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WAS THE RÂMÂYÂNA COPIED
FROM HOMER?

[A paper read by Kâshinâtth Trimbak Telang
Esq. M.A., LL. B., before the Students’ Literary
and Scientific Society, Bombay, on 2nd. Septem-
ber 1872.]

One of our two great National Epics has recently
become the centre of considerable attention on the
part of orientalists and Sanskrit Scholars. An
opinion, by no means particularly definite or precise,
has been hitherto floating about, that both our
voluminous epics, namely the Mahâbhârata and the
Râmâyâna, have just claims to a very high antiquity.
Greater precision than this, however, has not yet been
attained. True it is, that the question—what is the
meaning of the Râmâyâna—has been asked on vari-
cous occasions, and has been answered in various
ways. Some have maintained, that it symbolizes
the progress of Aryan civilization against the abori-
ginal inhabitants of the country. Others have seen
in it a representation of the conflict between Brahma-
manism and Buddhism. A third school calls it an
allegory on the progress of the agricultural art.  

(1) See Weber pages 121, 122, 124, of the Indian
Antiquary; and Indian Antiquary page 147, Mr. Pick
ford quoted by the Rev. K. M. Banerjea.
But although these and other interpretations of the matter of the Rāmāyaṇa have been put forward from time to time, the question as to whence that matter was derived; whether it was autochthonic or based on a foreign original; whether, if autochthonic, it was purely Brahmanical or borrowed from a Buddhistical or any similar source; these and questions like these have only just now attracted any considerable degree of attention. And it is to Professor Albrecht Weber of Berlin that the credit of drawing these questions into prominent relief undoubtedly belongs.2

I own, indeed, that the conclusion, to which the learned and elaborate reasoning of Professor Weber has led him, is not one with which any Hindu will be much gratified. To be told that the Rāmāyaṇa—that noble work with which so many of one’s pleasing and exalting associations are bound up—that work which sings the superhuman exploits of a deified man, who, beyond almost any other Deity in their Pantheon, is the greatest favourite of the Hindus of this day—that work which has ingrained itself into the very life of the nation, so that there is scarcely a Hindu who is not more or less acquainted with its plot—to be told that after all that work is nothing more than a Buddhist saga dovetailed to the Homeric story of the Trojan War, that causes a shock to one’s notions under which not many will find it easy to be stoical. For myself, I am free to confess, that I did not bring to the study of the exposition of this new theory a mind that was very much inclined to accept it. But if the progress of scientific inquiry must needs knock

(2) It need scarcely be said that thanks are due to the Reverend D. C. Boyd for introducing Weber’s essay to the knowledge of those who are unacquainted with the German language.
off its splendid pedestal this idol like so many others which it has similarly treated, it is our bounden duty to bend under the stroke, and adapt ourselves to the altered circumstances as best we may. And therefore, feeling what I do feel, I still hope to be able to preserve towards the new theory that scientific attitude which is the only proper attitude in such an inquiry.

Professor Weber's main conclusions may be summed up as follows (I) "The entire narrative" I use the Professor's own language as rendered into English by the Rev. D. C. Boyd for the Indian Antiquary "the entire narrative of the exile itself has to a large extent, been developed out of germs furnished by Buddhistic legends," (II) "In the existing condition of the text, however, we find unmistakable indications that the influence of Greece upon India was already firmly established" (III) "It is possible that in the addition of these two elements [namely the abduction of Sītā and the siege of Lankā] by Vālmīki, we should recognize the influence of an acquaintance with the Homeric saga cycle" (IV) "The work of Vālmīki can hardly date earlier than this" [i.e., the beginning of the Christian era]. These, at least for the purposes of the present paper, are the principal results of Professor Weber's laboured investigation. The other results, also of undoubted importance, concern a different set of questions, and will not here be referred to except as bearing upon these.

The first point to be considered, then, is the relation of the Buddhistic Daśaratha-jāatakata, which is alleged to be the original of Vālmīki's Rāmāyana, with this latter work. It is I think, much to be

(3) Indian Antiquary page 120.
(4) Indian Antiquity page 252.
(5) Ibid.
(6) Ibid. page 121.
regretted, that Professor Weber's deliverance is not quite explicit upon this point. I have looked through the whole of his paper once and again; but except in one or two places, where the point is more hinted at than distinctly set forth, I have failed to see the grounds upon which the Professor contends that the Buddhist book is the original of which the Rāmāyāna is the copy. Why may we not believe that the real relation stands the other way? Professor Weber says, indeed, at the very outset, that "the former (namely the Buddhist account) bears so plainly the impress of a higher antiquity, that it cannot well be doubted that it belongs to an earlier age." And he then enumerates the principal points of difference between the two accounts, intending, to all appearance, that these should be taken as confirmatory of his assertion. But he does not go on to show how that confirmation is to be derived from them. It seems to me, I must confess, a very remarkable circumstance, that upon the very point which is the principal foundation of the new theory, the position of its advocates is not better fortified than by an assertion that certain things are very "plain" and "cannot be mistaken." To me the thing is not "plain", and is capable, as Professor Weber would say, of being "mistaken," as I would rather put it, of being taken in a totally different light. I look at the points of difference set forth by Professor Weber himself. I read that "Rāma and his brother Lakshmana are sent by their father into exile during his life time, with the sole object of protecting them from the intrigues of their step mother." I read these words, and ask myself what in the nature of an argument for the antiquity of this version can one spell out of them? I can see no such argument at all. On the second

(7) Indian Antiquary page 120.
point of difference, noted by the Professor, I find firstly, that in the Bombay edition of the Rāmāyaṇa, as well as in Gorresio's edition, and as far as appears in the Raghunāsī also, Sītā is not represented as accompanying Rāma otherwise than voluntarily. And I say secondly, that even supposing it were not so, that circumstance would have no bearing upon the mutual relation of the Daśaratha-jātaka and Vālmīki's Rāmāyaṇa. This last remark applies also to the discrepancy about the length of the period of banishment noted under the third head of difference by Professor Weber. It applies similarly to the circumstance of Rāma and Sītā being married after their return from exile. The only points of difference, then, which remain, are firstly, that in the Buddhistic book Sītā is at once the sister and the wife of Rāma, and secondly, that it knows nothing of her abduction by Rāvaṇa. Now admitting that the marriage of brother and sister introduces us to an archaic condition of society, I ask, whether mention of such a marriage is evidence enough of the priority of a work to another which represents the marriage to have been in another form? Is not that but a frail reed on which to rest such weighty theories concerning

(8) Canto XII, 9. Indeed the first hint of it, I believe, and then nothing more than a hint, appears in the Vircharita Trithen's ed, p. 65.

(9) There is, I am afraid, some mistake here. What it is, or how it occurred, I cannot say; unless indeed, the emphasis is not on the "voluntarily," but on "the sister not the wife", and then the point can scarcely be said to have been properly put.

10. All these points of difference are enunciated at page 120. I may say here once for all that my references to Weber's essay are to the pages of the Indian Antiquary.
the originality or otherwise of a great work? Furthermore, what conclusion can be drawn from the fact that the Buddhist book has no allusion to the abduction of Sītā nor to the siege of Lankā? Does the history of literature furnish instances simply of the development of romances and histories by the addition of new matter, and has it no examples to show of adaptations and epitomes divested of details? Have we already formed such a complete historical induction, that the moment we see two accounts of an event which appear in the main to coincide as far as they go, but one of which omits a circumstance which occupies a prominent place in the other, have we, I ask, generalised so far, as to be entitled to say without more, that the work which makes no mention of the additional circumstance is the predecessor and model of that which does?

11. In that repertory of valuable information—Mr. Muir's Sanskrit texts—I find a hymn quoted from the Rigveda in which the marriage of brother and sister is expressly condemned as "unrighteous." True this hymn belongs to the Tenth Maṇḍala, which is generally looked upon as the latest portion of the Rigveda. But it must be remembered against this, that the hymn is repeated in the Atharva Veda which was already regarded as revealed in the time of Patanjali, nearly two centuries before the Christian era (see below), that one stanza in this hymn occurs in the Sāmaveda, and that another is quoted and explained in the Nirukta. These are sufficient testimonies in favour of the view assigning a considerable antiquity to the hymn, and it is of importance in the consideration of the point taken in the text. See Muir's Sanskrit Texts (1870) V, pp. 289-90-91.

12. How upon this theory, the relations of the Panchatantra and Hitopadesa would stand is a question, the consideration of which will also throw some light upon our investigation. See, too, Bābu Rājendralāla Mitra's. "The Homer of India" in
Professor Weber may think so; for myself, even after coupling this and the last noted fact, I continue to be sceptical even of their cumulative force. The position might possibly be admissible as an hypothesis, as it might no less be admissible as an hypothesis for English antiquarians of ten centuries hence, supposing them to be without any history of English literature, to hold, that Heminge and Condell's edition of the Plays of Shakespeare was only a later development of Bowdler's Family Shakespeare, or of some well—pruned "acting edition" of the noble works of the Bard of Avon.

Another point remains to be noted in this place. Professor Weber seems to have had a lurking suspicion, that the change of locality, the change of the principal scene of action from Ayodhyâ to Vârânasi-might, be urged, perhaps, against the priority of the Buddhistic story, as placing the chief seat of Aryan power and civilization lower South. I do not much

Mookerjee's Magazine No. I. Page 52. And consider further the application of the theory to works like the Taittirîya Sanhitâ and Satapatha Brâhmaṇa, with reference to the stories narrated in those works and quoted in Muir's Texts (1870) V pp. 230-1 and p 253. It is noteworthy, also, that Dr. Bühler seems to hold the reverse of this theory. See The Indian Antiquary p. 308. In my opinion, no argument of this kind, for whichever view it is used, is sound or trustworthy. And compare the following passages in Weber's essay p.240. "The substantial agreement" &c. and "and it treats" &c with p.241 "Without doubt" "&c and p242 "This Brahminical"&c—passages which seem to show the weakness of this line of argument.

13. See his explanation at p 121 and note especially the expressions "perhaps connected" and "no doubt" in the course of it.

14. Some further light is thrown upon this fact by the statements in Mr. Sherring's book on Benares.
rely on the argument, nor do I vouch for its having been in the mind of Professor Weber. But since he does attempt an explanation of the fact, it is worth remarking, that the explanation has no authority to support it, and is a mere ingenious conjecture. I now close this part of the subject by making a query and an observation which apply to the whole matter. The query is—what proof is there concerning the age of the Buddhistic stories themselves? This, it is evident, is a necessary inquiry, albeit Professor Weber has not gone into it. The observation is, that it is at least equally probable with the theory propounded by Professor Weber, that the Buddhistic story was not the model but the copy, not the predecessor of the Râmâyâna developed in it, but the successor of the Râmâyâna abridged from it. And I say, that this is at least equally probable, because on the one hand it is somewhat difficult of comprehension how a Buddhistic hero could be metamorphosed into a Brahmanical hero, and why such a metamorphosis should be resorted to at all (since it would probably be the last thing to be done by those who wished

“\text{The sacred writings of Ceylon}” says Mr. Sherring “called the Jātakas which contain an immense number of tales relating to the life of Buddha and to the early history of his religion are replete with references to Benares; indeed each Jātaka is almost invariably connected with a Brahmadatta king of Benares.” Is it not natural to believe, that Buddha, in adopting old stories to his own purposes, changed also the scene of action, wishing to obtain that importance which would belong to a system of faith connected with the very first of sacred cities. See Sherring’s Benares Chap. I passim and infra.

15. And what is more, according to one interpretation, positively anti-Buddhistic.
to withstand Buddhism\(^{16}\), while on the other hand it is easy to explain, how a separatist body would carry with them some of the traditions handed down to them while in the community from which they separated, and would, after separating, endeavour to adapt them to their altered opinions\(^{17}\).

We now pass on to that “unmistakeable influence” of Greece in general, and of Homer in particular, of which Professor Weber describes traces in the Rāmāyana. Of course, I need not pay very much attention to what the Professor himself is inclined to consider as a mere bagatelle, as not counting for much, in his argument to prove that Homer was the model of Vālmīki. But it may, I think, be pointed out, that the “analogy” supposed to exist

---

16. Especially would this be so at a time when, be it remembered, according to Prof Weber himself, the conflicts with the Buddhists were being fiercely waged (p. 121); compare Patanjali’s Mahābhāshya on Pāṇini II 4. 9, where the example ब्राह्मण्यमण्म indicates this fierce antagonism. Professor Weber himself characterizes the circumstances of the metamorphosis and its effects as only “remarkable.” Yet it is worthy of note that the Professor adds a mark of admiration at the close of his statement of what he thinks must be taken for granted by one who adopts Wheeler’s view of the matter. If the mark denotes that the assumption is not very probable, that criticism, I apprehend, will apply to Professor Weber’s own theory also, which is not very different (p 122). As to the theory broached further on, that Vālmīki’s object in glorifying Rāma-Buddha’s ancestor—was to lower the estimation in which the latter was held, I do not see much probability in it. That such a result would follow is not itself very likely, for how could Buddha lose by being affiliated on a family of renown? And besides the Rāmāyaṇa takes no cognizance of this alleged relationship of Rāma and Buddha.

