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HISTORICAL SKETCH OF THE HILL FORTRESS OF PĀWĀGADH, IN GUJĀRĀT, &c.

BY MAJOR J. W. WATSON.

GUJĀRĀT in former times included a considerable portion of what is now called Rājputānā.—Ābū, Sirohi, Dungarpur, and even Nāgor, being included in its limits; towards the south it comprised Sultānpūr and Nandūrār, now part of Khāndes̲h̲; while the sea-coast as far as and including Bombay formed part of its dominion. It included many first-class fortresses, amongst which the most famous were those of Junāgadh-Girmār in Sorath, Achalagāth on Mount Ābu, Idrār in the Mahi Kāṭhā, and the subject of the present sketch. Of all these, that of Pāwāgadh was incomparably the strongest, so much so as to have been impregnable in latter times except by famine. I distinguish between latter times and the times when it was ruled by the Khīchī Chohāns, because under these last-mentioned chiefs Pāwāgadh fortress hardly included the almost impregnable summit, and it is doubtful whether before the Muhammadan times buildings of any consequence existed there. In fact under its Chohān rulers the fortress occupied that lower portion of the hill commencing at the Burī Darwāzā and ending with the palace of Pātāi Rāwāl (as he is fondly called), which lies on an isolated portion of the hill some 1500 feet below the summit. And when we read of the siege of Pāwāgadh by Mahmūd Begdāhā, we must disbelieve our minds of any idea that the upper plateau was invested,—for it was in those days probably not even fortified, being defended, if at all, by a gate only. And it is under these circumstances alone that we can fully realize the conditions of the siege by Mahmūd Begdāhā, which otherwise would be incomprehensible, for no breach could be made in the stubborn rock, nor could guns be got into position; nor, if breaches be dismissed as out of the question, would it have been possible to escalade the place, save under circumstances which would imply the grossest negligence on the part of the garrison.

The earliest mention of Pāwāgadh is that of the time of Bhīm Deva I., of Ānihilūdā, quoted from the bard Chānḍ by Mr. Kinloch Forbes at pp. 95 and 97 of the Rūd Mālā, vol. 1. There Rām Gaur the Tārī is styled ‘Pāwā’s lord.’ The first authentic account, however, that we find of it is that, after the taking of Ranthāmbhīr and Gadh Gāgrān in Khīcjiwādā by the army of Sultān Alau’d-dīn Khīlji, a large body of the Chohāns emigrated to Gujārāt, and soon, whether by marriage or conquest, became the lords of Pāwāgadh and Chāmpānhrī and the surrounding country. The hill itself is called in the local Māhātmya, Pāwakhaṭal, and this name is preserved in an inscription found at Nāhāāī Umarwān under Hālōl, which is valuable as furnishing the genealogy of the Chohān rulers antecedent to the chief from whom Mahmūd Begdāhā conquered it. This chief is styled in the Mirāt-i-Sikandār, one of the most accurate of the Persian histories of Gujārāt, Jēśīngāh
son of Gangadáśa, and the inscription in question attests the accuracy of the Muhammadan historians, and it may probably be conceded that now no reasonable doubt exists but that this was his correct name. The name by which he is familiarly known throughout Gujarát, viz. Pátálí Bálval, is probably merely a contraction of Páwápati Bálval, or the Bálval lord of Páwá; and this view receives confirmation from the fact that Chohán's of this race, if asked their tribe, will tell you they are Páwápati, which name, indeed, has since the fall of Páwágaúdh become the common name of their branch of the Khichi Choháns. The inscription is as follows:

॥ स्वस्तिः संवत् १५२५ वेष्ठ माघवदाहिष्ठी बाली अनुसरणात्मों अव्यक्ती श्रीपामपणे नागराजप्रभासी नारायणसिद्धव निवर्तने श्रीप्रथिभारसुभाष चुहुअण्डोप्रेष राअको हर्षा कुमारिक रायकी हम्मरेद्वकुले राजा श्रीरामदेव श्री चांद्रदेव श्री चांद्रिगदेव श्रीभि (words wanting, probably न) मदन श्रीरामजी सिती अहिंकार श्रीहुरुराज श्रीङ्गराजको श्रीस्वात्राम श्रीस्वरदेव श्रीविक भुज श्रीगंगासिर नसुत पुर्युहोके हर्षागार श्रीसत्किरकानिय सुखप्रमुखदेवनकाणि विनाशान दाताधाराकिनी रानाराजाधिराज श्रीजाग्नित सेतुदेव अर्जुनो आर्क्तियामुं यांमविनिज्ञानी अस्वधामस्वरूप राज्याधिराज श्रीजाग्नि (words wanting) श्री राक्षसतुल (words wanting) श्रीमान युक्त स्मारिनी।

“Hail! In the Sávat year 1525, on the 8th day of the dark half of Mákgh, on Saturday in the Anurádhá nakshatrad, on this day, here in the fortunate fortress of Pá wā t, during the victorious reign of Maharája Śrī Jayasíngha Deva. Many rásjas have ruled of the race of Śrī Príthvirája, the chief Chohá. In the family of Rásji Hamíradeva, the ornament of his race, was Bágají Rámadeva, (then followed) Śrī Chángdeva, (then) Śrī Cháchingdeva, Śrī Somamdeva, Śrī Pálhansingha, Śrī Jítkarán, Śrī Kumpu Páwá, Śrī Viradhval Śrī Savaráj, Śrī Rághava-deva, Śrī Trímbak Bhuapa, Śrī Gagá Rájeśvára: his son, renowned for increasing the religious merit of his ancestors, the worshipper of the Śrī Śakti, the daily bestower of both cows and gold, and giver of annuities and elephanta to Bráhmá, the illustrious king of kings Śrī Jayasíngha Deva; he built this well for the spiritual benefit of his mother, Śrī Pámadévi, in the village of Ayásiámanu [words wanting]. May it remain for ever! [words wanting] Mehtá Dholuk Modáni [words wanting].”

The Príthvirája above mentioned is probably Príthvirája, the famous hero of the Príthvirája Rádsan, and Hamíradeva may probably be the celebrated Hamíradeva of Rántambhór, which fortress was conquered by Alu ád-dín Khíjí in about a.d. 1300. This inscription is dated a.d. 1469, or about fifteen years prior to the conquest of Chámpáner and Páwágaúdh by Mahámd Bégádá. The father of Jayasíngha is called Gagá Rájeśvára, who evidently corresponds to the Gangadáśa of the Mirát-i-Sikandári, as doos Trímbak Bhuapa to his ancestor Trímbakdási mentioned by the Mirát-i-Sikandári. The Tabáktá-i-Akkári alludes to a Vir Singha who reigned at Chámpáner in the reign of Ahmád Sháh. This would probably be Viradhval, and the reigns of Savaráj and Rághavadéva may have been short. This explanation would make the list of kings here given exactly correspond to what we hear of these chiefs in the Persian historians, and it connects the chiefs of Chótá Udayápá and Bárirá not only with Hamíradeva of Rántambhór, but also with the celebrated Príthvirája, of whom Hamíradeva was an acknowledged descendant. The name of Jayasíngha’s mother is put Pámadévi, but probably is Kámadévi. The Śrī Śakti mentioned in the inscription alludes doubtless to the shrine of Kálká, which crowns the summit of the loftiest pinnacle of Páwakachal. The fortress, too, is styled after the hill, Páwak Durg. But it must not for a moment be supposed that the fortress taken by Mahámd was that now called Páwágaúd on the summit of the hill; and, as previously mentioned, that portion of the hill was probably defended by a single gateway, and was only used as a retreat on an emergency. The palace of the chief is still the Bombay Civil Service, that in some Maráthá inscriptions of the same period one of the chief archaism is the cutting of k like ph.
shown on an abutting spur of the hill scarped by rocks at least a thousand feet in height, and only accessible by a narrow neck from the main mass of the hill. Here are the remains of the palace from which the devoted garrison watched the construction of the Jamā’ Masjid at Chāmpāner, and here it was that Jayasingh himself and his minister fell wounded into the hands of the Gujarāt Sultān’s army; neither he nor his minister would seem to have ever gone to the modern Pāwāgad at all. Both the Mirāt-i-Sikandīr and the Tabakāt give a very interesting account of the siege by Mahmūd.

But this was not the first time Chāmpāner and Pāwāgad had been besieged by the banners of Islām. In A.H. 821, according to the Tabakāt-i-Akhbarī and Mirāt-i-Sikandīr, Ahmad Shāh unsuccessfully besieged the fortress. Ferištah places this siege in A.H. 822. In A.H. 823 according to the Tabakāt-i-Akhbarī, and A.H. 855 according to the Mirāt-i-Sikandīr, Sultān Muhammad Shāh, son of Ahmad Shāh, besieged the fortress, and invested it so closely that the garrison, had they not been relieved by a diversion made in their favour by the Sultān of Mālāwā, Sultān Mahmūd Khiťi, which caused the king of Gujarāt to raise the siege, might have been reduced to extremities. The Mālāwā Sultāns appear always to have been allies of the Rāwals of Chāmpāner until the time of the bigot Ghiyāsh al-dīn, who, though appealed to for help by Jayasingh in his extremity, through fear or bigotry neglected to aid him. It is clear that the fortress of Pāwāgad, as it was in the time of the Rāwals of Chāmpāner, though proof against a sudden attack, was not calculated to stand a long siege by a superior force, and when an enemy once got a footing on the hill they could easily dominate the fortress and render it untenable; and, indeed, as will be seen hereafter, this is what eventually happened. After the conquest of the Gīrānār fortress and Junāgaḍh, Sultān Mahmūd Begāḍhā was always determined to conquer Chāmpāner, and though the conquest of Dāwārā, and the suppression of the disturbances created by the Jats and other turbulent tribes in Kachh and on the Sindh frontier, and other warlike operations, delayed him for some years, yet eventually he found no difficulty in picking a quarrel with Jaya-
singh, because in A.H. 887, during which year there was a scarcity in Gujarāt owing to a small fall of rain, Malik Asad, the Thānsādīr of Morāmli under the Sultān, having made a foray into Chāmpāner territor, was attacked, defeated, and slain by Rāwāl Jayasingh, and two elephants and all his baggage also fell into the Chāmpāner chieftain’s hands. Although the Rāwāl had acted strictly in self-defence, and although the foray into his territory by Malik Asad was wholly unjustifiable, the Sultān was exceedingly enraged and determined to conquer Chāmpāner, and collecting a powerful army he advanced to Baroda. On hearing of the Sultān’s arrival at Baroda the Rāwāl became seriously alarmed, and sent ambassadors with most submissive messages and humble apologies, but the Sultān refused to listen to any overtures for peace, saying to the ambassadors, according to the Mirāt-i-Sikandīr, “Except the sword and the dagger, no other message should pass between me and you.” The Tabakāt-i-Akhbarī represents him saying, “The sword of adamant will answer your message to-morrow.” The Sultān then sent in advance Tāj Khān, Azīn-ul-Mulk, Bahārm Khān, and Ikhtiyār Khān, and there were daily conflicts between the besieged and the army commanded by these nobles. Shortly afterwards the Sultān himself moved his camp to the vicinity of Chāmpāner and pressed the siege. After the siege had lasted about a year the Rāwāl again made overtures of peace, offering to pay nine māns (or 360 lbs.) of gold if the siege were raised, but the Sultān declared that he would not leave the place until the fortress was conquered. The Rāwāl now, seeing that no submission would avail him, sent his vakil to Sultān Ghiyāsh al-dīn of Mālāwā, imploring aid, and promising to pay one lākh of fantōs for every march made to his aid by the Mālāwā army. Sultān Ghiyāsh al-dīn at once marched from Mandu to Nāchah, a few kos distant from his capital, and purposed advancing on Chāmpāner vid Dohad. As soon as the Gujarāt monarch got news of his intention, he entrusted the conduct of the siege to his nobles, and himself advanced to Dohad to oppose Sultān Ghiyāsh al-dīn. The Mālāwā Sultān, however, alarmed at his advance, consulted the Muham-
madan priests as to whether it were lawful for him to succour an infidel when attacked by a true believer, and on their replying in the negative he returned to Mându without striking a blow in defence of Chàmpâner. Súltán Maḥmûd now returned to Chàmpâner and laid the foundations of the Jâmâ Mosque, to show the besieged that not only was their hope of aid from Málwâ gone, but that until the fortress was conquered he would never depart. In spite of this, and though the garrison must have known that their surrender was now merely a matter of time, owing to the difficulty of introducing fresh supplies of provisions into the fortress, the Ráwal continued gallantly to defend the place. At last the approaches came so near the walls that the soldiers of the approach, presided over by the Súltán in person, were able to overlook the walls and see what the garrison were doing. This statement, which is taken from the Tabakât-i-Akbâri, distinctly shows that it is not the upper fortress that is here alluded to,—that fortress being surrounded on all sides by a scarp which is nowhere, save at the gate, much lower than two hundred feet of sheer rock; whereas near the ruins of the Ráwal’s palace on the lower spur it is quite possible that approaches might have been constructed which would overlook the defences. The soldiers observed that in the early morning the defenders were wont to disperse, to obey calls of nature and for other reasons, and that consequently at that time the batteries were badly manned. The siege had now lasted about two years, and, as the Súltán was exceedingly anxious to obtain possession of the place, he directed Kiwâmû-l-Mulk to scale the fort next day at dawn. Kiwâmû-l-Mulk accordingly, with a body of picked men, entered the fort when the garrison were off their guard, attacked the Rájputs, and after much slaughter drove them within the citadel. The Ráwal and his Rájputs now prepared the jashâr, or funeral pile, and continued to defend themselves. But during the previous cannonade several breaches had been made in the western face of the fortifications, and Malik Ayâz Súltâni, mounting one of these, suddenly arrived over the big gate. Súltán Maḥmûd, observing this from his post, sent strong reinforcements. The Rájputs vainly tried to dislodge Malik Ayâz and his men from their position over the gate, by throwing there a large canister of powder with a slow match attached to it. This, however, was, fortunately for the assailants, blown off the gate by the wind in the direction of the Ráwal’s palace, and there harmlessly exploded. It was now too late for any further advance, but the whole of the Muhammadan army remained under arms all night, while the Rájputs, lighting the jashâr, burned all their wives and children. They then separated into two bodies, a few hundreds flying to the upper fortress (Pâwâgaḍh), while seven hundred Rájputs, bathing, determined to conquer or die. In the morning the gate was forced open, and a great slaughter ensued of the gallant defenders, and both the Ráwal and his minister Dungârshi fell wounded into the hands of the Súltán, who handed them over to Múhâz Khân in order that their wounds might be dressed. It is said that when Ráwal Jayasingh was brought wounded into the Súltán’s presence he refused to do him obeisance, though urged to do so by his guards. This happened on the 2nd of Zîlkâd in the year 889, and on this day the Súltán named Chàmpâner Mûhammád ábâd. Three days after this the Rájputs who had fled to the upper fortress, being probably ill provided with provisions as well as demoralized by their defeat, surrendered.

Five or six months afterwards, in the year 890, when the Ráwal’s wounds were healed, he was sent for to the Súltán’s presence and ordered to embrace Islam, and on his refusal was slain, together with his minister Dungârshi. Ráwal Jayasingh had two, if not three, sons. One of these, Râisinghji, who died before the siege of Chàmpâner, left two sons, Prîthvirâja and Dungârji, the founders of the houses of Chàtâ Udâyapura and Bâriâ respectively. Another son, Liimbâji, is said (vide Bombay Government Selections, No. XXIII., New Series, note p. 146) to have emigrated to Sarsodia (wherever that may be), and the third embraced Islamism. The Mirâj-i-Sikander only mentions two daughters and one son, and says that the daughters were sent to the Súltán’s barins, and that the son was made a Muhammadan and entrusted to Saiû-l-Mulk to educate, who brought him up, and in the reign of Súltán Muzaffár, son of Maḥmûd, this youth was ennobled by the title of Nîzâmû-l-Mulk. The Súltán now, making Mûhâm mâdâbâd Chàmpâner his capital, built the fortifications of the town called Jahân Páníh, and con
structed numerous noble buildings. He further strengthened the fortress on the hill, both the lower and upper forts, and made them what they are, viz. almost impregnable.

The author of the Mirat-i-Sikandri is most eloquent in praise of the different kinds of fruit grown at Champánar, and especially of the mangoes, which appear to have been as famous in their time as those of Bombay in ours. But after the reign of Sultan Bahádúr, Champánar seems to have been not only relinquished as a capital, but to have rapidly become wholly deserted: for the same author, writing in Akbar's time, describes it as being then even quite waste. After a long description of the various fruits and flowers grown there, he says: "They say that, besides fruit trees and flowers such as caused envy, there was so much sandal to be found in the neighbourhood of Champánar that it was used by the inhabitants in building their houses, and it sufficed them. O Purity of God! Is it that this Champánar which now is the lair of the tiger and lion? Its buildings have fallen into ruin, its inhabitants have given their property to the wind of destruction, its water is as it were poisoned water, and the climate is such that it rapidly enfeebles the human body, and in the place of each flower thorns are growing, and in place of each garden there is a dense interlaced jungle, and there is neither the name nor trace of sandal trees. However, the truth of this verse has been here shown.

'Everything on the earth shall perish,
And God does what He willeth.'"

The same author describes the introduction of fountains into Gujarat by a Khurásání, and the laying out by him of a garden with fountains, artificial waterfalls, &c., with which the Sultan was very pleased. It seems that this man, anxious to keep the secret of his fountains unknown, employed only ignorant labourers, and would not allow any one to inspect the work while in progress. A carpenter of Champánar determined to discover the secret, disguised himself as a labourer, and discovered how to make them. He then laid out a still finer garden, which pleased the Sultan even more than the first one, and on inquiring from the carpenter how he had learned the art of constructing fountains, the Sultan was so pleased at his recital of the stratagem he had practised, that he bestowed on him large presents and a dress of honour. The writer goes on to say: "And that garden is well known and famous, and by the natives of Gujrat this garden is called Hálol." Afterwards a village sprang up near this garden, which gradually grew into a town, and close to this town the unfortunate Sikandar Sháh and his equally ill-fated brother Latif Khán lie buried. It seems singular that, while the once proud capital of Gujrat lies waste, the little village which sprang up near the carpenter's garden is still a flourishing town.

Champánar remained, as mentioned above, the capital of Gujrat till the close of the reign of Bahádúr Sháh, after which Aḥmad ā bād resumed its former position and importance, which it has ever since retained.

Since its capture by Mahmúd, Champánar, as well as Páwágadh, was so strongly fortified that the upper fortress both was and is almost impregnable; nevertheless, whenever it has since been besieged, it has invariably fallen, strange to say, with scarcely any resistance.

The Mirat-i-Sikandri gives an animated description of the next siege of Champánar and Páwágadh in A.H. 942 (A.D. 1535), when Humáyún after defeating the Sultan Bahádúr near Mandur chased him to Mandu, and after capturing that fortress pursued him to Champánar, whence Sultan Bahádúr fled to Kambhát, and thence to Div. Humáyún followed the Sultan to Champánar, where he gave up the lower town to pillage, and then pursued him to Khambhát, but failing to overtake him returned to prosecute the siege of this fortress, which contained all the treasure of the Ahmadábad kings. The fortress, however, which was commanded by Rújá Narsingh Deva and Ikhtiyár Khán on behalf of the Sultan, held out gallantly. An enormous cannon, called the Bahádúr Sháhi, the garrison were unable, on account of its weight and size, to take up to the fort, and they had only got it up halfway when Humáyún's army arrived; they therefore drilled three holes in it and left it where it was. When Rúmi Khán, who, deserting Bahádúr Sháh, had now taken service with his enemy Humáyún, saw the cannon, he said he could repair it, and did so by pouring into the holes a mixture of several metals; and though now it took a little less charge of powder, and the range was somewhat diminished, it was still a very formidable weapon. Regarding this
the author of the Mirat-i-Sikandri thus expresses himself:—"They say that the very first shot that Râmi Khán fired with it cast down the gate of the fortress, and with the second shot he rooted up a great tree which was near the gate. In the mean time the garrison, seeing this, began to tremble. Now there was a Faringhâb in the fortress, by name Saktâ, who had been a Musalmân by Sultan Bahâdur with the title of Farang Khân. He said to Ikhtiyâr Khân, ‘Since matters are thus, shall I fire a ball down the muzzle of that cannon?’ Ikhtiyâr Khân said, ‘If you can do what you say, I will enrich you beyond your wants.’ The Faringhâb at the first shot so struck that cannon that he broke it into pieces, and the garrison were delighted. Ikhtiyâr Khân, however, gave him but a small recompense, but Râja Narsingh Deva gave him seven mans of gold.”

After this reverse Humâyûn was unable to make any impression on the fortress. Râja Narsingh Deva, however, shortly after this event died of his wounds, and, as he was the soul of the defence, the ardour of the garrison somewhat abated. But the natural strength of the fortress defied Humâyûn’s utmost efforts. This strength has only to be seen to be appreciated, and so great is it that the following extract from the Mirat-i-Sikandri is scarcely an exaggeration:—"It is related that one of God’s servants named Sayyad Jalâl, who had also the title of Mâmâvaru’l-Mulk Bakhârî, often used to say that the fortress of Châmpâner is such that if an old woman were but to hurl a stone from the top of the fort, all the men in the world could not continue the siege; wonderful was the good fortune of Humâyûn Bâdshâh that so strong a fortress was so easily conquered.”

The way in which the fortress was eventually conquered was this. The garrison, though they had, it is said, supplies of grain sufficient to last them for ten years, nevertheless one night sent down two hundred Kolls to bring up further supplies. These Kolls, incasiously going too near one of the outposts of the army, were captured and brought before Humâyûn, who ordered them to be put to death one after another. When seventy or eighty of them had been thus killed, one of the survivors said that if his life were spared, he would show the besiegers a road whereby to ascend the fortress, which was not only unknown to the army of Humâyûn, but of which the garrison even were ignorant. The Emperor that very night sent some picked men under the guardianship of these Kolls, who were as good as their word, and took them by a road whereby they arrived at the foot of the fortress at an unguarded spot, and scaling the rock with some difficulty they climbed over the battlements, and shouting Allah! Allah! furiously attacked the garrison, who were astonished and confounded at this sudden appearance of an enemy who had as it were been dropped from the skies, and in their alarm some threw themselves over the walls of the fort, and some were slain; while others, amongst whom was Ikhtiyâr Khân, fled to the lofty citadel now crowned by Kâlka’s fane, which citadel was in those days called the Ma’uliyâh (so named from the Arabic mauâlah, a lord), because it, so to speak, dominated over the whole interior of the upper fortress. This conquest of the fortress took place on the 7th Safar A.H. 942 (August 1535), and two days afterwards Ikhtiyâr Khân also surrendered.

Eight years after this, viz. in A.H. 950, when Sultân Mahmûd II. became independent of Daryâ Khân’s control, the latter, when expelled from Ahmâdâbâd by the Sultân and Alam Khân, depositing his women and treasure in the Châmpâner fortress, fled to Barhânpur. The command of the fortress was entrusted to one of his devoted followers named Fasûji, who, it is said, made a gallant defence. But the young king, emulating the courage of his great namesake, pressed the siege in person vigorously, and, though several men were slain by his side, he would neither leave the field, nor consent that the royal umbrella, which made him so conspicuous a mark, should be lowered. Such gallant conduct did not fail to make an impression on the garrison, who were out of heart both at fighting against their lawful sovereign, and at seeing that their leader had deserted them and fled to Khândesh. They made, therefore, but a half-hearted resistance, and the fortress was conquered; and Fasûji, who fled to the Mâliyâh citadel, was captured and bound and brought before the Sultân, who sent him to be confined in the fort of Surat.

Afterwards, during the reign of the last Muzafer, when Gujarât was divided among the

§ They climbed the scarp by the aid of iron spikes which they drove into the rock.
nOBLES, CHAMPANER fell to the share of Changez Khan, who for a short time exercised almost kingly power. As soon, however, as that accomplished noble was assassinated by Jhujhuri Khan Habshi, Champâner was seized on by Shâh Mirzâ. Previous to this, Champâner had, during the inglorious reign of Ahmad Shâh II., fallen to the share of Sayad Mubâran, who gave it to Alam Khân, but it remained in their hands only a short time.

When the emperor Akbar conquered Gujarât the Mirzâs were expelled, and Champâner became an imperial possession. Pâwâgâd Gh now received an imperial garrison, and remained in the hands of the house of Timur until A.D. 1727, when Kâsisji, foster-son of Kantâji Kadâm Bande, made a sudden attack upon Champâner, and captured the fortress, the garrison being surprised, and from that time Kantâji’s agents remained permanently in Gujarât to collect his share of the tribute. Afterwards it fell into the hands of Sindhia, by whom it was handed over to the British Government on August 1st, 1858. It had in the mean time been taken, in 1803, from Sindhia by a small British force commanded by Colonel Woodington, but was, however, restored to him in 1804.

Under the Moghal viceroys Champâner formed a separate charge or government (sârkar). The author of the Mirât-i-Ahmâd thus notices it:—

“"The fifth sârkar is that of Champâner, which consists of thirteen mahâlas, and a fortress named Pâwâgâd on the summit of a lofty mountain very rugged, which is nearly four kos in elevation, and in area the fortress is nearly half a kos, and it has several gates, and in one place there is an abyss sixty cubits deep, over which they construct a bridge of planks, and when occasion arises they remove them; they call this the Patidâ pul (‘plank bridge’). And it (the hill) is a pleasant place with green trees, and it has both tanks and springs of water. Sultân Mahmûd Begadhi during his own reign conquered it by force from Râwal Pâtâl, the zamindâr thereof, and building a city which he named Muhammadâbâd at the foot of that hill, he established his capital there, and most of the Gujarât Sultânas made that town their capital, as has been related in the above pages in the history of each of them. The kilaâr of that place is subordinate to the fanjudi of Govitâhrah, and it has fifty sadrs attached to it.”

And in another place I find in the same author the following notice:—”(Mount) Pâwâ is situated in the sârkar of Champâner, and is three kos in height. It has both springs of water and tanks, and there is a stream behind one of the kunda there, and there are trees there both of known and unknown kinds, amongst which are some myrobalan trees. And the fortress is very strong, (and there is a palace for a residence constructed by the old zamindârs,) with twelve gates, and the road is most difficult of access. And near the eighth gate is a yawning abyss, over which they place beams like a bridge, and thus they ascend to the fortress, and when occasion arises they remove them; this place is known as the Patidâ pul.
And the shrine of Bhawâni is on the summit of the rock, and above this temple is the shrine of Sadan Shâh, whom they consider a famous saint.”

There is also this notice of the temple of Kâlki:—”Kàl kà B h a wâ n i ‘s temple is on the summit of Mount Pâwâ, and on the top of that temple is a shrine which is that of Sadan Shâh, one of the people of God (i.e. Muhammedan), and the Brâhmans consider that place one of the chief places of worship, and they tell wonderful stories about it. Large numbers of men come to worship there from places both far and near, and they also pay their respects to the shrine of Sadan Shâh.” This shrine of Sadan Shâh is built on the spire of the temple, the top of which has been removed to make room for the shrine; it was probably done as a concession to Muhammedan fanaticism, and to ensure the protection of the rest of the temple. This temple Kâl does not appear more than two hundred years old, and her old shrine is probably the roughly carved stone smeared with vermillion outside the precincts. The temple is evidently modern, in that it occupies the site of the old citadel, as well as from its style of architecture.

In the upper fort there are the remains of several Jaina temples carved with much spirit, though of no extraordinary excellence. There are the remains of a mosque near the Mâkhâi Haweli, about midway up the hill, formerly the residence of Sindhi’s Thanldâr. In ascending the

|| This bridge is still to be seen, and is still called the Patidâ pul.
hill one first comes to the Meji and the Meji Talao. Here, they say, was a palace called the Meji; and here, as everywhere, were fortifications. Then further up comes the Burji Darwâzâ and the principal fortifications, very strong, and with a terrible ascent for troops in the face of a determined enemy. Next, one arrives at the plateau of the Mâchhi Haweli to the right of the gate, and as one issues forth on the ascent of the hill, just before reaching the Mâchhi Haweli, there is a curious sort of palace or summer-house in three stories, called the Champâ Râjânâ Mahâl, which is said to have been the residence of a favourite queen. It was, however, I think, meant for the ladies of the zaman to sit in and witness a grand hunt, as it overlooks a deep valley, and is perfectly secure, while it commands an extensive view. Almost opposite to this is a spring of very good water, called the Pâanch kuÎâ. From this point the hill is covered with lines of fortification defending every practicable spot. From hence one ascends, past the Mâchhi Haweli and a tank near it, to three large domes called the Makâi kotâr, or 'maize granaries,' from here one sees before him the isolated spur with the old ruined palace of Jayasingh Deva. On this spur are the remains of the palace, and covered-in tanks of water, and on the extreme point is a small shrine of Bhadrâ-Kâli (or 'the favourable, propitious Kâli'). From this spur one can form an idea of the difficulty of taking the fortress, even supposing that troops could reach this point, as the whole of this plateau is commanded by the gate and batteries by the Pâtîâ pul; and as there is only one narrow path whereby to ascend, advance would be almost impossible. Even supposing this gate won and the Pâtîâ pul crossed, and another gate close to the main gateway forced, the troops would have to run along a narrow path for about a hundred yards exposed to the full fire of the garrison, to find themselves in front of a strong double gateway. On entering these two gates one faces the great rock on which Kâlkâ sits in state; and on turning to the right, one arrives, after a walk of a few hundred yards, at the domes or kotâris, which overlook a tremendous precipice. Between these domes and this gate, following the fortifications, come tanks of cut stone, and it is evident that water was also stored in other places, and there is still another tank even higher still, at the foot of the stone steps which lead to the Mâtâi's temple.

With a very little trouble, and with but moderate expense, this upper fortress might be transformed into a very comfortable sanitarium; all that is wanted is the repair of, and additions to, the beautiful domes now standing. Already one of the lower domes has fallen, and unless the upper domes are speedily repaired they will fall too. Dr. Arnott, in 1839, reported on the advantages of the spot; and during the past year Lieutenant Gibbs, R.E., of the Great Trigonometrical Survey, specially reported on the subject to the officer commanding at Baroda, in a very interesting report.

