvyā from which Bhoja derives these Prabandha-guṇas and Prabandha-alamkāras. Pp. 447-449: Then a quotation from Bharata’s description of drama (N.S. XXI. Sls. 107, etc. Kasi Edn.) is given to which Bhoja adds a few verses of his own, making some general remarks on the nature of dramatic varieties. Thus ends this chapter on p. 449 dealing with Rasa-aviyoga, first in Vākya and
then in Prabandha, through the three-fold process of Doṣa-hāna, Guṇādāna and Alamkāra-yoga.

बाल्यप्रबन्धानुमृतोऽथमुत्तो
मया समासेन रसावियोगः।
अवेद वेषज्ञ न विवेचितां वृवणः
विविध्य ते केविनुपर्भयाने॥

इति महाराज + + + श. प्र. रसावियोगप्रकाशो नाम एकादशः प्रकाशः
समासिनमात्रे॥

CHAPTER XII. Pp. 450-553.

The chapter opens with the description of Nāṭaka with verses taken from Bharata. The chapter is devoted to the study of the structure and technique of drama which consist of:

I. (1) Five Ārambha-vidhis.
   (2) " Arthaparakṛtis.
   (3) " Avasthās.
   (4) " Sarṅsthās.
   (5) " Samavasthās.
   (6) " Sandhis.
   (7) " Vṛttis.
   (8) Four (five?) Pravṛttis.
   (9) 24 Pravṛtti-hetus ...

II. (1) Ten Lāsyāṅgas.
   (2) Thirteen Vīthyaṅgas.
   (3) Sixteen Vṛttyaṅgas.
   (4) Twenty-one Sandhyantarās.
   (5) Four Patākāsthānas ...

III. Sixty-four Sandhyāṅgas ...

IV. Sixty-four Kāvyalakṣaṇas ...

P. 452. Five Ārambha-vidhis.

Pramāṇa: Yukti, Ukti, Drṣṭa, Nidarśana and Arthāpatti.

Prameya: Dharma, Artha, Kāma, Loka, (?) and Lokayaṭṛā.


Pp. 456-457. Avasthā, Saṁsthā, and Saṁavasthā explained as action aided by divine agency (*Daiva*), by pure human endeavour (*Pauruṣa*) and by both. Each of these three have five stages.

*Five Avasthās*: Ārambah, Prasava, Udbheda, Kīñciccheṣa and Saṁāpti.


अन्तः लाभनाशयोः: वैक्षण्ड माधवमः, प्रार्थनासर्वोपयोः: पौरुषयः; संप्रातिः दौष्टिर्प्राकृतयः: ||


Pp. 459-465. To make up the number sixty-four Bhoja must have given five Praśṭtis but he gives only four. The four Praśṭtis are Paurastya, Auḍhhramāgaḍhī, Dākṣīṇātyā and Āvanti. Other views on other kinds of Praśṭtis are here mentioned.


Pp. 480-487. Twenty-one Sandhyantararas with definitions and illustrations.

Pp. 487-489. Four Patākāsthānas with definitions and illustrations. These constitute the second set of sixty-four.

The Sixty-four Sandhyāṅgas. Some general remarks on the purpose of these according to Bharata. The Aṅgas of each of the five Sandhis are enumerated, defined and illustrated from dramas. Pp. 489-524.


In this chapter many rare and lost dramas are quoted.
The chapter ends as follows:

एतानि काल्पनिक विमूषणानि प्रावधतुष्णिनिष्ठादतानि
प्रवधतोभास्करणात तज्ज्ञः सम्मक्षः प्रतिज्ञानिः वचारसानि
उदाहरत नास्तक्रियाकर्तज्ञः इत्यं चतुष्पचिदतुष्णि
रसाविक्षेपन निबन्धनीयः कथानु काल्पेण व सा महदितः
भक्तिः द्वादशां श्रुव्युत्प्रभुमाः संचित्न्य शल्य्यांशः
साहित्यस्य च शल्य्यांशसन्निबद्धः कायः प्रकृतेः अमः
केशरीवंदन्ति री हि विदुर्णो रोहिण्यं गहनें
वाणां लोकमात्रां दुवः तं तवविक्षोऽवासलें

इति भ्रीमहा + + + श्रृ + प्रधानहर्षितुष्णिनिष्ठादतानां नाम व्राह्वः
प्रकाशः

Vol. II of the Ms. of the Sr. Pra. closes with this twelfth chapter. Pp. 553.

CHAPTER XIII.


P. 1. Four kinds of Srṅgāra pertaining to the four Puruṣārthas, Dharma, Artha, Kāma and Mokṣa.


P. 9. Two kinds of Rati, Sambhoga and Vipralambha.


Each of these has five stages, Janma, Anubandha, Pravṛddhi, Samvṛtti and Anuvṛtti. Each of these (nine×five: forty-five) are illustrated. The nine kinds of Rati are given with illustrations in S.K.A. V. Pp. 515-520. The chapter ends on p. 33 with these verses:

शैष भवो रतिनाम काल्पनिकादूर्याखः
साधनाकृत्यव्यया द्विप्रकर्षेऽपि दशितः
भवानार्थस्य: सर्वमाः: रतिभावः प्रकृष्यते
केवलामेत्यमोक्षेऽपि तमेत्यमहाविश्वासितः
विसम्बन्धसंगमाः: प्रमेयः: जन्मातुष्णिनिवाचारिभिः
इति विनिविध्य निविषयायतं: कवी... "अल (?) कवयी समन्ते"

इति भ्रीमहा + + + श्रृ + प्रधानहर्षितुष्णिनिष्ठादतानां नाम च जयोर्वः
प्रकाशः समासः

CHAPTER XIV. Pp. 34-83

The illustrations for all the forty-eight Bhāvas in their five stages of Janma etc.
The chapter closes thus:

एते रत्नादयो भवा श्रृंगारन्याकिलमः।
कार्त्तिकादिवेदनपश्चात् ... ... प्रकाशितः॥
जन्मालंखवतिशा्यसपकङ्कलमग्मा [०] इति ॥
युष्मीत सर्वभ्रेष्टावं यथोक्तमोक्तपि॥

वद्रि च कथिते प्रकरणामी भवति रत्नो रत्निविश्वासदिरेख ॥
तद्रि न समजते प्रकटः प्रतिनिःभेदतमि हि सवे एव ॥

इति महा + + + दृष्टो च्वपिविदिवाभ पक्व (प्रक्षयः अवस्थापकः) प्रकाशो
नाम चतुर्दशः प्रकाशः समासः॥

**Chapter XV. Pp. 84-162.**

P. 84. Rati is taken up for special treatment with elaborate exposition of its Vibhāvas etc., in all their infinite varieties.

Two kinds of Vibhāva,—Alambana and Uddīpana. Alambana of two kinds,—Nāyaka and Nāyikā. Four main kinds of Nāyakas,—Dhīrodātta, Dhīrodhāta, Dhīralalita and Dhīrasānta, p. 85. Each of these four is again of various kinds according to the four features,—Guṇa, Prakṛti, Pravr̥tti and Parigraha.

**Guṇa**: Twenty-four: high pedigree etc. Men are of three kinds in respect of this Guṇa,—Uttama, Madhyama and Adhama. See Bharata, XXXIV. Kasi Edn.

**Prakṛti**: Sāttvika, Rājasa and Tāmasa.

**Pravr̥tti**: Anukūla, Daksīna, Saṭha and Dhṛṣṭa.

**Parigraha** : (Number of wives) Asādhāraṇa like Rāma and Sādhāraṇa.

Pp. 85-88. Illustration of these twelve varieties of men.

P. 88. When this twelve-fold classification is applied to the first and major four-fold classification of heroes we get 104 kinds of men. Dhīrodātta 8 plus Uddhata 44 plus Lalita 44 plus Praśānta 8=104. Pp. 88-111. Illustration of these 104 types. See S.K.A. pp. 405 and 589-592 for an enumeration and illustration of these types.
Some mixed varieties are then given. Endless is the variety of character.

एवम्येपि विभया: सेवा: संबंधतो मिच:।
चतुणाम्येपि द्विक्रेयुऽ नायकान्त: मन्निमीमः।
धृशरूदाताग्रेष्ये चतुर्खलुरोपीपृणः।
चतुर्खलुविधानालिताः नायकान्त: स किंचि: किंचि:॥
परस्मिनप्रक्षुल्कम् गुणप्रकृतियोगमः।
चतुर्खलुविधा वैंवस्य नायकलं निविन्यम्॥
इति निगविदि एव नायकान्त अस्थानिशिक्मनोहर: प्रवेचः॥
निविन्जनपुरुसिक्षानां बहुविधेनि दत्ताकोपिशाचे॥

P. 111. Nāyikās: Four main kinds: Svakiyā, Parakiyā, Punarbhū and Sāmānyā. The first two are then divided into:

Uttamā, Madhyamā and Kaniṣṭhā,
Ūḍhā and Anūḍhā,
Dhīrā and Adhīrā, and
Mugdḥā, Madhyamā and Pra-galbha.  

Punarbhū: Akṣatā, Kṣatā, Yātāyātā and Yāyāvarā.

Sāmānyā: Uḍhā, Anūḍhā, Svasarṇavāra, Svairinī and Veṣyā. The last, Veṣyā is of three kinds, Gaṇikā, Vilāsini and Rūpājīvā. By the mixture of the various sub-classes we get a total number of 143 Nāyikās, त्रिवलारिष्टविच्छल्लेन in the first class called Svakiyā. All these 143 are illustrated at the end of which, the following verses summarise: (P. 139)

शतमेतत्र स्वकीयानां त्रिवलारिष्टविच्छल्लेन।
उत्तमादिविनेद्यं नविनामानुस्त्राहतमः।
भृतप्रकृतीति धमः तथाभ्यष्टयुक्तयः।
प्रावो विन्यांसभ: काम: स्वकीयान्त्वेत तियती॥
गुणपरिणामयेंयात्रे सुसमर्थनांविलेपमः
लक्षितधर्मपरित्यागः विन्यातिहि वर्णः।
निजुच्छितं षड्यन्ते भर्मकालमायितोऽहि।
अस्मात् परस्वायामसुकल्लक्तियामः॥

Pp. 139-160. Mixed varieties of the Parakiyā, 143, and their illustrations

एवं पुनर्मुसत्तयोऽवदासंवमुग्मम(द) भर्मोद्वीभस्याः॥

P. 162. The chapter ends thus with the treatment of both kinds of Ālambana-vibhāva. The S.K.A. deals with the classification of Nāyikās on pp. 592-602.

चतुप्रकारः तद्भव निबन्धनः
कविधतुवर्गोऽयं लभेत्

सेतु कारिकाः ११०-१२० ऋत्वी विवेकानन्दसः

तथा तद्वादि (तदेनैव) सबस्यं स्वयं भूतात्मतिः: पुष्पधुमः
मनुष्याऽर्थेवते तद्विद्वस्तमानम् (मम ?) - - तत्तवः
हृद तत्ततीहयायां कुलवर्गमाध्यं समृद्धवने
यदेकः (कै ?) ताह्योपि सहाशोभितमहस्मानो युगदसः

विशिष्टो उष्ण ॥

CHAPTER XVI.


1. Rūtā: Six. Each has four stages, Sandhi, Utpatti (Śaśāvā is the name given by Rājaśekhara), Praudhi and Avasiti (Anuvṛtti according to Rājaśekhara). Illustration of these four stages of the six seasons, pp. 163-173.