17. And see below.
between some of the characters in the Râmâyana and some in Homer is not quite correct. What comparison can there be between the very feminine Paris, who was the ravisher of Helen, and the conqueror of the world, the dreaded enemy of the Gods themselves, who was the ravisher of Sītā? What comparison can there be between the mean coquetry of the Greek heroine and the heavenly purity of king Janaka's child? Agamemnon is Menelaus's brother, Sugrīva is not the brother of Râma. Lakṣhmaṇa is the brother of Râma, and is not killed; Patroklus is not the brother of Achilles and is killed. Further if Râma is to be compared to Achilles, who is to be impressed to do service for Menelaus?—And if on account of his wife having been ravished, Râma is to be likened to Menelaus, whom, on this theory, has the Râmâyana to show as the analogue of Achilles of him whose wrath was "to Greece the direful spring of woes unnumbered?" I submit that the principal characters are essentially distinct. You will find greater similarity between the main story and the principal characters of Shakespeare's Othello and Sir Walter Scott's Kenilworth. Yet nobody ever dreamt of contending that Sir Walter Scott took his Varney from Iago or his Amy from Desdemona. As remarked already, however, Professor Weber lays no stress on this. He "contents himself with the simple assumption that in consequence of the mutual re-

18 For the "analogies" see page 173 of Weber's essay. How much of an ignis fatuus, however, these "analogies" are, may be seen from this, that Mr. W. Taylor in his catalogue of MSS (vol II p XLIII) in the Library of Fort William finds the analogues of the Homeric characters in the characters of the Mahâbhârata, the main story of which epics, one would think, is sufficiently distinct from that of the Râmâyana.
lations which Alexander's expedition into India brought about......some kind of knowledge of the substance of the Homeric story found its way into India"19 Mark the word "assumption!" I thank Professor Weber for teaching me that word. It is an assumption of the barest kind and nothing more. Let us look a little under the surface of this "assumption" to see what stuff its foundation is made of. The first circumstance, then, which attracts our attention, is that we have accounts first in Dio Chrysostom and then in Ælian of an Indian translation of Homer. It need scarcely be said that no such translation of Homer is forthcoming. And Professor Weber; therefore, is constrained to take shelter under the opinion, that this simply means that "the people of India equally with those of Greece were in possession of an epic conceived in the style of the Homeric poems." Professor Weber then goes on to point out, that the statement indicates a Greek influence in the Mahâbhârata quite as much as in the Râmâyana, and finally arrives at the conclusion that "it is possible that this account of the matter was founded on some actual intimation of the existence of the Râmâyana, but on the other hand it evidently does not allow of being used, even remotely as a proof of that existence."20 I do in part admit the force of this last observation. But I ask, if the statement of Dio Chrysostom and Ælian is convicted of error in one part, are we bound to believe it in another part? If there was, as Professor Weber himself admits there was, no translation of Homer, why are we to believe that there was even an adaptation? Are we not, on the contrary, entitled to contend, that there was no translation and no borrowing in the case at all, that it was a mere vague impression of resemblance such as a superficial knowledge is apt to convey

19 p 173. 20 p 176.
which led to the erroneous supposition of the two Greek writers? I say that, at the worst, the whole matter is too obscure to cast any satisfactory light one way or the other upon the question before us. All, then, that remains to support Professor Weber's "assumption" is contained in the very questionable coincidences that have been traced in sundry particulars. And what after all do these coincidences come to? In two instances, they have nothing to do with the Râmâyâna at all, referring, as they do, to the Mahâvamsa and to Buddhaghosha's commentary on the Dhammapada, both works of the fifth century after Christ. As to one of the coincidences which does occur in the Râmâyâna, the hesitation about it in Professor Weber's mind indicated in the word 'perhaps' with which the statement of the coincidence is introduced, ripens, with the swiftness of the prophet's gourd, into an "absence of any room for doubt" before that statement is closed. And the coincidence itself consists in nothing more than this—that the story about Sîtâ being won in return for the bending of a bow as related in the Râmâyâna finds a parallel in a story in the Janaka-Jâtaka, as well as in Homer's Odyssey; and further that in the Janaka-Jâtaka, another story which is also similar to a story in the Odyssey is coupled with this story of the bow. On this Professor Weber thus delivers himself "If these incidents then" says he "be

21 See the Westminster Review April 1868 p. 420 an article attributed on good grounds to the late Professor Goldstücker. See 2 Wheeler's India among other authorities.


23 p 174.
really capable of being referred to Homer (and the combining of the two hardly leaves any room for doubt on this point) it seems to follow that the scene in the Rāmāyaṇa may also be assigned to the same source.\textsuperscript{24} I tremble, as Chief Justice Sir Edward Ryan once said, I tremble at the accumulated presumptions involved in this position! And this is a position taken up by a scholar, whose critical rigour refused any weight whatsoever to the possibility, that Dio Chrysostom’s reference to an Indian work analogous to Homer might be evidence of the existence of the Rāmāyaṇa at the time referred to by him!

As to two other coincidences concerning Hanūmān’s command to the sun to stand still, and Rāma’s sleeping on the occasion of the horse—sacrifice with a golden image of Sītā by him, Professor Weber has himself shown how very weak they are as a basis for any argument of the kind which it is sought to found on them.\textsuperscript{25} And as to Aśvapati\textsuperscript{26}, it is, perhaps, worth adding, that Aśvapati and Kekaya as names of royal personages both occur in

\textsuperscript{24} p 175. It must be remembered here, as pointed out by Prof. Weber himself, that the story of the bow occurs in the Mahābhārata also. It does not appear to me, therefore, that there is anything to prevent the application of Prof. Weber’s argument to that work. Is the Professor prepared to accept the conclusion? I think this is a \textit{reductio ad absurdum} of his theory, after the elaborate proof of the antiquity of the Mahābhārata given by Professor R. G. Bhandarkar in a paper recently read by him before the B. B. of the R. A. Society. And, be it remembered, the story of the bow in the Mahābhārata is not part of any episode which you can safely amputate without injuring the main story. It forms part—and a necessary part of that main story. Prof. Bhandarkar’s paper is summarized in the Indian Antiquary p. 350.\textsuperscript{25} p. 175 et seq. 26 p. 176.
the Sūtras of Pāṇini27, who will be admitted, I apprehend, on all hands to have preceded the invasion of Alexander the Great28.

Thus have we discussed the "unmistakable influence" of Greece which is traceable in the Rāmāyana of Vālmīki. One or two other points, which are akin to this, are discussed by Professor Weber under the head of the internal evidence about its date which is to be found in the Rāmāyana itself. Under that head we shall also discuss them. Meanwhile the results at which the considerations urged above seem to lead are not by any means consistent with this alleged "unmistakable influence." Professor Weber himself discusses the question of the relation of Homer to Vālmīki as "arising out of the relation in which Vālmīki's version of the Rāmasagā stands to that which is found in the old Buddhistic legends."29 We have endeavoured to point out already how exceedingly weak is the basis of the position that Vālmīki's story is a copy of the Buddhistic. If our reasoning there is correct, it is obvious that on the issue on which Professor Weber himself has rested the case about Vālmīki's being indebted for his story to the

28 Müller's Anc San. Lit p 245 and Goldstücker's Pāṇini. From this last work, however, which I happened to look into after this essay had been written and read, I find, that my expressions in the text are a little too broad. Prof. Weber, I see at p 23 of Goldstücker, actually put down Pāṇini at one time to as late a date as 140 A. D. (see too Müller p 305) I need scarcely say anything on this after the almost demonstrative proof we have of Patanjali's having flourished about as many years before Christ as Prof. Weber says Panini flourished after Christ. See infra in notis.
29 p. 172.
Homeric saga, judgment must pass against his contention. But we have further endeavoured to combat the Professor's assertions on this second branch of the case on their own merits. And we say it again, that there is nothing improbable in the supposition of the Buddhists having borrowed from the Brahminical saga—while the coincidences between the latter and the Homerid legends might very well be regarded as merely accidental, or, if necessary—and for my part, I do not by any means consider it to be necessary,—as due to the reproduction by the two brother peoples of a tradition which was the inherited property of both. I have studied the Buddhistic and Homerid stories too little to say more—but it certainly does strike me upon a review of the whole matter as put by Professor Weber, who certainly cannot be convicted of putting the case against the originality of the Râmâyana too low, that at the very worst, as far as the Professor's argument is concerned, the judgment must be "not proven", and not as Mr. Burnell would have us believe, "proved almost beyond doubt."  

We now proceed to a review of that internal evidence which the industry of Professor Weber has extracted out of the ponderous volumes of the Râmâyana, and which, as he opines, goes a good way towards fixing the chronological position of that work in Sanskrit Literature. And under this head the Professor first draws attention to the "great extent of the work, which shows that it cannot have been the composition of one poet only, but that centuries must have contributed to mould it into its present form." If by this is simply meant that the original work of Vâlmîki has had

30 Indian Antiquary p 57.
31 Vide contra, Williams Indian Epic Poetry.
32 p 177.
engrafted upon it stray verses, or short passages, or even small episodes, which do not belong to him, I think this not at all unlikely. But I cannot persuade myself that this process of grafting has gone so far as to point to what would, in common parlance, be understood by multiplicity of authors; or in Dr. Weber’s language “composition of more than one poet.” But even supposing such accretions demonstrated, what does this circumstance prove about the age of the old Rāmāyāna of Vālmiki? I think it makes against this new theory more than for it. If the works of Bhavabhūti and Kālidāsa allude to events described in the Uttarakānda of the Rāmāyāna which, according to Professor Weber himself, does not belong to the Rāmāyāna proper, but is a later addition, what must we allow, upon this theory, to be the minimum chronological distance between the author of the original work and these later writers who do not so much as suspect the subsequent addition to be any thing else than part and parcel of the original? The two episodes about Viśvāmitra and Jāmadagnya Rāma, to which Professor Weber proceeds next to call attention also, to my mind, point in the same direction. In both the triumph of the Kshatriya is the central point of attraction. In the story of Viśvāmitra, which we shall speak of first, Vasishṭha is actually represented as saying to his cow that the power of the Kshatriya is superior to his own.

33 p. 176 First note.
34 See Kālidāsa Raghuvanśa XIV 39 et seq and Uttara Rāmācharita Act I ad finem. For the age of Kālidāsa see below. Bhavabhūti is said to have lived in the beginning of the Eighth century (Journal B.B.R. A. S. January 1862 p. 219 quoting Prof. Wilson) See too Prof. Weber’s essay at page 241, which mentions another circumstance also throwing a gulf between Vālmiki and Kālidāsa.
And though in the Bombay recension, it is not said with that distinctness with which it is put in Gorresio's, even there we have Vasishṭha saying "my power is not equal [to his"].

35 Again I may on this point adopt the line of reasoning which Professor Weber has followed with reference to the Rāmāyana generally, and without laying stress here on an argument which, in another form and used under other circumstances, I have elsewhere combated, I may, perhaps be permitted to say, that it has more force in the application which I am going to give it than it can be entitled to when used as Professor Weber has used it. It is well known that the narrative in the Rāmāyana of the attainment of Brahmanhood by Viśvāmitra does not go farther than Viśvāmitra's own advancement to that dignity.

36 But if we turn to Pāṇini's Mahābhāṣya under Pāṇini IV 1,104, we find the following story related. "Viśvāmitra practised austerities to become a Rishi. He became a Rishi. He again practised austerities to become the son of one who was a Rishi Gâdhi also become a Rishi. He again practised austerities to become the grandson of one who was a Rishi— Kuśika also became a Rishi." Now with these two stories before one, one may well argue thus. In the passage in the Rāmāyana Satānanda is avowedly singing the praises of Viśvāmitra. Now it is unquestionably very high praise to say of a man that by his austerities he not only made a Rishi of himself but also of his father and grand father—and this is higher praise than to say that he raised only himself to the higher rank. If then this story as related in the Mahābhāṣya had been known at the time the Rāmāyana was com-

36 See Bombay ed. LXV. 26.
posed, it would unquestionably have been incorporated into it; and this argument assumes redoubled force, when it is remembered that a matter of something like three hundred and fifty stanzas in the Rāmāyaṇa is dedicated solely to a eulogy on Viśvāmitra. Have we not, after this, good ground for holding that the Mahābhāshya of Patanjali was a work later in date than the Rāmāyaṇa of Vālmīki?  

Similar remarks, though not to this extent, apply to the story of Parasurāma. The Kshatriya hero vanquishes the glorious champion of the Brahmins. And when Professor Max Müller speaks of the singular relation between Rāma and Parasurāma as having been "probably remodelled by the influence of the Brahmins," I do not quite understand him. The Rāmāyaṇa there seems to me to bear evident marks of antiquity. Professor Weber is inclined to regard the two episodes as ancient fragments incorporated by Vālmīki into his work. Be it so. The absence of that sort of apologetic tone about it, which may I think be traced in Kālidāsa or Bhavabhūti, shows that the

37 For the age of Patanjali, see Goldstücker's Panini towards the close of the book (p234), and Prof. R. G. Bhandarkar's paper in the Indian Antiquary for October p 302, upon which authorities his age may now be safely taken to be proved beyond controversy.

38 Max Müller's Sanskrit Literature p 49.

39 178 note.

40 Rāghu XI 89 and Mahāvīracharita, p 58 Trithen's ed, with which compare Rāmāyaṇa LXXVI. 24 (p 118 Bomb. ed). where instead of Rāma, falling at Parasurāma's feet, Parasurāma makes perambulations round the former. And it is remarkable that the only word in the Rāmāyaṇa, hinting at anything like what the Rāghuvaṇa and Viracharita refer to, is पूजित: which the commentator interprets by दाशरथिनानाराह्यणत्वाध्यि
story could not have been offensive to the spirit of the age when the Rāmāyana was composed, and our argument therefore remains unaffected.