Were the fortifications repaired the cost would of course be greater, but it would be a healthy spot, and one of the strongest fortresses in India. The only disadvantage that the place possesses as a sanitarium is that the wind is so violent in the hot weather that no buildings other than domes could stand it unless very strongly constructed. Colonel Wallace, when Resident of Baroda, once built a small bungalow on the hill, but it has long since had its roof blown away into the Birir jungles, and even the walls are considerably out of the perpendicular; but if Government were to build verandahs to the domes, and one or two cut-houses, and improve the water supply, the residents of Baroda would doubtless gladly pay a small rent for the occupation of the domes during the hot season.

In the Chohân annals Pâwâgadh occupied a prominent place. Their principal hero is, of course, Prithirâja of Delhi, then Hamiradeva of Ranthambhor, then Pâtâi Râwal of Pâwâgadh, Kânaâ Deva of Songadh Jhâlao, and Achâ Jâoâ of Gâgrawn. The more famous of these will be found mentioned in the verses quoted at p. 99, vol. III. of the Indian Antiquary. It will be observed that of the five Râjput heroes therein praised three were Chohâns, viz. Hamiradeva of Ranthambhor, Patal (poetical license for Pâtâi, the name by which Râwal Jayasingh of Pâwâgadh is usually known), and Kânaâ Deva, the Songadhâ Chohân of Jhâlao. Of the remaining two, Chunjâo Ráo is poetical license for Râo Chonâ, the Râthôj ances- tor of the present Chief of Jodhpur, and

* There were formerly verandahs, now fallen down.
FURTHER VALABHI GRANTS.

BY G. BÜHLE.

(Continued from vol. V. p. 312.)

The first of the three Valabhi grants now published was found in the ruins of Valabhi by Koisi who dug for old bricks. I acquired it in January 1875. The second was found at Botad, in the Bhanagar territory. It was kindly forwarded to me for deciphering by Messrs. Percival and Gaurishankar Ozha, the Joint Administrators of the Bhanagar State. The third grant was found by Mr. Raoji Vithal, formerly special Political Assistant in charge of Lunavada (Revakunfta), in the Bijas’ palace at Luṇāvāda. I owe its loan to the kindness of Major J. W. Watson, Acting Political Agent, Revakunfta.

A.—The Grant of Dharasena I.

The grant of Dharasena I. is written on two plates 9½ inches by 10½. The rings with the seal have been forcibly half torn half cut out, whereby semicircular pieces of the surface of the lower portion of the first and of the upper portion of the second plate, originally situated round the left-hand ring, have been lost. This accident makes some letters in the first lines of the second plate very faint and indistinct. They can just be traced with a strong glass. The second plate has also lost a piece lower down on the right-hand side. Both plates were covered, when I bought them, with thick layers of sand and verdigris. A prolonged immersion in lime-juice cleaned them. But the first plate is nevertheless not easily readable, and is unsuited for photography. The second gives a tolerable photograph.

The letters of the plates show a predilection for round forms like those of Guhasena, and resemble the latter in their thinness. The grant is dated from a ‘camp of victory,’ the location of which is not certain, as the name of the village appears to be mutilated. The beginning of the name is Bhadropatta.

The varśavati gives the usual list of rulers from Bhātārka to Dharasena I., the son of Guhasena. It offers only one addition to our knowledge of the history of Valabhi. Dharasena I. calls himself (Pl. II. I. 1) mahāsamaṇa, ‘the great feudal or provincial chief,’ as well as ‘mahārāja,’ and shows thereby that down to his times the rulers of Valabhi paid homage to a lord paramount. In my article on the grant of Dhrusasena I. of Sahaat 216, I pointed out that this mahārāja was certainly a vassal of some greater king, and that Dronasīmbha’s boasted coronation had not raised him much above that position which his predecessors, the two Señatotis or generals, occupied. Dhrasena’s confession confirms my view about Drusasena I., and permits the inference that his grandfather Dharapatta and his father Guhasena likewise did not enjoy independence. I will now express my belief that eventually we shall find it proved that the Valabhi dynasty was at no period free from vassalage, except perhaps during the reign of Dharasena IV., who calls himself ‘king of kings, chakravartin, emperor, and supreme lord.’

I should not wonder if further finds of inscriptions, and further investigations regarding the position of the villages granted by ‘those of Valabhi,’ entirely destroyed the legend of the power and greatness of the kingdom, which, first started by Colonel Tod, has since been adopted by most Indian historians and antiquarians.

The grantee is the ‘monastery called that of Śrī Bappapada, which had been built by the Āchāryya Bhadanta Sthiramati, and was situated in Valabhi.’ (Pl. II. lines 3 and 4.) There can be, I think, no doubt that this vihāra is the one which Hwen Thsaang ascribes to the Arhat ‘Ocho-lo. His remarks on this monastery are as follows: (Mémoires, vol. II. p. 164):—‘At a little distance from the town (Valabhi) there is a great convent which was erected in olden times by Arhat ‘Ocho-lo. It is there that the Bodhisattvas Guṇamatī and Sthiramati fixed their abode, and
composed various treatises which have become famous and widely known.

The Sthiranati mentioned in our grants and by Hiuen Tsang is, no doubt, the famous pupil of Vasubandhu, who composed commentaries on the writings of his master.*

The objects granted are two villages,—Mahavrasena, in the dharani of Hastavara, and Devabhadrapali in the dhalit of Dharmikatha (pl. II. l. 3). 'Hastavara' occurs in the grant of Dhrusena I. dated 397† as Hastalokavara, and has been identified with the modern Hatibah, which Colonel Yule has since conjectured to be the Greek Astitkamron. Mahavrasena is probably Mahadavapura, which lies to the south-west of Hatibah. Dharmasena's grant reads distinctly hastavarpdharanyam, and thus confirms my emendation of the reading 'haranyam,' and my statement that 'dharani' must have denoted a territorial division.

The purpose for which the two villages were granted is, as usual, in the case of grants to Buddha monasteries, to defray the cost of the worship of the Divine Buddhas, of clothing, food, and medicine for the revered Bhikshus, and of the repair of the monastery. (Pl. II. l. 4.)

As regards the date of the grant, I now read it as 348 Chaithra, dark half 2. In the interpretation of the second sign I follow Paudji Bhagvanlal, who, in my opinion, has succeeded in clearing up the difficulties regarding the signs for 40-70, with the help of a number of Katharupa coins in his possession.‡

As regards the language of the grant, the incorrect phrase hastavarpdharanyam mahavrasensakagranmo dharcdhoshthalyam ob devabhadrapalikagranmo instead of 'adisesakagranmo and 'pallidakagranmo, shows that the writer habitually spoke Prakrit, and possessed but an imperfect knowledge of Sanskrit grammar.

In conclusion I may add the explanation of the word 'diviria' which occurs in the title of the writer, Skandabhatā, ‘sandhivigrahahirdhiradhikriti-tadivirapatikandhabhateha’ (Pl. II. l. 16.) In the Petersburg Dictionary, which is followed, as usual, by Prof. Monier Williams, diviria is said to be a proper name, and the Rājatarangini, VI. 139, VII. 111, 119, is quoted as the authority.

---

In the first passage the reading Divirat is merely a faulty reading of Mr. Troyer's edition for Divirat, which latter the Calcutta edition and the Sārāmā Mss. give. The other two passages have been badly translated by Mr. Troyer. Otherwise it would have been recognized that a 'divira' must be an official. The first, VII. 111, runs as follows:—

पुरा देवभूमिपुष्करिणी तिलाणिनी।
आपूर्वकायां वेधयानं पुष्करिणी समाियमयम्॥

and the translation should be—

"Formerly a son, called Chandramukha, was born to a Divira called Devamukha by the courtezan Aparikā." The second passage, VII. 119, is, I think, as follows:—

दयू भिषुकू गोमलदुश्चाणिति व मुनिै।
केतिकदेशसमुद्विविविधसमायुः।॥

and the correct translation:—

"Whilst the ministers thus were worthy (of their places), and the king of a forgiving disposition, some Daris, Diviris, and Dāmaras became overbearing." In the land-grants Diviras or Divirapati is always used as a title, especially for the officials who drew up the śāsanas. This position shows also that it denoted the holder of some office. Kashemendra, the author of the Lokapakasa, gives us a clue to the exact meaning of the word. Firstly, in Prakrit III., he speaks of various classes of Diviras, ganjugadiviras, ugaradiviras, gadādiviras, kshadādiviras; and the next word is kāyastha. Secondly, when beginning to give the forms for kānta and other bonds, he says, "I will now propound all written documents according to the lines of each, in their proper order, for the benefit of the Diviras. Hence it becomes evident that these officials had to do with writing and accounts, and we may render the word by the modern 'kārkan,' or writer and accountant. Divirapati Skandabhatā means, therefore, 'Skandabhatā the chief clerk or secretary.' I am not able to find an etymology for the word in Sanskrit. Perhaps it may be connected with the Persian dip, 'writing,' which occurs in the cuneiform inscriptions.

---

* Weisälief, Budhdhasamr, p. 84.
† Ind. Ant. vol. V. p. 394.
‡ A paper which gives the substance of his very remarkable discoveries on the ancient Indian numerals will appear in the next Part of the Indian Antiquary, p. 43.

the surfaces were badly corroded and covered by verdigris, the finder knocked off the upper layers. Fortunately a kernel of sound copper had remained in the centre, in which the strokes of the letters were visible. Nevertheless, when I received the plates, I doubted whether I should ever be able to make out the whole grant. But, when I had filled up all the strokes visible with white paint, I found, to my delight, that the whole was readable except a line or two, which could easily be restored by means of the published plates.

The grant is dated from Valabhi. The samvatvālī offers nothing new. But it ought to be noticed that the grantor, Dhruvavasa II, called also Bālādītya, does not assume the title 'Mahārāja,' and that none of his predecessors receive any epithet but Śrī, 'the illustrious.' It may be that the omission is due to an accident; but, considering the habitual grandiloquence of Indian princes, the case is suspicious, and it would not be surprising if it were found eventually that Dhruvavasa II had some cogent reasons for being silent about his magnificence.

The grantee is (Pl.II.11) "the community of the reverend Bhiṣṣa in dwelling in the monastery erected by Gojha, which was included in the precincts of the monastery built by princess Dūjā, and situated in Valabhi proper." Dūjā and her cīdā are known from the adānas of Dhruvavasa I.† and of Guhasena.‡ If she is here called rājā, literally 'queen,' I presume that the writer means to indicate that she was of royal blood,—not that she was married to a king. For Dhruvavasa I. calls her "my own sister's daughter." I am not quite certain that I have got the exact meaning of valabhiyavatulasannvivishād, literally 'seated on the own surface of Valabhi.' It may mean, as I have rendered it, 'situated in Valabhi proper, i.e. within the walls.' But possibly the compound 'svatasa' may have a technical meaning.

The purpose for which the grant was made is the same as that mentioned in the preceding adāna of Dhruvavasa II.

The object granted is (Pl.II.13) the village Bhasanta in Kālīpaka patha in Surashtra. Kālīpaka patha must be the name of a subdivision of Surashtra. Regarding 'Surashtra' it ought to be noted that the word is always used in the plural, Surāṭkshāḥ, and that it is, therefore, really the name of the people who inhabited the country, just as 'Panchālā,' 'Kamniţā,' &c. The form Surāṭ is probably a corruption of 'Surāṭkshā,' but of 'Surāṭkshā' (mAṇḍala). For Sanskrit as caused by a Taddhita affix is regularly represented by Prakrit o. Rāsāheb Gopālī S. Deoni, Deputy Educational Inspector of Kālīlāvād, suggests to me that Bhasanta is probably the modern Bhasaṇ, a village of the Surashtra Prānt, belonging to the Navāb of Jumāgaṇḍā.

As regards the relation of Surashtra to the kings of Valabhi, Hiwen Thaang also states (Mémoires, vol. II. p. 165) that "this country is subject to the kingdom of Valabhi."

In the date, the year is Sauṃvat 310, and the month Aśvayṇja. Tuesday may be read either 'baha 5, i.e. baha (lapaśha), dark half 5,' or 'ba 15, dark half 15.' For on this plate the letter ha and the sign for 10 bear a very close resemblance.

Plate I.

† Ind. Ant. vol. IV. p. 106.
‡ Ibid. p. 174.
§ 'Puthaka' occurs in the sense of 'mahli' or 'tālukā' on the Chālukya plates of Ashokavāḥ pretty frequently.

† L. 1, read 'mālā
d. L. 2, read 'pālī
d. L. 3, read 'māhā
d. L. 4, read 'raś
d. L. 5, read 'bānā
d.
(२३) सम्प्रभुपुलिकत्वभूषण शाक्तेदीपांक चरितगवर्तीभागापि परमभद्रपक्तरपक्तिकृति[मण्ड:-
(२४) य विनयशांमात्मूणि: समरकात्यपत्ता[कारकमयमकलोद्धाराविचारित:]
Plate II.
(१) मिलाविनि भवद्वाद्यः सन्तुभूमिपरिधुतः कवितामिर्निगणमकलोद्धारित: पुनः
(२) मिलाविनि भवद्वाद्यः रक्षितायात्ञकादेशपत्ता: सचित्रालिभाषित: कवितामिर्निगणमकलोद्धारित: पुनः
(३) सकलारुपानगरिविवशाय निदुस्त्रायात्मूणि पराथः विस्मयाः मूमिनिकता पुष्पकारः
(४) राग्निम्नर[विचित्त: निर्माणी तम्यनुपपन्नः प्रक्रियामिर्निगणमकलोद्धारित: कान्तिमिरिति: सुरालकलापः कृपामिरिति: सब्जुधनः
(५) नायः प्रायप्रमाणत्वभित्तितनामकादेशपत्ता: प्रक्रियामिरिति: परार्थः यात्री: परार्थः
(६) मिलाविनि भवद्वाद्यः रक्षितायात्ञकादेशपत्ता: सचित्रालिभाषित: कवितामिर्निगणमकलोद्धारित: पुनः
(७) सकलारुपानगरिविवशाय निदुस्त्रायात्मूणि पराथः विस्मयाः मूमिनिकता पुष्पकारः
(८) राग्निम्नर[विचित्त: निर्माणी तम्यनुपपन्नः प्रक्रियामिर्निगणमकलोद्धारित: कान्तिमिरिति: सब्जुधनः
(९) मुखज्ञाननारघरिविवशाय निदुस्त्रायात्मूणि पराथः विस्मयाः मूमिनिकता पुष्पकारः
(१०) न न कुपली सुरूनिन्य यात्रीयामानक साधनाप्यथयस्तु वसंबितिः यया यया मातीपिन्नः
(११) वल्लभाव्य: विवाहित्रावती: कृषिकारिविवशाय मंदिराधिकारिविवशाय: विवाहानवाणीय: भुसुधन: यात्री: परार्थः
(१२) नारायणनारघरिविवशाय निदुस्त्रायात्मूणि पराथः विस्मयाः मूमिनिकता पुष्पकारः
(१३) परमशुद्धिकारितितनामकादेशपत्ता: पादमूलमजीवनाय गुरुराधिकारितितनामकादेशपत्ता: भरसंतायाम: सीतादुरुस्तोः
(१४) परिवर्तनारायणरिविवशाय परमशुद्धिकारितितनामकादेशपत्ता: पादमूलमजीवनाय गुरुराधिकारितितनामकादेशपत्ता: भरसंतायाम: सीतादुरुस्तोः
(१५) पूर्वनयेतनामकादेशपत्ता: भाषानारघरिविवशाय मंदिराधिकारितितनामकादेशपत्ता: भाषानारघरिविवशाय मंदिराधिकारितितनामकादेशपत्ता: भरसंतायाम: सीतादुरुस्तोः
(१६) न ब्राह्मणपुष्पों यतोन्योगिति: देवाभारतमेत्र: भुज्य: कर्षण: पादधिकता: वा न कैकिकवासारः
C.—The Grant of Śilāditya V.

The grant of Śilāditya V. is written on two plates of the largest size, 11 inches by 174. The left-hand ring has been lost. The right-hand one, to which the seal is attached, is in its proper place. The latter is, even for Valabhi plates, excessively massive. It bears the usual cognizance and inscription.

The letters resemble in general those of the Baroda and Kāvī Rāshtrakūta plates. But they show some curious forms, which I have never met with before. Thus δ is invariably represented by \( \delta \), which in the older inscriptions would be \( \delta \) or \( \phi \); for \( kr \) we find sometimes a sign which resembles \( bha \); and for \( s \) a sign resembling \( j \) or \( h \).

The execution of the plates is slovenly in the extreme. Not only does every line abound with mistakes, and whole lines have been left out, but frequently the engraver has not taken the trouble to connect his strokes, whereby the letters become rather doubtful. It would be impossible to read the plate if we had not numerous nearly identical inscriptions. The preservation of the plates is nearly perfect. There are only two small rents, one high up on the right-hand side, and one low down on the left-hand side of the second plate.

The grant is dated from “the camp of victory fixed at Godraha.” Godraha may possibly be Godrā, the chief town of the Panch Mahāls. The word Godraha is formed from Godraha by the individualizing or deterrative affix \( ka \), and godraha means “a lake for cows,” or “the lake of the cow;” compare also ndgudraha in Vākpati’s grant.” Now this name fits Godhrā very well, which possesses a very large tālā. The name Godhra occurs also in Someśvara’s Kṛtikavamsa, IV. 57, where it is stated that the lords of Godhra and Lāta betrayed their master, Rāṇa Viradhava of Dholka, and joined the kings of Māraudēa who fought against him. In that passage Godhra can only refer to Godhrā. I do not feel so confident that it designates the same place in our plate. For it is quite possible that another Godhrā may have existed in Kāthavād, though I am not at present in a position to prove this.

The vanādvālat carries us one step further than the Gondal plates translated by Rāośheb V. N. Māndlik. It appears that there was a fifth prince who bore the name Śilāditya. Our śāsana (pl. II. II. 20-22) gives the following description of this new king:

“His (i.e. the fourth Śilādityadeva’s) son is the ardent devotee of Mahēsvara, the great king of kings, the supreme lord, the illustrious Śilādityadeva, who mediates on the feet of the supreme sovereign, the great king of kings, the supreme lord Bappa, who humbles the pride of all (hostile) armies, who is an abode of auspiciousness (produced) by great victories, (who resembles) Purnottama, because his bosom is caressed by the embraces of Fortune, because he is possessed of marvellous power by assuming the shape of a man-lion, and because

* Nārāśinhha is one of the incarnations of Viṣṇu. The king may be likened to a man-lion on account of his bravery. The compound Nārāśinhha has to be explained differently in each case.
he protects the whole earth (gomaṇḍala) by destroying hostile princes (samuddhatavipakhaabhābhūtra), just as Purushottama protected the herds (gomaṇḍala) by raising a wingless mountain (samuddhatavipakhaabhābhūtra), whose toenails possess a brilliancy enhanced by the jewels in the diadems of numerous princes prostrated (at his feet), and who has effected a conquest of the faces of the nymphs of all quarters of the universe."

Śilādiya adeva V. is the eighteenth king of the dynasty who has become known. The number of Śilādiyas who have now revealed themselves becomes rather perplexing. It is evident that the Jaina legend, attributing the reestablishment of their faith to "Śilādiya of Valabhi," is about as explicit as a narrative would be which referred an event to the reign of "Louis of France."

The grantee is an Atharvavedi Brāhmaṇ of the Pārśāra gotra, called Sambhulla, the son of Dātula, who resided in Dāsaka. He is called tachchādhyayā, i.e., "a member of the community of the Chaturvedis of that (town)." (Pl. II. II. 23.-k) The three names are not Sanskrit, but apparently Deśi words. It ought to be noted that a small colony of Atharvavedis lives now at Lūnavādā. The grantee probably was one of their ancestors. The object granted is the village Bahabataka, situated in the zillā (vīśaka) of Sūrṇāpura, on the banks of the Vāppoiıkā river (Pl. II. I. 24).†

The purpose for which the village was given is to defray the expenses of an aṇgānihotra and other sacrifices.

The date I am inclined to read as "Śāvat 441, Kārtika Śuddha 5," or "the fifth day of the bright half of Kārtika of the year 441." The first two signs must be taken together and read as 400. This is perfectly certain, as the Gōṇḍal grants of Śilādiya IV. are dated 403. The next following figure might be read as 4 on account of its resemblance to the second sign, which must be taken with the sign for 100. But as a horizontal stroke follows, which appears to represent 1, it must be taken as a figure denoting one of the numbers between 10 and 90, and it comes nearest the sign for 40. I admit, however, that the last horizontal stroke may in reality be meant to form part of the third sign. In that case the whole stands for 404.

Plate I.

(1) सतिः गोदाति समासितवेष्टीपुरुषाराजसम्प्रदायविभाषानि मैत्रकाणामुच्यतिलिङ्गमवर्धकम्—

(2) निपा: व्यापता: नागाराजंवर्धिनिमुगस्तुलकुमारिवैद्यकीर्तिकेवथि: परमां

(3) छिंचरंवेष्टीपुरुषविवेष्टीपिनिविश्वेश्वरंकालं: शैवसाहित्य भृतिः कुड्किरिन्तीगर्भवर्तेतः समद्विगुणविशेषत्वत्वस्यम्

(4) प: तद्भवप्रज्ञाविद्वा चूर्दंदनसाधितविवेअसत्तपदातननमस्तितंहि: तत्कल्प्पितवानामांलम्बसम्यक्सिदः

(5) न: नास्तिदक्ष: याच्यात्ववर्द्धयमि वृद्धसंह: सर्वसाधारणबिधिपदीयसमुद्गुणस्मृतिविद्वत्वावत: साराणात्मकविद्वत्वावतः

(6) तातुप्पकालवाचार्य्यंवृद्धसंहं पार्थादिकार्यांवादानविनितिलिङ्गपीयदय पादवारी: सम्भवायस्मादसंहानामां

† I take the compound samuddhatavipakhaabhābhūtra, to consist of a Bahurwihī—sam-

† E. Forbes, Rāc. Mitāk, vol. I. p. 726; names Śrīyūpura as one of the harbours of the Anhilvāl kingdom, and thinks

that it may be Surat. This identification cannot stand, as Surat is a modern town. I am unable to offer any suggestion as to the whereabouts of the town.

§ I take the compound samuddhatavipakhaabhābhūtra, to consist of a Bahurwihī—sam-

$ Line I. read "सामानाः सुपुर्वीयः". L. 2. read "परमहे ज्ञानोऽऽवर्द्धिः"

$ Line 3, read "संस्ताविविधानः". L. 4. read "तस्याविनि रित: सत्तपदादित:"

$ Line 5, read "पार्थादिकार्यांवादानविनितिलिङ्गपीयहयानं पादवारी: सम्भवायस्मादसंहानामां

$ Line 6. read "हनुमानः". Hadeb.
वास्तविकता द्वारा इतिहास के दृष्टिकोण से महत्वपूर्ण है। आपके इतिहास के महत्वपूर्ण क्षेत्रों के बारे में हैं कि क्या इसका इतिहास क्षेत्र में कुछ बादशाह के जीवन के इतिहास के महत्वपूर्ण क्षेत्रों उपलब्ध नहीं हैं।

महान पंडित् ज्योतिबा महाराज, जिसका नाम 'महान धार्मिक' है, ने इस परियोजना में अपने इतिहासकारों के बीच समानांतर भी जोड़ा है। इन्होंने इतिहास के महत्वपूर्ण क्षेत्रों के बारे में कुछ बादशाह के जीवन के इतिहास के महत्वपूर्ण क्षेत्रों उपलब्ध नहीं हैं। इस तरह से, महान पंडित् ज्योतिबा महाराज ने इतिहास के महत्वपूर्ण क्षेत्रों के बारे में बहुत कुछ आंकित किया है।

लालपुर: महान पंडित् ज्योतिबा महाराज, जिसका नाम 'महान धार्मिक' है, ने इस परियोजना में अपने इतिहासकारों के बीच समानांतर भी जोड़ा है। इन्होंने इतिहास के महत्वपूर्ण क्षेत्रों के बारे में कुछ बादशाह के जीवन के इतिहास के महत्वपूर्ण क्षेत्रों उपलब्ध नहीं हैं। इस तरह से, महान पंडित् ज्योतिबा महाराज ने इतिहास के महत्वपूर्ण क्षेत्रों के बारे में बहुत कुछ आंकित किया है।

लालपुर: महान पंडित् ज्योतिबा महाराज, जिसका नाम 'महान धार्मिक' है, ने इस परियोजना में अपने इतिहासकारों के बीच समानांतर भी जोड़ा है। इन्होंने इतिहास के महत्वपूर्ण क्षेत्रों के बारे में कुछ बादशाह के जीवन के इतिहास के महत्वपूर्ण क्षेत्रों उपलब्ध नहीं हैं। इस तरह से, महान पंडित् ज्योतिबा महाराज ने इतिहास के महत्वपूर्ण क्षेत्रों के बारे में बहुत कुछ आंकित किया है।
SANSKRIT AND OLD CANARESE INSCRIPTIONS.

BY J. F. FLEET, Bo. C.S.

(Continued from vol. V. p. 343.)

No. XX.

This and the following six copper-plate inscriptions have been previously published by me in the Jour. Bo. Br. R. As. Soc., vol. IX., No. xxvii., pp. 229 et seqq. I now give revised transcriptions of them, with full translations.

The originals, which now belong to myself, were found some sixteen years ago in a mound of earth close to a small well called Chakratrekha, a short distance outside Halsi on the road to Nandigal, in the Bidj Taluk of the Belgaum District. They are all in the Cave-alphabet characters not yet developed into the Old Canarese characters, and in the Sanskrit language.

They record the grants of an old dynasty of Kadamba kings, and, in connexion with three more recently discovered copper-charters noticed below, they establish the following genealogy:

\[
\begin{array}{c|c}
\text{K\textnormal{\^{a}}kustha, or} & \\
\text{K\textnormal{\^{a}}kusthavarm\textnormal{\^{a}}} & \\
\hline
\text{S\textnormal{\^{a}}ntivarman, or} & \text{(not named.)} \\
\text{S\textnormal{\^{a}}ntivarnavarm\textnormal{\^{a}}} & \\
\hline
\text{Mrig\textnormal{\acute{e}}s\textnormal{\^{a}}, or} & \text{(not named.)} \\
\text{Mrig\textnormal{\acute{e}}svaram, or} & \\
\text{Mrig\textnormal{\acute{e}}savarnavarm\textnormal{\^{a}}} & \\
\hline
\text{Ravivarman} & \\
\text{Bhamuvar\textnormal{\^{a}}} & \\
\text{Siravartha} & \\
\text{Harivar\textnormal{\^{a}}} & \\
\end{array}
\]

This dynasty is known as yet only from the present inscriptions, though other branches of the Kadamba stock have been noticed by Sir W. Elliot and by myself. K\textnormal{\^{a}}kusthavarm\textnormal{\^{a}} was probably the first of the family to enjoy regal power; but, as allusion is made in lines 4-5 of the first of these inscriptions to an era dating from some victory over a hostile dynasty that took place eighty years before his time, the way must have been prepared for him by his father or grandfather. These kings were of the Jain religion. Their capital was Pal\textnormal{\acute{a}}sik\textnormal{\acute{a}}, —the modern Hal\textnormal{\acute{s}}i itself; but we have also the mention of the city of Vaijayantl, or the modern Banavasi, as a residence of Mrig\textnormal{\acute{e}}sa.

The exact date of these kings cannot be determined at present, no reference to any known era being made in these inscriptions. But the type of the alphabet, and the contemporaneous allusions, enable us to allot them with tolerable certainty to about the fifth century A.D., and to decide that these must be the Kadambas whose power the Chalukya king Kirttiwarman is said, in lines 4 and 5 of the Aiho\textfont{e} inscription, No. XIII. of this series, to have overthrown.

The application of the term 'Pun\textnormal{\acute{s}}a year to the third year of Mrig\textnormal{\acute{e}}s\textnormal{\acute{a}}'s reign in one of the Dh\textnormal{\acute{a}}rw\textnormal{\acute{a}}d plates, and of the term 'Vai\textnormal{\acute{s}}\textnormal{\acute{k}}ha year to the eighth year of his reign in No. XXI., below,—and the mention of the eighth fortnight of the rainy season in one of Mrig\textnormal{\acute{e}}s\textnormal{\acute{a}}'s grants from Dh\textnormal{\acute{a}}rw\textnormal{\acute{a}}d, and of the sixth fortnight of the winter season in No. XXIII. below, indicating that, at the time of these grants, the primitive division of the year into three seasons only, not into six as now, was still followed,—probably contain the clue, which will enable us hereafter to determine the exact date of these kings with accuracy.

As I have intimated, three more copper-charters of the same dynasty were found about a year ago in the Dh\textnormal{\acute{a}}rw\textnormal{\acute{a}}d District. When I can see the originals, I hope to include them in this series. Meanwhile, I have seen transcriptions and translations of them by Mr. P\textnormal{\acute{a}}nd\textnormal{\acute{a}}raung Venkata\textfont{e}s Chint\textfont{\acute{a}}mamp\textfont{\acute{e}}\textfont{\acute{p}}\textfont{\acute{a}}\textfont{\acute{t}}\textfont{\acute{a}}\textfont{\acute{a}}k\textfont{\acute{a}}, of the Educational Department. Two of them are dated in the third and fourth years respectively of Mrig\textnormal{\acute{e}}s\textnormal{\acute{a}} of the above table, or as he is called in these plates, Mrig\textnormal{\acute{e}}savarnavarm\textnormal{\^{a}} or Mrig\textnormal{\acute{e}}savarnavarm\textnormal{\^{a}}, and are issued at the city of Vaijayantl. We learn from one of them, that the Kadambas were of the

* An Old Canarese 'p' is frequently changed into 'k' in the modern dialect. As intermediate forms of the name we have Pal\textnormal{\acute{a}}sik\textnormal{\acute{a}} (Jour. Bo. Br. R. As. Soc., vol. IX., No. xxvii., p. 242, line 19), Palasige (id., p. 267, line 16), and Palasi (id., p. 379, line 15). Under the later Kadambas, feudatories of the Chalukyas kings, Palasige was the chief town of a district of twelve thousand villages.