कतरुक्करणांम्: इत्यादिसोवयां: (पर्वनिनि: ) ।
देशाकालोपथार्थतिः: चिन्नजन्मा प्रदीप्यते ॥

नात:परस्त्ति पुष्पधुमस्तीश्चात्रयमष्टमः
कतरुक्करणां यदेतुः रामाशक्त्यमः
कतरुक्करणां तथातिहास: कविधितं सह देशाकलमेधे: ।
पृथ्विगतिनिहित्त कलाविवारारुत्तिक( म ) यप्यमयोपदश्यमः ॥

5. The 64 Arts—Catusṭa-kalās. These sixty-four are Mūla-kalās. They fall into the following classes, Karmāśrayas 24, Dyūtāśrayas 20, (Nirūvas 15, and Sajīvas 5), Sayanopacārikās 16 and Uttara-kalās 4.

There are other numerous Avāntara-kalās dealt with in works devoted to them but Bhoja says that he omits them lest his work should grow bigger still.
Twenty-four Karmaśrayas:


Fifteen Nirjivas:

Ayaprāpti, Raksāvidhāna, Rūpasanākhyā, Kriyāmārga, Jivagrahaṇa, Nayajñāna, Karanajñāna, Citracitravidhi, Gūḍharāśi, Tulyābhīhāra, Kaśipragrahaṇa, Anuprapāti, Lekhasmrtyanukrama, Cchala vyāmohana and Grahaṇāda.

Five Sajivas: Upasthāna-vidhi, Yuddha, Tata, Gata and Nṛtta.


Four Uttara-kālās: Sāstrupātam ramanapasya viśaṇam, Svayam śapathakriyā, Prasthitānugamanam and Punar-nirikṣaṇam.

Pp. 192-204. Illustration of these sixty-four Kalās.


The chapter ends thus:

क्लाविचारप्रमुखः अपि...प्रकाशितः।
आदिप्रकाष्टिनन्देन उक्तज्ञो विदुच्चौः।
सन्तीवननमलस्य मुखः(त)नावामः।
कलाविनामिनयं भ्रमं: गृहरस्वश्चिणि जीवकम्।
उपनिषदविद्वादा तेवमुद्रीपनां निम्नुनविज्ञासा वैतदमणी स्मरस्य।
तदुपनिष्ठविवेकोपदेशस्मका जन्तुनुपदतुवावनेव संभावयामः।
इति त्री + + + शु प्र ० उद्धीपनविभावप्रकाशी नाम प्रोडङ्गः: प्रकाश:।
संभावः।

Chapter XVII. Pp. 208-236.

Anubhāvas

इदानीमुनावं व्याक्तायामः। तन्त्र विभागः: प्रक्ष्यस्तिररस्तिरप्रद्युतुम्भां: नामकर्त्या: ये स्मृतीशिष्योऽपि
प्रयालज्ञान: मनोवभवबिधिरीतिबम्ब: तैःन्युनमानतावाद र्यास्वादिनामानतामवावाब्य अनुभावः।


3. Buddhyārambahas : $3 \times 4 = 12$.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Riti</th>
<th>Vṛtti</th>
<th>Pravṛtti</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pāncāli</td>
<td>Bhāratī</td>
<td>Paurastyā</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gauḍī</td>
<td>Ārabhaṭī</td>
<td>Udhramāgadhi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vaidarbhi</td>
<td>Kāśīkī</td>
<td>Dākśīṇātyā</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lātiyā</td>
<td>Sāttvīkī</td>
<td>Avantyā</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


For the first set of twelve Mana ārambahas, see Bharata’s N.S. XXIV, p. 270. Sls. 7-11; p. 271. Sls. 24 and 31. Bharata gives them in three separate sets. For the Vāgārambahas see N.S. XXIV. p. 273. Sls. 49-51. Twelve Vāmārargas or Mārgas of Vācīkābhinaṇya according to Bharata. Bharata did not speak of Vṛtti and Pravṛtti as Anubhāva or Buddhyārambahānu-bhāva. Śingabhūpāla follows Bhoja and Bhoja himself follows Rājaśekhara.

Illustrations of these up to p. 220, except the last, Śarirārambaha. Riti, Vṛtti, and Pravṛtti on pp. 211-220.

मनोवाचुदिरराम्भा: क्षेत्रीयः प्रदशिता:।
अतः शरीरजराब्जकारोपेयं प्रबच्चते।
मनोवाचुदिरविन्यासं आम्ब्राम्भातू सहलस्य।
भरतदिरशीतिवत्तू विनियम्हैते प्रदशिता:।
छिलाददीपंभरमोझीलबिकल्पमह( हा )सै:।
शुरुआतःप्रबच्चति।
पद्मनिशाचेत्य द्यो भरतप्रशित:।
काव्यक्षेत्रकरणार्धमोझीलबिकल्पमह( हा )सै:।

Śarirārambahas : pp. 221-236.
Visarga, Vinigūhana and Sandaṣṭaka with illustrations.

1. Adharārambhās: Bharata VIII. 135-140.
2. Kapolārambhās: Bharata VIII. 130-134.
3. Hāsārambhās: The six kinds of Hāsa in Bharata VI.
5. Tārākarma: Bharata VIII. 93-100.