Professor Weber goes on next to call attention to the catalogue of various peoples, which occurs in two places in the Rāmāyana, and which contains the names Kamboja, Pālava, Yavana, Saka, Barbara, Mlechchha, Tūshāra Ḥārīta, Kirāta and others\(^{41}\). "Under the name Yavana" the Professor then goes on to say "we are to understand the Bactrian Greeks, or rather, perhaps, by this time, their successors", and this he considers "the decisive circumstance in the matter\(^{42}\)". It is unlucky that the arguments for this conclusion are set forth by him in the Indische Streifen, which, being written in German, is, of course, for the present a sealed book to us. Meanwhile, however, we may pit against this the authority of Professor Lassen which is endorsed by Professor Müller "Yavana is not" says the latter "the exclusive name of the Greeks or Ionians. Professor Lassen has proved that it had a much wider

तोनमस्कृतभ्य. But in the stanza in the original, Rāma Dāśarathī is in the accusative case, and the more natural sense of प्रपुजित: is simply "honoured", which Paraśurāma certainly was. It is remarkable, too, that the commentator mentions a various reading प्रशस्यह for प्रपुजित: which removes even this slight hint.

\(^{41}\) A similar, but not quite identical, catalogue occurs in the Mahābhārata Adiparva as cited in Mr. Muir's Texts I p 388 (ed. 1870). It may, perhaps, be worth asking, what Professor Weber means by the expression "by this time" which occurs in the quotation from his paper in the text. By what time? To my mind, it is one indication that Prof. Weber is arguing for a foregone conclusion.

\(^{42}\) p 176.
meaning, and that it was even used of Semitic nations." In support of this, I may refer to the fact, that the word Yavana occurs in one Sûtra of Pâñini himself (Sûtra IV 49) And it is hardly possible to suppose that in Pâñini the Greeks were the people referred to by that word. Another of the names in the list above, namely Kâmbojas, also occurs in another Sûtra of Pâñini IV 1,75. And generally, there is so little known on which an identification of these different peoples can be confidently based, it is so probable that they were originally but little distinguished from each other in the minds of the ancient Hindoos themselves, that it is by no means safe to base a hypothetical chronology upon a questionable identification; not to say that the passage itself may have been an interpolation of later times. We know that long before the time of the Greeks, Darius Hystaspes had invaded India. We know, too, that the Phœnicians, and probably also the Egyptians, carried on trade with this country before the invasion of Alexander the Great. What more natural, then, than that a poet of no jejune imagination, should describe the vanqui-

43 Max Müller Anc. Sans. Lit p 501. And according to Goldstücker, Yavanáti alluded to by Pâñini was the Persian cuneiform alphabet. See Goldstücker's Pâñini p 17.

44 Similar lists occur in other places in the Mahâbhârata and in Manu. They are quoted by Mr. Muir in his Sanskrit Texts (1868) I p 481 et seq. But Mr. Muir declines the task of identifying the several peoples enumerated p 482.

45 See Goldstücker's Pâñini p 16 citing Herodotus and also Robertson's Ancient India § 1. And though the evidence on the point is insufficient, it is not impossible, that there may have been an invasion before Darius's time. Robertson § 1. But see Note I Section I.
shers of the national soldiers as belonging to those foreign people, with whom commerce or war had brought him acquainted already? The connexion of these names therefore with the Greco—Bactrian or Indo—Scythian sway in India, which Professor Weber characterizes as "evident", nevertheless, we submit, does require proof.

We go now to the argument which Professor Weber bases upon the fact, that whereas Ceylon was known to the Greeks only under the name "Taprobane" or Sinhala, or at one time (namely the time of the Periplus) Palaesimundu, the Râmâyana throughout designates it by the name Lankâ—a name which we meet with only in the Mahâvansa, in a Parisishta of the Athârvaveda, and afterwards in Âryabhaṭṭa and Varâhamihira. As I understand the argument, Professor Weber contends, that the ancient name of Ceylon was that which was known to the Greeks; that about the beginning of the Christian Era, or some such period, the name of Lankâ commenced to come into vogue; and that, therefore, since the Râmâyana mentions only the latter name, *ergo* it must be a work later than the age of the Greek writers. It seems to me, that Professor Weber has not observed the other possible alternative, namely, that Ceylon may have borne the name Lankâ before the time of the Greek writers, and may have ceased to go by that name in their time. If it is objected to this, that it requires us to suppose that the name Lankâ had a sort of resurrection after having been in a state of abeyance for some time, we answer first, that there is nothing improbable in it, and secondly

---

46 P. 180:—It is worthy of note that according to the Mahâvansa Tâmraparnî or Taprobane is a division of Lankâ, and not the name of the whole of Lankâ. See Mahâvanse quoted in Müller's Ancient Sanskrit Literature p 270 and see further Appendix D. *infra.*
we reply by the *tu quoque* argument. For on Professor Weber’s theory, we have the name Sinhala first, and Lankâ afterwards; and now in our own day we have come back to the name Sinhala. The two cases, therefore, are thus far parallel; and to argue from the use of the name Lankâ against the antiquity of the Râmâyâna is clearly a *non sequitur*.

Come we now to the “literary data,” as Professor Weber calls them, which he has concentrated together from various parts of our poem. And in the first place, note here the remark which Dr. Weber himself makes, namely, that all these “data” are called from one recension only, that is to say, the Gauda recension. Now barring the objection which might be based upon the exceedingly strong opinion of Dr. Fitz-Edward Hall47 about it, it is still quite clear, that the argument to be drawn from these data can apply to that recension alone. And this Dr. Weber candidly admits. But admitting this, he still contends, that “they certainly furnish decisive evidence against so high an antiquity as has hitherto been assigned to the poem.”48 We shall presently consider this evidence upon its own merits to see how far it can take us with regard to the recension which has supplied it. But certainly, even allowing the whole reasoning Dr. Weber bases upon it to be perfectly irrefragable, you cannot allow the conclusion to affect the other recensions of the Râmâyâna, unless you can show that those other recensions also furnish the premises on which it is based. Now the first remark which suggests itself to one upon a perusal of Dr. Weber’s elaborate list is that it only shows, that before the Râmâyâna had been composed, Sanskrit literature

47 p 177 of Weber’s essay; and see too Muir Sanskrit Texts (1868) I. p 54 and p 401 notes. And about all the recensions see Weber’s own remark p 178 and see p 247.
48 p 181.
had been already largely developed. And there-
fore what the epithet of "comparatively modern" means which he applies to the names under which the several portions of that literature are spoken of in the Rāmāyāna is not by any means easy to discover. Comparatively modern! Compared with what? We can get no answer to that from Professor Weber's paper. Nor have we any proof that Sanskrit literature had not been largely developed long be-
fore the commencement of the Christian era, subse-
quently to which Professor Weber supposes the Rāmāyāna to have been composed. On the con-
trary we have some proof of the reverse of this, which will appear presently. Subject, therefore, to these two general observations, we now proceed to particulars.

The Vedas need no remark at all. The Vedângas and, what is more, the six Vedângas, are referred to also in a passage cited by Pataujjali. About the Śiksha, one of the Vedângas especially empha-
sized by Professor Weber, it is sufficient to refer to the tradition which ascribes the first work on it to Pâṇini, and to the fact mentioned by Max Müller, that Sāyana considers that certain chapters on Śiksha had a place in the Brâhmanas- an opinion, which I may add in passing, Max Muller does not attack, but accepts as a necessity.

49 p 181. It will be seen that Professor Weber does not even attempt to fix the age of any of the works referred to, or of the commencement of the use of any of those expressions on which he relies. The lacuna in the argument is remarkable, but by no means rare in the paper before us.

50 Introduktion p 4 (Benares Edition).
51 P. 181.
52 See Madhusūdana Sarasvati's Prasthânabheda in 1 Indische Studien p 16.
53 Anc Sans. Lit p 114 et seq.
Sūtra and Kalpa occur in Pāṇini,\(^{54}\) Kalpasūtra in Patanjali\(^{55}\). The Dhanurveda, astronomy, the art of reckoning, seem to be alluded to in the Chhândogya Upanishad\(^{56}\). Nâtakas, and what Professor Weber emphasizes particularly, even the Dharmasâstra, are both alluded to, and the latter apparently with respect, by Patanjali.\(^{57}\) Nyâya, and the derivative Naiyâyika, are connected with Pāṇini IV 2,60, and the Gâṇa under it in which the word

---

\(^{54}\) Pāṇi IV, 2,65; and IV, 3,105.  
\(^{55}\) Under Pāṇi IV 2,60.  
\(^{56}\) Bibl. Ind. Ed. pp. 475,478,493. See as to the date of this Upanishad p 322; and with it Bâbu Râjendralâla Mîtra’s translation of the Upanishad p 86 Note. Bâbu Râjendralâla speaks only of “authenticity,” I would add antiquity also. Professor Weber seems to be in doubt as to the antiquity of the Upanishad. See the quotation from his writings in Muir’s texts (1870) V 322 et seq. It is notable that the Brihadârañyaka (p 334. Bibl Ind. Ed—but see too p 1030) and Kaushitaki (p 118 Bibl. Ind Ed) Upanishads are both against the high claim of the Kshatriya admitted in the Chhândogya. My knowledge of the passage in the former is exclusively from Mr. Muir’s book(1868) I. 432; of the latter I became aware independently of him in the course of my own perusal of the work. It is not by any means easy to fix the age of either of these Upanishads. The Brihadârañyaka seems to be older than Kâtyâyana (see Goldstücker’s Pâṇini). About the Kaushitaki, a note of Prof Cowell (p 157 of his translation of the Upanishad) might be of some use, though it can scarcely be regarded as conclusive. If the note is correct, will not the Upanishad be older than the Mahâbhâshya? See Appendix. D.  
\(^{57}\) See Pâṇini’s Sûtra III, 1,26 and I,2,69 respectively.
Nyāya stands third. Nāstikas are also referred to by Pāṇini in Sūtra IV, 460; and the Lokāyatikas and a work on their system by Patanjali. The quotations, which Professor Weber refers to, again, are not of much assistance to his theory; on the contrary, if any conclusion can be drawn from them at all, they rather support a view conflicting with it. They are quite unfamiliar now, and refer to some writers or works now entirely forgotten even in name. And when the Professor refers to the mention of Kātyāyana, and Jābālī, and others, as well as of Dhanvantari as king of the physicians, I am not aware what conclusion he wishes to base upon it. And the same observation applies to his reference to the use of the words Sanskrit and Śāstra—the latter of which, it may be remarked by the way, may be found used in Patanjali’s Mahābhāṣṭya, both by itself and as the latter member of compounds.

58 And see Goldstücker’s Pāṇini 152 et seq. वाक्यावय (see Chhāndogya Upan p 475) is explained by Śankara to be Tarkaśāstra but differently by Kaiyāṭa Mahābhāṣṭya p 16. (Benares ed).

59 Under Pāṇini VII, 3,44 and see Kaiyāṭa on the passage.

60 p 181.

61 But if anything does really turn upon the mention of these names, it may, perhaps, be just as well to note here, that at least one of the names enumerated by Professor Weber—namely Jaimini,—occurs in connexion, with a Prince named Putra of the Raghu family in the Raghuvansha XVIII, 33.

62 See page 28 (Benares Ed) and under Pāṇ I, 1,6. For Upanishad, or Rahasya, not referred to in the text, see Patanjali. Introd. p 16 (Benares Ed); for writing, Goldstücker’s Pāṇini passim; for Nitiśāstra, and on other points, also, see Chh : Upanishad. 474 and Śankara’s commentary on it.
We now come to the data relating to the History of Religion. And Professor Weber, at the very outset of his observations on this head, refers as especially noticeable to the absence of any mention of Krishna-worship in the Rāmāyana, and says, "of course the only legitimate inference to be drawn from this silence is that we must not push the date of the work too far back." I confess at once, that I cannot understand the argument of Professor Weber on this point. The note which he gives does not mend matters, and itself requires a note of explanation. "Rāma" says this note "undoubtedly represents an earlier stage of Vishnuism; but it is certainly possible, that his becoming the deity of a sect is due to some previous development of the Krishna worship." This last portion of the remark requires both explanation and proof. But if the former portion of it is correct, or rather if it correctly sets forth Professor Weber's opinion—and his language is very strong—what becomes of his argument in the text? If the worship of Rāma is older than the worship of Krishna, the fact of the latter being nowhere referred to in the oldest work which glorifies the former stands fully explained. Apparently, Professor Weber entertains the notion that Krishna worship is a new—fangled system. I am not aware whether he does not see in it a Brahmanical reflex of Christianity. But I am now in a position to prove to demonstration, that this belief, which has been a very prevalent one, is totally false; and that Krishna—worship is as old at least as the age of Pātanjali, if not also of Pāṇini. The point is important; a false notion

63 Prof Weber's remarks under this head are not perfectly clear and intelligible. I have endeavoured to answer them as far as I have understood them.
64 P. 182.
65 See for instance the Indian Antiquary. p 325
on the subject is very generally received; I therefore set out at length the passage in Patanjali which bears out my remark. Patanjali is commenting on Pāṇini's sūtra IV, 3,98. He says "why is it laid down that the word Vāsudeva takes the termination "Vun" (वृन्) ? Is not the object attained by the sūtra IV, 3,99? For there is no difference. The word Vāsudeva with the termination "Vun" (वृन्) or "Vun" (वृज) takes the same form and the same accent. Well then, the object is this, that we may lay down, that the word Vāsudeva stands first. Or rather this is not the name of a Kshatriya. It is there a name of the Supreme Being." There is no room for mistake here. Vāsudeva is clearly spoken of in the passage as the Supreme Being—as "Bhagavān." And having said thus much, I can say nothing more upon this point, as I do not understand Professor Weber's position upon it. But I may add here—for Professor Weber goes on to refer to this point also—that there is evidence in Patanjali proving, as I think, the existence of the belief in Śiva as Bhagavān; and this evidence is as strong as that about Krishna referred to above. This is in the Bhāshya on Pāṇini I, 2,76. The passage is interesting. Having set out the sūtra, the Bhāshya proceeds "What, is everybody an "āyahsūlika" who searches for iron with a club? What if he is? It will apply to a Śivabhāgavata votary of the God Śiva." The word in the original which I have rendered "votary of the God Śiva," is शिवभागवत, which is a rather curious compound, but Kaiyāta explains it thus भगवानभक्तिः भागवतःशिवस्यभागवतः शिवभागवतः.