† Vol. V. p. 47.
Aṅgiraṇa gṛṭa. The third is of the time of Dēvavarmā, the son and Yasavīja of the Kadamba Makhāryāja Kṛishnavormā, and is issued at (the city of) Tripārvanta. There is nothing at all in this inscription to indicate the date of Kṛishnavormā and Dēvavarmā, or the place to which they should be referred in the above genealogy. There can be little doubt, however, that they belong to this same branch of the Kadamba stock; rather than to the other branch, of which the genealogy, commencing with Māyuravarmadēva, followed by his son Kṛishnavormadēva, followed by his son Nāgavormādēva, and so on, is given by Sir W. Elliot. And, equally, there can be little doubt that this same Kṛishnavormā is the Kadamba king who is mentioned in Mr. Rice’s Morkara and Nāgamaṇḍala copper-plates, and whose sister married the Chēra king Mādhavā II. The Morkara plate† being dated (? Saka) 388, in the time of the son of Mādhavā II, and the

Nāgamaṇḍalā plates being dated Saka 699, in the time of Koṅgaṇi-Mahādhrāja, who was subsequent to Mādhavā II, by nine generations,—we have about Saka 389 (A.D. 438-9) as the date of Kṛishnavormā. This will make him and his son anterior to Kākusthavarmā and his successors, according to the estimate that I have formed of the date of the latter.

The present inscription, No. XX., is the earliest of the set, is the smallest and most illegible; in some places the plates have been completely eaten through with rust. It consists of three plates, about 6½" long by 1¼" broad, fastened together with a ring; the seal of which bears the figure of apparently a dog. The inscription, in this and the remaining six cases, begins on the inside of the first plate and ends on the inside of the last plate. It records the grant of a field at the village of Khēṭagrāmā to the General Sūntakirtti by Kākusthavarmā, the Kadamba Yasavīja.

**Transcription.**

First plate.


[2] वैश्वानरकसरी दयितासहीचिरस्त यस्य [II] परस्म- प्रजापतिरव[गाम] [III]

[3] श्रीविनयपललकिकाय अर्थि तत्वमेव [II]

[4] कदम्भाम्युरान: श्रीकुकुस्वम्म श्रवणातिके अर्थितिवथे धन्याम् आर्या देवमवतेवम् सरवाकुकुस्वमाचाराताम् कैलाकृत्तिवथे।

[5] काणाम् व्यः [III] भृत्वम्ववति (तितितितिनपतिं) [II]

Second plate; first side.


Third plate.

[9] [III] जपमातरागादभिः यद्य यथय: पद्य भूतैिम् तथातृ वदा भूवम [II]

[10] स्वदा स्ववदा सा यो हरम् वद्य-पद्य: वर्षितसङ्कवस्तमानिव: [III]


II This mark of punctuation is superfluous.

If This mark of punctuation, also, is superfluous.

§§ The corrected reading must be either sārva-puṇa, sāc, omitting the sā as inserted by mistake, or saṣṭa-puṇa, sāc.

†† This mark of punctuation, also, is superfluous.

* These three syllables are omitted altogether in the original; but they are required to make up both the metre and the sense.

** Contrary to the rule of these seven plates, the original here has the sāriṇa itself, and not the uṛṣdaṁśaymāṇa.
Translation.

Reverence! Victorious is the holy one, Jīnendrā, who abounds in good qualities, and who is renowned as being extremely compassionate; the banner of his tenderness, which comforts the three worlds, is lifted up on high!

At the most glorious and victorious (city of) Paḷāśikā, in the eightieth year of his victory, Śrī-Kākusthavarmā, — the Yuvārāja of the Kadambaś, who enjoy the general good wishes of their subjects,—gave to the General Śrutakīrtti, as a reward for saving himself, the field called Badāvarakṣahētra, in the village of Khēṭagām, which belongs to the holy Arhatas, who are the refuge of created beings and the saviours of the three worlds.

He incurs the guilt of the five great sins, who injures this grant, whether he is born in his own lineage or in the lineage of another; he, who preserves it, shall truly obtain the religious merit of all virtuous qualities! Moreover it has been said,—land has been given by many kings, commencing with Sāgarā; he, who for the time being possesses land, enjoys the fruit of it! He is tormented in hell for the duration of sixty thousand years, who seizes upon land that has been given, whether by himself or by another!

Reverence; reverence! Reverence to Rishabhā! *

No. XXI.

This inscription consists of three plates, about 8' long by 2½' broad, fastened by a ring, the seal of which bears the name of Sār-Mrigēsvarā. It records how Mrigēsvarā caused a Jain temple to be built at Paḷāśikā, and endowed it with a grant of land, in the eighth year of his reign.

Transcription.

First plate.

[4] कर्मिति राजारतीजोतन: खलेल्वः वनिवृक्षः

Second plate; first side.

[8] तुझाकलकृतस्तादी पत्तचाराय: स्वायत्तेक नृपौते मथमा

Second plate; second side.

[10] कानाम् स्त्रासिरे भट्टने वेशालेसंसारोरं कालांवृत्तिणयामम्
[11] मनोरतिः अर्थम् आ श्रीविस्तिरुद्धाराजमानेन वयोः (द्व)विब्रिहितिसर्वतं
[12] श्रीविस्तिवस्यविनिविशी दानानन्दं ववहुस्य [11] तमापाराम:

* Jīnendrā.—a Jain saint, a Buddha.
† Rundrā.—see vol. IV., p. 204, note §. "Gunda-rundrā" is evidently equivalent to "gunda-kustā", which, though it is not an expression of frequent occurrence, we have had in No. XV. of this series, line 6, vol. V., p. 155.
* The classical spelling would be 'Kākuṭhavarmā'; but 'Kākustha' is manifestly an established corruption of 'Kākuṭhā.'
* Arhat,---lit., venerable,—a superior Jain saint or divinity.
|| Vis,---among the Jains,—destruction of life, lying, stealing, unchastity, and immoderate desire.

* Sc. 'the donor's.'
* The first Arhat, the first of the twenty-four Jain Thānāvarna or sanctified teachers, of the present age.
Third plate.


[14] उक्तम् [1] वहुभूमिः दत्ता राजभिसर्वार्दिमः परस्परम् यदा


[18] भैरास्त्र विपर्यायत्वावर्शी कुम्भके त पच्चे त [11] सिद्धस्थसु॥

Translation.

Hail! Victorious is the holy one, Jīnendrā, who abounds in good qualities, &c.!

The son of the king Śrī-Kākūṣṭha, who was the glory of the family of the Kādambas on account of his riches which consisted entirely of meritorious actions, was the king Śrī-Sāntivaravarmā, who was, as it were, a second sun, and whose eyes were like the blue lotus-flower; as if she were a woman of easy virtue, the goddess of the fortunes of his enemies was enticed by him from their abodes.

His beloved eldest son was the king Śrī-Mṛigēśa, who was most eminent in piety among all mankind, and was worshipped by the twice-born and by chieftains. Having reflected upon the saying that “The gifts of the poor have a rich reward,” he, though poor himself in the sensation of fear, gave great fear to his enemies.

On the day of the full-moon of (the month) Kārttika, in the Vaiśākha year, the eighth of his victory, he, who uprooted the family of Tāṃgāgāgā, and who was a very fire of destruction to the Pallavas, while residing at the glorious and victorious city of Vaiṣākha, through devotion for the king (his father) who was dead, caused to be built a temple of Jīnai at the glorious and victorious city of Paḷāśikā, and gave to the holy Arhats thirty-three śivāntas of land, from the river Mātrisarit up to the sacred confluence of rivers called Īṅgītaṃgamā, for the purpose of supporting the Kūrkaṇa, who are naked religious mendicants. The specification (of the principal grantees) was—Dāmakīrti, the Bhūdaka, and Jīyanta, the minister and the general superintendent.*

Moreover it has been said—Land has been given by many kings, commencing with Saṅgara; &c. He is tormented in the hell called Kumbhīpāka for the duration of sixty thousand years, &c. May there be success!

No. XXII.

This inscription consists of five plates, about 7½ long by 2½ broad; the device on the seal of the ring is almost entirely worn away, but seems to have been the same as the dog on the seal of No. XX. It records grants and ordinances, for the celebration of the Jain religion, made by Rāvinvarma and others.

Transcription.

First plate.

[1] जयति भगवानवंशे गुप्तसं-प्रभवसम्मकान्तिकः बैलोया-
[2] आसकरी दयपवाहिकताः यस्य || स्वामिवसेनसम्मागणानु-
[3] द्या(ि)लाभानि मन्त्रमयौषधाणि हारिहीतप्राणि प्रतिभक्तस्वद्या(ि)यच(ि)बृह-[ि]-

I. The meaning of this expression ‘Vaiśākha year’ is not apparent. ‘Vaiśākha’ being the name of a month, and not of any of the sixty saniśāntaras. Vaiśākha was not originally the initial month of the solar year. Perhaps at the time of this inscription it was usual to speak of each year as a ‘Vaiśākha year,’ in order to bring constantly to notice, and so to firmly establish, a method of computation that had been only newly introduced. Or it may even be that the year in which this grant was made was the first the initial month of which was Vaiśākha; and, if so, it would follow, from the table given at p. 149 of the Useful Tables of vol. II. of Thomas’s edition of Pṛṣīpa’s Antiquities, that the date of this inscription was A.D. 538. As noted in my remarks above, the contemporary historical allusions, and the style of the alphabet, point to about this time as the date of Kājasthavarmā and his successors. Curiously enough, I find that in one of the plates from Bihārvald the third year of Mṛigēśa’s reign is called in a similar way, ‘Paṇaḥ year.’ But, by the Useful Tables, the year commenced with the month Paṇaḥ in A.D. 451! § Another form of ‘Jayantipara,’ an old name of Vaṇṇa, modern Varanāsī, which was always a Kādamba capital.

* Apparently some Jain sect; they are mentioned again in No. XXV., line 12.

* Bhūdaka, name of a class of officiating priests in Jain temples; in No. XXII., line 10, we have again Bhūdaka, and in No. XVIII., line 11, ‘Bhūdaka.’

* Conf. the amended reading and translation of No. XVII., II. 16-11, as noticed in the Répertoire to vol. V.
Translation.

Victorious is the holy one, Jiněndra, who abounds in good qualities, &c.!

In former times the Bhūja priest Śrutas-\(\text{kīrtti}\), the best among men, who was the receptacle of sacred learning, who enjoyed the rewards of many meritorious actions, and who was possessed of the qualities of performing sacrifices and bestowing gifts and tenderness, —he who had acquired the great favour of Kākusthavarmā, the king of the Ka-\(\text{dāmbās}\), who meditate on the assemblage of the mothers of the lord Mahāśēna; who are of the kindred of Mānavyā; who are the descendants of Hārti; who are thoroughly well versed in the system of private study and prayer that they have adopted; who enjoy the rewards of meritorious actions performed by themselves; who partake of the enjoyment of the riches acquired by the prowess of their own arms; and who are the abiding-places of the true religion,—enjoyed the village of Kheṭa.

When he died, (there was) the king Sāntivarman; and his son, the pious Śrī-Mrigēṣa, who was renowned in the world, gave the grant (again), for the sake of piety, and according to the direction of his father, to the mother of Dāmakirtti.

The eldest son of Śrī-Dāmakirtti, who was widely renowned for his meritorious actions, and whose pure intellect adhered to the path of true religion, was the doorkeeper Jarayākirtti,—who was intent upon religion; who was famous; who was possessed of a pure intellect and limbs; who was first in good qualities; whose family had been established in the world by the Achāryas called Bandhushēna, who were versed in the knowledge of omens; who had acquired fortune through his favour; who was diligent in the rites of charity and worship; who was devoted to his spiritual preceptor; and who was well-behaved through his desire for the welfare of others and of himself. In order to increase his good fortune and fame and family, and for the sake of religious merit, he, through the favour of king Ravi, gave (the village of) Purukheṭaka, to the mother of his own father.

The lord Ravi established the ordinance at the mighty city of Pālāṣikā, that the glory of Jiněndra, (the festival of) which lasts for eight days, should be celebrated regularly every year on the full-moon of (the month) Kārtiṣka from the revenues of that (village); that ascetics should be supported during the four months of the miny season; that the learned men, the chief of whom was Kāmradaṭa,—whose intellects had been wearied by (excessive study of) many scriptures and collections of precepts; who were renowned in the world; who abounded in good penances; and whose sect was his authority for what he did,—should according to justice enjoy all the material substance of that greatness; and that the worship of Jiněndra should be perpetually performed by the pious countrymen and citizens.

That (land &c.) —which has been conveyed by copper charters under that same ordinance, as accepted by previous kings,—should be preserved by the king, not insatiable to religion, having pondered over the misfortune of being born again and again (if he does not comply with this command)! Land has been enjoyed by many kings, commencing with Sagara; &c.! He is tormented in hell for the duration of sixty thousand years, &c.! That (grant) which is bestowed with libations of water, and that which is enjoyed by three (generations), and that which is preserved by good people,—these are not resumed; and also (grants) that have been made by former kings! Wheresoever the worship of Jiněndra is kept up, there there is increase of the country, and the cities are free from fear, and the lords of those countries acquire strength! Reverence, reverence!

No. XXIII.

This inscription consists of three plates, about

---

\(\text{§}\) Either Mrigēṣa's, or Ravi's.

\(\|\) Sc. 'the larger Kheṭaka or Kheṭa.'

\(\ddagger\) The 'tribhāpa' is referred to here; see vol. IV., p. 577, note *.

* I notice that, instead of the present reading 'mahāśēna paripūlitām', which is quite distinct, Mr. Rice, in the last two lines of the second Čhēra grant published by him in the Ind. Ant. vol. V., p. 139, reads 'mahāśēna paripūlitam', and translates 'one' (i.e. a grant) 'maintained for six generations.'
5 inch long by 2 inch broad; the characters on the seal of the ring that fastens the plates together are too much worn to be legible. It records a grant made by Bhānuvarmā, and another by a follower or subordinate of his, in the eleventh year of the reign of his elder brother Ravi-varmā. It is dated in the sixth fortnight of the winter season. These inscriptions, therefore, as I have already intimated, belong to a time at which the primitive division of the year,—into three seasons only, Summer, the Rains, and Winter, each of eight pakhās or fortnights, instead of into six seasons, each of four fortnights, as is now the practice,—was still followed; and this should enable us hereafter to determine the era of these grants with accuracy.

I observe that the same division of the year into three seasons only is followed in the Nāsik Cave-inscriptions, a paper on which, by Professor Bhandarkar, is published in the Transactions of the International Congress of Orientalists of 1874. Thus, No. 27, at p. 338, runs 'Sidhan rāṇō Vāsathī-puṇasa sarā-Paṇumayasa savachhāre chha(?)thē 5 Gima-pakhē pachām(?) 5 divasē',—and is translated "To the Perfect One. In the sixth year of the King, the prosperous Paṇumaya, the son of Vāsathī in the . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . .
Translation.

Hail! Victorious is the holy one, Jīnendrā, who abounds in good qualities, &c.!

The beloved eldest son of the glorious king Kakunatha was king Sāntivarmana; and his eldest son was the king Śrī Miśrīti, who was possessed of renowned and wide-spread fame. His son was the glorious king Ravi, who acquired good fortune by his excellence and fortitude; and his younger brother is king Bhānuvarma, who is resplendent, and who effects the welfare of himself and of others.

By him, desirous of prosperity, this land was given to the Jinas, in order that the ceremony of ablation might always be performed without fail on the days of the full-moon.

Land of the measure of fifteen saṅvataras, in (the field called) Kardamapatiṭṭ at Palaśikā, free from the gleaming-tax and all other burdens, was assigned in a copper charter (and so was given), on the tenth lunar day in the sixth ūṣa of the winter season in the eleventh year of the reign of the pious Great King Śrī Rājivārma, by the Bhūjaka Pāndara, the worshipper of the supreme Arhat, who had acquired the favour of the feet of the glorious king Bhānuvarma.]

He who injures this land, whether he be born in his own lineage or in the lineage of another, incurs the guilt of having committed the five great sins! And it has been said:—Land has been given by many kings, commencing with Sagarā; &c. He is tormented in the hell called Kumbhipaka for the duration of sixty thousand years, &c.!

No. XXIV.

This inscription consists of three plates, about 5½" long by 2½" broad; the seal of the ring that fastens the plates together has the device of a dog, as in the case of Nos. XX and XXII. It records a grant of land to the god Jīnendrā by Rājivārma.

Transcription.

First plate.

[1] नामम् भगवानिनिः गुणार्थः प्रतिपरंगपातः
[2] चित्र: वैलोकणांतरी दयपताकोत्तित्रा यस्य II
[3] श्रीविवर्धनविर्भाषिः सिद्ध जितो श्रुतिः समस्त: [स]
[4] उत्साह काण्डोवर्धनविर्धंकरः पलाशिकायाः समस्थितस्य: [II]

Second plate; first side.

[5] रथोऽद्राकूतायां गुणाध्वमविण्यं जगत्समस्त: [सं]
[6] अनेन चावताः नित्यानान्तिन दशी नित्याय सही(सही) संहद्र: [II]
[7] संवायम् माहात्मयपरसादं धम्मकृत्यमेधारोपां दाताको: [II]
[8] तपस्विकृत्यविच्छेदमधुरंकितम् श्रीतिनिनिनामा तु च त्वाको: [II]

Second plate; second side.

[9] रागावतादात्यावपि मोहाति यस्तानि हिसादिहाय भूमि-
[10] पारक्तं आसत्तम तत्त्वकुलां निर्मितं तत्त्वायनशीवरायमभम् [II]
[11] जात्तेन यो रशसी पुष्पकोकालं: स्वास्थयो वा पवस्तङ्गो वा
[12] स मेधामनसस्यपुनर्दिविं चिरं सदा श्रीवस्ति नाक्रश: [II]

Third plate.

[13] अधि चोक भवना [I] भुमिभिंकुशो दन्ता राजर्षिसमर्थादिभि:
[14] यथाः यथाः यथा भूमि: तस्य तथा तदा फलम् [II]

† 'Pañca' is probably for 'pañcikā', strip, slip, which, in both Canarese and Marathi, is commonly used for a strip of land; 'pañcikā' is used in the same sense in other inscriptions.

‡ According to the present method the year consists of six seasons (rītas)—Vasanta, spring; Grīṣmahs, the hot weather, or summer; Varāhī, the rains; Śarade, autumn; Hāṃsanta, the cold season, or winter; and Śīrā, the dewy season,—and each season consists of only four fortnights (pakṣa).

* Apparantly, then, Rājivārma and Bhānuvarma were reigning jointly.

† Sc. 'the donor's'.

* The word 'sceñti' seems to have been engraved before 'pañca', but to have been cut off in shaping the plate, so that only part of the second syllable can be seen in the margin.
[15] सदृशं परदृशं वि ये हरेत वृभुराम्

[16] पाठि वर्तस्थाणि निमयं स विषये।

Translation.
Victorious is the holy one, Jīnendrā, who abounds in good qualities, &c.!
That mighty king, the sun of the sky of the mighty family of the Kāmadbae, - who, having slain Śrī-Viṣṇuvarma and other kings, and having conquered the whole world, and having uprooted Candraśā, the lord of Kācli, had established himself at Pālāsā, - having pervaded the whole earth, with his rays, which were his virtuous qualities, gave four nicartana (of land) by measure to Jīnendrā, having obtained the favour of the feet of the mother of Dāmakṛiti, who was a very incarnation of religion; the motive that incited him was to increase his religious merit.
And he, who bore the name of Śrī-Kṛiti, was his younger (brother)।

That king who, from envy or negligence or even avarice, injures those (nicartana), his family shall be plunged into hell and shall not escape from it up to the seventh generation; but he, whether born in his own lineage or in the lineage of another, who, being desirous of acquiring religious merit, preserves them, shall disport himself for a long time in heaven with the lovely women of the gods!
Moreover, it has been said by Maṇu: - Land has been given by many kings, commencing with Sāgra; &c. He is tormented in hell for the duration of sixty thousand years, &c.।

No. XXV.

This inscription consists of three plates, about 6½ long by 1½ broad; the seal of the ring connecting the plates bears apparently the name of Śrī-Harivarma. It records the grant of the village of Vasantavatika, in the district of Suddhakundura, to a Jain sect, by Harivarma, in the fourth year of his reign.

Transcription.
First plate.

Second plate; first side.

Second plate; second side.

[1] सिद्धम्। स्वधिता स्वामिनागानुगानाधिपिकां नानाचिनम्।
[2] श्रावणं हरितिकुटिकांम् निपुङ्कतस्य सा नानाचिनम्।
[3] महाराजम्: श्रवणं 'म'हं दुःखतकते: पुरुष रश्मिरिय नितछन्दम्।
[4] प्रकटपु: हितं: पासो प्रायो गायनासाधिकाम्य श्रुतिकृतिम्।
[5] बायाधप्रदामया सिद्धम्। स्वामिनागानुगानाधिपिकानम्।

† The name of Ravi, or Harivarma, the son of Mrigida, is introduced here by a play on words, the word used for "sun" being "sarity.
‡ Possibly the Pallava king Visnuvarma or Visuvarma, see vol. V., p. 59, text, and note.
§ Probably the person of this name, who is mentioned in line 10 of the Athole inscription, No. XII. of this series.
‖ This statement is introduced in a very casual and distant connected way; and it is not at all clear whose younger brother Kṛiti was.
¶ See note † to line 11 of the text of No. XXI. of this series, p. 24.
[14] यज्ञेन रामेश्वरसेवार्थं स निकृष्टव्याक गतिमः

Third plate.
[16] सहायता नक्यं प्रचूरं तु सः [11] बहुविन्यासाः भुक्त राजगीत्वा
[18] कर्त्ता वर्धनार्ध्यस्थानाः संयुक्तसनम् चेताय विचारितम् आगम

Translation.
It is accomplished! Hail to Śrī-Harivarman, the great king of the Kadambas, who was consecrated by meditating on the assemblage of the mothers of the lord Mahāsēna; who are of the lineage of Mānavya; who are the descendants of Háriti, and who have adopted the practice of private study and prayer,—being kindly disposed towards his subjects, acquired, through the pious acts performed by him in many (previous) states of existence, a sovereignty that was free from all troubles, and pervaded the whole world with his fame, and, being the receptacle of the waters which are the sacred writings, adhered to the path prescribed by those who were mature in science, and eft open the mountains which were his enemies by the blows of the thunderbolt which was his own arm.

In the fourth year of his reign, on the thirteenth day of the bright fortnight of (the month) Phālguna, at the hill or village, called Uchchaśāyina, he, giving such a promise as gladdened the hearts of all people, at the advice of his father's brother Śivaratha, having made Chandrakshata the principal (donor), gave into the possession of Vārishēnachārya of the Kārkhana (the village of) Vasunatavatika in the district of Sudikundura, free from all claims, saying that it was for the purpose of providing annually, at the great eight-days sacrifice, the perpetual anointing with clarified butter for the temple of the Arhat which Mṛgāśa, the son of the general Śīnuha of the lineage of Bhardvaja, had caused to be built at Palakā, and that whatever might remain over after this was to be devoted to the purpose of feeding the whole sect.

He, who with justice protects this grant, shares in the reward of the religious merit of the grant; but he, who through envy or hatred or avarice or folly confiscates it, falls into the most low condition! And it has been said:—
He is tormented in hell for the duration of sixty thousand years, &c.! Land has been enjoyed by many kings, commencing with Sagaras; &c.!

May the practice of sitting in abstract meditation, which is the doctrine of the Arhat Vardhamana, and by which (is effected), even in the present time, the destruction of the sins of worldly existence, flourish! Reverence to the Arhat Vardhamana!

No. XXVI.

This inscription consists of three plates, about 8½" long by 2¾" broad; the seal of the ring connecting the plates bears the word 'Śrī-Harivarman', i.e. 'by Śrī-Harivarman', preceded and followed by a Seastika. It records the grant of a village by Harivarman, in the fifth year of his reign, at the request of king Bhanusakti of the family of the Sendrakas.

Transcription.
First plate.

[1] सिद्धम्[1] विष्ठिः || सामिक्षरसेवानां गृहाः सामिक्षराक्षिपालाकानानामसंग्राहण [∴]
[2] हारितीपुञ्जायायप्रत्यक्षाय स्थिताय पथ्र्यातापणसनम् क्राणुनाम

1 Either 'the hill of the high peak,' or 'the village where there is the hill of the high peak.'
2 The last and most celebrated of the twenty-four Jain Tirthakaras of the present age.
3 A mystical mark, to denote good luck, shaped like a Greek cross with the extremities of the four arms bent round in the same direction.
4 This word is given in the margin of the plate, by the side of the hole for the ring, instead of in its usual and proper place as the first word of the inscription.
MEMORANDUM ON THE BUDDHIST CAVES AT JUNNAR.

The caves of Junnar, like those of Bhijji, Bejsha, Talaji, Sinha, Kandi, and other groups, are remarkably devoid of figure ornament or imagery; in this respect contrasting strongly with those at Ajanta, Elora, Karli, Aurangabad, and elsewhere. The Dahgoba has alone been common to all; and, on comparing the different groups, one might almost suppose that the Dahgoba and Buddhist rail were the earliest ornaments as well as furniture of the caves: that the Chaitya or horse-shoe window with its latticed aperture was next developed, both as a structural feature and an ornament, and at Junnar there are some peculiar applications of it; and that figures of Buddha, as in the later caves at Nasik, at Kanheri, and at Ajanta, Elora, and Aurangabad, were introduced at a later date. Is or it possible that a puritan sect of Buddhists, objecting to all anthropomorphic forms, made the Dahgoba their only gobla, while a separate school delighted in pictures and images of the Great Teacher, his Mother, and all the Buddhist Saints? This is a point deserving the attention of archaeologists in attempting to arrange the Buddhist remains in anything like chronological order. We know that in early times it was usual for one school or sect almost to monopolize the popular religious attachment of particular cities or even provinces: these sects doubtless differed in their ritual and its accessories; and this might account for the prevalence at Ajanta and elsewhere of images of Buddha, both in the sanctuaries and on the façades, and for the entire absence of such symbols at Bhijji, in the older and middle series of about ten caves at Nasik, and at Junnar. It has yet, I think, to be decided how far the former class of caves are subsequent to the latter, or how far they may be regarded as synchronous.

Other ornament is but sparingly found at Junnar—partly perhaps because the façades of many of the caves have peeled off in the lapse of centuries; but all instances of its occurrence are noted in the following brief descriptions.

The Ganesa Pathar group of caves is about three miles north-east of the town, and about 300 feet above it. The ascent is partly by a built stair, which leads up to the front of the Chaitya. This Chaitya faces due south, and measures inside 40 ft. in length by 22 ft. 5 in. wide and 24 ft. 2 in. high. It has a verandah 20 ft. 5 in. long by 4 ft. 2 in. wide, reached by about six steps, with two pillars and two semi-pillars in front, of the style so prevalent at Nasik, the capitals consisting of an abacus of three, four, or five thin square tile-shaped members, each projecting a little over the one below it. Under this is a deep member resembling an inverted water-jar. The shaft is octagonal, and the base is just the capital reversed. Over the abacus are figures of elephants roughly chiselled out, somewhat in the style of those in the Vihara to the right of the Paghulena Chaitya to be noticed below. The door is perfectly plain, 5 ft. 9 in. wide, and lofty, and is the only entrance for light to the cave: for the arched window is merely indicated as a slight recess, high up in the rock, too high to have corresponded with the arch of the cave: but its carefully smoothed area shows that it was never intended to drive it through. Over the entrance is a well-cut inscription in one long line.

(No. 1.)

The nave is about 12 ft. 9 in. wide, and 24 ft. 6½ in. up to the Dahgoba, limited on each side by five columns and one semi-column 10 ft. 10 in. high, similar to those in the front, and with lions or tigers and elephants over the capitals, fairly well cut. In the apse round the Dahgoba, about 3 ft. from it, are six plain octagon shafts 16½ in. in diameter without base or capital. The aisle behind the pillars is 3 ft. 6 in. wide, and is ribbed over, like the roof of the nave, in imitation of wooden ribs. The Dahgoba is of the

* This Memorandum was originally prepared for Government and printed in November 1874, and is now closed to the only published accounts of the Junnar Caves were—a very sketchy one by Dr. Bird in his Jamina Reisen, and Dr. Henderson, derived from the notes of Professor Orihara; one by Dr. J. Wilson in the Journ. Royal Asiatic Soc., vol. III. pt. ii. (January 1850), pp. 62-64, founded on memoranda communicated by Dr. Gibson; and that by Mr. W. F. Nicolas, in the Indian Antiquary, vol. II. (1874) p. 409. In the Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society, vol. IV. (1853) pp. 237-239, Colonel Sykes gave copies of a number of the inscriptions from these caves, but without any detailed account of the excavations.

usual form, a plain circular drum or base 8 ft. 9 in. in diameter and 6 ft. 4½ in. high, with a Buddhist-rail cornice, supporting the garbha or dome on which stands the torana or capital, consisting of a square block, representing a box ornamented with the Buddhist-rail pattern, surmounted by an abacus of five thin slab-like members, each in succession wider than the one below, until the uppermost is 5 ft. 10 in. square, with a hole in the centre of it to support the shaft of a wooden umbrella, as at Kārāli, and four shallow square ones for relics: for it was on this torana, as on an altar, that the relics of Buddha or of Buddha saints were deposited for adoration. In some cases, as at Bājā, the box under the capital of the tee was hollow, for the preservation of the relics. The whole height of this Dahgoba is 16 ft. 5 in.

The next cave east of this is a Vihāra,—the door-jambs now broken away. It has two windows, is 25 ft. wide by 20 ft. deep, and 8 ft. 2 in. high, with a bench or seat 16 ft. 10 in. wide round the three inner sides. At the back are three cells, and at each side two, for the resident monks. In the cells are high stone benches for their beds: on these they spread their quilt and enjoyed their rest,—simple beds for simple lives. Their sāha or hall, which they doubtless regarded as spacious, is now used as a goat-shed. Over the left window is the inscription No. 2. 8

The next cave is higher up in the rock and is a small square one, with a stone bench-bed at the right end. The next, still to the east, is similar, about 8 ft. square, with a bench at the left end. The next again is similar, with a bench at the left end and one large cell at the back, also a small recess—probably for a water-vessel. In the wall is a square hole into the next cave, which is 13 ft. 8 in. deep at the left or west side, but at the other has a cell about 7 ft. by 6 inside, having a bed at the east end. In front of this is a verandah, with two pillars, supporting a projecting frieze carved with the Buddhist-rail pattern as in several of the caves at Nāšik.