Then are given 36 Drṣṭis, Kāntā etc. Bharata VIII. 37-91. The chapter ends thus:

मनोवाचुव्विज्ञ ये च ये चारभा: शरीरजा:।
अनुभवावनामी (?) ते यथा...प्रदर्शिता:॥
भावः संचारिण्ये च स्थापितो ये च साविभाका:।
सचिवालयात्मकस्य सार्वस्य प्रकरणः॥
प्रतिमष (प्रतित्तिः) मनोरित्तमकस्य समस्तमात्माविभावः:।
स्मिप्रभुवालयात्मकस्य नीतिमात्रविप्रेलेनु (य) नीतिवर्गः (नीतिवर्गः:॥

इति महा + + य + प्र + अनुभवप्रकाशो नाम सत्त्वन: प्रकरणः समासः:॥

With chapter XVII, a section begun in chapter XV closes. In chapters XIII and XIV, the 49 Bhāvas were given and then Bhoja proceeded to enumerate and illustrate the varieties of the Vibhāvas and Anubhāvas with reference to one Bhāva, namely, Rati, and this subject finishes with chapter XVII. The chapter ends with the two verses, given above, on the general Rasa theory of Bhoja that all the 49 Bhāvas with their Vibhāvas and Anubhāvas only serve to heighten the inner inborn Śṛṅgāra of Aharīkāra.


With this chapter begins a section which ends with chapter XXI. These four chapters deal with the four Śṛṅgāras of Dharma, Artha, Kāma and Mokṣa. Chapter XVIII Dharmaśṛṅgāra.

Definition of Dharma:

तत्र धर्मो नाम सुसृष्टिमधृतिविविधतानाः।

It is of three kinds, Pravṛtti, Nivṛtti and Niyama. Pravṛtti is of ten kinds, being done by Vāk, Manas and Kāya. (4 plus 3 plus 3 : 10)

Vāk (Speaking): Hita, Priya, Satya and Apta.
Manas (Thinking): Astikya, Dayā and Parasva anīpsā.
Kāya (Doing): Gurūpāsanā, Dāna and Ārtatrāṇa.

Pp. 238-9. Nivrūti of ten kinds. Five are missing in the Ms. Those available are Nivrūtis from Nṛṣaṁsata, Parasvābhidyā, Niśiddhasevā, Steya and Hirnā. Illustrations from Kavyas.

Pp. 239-242. Niśama, also of ten kinds.

Def. of Dharma again and of its three forms Pravrūti, Nivrūti and Niśama. P. 242.

The Riti, Vṛtti and Pravrūti of this Dharmasṛṅgāra are given as Paṇcālī, Paurastya and Bhāratī respectively. With the exercise of a lot of ingenuity, the old definitions of Bhāratī vṛtti, Paṇcālī riti and Paurastya pravrūti are shown to refer significantly to the various aspects of Dharmasṛṅgāra.

P. 244. The Nāyikā of this Dharmasṛṅgāra is Svakāyā and the Nāyaka, Dhīrodātta. A list of the Guṇas of a Dhīrodātta. This goes up to p. 264. All these Guṇas, given in three sets, are illustrated with two illustrative verses each.

I 1 अनुकूलदायिक: अनुसेक:। 2 शोकादिन: अवैक्षिण्यः। 3 व्यसनापविसिद्धीनलम्।
   4 रामनादिरथं वर्मभवः। 5 कर्तिके दु:पत: परमन्तः। 6 त्रिचिन्हयो ज्युतपसा।
   7 विशिष्ठानः व्यसीत:। 8 प्रवव्यसिद्धीते अनुसेकः। 9 ददनायेऽपि आद्यः।
   10 पर्यन्त्यानायान्यः। 11 पर्यन्त्यान्यं न प्रस्थः। 12 पर्यन्त्यान्यं न प्रस्थः।
   13 मया न कोऽतः। 14 पर्यन्त्यान्यं न अनिवः। 15 कम्पतितः:। न विस्मयः।
   16 कालाधिभ: न अभिमानः।

II 1  श्रीलम्, शाश्वस्म, शिर्यम्, गाम्यम्, वाल्मिकम्, शोभा, ह्यत्तता and अविकल्यनः।

III 1 अनुकूलदायिक: अनुसेक:। 2 अनवग्नसंपर्य:। 3 उपज्यु उत्क्षयः। 4 धार्मिकतम: सितता।
   5 उन्मत्ततः। 6 अन्याय:। 7 तथावपतिः। 8 फ़ास्नारसिनः शशा। 9 विशिष्ट:। 10 निर्धारी:।
   11 अन्तरसं प्रेपः। 12 श्यामाशिर्यरः नीऍ। 13 समाधिसंमयः। 14 समयावक्ष:।
   15 पर्यासिद्ध:। ह्यय:। 16 पर्यासिद्ध:। 17 समयावक्षः। 18 महासेकः। 19 न्यातिस्मारः।
   20 विशिष्ट:। 21 महासेकः। 22 अनुसूचः। 23 प्रार्म्भितिरः। 24 अन्यायावक्षः।
   25 महासेकः। 26 गधाद्यवः। न समयावक्षः। (ग्यायः, मद, अग्नी, असुतः अन्य- absence of these even when causes for these appear). Most of these are given two illustrative verses each and the section affords interesting reading.
The chapter ends thus:

स एष धर्मार्थवादः…ऽनो (पहले)
लज्जयः (७) सुतुतुमित्वसमदायः।
पदं दशान: श्रीतमार्गमोचरे
शिराय यावा…….(अ) वत्ससताम।

इति आँ + + श + च + धर्मशृष्टिर्मकाशी नाम अध्यादशः प्रकाशः समासः।

CHAPTER XIX. Pp. 264-299

Arthaśāṅgāra.

Definition of Artha:

अर्थेन नाम आत्मन: खुलशाखनानां कल्पमिश्रितादीनामज्ञनम्।

Three kinds of Artha:

Nava, i.e., earned by oneself (Swayam ārjita). It is of ten kinds: Vidyā, Bhūmi, Paśu, Dhānya, Hiranya, Bhanḍa, Upaskāra, Kalatra, Putra and Mitra.

Bhūtapūrva defined as Praṇāṣṭāṇīta.

Pitrya, i.e., ancestral property (Kula-kramāgata).