66 Brahmā is also mentioned in the Bhāshya. See under Pāṇini VI, 3,21 Śiva is mentioned again in the Mahābhāṣya in the passage quoted in Goldstücker's Pāṇini p 229.
As to the comparison of the Rāmāyāna and Mahābhārata with respect to the liberties which they take with the grammar, admitting for the present that the comparison is unfavourable to the former, it can only affect their relative chronologi-cal position. And if it be remembered, that one of the greatest of European Sanskrit scholars, the late Dr. Goldstücker held the most ancient parts of the Mahābhārata to be more ancient even than the age of Buddha, and the greater portion of the work to be older than the commencement of the Christian era, the advocate of the antiquity of Vālmīki’s Rāmāyāna need not be alarmed at Professor Weber’s conclusion on this point. The same remark applies to the artificial and artistic variation of the metre at the close of many of the sargas. And upon this, I may also say, that I shrewdly suspect that in some of the cases, at any rate, these final stanzas are interpolations. Very often—indeed, it is perhaps not too much to say, more often than not—these stanzas add nothing at all to what has been already said in preceding stanzas; and in some cases they make it rather difficult to see a proper continuity between the close of a previous sarga and the commencement of a subsequent one. As to the name sarga, Professor Weber has himself pointed out as noticeable the fact that in Bhāvābhūti’s Uttararāmacharita, the word Adhyāya, and not sarga, is employed; and besides, even if the name sarga was the orig-

67 See Westminster Review April 1868 p 420.
68 For instance, see Gorresio Adikāṇḍa sargas XXI and XXII. A kind friend who has seen Mr. Griffith’s Translation of Vālmīki informs me, that a note in that work says, that Schlegel thought all these stanzas of varying metres to be interpolations. I do not think this at all unlikely.
69 p 246.
nal and genuine name; it is explainable upon the theory, which, it is submitted, is by no means an improbable one, that subsequent authors of Kâvyas borrowed the terminology of the Râmâyâna, seeing that that work, with respect to unity and general arrangement of subject matter, was nearer to the plan of their own works than the Mahâbhârata. So that instead of making the Râmâyâna belong to the class of the later Kâvyas, we may say that the later Kâvyas borrowed the terminology of the Râmâyâna which was hallowed by antiquity. And it must not be forgotten, that even the Râmâyâna abounds with stylistic characteristics, such as, among others, grammatical anomalies, which are not employed in the later literature, and which throw a big gulf between it and this later literature.

One more point, adverted to by Professor Weber under the head of internal evidence, still remains—namely the allusions to astronomical matters which occur in the Râmâyâna. About the zodiac, Professor Weber has himself pointed out, that as it does not occur except in only certain of the recensions, it is no evidence against the antiquity of the others. 70 I do not here go into the question whether our ancestors borrowed the zodiac from the Greeks. I do not think myself competent to do so. Besides the work referred to by Professor Weber as proving that the Greeks first completed it, and that the Hindus afterwards took it from them, is written in the German language. But when Professor Weber says, that the references to astronomical matters in all the recensions furnish support for the opinion suggested by the reference to the zodiac in some of them, I think, we may well demur to this; firstly, because astronomical matters are as old in India as the age of the Vedas themselves; and secondly, because even if they

70 p 179.
were not, they could not still be logically employed
to bolster up an imperfect argument of the descrip-
tion we are considering. As to the reference to
the Nakshatras, the value of any argument based
on it is simply nil, for the Nakshatras are referred
to in the Sūtras of Pāṇini, and what is even more, in
the Vedas themselves.\footnote{And see further Goldstücker’s Pāṇini p 77.}
Nor do I think can much weight be attached to the argument based up on
the mention of the planets. We know that in In-
dia a good deal of progress in astronomy had been
already made in the time of the Vedic hymns. We
know that such progress was essential to the cere-
monials and rites which constituted the highest
walk of religiousness in ancient India. We know
that Nakshatra Vidyā, or the science of the Naksha-
tras, is mentioned in such an old work as the Chhān-
dogya Upanishad.\footnote{See the wellknown passage already referred to.
And Nakshatras are mentioned in that work with
very great frequency. See pp 130.273,324 &ca. &ca.
For the antiquity of the Chhāndogya Upanishad see a
former note. I may here add the fact, as perhaps
bearing on that point, that a king is in that Upanishad
addressed as भगवारजन see pp. 367-9. On the
Nakshatras see also Goldstücker’s Pāṇini p 77 and
Professor Lassen there cited.}
We know that in Pāṇini, a
knowledge of astronomy is certainly exhibited, and
in all probability he was not ignorant of the “Gra-
has.”\footnote{See Pāṇini III, 1,144. I say “probably,” because
of course, we do not know in what sense Pāṇini under-
stood the word “Graha” in that Sūtra,}

And when Professor Weber says that the planets
are first mentioned in an Atharvaparisishta and in Yajnavalkya, here as elsewhere, he certainly does not do enough for the exigencies of his argument. The onus still lies on him to prove that these works are of a particular date, or at least that they cannot have been written prior to a certain limit of time.

And as to the remark made by the Professor, when speaking of the supposed connexion between Mars and war, between Jupiter and sacrificial ritual, and between Mercury and commerce, to the effect that neither the names of the planets nor the Deities associated with them sufficiently or at all explain these relations, I can only say, that, in at least two of the instances cited by Professor Weber, a satisfactory explanation is possible. For redness is a characteristic of Mars—a characteristic connoted by the names Lohitanga and Angarak. And what more natural than to connect the redness through blood with war? What more satisfactory explanation can be desired? And as to the connexion of Jupiter with sacrificial ritual. The name of Jupiter in Sanskrit is Guru, which often means a religious preceptor, and the Deity associated with the planet is the priest of the Gods. How can Professor Weber’s remark be explained in view of this fact? Lastly as to the Planet Mercury. As I have said already, the explanation of his relation with commerce is not so easy. But, perhaps, and I submit this with very great diffidence and hesitation, the meaning of the name Budha—wise, pru-

74 What is the bearing on this inquiry of the tablet mentioned by Mr. Broadley in the Indian Antiquary p 20? Is the tablet older than Fa Hian’s days?

75 Since this paper was written, I have come across a passage in the Vidvanmodatarangini (Calc Ed. of 1871) p. 11 which says “बार्यंदेधनआत्मना तु. This seems to give some confirmation to the theory
dent—furnishes the connecting link between that planet and commerce. On the whole, however, I put it with confidence to any fair judge to say, whether, seeing that such an explanation is possible, the very strong remark of Professor Weber is just when he says, that the names of the planets and the Deities associated with them afford not "the smallest explanation" of the supposed relations.

We have now gone through the several heads under which Professor Weber has marshalled the pieces of internal evidence collected by him. In the closing portion of his monograph, he takes a survey of Sanskrit literature, to see what is the earliest work in which the Râmâyaṇa is referred to. I gladly avail myself of this opportunity of bearing my humble testimony to the very great industry of which this portion of the essay bears unmistakeable traces. But the result at which that branch of the argument leads is not worth very much, because, taking it at the highest, it only shows that the Râmâyaṇa is not referred to in any very early work.\textsuperscript{76} But, of course, this does not prove that it did not exist in very early times, although it might be of some little use as corroborative evidence, if other evidence of at least moderate cogency were forthcoming. There are, however, one or two additional observations which I wish to make upon this part of the subject. Professor Weber himself admits, that in the Mahâbhârata

\begin{footnote}
\text{here broached. May not a misunderstanding of the name \textquotedblleft Saumya\textquotedblright which also belongs to Mercury (in the sense of moon's son) have something to do with the connexion? \textquoteleft Saumya\textquoteright means also tranquil, peaceful.}
\end{footnote}

\begin{footnote}
\text{76 The scarcity of works, acknowledged to be old, in which a reference to the Râmâyana might fairly be expected, is also a point worth consideration here. And see how one piece of evidence looking this way is treated by Professor Weber himself p. 124.}
\end{footnote}
references are often made to the story of the Rāmāyaṇa. The question, therefore, at once arises—To what date do these portions of the Mahābhārata belong? I have already drawn attention to the dictum of the late Dr. Goldstücker, in which that learned scholar maintains, that there is no reason to ascribe even the post—buddhistic portions of that great congeries of poems to a later date than the beginning of the Christian era, while there are, according to him, several portions which are fairly entitled to a higher antiquity than the age of the Nirvāṇa. And even independently of au-

77 In considering the date of the episodes of the Mahābhārata, I think, a caution is very necessary. It is a very common opinion, that the episodes of the Mahābhārata are later grafts on the original stalk. That opinion I do not now impugn. But in considering what portions are such episodes, we must, I think, be guided by something better and more tangible than our own opinions about what the unity of the whole work requires. What may appear to us to be out of place, and a breach of the unity of narrative, may not have appeared in the same light to those who lived in a different intellectual plane and atmosphere. And sound canons of criticism do not allow the application of the opinions of one age and clime on such matters to the works of another and a different age and clime. Thus, to take a well-known example. Many have remarked on the incongruity of Krishna's engaging in a philosophical dialogue with Arjuna in the very midst of the battlefield, after the exchange of missiles had actually been commenced by the combatants on either side. For one instance take Wheeler, who in his History of India animadvert on this circumstance. But on the other hand it is worthy of remark, that a very similar thing occurs in the Iliad also, in the shape of the well-known interview between Diomed and Glaucus. Now this part of the poem may, of course, be regarded as an episode in this sense, that it is a long—drawn chap-
thority, we are certainly prepared to contend, that such portions of the Mahâbhârata as have no traces of having been tampered with by interested parties should be presumed to be earlier in date than the rise of Christianity. Professor Weber, we therefore contend, was bound to produce proof, that the references to the story of the Râmâyana are contained in parts of the Mahâbhârata which cannot be earlier than the beginning of the Christian era. Secondly, it is also worthy of remark in this connexion, as suggested by a very erudite friend,78 that whereas the Mahâbhârata does allude to Râma and his exploits, the Râmâyana nowhere makes any mention of Pândavas, or Kauravas, or of any of the principal characters in the great action of the other Epos. Thirdly, I would call attention to the fact, that, according to a quotation candidly made by Professor Weber, the story of Râma is alluded to in a Parisishta of the Sâmaveda, namely, the Karmapradîpa, and that the portion of the story thus alluded to is that related in the Uttarakânda, a part of the Râmâyana, according to Professor Weber himself, unquestionably much later than the portion which goes before it. It will hardly be logical to say, that the Parisishta is a recent work, because it contains an allusion to this circumstance. The date of it must be considered on other and independent grounds. This Professor Weber has not done. As I have not seen the work, I am, of course, unable to make any attempt in that direction. Professor Weber says, that it bears the name of Kâtyâyana. What this means I do not quite see. As I un-

78 Professor R. G. Bhândârkar of Elphinstone College.
derstand, the Parśīśṭatas are regarded as part and parcel of the Śrutī, and therefore as without human authors. But if the Kātyāyana “whose name the work bears” is the author of the Vārtikas on Pāṇini, the story of the Rāmāyana goes back a very great distance into that antiquity out of which Professor Weber seeks to draw it. At any rate, the point has not been considered79, and requires to be considered as having an important bearing upon this inquiry.

Further, the author of the Rāghuvaṇaśa clearly refers to the Rāmāyana and to Vālmīki, and what is more, he refers to the former as the first poem, and to the latter as the first poet80. Now what is the date of the Rāghuvaṇaśa? Dr. Bhāu Dājī has assigned it to the sixth century A. D.81 And even taking that date, which, I think, is the latest to which Kālidāsa has been assigned on any thing like good evidence, is it likely, is it possible to believe, that the Rāmāyana—which, according to Professor Weber, was composed about the second century after Christ—could be regarded by the author of so old a work as the first poem? In spite of that want of a “historical sense” with which our people have been often charged, and I must admit not unjustly charged, I cannot believe, that such an almost outrageous opinion could be held by any Hindoo who knew any thing of literature. But further, I must say, that I do not concur in the argument advanced by Dr. Bhāu Dājī for the position which he takes up with regard to the date of

79 See a few more remarks on this topic in Appendix C infra.
80 Rāghuvaṇaśa canto XV. 33-41; also 63 and 64 referred to by Professor Weber p. 245.
Kālidāsa\textsuperscript{82} I think his date must be put somewhat further back. I have caused certain inquiries to be made into this matter, but for want of the necessary materials, the inquiries have not yet yielded a satisfactory result. Such as it is, however, I put it forward for what it is worth. One stanza which occurs in Kālidāsa's Kumārasambhava is quoted in two places in the Panchatrantra.\textsuperscript{83} Now we know as a matter of fact, that between 531-579 A.D., Nourshirvān, the enlightened king of Persia, had the Panchatantra translated from the original Sanskrit.\textsuperscript{84} That being so, I think we may safely take it, that the Panchatantra must have been composed, at the latest, about the close of the fifth century. And considering the distance between the two countries, and the period at which the translation was made, when communication could hardly have been particularly rapid, that will, I think, be admitted to be not a very extravagant estimate. Now if we could trust to the genuineness of the text of the Panchatantra as we possess it, Kālidāsa, the author of the Kumārasambhava, would from this be demonstrated to have flourished at the latest in the fourth century A.D. or thereabouts. But as this genuineness is not by any means beyond the reach of controversy, and although

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{82} I have not thought it right to enter here into a discussion as to the worth of Dr. Bhau's argument, which, by the way, Professor Weber rejects without hesitation (p 245) I here put forward only one positive fact bearing upon the question, which, as far as I am aware, has not been noticed before.
\item \textsuperscript{83} See p 63 of the Bombay Sans. Class. edition in which, however, the stanza occurs only once. In Kosegarten's edition, it occurs twice, as stated in the text See p 59 (where the misprints are very gross,) and p 102.
\item \textsuperscript{84} See Academy for August 1871 p 387.
\end{itemize}
the stanza from Kālidāsa on which I base my argument occurs as well in the German edition as in the Bombay edition which differs a great deal from the former, I caused inquiries to be made whether anything corresponding to Kālidāsa's stanza occurred in any existing translation of the Panchatantra. The translation referred to was the Persian Anvārī Sohili; and a passage which is in sense akin to the second line of Kālidāsa's stanza above alluded to was found in the very story in which it is quoted in the original Sanskrit. True it is, indeed, that the original and this Persian rendering do not agree word for word. While the original inculcates the impropriety of cutting off even a poisonous tree after once rearing it up, the translation only speaks of the impropriety of rooting out what one has exalted. But it must be remembered against this, that the translation is in no part literal; that it was not made directly from the Sanskrit 85; that in the part now in question, it is in verse, and that, therefore, the translator must have been obliged to allow himself greater freedom in his rendering 86. And in view of all these circumstances,

85 It was, I understand, prepared from an older Persian version of the Arabic, which was itself taken from the original Pehlevi translation.