Returning now to the Chaitya, and proceeding westwards, an ascending stair enters under the rock and comes out in the verandah of the largest Vihāra cave here,—now known as the Gāṇeśa Lenā, because this fine cave has been appropriated by some low Brāhmaṇa in which to enshrine an image of the pot-bellied, elephant-annointed Gāṇeśa. This personification of the misformed is named Asht Vināyaka, as being, according to the Gāṇeśa Purāṇa, the eighth avatarā of this devo, performed here to please his mother, Girīḍā. He is a favourite idol of the populace, and is visited from far and near at the annual jatā or fair held in his honour. The shrine is taken care of by a pancha or committee, who pay the gurī's wages out of a yearly endowment of Rs. 62 per annum. The gurī goes there daily from Jūnam.

The stair originally came up in front of the east end of the verandah as it now stands, it is built, and closes the entrance to a cell or cistern partly under the Vihāra. The hall is 50 ft. 6 in. by 56 ft. 6 in., and 10 ft. 2 in. high, with three doors and two windows in front, and a stone seat round the three inner sides. It has seven cells on each side, and five at the back—the central one altered to make a shrine for the rat-riding god, whose large image is cut out of the rock, probably, from a Dahgoba that may originally have occupied this cell. It is smeared red, and the shrine is enclosed by wooden doors. Outside the cell are a verandah 7 ft. wide with six pillars and two demi ones, rising from a bench as in Cave III. at Nāšik, the back of this bench forming the upper part of a basement carved in the old Buddhist-rail pattern: this also resembles the general style of the Nāšik Cave just mentioned, in having animal figures over the capitals, but on the outside only, and in having a projecting frieze above, carved with rail pattern ornamentation.

Further west are two cells, nowadays peculiar; then a Vihāra without cells, the verandah of four columns totally gone except the bases. It had a door in the centre, another at the west

Prinsep, ‘correcting the second anomalous letter conjecturally’ reads it—

Dharmikā senyātaka sārahka utṣhā cha dharmakahan—The hundred caves and the tank of Dharmika Sen—his net of pious and companion.' But for what we should surely read pūjā.

[i] See Notes on Junnar Tutak by W. F. Sinclair, Bo. C.S. Indian Antiquary, vol. II. p. 44.
end, and two windows, and measures 31 ft. 3 in. wide by 23 ft. 2 in. deep. The next is difficult of access, and of the plan of the most easterly cave, which is a very common type here.

Passing along a ledge of rock and over a small water-cistern, we come to the next, also a small Vihāra about 25 ft. wide, the front entirely gone, and with a cell at the left end and stone bed in it. Close to it is another similar to the most easterly one,—that is, a cell in the corner of a large one. Lower in the rock the next is like the last, and has a verandah with two pillars and a low screen in front, with a cistern outside at the east end.

The next is a rectangular flat-roofed Chaitya 31 ft. 10 in. deep by 12 ft. 9 in. wide and 13 ft. 8 in. high, with a Dhagoba 6 ft. 11 in. in diameter standing 3 ft. from the back wall. The cylinder is 5 ft. 7 in. high, including a base of 7 in. formed of three projecting annuli, and a cornice 12½ in. deep, of the Buddhist-rail pattern. The dome rises about 3 ft. 4 in., and the torana 2 ft. 4 in., and is 4 ft. 4 in. square at the top. This is connected with the roof by the stone shaft of the umbrella, for here, as in the case of several at Bhājā, the canopy of the umbrella is carved on the roof. To this cave there is a verandah 2 ft. 7 in. wide and 19 ft. 5 in. in length, which has had two pillars in front. On the left of the door outside is an inscription in two lines. (No. 3.)

Above this are—(1) a cell with a stone bed at the right side; (2) a small room enclosing a cell, after the common plan here; (3) another similar, but a horizontal flaw in the rock has opened the top of the inner cell and of the whole of the next cave; (4) a Vihāra, with two cells at the back, and a bench seat along each side, but the front wall is gone. Under the left front corner is a cistern, and outside is another; and (5) further along are three more cisterns. Over the first of these is an inscription in two lines (No. 4).* Over the second is one in three lines (No. 5), but the letters have a slant, and are not so neatly cut as most of the inscriptions here.†

We now come to a Vihāra 22 ft. 5 in. deep by 24 ft. 3 in. wide, the front wall much destroyed, but which was perforated by a door, and probably two windows. It has no cells, but has a stone bench round the three inner sides, and may have been a refectory or a school. Under the left corner is a well with abundance of cool water. Still westwards is a cell and cistern, then a small hall,—the front wall gone and without any cells; next, one or two more cisterns, beyond which the advance becomes more difficult, and leads to, or through, three more small caves, on the wall outside the last of which is an inscription in three lines (No. 6) measuring about 2 ft. by 8 in., with the Sotānīkā to the right of it, and a curious triangular symbol at the commencement, which appears also in a modified form at the beginning of No. 2, and sometimes on other caves and on coins.

To the left of this is a recess, then two cells, and still further west are two or three others, which are almost inaccessible. An avenue of trees said to have been planted by Amṛtārāj, the adopted son of Rāghobā, runs from the Kukadi river to the foot of the hill in which these caves are, and which is said to be mentioned in the Gaṅga Purāṇa under the name of the Lehaṇāḍrī: locally it is known as the Gaṅga Pahār or Sulaimān Pahār.

The Mānmodi Hill lies to the south-south-west of Junnar, about a mile west of the main road. Proceeding to the east face of the hill, I went up to the level of the most southerly group of caves. The first reached was a recess over a cell or cistern, the floor broken away; on the left side of the recess is an inscription (No. 7)§ in one line. A little to the north of this, on the left side of a larger recess over the side of a cistern, is another inscription (No. 8) in three lines, of which, however, the

---

* This is No. 12 among Colonel Sykes's copies; No. 5 in Jour. As. Soc. Benj. vol. VI. p. 1046; and No. 4 of Lieut. Brett's, Jour. Bo. Br. R. As. Soc. vol. V. p. 161.
† This is given by Colonel Sykes as No. 11 among his, and No. 5 among Lieut. Brett's copies.
‡ This is No. 6 of Brett and Stevenson, Jour. Bo. Br. R. As. Soc. vol. V. p. 162; No. 15 in Colonel Sykes's copies; and No. 6 of those sent by him to Princep, who read it—Samaṇapāsaka puṇasa;
first letters are quite obliterated. Above a precipice to the north of this are—(1) a single cell, (2) a broken cistern, and then (3) seven cells in a line.

Returning from these and scrambling along the precipice to the south; we reach first a small Vihāra without cells, then another with two octagonal columns and two pilasters in front of the verandah, rising from a seat. The door is 5 ft. 10 in. wide and reaches to the roof of the hall, which has been frescoed. The verandah is about 2 ft. higher than the cave, and the back of the seat or low screen outside is carved with the rail ornament. The hall is 33 ft. deep and varies from 11 to 13 ft. wide, but at the back stands a mass of rock over 8 ft. wide by 3½ thick, with a squatting figure roughly sketched out on the front of it. This mass of rock is very rotten behind, and at the left side of it is a well of excellent water. The verandah is 4 ft. 7 in. wide and 19 ft. 10 in. long; the columns are of the usual Nāsik pattern but without animal figures above: over them the frieze projects considerably, and is carved in the style of Cave IV. at Nāsik,—the ends of the rafters projecting on the lower fascia, and the upper being carved with rail pattern. Over this is a recess some 2 or 3 feet deep with the Chaitya arch over it, but without any carving.

Lower down in the face of the cliff and somewhat to the north of this are some cells choked with prickly-pear and milk-bash. A few yards south of the larger cave above mentioned is a Vihāra with two pillars and pilasters in the verandah, and with three doors leading into as many cells. Still further on are one or two others almost inaccessible.

Returning from this point to the north and winding round the hill to the north-west side, we come upon another group of caves, the lower ones of easy access. Among them is an unfinished Chaitya the front of which is almost covered with inscriptions; but from their positions, and the circumstance that in most cases the surface of the rock has not been smoothed before cutting them, it may be inferred that they are only the work of visitors, and not the records of the original excavators. Three of them are given by Colonel Sykes, and others by Dr. Bird and Lieut. Brett. This Chaitya has a verandah with two columns of the Nāsik type in front, which support the entablature above the great window. Inside it is wholly unfinished: the aisles have not been commenced, for a great fault in the rock seems to have stopped operations. The capital of the Dohgoba is blocked out, and portions of a square mass from which to carve the dome. The floor is now much filled up with mud. The cave faces north by east.

At the east side of it is a cell, also deep in earth, in which is a Dohgoba, the chhatra or umbrella carved on the roof, but the staff has been broken,—evidently with a view to convert it into the usual Saiva emblem. Beyond it are portions of other cells and a fragment of an inscription beside some modern steps leading up to five cells above those last mentioned. The two at the west end are converted into one by cutting away the partition. In the back wall of this apartment are two defaced figures of Buddha, and in the west wall a third sitting under foliage, with diminutive attendants or figures in the parivara. The sikhara or lion is traceable on one or two of the asanas or seats, and a wooden framework seems to have been fitted to them, for there are holes in the stones for the wood to hold. This is now dedicated to the goddess Ambikā,—a name of Parvati indeed, but also the āsana-devi or patron goddess of Ne mittha, one of the favourite Tirthāṅkaras of the Jains,—by whom she may have been borrowed from some Buddhist sect. Here we have Brāhmans worshipping the mutilated images of Buddha as a Saiva goddess! In the outer wall of the first of these cells there have been a standing and a sitting figure of Buddha, but these are now almost obliterated. They are the only figures of the kind I have met with in the caves here.

On the west of the Chaitya are some cells much choked up with earth, and with at least three inscriptions in them, and high up above these are a few more cells, but inaccessible. Further to the west is a cistern under a tree.

Two of the inscriptions (Nos. 9 and 10) are in the cells on the right or west of the Chaitya; a third—one of those on the left side of the façade—is given by Dr. Bird as No. VI., but this copy is certainly wrong, at least in some of the letters.

Proceeding a considerable way round to the north-west on the slope of the hill, another unfinished Chaitya is reached, facing north-east by north, towards Junnar. This is the cave of which a very imperfect sketch by Professor Orlebar is given by Dr. Bird (plate XVI). The door is nearly the whole width of the cave; the lintel of it is broken; and the top of the aperture of the window is much lower than the arched roof of the cave. The great arch over it in the façade, however, is high, and over the window the space is divided fan-wise into seven petal-shaped compartments; in the upper or middle one is a female figure with a lotus-flower on each side; the compartments next to this have each an elephant standing on a lotus and holding up a water-jar, as frequently represented beside figures of Lâkshâmi or Sri on old Vaishnavite temples. In the compartment behind each elephant stands a male figure, his hands over or in front of the head, doing puja towards the central figure; and in the lowest or outer petals are two females in similar attitudes: beside each is a lotus flower and bud. Over and outside this the architrave or jamb of the great arch projects, and on each side of the finial of the arch is a figure (very unlike those in Professor Orlebar’s sketch): that on the left holds a chauri and has wings, and some animal’s head above his jaunty turban; the other holds some object in his right hand, and behind each shoulder are two snake-hoods with their tongues (?) hanging out. Right and left of these are Dahgobas in high relief but roughly formed. On the projecting frieze over all are seven Chaitya-window ornaments, with smaller ones between their finials; and two on the faces of the jambs. Inside the cave three octagonal pillars on the right side are blocked out, as is also the Dahgoba, but without the capital. There is a horizontal stratum in the rock, which has probably led to the work being relinquished in its present state.

Higher up the rock, on the east side of this, are four cells with neatly-carved façade, each door having a Chaitya-window arch over it, projecting about 15 in.; and between the arches are two Dahgobas with chhatris in half-relief, while over the shoulder of each arch is a smaller one as an ornament, and the Buddhist-rail ornament along the top. There is one plain cell west of these; and rather higher up on the east are four others. Under these latter is a Vihâra with two cells in the back and two in the left or east side, but the front is gone. It communicates by a passage with another to the west of it, nearly filled up with mud. West of the Chaitya are two small cells high up in the rock.

The Taâla Leenâ group of caves lies in a hill about a mile and a half or two miles west from Junnar, and are so named because one of them has been appropriated by the modern Brahmins to Tulja Devi.

They face north-east, but all the façades have fallen away. Beginning from the south-east we come to (1) two sides of a cell; (2) a small Vihâra with two cells on the left side, two in the back, and one in the right side; and (3) a Chaitya of a form quite unique: it is circular, 25 ft. 6 in. across, with a Dahgoba 8 ft. 2 in. in diameter in the centre, surrounded by twelve plain octagonal shafts 11 ft. 4 in. high, supporting a lofty dome over the Dahgoba. The outer aisle is arched over, from a wall line 9 ft. 1 in. from the floor, to the upper side of an architrave 7 or 8 in. deep over the pillars. The Dahgoba is plain, the cylinder being 4 ft. 4 in. high, but the capital has been hewn off to convert it into a pinda of Śiva, and even the dome is much hacked. Before the last care, this, and the next is a platform built by the modern votaries of Tulja Devi. The next (4) is the back of a cell with a recess appropriated to Tulja; then come the remains of three more cells, and a fourth on which is hung a wooden door, the cell being appropriated by the priest. The next is a plain cell, and beyond it the backs of two cells,—over the front of one of them are Chaitya-window ornaments and two or three figures: then two more plain fronts, and two with Chaitya-window heads over the doors, and smaller ones between, and the rail ornament, and quadrantal carved roll supported by slender brackets in entire relief, as at Bhâjâ. The last cave is a hall 23 feet wide, with one large cell at the left corner, and a seat round the three sides. In front of and considerably below the cells towards the north-west end is a tank with masonry walls on two sides. The rock is so cut away in front of the cells above, that

* See Plan and Section of this cave, from the writer’s drawings, in Ferguson’s History of Indian and Eastern Architecture (1876), p. 107.
it must have undermined the fronts of them, and aided in causing their destruction. Possibly this tank was originally a large cistern in the rock underneath the cells, and the pressure at the same time destroyed its roof and the front of the caves.

The Sivaner hill fort lies to the west of the town, and going well along the east face of the hill towards the south, after visiting several cells in the lower scarp, we come to a cave which has had originally two columns and pilasters in front of a narrow verandah. The cave has a wide door, and inside is a large square cell with the cylindrical base of a Daghoba—all coarsely hewn. Can the top have been of wood or other perishable or removable material? This cave faces E.N.E. On the sides of the scarp to the north of these excavations are several cisterns.

The side of the hill is peculiarly steep, and, owing to the slippery dry grass, it was ascended with difficulty. At the south end of the upper scarp a cave is reached, and in the north end of this cave is a stair leading to an upper floor. It has been a small hall, but the front is entirely gone except one pilaster at the south end. In the south wall is a small roughly bawn recess, and along the wall near the roof is an inscription (No. 11)† in one line of deeply incised letters, with a raised device at the commencement. The hall below this has three cells on each side and four at the back—several of them quite unfinished.

Further north and somewhat higher, beyond a recess and a cistern with two openings, is a Vihara, the entire front of which is open, with a plain pilaster at each side having holes in them for the fastenings of the wooden front that has once screened the interior. There is a bench round the walls, and an advanced seat at the back as if for an image, or perhaps a gurū or teacher. The cave has been occupied in more recent times, as evidenced by a mud wall inside. Next we come to some large cisterns of which the roof has fallen in, and over the north side of them is a large Vihara with four cells at the back and two in the south end. In this case, again, there seems to have been originally only a wooden front; but for it has been substituted a stone one of ten courses of ashlar most carefully jointed, with a neatly carved door of the style of about the 10th century, and a wall-wrought lattice stone window let into the wall. These were probably substituted by some Hindu sect not Baudhā. There is a fragment of an inscription at the north end, over a bench outside. North of this are some cells, much decayed, but which had probably all wooden fronts: holes in the rock seem to indicate this.

After a difficult and painful scramble from the last group, I reached the Bārā Kotri group, so called from a large Vihāra with twelve cells. First, over a cistern broken in, is a Daghoba in half-relief in front of a large cell with one stone bed, and having on the south side of the door a long inscription in five lines of varying length and in somewhat florid characters. Time did not permit my copying this, but, as the letters had all been painted, I doubt not it was copied by Dr. Bhānu Dāji's paṇḍit. Next come four cells, the last with a stone bed; third, three wells, with a small hall over the last, which once had two square pillars in front; it is reached by a stair-landing in the north end of the verandah. Fourth, the Bārā Kotri, 36 ft. 8 in. wide and 33 ft. 5 in. deep, with four cells on each side, and a bench round all four. It has two doors and two large windows, one of them measuring 9 ft. 10 in. in width, with a groove in the sill for the wooden framework. Beyond this are several cells and a well, then a small Vihāra with three cells on the south side, and two at the back, with a Daghoba in half-relief, in a recess—probably an older form than that in Cave III. at Nāsik.

The next is a fine cave; it is a lofty flat-roofed Chaitya. The front wall was probably originally pierced for two windows and the central door 6 ft. 1 in. wide, but the south window has been hewn down until it forms a door; inside the front wall is an outer cross aisle or vestibule 4 ft. 9 in. wide, separated from the inner hall by two octagonal pillars and two others just attached to the wall: these have the Nāsik or water-jar base and capitals, but the latter do not reach the cross beam above; from the capital rises a short square pillar about 2½ feet high reaching to the roof, which is perhaps 18 or 19 feet high. The inner hall is 30 ft. 11 in. by 20 ft. 6 in., near the back of which stands a well-proportioned Daghoba 10 ft. 3 in. in diameter, the cylindrical part 5 ft. 11 in. high, and surround-
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ed on the upper margin by the rail pattern and
with what are intended to represent the ends of
bans projecting out below it. The umbrella is
carved on the roof, and connected with the
capital by a short shaft. The ceiling has been
painted, and still retains large portions of the
colouring: the design is in squares, each con-
taining concentric circles in orange, brown, and
white; but light was beginning to fail, and I
could not be certain of the darker tints. Out-
side is an inscription in three lines (No. 12),
first given by Colonel Sykes in a not very ac-
curate copy. Beyond this are some wells and
fragments of cells.

After a four miles' walk and a steep climb the
caves in a spur of a hill to the east of the Ga-
ñesa Lena are reached, about 400 feet above
Junnar. They face S.S.W. The Chaitya, the
most easterly of the group, is a small one 8 ft.
3 in. wide inside and 22 ft. 4 in. in length, or
about 15 ft. 4 in. from the door to the Dahgoba,
which is 4 ft. 10 in. in diameter. The sides or
jams of the façade are carved with Chaitya-
window ornaments, some having a Dahgoba in-
side, and others a lotus-flower, while the rail
ornament is interspersed in the usual way. The
face of the moulding round the window is also
carved with a geometrical pattern. The walls
are not straight, nor the floor level, and altogether
the work seems to have been left unfinished,
except perhaps the upper part of the Dahgoba,
the cylinder of which is 4 ft. 10 in. high, and
the total height 9 ft. 4 in. The aisle, which is
never wanting in a finished Chaitya cave, has
not been begun here. To the narrow ledge over
the architrave of the walls is 16 ft., and to the
roof 18 ft. 2 in. Next to this, but higher up
and almost inaccessible, are two cells; then a
well; and thirdly a small Vihañá with two win-
dows and two cells at the back, one with a stone
bed, and some rough cutting in the wall
between the cell doors resembling a Dahgoba,
but quite unfinished. It has also a cell with
stone bed at the left side; outside are two more
cells, and a chamber at the end of the verandah,
which runs along the front both of the Vihañá
and the cells. These caves, usually represented
as inaccessible, from the precipice being almost
perpendicular, are really difficult of access, and
dangerous: for any one not having a steady
head or unaccustomed to climbing.

Prof. H. Kern, of Leiden, has translated a
number of the inscriptions in a paper in the
Indische Studien, XIVter Bd. S. 393—397, of
which a translation is given in the next
paper. J.B.

---

THE INSCRIPTIONS OF JUNNAR.

BY PROFESSOR H. KERN, OF LEIDEN.

Translated from the 'Indische Studien,' XIVter Band, by Miss M. Tweedie, Edinburgh.

J. Burgess, in his Memorandum on the Bud-

nhist Caves at Junnar,* has lately published

again, and very completely, the Cave-inscrip-

tions, some of which were formerly communi-

cated by Col. Sykes.†

These inscriptions are indeed of different
dates, but collectively they are later than those
of Añoka. To judge by the forms of the charac-
ters, they are perhaps 200 or 300 years later.
But the way of writing is quite the same, for
the double consonant is either not given at all,
or is indicated by a mark like the anusvára
standing before the consonant that is to be
doubled. It is so also in Añoka's inscriptions
from various places. The only exception which
was believed to have been found, namely dda,

† Conf. ante, p. 53, note*; and Jour. R. As. Soc. vol. IV.
p. 299, No. 7; Jour. As. Soc. Beng. vol. VI. p. 1045,
No. 8; and No. 7, Jour. Br. H. Asiat. Soc. vol. V.
p. 163.

‡ Archæological Survey of Western India, Bombay,
1874, reprinted, with additions, above, p. 33.
[Also Jour. R. As. Soc. vol. IV. (1889) pp. 285-301.—Ed.]
No. 9 has—

'Dhāruradachakhamānī Lāṅkukayaasnā bhātāna Buddhavītasa Buddhakakhatasa cha bhikhanān (for bhikhanānā) deyadhānaṃ.'

Between the first and second lines stand in smaller letters 'Asasama pudāna.'

The translation is: "A pious gift of charity of the brothers Buddhānātra and Buddhakakhatasa, sons of Asasama (for bhikhanānā) dwelling in Bārygama (Bharoch), who came to this place from Ceylon."

This proper name Asasama is unknown, at least to me. It may also be read Asasama. As the proper name Sivasama occurs in No. 7, and Sama is without doubt the Sanskrit Sarman, so Asasama is perhaps to be read in the Sanskrit as Asvisarman. Bārygama is a regular taddhīta formation from Bharukaccha (see the Pāṭertsburg Dictionar, s.v.). I have great doubt myself about the correctness of the reading bikhanān. Monks have nothing to give, away, all to receive. The marks may be read as bhikha(m)bhan; in spite of the difference of the gender, this might correspond to the Sanskrit bhikkhambha, 'prop.' Or should we read chabi gobhe, Sansk. chápi garha?"

No. 3 has—

Kapita-udānakāsa natuno Tāpala-udānakāsa ka-
(m)-

sthapunasa Ana(n)dāsa deyadhānaṃ chetiya-
ghārariniyata

That is: "A pious gift of charity, designed for the sanctuary, by Ānanda, youngest son of the believer Tāpala, and grandson of the believer Kapila."

Instead of natuno we might be induced to read natuṣa; the marks for qa and sa are so much alike, that I have chosen so only out of respect for the known phonetic laws. The stha agrees with the often recurring st in the Gīrṇār edicts. In the Pāli, so far as I know, there is no trace of it; in the Prākrit of the dramas, however, and even in the Gipsy language, the union of the consonants st is in part retained.

No. 12 has—

Virasenaṃ kasa yahapitiyaṃkasa dharmamigamaṃ deyadhanaṃ chetiyaṃghara-

nīyata nāvalokabhitarkādhān

That is: "A pious gift of charity, designed for the sanctuary, for the common weal and happiness, by Virasena, a distinguished householder, confessor of the Dharma."

Dharmagigama I have not met with elsewhere; I suppose it is 'one for whom the Dharma is the source of authority.'

Nos. 4 and 11 have the same word at the beginning, the reading of which is not perfectly certain; this much, however, is certain, that Prinsep's reading (Journ. As. Soc., Beng. vol. VI. p. 1046) is inexact and in contradiction to the form of the letters. I read in No. 4—

kaliṣāvakaṃ Kukimputasa sammāsa-

kārīsa Sā(u)ghāvaṃ paṭi deyadhānaṃ

That is, "As a pious gift of charity from the pure-hearted Sāngkha, goldsmith, son of Kuṭira." That the proper name usually follows the name of the father is seen also from No. 10:—

Sayitīhagapitaputasa gahapitasa Sūlāsado

Paṭi, prati also stands, as indeed we might expect from the Sanskrit, after the governing substantive, and in fact in No. 7—

Sivasamayutasa Sīntabhati(?) paṭi deyadhānaṃ

That is, "For a pious gift of charity, from Sīntabhati, son of Sivasarman."

No. 1 runs thus:—

kaliṣāvakaṃ Haraṇikaputasa Sūlāsado (or Sūleṣjātasa) thakapurisasa chetiyagharinīyata deyadhānaṃ:

"A pious gift of charity, designed for the sanctuary, by the pure-hearted Sulāsado, trader, son of Haranika."

Thakka, as is clearly seen from the Mārāthī thakka and this inscription, is the correct spelling, instead of tukka, as is printed in the Kathāsārītīṣaṅgasa, lv. 140, 145, 152, and tūkka, as in Rājatārāntikā vii. 415. In the latter place it signifies 'a chatterer,' and probably also in the Kathāsārītīṣaṅgasa. We see by the word being used in the inscription that in itself it is no word of abuse, and was only understood as such because 'merchant' and 'deceiver' come to pretty much the same thing according to Indian ideas, since the period of the Veda (let us think of the pāṇi). A similar case as with pāṇi and thakka; thāka is afforded by the term kīvara. This by itself signifies 'trader,' and is used by Upalaka as the customary paraphrase for samy; in Rājatārāntikā viii. 192, however, it occurs as a term of contempt. According to this idea the taddhīta-formation kēdipko contained in the Pāli denotes 'hypocrite, charlatan, humbug' (perhaps 'cheat' also). The pas-
sage in the Rājaratanaśīna is instructive and pretty, and as it has been entirely spilt by the editors, as has generally been the case with the whole excellent work of Kalhaṇa, I present the following reading of the strophes referred to (128-134):

srotobhīr vyastam ambhodhau labhyan meghamakhaḥ payāḥ | prāptir bhūyas tu nā'sty eva vaniggrastasya vastunaḥ ||
tailasmigdhamakhaḥ svalpālāro mṛīvākṣīrīr bhavān | nyāśasṛgssavivādaro vanig vyāghrād vīṣāhyate ||
vīvāde śrēsthitānā prāthānūs sintiḥ prāk sa-
khyaḍarśānāḥ | sasṭhān-sasṭhānā jñāyāmā
nam prāṇānte 'pi na muchyate ||
nisargavānīchākā vēsyāḥ, kāyastho 'pi, varo

vanīk | gurupadēsopakśānī vīśākhaḥ savi-
śāśīṣāḥ ||
chandanaṁkāle śvetāśāke dhūpākhyāvāsaṁ | vīśvastraḥ syāt kīrāte yo viprakriṣṭāḥ sa na
"padaḥ ||
laṁdriṣastarātraśūtraśūtraśūtraśūtraśūtraśūtra

The etymology of the word ṛhakka is unknown; it may have been originally the name of a tribe. At least ṛakka is interchanged with Bāhika. It is known that the Bāhika also did not enjoy a good reputation.

ARCHAEOLOGICAL NOTES.

BY M. J. WALHOUSE, LATE M.C.S.

(Continued from vol. V, p. 241.)

XIV.—Curious Tombs and Entombments.

In an account of a Toda dry funeral (Ind. Ant. vol. III. p. 95), when speaking of the circle of stones within which the last remains were finally burnt, doubt was expressed whether the circle was ancient or new; from the late Mr. Breeds’s exhaustive work on the Primitive Tribes of the Nilgiris, lately published by the India Office, it appears to be doubtful whether these circles, called by the Todas Ázāras, are old, or made for the occasion. It seems that sometimes a circle of old date is used, and sometimes a new one is formed; the ashes of the deceased are scraped together and buried under a large stone at the entrance of the Ázāra. At any rate it is clear these circles are claimed and formed by the Todas. We learn also from Mr. Breeds that when all depart hurriedly after the final farewell rite in the gray dusk of the morning, none may look back—a point occurring in the superstitious of many races. The Kurumbas and Irulas of the same mountains, after everyday amongst them, bring a long water-worn stone (dēra kotta kallu) and put it into one of the old cromlechs sprinkled over the plateau. Some of the larger of these have been found piled up to the capstone with such pebbles, which must have been the work of generations. Occasionally, too, the tribes mentioned make small cromlechs for burial purposes, and place the long water-worn pebbles in them. Mr. Breeds reports that the Kurumbas in the neighbourhood of the Rangāsāi peak and the Bālīa born their dead and place a bone and a small round stone in the sāvī-mani—death-house, an old cromleck. On the Travancore mountains, the Malei Arīyaṇa, a numerous tribe, make miniature cromlechs of small slabs of stone, and place within them a long pebble to represent the deceased. (See Ferguson’s Rude Stone Monuments, p. 479.) The same practice is said to prevail amongst jungal tribes in Orissa. Dr. Livingstone noticed a similar custom in Africa:—“In various villages we have observed miniature huts about two feet high, very neatly thatched and plastered; here we noticed them in dozens. On inquiry we were told that when a child or relative dies, one is made, and when any pleasant food is cooked or beer brewed, a little is placed in the tiny hut for the departed soul, which is believed to enjoy it.” (Livingstone’s Last Journals, vol. 1. p. 156.) So the Malei Arīyaṇa offer arak and sweetmeats to the departed spirit supposed to be hovering near the miniature cromleck. All these instances existing to-day are of especial value as showing a connection of funeral rites with monuments of prehistoric type—stone circles and cromlechs amongst living.