These two are only of eight kinds. These eight kinds are the same as the eight in the ten in the list of 'Nava' minus Kalatra and Putra both of which cannot but be Nava. All these have varieties and are all illustrated on pp. 264-266.


P. 267. Means of Arjana: Vinaya, Vārtā, Vyavahāra, Rakṣa, Mantra, Upāya, Vikrama, Yuddha, Upanisat and Praśama which are the various sections of the Arthaśāstra. Artha earned by these means is for the help of attaining the other three Puruṣārthas. Arthaśāṅgāra is activity in the direction of Artha.

—प्रकृती तद्वाप्रयिमान: अर्थशृष्टारः।

P. 268. The hero of Arthaśāṅgāra is Dhiroddhata; Nāyikā, all kinds; Riti, Gaudī; Vṛtti, Arabhāti; Pravṛtti, Uḍhramāgadhī. Ingenious explanation of the definitions of these Riti, Vṛtti and Pravṛtti as applicable to conditions of Arthaśāṅgāra.

P. 270. The Dhiroddhata who belongs to Arthaśāṅgāra is of 44 kinds according to Guṇa, Prakṛti, Pravṛtti and Parigraha.
His Guṇas : 24 तत्र धीरोद्वस्तय दैत्यसुद्दत्य भवति। यत्रभावाद्य अभ्युदयादिर्मिति: उत्तेकः, शोकादिर्मिति: वैक्रमयम्, ननुमस्तिर्मिति: दीन्तम, रागादिरिमित्वमचाथ, चकिततु असत्क्रस्तूर्थू, नीचयेषु अर्था असुन्तु, अस्माकैविव शालिग्न, स्वानितस्य नान्दशं; सदाचारेषु अनादोऽयोऽस्थितम्, परसुणेषु मालसान्यम्, परसुरसनेषु प्रहस्य; पराशानेषु प्रतिति; अस्लानेषु कोष; प्रारम्भेषु अनविवहः; कमान्तिस्ये: विस्वयः, स्वजात्यादिरिमित्व अभिमान: ( जात्यादयो गुणः: चविवशिति: रूक्र )

The last item mentioned above namely, Jātāyūdi guṇas, refers to 24 Guṇas which are as follows: Jāti, Anvarya, Abhijanya, Nivāsa, Āspada, Pāda, Pītā, Sāstra, Vāgni, Kalāvādaghṛṇya, Cāturya, Rūpasampat, Saubhāgya, Tyāga, Saurya, Adīnąvākyatā, Śakti, Daksāṭa,—18. Six are missing.

Then are given eight special Guṇas of the Uddhata: Māna, Tejas, Saundarya, Vīlāsa, Vikatthana, Asthiratva, Agambhiratā and Sāhasa. Illustrations for all these go up to p. 280.

Three kinds of Dhīroddhatas—Uttama, Madhyama and Kaniṣṭha—according to the presence of all or some or a few of the above given Guṇas.

From p. 280 to the end of the chapter on p. 299 illustrations of the 49 Bhāvas in all the three kinds of the Uddhata hero. The chapter ends thus:

Chapter XX. Pp. 299-325.

Kāmaśṛṅgāra

The Kāmasūtra of Vātsyāyana and the Jayamanalā on it are utilised here.

P. 299. Definition of Kāma : कामो नाम आत्मान: सुखाविभाजा-(or मानी)विशेषयगुणा। Two kinds: Sāmānya rūpa and Viśeṣa rūpa. The former is the pleasurable experience of the five senses and the mind. The latter is pleasure born of love to a sweetheart. The latter is of two kinds: Pradhāna which is the sense of touch in her—Sparśa-sukha. And Apradhāna which is joy in thinking of her beauty etc.

P. 300. Everywhere Kāma is a kind of Abhimāna of Sukha: सुखाविभाजाय प्रकाशयति: Therefore it is said that certain kinds of unpleasant experiences also are part of Kāma. The Kamasūtras’ definition of Kāma is quoted.
Visāya-samprayoga, Tatsampratyaya, Sarinśkāra, Smarana, Abhilāsa, Manahpravṛtti and Samkalpa—all, forms of Kāma. Illustrations of these.

P. 301. Further classification into Hetubhūta and Phalabhūta.

P. 302. Two kinds of Samprayoga, Aṅga samprayoga and Adhiśṭhāna samprayoga. The latter is again two-fold, Bāhya and Ābhyanātra.

In Kāmaśṛṅgāra the Nāyaka is Dhirālalita; Nāyikā, all kinds; Vṛtti, Kaiśiki; Pravṛtti, Dākṣiṇātyā; Riti, Vaidarbhi. Explanation of the applicability of the definitions of these to conditions in Kāmaśṛṅgāra.

P. 304. 44 kinds of Dhirālalita. Explanation of the Lālitya which characterises his Citta and affects all his actions. As in the cases of the other heroes, here also a number of Guṇas are given and illustrated. Then follow illustrations of the 49 Bhāvas in a Uttama, Madhyama and Karani-śtha Dhirālalita. These go up to p. 325. The following are the Guṇas in two sets:

I 8 vikāpayukta:-
1. Sāyāsita, sāṇiti, Śrīyam, Śrūtyakṣa, Pratyanātha, labhita, labhitam, labhitam, labhitam, labhitam, labhitam, labhitam, labhitam.

The chapter ends thus:

The chapter concludes:

Chapter XXI. Pp. 326-349.

Mokṣaśṛṅgāra.

Pp. 326-7. Definition of Mokṣa. Gautama’s Nyāyasūtra is followed. P. 328. Tattvajñāna: The different Tattvas according to the different systems of philosophy and branches of knowledge beginning with the one Tattva of Brahman of Advaita to the sixteen Pādārthas of Gautama’s Nyāya. P. 329. Different conceptions of Niḥśreyasa according to the several systems of philosophy.