86 On another, though similar, point taken in Appendix B, infra, it will be seen that I have made a reference to the English translation of the Arabic Kalila u Dimnah, while my reference here is only to the Anvārī Sohili. It is only fair to state, that the stanza from Kālidāsa referred to here cannot be traced in the English translation. On the other hand it is to be noted, that this English translation has no trace also of a certain stanza which does exist in the original Arabic, as results from the quotations given in Kosegarten's introduction to his edition of the Panchatantra. Thus the stanza of the third Tantra which is numbered 113 in Kosegarten's edition, and 112 in the Bombay
I think, we are justified in taking it for granted as at least very probable, that the quotation from Kālidāsa existed in the days in which the first translation of the Panchatantra was made. And if so, and if upon this Kālidāsa may be taken to have flourished about the fourth century A.D., does it not become vehemently improbable—not to say perfectly impossible—that he should have thought a writer who was his predecessor by not more than two centuries to be the first poet, and his work the first poem in the Sanskrit language?

One word more on this point, which I have dwelt on at some length, on account of its importance no less in itself than in its bearing upon the immediate question in hand. Professor Weber re-

edition, appears from Kösegarten's Preface (p X) to have its corresponding stanza in the Arabic Kalila u Dimnah. But Mr. Knatchbull's translation does not contain any idea like it, while it has something corresponding to the immediately preceding and immediately succeeding stanzas. See pp. 230 and 231 of the translation. It would be well if somebody who has the requisite materials were to direct his inquiries towards the Arabic Kalila u Dimnah to check the results, arrived at, as it were, hypothetically here and in Appendix B, Dr. Bhāu Dāji possesses one copy of this Arabic version, and he offered to lend it me. But he is unable to lay his hand on it just now.

87 I observe from the Academy for August 1871 that Professor Benfey has been able to secure a copy of a Syriac version of the Panchatantra. It is possible that that work may assist in this investigation. It may therefore be permitted us, perhaps, to hope that Prof. Benfey will clear up this point, as far as practicable, from his recent acquisition.

88 At pages 182 and 241 Professor Weber mentions other circumstances which show that there must be a good deal of chronological distance allowed for between Kālidāsa and Vālmīki.
fers to an essay of his own written in the German language, where, he says, he has discussed the question of Kālidāsa's date, and where he has arrived at the alternative conclusion, that Kālidāsa lived either in the third or the sixth century of the Christian era. The circumstances set forth above seem clearly to point to the former as the more likely date of the two; and if we accept that date, Professor Weber's theory with regard to the Rāmāyaṇa must, I think, be incontinently thrown overboard. And here I may mention that this argument is not at all affected by the attempt made by Professor Weber to split Kālidāsa into two, that is to say, to distinguish the author of the Śakuntalā from the author of the Raghuvanśa. That theory of his may or may not be a correct theory. I need not discuss it in this place. Suffice it to say here, that it is impossible to separate the Kālidāsa of the Kumārasambhava from the Kālidāsa of the Raghuvanśa, and our argument requires the identity of the authors only of those two works.

I think I may allude in this place to the opinion of Professor Weber about the passage in the Ayodhyākanda, in which reference is made to Buddha by name. Schlegel thought that the passage was an interpolation. But Professor Weber says, that in the light of the circumstances which have been now brought to our knowledge, this opinion of

---

89 See further Mr. Muir's Sanskrit Texts (1871) II. 12.
90 p 246.
91 I agree generally with the principle stated by Dr. Goldstücker as the one proper to be adopted in such an investigation p. 209.
92 And this Professor Weber himself admitted when he wrote his paper on the Rāmāyaṇa p. 122. But he has since found reason to change his opinion. See Indian Antiquary p. 253.
Schlegel's requires reconsideration. The value of these new circumstances, and the light which they throw upon the question before us, we have already examined; but as to this passage itself, it must be remembered, first, that it does not occur at all in Gorressio's edition. It must be remembered in the second place, that Buddha is never again mentioned in the whole of the Râmâyana. It must be remembered in the third place, that the way in which Buddha is introduced into the passage under discussion is not sufficiently connected with the context. And it must be remembered also, that the tendency of Jâbâli's remarks which elicit the wrathful expression of Râma is more towards the Chârvâka than the Buddhist system—indeed, some of the stanzas in the speech of Jâbâli bear a striking resemblance to some of the stanzas quoted in the Sarvadarśanasangrahâ as belonging to Brishaspati, the ringleader of the Chârvâka movement 93.

And here I close this, the principal, part of the present paper. I have now said what I have to say in reply to the several arguments put forward by Professor Weber in support of his theory. The negative portion of my task is here finished. But there are some few positive considerations, to which I wish to call attention. I acknowledge, in limine, that the weight to be attached to these considerations is a question on which different judges may have different opinions. But I think that they ought to have some weight; and at any rate, they are considerations, which are calculated to throw some light upon the subject under investigation.

We shall first see what we can find in the Sûtras of Pâñini. And it must be acknowledged, at the

93' See Râmâyana (Bombay ed.) p. 202 and Comp Sarvadarśanasangrahâ (Târân. ed) p. 2 et seq. I see that Mr. Muir is also of the same opinion I 115,
very outset, that what we can find there is not very much. I observe first that in Pâñini’s Sûtra VI, 1,174, the anomalous form Aikshvâka—a name meaning descendant of Ikshvâku, and frequently applied to Râma—is explained, or rather laid down to be correct, though against the general rules of grammar. I observe next, that the name Kaikeyî—a name having a most important connexion with the history of Râma, and one which is also grammatically anomalous—is explained in Pâñini’s Sûtra IV, 1,171. The name of Râma’s mother also—Kausalyâ—is partially explained in Sûtra IV, 1,171. And this is the sum total of what I have been able to find in the Ashtâdhyâyî itself, which is calculated to be of any use in our inquiry. Of course, this is very meagre, especially when placed by the side of what we can get in connexion with the history of the Kauravas and Pândavas. But as as a partial explanation of this circumstance, it must not be forgotten, that very few other names of grammatical interest are to be found in connexion with the history of Râma, and we can expect only such names to be alluded to in the work of Pâñini.94

94 I believe that, in numerous cases, this point is lost sight of. Absence of reference is too often regarded as equivalent to absence of knowledge, and absence of knowledge of a work on the part of any author is held to be proof sufficient of the non-existence of the work in the time of the latter. Before this proof can be held to be satisfactory—it is necessary, I think, to take careful note of surrounding circumstances. Look for instance to the Chhândogya Upanishad p 59 and p 288. In the former passage, Rig and Sâma alone are mentioned; in the latter, Rig, Sâma, and Yajus. But it would surely be the height of temerity to base on these two passages any conclusion as to the non-existence of the Atharvaveda at the time of the Chhândogya Upanishad, or on the first of them any conclusion as to the similar non-
If we now come to the work of Patanjali, what we see there is even more meagre than what Pāṇini gives us. I ought to add, however, that hitherto I have not been able to avail myself of anything more than merely occasional and desultory glances at the great work of Patanjali. And in the course of such a view of it, I have come across but one hint upon this subject, and that is the mention in one place of the name of Rāma, which occurs in company with the names of Dhanapati and Keśava in the commentary on Pāṇini’s Śūtra II, 2,34. The passage is in verse—and I therefore quote the lines which run as follows:—

मृदंगशंखतूणवः || प्रथड्नदंति संसदि || प्राशादे
धनपतिरामकेशभानाम ॥

Of course, I admit at once that the mention of Rāma in this connexion is ambiguous. It is next to impossible to say which Rāma is meant here. It is possible that it is Balarāma who is alluded to, as Patanjali in another passage shows an acquaintance with Krishna’s brother under the name Bāleva. But it must also be remembered on the existence of the Yajurveda And as if any body drew the latter conclusion, he could be answered by the second passage, so if any one drew the former conclusion, the passage at p.474 of the same work would conclusively negative that inference also. The late Dr. Goldstücker’s remarks at page 18 of his work are to the same effect; though it is possible, I think, to point to cases where he has not applied the principles he has himself laid down. See, for instance, p. 150 et seq. I have myself employed the argument at times, for instance, see Appendix B infra; but I have not done so without hesitation; and I think that some peculiarities are observable in these cases which render the argument less unsafe than it would ordinarily be.

95 Under Pāṇini IV, 1,114.
other hand, that neither Balarāma nor Krishṇa has very much connexion with Kubera in any one of the well known stories which have descended to us. And the conclusion I deduce from this latter fact is, that the argument of noscitur a sociis, even if it were otherwise valid, could not be made to apply to the compound before us. Another hint on the subject to be found in Patanjali has been mentioned to me by the same erudite friend to whom I have already referred. It is contained in the verse. पद्य वानरते, परिवर्तितयद कृपयं तिलं: which is cited by Patanjali in one place,\textsuperscript{96} but which also, as we both think, is by no means unambiguous\textsuperscript{97}.

Let us now come to the gaṇapāṭha, in which some important names are to be found. I need scarcely say, that I am not prepared to dissent from those\textsuperscript{98} who maintain, that the gaṇapāṭha by itself cannot be treated as of conclusive authority for critical and chronological purposes. I quite admit the general

\textsuperscript{96} Under Pāṇini I, 3,26.

\textsuperscript{97} A third instance has come to my knowledge since this paper was read. Under Pāṇini I, 1,57 there is a stanza cited by Patanjali which runs as follows: स्त्रेष्याध्यां पादिकमीद्राहक्त: शोभते झातनां पत्तनीच || नेताराभगच्छतं धारणं रांगणचतत: पश्चातस्त्यते ध्यनस्यतेच. where the word Rāvaṇi is to be noted. It might be a patronymic from Rāvaṇa, and might be used of Indrajit. I must own, however, that the stanza is not in its entirety intelligible to me, and neither Kaiyāṭa nor Nāgoji Bhaṭṭa gives any help in our investigation. I may remark that though Kaiyāṭa understands शोभते to be a vocative, it may simply mean ‘tomorrow’ as in Kādambarī (Tārānāth’s ed) p. 341.

\textsuperscript{98} See Goldstücker’s Pāṇini p. 131 and Professor Weber there cited.
correctness of that view, but it is only because, in the facts which I am going to set forth, I see something which gives a certain value to the portions of the Gaṇapāṭha I intend to rely on, that I adduce them as evidence worth attending to in our investigation. First, then, the name Sumitrā occurs in the gaṇa Bāhvādi under Pāṇini’s Sūtra IV, 1,96; and according to the rule contained in that Sūtra, we can form from that name the patronymic Saumitri; so that we get here the names of Lakṣmana and his mother. The name Sumitrā stands seventeenth in a list, which, as far as it is fixed, contains over fifty names, including among others that of Rāma also, which occurs later in the enumeration. Now the next name but one after Sumitrā is Pushkarasād from which the derivative under the rule alluded to will be Paushkarasādi. And this name—Paushkarasādi—is the name of a grammarian mentioned by Kātyāyana in his Vārtika on Pāṇini VIII, 3,2899. I think, we may, therefore, take it as highly probable, that the name Pushkarasad was in the gaṇa Bāhvādi in the time of Kātyāyana. If so, we may take it as also highly probable, that the name Sumitrā which precedes it also existed in the gaṇa in question in his time. It may, indeed, be said by way of exception to this, that the later additions to the gaṇas need not necessarily have been made at the end of the lists as they may have stood before the additions were made, but that they may have been simply foisted into some of the intermediate places in the list. I admit this to be possible, but I do not think it very probable, and for three reasons. Firstly, as these are avowedly akritigaṇas, there is no temptation to throw the new additions into any

99 See Siddhānta Kaumudi (Tārānāth’s ed.) p.64. and note there. But I abandon the argument on this point, as the Vārtika referred to does not seem to be Kātyāyana’s—not being noted by Patanjali.
other than their natural places at the close of the list and after the names already existing. Secondly, to presume such an interpolation as above referred to is to take for granted, on the part of the grammarians, making the additions, a conscious dishonesty of purpose, and a knowledge, or at any rate, an apprehension, that the gaṇas would be used for such critical purposes as they are now being made to subserv. Thirdly, the logical result of the principle involved in this exception is, that all the members of all the gaṇas except the first will have to be at once thrown overboard. A line of reasoning similar to this applies to the names Rāvana, and Kākutstha which occur in the gaṇa Śivādī under Pāṇini’s Sūtra IV, 1,112, by which we get the derivative forms Rāvana and Kākutstha. The only difference between this and the last case—and it is favourable to the present—is, that here a word which is later in the list of the Śivādis, namely Rishṭishēna, is distinctly mentioned in the Mahābhāshya as belonging to this gaṇa, and we are not left to prove its existence by a process of inference. In connexion with these two facts, I may mention also, that Saumitri occurs in the gaṇa Gaḥādī under Pāṇini IV, 2,138, and Rāvaṇi and Paushkārasādī in the gaṇa Taulvalyādī under Pāṇini II, 4, 61. And in order to couple it with a previous observation based on the text itself of the Ashtādhyāyī, I add here, that the word Kekaya stands third in the gaṇa Bhargādī under Pāṇini IV, 1,178; and it is with the assistance of this rule, that the full form Kāikeyī can be derived. Again in the gaṇa Gargādī, under Pāṇini’s Sūtra IV, 1,105, we find the name Pulasti, from which can be derived the patronymic Paula-stya, which is well known as one of the names of Rāvana. And in this list, Pulasti occurs towards the beginning, when compared with the name Vata-ndā which is recognized in Patanjali’s Mahābhāshya.
as contained in the gāṇa in question. The names Rāma and Bibhīshaṇa, Pampā and Kishkindhā, and even Laukā, also occur in some of the gāṇas. But I do not refer to them here as yielding evidence of much value in this investigation. I am unable to suggest any such circumstances as I have set forth above, in order to show their genuineness or existence in the time of Pāṇini or his ancient commentator.