* Driksatra (edition dri-kashaṭra, the manuscript perhaps dri-kashaṭra) signifies ‘eyelid’ (compare netrāchāda).
tribes who most nearly represent pre-historic peoples.*

In 1874 the Right Reverend Mar Kurilus Jehoiakim, Syrian Metropolitan of Malabar, died at Kotapam—a venerable and highly respected prelate. The Madras papers at the time contained the following account of the funeral, which has an interest and air of antiquity about the details that make it worthy of record in an antiquarian journal:—"The body was dressed in full canonicals and placed in a sitting posture on a chair, and then removed into the church, where it was left in that position, with the pastoral staff and crozier placed in the hands, until the third day, and during this time the usual ceremonies prescribed by the Syrian ritual were performed. On the third day—it is rather singular that about this time only signs of decay showed themselves—nearly two hundred priests and about ten thousand people assembled for the funeral. The body, still seated on the chair, was carried by priests under a canopy in solemn procession to some distance, and brought back to the north-east side of the church, where a tomb measuring eight square feet, with a seat inside like a chair, was built. The custom hitherto was to bury bishops within the church, but the deceased had desired that his body should be buried outside, but close to the church. In this seat the body was placed again in a sitting posture, facing the east, and the burial service was chanted. The brother of the deceased then removed the ring, pastoral staff and crozier, to be sent to the Patriarch of Antioch. From the roof of the tomb a globe lamp was hung up about a foot or so before the face of the deceased, and after the entombment it was lit, and a large quantity of incense thrown into the tomb until it reached the neck of the corpse, when the stones were piled up, and the builders closed the tomb." This antique ceremonial of an ancient church has probably come down, with little change in many of its features, from the remotest antiquity. The eight feet square tomb filled up with spices and incense, in which the dead was seated in his habit as he lived, recalls Egyptian and Etruscan tomb chambers, as well as mediavol modes of interment; and possibly all may be developments of the kistvaen or sepulchral stone chamber of prehistoric times, in which, too, skeletons have at times, as in Guernsey, been found placed in a sitting posture.

Here perhaps a place may be found for recording another funeral memorial of bygone days. The port of Bakal, in South Kanara, was once important, possessing a factory, and frequented by vessels from Europe. It is now deserted except by native craft, and three mouldering tombs preserve the else forgotten names of some of those bold and enterprising pioneer Englishmen who, in times before "the Company," sought their fortunes in the then half-fabulous East. Many such memorials survive in now deserted nooks and spots in India, mute witnesses of daring and wasted lives. Copies of the inscriptions on the Bakal tombs are subjoined:

1.
Here lyeth the Body of William Barton,
M.D.C.X.X.X.

2.
Here lyeth the Body of George Wye, Merchant,
M.D.C.X.X.X.I.

3.
Salv. Mundii.
M.D.C.X.X.X.V.III.

ON THE ANCIENT NĀGĀRI NUMERALS.

BY PÅNDIT BHAGVANLAL INDIRAJI.

The researches of Mr. Thomas, Dr. Bhaudji, and General Cunningham have proved beyond doubt that the system of numeral notation used in the most ancient Indian Nāgāri inscrip-

* It is noteworthy that whereas the Todas always place a body on the funeral pile face downwards, Col. Meadows Taylor, in his exploration of cairns and kistvaens in the Sinharap and Haidarabad (Dekhia), found several skeletons laid in the stone cists with the face downwards too.
of the signs employed for this notation are now well known through the numerous inscriptions which express numbers both in words and in figures, and it is only regarding the signs for 40, 50, 60, and 70 that some confusion is observable.

The object of the present paper will be—firstly, to settle definitively the signs for these numbers, and, secondly, to explain the origin of the whole of this ancient system of notation. The explanation will, I trust, give further proofs of the correctness of the value assigned to the signs.

As regards the first point, the figures for the four doubtful signs are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Sign</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>वृ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>वृ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>वृ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>वृ</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The signs for 40 have already been correctly read by General Cunningham. Prof. Bhāgārākar has mistaken its Valabhi form for 50, and Dr. Bühler for 60. The proof that it is really the sign for 40 may be derived from the coins of the Kshatrapa kings. In the Jasdan inscription Rudrasena I, the son of Rudrasiṃha and grandson of Rudradāman, gives as his date the year 127 or 128. A coin issued by the same Rudrasena bears the date 138. A second, on which the father's name, Rudrasiṃha (putrasa), is clearly legible and certain, while Rudrasena's name is obliterated, shows, after the sign for 100, the doubtful figure (५), which, under the circumstances, can only be read as 40. The sign for 50 occurs on a third coin which bears the name of Damaśena, another son of Rudrasiṃha. The coins of sons of Damaśena show the signs for 60 and 70, viz. Viradāman 160, Viṣajīvansena 168, 174, Damaśendesa 174, and finally two coins of Viradāman's son Rudrasena II, are dated 188 and 189. The old forms of the figure for 70, which slightly differ from those given above, appear also in the Girnār inscription of Rudradāman [५], and in the inscription of Uśvāradvāsa, Nāṣik Cave No. 16 र१. In the former the words 'varṣeṇa devāṇaptiśamane,' and in the latter 'sahānārāti satārī' are added.*

As regards the origin of these figures, I believe that I can confidently assert that all of them except the three first express letters or groups of letters, and that the variations which occur in their forms in the inscriptions of different dynasties and centuries are caused chiefly by the variations of the forms of the letters in the alphabets of the same times and dynasties. At the same time, however, it seems that there was a tendency to distinguish the signs which were to be read as letters from the corresponding ones which were to be taken as numbers, by very slightly changing the forms of the latter.

The resemblance of very many figures in the Kshatrapa, Valabhi, and Gupta inscriptions and coins to letters, e.g. of जो (7) to ज त्रास, of त्र [5] to त्र, struck me a long time ago. When I then found that the Jainas on their palm-leaf manuscripts, and the Buddhists of Nipāl both on their palm-leaf and paper manuscripts, marked the pages both by the ordinary numerals, and by letters and groups of letters which correspond to the alphabetical value of the old numerals, I felt that my conjecture was more than a mere haphazard guess. But I gained only the full conviction that my views were correct when I found the numerals expressed by letters in the plates of Vinayakapāla,† of Mahendrapāla, of Balavarman, of Bhāna, and in the late inscriptions of Nipāl.

I now give a synopsis of the figures found in the following inscriptions, coins, and manuscripts:—(1) in the inscriptions of the Śātavahana dynasty on the Naṅgāṅhā, (2) of the Kshatrapa and Andhrabhṛtya inscriptions of Nāśik, Kantneri, and Junnar, (3) on the Kshatrapa (valgo Sāha) coins and in their inscriptions at Girnār and Jasdan, (4) in the Gupta inscriptions of Sanchi, Mālwā, and Central India, and in the Lichhavi inscriptions of Nipāl, (5) on the Valabhi and Chālukya plates, (6) on the Pāla and other plates from Eastern India, (7) on the margin of a palm-leaf manuscript of the Pṛajā pāramitā acquired in Nipāl, (8) on the margin of the Śrīdāda Dīnāhiya and the Bṛhatkalpaduṣṭra (collection of the Bombay Government 1872-73), (9) on the margin of modern Buddha paper manuscripts.

* This sign has been read correctly by General Cunningham, Jour. Beng. As. Soc. vol. XXXIII. p. 28.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Early Indian Numerals—From Inscriptions and Coins.</th>
<th>From MSS.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1</strong> NaNagha Inscriptions.</td>
<td>7 Bandhika Nipal Palm-leaf MSS.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2</strong> Karatapya Inscriptions.</td>
<td>8 Jaina Palm-leaf MSS.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3</strong> Karatapya Coins and Inscriptions.</td>
<td>9 Bandhika Nipal Paper MSS.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>4</strong> Gupta Inscriptions.</td>
<td>Eastern Plates, 5th-10th century.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>5</strong> Valabhi Plates.</td>
<td>5 Bandhika Nipal Palm-leaf MSS.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>6</strong></td>
<td>6 Bandhika Nipal Palm-leaf MSS.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>7</strong></td>
<td>7 Jaina Palm-leaf MSS.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>8</strong></td>
<td>8 Bandhika Nipal Paper MSS.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>9</strong></td>
<td>9 Bandhika Nipal Paper MSS.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>10</strong></td>
<td>10 Bandhika Nipal Paper MSS.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>20</strong></td>
<td>20 Bandhika Nipal Paper MSS.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>30</strong></td>
<td>30 Bandhika Nipal Paper MSS.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Numeral</td>
<td>Nāgārī Inscriptions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>घ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>ख</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>ग</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>ध</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
<td>न</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90</td>
<td>ट</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>ठ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200</td>
<td>ड</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Numeral</th>
<th>Nāgārī Inscriptions</th>
<th>Kshatrapa Inscriptions</th>
<th>Valabhi and Chānkya Inscriptions</th>
<th>Gupta Inscriptions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>300</td>
<td>ण</td>
<td>ण</td>
<td>ण</td>
<td>ण</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>400</td>
<td>त</td>
<td>त</td>
<td>त</td>
<td>त</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500</td>
<td>ह</td>
<td>ह</td>
<td>ह</td>
<td>ह</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>600</td>
<td>क</td>
<td>क</td>
<td>क</td>
<td>क</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>700</td>
<td>ल</td>
<td>ल</td>
<td>ल</td>
<td>ल</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Numeral</th>
<th>Nāgārī Inscriptions</th>
<th>Andhrabheri Inscriptions</th>
<th>Valabhi</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1000</td>
<td>त</td>
<td>त</td>
<td>त</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>ह</td>
<td>ह</td>
<td>ह</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3000</td>
<td>क</td>
<td>क</td>
<td>क</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4000</td>
<td>ह</td>
<td>ह</td>
<td>ह</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5000</td>
<td>क</td>
<td>क</td>
<td>क</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6000</td>
<td>ह</td>
<td>ह</td>
<td>ह</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7000</td>
<td>क</td>
<td>क</td>
<td>क</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8000</td>
<td>ह</td>
<td>ह</td>
<td>ह</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9000</td>
<td>क</td>
<td>क</td>
<td>क</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10000</td>
<td>ह</td>
<td>ह</td>
<td>ह</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I think that a careful comparison of these figures with each other and with the corresponding groups of letters will go far to establish my proposition. But I must add some further considerations regarding each numeral.

The oldest sign for 4 appears to be (p. 44, col. 1) $k$; in the Khāstrapa and Andhrārāṣṭrīya inscriptions (col. 3) it resembles partly $k$ and partly $n$. The latter group is clearly observable in the Gupta inscriptions and on the Valabhi plates (col. 5), on which latter, however, $k$ also occurs, and the sign from the manuscripts resembles $n$ or $nk$, mistakes I think, for $nk$. Now the remarkable fact is that, though the upper part of the sign is not always the same, the lower always shows the figure of that form of $k$ which is used in the alphabet of the period. Thus the first two columns show the simple cross, which is the oldest form of the letter $ka$, and the third a cross where the vertical stroke is curved towards the left, just as we find the $ka$ in Radhākīman’s Girnār and the Jasdan inscriptions, while the manuscripts give the usual Devanāgarī $ka$. The 4 of the Gupta and Valabhi inscriptions likewise shows the particular $ka$ of those alphabets.

The sign for 5 is in the old Baudhā and Jain manuscripts distinctly $trī$. The signs in the Andhrārāṣṭrīya and Nāhāpāna inscriptions may be read in the same manner, though the $ri$ vowel is not, as usual, attached to the right-hand curved horizontal, but to the left-hand vertical stroke of the $t$. This discrepancy may be either the result of the desire to distinguish the numeral sign from the syllable $tri$ (in order to prevent mistakes), or be owing to the indifference which the old writers felt as to the manner in which they joined the parts of compound letters. Similarly $kṛi$ is sometimes $j$ and sometimes $ṛ$ or even $ṛ$. The same remark applies to the Khāstrapa signs (col. 4), but it ought to be observed that as the $ri$ in their inscriptions receives a stronger curve to the left, so the sign for 5 shows the same peculiarity. The first two signs in col. 5 are simply repetitions of those in col. 3, but it agrees with the nature of the Gupta characters that the left-hand stroke has no curve to the left. The third sign of the same column is clearly a $trī$ in the latter form. The same sign actually occurs as $trī$ in the name $Mātrivishnau$ in the Eran inscription. The fourth sign of col. 4 seems to owe its upper right-hand stroke to a desire to show a difference between the syllable and the figure. The fifth sign of the same column, and that in col. 9, may be read $kṛī$.

But it seems to me that they are merely a corruption of the second form in col. 5, the vertical stroke of which was curved towards the right.

The Valabhi figures in col. 6 offer at first sight some difficulties. But the first figure is clearly $trī$, and the sign for the long $ā$ which we found already in the fourth Gupta form is probably owing to the desire for differentiation. The following two signs, which look like $nd$, are mere corruptions of $tī$. For the $j$, for $t$ does appear occasionally instead of $j$ in other inscriptions, e.g. in the Nāsik inscription No. 12, l. 1, $veldātapatasa$. The loop was no doubt caused by hasty writing.

The sign for 6 in the Baudhā books (cols. 7 and 8) is clearly $phā$, and all the other signs represent the same group or $phā$, with the exception of the second sign in col. 4 and that in col. 8. The former may be read $pha$, and seems to be a mutilation of the full figure, made for convenience sake. The latter, which represents $rphā$, is apparently owing to the fact that the scribes mistook the subjoined $ra$ in the old books for $u$, and the $v$ before the $ph$ is the remnant of the long $ā$ which we find in the Valabhi and Gupta figures.

The sign for 7 is throughout $grā$ or $grād$. It ought, however, to be observed that only the second sign of col. 4 shows the little notch at the junction of the two letters, which is usual when the syllable is not to be taken as a numeral.

The sign for 8 is clearly $kṛā$ or $kṛa$ in the manuscripts, on the Eastern plates, and on the Valabhi plates. On the latter the $a$ is, however, joined to the $ka$ in a manner different from that in the words, where we have ($j$). The reason is probably the desire for differentiation. The other columns show mostly $ha$.

The sign for 9 is throughout $ṛ$. The shape somewhat differs from that usually employed in the texts, but agrees exactly with that used in the word $ūrō$ : compare, e.g., the $ūrō $sastī of the Valabhi plates with the sign for 9 in the same inscriptions.

The sign for 10 is in the ancient Baudhā (col. 8) and in the Jain manuscripts clearly.
The ancient Nāgārī numerals.

On the Eastern plates it looks more like लि, for which it has been mistaken by Bābū Pratāpchandra Ghose. But there is no objection to reading the sign लि. The fourth sign of col. 6 is likewise clearly लि. The signs in cols. 2, 3, 4, the first two in col. 5, and the first in col. 6, correspond to the letter ल, as it appears in the inscription of Rudradāman, and on one Valabhi plate. The second and third figures of col. 6 appear to be corruptions of this letter. It ought, however, to be kept in mind that we do not know what was the oldest form of लि; and the signs for ल and लि may have been identical. The sign in col. 10 is clearly द्व, which stands for द, as the Nāpalese have no द.

The fifth sign in col. 6 and the third in col. 5 may be read प्र and शो, and appear to be corruptions of द्व.

The signs for 20 and 30 offer no difficulties, as they exactly correspond each to the ता and त्रा (धर, द्र) of the period.

The sign for 40 is in the older inscriptions and in the manuscripts clearly प्र. On the Valabhi plates and in the coins of the later Kasathrapas it looks like स. The difference is caused by the omission of the lower part of the right-hand vertical stroke, and is perhaps intentional.

The sign for 50 used in the manuscripts and on the Eastern plates corresponds to the Amunāska (6) as it occurs in the manuscripts of the Mādhyāntina Sāhā of the White Yajurveda. The sign on the Kasathrapa coins is the same, only turned the other way, and that on the Valabhi plates a further corruption of the latter.

The original meaning of the signs for 60 and 70 is doubtful to me. Only this much seems certain, that 70 is derived from the former by the addition of a horizontal stroke on the right. The manuscripts read them ध् ि or च्ज्, and ठ्ड or च्ज्ड, respectively.

The sign for 80 corresponds to the ancient Upadhamaniya, such as we find on the Valabhi plates and in the alphabets of Kashmir and Nipāl (60).

The sign for 90 is the ज्ञानमाल. It is sometimes a hundred according to the syllable सव or स, and appears as such in cols. 2, 5, and 9. Cols. 7 and 10 show a, which seems to be a mistake, arising out of the great resemblance of the ancient forms of सव and a (6). The sign in cols. 3, 4, 6, and the second in 5, I take for mutilated forms of the ancient सव, caused by hasty writing. The लि in col. 8 is another corruption of लि.

The oldest sign for thousands may be read श्र, later it is clearly द्वा.

Postscript by G. Bühler.

At the request of Paṇḍit Bhaugānālī, who is not able to express himself in English, I have translated the above article on the Nāgārī numerals from his Gujarāti notes. I undertook this task because, after considering all his arguments, I felt convinced of the general correctness of his views, and because I wished to secure for my fellow-Sanskritists a speedy publication of this important discovery, and to the Pandit the credit due to him. I now use this opportunity to add a few remarks of my own on the subject.

Firstly, as regards the Paṇḍit's chief point, that the Nāgārī numerals are aksaras or syllables: its correctness can be proved by the statement of Malayagiri, a Jain writer of the 13th century, which Professor A. Weber first brought to light. This statement occurs in the commentary on the beginning of the Śīrṣayajñāniti, where a short-hand description of the town of Mithilā is given. The text runs as follows:

"At that time, during that period there was a town called Mithilā, rich in wealthy men, filled with joyful citizens and country-people—down to—adorned with palaces, खोका." (6)

In commenting on the latter portion of this passage, Malayagiri states first that the word ज्ञान, "down to," indicates that the description of the town is not given in full, and that a whole paragraph has to be supplied, in accordance with the conventional descriptions occurring in other works. Then he goes on according to Professor Weber's text, to say:

"kiṣṭra dassantiṇi sṛṣṭuḥ: pāśā iṣyāk kha ॥ ॥ ṭoṣa k a a b ā dāḍa dāḍa iṣyānām padava saha padachajñānivyayaḥ nācaddh krita,"

My manuscript has a sign which may be read खोका or खोक, as that used by Professor Weber.
ON THREE MĀLWA INSCRIPTIONS.

BY NILKANTA JANĀRDAN KIRTANE.

While at Ujjain in November 1875, I obtained a copper-plate grant or inscription, which had been brought to the local authorities by a farmer, who found it while digging in his field. This led to the acquisition of two more inscriptions, one of which is a copper-plate grant, the other is engraved on a stone.

The first in chronological order is that of Śrī Vākpati Rāja Deva. This inscription is on two plates of copper, that were held together by two copper rings inserted through holes made in the plates. The rings are now wanting. Each of the plates measures 12 by 8½ inches. The inscription contains 34 lines, and each line, on an average, contains 35 letters. In the left corner of the second or last plate is engraved the figure of Gauri holding in his right hand a cobra de capello;—for what purpose the reader will easily imagine. The numeral 2 stands at the beginning of the grant. The last two characteristics are common to both the copper-plate inscriptions; and the characters in which all the three are written are those of the old Kāyasha Sanskrit alphabet, in which the padmanda is very frequently used. I got this inscription of Vākpati from the archives of the Central India Agency, and am indebted for it to the kindness of Sir Henry Daly and Pāṇḍit.
Sarupa Nārāyaṇa.* This grant has already been translated and commented on by Dr. FitzEdward Hall in the Jour. Beng. As. Soc. vol. XXX. pp. 185-210.

The second copper-plate inscription I got at Ujjain through the kindness of the local authorities there. It is signed by the famous Rāja Bhōja of Dīrā, and purports to be a grant of a village by name Vīrānaka to a certain Brahmāṇa of the country of Rādhasuryasanga Kāraṇa, by name Dhanapati Bhaṭṭā, who had come into Mālava from Śrīvīḍa, in the country or division of Vāllu Vālla. This inscription also is on two plates of copper joined together by two rings of copper. Each of the plates measures 12 inches by 8.

This second grant connects itself with the first by enumerating some of the kings mentioned in the first grant, thus enhancing the value of both. It was turned up by a farmer while digging in his field, which adjoins a small stream now called Nāgājharī, which must apparently be the same as the Nāgādharī mentioned in the grant. This stream is included within the holy Panchakroṣhi of Ujjain. The date of this inscription is Chaṭvārthi Chaturdīśi of the Saṅsvāt year 783, i.e. 1021 A.D.; the date of the grant is Māγha Asatāstrītiya of the same year.

The third inscription is engraved on a slab of stone measuring about 20 inches by 14, which is now let into the wall of a newly built temple at Iṅgnūda, in the territory of the junior Rāja of Devaś, It purports to be a grant of a village, called Akgāsiyaka, towards the expenses of a temple of Mahādeva by name Gohadesvāra. Śrī Vījaṇapāladeva is the granter of this inscription, which is dated Ashādha Śukla Ekādaśi of the Saṅsvāt year 1190, or 1193-4 A.D.

The numeral Ḍ (if it be not meant for "Om"), and the figure of Garuḍa holding the hooded snake, in the first two inscriptions, are not, I presume, without significance. The numeral may suggest that the writers of the grant were Buddhists, the 9 standing for the well-known nine prāṇās or salutations to the deities of the followers of Buddhī; and the figure of Garuḍa, I conjecture, signifies that the king whose royal device it is, is one of the line of Śeṣaḥ ikṣikings of Ujjain or Mālava, the hereditary enemies of Śālivāhana of Praitishṭhāna or Paithana on the Godavari—in other words, the successors or descendants of the famous, but almost fabulous, Vikramāditya of Avantī or Ujjain.

It may be remarked of these inscriptions that they were found in or near the identical places which they respectively purport to give away.

Vākpati Rāja Deva may or may not have been the grandfather of Bhōja, and my reason for doubt is that the grandfather of Bhōja is said to be (vide Asiatic Researches, vol. IX. p. 160) one Mahendra Pāl. As this statement is not, however, corroborated by any satisfactory evidence, I incline to the belief that Vākpati was the grandfather of Bhōja, and that the line of kings as given in this and the other inscriptions is in the order of natural descent from father to son, or of those who stood to each other in that relation by the rite of adoption. The very words made use of in the documents—"पाबधिवयसः"—"meditating on the feet of," "साताशिनिन्यस्यसमुपासिः"—"for the extension of the merits of mother and father (= ancestors) as well as of ourselves"—tends to lead to the

---

* I am told that they were exhumed at Dharampurī—60 miles from Indore.

† नौ कृतिहारिन, नौ अत्तरि, नौ अट्टरणाओं.

‡ The Bhairavī called Nātha sing a song of Bhartṛi, which is a strange mixture of kings and places. The song says there was a marriage between Rādha Piṅgāla, whom it makes the daughter of Bhōja, and the Rāja Bhartṛi of Ujjain. Bhartṛi is asked to accept the hand of Piṅgāla by a Brahman on the part of Bhōja. Bhartṛi wants to know the family and race of the damsel. The reply of the Brahman, who is the only true and valuable assertion in the whole song, is—

**अत वहस्ति विषयाप्पाकी। गणानि-वायुरि वायरि।।**

Gādabhasmae Nāma Daśmān adv. &c. &c.

This song supports the view I have taken above. Gādabhasma, as the reader will easily remember, is the reputed father of the Vikramāditya who is supposed to have reigned at Ujjain 466 A.D.
latter belief, which gains strength from Munja's name being omitted from the list of kings in both inscriptions. Munja, it is notorious, was elected to rule the state after the death of Sindhurāja Deva, the father of Bhoja, as the latter was then a minor of only eight years of age, and that he tried to usurp the regal power after Bhoja his nephew had come of age. Bhoja is said to have addressed to Munja several complaints, still well known, wherein, reproaching Munja with his base schemes, he said, "Karṇa Rāja Vikrama is no more, and he carried nothing with him of his immense treasures, but died like other men." This Karṇa Rāja Vikrama had, it is said, usurped the powers of his master, who was a great monarch. There was disseminated a prophecy which said that Bhoja would be a fortunate and powerful prince, and that he would reign over Mālwa, the Central Provinces, and the Dakhan. This prophecy, it is said, had the desired effect, and Munja resigned his powers into the hands of Bhoja, and himself leading an army into the Dakhan in the service of the state died in battle there. All this, I think, shows the existence of bad blood between the uncle and the nephew; yet, I presume, the natural aversion of a high-spirited and gifted youth towards a regent who tried to delay his desires is not sufficient to explain the omission of a brave and learned predecessor, if the end in view were not to mention one's own lineal ancestors only. This much I advance to support my assertion that the kings mentioned in Vākpati's and Bhoja's inscriptions stand to each other in the relation of direct ancestor. The Dānchandrikā certainly supports this view in cases of all sorts of religious grants, as it is incumbent on the grantor to name in the deed of grant at least the names of his father and grandfather.

Of the proper names mentioned in Vākpati's

"The verses said to have been reported to Munja,—when he supposed that Bhoja had been put to death in pursuance of his orders,—as his victim's last words, are these:—

शास्त्रा स मर्यात्: \ सूर्यवत्स्य श्रवणामि गिन।
कृष्णम् सहिष्ठवे विवचः: \ कार्ये दानवालात्:।
अधार्य च विश्वास्य विवचः: \ विवचः ब्रह्मायण:।

"King Mahabali, the ornament of the golden age, has passed away: and where, too, is the slayer of Dasaka, Pandu, who threw a bridge over Mahadudhi, the southern sea? All other monarchs, likewise, that have Rourkela, Yudhisthira and the rest, where are they? None of these did the earth accompany: but I imagine that it will accompany thee."

inscription, the most notable is the Ahičchhatra from which the philosopher Vasantaḥaryya, as the grant says, emigrated into Mālwa, which to him naturally was a 'Dakshina Dhāma,' or 'Southern country.' The locality of the place granted by this inscription can even now be clearly identified. The Pishācha Tirtha remains till this day, and also Chikkilika, now called Chikhalda—a tālukā of Holkar's. The Gardhaba Nadi is now called Kharja, a word of the same meaning. This place now is in the Dharampuri tālukā of H.H. the Rāja of Dhār. Of Ahičchhatra, it will be sufficient to say that it was formerly the capital of the North Pānchāl, and is now identified with Adhi-Kotha, near Rānagār, in Rohilkhand. A pretty full account of Ahičchhatra is given by General Cunningham in his Ancient Geography of India (pp. 359, 360, 363).

The grantee of the second inscription—Dhanapatī Bhāt, I am told by Balkrishna Śastrī of Indor, was a very learned man at the court of Bhoja. I do not know anything of Rād Sub Sang Karnaṇṭa or of Velly Vella. The village Virānka no longer exists in Mālwa. There is a certain Virānka mentioned in the Rājatarangīni; but that is not the Virānka of the present grant, I suppose.

The Inganapat of the third grant is the modern village of Ingoda, in Western Mālwa. Agāsiyāk no longer exists. About seven miles from Ingoda there are to be seen on the banks of the Kahipir the ruins of a Šaiva temple of large dimensions. I think this must have been the temple of Gohādeva named in the grant.

As Bhoja is not mentioned by any foreign writer, it was impossible, until very lately, to ascertain with any near approach to the time at which he lived. Dr. Bühler says:—The date

"These lines are wrought into the Bhoga-prabhanda. An earlier work in which they occur is the Śravnavāna-paddhati, written in A.D. 956. There they appear as an anonymous extract."—Jour. As. Soc. Beng. vol. XXXI. pp. 203.6.—En.

Dr. Hall thinks Ahichchhatra may not have been far from the Vindhyas, and Wilson supposed there were several places of the name. The former adds:—

"Many is the pious Marāthā who never submits himself to the hands of his barber without repeating these lines:—

सत्तरस्यनामानाय \ ब्राह्मणस्यनामाणि न भवे।

"By the recollection, on shaving, of Ananta, Ahichchhatra, Pithliputra, Aditi, Diti, and Sride, the evils incident to the operation are all obviated."—En.
COPPER-PlATE GRANT OF VAKPATI RĀJA OF DHĀRA, A.D. 974.
of Bhoja is, unfortunately, not yet satisfactorily ascertained. Lassen places his reign between 997 and 1053. But the only certain date in his reign is the year 1043, in which his barana, the Rājmirīgānka, is dated. My reasons for placing him later are, firstly, that Bilhana states that during Bhoja's reign, Somsēvara I. (1040-1069) took Dhārā by storm, and secondly that Kalhana asserts (Rājatalaṅkāvi vii. 259) that Bhoja and Kahiti Rājā or Kahiti Pati were, after 1062, the only true friends of the poet, &c.

Now the date of our inscription is Samvat 1078, Chaitra Śuddhi Chaturdashi, i.e. A.D. 1022, and it is evident that the Rājmirīgānka was written nearly twenty-one years after the date of the present grant, which, there is reason to suppose, was drawn after Bhoja had attained undisputed authority in the state. Let us now suppose that this happened in his eighteenth year, according to the provision of the Hindu Law in such cases. But we have further aid: for the Jain poet A m i t a g a t i, in his work called the Subhadśitarangininasandoha, says that he composed it in the Samvat year 1050 (994 A.D.), when Rājā Munja was reigning. We know also that when Sindhu Rāja, the father of Bhoja, died, the latter was a minor of some eight years only. If we take now the year 994 A.D. as the first of Munja's regency, which it is generally believed was a very short one, and deduct eight years from it, we get the year 986 as that of Bhoja's birth, and again if we add eighteen years to this time we get the year 1004 as that of Bhoja's accession to the throne. Add about fifty-five years to this—Bhoja is said to have reigned 55 years and some months—and we get the year 1059 as that of Bhoja's death, surely within a few years of the real dates. There remain now about 19 years, in which we must place part at least of Vākpāti's reign, and the whole of Sindhu Rāja's.

The two inscriptions taken together give the following line of kings:

1 Krishna Rājā Deva.
  2 Vaira Siṭha Deva.
    3 Siyaka Deva.
    4 Vākpāti Rājā Deva.
    5 Sindhu Rājā Deva.
    6 Bhoja Deva.

I do not know much about the kings mentioned in the third inscription. Malwā, at and before the time of the Muhammadan invasion, was split into a number of small kingdoms, and the kings in this grant may be some of them.

I.—Vākpāti's Inscription.
1st Plate.

[Inscriptions translated and discussed.]

* Pāṇḍita ... 55 years, 7 months, and 3 days.
† Read svāpīhitā.
‡ Read bijapīhitā. Or swa ...
May the resplendent beauties of the manly throat of Sṛṅkaṇṭha (Māhādeva), smoky in appearance from their mixing with the smoke issuing, as from the fire-like poison of the hissing snake, which, as they reach where the ever-changing and shining crescent is placed on his head, may appropriately be compared to Rahu,—beauties which are the result of frequent contact with the quivering cheeks of Girijā (Pārvatī), and which are mistaken for the mask applied to them,—increase your prosperity!