In Mokṣaśṛṅgāra, the Vṛtti is Sāttvikī, the Pravṛtti is Āvantī, the Riti is Lātiyā, the heroine is Svakiyā and the hero is Dhirapraśānta. P. 332.
Pp. 332-337. A list of Gunas of the Dhīrāpraśānta Nāyaka in two sets:

(1) समन्वयमयम्। व्यसनोत्सवोवरिविशेष। इत्यथायंतु अनास्य। विलासः। उपरासः।
शरीरदासनमानुष्यः। प्रतांतुः। नोकरः। विन्दालः। न क्रियः। भवयोगिणः। प्रयोगः।
सब्बः। अनुप्रेयः। साधुजनः। वैदेयः। अपासमकः। उपेयः। सदाचरे। आद्यः।
सवंभायः। विनासः। रामादिर्मः। न धर्मचायः। कर्मालः। अविस्मयः। जातिरिश्यः। नाभिमानः।
(2) स विशेषगुणः।—धर्माः। विद्यमानः। साहित्यः। प्रशासः। शौचः। आर्जः। वैशावः।
पौरामाः।

The section on Mokṣaśrīgāra ends on p. 337.

P. 337. Another topic begins here viz., the classification of characters into Hero, Anti-hero, Sub-hero etc.—Nāyaka, Pratināyaka, Upānāyaka and Anunāyaka. Illustrations of these four multiplied by the four old types of Dhīrodātta etc., which give 16 varieties in all. P. 340.

P. 340. Four kinds of Nāyikās, Udātātā, Uddhātā, Lalitā and Sāntā and from another point of view another classification of Nāyikās into Nāyikā, Upānāyikā, Anunāyikā and Pratināyikā. P. 343.

Pp. 343-346. 24 Gunas of Nāyakas which has already been given once, Jāci, Anvaya etc. Illustrations of these.


The chapter ends on p. 349. The following verses at the end sum up this section of the chapter on the varieties of the hero and the heroine and on their qualities.

य एते योध्यम प्रोक्ता नायका नायिकायाद यादः।
तेषां ये चाचत्तमनविद्विजुज्वाहयादयो गुणाः॥
युक्तसतिसतमवेशं पद्हायव तु मनयमः।
अभिधान्या कनिश्चरायत नायिकायाचेष्यविधि॥
उदाता गृहमानविद्य (माना स्वाता) क्रिष्टा (उदता) मानवाशिर्नी॥
वैस्यसाध्यमने शाश्वत शर्मान्मान्मानसा॥
मनस्तिययमहाङः शाश्वस्तस्मेत्मतः।
निहिरममणीयं चेष्टित्य नायकानाम्॥
कथितयत्व यथावत्त कामश्रुतारसारः
पुरितीत तद्वस्ताविशिष्टं कर्णयां॥
इति भ्रे + + श्रुं + प्रो मोक्षशृद्वारादि प्रकाशो नाम एकविवा: प्रकाश: समासः।

This chapter is called Anurāgasthāpāna.

P. 350. Dharma, Artha and Kāma are the three Puruṣārthas sought after by all men in the second stage of life of the house-holder. Of these Dharma and Artha are the means and Kāma is the end and as such Kāma is the most important among these three.

Kāma is general or special, and is Sukha. A number of verses on love culled from dramas and Kāvyas are given here:

अहेतुःपक्षातो संयुত्कालिकाः सहस्रं तदात्मप्रवाहम् इति स्तम्भावैः।
व्यथामकीषेंतमेव तृत्यं व्यासनमुस्तवे।
तदात्मप्रवाहम् सः साध्यं तदात्मनं इति तदसाधवः।
तदात्मप्रवाहम् सः साध्यं तदात्मायां इति तदसाधवः।
(Bhāravi K.A. XI. 27-28.)

P. 351. This love is of 64 kinds:


एते भद्रायवृष्टिनिरुपस्तम्नां नामतः।
उदाहरणामााधैं रुपवेष्यं निदर्शने।।

Pp. 351-358. Illustrations of these 64 forms of love. Illustrations for four of these, Ipsā, Lipsā, Ichā and Vāñchā, are missing. Each of these can be in eight forms:

Nityānurāga, Naimittikānurāga, Sāmānayānurāga, Viṣeṣānurāga, Pra-kāśānurāga, Prachannānurāga, Akṛtrimānurāga and Krtrimānurāga and definitions of these. These eight are called the Mahardhis of love in the S.K.A. (Vide p. 484.) Twelve are given there. Only eight are here taken and the remaining four are brought under one or the other. Vide also pp. 581-584, S.K.A. where they are illustrated.

8 varieties of Nityānurāga: Anurāga pertaining to Viṣaya, Āśraya, Ālambana, Udāpana, Sthāna, Saṃsthāna, Rūpa and Svarūpa.

तत्र अनुरागः—स्त्रीलिङ्गजाते संविधाः। वस्त्र जाते सं आध्यायः। यद्य आलंबते तद्य
आलंबनम्। यद्य उद्धृतीति तद्य उद्धृतम्। वेन अवतिष्ठते तद्य, स्थानम्। वेन मुष्किन्ते तद्य, स्थानम्।
वेन शोभते तद्य, रूपम्। वेन निहयते तद्य, स्थानम्।
Each of these is again of three kinds:
Viṣayānurāga is Ucca, Nimna or Sama;
Aśrayānurāga is Uttama, Paniyān or Madhyama;
Ālambanānurāga is Śīghra, Madhyama or Cira;
Uddipanānurāga is Mrdū, Madhya or Čanda;
Sthānānurāga is Sadṛk, Sadṛśa or Sadṛkṣa;
Sarīsthānānurāga is Sarīyak, Mithyā or Atiśāyī;
Rūpānurāga is Čaru, Acāru or Ubhayātman;
Svarūpānurāga is Gabhira, Utkaṭa or Prakṣaṭa.