There is also some internal evidence furnished by the Rāmāyāṇa, which deserves to be weighed in the balance against that which has been adduced by Professor Weber, and which we have discussed above. True it is, as we have conceded already, that Brahmā, Vishnū, and Śiva, are all mentioned, and mentioned with high veneration, in the Rāmāyāṇa. But as has been already pointed out, neither Śiva nor Vishnū, as identified with the Supreme Being, is unknown to a writer of such acknowledged antiquity as Patanjali. Brahmā, too, as pointed out in a note there, is mentioned in the Bhāshya. But beyond this, it must also not be forgotten, that in the Rāmāyāṇa, they have not yet, as far as I am aware, been aggregated into the Supreme Trinity, as they are aggregated even in the Kumāra-sambhava or Raghuvanśa of Kālidāsa. It must also not be forgotten, that Indra, too, is mentioned with great reverence in the Rāmāyāṇa, and in one

100 I have not even attempted to set out the whole of this evidence. In fact, I am not yet in possession of the materials for so doing. All I say is, that if any body took a survey of the Rāmāyāṇa from a standpoint opposite to that of Professor Weber's, he would be able, I think, to make out a good case on the other side.

101 See Raghu III, 27 and X, 16; and still more clearly Kumāra II, 4 and 6 and VII, 44.
passage is thus spoken of उन्नत्वमम नन्दगणवत्साला महद्गण-बुद्धःः।102 And further, it will be found, I think, that the description of the marriage of Râma and his brothers, as given in the Râmâyâna, exhibits a greater simplicity103 than does the description, for instance, of the marriage of Mahâdeva and Pârvati in the seventh canto of the Kumârasambhava; and this is another fact which places some interval between Kâlidâsa and Vâlmîki.

This is all in the way of positive evidence that I have been able to collect on this point. It is not to be denied, that, altogether it is not very full. But I think it deserves considerable weight. And it must be remembered, even supposing it were weaker than it is, that the mere absence of positive evidence to prove the existence of anything at any particular time is not equivalent to a proof of its non-existence at that time. It has been shown in the previous portion of the present paper, that the argument adduced to prove the Râmâyâna to have been composed after the commencement of the Christian era are not by any means conclusive, or even very powerful; on the other hand, we have also shown that there is some positive evidence leading to an opposite conclusion. And I say that if we fairly look at the evidence brought together by Professor Weber, and at his comments upon it; if we look at the answers which may be given to those comments and that evidence; if we look further at the positive evidence, scanty though it be, which can be adduced upon the other side; if I say, we take a comprehensive view of all this, the conclusion must be, I think, at the very least, that the antiquity of the Râmâyâna still remains to be disproved.

102 Gorresio Bâlakânda XIV, 5.
103 This simplicity, of course, means simplicity in the rites and ceremonies to be performed.
[Postscript.]

Since the foregoing part of this paper was finished, I have been able, through the kindness of Professor Râmkrishna Gopâl Bhândârkar to have a look at the Daśaratha Jâtaka in the original. And upon a perusal of it, not only do I see no reason to change the opinion I have already expressed, but I think that the narration of the story as a story of "past" times, as well as the circumstance that in the closing paragraph Buddha identifies himself and his surroundings with Râma and his surroundings, points to the view which I have suggested above, that the Buddhistic version may be after all not the model but the copy. It would appear as if Buddha was making use of an older story for his own purposes. The coincidence of some of the stanzas of the Râmâyâna with some of those to be found in this Pali work, as far as it proves anything, goes, I think, still further in the same direction. It gives greater force to the question I have put above, namely,—Is it possible that such a copy as the Râmâyâna should have been made for the purposes for which it is alleged to have been made? Surely the Buddhists could have pointed out at once that what was going to be palmed off upon the people as an old Brahmanical work was really and truly a work of their own, only vamped up, as it were, and altered in some places, to bolster up the foundations of tottering Brahmanism. What could be the answer to such a charge? And were the Brahmins—who have been credited with so much political sagacity—likely to make such an egregious blunder? It may, perhaps, be said—if the Buddhist book was the copy, could not the Brahmans point out the cribbing? I answer—they could. But why should they do it? The Daśaratha Jâtaka was not put forward to stem the tide of Brahmanism, or to help on the
vessel of Buddhism. It was probably an innocuous thing in the eyes of the Brahmans. It was, at the highest, but the old story of separatists justifying their separation by new interpretations of things accepted from antiquity. The work made no claim as a work of authority, or as a revealed work, and needed not to be minded. I may add here, that in the Mahâvanso and another Buddhistic book, a story is told of an old Buddhist king, in the course

104 Since this paper was read, the testimonies in confirmation of this hypothesis, propounded here on a priori grounds, have been crowding upon me. I will content myself with simply referring to them without discussing them at length. See Sherring’s Benares p. 7. Bâbu Râjendralâla Mitra’s Lalita Vistara (Trans) p. 11 and note p. 17. Mark the explanation given by Burnouf of the name Tathâgata. And see Turnour’s Examination of Pâli Buddhistical Annals. No. 3 p 1, which is perhaps too strong. Professor Weber, (p. 127) quoting Prof. Max Müller, speaks of the moral of the Daśaratha-Jâtaka as a “test of true Buddhism”. If so, that will fully explain the fact of the Jâtaka making no reference to the abduction of Sîtâ, consistently with the theory in the text, if any explanation is wanted. In the October number of that excellent publication—the Academy—there is a review of Fausboll’s Jâtakas by Mr. R. C. Childers. Mr. Childers there quotes Fausboll to the following effect. “Nearly all the tales of the Jâtaka book are old folklore in common for all India without regard to religion, and many of them treat evidently of pre-Buddhistic Bramhical affairs and have been made Buddhistic in their application only.” I may add that, after quoting this, Mr. Childers himself does not express dissent from this position. The Italics are mine, and the passage italics offers very valuable confirmation of the remark on “the test of true Buddhism” which I have made above, and which had been made before I saw Mr. Childers’s paper.
of which the island of Ceylon is referred to; and upon this, the story speaks of a giant king of Ceylon—named Râvana—who is said to have lived in a former age, and whose wickedness is there related to have brought a great calamity upon the island in the shape of a destructive deluge. (See Hardy's Legends of Buddhism p. 8)

APPENDIX A.

It will have been observed that, in the foregoing portion of this essay, I have made no allusion to the argument based by Professor Weber upon a circumstance relating to the Râmâyana, which is mentioned in the Râjatarangini. The reason of the omission lay in the fact that, at the time I wrote my paper, I had absolutely no knowledge of the chronology of the period to which the circumstance was alleged to belong. I have, however, been looking into the question since. And I, therefore, throw together a few observations on that topic in the present Appendix, although, as I may say at the very outset, the question seems to me one beset with great difficulties, and therefore one, also, upon which I cannot say that I have satisfied my own mind.

It is, I think, right to set out in the first instance the passage in the Râjatarangini, upon which the argument is based. Having stated that king Dâmодara was cursed by certain sages for refusing to give them food when asked, the Râjatarangini goes on to say अदैशमेकनेरन्नाथग्रुथत्रा रामायण तव || चापस्य शान्तिभावितत्स्यूचि ते प्रसादिता: ||105 which may be

thus rendered. "They being propitiated said, 'your curse shall expire when you shall have heard the entire Râmâyâna in a single day.'" This is the story about king Dâmodara, who is described in the Râjatarangini itself as the immediate predecessor of Hushka, Jusîka, and Kanishka, and as having sprung from the race of Asoka. With this before him, Professor Weber first quotes Lâssen for the date of Dâmodara, and from this quotation Lassen seems to place him some time in the beginning of the first century B.C. Professor Weber then proceeds in this wise"...it is certainly a singular circumstance, that the earliest time to which the Râmâyâna is referred, and then it would seem as a work that had not been completed, is just a period that lies exactly in the middle between the Râj of the Yavana and that of the Saka"106 Now I must say, that I cannot understand the reasoning of this passage. Where does it appear in the stanza cited and translated above, that the Râmâyâna is by it referred any particular date at all? How is any reference to any "earliest time" to be ferreted out of it? Where again is there any, the remotest, allusion to the work being in an unfinished state? Against all this, it seems to me patent upon the face of the passage itself, that it speaks of a completed Râmâyâna—for that is the more natural conclusion to be drawn from the word 'entire' or literally 'without a remainder'—that further the book must have been, in the time of the Prince referred to; already regarded as a sacred work, the hearing of which was enough to dispel sin—that lastly no terminus à quo for the Râmâyâna is fixed by this passage at all.

That being so, the next question which arises on the passage is this—What was the date of Dâmo-

106 p 240. The Italics are all mine.
dana's reign? I have neither the time, nor the space, nor yet the materials, necessary for discussing the question here at length. I will first refer to the several authorities that I have seen on the subject. Prinsep places Kanishka "nearer the end of the second century." As the date for the termination of Abhimanu's reign—118 B.C.—given, according to Prinsep, by the Rājatarāṅgini, is in his opinion correct,107 this "end of the second century" must be, according to him, at the very least ten or twelve years earlier—so that as the result of this chronology, Dāmodara might stand about 175 B.C. Professor Wilson places Kanishka even earlier than this—viz. 388 B.C.108 That would send Dāmodara still further into antiquity. Bābu Rājendralāla Mitra, in his Translation of the Lalita Vistara, puts down Kanishka as belonging to the year 143 B.C.—apparently subtracting the four hundred years which tradition fixes as the interval between the Nirvāṇa and the reign of Kanishka from B.C. 543, the date of the Nirvāṇa.109 On this date we shall have something to say further on. The Honourable G. Turnour, in his Examinations of Pāli Buddhistical Annals, places Kanishka at 103 B.C. or thereabouts110 Professor Max Müller, following Lassen, sets down Kanishka to some years before, and some years after, the beginning of the Christian era—and he uses this date as confirmatory of the date fixed by him for Buddha's Nirvāṇa. But he confesses, that it is difficult to determine when Kanishka's reign commenced.111 On the other hand, the late Professor Goldstücker does not accept Müller's date of the

108 Cited in I Prinsep 40.
109 p 22.
Nirvāṇa, but accepting the traditional dates both about that event and about Nāgārjuna's distance from it, fixes the date of Nāgārjuna at 143 B. C. And as Nāgārjuna was a contemporary of Kanishka, the latter would also, on Professor Goldstücker's theory, have to be placed at about 143 B. C. Now upon these dates, a variety of questions arise. Are they reconcilable? If not, which ought to be accepted? Supposing we have fixed the date of Kanishka, are he and Hushka and Jushka to be taken to have ruled jointly or one after the other? How long did they reign? And how long did Dāmodara himself reign? As I have said already, I do not propose to go into these questions. The balance of authority—if we allow ourselves to be guided by that—is in favour of Kanishka's having flourished in 143 B. C. or thereabouts. So that we may, perhaps, take 175 B. C. as a probable date for Dāmodara, and then it would result, that at least towards the end of the third century B. C, a Rāmāyaṇa existed which had already come to be regarded as Holy.

With this statement of the case on this point I should have contented myself, had not Professor Goldstücker endeavoured to fortify his conclusion by evidence independent of Buddhistic chronology, thus attempting to give it greater strength than it would otherwise have possessed, and had he not further expressed himself as if the proof was nearly complete. The learned Professor's argument is as follows. Nāgārjuna was the founder of the sect of Mādhyamika Baudhhas—the Mādhyamikas are mentioned by Patanjali—Patanjali can be shown to have flourished about 143 B. C. Therefore Nāgārjuna may be taken to have flourished before or about 143 B. C. And as tradition places Nāgārjuna

112 Pāṇini p 30 et seq. Compare 2 Prinsep 87.
113 See Pāṇini p 230 et seq.
about 400 years after the Nirvāṇa, therefore the Nirvāṇa must have occurred about 543 B.C—which is the date fixed by the Ceylon chronology. Now the first criticism on this argument is, that there is absolutely no ground shown for the identification of the Mādhyamika Baudhās and the Mādhyamikas mentioned by Patanjali. On the contrary, the fact that they are said to have been “besieged” by the Yavana militates, I think, very strongly against this supposition. And a further criticism is, that the conclusion is irreconcilable with other known facts, and facts admitted by Dr. Goldstücker himself. Thus the Rājatarangini makes Nāgārjuna live not only in the reign of Kanishka, but also of his successor Abhimanyu. 114 Now according to Lassen, whose conclusion is accepted by Professor Goldstücker, Abhimanyu flourished about 60 A.D. 115 Is it possible to believe—would Dr. Goldstücker have believed—that Nāgārjuna flourished contemporaneously with both the princes who reigned at those two several periods?