May the active body of the enemy of Mūra (Krishṇa), which the face of Lakṣmi would not please, which the waters of the ocean could not cool, which the lotus of the lake of his own navel was powerless to pacify, and which could not be soothed by the fragrant breath issuing from the thousand mouths of Śeṣa: that body of Kṛṣṇa so heated by Rādhā's separation, protect you!

Happy be the great monarch, the king of kings, the lord paramount, the illustrious Amaṅgaharṣa Deva, otherwise called the illustrious Vākpatriyā Deva, the lord of the earth, the lord of wealth, and the lord of kings, successor of the great monarch, king of kings, the lord paramount, the illustrious Siya Deva, successor of the great monarch, king of kings, the lord paramount, the illustrious Vairisāhā Deva, successor of the great monarch, king of kings, the lord paramount, the illustrious Kṛṣṇaprāṣā Deva. He has no doubt, with much greater fidelity than was observed by the dilettante who first published it.—Dr. F. Hall, Jour. As. Soc. Beng., vol. XXX. p. 107 n. This Vāpakṣī inscription may assist in settling the date of Bhavabhuti if the assertion of Kālana in the Rājatarangini be true.
orders all the Government officers, Brâhmans and others, patels, and inhabitants, and cultivators assembled in the Tâdâr by name Pippurâkâ, situate on the banks of the holy Narmâda, to the north of the portion of waters called the Gardabhapâni, that it be known to them that the said Tâdar (?), which is bounded on the east by the Agârvâhalâ, and on the north by the river which flows into the ditch belonging to Chikhiliâ, and on the west by the Gardâhaba river, and on the south by the Pejâhâtirhâ the Tâdar whose boundaries on the four sides have been described—the king being at Ujjain on the fourteenth day of the bright fortnight of the month of Bhadrâpada, the auspicious day of the Pâvitrâ Parvâi of the Sâvanâ year 1031, after bathing himself in the waters of the Śiva lake and worshipping the lord of every living as well as lifeless thing, the lord and husband of Bhavânâ, and considering on the vanity of the world—

"The dominion of the earth is as shifting as the tempest clouds," &c.‡

"The life of man is like a drop of water," &c.‡

"Wealth is changing like the edge of the circumference of a revolving wheel," &c.‡

—being thus convinced of the vanity of all created things, and choosing to abide by the unforeseen rewards for meritorious deeds, bent on furthering the merits of his mother and father as well as of himself, with singleness of heart and the ceremony of pouring water (on the palms of the hands of the grantee) does hereby give away the above-mentioned Tâdar, with all its proper boundaries, which extend as far as the ground for the tending of the cattle and for cutting grass and fuel extends, covering the space of one kos,—with all the rows of trees thereon and the minerals therein, with all the gold, the land revenue, and the servitude and sundry other revenues or fines, and with all sorts of rights belonging to it,—to the very learned Brâhman philosopher the illustrious Va-santâchârya, son of Dhânâka Pândit, who has emigrated from Ahichchhatra into this southern realm,—as long as the sun and moon, the earth and the seas endure.

Knowing this, they are henceforth to give to this Brâhman, in obedience to the royal order, all established rents, servitudes, taxes, and the gold.

"Considering that the merit," &c.‡

"This earth has been enjoyed by many princes," &c.‡

"Of wealth, which is as transitory as a bubble of water," &c.‡

"To all future kings of this earth," &c.‡

"Looking upon wealth," &c.‡

Dated 1031 Bhâdrâpada Sudî Chatturâsâ

14. This order has been given by Śrî Kanha-paîka. This is the signature in Vâkpatirâja Deva's own handwriting.

II.—Bhoja's Inscription.

Plate I.

1 जयति ज्योक्षितेऽः तमां सर्गां विभाजति तां अन्नां धीरे विश्रासा लेखा जयदीजंकुरक्राक्तिम्
2 हनुमन्दु वा स्मारिता कल्याणानविश्व जया कल्याणानाथयानातिक्षलय
3 तत्रसंगता परममात्रक महाराजाधिराज परमेशर श्री सीतकदेव पादप
4 नृपतात परममात्रक महाराजाधिराज परमेशर श्रीवासतिराजदेव
5 पापादेवपरममात्रक महाराजाधिराज परमेशर श्रीसिद्धार्जनपादासाताल
6 परम महात्रक महाराजाधिराज परमेशर महाराष्ट्रक देवोजिनोपकुशी नागार्थ
7 प्रकतित हृदयमयो तत्त्वातिक्षलय जयसयां कंठदीविना सवृष्टिमय जयसया
8 जनपदाघिथसंगताधिस्थिस्य संहितासस्तु संहिताइतिस्य यथा अवि-परमात्मात्मिकसंहिताभिन्नस्य
9 समातने मायाजितृतीयम् राजपुराणपरि समझम् उपरि
10 लेखास लेखास श्रीमहाराजाधिराजदेवशिल्पाभिन्न

† Dr. Hall reads this Vadar.—Ed.
‡ The full translation of the slokas marked thus ‡ is given in the translation of the second inscription, where they occur again.
Translation of Bhajo's Inscription.

Glory to the god whose hair is the sky (Maha
deva), and who bears on his head the horned moon, emblematic of the shoot from which sprung the world!

May the braids of the enemy of the god of love, brown like the dread lightning of the day of final dissolution, always extend the sphere of your prosperity!

Happy be the great monarch, king of kings, the lord paramount, the illustrious Bhaja
deva, the successor of the great monarch, king of kings, the lord paramount, the illustrious Sindhu
rajadeva,|| the successor of the great monarch, king of kings, the lord paramount, the illustrious Vak
patirajadeva,|| the successor of the great monarch, king of kings, the lord paramount, the illustrious Sivas
kadeva. He orders all the officers of Government, good Brhamans and others, pafila and rayatas

assembled in Vira
aka, situate within the limits of the division or country to the west of the Nagadraha, that it be known to them that on the 3rd day of the dark fortnight of the month of Margha of the Samvat year 1078, on Sunday when the sun began his northern journey, he being then at the glorious city of Dhur, after bathing himself and worshipping the lord of every living as well as lifeless thing, the lord and husband of Bhavini, and considering on the varity of the world (as in the skloka):

"The dominion of the earth is as shifting as the tempest-clouds that are wafted on the wind, and the enjoyments which it offers are pleasing only for a moment.

"The life of man is like a drop of water hanging on the point of a blade of grass. If one wish to go to heaven, virtue, O men, is the greatest friend in the journey!

"Wealth is changing, like the edge of the cir
pp. 299, 300, 328; Lassen reads Sinaraja, apparently from the Nagpur copperplate: Ind. Altert. III. 1169.—En.
cumference of the revolving wheel of worldly life. Repentance, therefore, will be the sole reward of those who obtaining wealth will not bestow it in works of charity."

And being thus convinced of the vanity of all created things, and choosing to abide by the unforeseen rewards for meritorious deeds, bent on furthering the glory and merits of his mother and father as well as of himself, with singleness of heart and the ceremony of pouring water (on the hands of the grantee), by this writ of the ploughs of land to be given (in charity), he (the king) grants away, as long as the sun and moon, the earth and the seas endure, the above-mentioned village, with all its proper boundaries, which extend over the space of one kos, as far as the ground for tending cattle, with all the gold, the land revenue, and the servitude and sundry other revenues or fines, and with all sorts of rights thereof, to Dhanapati Bhatta, son of Govinda Bhatta, a Rigvedi Brahman of the Asvalayana dakha, of the Agasti potra and kripawara, who, being an inhabitant of Rádhá Suhasana Karna, has come from Srijada, situate in Vellu Valla. Knowing this, they are henceforth to give to this Brahman, in obedience to the royal will, all established rents, taxes, and cash.

Considering that the merit of this charitable deed belongs to them in common with him, all succeeding kings, whether of his family or of any other, ought to acquiesce in this his charitable grant and uphold it; for it is said:

"This earth has been enjoyed by many princes, Sagara and others, and the merit of charitable grants has successively belonged to those who, for the time being, were possessed of sovereign power over her. Things given away in charity by former kings with aims of philanthropy and renown are likened to rejected things and to vomitings, and what good man would again resume them?"

"This charity of ours should be acquiesced in alike by those who will glory in the nobility of our family, and by those who may be strangers to us.

"Of wealth, which is as fleeting as a flash of lightning or a bubble of water, there are two good fruits or uses, and only two: one is its employment in charities, and the other is the maintenance thereby of other men's fame.

"To all future kings of this earth does the Sri Rámachandra entreat again and again that as the bridge of charity is a common boon, which benefits all kings in their times alike, it should in successive times be maintained intact by them all."

Therefore, looking upon wealth as if it were a drop of water on the petal of a lotus-flower, and upon life as quite uncertain, and thinking on all that I have said, a man should never try to undo what others have done to commemorate their names.

Dated in the Śaṅvat year 1078, Chaitra Śuddhi 14 Chaturdashi, Svayamajñyā Maṅgalam Mahārājī.

(Witness) this signature in Bhoja Deva's own handwriting.

III.—Inscription at Ingoda.

1. ॐ ॐ ॐ

2. Saṃsattāramātādāsām

3. Saṃsattāramātādāsām

4. Saṃsattāramātādāsām

5. Saṃsattāramātādāsām

6. Saṃsattāramātādāsām

* A plough of land in Mālwā is equal to a piece of ground one can till with one pair of bullocks. Drona is another measure of land mentioned in old grants.

* वें may be short for वें (modern वें).
Translation of the 3rd Inscription.

Adoration to Śiva. On the 11th day of the bright fortnight of the month of Ashāḍha of the Samvat year 1190, here in Inganaṇapati, by me the king of kings, the lord paramount, the illustrious Vijayapāladeva, the successor of the great monarch, king of kings, the lord paramount, the illustrious Tivunapāladeva, the successor of the prosperous Priṭhavipāladeva, who shone resplendent among the row of the kings, and who possessed the titles of the lord, king of kings and lord paramount: (By me) after worshipping the lord and husband of Bhavānī, and meditating on the vanity of the world—in order to increase the merit and fame of my mother and father as well as of myself, in the presence of all my councillors, the family priest, and the astrologer, and all other dependants, and of the Brāhmaṇa Indu ŚrāvīŚādēlāk, resident of the Brahmapuri street of this place, and of Mahākakal, and Radhānduka, and Śrī Lalā, and Śrī Sadhā, and Śrī Lakshmanā, and others of the merchants, on the propitious 11th day of Ashāḍha, is given, with the ceremony of pouring water, the village of Agāsiyaka as far as its own boundaries extend, with all the trees, shrubs, and riches contained therein, as well as all the rents and servitude, taxes and titles, to the god Gohadeivara, situate within the division or country to the south of Inganaṇapati.

In virtue of this, the pāśyas and cultivators of the village should, in deference to the king’s order, henceforth pay all this to the above-mentioned god.

Things granted in charity by former kings, &c. &c.

This earth has been enjoyed by many princes, &c. &c.

He who resumes land given (in charity) either by himself or by anybody else, lives a worm in the hell called Raurava for sixty thousand years.

The dominion of the earth is as shifting as a tempest-cloud, &c.

This has been written by Āshāḍhara, son of Kelaḥa, son of Rājapāla, a Kāyaṣṭha of the family of Valabha.

This is engraved by Sagana, son of Harsena, son of the artisan Mahābāl, of the family of Kukās.†

† The last two paragraphs are unintelligible as they stand in the original; the translation is merely a guess at what the writer and engraver may have meant. This inscription, again, it will be observed, is interspersed with glaring grammatical mistakes, which, however, may easily be corrected. The transliteration given, however, is a faithful copy of the original,—of which a reduced facsimile is given in the accompanying plate.
NOTES ON GUPTA COINS.

BY THE HONOURABLE SIR E. C. BAYLEY, K.C.S.I.

SINCE the publication of Mr. Thomas's latest paper on the dynasty of the Guptas* I have become possessed, through the kindness of Dr. Bühler, of three coins which tend to elucidate some of the points left doubtful by Mr. Thomas.

The first of these coins is a duplicate of that in the late Mr. Freeling's cabinet,† which Mr. Thomas attributes, doubtfully, to "Srl Gupta."

The rough execution of that coin allies it with those of the latest Guptas renders it, as Mr. Thomas points out, a priori unlikely that the coin could have been struck by the founder of the Gupta dynasty; but if the reading were correct it might still be attributed to a later king of the same name.

My coin, however, is in considerably better preservation, and though, unfortunately, the actual name of the king by whom it was struck is not legible, yet the rest of the inscription leaves little doubt that his name was not Srl Gupta.

The words "Srl Gupta" undoubtedly occur, but in the beginning of the legend; and though the letters which follow them are, unfortunately, too rudely cut to be legible, still there can be small doubt that the entire word is merely some epithet applied to the king, referring to the Gupta race. The legend reads as follows:—

\[\text{Srl Gupta} \quad \text{vātāryā} \quad \text{Gupta vikramārkasya} \]

or Srl Gupta vā - - vātāryā - - - Gupta vikramārkasya.

My own impression is that the blank for the fifth word in the above legend should be filled up with the word Kumāra, but I cannot pretend to make any suggestion as to the emendation of the third word.

The next coin is only curious as being allied to the above, for it is undoubtedly one of "Chandra Gupta," and in all probability of Chandra Gupta II.

Both coins have the same style of head on the obverse (unfortunately no dates), and the symbol which Mr. Thomas terms the Pārvati symbol on the reverse.

I give the legend on the reverse:—

\[\text{Srl Gupta} \quad \text{vātāryā} \quad \text{Gupta vikramārkasya} \]

Of the above twenty-two letters, twelve, forming the latter half of the legend, are quite distinct, viz.

Rāja Srl Chandra Gupta Vikramārkasya.

The three first letters seem to be the same as those at the commencement of the legend on the coin already described, viz. Srl Gupta; and the letters 4, 6, 7, and perhaps 8, seem interrupted by a star to form the conclusion of the word thus commenced. The 9th and 10th letters are not clear, and may be de, va,—deva Rāja—being an epithet assumed by Chandragupta II.‡; but while the ninth letter seems preferably to read ja, the tenth may be dhi.

The entire legend would therefore read—

Srl Gupta - - - - - rāja-dhirāja Srl Chandra-de-va

Gupta-vikramārkasya.

I believe the epithet Vikramārkasya is new to Indian numismatics; at least I can recall no other example of it.

These two coins have, however, rather a purely numismatic than an historic interest. The third coin is of value historically, for it gives the date of a king hitherto unplaced in the Gupta dynasty, viz. Bakrā Gupta.

I do not give any description of this coin: for, save in the points noticed below, it is exactly the same as that figured by Mr. Thomas in his paper already quoted as No. XII.* (Archaeol. Rep. p. 63).

The only points of difference are that the letter B is more clearly B on my coin,—squerer, that is, than in Mr. Thomas's figure, or ； and secondly the obverse is that of the coin No. X. of Mr. Thomas's paper: it bears a date, that is to say, behind the head (as in the Kshatrapa coins) \[\Delta \text{Ar} = v(\text{Arsha})\] 90. The date on both the

* In the Report on the Antiquities of Kāthiāwan and Kachch of the Archaeological Survey of Western India, pp. 18 ff., also printed separately (Trübner & Co.).
† Save that it does show the group of stars on the reverse, which Mr. Freeling's coin, apparently, bore.
‡ I am indebted for this suggestion to General Cunningham.

§ It will be seen that I read the "ista" symbol prefixed to the date as va for vārsha. I do this on the authority of an unpublished late Kshatrapa coin (also given me by Dr. Bühler); on it is clearly \[\Delta \text{Y} (\text{vārsha})\] 900. See also the prathama of Iśvaradatta's coins.
known coins of Toramāṇa (to the style of which this coin closely approximates) is "82"; in neither case is there any figure to represent the century.

The inference which I think may be first drawn from the fact is that, supposing both kings to use the same era, Bakra Gupta (I imagine Bakra to be a local barbarism for Vakra) was eight years later in date to Toramāṇa, and secondly that both were included in the series of later Gupta kings.

As to the era of the date, Mr. Thomas has suggested that it may be applied (1) to the Gupta family era; (2) to the era adopted by the Khaṭrapa kings, as for a time used by the Gupta; and (3) to the Seleucid era (so I understand), omitting the cipher for hundreds. I venture to suggest a fourth, viz. the "Loka Kāl," as to which General Cunningham and Dr. Bühler have recently written, and in applying which the century is never mentioned. Accepting the Gupta era, the date cannot be less than 190 of that era, for Chandra Gupta II is of the year 90, and this coin is of far later date and execution. If the Gupta era be taken as the equivalent of the Śaka era, this would place Bakra Gupta in 268 A.D.

If it be taken as representing the (2)99th year of the Khaṭrapa dynasty, and that be the equivalent of the Vikramāditya era, then the date would be 233 A.D.

If the Seleucid era be adopted, the date would be (the fifth century of the Seleucid era being taken) 278 A.D.

Again, if the Loka Kāl be taken, and supposing the century to be that beginning in 214 A.D. (it could scarcely be earlier with reference to the date of Chandra Gupta II), then the date of Bakra Gupta would fall as low as 314 A.D., and Toramāṇa would be brought down to 306 A.D.

I proceed to consider which of these dates seems the most probable.

---

As to the first, if the Khaṭrapa era is to be taken as equivalent to that of Vikramāditya, and the Gupta era as that of the Śakas, or if ever they respectively approximated, then Bakra Gupta would be brought in before Buddha Gupta, whose dates of 155 and 165 of the Gupta era are equal to 234 and 244 A.D. on the theory that they are Śaka dates. The style of Bakra Gupta coins hardly warrants this supposition, though it is not impossible.

The other three dates appear preferable; the Seleucid era if applied to Toramāṇa's coin also would place that king in 270 A.D.—about twenty-six years later than Buddha Gupta; the Gupta era would place Buddha Gupta, Toramāṇa, and Bakra Gupta in closer contact still; while the Loka Kāl would doubtless bring down the last named two kings 58 and 69 years respectively later than Buddha Gupta.

On the whole I am inclined to believe that the Gupta era is that to be preferred. It is clear from the two Eran inscriptions that the kings Buddha Gupta and Toramāṇa both were reigning during the life of one and the same man, Dhaṃya Viṣṇu, and that the latter was a man of some position and wealth under the earlier king. It is, of course, far from impossible that Dhaṃya Viṣṇu may have been young when he caused one monument to be erected, and very old when the other was executed. If he lived even to, say, eighty years of age, even sixty years may well have elapsed between the execution of the two monuments, i.e. the later years of Buddha Gupta and the earlier of Toramāṇa. Still the shorter interval is certainly the more probable one, and I am therefore inclined to think, with Mr. Thomas, that Toramāṇa should be placed in 260-61 A.D., and Bakra Gupta I would accordingly place in 268-69,—adopting, that is, the Gupta family era as that of both coins, and assuming that to be identical with the Śaka era.
A NEW GRANT OF GOVINDA III., RĀTHOR.

BY G. BÜHLER.

In June last Major J. W. Watson, then Acting Political Agent, Revākāñhā, informed me that, while acting in 1873-4 as Political Agent of Pahanpur, he had been shown by the Kārbhārī of Rādhanpur two copperplates the writing of which resembled very closely that of the Morā plate published by Professor Bhāndārkar in the Indian Antiquary. I at once addressed Colonel Shotett, the present Political Agent, Pahanpur, on the subject, and solicited his good offices with the Rādhanpur Darbār for a loan of the plates seen by Major Watson. Colonel Shotett very kindly acquainted the Nawab with my request, and procured for me four plates, after a troublesome hunt for the half-forgotten grants. On examining them I found that two of them contain three-fourths of a land-grant issued by Govinda III., Rāthor; while the other two belong to Bhimadeva I., Chālukya, of Aṅhilvād-Pāthān. The latter will be published in my paper on the land-grants of the Aṅhilvād Chālukyas. The former are so important that they deserve a separate article.

The two plates measure each 12 inches by 10, and have one hole in the middle of the left-hand side, in which the seal-ring was fixed. The later has been lost, as well as the third side. For this grant, like other ancient Rāthor śāhanas, was written on three plates, the first and last of which are inscribed on the inner sides only, while the centre one bears letters on both sides.* The loss of small importance, as the last plate contained only the well-known verses from the Śrīmātu on the subject of gifts of land. The letters of our grant are ancient Devanāgarī, exactly resembling those of the Sāmangadā plate published in the Journ. Boh. Br. R. As. Soc. vol. II. p. 371. The preservation of the plates is, on the whole, good. Only in the centre of PL I., and in the first line of PL II.a, some letters have become indistinct, apparently by the friction of the sheets against each other. The execution is also good. A few letters have been left out accidentally, and a moderate number of other mistakes occur. Noticeable peculiarities are the employment of the Amavāsā in stead of final n, and of the vowel ri instead of the syllable ri, both of which are incorrect, but of frequent occurrence in MSS. also.

As regards its substance, the śāhana is for the greater part identical with the Van Dindori grant, which was discovered by L. Reid, Esq., and published by Mr. Whethen in the Journ. R. As. Soc. vol. V. pp. 350 et seq. Both have been issued by the same prince and in the same Sāka year. As might be expected from these circumstances, their historical portions agree very closely. But it is very fortunate that the new grant contains a few more verses than the earlier one, some of which are of great importance for the history of Western India.

Govinda III. was one of the most powerful princes of that great Rāṣṭrakūṭa, Rāthor, or Raṭṭa family which rose to power in the Dekhan about the middle of the eighth century, and for the space of two centuries obscured and almost took the place of its older rival, the Chālukya race of Kalyāṇa. During the time of its prosperity it extended its rule not only over the Dekhan proper, but over the Koṅkana, a portion of Gujarāt, and Central India up to the Vindhya. Its influence, no doubt, made itself felt much further north. Its power sank again towards the close of the tenth century, when the Chālukyas, under Tāllapa of Kalyāṇa and his successors, regained their ancient position. But even after that period we find Rāṣṭrakūta states at Devagiri, at Belgaum, &c. in the Dekhan, in Central India, and even as far north as Kānōj, some of which played a considerable part during the last period of Hindu rule, and branches of which flourish even in the present day.

We possess a considerable number of grants issued by, or referring to, this particular Rāṣṭrakūta family, which, according to their dates, may be arranged in the following order:—

1. The Sāmangadā plates of Sāka 675.†
2. The Van Dindori plates of Sāka 730.‡
3. The Rādhanpur plates dated Sāka 730.§
4. The Baroda plates dated Sāka 734.||
5. The Kāvī plates dated Sāka 749.*

* Compare the description of the Kāvī grant, Ind. Ant. vol. V. p. 144.
|| Ind. Ant. vol. V. p. 144.

* i.e. those now under review.
6. The Sāngli plates dated Śaka 855.*
7. The Salotgi inscription dated Śaka 887.†
8. The Kardā plates dated Śaka 894.‡
9. The Khāropatā plate dated Śaka 930.§
But, in spite of these considerable materials, the history of this family has not been made out satisfactorily,—partly because the first discovered grants have been badly read, and partly because the last discovered ones give fuller information than those accessible to H. H. Wilson, Lassen, Bāl Gangādhāra, and S. P. Paṇḍīt. Other circumstances, too, have contributed to obscure the real state of things. The first point is the evil habit of the Rāṣṭrapālas (which, indeed, may be observed in the case of many other Indian dynasties) of taking a large number of bīrudas, or honorific titles; and of their poets, who composed the historical portions of the grants, of using these names indiscriminately, or even of substituting synonyms for them.

The second cause of confusion is the still more reprehensible practice of some writers of the śēdanās of leaving out in the sāhāsvarī any princes whom they considered unworthy of notice. Well-authenticated instances of this kind are afforded by the Vālābhi grants, most of which omit the four sons of Bhavānī; by the grants of the Chālukyās of Aphilvād, several of which pass in silence by the name of Vālābhasena, who reigned for a few months only; and by the śēdanās of the ancient Chālukyās of Kalyānā.

Instead of simply giving an analysis of the Rādhanpur plates, I shall now attempt to reconstruct a portion of the pedigree and of the history of the Dakhani Rāṣṭrākūtas from the above nine grants. I do not pretend to trace all Rāṣṭrākūtas back to their origin, nor even to give the history of all the kings named in the nine grants. The historical documents which are accessible at present are in my opinion insufficient to decide whether the Rāṣṭrākūtas were an Aryan Kṣatriya, i.e. Rājput race, which immigrated into the Dakhān from the north like the Chālukyās, or a Dravidian family which was received into the Aryan community after the conquest of the Dekhan. It is, further, as yet impossible to determine the period when a Rāṣṭrākūta empire was first founded in the Dekhan. Only this much is clear, that Rāṣṭrākūta kings ruled over parts of the Dekhan in the fourth and fifth centuries; because the first Chālukyā, Jayasimha, destroyed one Indra, the son of Kṛṣṇa, who belonged to this family.† Nor is it feasible to determine the relation of the latest Rāṣṭrākūta dynasties, especially those of Kānauj, from whom the present Rāthors of Jodhpur and Ida are descended, to the family of the grantors of the above śēdanās. The list also of the kings from Govinda I. to Kakkāla, enumerated in the nine grants, offers a difficulty regarding the succession to the tenth prince, Akālavarsa, which has already exercised the ingenuity of H. H. Wilson, Bāl Gangādhāra Sāstri, and S. P. Paṇḍīt. All I shall attempt is, therefore, to give an account of the first ten kings of the nine grants,—a contribution to the history of the Dekhan and the adjacent western coast during the time from 660 to 850 A.D.

The first three princes,—Govinda I., Karka I., and Indra I.,—who are noticed in grants Nos. 1, 4, and 5 only, are described in general terms. The poets, as in duty bound, extol their bravery, their justice and piety, but without stating how they distinguished themselves. Hence it may be inferred that not much was to be said about them, and especially that during their reigns the war with the Chālukya had not yet broken out. In favour of this view the fact may be adduced that the queen of the third, Indra I., was the daughter of a Chālukya father and a Somānaya (i.e. Yādava or Rāṣṭrākūta) mother (grant No. 1, v. 9). For, with the state of things which existed during the succeeding reigns, matrimonial alliances between the two houses would hardly have been possible. Counting backwards three generations from Śaka 675, the date of grant No. 1, and allowing twenty-five years for each generation, the year 650 A.D. may be roughly assigned to Govinda I. as the initial date of his reign, 685 A.D. to Karka I., and 710 A.D. to Indra I.

The fourth prince, Dantiūrā, the son

---

† Ind. Ant. vol. I. p. 206.
‡ Jour. R. As. Soc. vol. III. p. 94.

† A glaring instance of this practice I have noted in my Introduction to the Viṣṇumadhakaccharī, where eight names of the hero are mentioned: Viṣṇum. p. 50, note 2.
† See the Mirā plates, v. 7, Jour. R. As. Soc. vol. III. p. 299.
of Indra I. and of his Chālukya queen, was one of the great rulers of the family, and for this reason he has been considered its founder in three of the grants, Nos. 6, 8, and 9.

His own grant apparently attributes two great deeds to him,—the subjugation of a prince called Valla bha (No. 1, v. 17), whereby he obtained the title of Rudārīparasa-deva, "Supreme lord of kings of kings," or "king of kings and supreme lord," and an easy victory over the army of Karṇā, "which was expert in defeating the lords of Kanchi and Kerala, the Chola, the Pandyas, Śrīharsha, and Vajrata" (No. 1, v. 18). Possibly the two verses contain a "hen dia dysin," and both refer to the same event, i.e. Valla bha was the Karṇā king who was defeated. But it is certain that the Karṇā army is intended for "the Chālukya army," since the Chālukyas of Kalyāna are frequently called "the lords of Karṇā,"* and since it is their constant boast in their older inscriptions that they conquered Śrīharsha.† Grant No. 5 repeats the two verses of No. 1. Nos. 6 and 8 describe the king merely in general terms, and No. 9 contains nothing but the name. He probably did nothing more of importance, and died soon after the date of his grant. A remark which No. 4 makes about his successor, Kṛishna I., proves that he did not reach old age, and probably died a violent death. All the grants which mention both Dantidurga and Kṛishna I. state that the latter was the paternal uncle of the former, i.e. a brother of Indra I. Grant No. 8, v. 5, says that Dantidurga died childless. But No. 4, v. 8, affirms that Kṛishna I. "destroyed his relative, who had fallen into evil ways, and became king for the good of his race;" though it does not mention Dantidurga's name, and in fact ignores him and his father altogether. Considering how anxious the court poets must have been, and in some cases can be proved to have been, to disguise, or to place in the best light, the internal dispositions and revolutions in the families of their patrons, I have no hesitation in accepting as correct this version of the manner in which Dantidurga lost his life and Kṛishna succeeded to the throne. It seems to me evident that, as it has happened so frequently in the Rājput families of India, the younger branch of the family ousted the elder one.

From the last line of the grant No. 1 we learn that Dantidurga was also called Dantivarman. The name may be translated "he whose protection elephants are," or "he who is like an elephant that resembles a fort or a suit of armour." The same plate mentions two bīrulas or gaua adhānas of this prince,—Prīthivirāja and Kṛṣṇa-vallabha (?). The former, "husband of the earth," is a general title common to many kings. The reading of the latter is doubtful; the formative has a nonsensical form Kṛṣṇa-vallabha, which Bāl Gangādhara has changed into Kṛṣṇa-dhāraka.

The fifth king, Kṛishna I., whose relation to his predecessor and accession to the throne have already been discussed, was likewise a ruler of great distinction. Two grants, Nos. 2 and 3, place him, for this reason, at the head of their enumeration, and most have something particular to relate regarding him. From grants Nos. 2, 3 (v. 3), and 6 (v. 5) it appears that he continued the work of Dantidurga, and, further, elevated the Chālukyas. No. 4, v. 10, also states that "he changed to a dear the great boar (mahāvāra), who was taken with an itching for the battle, and inspired by valour flashed his bow-tusk."§ As the boar is the cognizance of the Chālukyas, it is probable that this verse also refers to the defeat of a Chālukya prince, not of a person called Mahāvāra. The same grant, vv. 11-13, connects him with the hill of Eiāpurā, where he seems to have built a fort and a splendid temple of Śiva.|| Nos. 2 and 3 mention that he bore the bīrula Valla bha. His accession to the throne may be placed about 755 a.d., and, as he was the paternal uncle of his predecessor, he cannot have ruled very long. If we allow him ten years, until 765, that will be quite as much as is probable.