Definition and illustration of these up to p. 362.

P. 362. Naimittikānurāga: also of (8 × 3) 24 kinds:
Kāla; Haimantika, Vāsantika, and Vārṣika;
Samaya: Pravasārāmbha, Pratyāgama and Prathama-saṅgama;
Veḷi: Pradoṣa, Niśītha and Prabhāta;
Upādhi: Tamas, Candrodaya and Jyotsnā etc.;
Sādhana: Snāna, Vilepana etc.;
Samāvesa: Upasara, Prasāda and Mada;
Deśa: Vivikta, Ghana and Sevya; and
Prakīrṇa: Gita, Utsava and Čūtādi.

Illustration of these on pp. 362-365.

Pp. 365-368. Sāmānyānurāga of 24 kinds:
Dravya-gocara, Guṇa-gocara, Karma-gocara, Samkṣipta, Vīkṣipta,
Samasta, Vyasta, Saddha, Sarīkīra, Sādharmyakṛta, Vaidharmyakṛta,
Mahāviṣaya, Alpaviṣaya, Deśahetu, Kālahetu, Dharmaviṣaya, Dharma-viṣaya,
Samayajana, Sambhandhajanan, Prākṛta, Vaiķṛta, Vayahkṛta, Vaidag-
dhyakṛta and Saubhāgyakṛta.

Illustrations for all these are then given and while illustrating, Bhoja
gives the last as Prasiddhikṛta and not as Saubhāgyakṛta as in enumeration.

P. 368. Viṣeṣānurāga—24 kinds.

Jātikṛta, Kriyākṛta, Guṇakṛta, Dravyakṛta, Sādhāraṇa, Asādhāraṇa,
Pratiyāmaṇa, Abhidhiyāmaṇa, Bāhya, Abhyanta, Sadṛśa, Asadṛśa,
Svaprakāśa, Anyābhibhāvī, Ullekhavān, Anullekḥi, Atirikta, Anatirikta,
Naisargika, Svasammata, Stokasammata, Bahusammata and Sarvasammata.

Illustrations of these up to p. 371.


Svakiyāviṣaya, Svayānvarāviṣaya, Kanyāviṣaya, Punarbhūviṣaya,
Vesāyāviṣaya, Sāmānyodhāviṣaya, Navodhāviṣaya, Praudhāviṣaya, Svādhīna-
bhartṛkāviṣaya, Proṣitapatikāviṣaya, Virahotkaṇṭhitāviṣaya, Kalahāntaritā-
viṣaya, Khaṇḍitāviṣaya, Vāsakasajjikāviṣaya, Ekacāriṇivīṣaya, Sapatnī-Jyeṣ-
thā-Kanisthā Subhagā-Śivaya, Siddhāntacārinīpracieśa, Dharmānubandha,
Arthānubandha, Sānubandha and Niranubandha.

Illustrations of these up to p. 375.
P. 375. Pracchannānurāga—24 kinds.
Illustrations of these up to p. 378.

P. 378. Akṛtrimānurāga—24 kinds.
Sahaja of 2 kinds: Ekaviṣaya and Anekaṃviṣaya.
Yauvanaja of 2 kinds: Sārīra and Mānasa.
Ahārya of 2 kinds: Sthira and Bhaṅgūra.
Visrambhāja of 2 kinds: Mugdha and Pragalbha.
These are the main \((4 \times 2) = 8\) varieties which mix and produce 16 varieties. Illustrations of these up to p. 382.

P. 382. Kṛtrimānurāga—24 kinds.
Illustrations of these up to p. 385.

The closing verses of the chapter sum up the varieties of Anurāga above given as 12,288. That is, 64 kinds at first; then 8 kinds having each 24 varieties which give 192. These two classes multiply into 12,288. Further varieties are also possible, though only 256 (192 plus 64) are here illustrated.

The closing verses of the chapter sum up the varieties of Anurāga above given as 12,288. That is, 64 kinds at first; then 8 kinds having each 24 varieties which give 192. These two classes multiply into 12,288. Further varieties are also possible, though only 256 (192 plus 64) are here illustrated.

P. 386. Two kinds of Śrīgāra: Sambhoga and Vipralambha. The latter is of four kinds: Prathamānurāga, Māna, Pravāsa and Karuṇa. And Sambhoga is of four kinds: Sambhoga after each of the four above given Vipralambhas.
P. 387. Two aspects of love-varieties: Vicitra and Rāgavardhana. Analysis of all types of Anurāga given in the previous chapter from the point of view of these two.


Varieties of Vipralambha: Same. Illustrations up to p. 392.

P. 392. Illustrations of the four Sambhogas and the four Vipralambhas, mixed varieties and aspects of Vicitra and Rāgavardhana also p. 399.

P. 400. Analysis from the point of view of the heroine and her varieties.

P. 402. Two kinds of Samparka, that between Sajātiya persons and that between Vijātiya persons. Two kinds of Anugama, Shhitānugama and Āgantu-anugama.

P. 404. Illustrations of poems of different poets as containing one or more of the four Vipralambhas and four Sambhogas. The combination of two or more of these eight kinds of Sambhoga and Vipralamba put together in the same poem is called Sanvidhi. Hundreds of varieties are set forth as possible and some of them are briefly illustrated. P. 407.

The chapter ends on p. 408.

CHAPTER XXIV. Pp. 409-438

P. 409. Vipralambha: Definition and four-fold classification, a summary of what has already been said.

Nirukti or Etymological explanation of all ideas associated with the words Vipralambha, Māna, Pravāsa etc., by the words themselves, their roots and their suffixes and affixes.