One more observation on this topic. Professor Weber questions the credibility of the account of the Rājatarangini. 116 But it must be remembered that there is no motive to the fabrication of such a story. For barring the fact that Kālhaṇa Pandit had no prescience of the critical tendencies of the nineteenth century, he could not have intended the story to furnish us with what he considered to be the date of the Rāmāyaṇa, as in his opinion it must have been immensely older than even 1400 B.C. As to his opportunities of knowledge, they need certainly not have been worse than he had for some of the other matters related by him, which yet are

---

114 See Calcutta ed. p 7 line 177. and see 1 Prinsep 39.
115 Pāṇini p 234.
116 pp 239 and 240.
taken upon his authority as entitled to a good deal of credit. And as to the inference based on the fact that he sends back the whole chronology so far as to place a successor of the great Aśoka fourteen centuries before the birth of Christ, I do not think that makes very much against his credit generally, it being only another instance of the too common tendency of our Hindu writers to antiquate every thing Indian. But though the starting-point of Kalhāṇa’s chronology may have to be given up, the duration of the reigns of the princes and their order need not, therefore, be also given up; though I am prepared to admit, that some shadow of suspicion must always rest upon them.117

117 Comp. Max Müller’s Anc. Sans. Literature p 274. If from the “singular” fact, mentioned by Prof. Weber in a note to his observations on this point, about the date of Hushka, Jushka, and Kanishka, he wishes to draw any conclusion as to the time at which Rāvana flourished, and consequently as to the time when the Rāmāyaṇa was composed; it may be just as well to note here, that a Karna dynasty is said to have flourished in the Anga country in the 2nd century A. D. (see 1 Wheeler 95); and that therefore, a similar argument applied to the Mahābhārata will bring down that work to the 3rd or 4th century of the Christian era, at the earliest! I avail myself of the opportunity here afforded of making a reference to an inscription, belonging. I am told, to the second century A. D., a translation of which is given in Prinsep’s essays Vol II, p 68. According to Professor Wilson, the inscription seems in one place to allude to Rāma’s Bridge. Unluckily, however, it has not been made out in its entirety, and it is impossible to say how the case really stands. But from the context, it may be inferred, that Prof. Wilson’s conjecture is not entirely unwarranted.
APPENDIX B.

Since this paper was read, it has occurred to me that reference to a passage in Bhartrihari's Nitiśataka might usefully be made in this investigation. In one stanza of that work Bhartrihari speaks of the Ten Incarnations of Vishnu, so that the main story of Vālmīki's Rāmāyaṇa, at any rate, down to the destruction of Rāvana, may be taken to be implied in that passage, besides that Paraśurāma is recognised as an incarnation of Vishnu. Now it is worthy of note, that even in Kālidāsa's Ragu- 
vansā, Paraśurāma has not yet been raised to that rank, any more than he is in Vālmīki's Rāmāyaṇa. One might, however, have certainly expected an allusion to it— as it would have given the poet an

118 Nitiśataka 93. I see that the Vishnu Purāṇa also recognises this divine character of Paraśurāma (I Muir's Texts p 350). This Purāṇa is quoted in Śankarāchārya's Bhāshya on the Śvetāsvatara Upanishad (Bibl. Ind. ed pp 65,295 &c). When did Śankara live? It seems to be commonly regarded as an almost settled question. But the arguments for the received date are not perfectly satisfactory. And see the Indian Antiquary p 354 where Professor Bhāndārkar suggests a date which is different from the received date, but which, it is just possible, may after all prove to be nearer the truth. I have already expressed my opinion as to the weakness of the kind of argument I have here used to show the priority of Kālidāsa over Bhartrihari. As I have said there, I have used the argument with some hesitation. That hesitation has now become stronger, when I see that such a comparatively recent work as the Prasanna Rāghava Nāṭaka does not refer to Paraśurāma's divinity in the scene of the renounct between him and his namesake. I have not, however, thought it necessary to entirely omit the argument.

119 See Canto XI.
opportunity of explaining away the superiority of the Kshatriya over the Brahmana as proved by the result of the rencontre between the two, Rāmas. And the fact is even more remarkable in the Meghadūta\textsuperscript{120}, where, in one and the same stanza, Parasurāma is spoken of merely as “Bhrigupati”, while Vāmana is “Vishnu engaged in bridling down Bali”. It is not, I think, quite unsafe to conclude from these facts, that we must allow some chronological distance between Kālidāsa and Bhātrihari. The only difficulty which presents itself to me in the way of accepting this conclusion is offered by a stanza, which occurs in the Śākuntala\textsuperscript{121} and which is also to be found in precisely the same words in the Nitiśatākā\textsuperscript{122}. At one time, I was inclined to hold, that the stanza in the Nitiśatākā was the original, and that Kālidāsa had borrowed it from that work to put it into the mouth of one of his characters. And I was inclined to hold this, because it would have absolved both writers of the charge of plagiarism—a literary fraud, of which no instance that I am aware of\textsuperscript{123} has yet been found in Sanskrit literature. But if the conclusion broached above is correct, this supposition must, of course, be abandoned. Now in the observations made by Professor Rāmkṛishṇa Gopāl Bhāndārkar on the occasion when the foregoing paper was read, he suggested a theory which might, perhaps, obviate this difficulty. Professor Bhāndārkar contends, that the stanza alluded to above is one of those

\textsuperscript{120} See Calc ed stanza 58.
\textsuperscript{121} See Williams’s Śākuntala pp 194-5.
\textsuperscript{122} See Bohlen’s Bhātrihari p 46-7. The stanza occurs in all the twelve copies of the Nitiśatākā which I have consulted.
\textsuperscript{123} See, too, Dr. Hall’s preface to the Vāsavadatta p 15.
Subhâshitas floating about in popular talk, about the authorship of which nothing definite can be laid down. According to him, therefore, the stanza in question would, both in the Nîtiśataka and the Sâkuntala, be a mere reproduction of a part of what may be called the literature living in the mouths ofrespectably educated people. To some extent, I have no hesitation in accepting this theory, but to some extent only. I cannot yet persuade myself that it is true in its entirety. The stanza before us will itself illustrate my view of the matter. In dramatic poetry, where such a Subhâshita is put into the mouth of a character in a play, we are, I concede, at liberty to hold, that the stanza need not necessarily have been composed by the author of the play. We are at liberty to suppose, that the author may have taken the stanza from among the current Subhâshitas, to make the conversation in his play so much more of a correct picture of an ordinary conversation in real life under similar circumstances. The same remark, may, I think, apply to ordinary poetry, not dramatic, in which dialogue is introduced—to such cases for instance as those of the stanzas common to the Râmâyâna and the Daśaratha Jâtaka—and it is but just to Professor Bhândârkar to mention that it was primarily with reference to these stanzas that his remark was made. But if the theory is extended to cases in which there is no dialogue, I cannot see where we shall stop. Take for instance the stanza in the Nîtiśataka alluded to above. Can we say that Bhartrihari only reproduced a stanza current in his time? If we can, what will there be to prevent our saying the same thing of all the other stanzas in his works. And if we cannot be prevented from so saying, the theory will have to explain the meaning of the tradition of Bhartrihari’s authorship of those works. Fur-
ther, admitting for a moment that the theory is true as far as it goes, it is not to be denied that such Subhâ-
shitas must have had some authors. And on what ground are we to ascribe them to other authors than those in whose works we do observe them? The Subhâshitas may embody the wisdom of many, but they must embody also the wit of one; and this one may be, and ought prima facie to be presumed to be, the same writer in whose work we find them first introduced. Where the identical stanza, identical not merely in sentiment, but generally identical in words also, really occurs in two writers, that circumstance may, perhaps, be a collateral circumstance to justify the application of this theory. And in the case immediately before us, I should not be unprepared to apply that theory, having regard to the difficulty which I have suggested above.

Dr. Bhâu Dâjî has identified Bhartrihari with the Bhartrimeṇtha mentioned in the Râjatarangini, and he assigns to him an equal antiquity with Kâli-
dâsa. 124 This may or may not be correct. Dr. Bhau only says that the identity “is to be presumed.” But it is also worth consideration, on the other hand, that the Sarasvatîkanaṭhâbharana quotes both names Bhartrihari and Bhartrimeṇtha; 125 that the latter name is not, as I believe, much known, while the former, as well as the alternative name Hari, is very widely known. And about Bhartrihari, also, a similar argument to that urged in the text about Kâlidâsa may be employed. The difference—and it is, I think, in favour of this argument—is, that I refer here not to the Anvâri Sohîli, but to the English translation of the Kalila u Dimnah.

125 See Aufrecht’s Catalogue 209 a.
page 5 of the second Tantra, (I quote from the Bombay Sanskrit Classics edition) there is a stanza quoted which occurs in the Nitişataka. It may be thus rendered, not very literally—"Observing the injury inflicted on the sun and moon by the Graha, and the imprisonment of elephants and serpents, and also the indigence of men of talent, my opinion is that destiny is very powerful." Thus the English rendering of the Sanskrit of the Panchatantra. Compare the English rendering of the Arabic of the Kalila u Dimnah—"The ringdove said that it was the decree of fate which determined irrevocably both good and evil, that even the sun and moon were subject to its irresistible laws in their appointed eclipses."

When I add that the two passages cited above occur in the same context in the Panchatantra and the Kalila u Dimnah—being in the same tale and referring to the same state of circumstances—when I add further that the Arabic of which the English

126 Stanza 91. It is but fair to add that in the Kavyasangraha, lately published in two parts at Calcutta, this stanza is ascribed to Veṭālabhaṭṭa; but in the critical value of the Kavyasangraha I have not very much faith. Thus एका माया &ca (p 43), is once ascribed to Ghaṭakarpara, and then (p 46) to Halāyuḍha; so आँमश्व &ca (301) and नमस्यामो &ca (301). both occur elsewhere as Bhartripari’s(pp 255 and 239). Or again—and this is very remarkable—अर्थस्य &ca (p 42) is given as Ghaṭakarpara’s, when it is well known to belong to the Mahābharata, and when the context shows it to be a clear interpolation in the place where it occurs in Ghaṭakarpara’s poem. And see similarly page 29 stanza which is in Kumāra canto IV ad finem.

above cited is a translation was itself but a translation from a Pehlvi rendering of the original Sanskrit, and when I add, lastly, that the English translation, according to the preface by its author, does not lay claim to literal accuracy, but acknowledges a "certain range and freedom of expression"\textsuperscript{128}, I think I have said enough to prove, that my conclusion is not fanciful when I contend, that the passage translated above from the Sanskrit may be taken to have existed in the Panchatantra when that work was translated for king Noushirvan. If so, the argument used in the text with regard to Kālidāsa will also apply to the date of Bhartrihari. And having got thus far, we may well ask whether Bhartrihari could speak of the "ten incarnations" in the way in which he does speak, if one of the individuals alleged to be an incarnation had been raised to that position only two centuries before his time? And further, if we accept the position, not, as I submit, unlikely to be correct, that Kālidāsa must be regarded as a predecessor of Bhartrihari by some decades—the force of the question as applied \textit{mutatis mutandis} to Kālidāsa becomes simply irresistible.