After him ruled successively his two sons,

---

* See, e.g., Vikramadityacharita, p. 25, note.
† I must add that I do not feel as certain as most of my colleagues (see, e.g., A. Burnell, Elem. of So.-Ind. Falcoper, p. 10) appear to do that the Śrīharṣa conquered by the Chālukya is Hiren-Tunga's and Bāla's friend, Hrasvardhana of Taṭasaṅga. The question requires reconsideration, as the dates will not fit, and

Śrīharṣa, like Vikrama and Bhoja, a name common to several powerful princes.
‡ Compare my remarks on the subject,—Vikramadityacharita, p. 37, note.
§ This translation differs from that given by Pandit Sṛṅgāvarāja, who, as usual, had only a very dim view of the meaning of his text.
|| V. 11 has been badly deciphered or is corrupt.
Govinda II and Dhruva. The only particular information which we receive about the former is that he also bore the surname Vallabhāṇḍa. Three grants, Nos. 2, 3, and 4, do not mention his name at all; hence it may be inferred that he did not reign long, and was not particularly distinguished. If my view of the interpretation of v. 5 of Nos. 2 and 3 is correct, Govinda II. was dethroned by this younger brother, who appears to have been a much greater ruler and warrior.

This king, the seventh from Govinda I., is called Dhruva, ‘the constant,’ in grants Nos. 4 and 5; while he appears under the appellation Nirupama, ‘the incomparable,’ in Nos. 6, 8, and 9. In No. 2 he is called Nirupama and Pauna, while No. 3 reads clearly Dhora instead of Pauna. The preservation of this form is the first important service which the Rādhanpur grant (No. 3) renders to the history of the Rādhārākūṭas. For while Pauna, the form of the Van Dindori plates (No. 2), is utterly irreconcilable with the reading Dhora in Nos. 4 and 5, Dhora may be easily recognized as a Prakrit corruption of Dhruva; and thus our plate furnishes the complete proof that Dhruva and Nirupama are the same person. Only two grants give particulars regarding Dhruva-Nirupama’s exploits. Both Nos. 2 (v. 6) and 3 (v. 6) state that he conquered and imprisoned a king called Gāṅga, and that (v. 7) he dispossessed a ruler named Vatsa or of Vatsa, who had conquered the kingdom of Gauḍa, and that he drove him into the desert of Marvād. From the mention of Gauḍa it is clear that Vatsa’s paternal realm must have been situated in Central India.† Our grant No. 3 (v. 7) states that he also conquered the Pañcāla king in the south. The same two grants show also that Dhruva-Nirupama had another biruda, Kalivallabha, ‘the beloved of the Kali age’ (Nos. 2, v. 8, and 3, v. 9), and a third, Dhāravarsha, as his son and successor is said to “meditate on the feet of the supreme lord,” &c., “the illustrious Dhāravarsha.” The phrase pādānubhaya, “meditating on the feet of,” is no doubt ambiguous, and the subject of the meditation is in other cases sometimes a spiritual guru, and sometimes a lord paramount. But the epithets given to Dhāravarsha show that he was not a priest, and he cannot have been a lord paramount, because those Rākhās acknowledged none. It is, therefore, not doubtful that Govinda’s father is meant.§ Another name, ‘Samandra,’ which the translation of No. 6 gives to Dhruva, is nothing but the result of a mistake. As the reign of Govinda II. was probably of short duration, Dhruva-Nirupama’s accession to the gṛdha may be placed about 770 a.d.

The next king, Dhruva-Nirupama’s son, is called Govinda III. in Nos. 2, 3, 4, and 5, Jagattungā in Nos. 6 and 8, and Jagadhrudra in No. 9. As the latter two names are merely birudas, Jagattungā meaning ‘the world-exalted,’ and Jagadhrudra ‘the Siva, i.e. Supreme lord of the world,’ I do not hesitate to assume that they belong to Govinda III. in order to express the high position which he occupied. But I must admit that any one who is hypercritically inclined may contend that Jagat-tungā was a third son of Dhruva-Nirupama, who succeeded his brother Govinda III. Govinda III. seems to have been the most eminent prince of the dynasty. Immediately after his accession to the throne he had to fight a confederacy of twelve kings, who assailed the supremacy of the Rādhārākūṭas (No. 2, v. 11, No. 3, v. 13, No. 5, v. 27). Grant No. 5 names Stambha as their chief. The result of the contest was that “Govinda made their lustre pale, as the Śneisvara fire extinguishes the twelve sums that shine at the end of a kalpa.” After he had subdued these enemies, he released king Gāṅga, whom his

† The translation of No. 6 asserts that he was born at Indumāñjasālītāla, but the Sanskrit says nothing of the kind. The facsimile reads as follows—tīsma dhāvinda-rājaṁkhaṁ śudakālaṁ śudakālaṁ prākritī. Tākāya || “From him sprang Govinda-rāja; a dark spot (ceased) by the burning of his enemies is visible on the crystal disc of the moon (tīsma-rājaṁkhaṁ), resembling a lamentatory inscription.” The post means to say that Govinda destroyed so many enemies that the smoke from their pyres may be considered to have caused the spots in the moon, which latter, therefore, are in reality prākriti, i.e. lamentatory inscription executed by the king.

§ I have no doubt that Pauna is merely a mistake of the decipherer.

† This identity results also from his position on the list. For while grant No. 5 names the two sons of Fisara, and his father Aklavarsha. These epithets were intended to commemorate the liberality of their wearers.
father had imprisoned, “from the prolonged pain of his fetters.” But Ganga again opposed his benefactor, and had again to be reduced to obedience (No. 2, v. 12, No. 3, v. 14) and to be imprisoned.

Our grant (No. 3) describes his next exploits as follows (vv. 15-18) — He undertook an expedition against the Gūrjara king, who fled at his approach, “as the clonds disappear on the approach of the autumnal season.” Next he received the submission of the ‘politic’ ruler of Mālava, who by the study of the Nitiśāstra had learnt to form a just estimate of his own strength. Then, on reaching the slopes of the Vindhyas, a king called Mārasuvra hastened to offer him presents. Finally he spent the rainy season at Śribhavana. The last three statements occur also in grant No. 2, vv. 13-15; but the first verse regarding the Gūrjara, which is of the last importance for the correct appreciation of the expedition and for the history of Gujarāt, has been left out. This one piece of information forms the connecting link between several other scraps of information regarding the history of Gujarāt. Firstly, we know from the grants of Javabhata dated Vikrama 486, and of Dadda II, dated Śaka 330, 333, 340, and 417, that during the fifth century A.D. Central Gujarāt was governed by a dynasty of Gūrjara kings, who had their capital at Nandīpura, a fort once situated to the east of Bharuch, close to the Jhadeśvar gate. From Hiwen Thsang we learn that further north a Gūrjara kingdom existed in the seventh century, the capital of which was Pilmolo, the modern Bhīmāl, in Southern Marvad, just across the Pahlamur frontier. The grants of the Gujarāt Rāthors, Nos. 4 and 5, finally inform us that Govinda III. conquered the realm of the ruler of Lāta (the region between the Mahi and the Tapti, and between the sea and the Sabhāyātras), and made it over to his brother Indras, some time before the year 812. If we now read the Pahlamur grant (No. 3) that the same Govinda III. conquered or drove into flight the Gūrjara, while on the same expedition he afterwards re-

The identification of Bhīmāl with Pilmolo belongs to Major J. W. Watson, whose services to the history of Gujarāt I have had to acknowledge so frequently. Bhīmāl had two other names, Śrīmālā and Bhīlāmālā. The latter is, I think, the parent of the modern one on our maps, and is represented by ‘Pilmolo.’ The Arabic Pahlamur represents also Bhīlāmālā. Merutunga states that Buja of Dhūr called Śrīmālā—Bhillāmālā because its people allowed the poet Maheha to die in want. Several castes now meet with in Gujarāt and Rūjputana call themselves, from the first form, Śrīmālā.

I am not able to identify this place. But I feel certain that it is not ‘Govindurgas, in Myore,’ as Mr. Wathen’s informants stated.
were certainly very considerable, and he fully
deserves his titles, Jāgattunga or Jaga-
d breadcrumbs. Govinda bore, besides these two
birādas, three others,—Prīthivīdālāba, the husband of the earth (Nos. 2, 3, 4, and 5); Śrīvīdālāba, the husband of Fortune (No. 3); and Prahūta-vārsha, the showerer of prodigious (wealth) (Nos. 2 and 3). Both his grants are dated from Māyākhaṇḍi (No. 3), or Māyākhaṇḍi (No. 2),—no doubt the modern Morkhandā, a hill-fort north of Vauṇ, in the Nāsik district. It does not seem likely to me that this place was his capital, though it may have been an occasional place of residence. For Indian princes do not usually govern their dominions from lonely forts.

Govinda’s grants are both dated Saka 730, or 808-9 A.D., and it is probable that he did not reign much longer. For, firstly, the number of his wars which the grants mention shows that he must have reigned a good many years before they were issued. Secondly, the manner in which the grant of his nephew Kākṣu (No. 4) speaks of him indicates that he was dead at the time of its issue, i.e. Saka 734, or A.D. 812-13.

We shall probably not go far wrong if we place the end of his reign at 810 A.D. His accession to the throne may be put about 785 A.D.

Not much is known regarding Govinda III’s successor, his son Amoghavarsha (No. 6, v. 9, No. 8, v. 9, No. 9, v. 3). We do not even know his real name. For Amoghavārsha, he who showers not in vain, is nothing but a birāda. But the one fact which No 8 mentions, viz. that his capital was at Mānyakhetā*, the modern Mālkhēd, in the Nīsān’s territory, is of great importance. For it permits the identification of the Dekhā Hindu Rāthors with the Bahlārās of the Muhammadan geographers of the tenth century. This identification has already been proposed by Dr. Bhāū Dājī, who correctly perceived that Tod’s wild guess about the Bāi kārī, or Valabhi rīja, and Reinaud’s identification with Mālāvaraja, could not stand. The arguments in favour of Dr. Bhāū Dājī’s view are as follows:—Both Ibn Khordadbeh† and Mānuṣī† allege that Bahlār meant ‘king of kings,’ and was a title which all kings of the dynasty bore. The corresponding Sanskrit word can only have been Bhāṭṭāra-kha, which means ‘lord,’ or ‘supreme ruler.’ Now, as grants Nos. 2, 3, 6, 7, and 8 show, all the kings of the Rāthor dynasty affected the title pava-nā-bhāṭṭāra-kha, ‘supreme lord.’ Secondly, the capital of the Bahlārās is stated to have been Mānkrī. This word resembles Mānyakhetā, the name of the capital of Amoghavarsha and of his successors very closely, and it is absolutely identical with the Prakrit form Mānkhē or Mānkhēr, which must have preceded the modern form Mālkhēd. The identity of the two towns is further proved by the statement that Mānkrī was the great centre of India, and situated 80 farsangs, or 640 miles, from the sea. A glance at the map will show that Mālkhēd lies almost exactly in the middle, between the western and eastern seas. Its distance from the western coast is, as the crow flies, about 350 miles. But if we assume that Mānuṣī thought not of the straight line from the western sea, but of the distance from one of the northern ports to which the Muhammadans chiefly traded, say Kambay or Bharoch, his estimate of the distance is correct. There is another point in his notes on the town which may be used to support this identification. He says that the language spoken at Mānkrī is ‘the Kirīya, called so after the country Kirā.’ The word kirā, i.e. true, is not easily explained. For in Sanskrit kirā means ‘a parrot,’ and its plural is a name of the Kaśmirins. But with a (for the Arabic alphabet) very slight change of the diacritical points we may read Kanāra, i.e. Kanāda = Kārṇāta, for Kirā, i.e. कर्नटक for kirā; and this emendation exactly fits Mālkhēd, which lies just on the border of the Kanarese-speaking country.|| A third argument for the identity of the Rāthors with the Bahlārās of Mānkrī is the circumstance that while the Muhammadan writers of the ninth and tenth centuries state that the great prince of India, the Bahlārā, resides at Mānkrī, Al Idrisi in the twelfth century asserts that Nahrwalla was his seat.

* This, not Mānyakhetā, is the correct form of the name; see S. P. Paul, Ind. Ant. vol. i. p. 106, and the facsimile of grant No. 6.
† Elliott, The History of India by its own Historians, vol. i. p. 13.
We know from the inscriptions of the Chālukyas of Kālayaṇa and from grant No. 9 that the star of the Rāthors of Mālkheṣ ṣet in the last quarter of the tenth century, and that Tailapa (973-1008 A.D.) humbled them to the dust, and reestablished the supremacy of the Chālukyas in the Dekhan. At the same time the Chālukyas of Aṅhalivaṇ (Nahrwalla) rose to importance in the latter half of the eleventh and in the twelfth century, under Jayasimha Siddharājya and his still greater successor Kumārapāla; and these princes, too, assumed the title parama-bhāttāraka.

But to return to Amoghavarsa. It is not clear from the inscriptions if he built Māṇyakbhe. I rather think that Māṇyakbhe is the unnamed town which the king of Vengi fortified for Govinda III. But it seems probable that Amoghavarsa was the first Rāthor who made the place his capital. The statements of the Mahāmaddans about the Bāḷhārās of the eighth century allow us to infer that during his reign the power and extent of the Rāthor empire remained as great as under his father. The end of his reign may be placed about 835 A.D.

Amoghavarsa's successor is named Aṅkāla-varsha. There can be no doubt that the real name of this prince also is unknown—Aṅkāla-varsha, 'he who showers gifts out of season (as well as in season),' being merely an honorific title or biruda. The inscriptions give no details regarding his reign. Who really succeeded this prince is somewhat doubtful. The statements of grants Nos. 6, 8, and 9 are apparently not quite in harmony. I think, however, that if we obtained a good facsimile of the Kardā plate the difficulty would be solved. As this is not within my reach, and, as I learn that a new grant of one of the later Rāthors has recently been discovered and will be shortly published by Professor Bhāṣādārkar, I pass over the remaining princes of the dynasty. I will merely remark that Kakkala, who issued grant No. 8, is the last prince of the Māṇyakbhe dynasty. Grant No. 9, v. 9, states distinctly that he was the Rāthor whom Tailapa conquered. No. 8, Kakkala's own grant, is dated in 973 A.D., the very year of Tailapa's accession to the throne. Kakkala's fall must have come soon after.

**TRANSCRIPT.**

**Plate I.**

(1) स मेघार्यस्य द्राक्षे यात्रिकंनम् कुम्भकर्मकं कुम्भकर्मकं [11.11] मण्डलमधूदुरस्तालम्

(2) मानवकोल्लभाभिकरणं कृपृदुर्भवत् [1] सत्याञ्जी विपुलचन्द्रनिन्तितार्चकयथमनरम्

(3) विवृत्ताराम [11.11] पवत्त्वसदविशेषसिद्धिर्महामूलक्ष्मेनानिकोम्यकं भाविक्षु

(4) रन्नामिताल [1] मण्डलमधूदुरस्तालम् सर्वायमेवमनविविधानकाततः सारिवेच्छेतरस्मयमनविविधानकातः

(5) नारायणनन्दन: पत्रपाठमिरराकान्तराममन्दिरम: चैन्द्रां: सद्यवृक्षविना प्रहासविना

(6) गा रह भीत िविशेषभवनां भज्जीहरु हरिकप्य पार-धरिपयनिन्यथं दिरामोकिप्पुर्यां

(7) जात्रायुद्धसत्यमं लक्ष्मी समीपितयो ग्रहणयुक्तमेवमर्यमलमन्दिरस्तितियुयं दैवकार्यो न कान्तः [1]

(8) तत्त्वज्ञानी सत्यायन: द्राक्षे वैक्षेत्र सुलिंगिता इति दिनां: प्राने स्थिता दिनां: [11.11]

* The same statement is made in the Chālukya Miṣraj grant, v. 37, where the name is given as Karkara. I suspect that its Sanskrit form was Karkarī.
Plate II A.

I L. 1, read सूक्तः: सूक्तः। I L. 2, read िविवेका:
L. 3, read िविवेका:
L. 4, read तात्त्विकमया विद्विजयमया: I L. 5, प्रत्येके: प्रत्येके: प्रत्येके: प्रत्येके: प्रत्येके:
L. 18. The restoration has been made according to the Van Dender grant.

† L. 10, aksharas 4-10, as well as the last, are very indistinct on the plate. L. 12, read सूक्तः। I L. 13, read िर्यंततः। L. 14, read िपटतनात:। L. 15, read सूक्तः। L. 17, read िविवेका:
L. 18. The restoration has been made according to the Van Dender grant.
GRANT OF GOVINDA III, RATHOR.

Plate II B.

(९) रिति सत्यालिन्यश्यामया यथा तत्सरा [१] २०३ [२] वेदान्तमर्किन्युः चलमन्येक्य जीवित-

(१०) रिति सत्यालिन्यश्यामया यथा तत्सरा [१] २०३ [२] वेदान्तमर्किन्युः चलमन्येक्य जीवित-

§ L. 8, read विद्यानमन्त्रयवस्यान्यां. L. 11, read विद्यानमन्त्रयस्यान्यां. L. 13. The restoration of "भृगु" is made according to the Van Dindori plate. L. 14, read वुक्ति. L. 15, read टुक्ति. L. 16, read महाकुलार. L. 18, read वित्त्रयस्यान्यां. L. 17, read महाकुलाराण्यां. L. 18, Dele Varnaga after वित्त्र. L. 19, read वर्द्धितयां. The insertion of यस before यस is required by the metre and by the sense. 

१० The sign used for १० at the end of the Praisthi of the grant is ये. It slightly differs from the form of the syllable used otherwise in the grant. The latter is written ये. It is the only instance of the syllabic notation of numerals hitherto observed on Rāthor grants. Read वृचिक. L. 5, read "भृगुप्रमाणः". L. 4, read "भृगुप्रमाणः". L. 6, read "भृगुप्रमाणः". L. 7, Dele the first akshara of the line.
Translation.

1. Om! May he protect you, the lotus on whose navel has been made the dwelling-place of Brahma and Hara, whose forehead is adorned by the lovely moon-sickle.

2. There was a truthful king on earth called Kṛṣṇa rāja, whose throat was hidden by the twinings of Artha and by the far-reaching rays of the royal insignia, which glittered on his broad chest, just as Kṛṣṇa's throat is hidden by the twinings of Lakṣmī and the far-reaching rays of the Kaṁsadī, who, though he conquered a host of foes with his huge war-disc, lived a pure (akṛṣṇa) life.

3. He (who was also called) Vañcāḥa, and who was surrounded by a large crowd of exceedingly wise (Pandīts, vimūḍha), in sport and swiftly tore Fortune (lakṣmī) from the ocean-like Chālukya race, which derives lustre from numerous powerful princes that, afraid of the destruction of their partizans, sought its protection (paksiṣhchāchahaddabhatārītākhilādubhābhī), which is difficult to conquer for others (durlanghyādoparāh), and which contains many pure resplendent gems (anekavimalabhṛjajishnurānāvīlāt), just as Mount Mandara, surrounded by a large crowd of immortals (vimūḍha), tore the goddess of Fortune (Lakṣmī) from the ocean, which derives lustre from all the great mountains that, afraid of the loss of their wings, sought its protection (paksiṣhchāchahaddabhatārītākhilādubhābhī), which is difficult to cross for other (beings) (durlanghyādoparāh), and which contains various pure resplendent jewels (anekavimalabhṛjajishnurānāvīlāt).

4. To him was born a son, (called) Dhoras, whose only wealth was fortitude; who, though in conquering the universe by the expansion of his fierceness he resembled the god with the fierce rays, still gladdened the earth by the lightness of his taxes (aṅkṣaṅkṣaṅkalvāt), while the sun torments it by the fierceness of its rays (aṅkṣaṅkalvāt), who destroyed the beauty of the lotus faces of the wives of his enemies, whose fame the nymphs that guard the quarters.

* L. 9, read र्व. L. 9, निच is not distinct on the plate.
But the reading must either be this or निच. L. 15, read विक्रम. L. 16, read विक्रम. L. 17, read भक्तमयु. L. 18, read विक्रम. L. 19, dele Anuvārāa over पाणिपिया.
† Metro Anuvārāa. Compare the Kāvi grant (Instr. Ant. rol. V. p. 144, note) and the Van Dindorff grant, v. 1.

† Metro Vannatārītāsā. The verse contains a series of puns. Each epithet has a double meaning, and fits both the king and the god Kṛṣṇa. Compare also the Kāvi grant, v. 12. The verse is also the second of the Van Dindorff grant, but Mr. Water's Pudlit has not seen all the marginal footnotes which it contains. The double meaning of शमातरा has escaped him entirely.

§ Metro Śāntabrānti. Mr. Water's Pudlit has misunderstood this verse also, which likewise stands third on the Van Dindorff plate. - G. H., s. a. illustrious princes.
of the universe wove into pearl strings and ever
wore.]

5. Though he was endowed with a splen
dour acquired by a rebellion against his elder
brother (jyeshthollanghana), still (that splen
dour) was pure and, established in a faultless
realm (nirmala mandala), he was never dis
figured by any blot (doshikara), [and he thus
resembled and surpassed the moon that is en
owed with a pure splendour after passing the
constellation Jyeshtha, and is surrounded by a
spotless halo (nirmala mandala), but always
disfigured by a blot (doshikara)]. Seeing his
liberality, which surpassed the liberality (ddn)
of all other men, the guardian elephants of the
quarters that are covered with streams of
ichor (ddna) issuing from beneath their ears,
have placed themselves, deeply ashamed, as it
were, at the extremities of the four regions of
the universe.]

6. Seeing that he (Dhora) had conquered
impetuous Gang, who, forsooth, had not been
vanquished by others, who excelled through
venerable regal qualities, who had conquered
the world and possessed a pride not common
to others, Kali fled, fearing lest he also should
be punished.*

7. Wonderful it is that having obtained
from the humbly bowing Padma, whom on
the one side (Dhora's) ocean-like cavalry pressed,
that exulted over its crushed foes, that roamed
about and was formidable on account of its
bravery, while on the other side the self-moving
ocean restrained him, that is uprousious like a

*Metro śradāśvāśkātra. Pānah, which I have ren
dered simply by 'baronna,' has really a double meaning,
when applied to the king it means 'valour, prowess,' when
applied to the sun it means 'exceeding heat.' The fortunum
comparatione between the king's fame and the pearl strings
of the Dīnagadha is the brilliance or 'whiteness' (as a Hindu
would say) common to both. The verse is the
4th of the Padma grant.
† Metro śradāśvāśkātra. The verse is identical with
Padma 3, though Mr. Wathen's and my renderings
differ very considerably. There are only two points in his
version which require to be noticed. Firstly, it is possible
to translate it with śradāshvāśkātra, ' acquired
by overhearing the goddess Jyeshtha or Misfortune,'
which is represented as the elder sister of Fortune. But
rejecting this translation, because the contrast to anulay, 'never
theless pure,' requires that the fortune of the king should
owe its origin to a blameless act. The emphatic
statement that Dhora was 'never disfigured by any blemish'
also suggests the second half-verse 'niruddhāśāstrāṁ
nirdhāvahāri,' 'covered by streams of ichor
issuing from beneath their temples,' can also be referred to
the king, and be translated by 'endowed with a liberality inferior
to that of Kama.' It is unwise to stuff this
into the translation. Mr. Wathen's Pavāstī translation has a
dim idea of both these renderings. The natural phenomenon which
suggested the first series of puns is that after the month of
Jeth, in the rainy season, the moon is constantly surrounded
by a halo. Wathen's many lectures are misreadings.

victor in battle, and formidable on account of its
roaming monsters,—elephants shedding streams of
ichor (mada),* he never became in the least
intoxicated (mada) with his glory.

8. Swiftly driving Vatsarāja, who was
intoxicated with the wealth of the kingdom of
Gauda that he had easily acquired, on an eviload into the heart of Māru (land), he took
from him not only the two royal parasols of
Gauda, resplendent like the rays of the autumnal
moon, but also, at the same moment, his fame,
that had reached the extremities of the universe.‡

9. Wonderful it is how Nīrūpaṇa came
to be (called) Kalivallabha ('the beloved of the
Kaliyuga'), since by his pure life he drove
Kali, who had gained a firm footing, swiftly
away, and entirely restored on earth the splen
dour of the (golden) Kṛita age.§

10. From that constant Nīrūpaṇa sprang
a son, who is honoured by good men, called
Govindaśrāja, who may be likened to the
moon produced from the ocean, since he was
pure in mind, just as the moon is pure in splendour:
since his feet were touched by the heads of the
greatest princes, just as the rays of the moon
touch the proud head of the supreme lord
(Siva); and since he was the favourite of Fortu
ne (padmānandakara), just as the moon glad
dens the night-lotuses; who also resembles the
sun that comes from the lofty mountain of the
east, since he is endowed with valour (pratāpa),
just as the sun is possessed of exceeding heat
(pratāpa); and since he is always prosperous
(satyodaya), just as the sun rises daily
(satyodaya).
11. When that prince, the abode of all good qualities, was born, the family of the Rāṣṭra-katra became unconquerable to its foes, just as the Yādava race after the birth of the foe of Madhu. He clearly made his foes and his dependants resemble each other, since in consequence of his slaying (dāna) the former were made acquainted with the extremities of the regions (drśīkṣīti-vādōhantah), were annihilated (uddratāḥ), and were made to leave their food and their ornaments (vāndhakārabhisāhāhī), and (the latter) by means of his liberality (dāna) were made to see the limits of their desires (drśīkṣīti-vādōhantah), were made proud (ud-dratāḥ), and were adorned with pearl necklaces (mukta-kārabhisāhākhaḥ).

12. When his father, seeing his superhuman form fitted like that of Krishna to protect the world from ruin, offered him the sole supremacy over the earth, he addressed to him this seerly answer:—“Let it be, father! That belongs to thee; have I not kept the necklace bestowed by thee, like an order that must not be disobeyed?”

13. When that parent had gone to adorn heaven, and nothing was left of him but his fame, (Govinda,) resembling the world-destroying fire that extinguishes the (twelve) suns (at the end of the kalpa), bereft, though alone, by means of superior valor, twelve famous kings of their Inste, who, allied, were bent on destroying the earth through their desire of acquiring its possession.

14. Exceedingly compassionate, he liberated Ganga from its protracted, painful captivity, and sent her to his country. When (Ganga) parison of Nirupa na to the ocean and to the mountain of the east indicates that the poet attributes to him āśīrva, ‘depth of mind,’ and snātaka, ‘riotous.’ Compare also the description of Guhasena in the Valabhl grants. The moon-sickle is one of the well-known attributes of Śiva; hence the elaborate pan on pānta-vi-nātā-vi-kaukā-viyā da. I am not quite certain about my translation of padma-vāndhākara. I dissolve padmāy padma-yā padma-vāndhākara. But padma may be a N. pr. or be taken as a synonym of padma, ‘army,’ since one of the padma-vāndhās is called padma.

15. When the Gūrdara (king) saw that (Govinda), the protector of the lives and wealth of his relations, whose fortune was increasing; and who (was born under) an auspicious constellation, approaching with arrows placed on the bow (and) directed against him, he fled in fear to some (unknown hiding-place), so that even in his dreams he had no hope of giving battle; just as the clouds (disappear) at the approach of the annual season, which increases the splendour of the Bandhūjīva flowers, which is favourable to the growth of lotuses, and during which the stars shine with particular brilliancy.

16. The politic lord of Mālava, seeing from afar that the only safety for his prosperity lay in submission at (Govinda’s) feet, bowed to him with joined hands. What wise man of small power would engage in a desperate conflict with a powerful (antagonist) ? For the result of (a study of the rules of) polity is that one learns to estimate accurately one’s own and the enemy’s strength.

17. Prince Māraśvara, learning through his spies that (Govinda) had pitched his camp on the slopes of the Vindhyā hills, and considering him as already within his country, quickly went, impelled by fear, to satisfy his desires with excellent hairrooms (such as he had) not before obtained, and (to worship) his feet by prostrations. to have been left out accidentally. I do not feel certain about the utterer meaning of patāka, ‘a necklace.’ Was it a sign of the dignity of Yudhāra?

† Metro śrāddāvārārvārārā. The Van Dindor grant, II b and c, gives three pādās of this stak. The omission of the fourth is not doubt accidental, as the remainder gives no sense. Its various readings vamandhānt and daddadānt are ungrammatical. The construction of same-

† Metro śrāddāvārārvārā. Compare Van Dindor, v 12, where the text shows an erroneous versā l W,, and the translation is an utter failure. Regarding Ganga compare above, v 6. ‘a shower,’ which I have rendered by a ‘shower,’ may possibly have a technical meaning, as in the Gūrda Grant of Dudda II.

† Metro śrāddāvārārvārā. Compare Van Dindor, v 13, the text of which contains a mistake not for pain. The translation is on the whole correct, though not accurate.

† Metro śrāddāvārā. Compare Van Dindor, v 14, the translation of which is satisfactory except in the last pāda.
18. Having passed the rainy season, during which the sky is covered by dense clouds, at Śrībhāvana, he marched thence with his army to the banks of Tunga bhadrā. Tarrying there, he whose foes are submissive again drew towards himself, by showers (of arrows) even—oh, wonder!—the entire wealth of the Pallavas, though he already held it in his hand.*

19. In obedience to one brief half-sentence which (Govinda) sent by the mouth of his messenger, the lord of Vengi came thither and worked (for him) like a servant without cessation, desiring his own welfare. If the external circumvallation raised by him for his master has not stuck to the summit of the heavens, then the star-crowds above-head wear it as their pearl garland.†

20. Out of fear many hostile kings, their heads (bowing, and) adorned by their hands joined in supplication, bent on doing service to him, came to his two feet for protection. Those feet were not so much ornamented by priceless jewels, the gifts of various (princes), as by his word “Fear not,” which was famed for its trustworthiness.‡

21. He,§ perceiving this life to be unstable like the wind or the lightning, and worthless, has effected this gift to a Brahman, which is most meritorious because it consists of a grant of land.