Vipralambha is derived from Labh with Pra and Vi meaning Vañcanā. This Vañcanā is of four kinds, Pratiṣtrutyādāna, Visarvādāna, Kālaḥaraṇa and Pratyādāna. Though Labh means Prāpti, the addition of Pra gives its direct opposite meaning of Aprāpti or Vañcanā. Instances of where Pra is added to give the opposite meaning are given here. Tiṣṭhati—Pratiṣṭhate. Vasati—Pravasati. Smarati—Prasmarati. The Vi added to Pralamba has four meanings and qualifies the four meanings of Pralamba. The four meanings of Vi are Vividha, Viruddha, Vyāviddha and Vipratiṣiddha and these four qualify respectively the four meanings of Pralamba.
Prathamānurāgavipralambha: Pratiśrutyādāna: Vividha.
Māna: Vīśaṁvādana: Viruddha.
Pravāsa: Kālaharaṇa: Vyāviddha.
Karunā: Pratyādāna: Vipratisiddha.

Thus both the four kinds of Prakṛtyarthas and four kinds of Upasargārthas are present in the four types of Vipralambha. These are illustrated up to p. 412.

Though Bhoja assigns these distinct meanings to the words with reference to each variety of Vipralambha, he adds that there is Samplava, overlapping, i.e., the appearance of other significances in one variety. Thus even in Prathamānurāga which has Pratiśrutyādāna and Vividha as Prakṛtyartha and Upasargārtha of Vipralambha, there appear the characteristics of Pravāsa viz., Kālaharaṇa and Vyāviddha. Illustrations up to p. 420. Bhoja concludes that such overflow is natural and the point is that in Prathamānurāga, Pratiśrutyādāna and Vaividhya predominate in a degree absent in the rest.

P. 421. Explanation of the meanings of the words Prathamānurāga etc.
Rāga is from Raṇj. Anu means Pascat or Saha. Rāga is colour. Rāga is relatable to the root Rāj to shine and Anurāga is associated with śobbā, Aujjvalya, etc. (Śrṅgāra itself is Śuci and Ujvala as Bharata says.) Anurāga is Anuṣakti, or colouring. Colouring also is a significance, for love gives a hue to the face which is a Śattvika bhāva. Rājate means also Prakaṛṣam Āpadyate.

Illustrations for all these cases up to p. 424.

P. 425. Māna.
Māna is a double negative—Mā, Na—'no, no' which refers to the refusals uttered by the angry lady in Māna. The path of love is Kuṭila and bristles with 'Nay's'.

Māna means according to the Nirukti given above Pūjā, Jñāna, Bodhana and Māpana. Illustrations from love-literature of love in these phases. Māna meaning Jñāna is Abhimāna which considers even unpleasant feelings as part of pleasure.

The last is the measuring of the depth of love. Then follows a small grammatical discussion why Māna which is a Lyuḍanta is used in the masculine gender though it must be in the neuter. Justification of the masculine gender with Patañjali's use of 'Anumāna' in the masculine. Illustrations of these four aspects of Māna.

P. 425. Pravāsa: "Vasa nivāse" and "Vasa ācchādaṇe" are the two roots from which Bhoja derives Pravāsa. The first root gives its opposite
meaning when Pra is added to it. Pravāsa therefore means, first, going away. Then another meaning is suggested:

प्राधुर्य वायस्यति अनुरंजयति नम्नयति कामिन: त्यतिमिति वा प्रवासः।

For, exile increases yearning. Bhoja tries to find grammatical justification in the words themselves for all the various circumstances natural to those states of separation. Another meaning is then given.

यदि वा प्राधुर्ये: वतिंशिष्टतपि: प्रमापणे वर्तते वेधा तुसैैमें वर्तवेष्युः इति प्रवास्यन्ते हन्यन्ते विश्वदर्मिनः: इति प्रवासः।

These are the three different possibilities from Pravāsa derived from ‘Vasa nivāse’ with Pra.

‘Vasa āchādane’ with Pra is not taken as giving the opposite meaning. Pra here indicates Prakāra or Viśēśa which refers to the special dress, Viśēśa āchādana in Pravāsa. In Pravāsa, those in separation rarely do their toilet or they dress themselves differently. Illustrations for all these varieties.

P. 426. Karuṇa: It is derived from 1. Kṛ to do, meaning many things, creating, placing etc. 2. Kiratiḥ from Kir to scatter, Vikṣepa. The second etymology refers to the fact that one in Karuṇa is separated (Vikṣipta) from Bhoga or enjoyment.


2. In Coramkāram kroṣati which means ‘चोर-चोर इति उच्यते क्रोषित’ Kṛ means Uccāraṇa or Vilāpa. One weeps a good deal in Karuṇa.

Two other meanings of Kṛ, Sthāpayati and Abhyaṅjayati are explained and illustrated as applying to conditions of Karuṇa, p. 428.

P. 428. Above were given the significances of the words with the Pratyayārtha subordinated to the Prakṛtyartha. Now, taking the Pratyayārtha as the dominant factor, the several significances are elaborated. The six cases and Kartā, Hetukartā, Bhāvakartā, Karmakartā, Kartṛkarma and Bhāvakarma are illustrated up to p. 431.

P. 431. अर्थ प्रयोगयतिचलकः—भूति, मविष्ठति, वर्त्तमान and अवयव।

Illustrations of these up to p. 434.

P. 434. अर्थार्थ द्वारायमान: कृत्यासाधारणन्या बिच्यन्ते।
A. Nitya: Sāśvatika, Vaikalpika and Naiyogika.
B. Naimittika: Audhyotika, Aupabhogika and Prayogika.
C. Svabhāvika: Agantu, Naisargika and Sāṁsargika.
D. Vaiparāmarśika: Satkīrṇa, Prakīrṇa and Viprakīrṇa.

These are further divided into many classes:

A-1. Nimesa, Muhūrta, Naḍikā and so on.
A-2. Dīna, Māsa, Pakṣa, Rūtu and Ayana.