\textbf{APPENDIX C.}

Among the works which mention or refer to some of the events of Rāma's life as narrated in the Rāmāyaṇa, Professor Weber has noted the drama called \textit{Mrichchhakatika}\textsuperscript{129}. But the argument which may be based upon the allusions in that work is not carried any further by the Professor, as the date of the \textit{Mrichchhakatika} is uncertain. Now I find, in the first place, that the Kāvyādārsa of

\textsuperscript{128} p. IX. \hspace{1cm} \textsuperscript{129} p. 244.
Dandin\textsuperscript{130} quotes from the \textit{Mrichchhakatika}—and Dandin is now generally placed, I believe, in the sixth century A. D.\textsuperscript{131} The distich in the \textit{Mrichchhakatika} to which I allude runs thus \textit{सिधिविव तमोऽगानि वर्षते|वांजनं नमः}.\textsuperscript{132} Now note first, that Dandin has a long discussion on this line occupying no less than seven stanzas of his work. He sets out different views opposed to his own, and for one reason or another, puts them all out of court. Now such an elaborate dissertation could hardly have been bestowed except upon a work of established reputation—and on this ground a considerable distance between Dandin and the author of the \textit{Mrichchhakatika} must be allowed for. Further, the authorship of the drama is referred, as well by tradition as by the introduction to it, to a king named Śūdraka\textsuperscript{133}. And a prince of that name is mentioned in Prinsep’s \textit{Useful Tables} as having flourished about 21 B. C.\textsuperscript{134} If that date is accepted, then the Rāmāyaṇa—to the story of which, as Professor Weber himself admits, clear reference is made in the play—must be assigned to a period considerably earlier than the beginning of the Christian Era. And it should be noted, that the way in

\textsuperscript{130} p 217.
\textsuperscript{131} \textit{Indian Antiquary} pp 177, 246 see also p 304.
\textsuperscript{132} It may be remarked by the way that Śāṅgadharma attributes these words to \textit{Metha} and \textit{Vikramāditya} probably through a \textit{lapisus memoria} (see Aufrecht’s \textit{Oxford Catalogue} p 209a). It is not possible to say who this Vikramāditya is, nor what the ‘and’ means. Were the two joint authors of any single work?
\textsuperscript{133} p. 5 Calic. Edition of Śaka 1792:
\textsuperscript{134} p 241. \textit{Vol II of Prinsep’s Essays} by Thomas and see the note. For the dates to which the work has been attributed by various scholars see Muir’s \textit{Texts} (1870) II p 12, where among others Professor Weber’s conclusion on the point is referred to.
which the references to the story are introduced show that the story must have been one perfectly familiar to all classes of people. The allusions are to be found in the speeches of Śakāra, who is in some respects, though, of course, not in all, the analogue of Sheridan's Mrs. Malaprop. He must make nonsense of what if put properly would be perfect sense. In one place, this foolish ignoramus brackets Rāvana with Kuntī; in another, Hanūmān with Subhadra; in a third, Chāṇakya and Draupadī. He declares in one place that he hears the smell of flowers, but cannot see the sound of ornaments. Well, it is this worthy—the very pink of ignorance—who talks about the characters of the Rāmāyaṇa and the Mahābhārata, and stumbles on from blunder to blunder, making a hopelessly confounded jumble of the two. Now the propriety of putting this sort of language into the mouth of Śakāra is at once evident, if we remember that both the Rāmāyaṇa and the Mahābhārata must have been so well known in the time the drama was written, that to have confused notions about the characters in the two epics was regarded as a piece of ignorance, of which only the foolish brother-in-law of a prince was capable, and which showed about as much intellectual calibre as the nonsense about hearing smell and seeing sound. Under these circumstances, the language is felicitous; without them, it would fall flat long and be void of effect. Mark, too, that the blunders concern the most salient points in the story. And on a review of these facts, the conclusion logically follows, that in the time of the

135 See the note in the Calcul ed p. 24 et seq.
137 Ibid p 28.
139 Ibid p 36.
Mrichchhakatika, the Râmâyana must have already been venerated as a national epos by the side of the Mahâbhâra. And that being so, what must have been the distance of time between Śûdraka and Vâlmiki?

Another of the works in which the story of Râma is alluded to is the Karmapradîpa—a work referred to in a note in Professor Weber’s essay. We have spoken something about this work in the text; but something more now requires to be added—supplementing what has been there said. I observe from Max Müller’s Ancient Sanskrit Literature, that the Kâtyâyana to whom this Karmapradîpa is ascribed is the same as the Kâtyâyana who wrote the Vârtikas on Pâñîni. And Dr. Goldstücker says, that the work is mentioned “as such,” that is to say as a work from the author of the Vartikas, by Müller himself, “on the authority of Śhadgurusishya.” Notwithstanding the concurrence, however, of these two great names, I must confess to some misgivings on this point. The passage from Śhadgurusishya, on which Dr. Goldstücker and Prof. Müller rely, is set out in the work of the latter. As far as it is material to the present matter it runs as follows:||

140 After what has been said in the text of the foregoing essay, Prof Weber will probably withdraw his dogmatical assertion, that the Mrichchhakatika was composed before Krishna-worship came into prevalence 141 pp. 54 and 235.
142 p 80.
143 p 238.
144 p 235.
And his rendering of this passage is as follows. He composed "the sūtras of the Vājins; the Upagrantha of the Sāma Veda, the ślokas of the Smriti (the Karmaprādīpa)" Bhrājamanāna is, of course, not translated by Prof. Muller, as he pronounces it to be unintelligible. But it will be observed, that the Karmaprādīpa, which Prof. Muller interpolates in his translation, is not in the original of Shaḍguruśishya. Nor, I submit, can it be understood to have been referred to by Shaḍguruśishya, if the words of that writer are properly interpreted. I think भ्राजमानाम is an obvious mislecion for भ्राजनाम; 145 and the meaning of the stanza set out above is as follows—[He was] the author of the Sūtra of the Vājins; the author of the Upagrantha of the Sāma-Veda; the author of a Smriti; and the author of ślokas called Bhrāja. This I take to be the clear meaning of Shaḍguruśishya’s words, after they are freed from what I consider to be an obvious mislection. We know that Kātyāyana wrote ślokas called "Bhrāja" 146 and we know that he is mentioned as an author of a Smriti 147 and also that he is quoted from as such by the Mitāksharā 148 and the Vīramitrodvaya 149 and other Hindu Law Books. This account of Shaḍguruśishya, therefore, as I read it, is quite consistent with our previous knowledge. But upon this interpretation, where is the room for the Karma

145 I call this an “obvious mislecion,” because in the first place, it is so easy to mistake the one reading for the other; and because, secondly, the correction I suggest makes such excellent sense.

146 See Patanjali’s Mahābhāṣya, Introd p 6 with the note thereon of Kaiyata (Benares ed); and Goldstücker’s Pāṇini p 80.

147 Yājñavalkya quoted in Yajñesvar Śastrin’s: Aryavidyāsudhākara p 49.

148 See Bombay ed. Vyavahāra kānda p.73,75, & ca.

149 Calo ed (1815) pp 126,127.
pradīpa, which Professors Müller and Goldstücker refer to? Unless that is the name of Kātyāyana’s Smriti work, or of his “Bhrāja” Ślokas—a sufficiently improbable circumstance, I think—it cannot be regarded as comprehended in the account given by Shadguruśishya. Prof. Müller in one place speaks of a commentary on the Karmapradīpa\textsuperscript{150}. Does that commentary afford any ground for his interpretation?

It would seem to result from this, that the mention of Kātyāyana’s name in connexion with the Karmapradīpa is not warranted by the authorities referred to by Professors Goldstücker and Müller for that connexion. The argument in the text based upon it will, therefore, also have to be looked into, when more trustworthy information on the subject becomes available. It is certainly unfortunate, that Professor Müller, who generally takes care to indicate the authorities for his assertions in accordance with the very proper practice of modern writers, should have allowed this interpolation to appear in his work, without the sanction of any authority whatever. As it is, I certainly cannot understand how that name—Karmapradīpa—came in at all. Even the misunderstanding of Shadguruśishya’s words, which I have endeavoured to make clear above, is not enough to account for it.

---

APPENDIX D.

Professor Weber has pointed out, following, as he says, other writers, that Vālmīki is not perfectly at home in the geography of the Deccan,\textsuperscript{151} On the contrary, as remarked by Professor Bhāṇḍārkar

\textsuperscript{150} Anc. Sans Lit, p 201, note.
\textsuperscript{151} P 180.
in the course of his observations on the foregoing paper, his describing the inhabitants of the southern regions as monkeys or apes is an indication that he knew almost nothing about them. On the other hand we have indications in Patanjali’s Mahâbhâshya and Asoka’s inscriptions, that they knew some of these provinces of the south. Patanjali knows Chola\textsuperscript{152} which is identified with Coromandel—and he knows Kerala\textsuperscript{153} corresponding with Malabar and part of the Mysore dominions. Indeed Chola occurs in a Vârtika which is of course older than Patanjali’s time. (Patanjali also knows Sumha,\textsuperscript{154} which is still the name of Siam.) He is also aware of a city named Kânchipura\textsuperscript{155}—which is identified with the modern Conjeeveram south of Madras. Now this seems to show a good deal of progress in the geography of the southern regions of India, while Vâlmîki’s knowledge of it may be safely pronounced to be of the vaguest—if nothing worse. What is the inference from this comparison?

I am aware, that an attempt has been made to repudiate this identity of Chola, Kerala &c. with these provinces in the south of India. Those names are mentioned in one of Asoka’s inscriptions—and Professor Wilson, in commenting upon that inscription, says, that Chola and Kerala may probably turn out to be names of provinces in the north; because, forsooth, they occur in a gâṇa to one of Pânini’s Sûtras in combination with others designating countries or peoples in the North West.\textsuperscript{156} But this is hardly anything like a sufficient reason for such pyrrhonism.

\textsuperscript{152} Under Pânini IV, 1,175 and Elphinstone’s India 5th ed p 239.
\textsuperscript{153} Under Pânini IV, 1,175 and Elphinstone 239.
\textsuperscript{154} Under Pânini IV, 2,52 and see Raghuvanša IV 35.
\textsuperscript{155} Under Pân. IV, I, 112, and Elphinstone p 239.
\textsuperscript{156} See 2 Prinsep’s Essays by Thomas p 17.
There is, on the contrary, something to show that it is groundless. In the first place, the names are still current—and upon that, it clearly must be taken for granted, until inconsistent circumstances are brought to light, that the regions which bear the names now were the regions which bore the names in former times. Furthermore, it is remarkable, that with the two exceptions of Śaka and Chola, all the names referred to by Professor Wilson—namely Kāmboja, Yavana, Muralā, Kerala, Tāmrāparṇī, occur in the fourth Canto of Kālidāsa’s Rāghuvanaśa. And they lodge an emphatic protest against this scepticism. Whereas the first two are mentioned in connexion with the Northern Provinces, the last four are all spoken of in connexion with the victories of Rāghu in the Southern regions. And surely when we find names used in our own time of certain parts of the country identical with their names in the time of Kālidāsa, we should require some strong proof, and not content ourselves with light conjecture, to show that in earlier times—in the times of Patanjali or Aśoka—those, names stood for very different places. To do otherwise would be adopting the philosophy of foregone conclusions, and that carried too far. See too Daṇḍin’s Kāvyādāraḥ p 435; Kādambarī p 176—where Andhra, Dravīḍa and Simhala are spoken of together.

APPENDIX E.

Bābu Rājendralāla Mitra’s paper on the so-called Dasyus of Sānchī gives a summary of a story related in the Janaka Jāṭaka, which is very

157 See stanzas 69, 61, 55, 54, 50. Note that in Kālidāsa Tāmrāparṇī is the name of a river on the continent of India.

158 Indian Antiquary p 38 et seq.
similar to the story about the curse of Dāsaratha related in the Rāmāyāna. Now it is remarkable, that the line of argument which Prof. Weber adopts in determining the relation of the Dāsaratha Jātaka and the Rāmāyāna applies mutatis mutandis to the relation of the Rāmāyāna and this Jānaka Jātaka. Thus we may, I think, correctly lay down the following propositions. "Leaving out of view many minor particulars, the main points of difference are these. 1 That the king shoots his arrow with the intention of hitting an unseen elephant not in order to ascertain whether the person he sees is a nymph or not; 2 That the blind parents do not at once recognize the steps of the king to be those of a person different from their son; 3 That the wounded boy immediately dies and ascends to Heaven; and consequently, 4, That the Satya Kiriyās, the resurrection, and the lecture to the king, are entirely wanting! Now suppose, that after setting forth these points of difference, any one says, that the story in the Rāmāyāna "bears so plainly the impress of a higher antiquity, that it cannot well be doubted that it belongs to an earlier age." Upon this supposition, I should like to know how Professor Weber and those who think with him would answer this person. I need scarcely say, that I do not maintain this ground at all. I only put the case. I put it as an argumentum ad hominem—to Professor Weber and his school. And I ask, whether the reasoning which led them to the conclusion that the Dāsaratha Jātaka was the stalk which Vālmīki nourished up into his well—developed Rāmāyāna might not lead them similarly to this other conclusion that.

159 Rāmāyāna Ayodhyākānda (Bomb ed) LXIII. 22 et seq.

160 See Indian Antiquary p 120 for the original remarks of Prof. Weber which are here reproduced with modifications,
the Janaka Jātaka was developed out of the story of Vālmīki. And if that conclusion may be drawn, I ask this further question—are we prepared to accept the result? The position, it will be observed, becomes just this. Vālmīki borrows from the Buddhists and from Homer, and gives us his Rāmāyāna. The Buddhists borrow from the Rāmāyāna, and give us their Janaka Jātaka. Whether that will fit into the received facts of Buddhistic literary chronology, I do not know. But this I do know, that it will not quadrat with everybody's notions of the probable.

APPENDIX F.

I have been lately looking into the Homeric story as presented in an English dress in the first two volumes of that excellent series—the Ancient classics for English readers. And with reference to the remarks made in several places by the learned author of those two volumes—who, it is clear, is not particularly fond of theorising and conjecturing—I may, perhaps, be allowed to suggest, that after all, even as between Greek and Hindu, the latter may yet prove to be the lender, not the borrower. Thus it is admitted, that additions may have been made from time to time to Homer's original work. It is more than suspected, that the Greek race and religion had an Eastern origin. It is contended that a number of circumstances betray the eastern birth of the Homeric legend. It is suggested that Homer may have travelled to some Eastern city. In the light of these circumstances, is it not

161 Iliad pp 4, 5.
162 Do p 37.
163 Do p 116 and compare Odyssey p 33.
164 Odyssey 33.
worth considering, whether anybody is justified in taking it as a mere matter of course, that Homer's work should be entirely Greek and unborrowed, while all works bearing a similarity to his work should be copied from him. The suggestion I have thrown out above will, I dare say, jar harshly on some ears. I do not put it forward, however, with anything like confidence. All I say is, that a point like this shall not be taken for granted as against Välmíki. The view I prefer I have already expressed in the foregoing pages.165 And against the "analogies" noticed by Prof. Weber, he ought, I think, also to consider the more numerous "analogies" between Homer and the Bible which are pointed out by Mr. Lucas Collins in his volume on the Odyssey.166

165 I observe in the volume on Aristophanes in the series of Ancient Classics for English Readers, that the learned author of it mentions a story related by Ælian about the "Clouds" of Aristophanes, and adds that it "has been long refuted." This Ælian, I suppose, is the same as the Ælian whom Professor Weber has cited as one of his authorities about the story of an Indian translation of Homer. 166 P 128 et seq.
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