And he, the supreme lord, the supreme ruler of the kings of kings, the husband of the earth, the illustrious prince Śrīvallabha, (called also) Prabhūtavarsha, who meditates on the feet of the supreme lord, the supreme ruler of the kings of kings, the illustrious Dhāravarsadeva, being in good health, (thus) admonishes all rulers of provinces, rulers of siltas, heads of villages, officials, officers, and persons in authority, aldermen, and all others, whatever their connexion (with his government) may be:—

* Metro Śrībhāvana. Compare Vayu Dindori, v. 14. The plain meaning of the second half of the verse is that Govinda again subjected and plundered the Pallava, when his father had already subdued; compare above, v. 7.
† Metro Śrībhāvana. Vṛkṣḍhel, which I translate by “external,” is not to be traced elsewhere. It seems to be a compound of vṛkṣa and dhel. The ascensive midhām is ungrammatical. The poet seems to have employed it in order to avoid a litotes. The meaning of the whole verse is that the king of Vengi built for Govinda the walls of a town or fort, which were exceedingly high.
‡ Metro Śrībhāvana. § Metro Śrībhāvana. || The year Sarvarjita corresponds to Śaṅkara 771.
|| The year Sarvarjita corresponds to Śaṅkara 771.
|| The plain meaning of the second half of the verse is that Govinda again subjected and plundered the Pallavas, when his father had already subdued; compare above, v. 7.
|| The word Rājkṣānārāma is repeated in the text, and the names of the Brahmanas and Mahārājas now enumerated stand in the genitive, not in the dativus as in the name of Prasunavārāha. The village was, therefore, not given to a shared by them, but they were probably merely allowed to live there. I am not certain that I have correctly divided the string of Telingana names.
PEDIGREE OF THE RATHORS OF MALKHED, OR BALHARAS, FROM ABOUT 660 TO 850 A.D.

I. Govinda I. [A.D. 660.] (Grants 1, 4, 5.)
   II. Karka I. [A.D. 685.] (Grants 1, 4, 5.)

   III. Indra I. [710 A.D.] (Grants 1, 5.)
      V. a. Krishna I. [A.D. 755.] (Grants 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 8, 9.)
      b. Vallabha.

      IV. a. Dandidurga [A.D. 725-755]. (Grants 1, 4, 5, 6, 8, 9.)
      b. Dantivarman. (Grant I.)
      c. Prithivivallabha. (Grant I.)
      d. Khadgavakaloka (f). (Grant I.)
      Saka 675.

      VI. a. Govinda II. [A.D. 765.] (Grants 1, 6, 8.)
      b. Vallabha. (Grant 5.)

      VII. a. Dhrus [A.D. 770.] (Grants 4, 5.)
      b. Dhora [Pura]. (Grants 2, 3.)
      c. Nirupama. (Grants 2, 3, 6, 8, 9.)
      d. Dhurvavaraha. (Grants 2, 3.)
      e. Kallivallabha. (Grants 2, 3.)

      VIII. a. Govinda [785-810 A.D.], Saka 730. (Grants 2, 3, 4, 5.)
      b. Prithivivallabha. (Grants 2, 3, 4, 5.)
      c. Srivallabha. (Grant 3.)
      d. Prabhutavaraha. (Grants 2, 3.)
      e. Jaguttunga. (Grants 6, 8.)
      f. Jagadrudra. (Grant 9.)

      IX. Amoghavaraha [A.D. 810]. (Grants 8, 8, 9.)

      X. Akalavaraha [A.D. 835]. (Grants 6, 8, 9.)

&c. &c. down to Kakkala or Karkara, overthrown by Tailapa of Kalyana between 973 and 990.

SANSKRIT AND OLD CANARESE INSCRIPTIONS.

BY J. F. FLEET, Bo. C.S.

(Continued from p. 82.)

No. XXVII.
I continue with the Chalukyas of Vata-pinqagari, or Badami, and afterwards of Kalyana, of whom I have already given a notice at Vol. V., pp. 67 et seq.

The present inscription is a copper-plate grant from Sir W. Elliot's faesimile collection, obtained by him from General Fraser, and a transcription of it is given at p. 19 of Vol. I. of his MS. collection now with me. The original belonged to the Jain Gurus Mahendra-santaya, of the Begam Bazir at Haidarabad in the Dekaon; it consists of three plates, about 7½' long by 3' broad. The characters are those of the Cava-alphabet, and the language is Sanskrit. The impression does not show whether there is any emblem on the ring connecting the plates.

It records a grant by the Great King Satyashaya, or Pulikela II. of my previous notice, in the Saka year 535.*

This inscription introduces the first uncertainty in the history of the Chalukyas. For, whereas we find in No. XIII. that Pulikela II. was reigning in Saka 507, we now have the Saka year 535 spoken of as the third year of his reign. I can only suggest the following explanation of this discrepancy. It is well known that the Western and Eastern Chalukya dynasties were separated in the persons of respectively Pulikela II. and his younger

* According to the original, "five hundred and thirty-four years of the Saka king having elapsed."
brother Kuba-Vishnuvardhana.† The exact date of the latter has not yet been determined, no inscription of his own time being known of; but, calculating backwards by means of inscriptions which give the duration of the reigns of him and his successors of the Eastern dynasty, Dr. Burnell places it at about A.D. 630, or Sakā 552. It may well be that the two dynasties were separated in Sakā 533, and that Pulikēša II. was then installed afresh on the throne of the Western branch of the family, at the same time when his younger brother, after being already united with him in the government as Yuvarāja, according to the usual custom, was installed as the separate sovereign of the Eastern branch. The expression made use of in line 11 of the present inscription,—"in the third year of my own installation in the sovereignty,"—seems to point to some such ceremony having been gone through, and thus to support this suggestion. And,—the duration of the reign of Kuba-Vishnuvardhana being always recorded as eighteen years,—if we take Sakā 533 as the starting-point, the computation agrees closely enough with the date otherwise arrived at by Dr. Burnell.

The separation of the two dynasties in the persons of Pulikēša II. and his younger brother is a historical fact, whatever the exact date of the occurrence may be. Accordingly, in future notices I shall speak of the successors of Pulikēša II. as 'the Western Chālukyas,' and of Kuba-Vishnuvardhana and his successors as 'the Eastern Chālukyas.'

Transcription.

First plate.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>स्वारित</th>
<th>श्रीमति श्रीकृष्णसिंहवर्धनम्</th>
<th>हरि (रि) कृष्णसिंहवर्धनम्</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>लक्ष्मी भवानीसिंहवर्धनम्</td>
<td>संसार कृष्णसिंहवर्धनम्</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>परंपरावर्धनम्</td>
<td>भवानीसिंहवर्धनम्</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>परंपरावर्धनम्</td>
<td>कृष्णसिंहवर्धनम्</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>परंपरावर्धनम्</td>
<td>कृष्णसिंहवर्धनम्</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>परंपरावर्धनम्</td>
<td>कृष्णसिंहवर्धनम्</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>परंपरावर्धनम्</td>
<td>कृष्णसिंहवर्धनम्</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>परंपरावर्धनम्</td>
<td>कृष्णसिंहवर्धनम्</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Second plate; first side.

| 8 | अर्जुनसिंहवर्धनम् | सर्वसमापनम् |
| 9 | विद्याप्रमेयसिंहवर्धनम् | सर्वसमापनम् |
| 10 | बलानासिंहवर्धनम् | सर्वसमापनम् |
| 11 | याज्ञवल्क्यसिंहवर्धनम् | सर्वसमापनम् |
| 12 | यशोवर्धनसिंहवर्धनम् | सर्वसमापनम् |
| 13 | पदामासिंहवर्धनम् | सर्वसमापनम् |
| 14 | वाज्जसिंहवर्धनम् | सर्वसमापनम् |
| 15 | वाज्जसिंहवर्धनम् | सर्वसमापनम् |

Second plate; second side.

| 16 | सानिध्यम् | सानिध्यम् |
| 17 | सानिध्यम् | सानिध्यम् |
| 18 | पवित्रमहाप्रसाधिके | पवित्रमहाप्रसाधिके |

† I do not know of any mention of this person in the grants of the Western dynasty; but his elder brother is always mentioned, usually under the name of Satyendra-

Vallabhaṭṭa, in such of the grants of the Eastern dynasty as trace the genealogy back to Kṛttikavarmā, the father of the two brothers.  
* Sir. Ind. Pol., p. 19.
Third plate.

I hail! The grandson of the Great King Satyaśrāya-Srī-Pulikšivallabha, whose body was purified by ablations performed after celebrating horse-sacrifices, and who adorned the family of the glorious Chālikyaśeṣa, who are of the kindred of Mānavya which is praised over the whole world, and who are the descendants of Hārītī, and who have been nourished by seven mothers who are the seven mothers of mankind]], and who have attained an uninterrupted continuity of prosperity by the favour and protection of Kārtikeya, and who have had all kings made subject to them by the mere sight of the sign]] of the Boar which they acquired through the favour of the holy Nārāyaṇa;—the son of the Great King Kṛttivarma-vallabha, the banner of whose pure fame was hung up in the territories of the hostile kings of Vanavāsī and other countries that had been invaded by his prowess;—the favourite of the world, the Great King Sṛi-Satyā-

śrāya,—who is the abode of the power of statesmanship and humility and other good qualities, and who has acquired the second name of ‘Supreme Lord’ by victory over hostile kings who applied themselves to the contest of a hundred battles,—issues his commands to all people:

"Be it known to you that, five hundred and thirty-four of the years of the Saka king having elapsed, in the third year of my own installation in the sovereignty, on the day of the new-moon of (the month) Bhādrapada, on account of an eclipse of the sun, in order that my parents may acquire my own religious merit, the village of Mākapāpi, with its treasures and deposits and assignments and major taxes, to the north of (the village of) Rēkūruki and to the south of the village of Kādapā, has been given by me, while governing (at) the city of Vāṭāpainagar, with libations of water, for the purpose of celebrating the five great sacrifices, to Jyēṣṭhāsārama, whose family

§ This form of the name is not of very common occurrence. The other forms are Chālikya, probably, the oldest and original form,—Chalikya,—and Chālikya. Tradition,—as recorded in a stone-tablet inscription at the temple of Lōčānakāla, at Hardarika in the Haidarabad territories; Ed. M.S. I, 426,—states that the Chālikyas sprang from the spray of a waterped (chatula, chalabha, chalaka) when Hārītī, who wore six tufts of hair on his head, was pouring out a libation to the gods.

¹ The computation of this eclipse would be interesting.

² The meaning of Ėṛṣṭa and Ēṛṣṭi is somewhat doubtful.

§ The Brahmāyajña, or offering of prayer or of repeating the Veda; Devayajña, or burnt sacrifice offered to the gods; Pitrīyajña, or sacrifice offered to the Manes; Maraḥyajña or Nirguṇja, or the sacrifice or act of hospitality due to guests; and Bhūtayajña, or the oblation of food, &c. to all created beings.
name is Uma raskhēda, of the kindred of Vāsinītha and of the school of the Taítiriyas, an inhabitant of the city of Tagara, who is acquainted with the four Vedas. This my gift should be recognized and increased by other kings who may come after me. He shall incur the guilt of the five great sins and shall dwell for many thousands of ages in hell, who, through ignorance or because he esteems himself incapable of decay or immortal, may misconstrue it; he, who preserves it, shall dwell for the same duration of time in heaven!

And it has been said by the holy Vyāsa, the arrange of the Vedas:—Land has been enjoyed by many kings, commencing with Sa gara, &c. O Yudhishthira, best of kings, carefully preserve land that has been given, whether by thyself or by another; preservation (of a grant) is better than making a grant! He, who bestows land, enjoys happiness in heaven for sixty thousand years; he, who revokes (a grant) or convives at such an act, shall dwell for the same number of years in hell! They, who confiscate a grant of land, are born as black serpents, dwelling in dried-up hollow trees in the forests of the Vindhya mountains, which are destitute of water! What good man would presume those gifts which have been made in former times by kings, and which produce piety and wealth and fame, but which, (if revoked), are like the remains of an obliteration that are vomited forth?

No. XXVIII.

This is a Western Chālukya copper-plate grant from Sir W. Elliot's facsimile collection, and a transcription of it is given in his MS. collection, Vol. I., p. 17. The original, which belonged to the same person as the original of No. XXVII., and was also obtained by Gen. Fraser, consists of three plates about 8½ long by 3½ broad. The facsimile does not show whether there is any emblem on the ring with which the plates are strung together. The characters are of much the same standard as those of No. XXVII., and the language is Samskṛt.

It records a grant made by Vikrama ditya I., or Vikramāditya-Satya śraya, the son of Pulikēśī II.

No date is given, either in the year of the Śaka era, or in the year of Vikramāditya's reign. The language, again, is decidedly more inaccurate than is usually the case. And the concluding passage, which commences in line 34, and which, in addition to its irregularity of diction, contains the Prakrit or Marathi word paṃtā, 'fifty', is in all probability a later addition, an attempt being made to imitate the antique writing. But, down to line 34, the characters of the original appear to be genuinely antique.

The genealogy differs from that of the Yewar stone-tablet inscription, followed by Sir W. Elliot and transcribed in Vol. I., p. 258, of his MS. collection, which gives Ama rā as the son of Pulikēśī II, and Adityavarmā as the son of Ama rā, and makes Vikrama ditya I, the son of Adityavarmā and, thus, the great-grandson of Pulikēśī II.

With reference to this discrepancy in the genealogical account, I have to remark,—on the one hand,—that, down to the mention of Vikrama ditya-Tribhuvanamalla (Śaka 998 to 1049), the genealogy given in the Yewar inscription only professes to be derived from some unspecified copper-plate grant of earlier date; and, 2, that the inscriptions of Vinayāditya I., the son of Vikrama ditya I., which I shall give in another paper, agree with the present in making Vikrama ditya I., the son of Pulikēśī II., and in omitting any mention of Amara and Adityavarmā. And, on the other hand; that, as the reign of Vinayāditya I commenced in Śaka 603, then if only Vikrama ditya I. intervened between him and Pulikēśī II., there is, taking into consideration the date which is allotted to Pulikēśī II. in No. XIII. of this series, a full century occupied, at first sight, only by the two reigns of Pulikēśī II. and Vikrama ditya I. In line 16 of this inscription, however, we have a distinct indication that Vikrama ditya I. did not immediately succeed his father, whoever that father was, but was ousted for a time. And, if we admit the possibility of this fact of an interruption of the rule of the Chālukya, being due to their having no capable leader by reason of Vikrama ditya I. being only of girl, not far from the cave temples of Kalsa,—Ko.

The killing of a Brahman, drinking intoxicating liquors, theft, adultery with the wife of a spiritual preceptor, and associating with any one guilty of these crimes.
tender years at the time of the death of Pulikēśī I, and allow that the reign of Pulikēśī I continued till about 550, which is perfectly possible, the lapse of time is sufficiently well accounted for.

In the case of such a discrepancy as the present, between a stone-tablet and a copper-plate grant, I should be inclined, ceteris paribus, to allow a preferential authority to the stone-tablet, as being a record of a more public nature and in every way less easy to fabricate. But, in the present instance, we have the concomitant testimony of other copper-plate grants in support of the one under notice. And the stone-tablet, with which it is at variance, professes only to be based upon an earlier copper-plate grant, and consequently is, at the best, of only precisely the same authority as a copper-plate grant; and it has, moreover, all the style of being a touched-up and amplified version of the original.

Accordingly, I accept Vikramādiyā I. as the son, and not the grandson, of Pulikēśī II. And I would further suggest the probability of Armā and Ādityavarmā being really not of the Chālukya family at all, but two of the three confederate kings, who seized upon the sovereignty after the reign of Pulikēśī II., and from whom Vikramādiyā I. wrested it again.

Transcription.
First plate.

Second plate: first side.

---

* Some emendation seems necessary here. I would suggest jala-vadāna-nāma, and have adopted this in my translation.
† This syllable, śa-, is superfluous, as the locative rāga-bhayā is required with tāmāna. Or, if rāga-bhayā is to be upheld, tāmāna must be corrected into bāhā.
Second plate; second side.

Translation.

Hail! Victorious is the body, which was that of a Boar, that was manifested of Vishnu, which agitated the ocean, and which had the earth resting upon the tip of its up-lifted right tusk!

The great-grandson of the Great King Sri-Pulakasivallabha, whose body was purified by ablutions performed after celebrating horse-sacrifices, and who adorned the family of the Chalukyas, who are of the kindred of Manavya (etc., as in No. XXVII.);

— the grandson of the favourite of the world, the Great King Sri-Kirtivarman, whose fame was established in the territories (etc., as in No. XXVII.);—the beloved son of the

† The reading intended is probably abhiramanasp.
‡ The letters are clear, but what they are intended for is not very apparent.
|| Some verb, such as chakada, 'he made', or prepandana, has to be supplied here to complete the sentence.
* A better reading would be sayya for sayya, as the latter is hardly capable of use in the sense of sayya or mit, which is evidently intended here.
†† From here to the end the characters are of a larger and inferior type, and this portion seems to have been added at a later date. The language also is very inaccurate, and the use in the last line of the Prakrit or Marathi word pandada, 'fifty', is peculiar.
favourite of the world, the Great King, the supreme lord, Satyaśraya, who was possessed of the second name of ‘Supreme Lord’ acquired by defeating Śrī-Harshavardhana; the warlike lord of all the country of the north;—(seas) Vikramaditya, who,—borne by one horse of the breed called Chitrakanaḥṣ, and having with his arm, that was like the coils of the serpent who sustains the burden of the earth, conquered those who were desirous of conquering him,—though many blows fell upon his armour, acquired for himself, with his pure and sharp and cruel sword that was irradiated by the elixir which consisted of tasting the blood of the hostile kings in the front ranks of many battles, the royalty of his father, which had been interrupted by a confederacy of three kings, and who, having effected the subordination of the whole kingdom to one (sovereign), re-established, by his own (word of) mouth, in order to increase his piety and fame, the grants which had been made to gods and Brāhmaṇas, but had been destroyed by those three reigns, and, having conquered the hostile kings in country after country in the war of war, without any impediment (made) the goddess of the fortunes of those of his lineage to possess the position of sovereign lordship. And again when he was conquered by the lord Śrī-Vallabha, who trampled upon the fame of Nārasiṁhaḥ and effected the destruction of Mahendrapatapa and surpassed even Iśvara in the art of government,—he achieved the ruin of the Pallavaś, and, though delighting much in Kāṇchikā, which is, as it were, the wanton girdle of the woman who is the country of the south, he bears preeminently the condition of being the favourite of the goddess of fortune. Having shoulders that delighted in war and were glorious and of great strength, he conquered that family of mighty wrestlers] who were possessed of the title of ‘Royal Wrestler.’ By him, the ruler of the southern region, was Kāṇchika captured, the mighty abode of enmity that was hard to be surrounded and difficult to be borne,—which was girt about by a moat that was very deep and difficult to be crossed,—and which was as it were the girle of the sea-king Jayatīvara.

He, Vikramāditya-Satyaśraya, the favourite of the world, the Great King, the supreme lord, who possesses the supreme sovereignty over all the countries of the world, which have been invaded by his prowess, thus issues his commands to all people:—

"Be it known to you. The village of Chintakanaḥ, to the east of the village of Kandugil, in the district of Kaṇha, has been given by us to Nandīsvāmi, of the lineage of Kāśyapa, who has attained the excellence of the supreme knowledge of the whole of the Vedaś by means of his manifold penances which comprise the Kriṣhchhara and Atikriṣhchhara and Oldudrückaṇa and other ascetic exercises. And half of a village each has been given to Śāntiśārmā, of the lineage of Kāśyapa, who celebrates the Soma sacrifice, and Adityāśarmā, of the lineage of Harita, who has studied the science of reasoning, and who celebrates the Soma sacrifice."

Twelve shares (were given) to Agundabhōyopiddīṣārmā, and one to Damaśārmā, and one to Lōhasvāmi, of the Bharadvāja gōtra. One share (was given) to Bhallāsvāmi, and one to Bādīśārmā, and one to Pidīśārmā, of the Māṇḍarva gōtra. One share was given to Nijabhyōdūsārmā, and one to Gandabhōyū, of the Kāśyapa gōtra. In the whole village there are fifty shares.

I do not know to what dynasties Śrī-Vallabha and Mahendrapatapa belong. From the context, Śrī-Vallabha may perhaps be a Pallava king.

Whether the god or some king is alluded to, is not clear.

Kāśchī, the capital of the Pallavas: see No. XIII., Traverser, I, 14, Vol. V., p. 70.

See note § to line 2 of the text, which is corrupt here.

What particular family is alluded to, is not clear. It was probably from this conjecture that the Chāhuśyā came to assume, as secondary names, titles ending in ma,—Yudhamalla, Ahamalla, Tribhuvanamalla, &c.

Pitārāja, lit. the king of ships. Who Jayatīvara was, I do not know.
MISCELLANEA.

NOTES ON THE MUHARRAM FESTIVAL.

I have seen many accounts of the Muharram ceremonies, and it is well known that the Indian form of them is confined to this country, and even here regarded with disfavour by many of the more educated Hindus. I do not think, however, that attention has been drawn to their exceeding resemblance, as observed in some places, to the Hindu processions of gods' cars and palkhas. In the course of my own service I have been obliged to spend many weary hours in the saddle, keeping order about the tábuts, but never noticed this feature of the festival so much as this year. The scene was Kālyān, a port of the Thapar collectorate, inhabited by about 12,000 souls, of whom, at the outside, about 2,500 are Muhammadans. Nearly all these are of the Sunni sect, and of the race called Kónkañi Musalmáns; descended chiefly, I believe, from Arab settlers on the coast. There were half-a-dozen tábuts and as many panjáds, or standards.

On the ninth night of the Muharram most of the panjáds and one tábút paraded particular streets with music and lights. This is usual; what is, I believe, less so is that each of the panjáds went to visit its neighbours, when greetings were exchanged by bows of the Punch and Judy sort, and by a dance of the attendants of both host and guest round a hole full of fire. The rest of the ‘fair’ was of the usual type—shouts of ‘Día’ and ‘Dála,’ fireworks, dances, ‘Songs and quavens, roaring, humming.

Guitars, and every other sort of strumming.’

On the tenth day, when the tábuts were taken to be cooled (thaydrá karmá) in a tank, the start and progress of every one of them was impeded by dozens of Hindu women rushing out with female infants, whose noses and ears it is considered auspicious to pierce for the first time literally under the tábút. Some brought out water to pour out under the tábuts (not before them); and every one threw sweetmeats and coloured threads upon them, the fall of which on the ground was thought a great misfortune.

Some of the tábuts belonged to the tombs of saints, and each of these had before it a censer, the ashes from which were distributed by attendants fādhrs to Hindu women (at one house, at least, to Bráhmánas), who made themselves ‘beautiful for ever’ therewith on the spot, and in the sight of all men.

Whenever one tábút came to the place of another, or of a panjád, both solemnly circumambulated the firepits, and the attendants danced round them also, both before and after.

It is impossible not to see in these ceremonies the strongest resemblance to the mutual visits of Hindu idols borne in rathas (chariots) or palkhas, to the distribution of ashes from Gossainis’ fires, the wild fire-dances of the Holi, and the occasional sacrifice of life under the wheel of the ratha.

W. F. Sinclair.

THE DERIVATION OF THE WORD ‘MEHWÁSI.’

The derivation of the little words ‘Mehwási’ and ‘Mehwás,’ so commonly used in Gujrat, has not, as far as I know, been hitherto attempted, except by Sir John Malcolm. Central India, vol. I. p. 216, where he says:—“The chiefs on the Nerbudda are generally called Mehosse, which comes from the place they have chosen for their residence, Mehos signifying, in the colloquial dialect of the country, a stronghold or fastness.”

The words occur in the Persian histories of the province, and are commonly used in the English correspondence and records regarding Gujrat. In the Persian histories the word is generally used in conjunction with the word Girds, thus Girds and Mehos, or in contradistinction to Edoi or settled districts. Both Colonel Walker and Mr. Kinloch Forbes use the word Mehos as signifying ‘country inhabited by turbulent tribes,’ or ‘strong country’ where those who exercised control over the province could with difficulty penetrate; and, in its modern meaning, a Mehwá holding, no doubt, implies the possession of a more than ordinary amount of independence, and the absence, more or less, of the subordination which distinguishes other more ordinary tenures.

But the original signification of the word, as far as I am able to ascertain, is merely a contraction for ‘Mahiwási,’ or ‘dweller on the Mahi,’ Mehos would therefore be ‘a dwelling on the Mahi,’ and I believe both Mehos and Mehosí are used only in Gujrat and part of Malwa, in which latter province the Mahi has its source. Dr. Bühler informs me that he considers this derivation the correct one, and that there are analogous derivations. Thus he quotes mukhi, Sanskrit for ‘buffalo,’ which has been contracted into mhe = bhaka, and other words. And Joshi Atanārā Dulañārām of Baroda informs me that this view is supported by the following sloka:—

कृ.

महि महिमादत्ते विलिते
प्रभुत्वमारा निससति यनु
बलिपि चौरसत्तापि चोरि
ञौरागिना न प्रसत्वति नार्थः ॥ १ ॥
The river Mahi is one of the most excellent in the world.
There reside only thieves;
Children even are thieves, the young men are also thieves,
And except thieves women give birth to none other."
Under the Marathas, as is well known, tributary Gujarat was divided into two portions, viz. Mahi Kântâ and Kâthiwâd, and this broad definition of the Mahi banks would include all the Mehwas holdings. The oloka quoted sufficiently shows the predatory character of the inhabitants from the earliest times.
The first instance of the use of this word that I am acquainted with, occurs in the Daśakārtya (see Ind. Ant. vol. IV. p. 74), and it is there translated as 'forest.' This shows that so far back as early in the 12th century Sanvrit the word was in common use for a holding in difficult country. Mr. Sinclair has drawn my attention to Professor Dowson's notes to Minâh-âs-Sirâj (Elliot, vol. II.), and while I cannot agree with that distinguished scholar that so palpably Aryan a word as 'Mehwas' is derived from the Semitic root \textit{mhw}, it seems probable that the word 'Mehwas' or 'Mewas' had become so generally accepted a term for a holding in difficult country, like that on the banks of the Mahi, that it may have reached distant Dihïl, and thus come to Minâh-âs-Sirâj's knowledge.

JOHN W. WATSON,
Acting Political Agent, Rewâ Kântâ.

EXPLORATIONS AT KORKEI AND KÂYAL.

By the REV. DR. R. CALDWELL.
I visited Körkei once many years ago, and, though my visit was a hurried one, yet from what I saw, and from the inquiries I made, I came to the conclusion that Körkei (in Tamiḻ properly Êolkei, euphonised into Korkei), though now so insignificant, was to be identified with the Kōly of the Greeks, which Lassen had identified with Kilakarei, a place on the Madura coast. The Greeks came to Kōly to purchase pearls, certainly soon after the Christian era,—probably many years before,—and represented it as the head-quarters of the pearl trade between Cape Kumrâf and the place they called Kāpo, properly Kōî, now Rāmeśvāra, which was also an emporium of the same trade. It must have been regarded as a considerable place at that time, seeing that from its name they called the Gulf of Mannar the Kolche Gulf. It was easy to conclude also that this was the Körkei to which all native traditions pointed as the cradle of South Indian civilization,—the place where the three brothers Chēran, Chōlam, and Pāṇîyan were said to have been born and brought up, and from whence they set forth to form dynasties and kingdoms,—or, as might more readily be admitted, the place where the rule of the Pāṇîyan a commenced, and from whence they afterwards migrated to Madura. The meaning of the name Körkei is 'an army, a camp.' The interest of this identification was heightened by the conclusion at which I arrived at the same time, that an insignificant place called Old Kāyal, about halfway between Körkei and the sea, was to be identified with the Caël of Marco Polo, the most important city and seaport on the eastern coast of India during the Middle Ages. (See Colonel Yule's Marco Polo.)
The sites of two famous places were thus discovered in the same neighbourhood, and a glance at the geology of the neighbourhood disclosed the reason why each had been abandoned in turn. Both places are situated on the delta of the Tâmârâpârîn,—Körkei within five, Kāyal within two miles of the sea,—and each was originally on the sea-coast. As the silt accumulated in the sea near the mouth of the river, or as the land rose,—or from both causes,—Körkei was found at length too far inland for the convenience of a sea-borne trade, and Kâyal (meaning a 'lagoon opening into the sea') rose in its stead on the sea-shore, and attained to still greater dimensions. Kâyal carried on an immense direct trade with Chinnâ and Arabia, the evidences of which are found lying all over the open plain on which the city stood. In time, however, through the continuous operation of the same causes, Kâyal came to be too far from the sea; and accordingly, shortly after the Portuguese arrived on the Coromandel Coast, they abandoned Kâyal, and established themselves instead at Tâtocerin, which has ever since been the principal seaport of Tinnapally, there being no river near to silt up the harbour and roads. It would seem as if Körkei, though probably never so important an emporium of trade as Kâyal, must at one time have been nearly as large. This is proved by the relics of pottery, &c. scattered about the country for miles, and especially by the circumstance that places, such as Akkasalei ('the Mine'), which are now at a distance from Körkei, are ascertained, by the inscriptions I have found on the walls of the temples, to have been portions of Körkei originally.

Whilst in Körkei and the neighbourhood I employed ten or twelve coolies for four days to make excavations here and there, under the superintendence of one of my assistants; whilst it was made the duty of the choir boys—much more a pleasure to them than a duty—to examine every sherdful of the earth that was thrown up, to see whether it contained any objects of interest. The Collector
of the District, Mr. Stuart, kindly sent me a peon, to let the people of the place see that nothing illegal or improper was going to be done, and in return I sent him a list of the articles found, though unfortunately they were of no particular interest.

The geology of the place seemed to me more interesting than its antiquities. The whole of the country in this neighbourhood is included in the delta of the Támraparní, the great river of Tinnevelly; and this place is situated in the last-formed portion of the delta, lowest and nearest the sea, so that the mode in which the delta was formed, which is doubtless more or less the mode in which all deltas have been formed, could be easily studied. The upper stratum is composed of stiff alluvial clay, which had been brought down by the river and deposited in the bed of the adjacent sea. Every portion of this alluvium contains sea-shells in great abundance—not merely sea-shore shells, but deep-sea shells, such as the chank and the pearl-oyster. So abundant are they that in places where the surface of the ground has been washed away by rain, and cultivation has not been carried on, the white shell-covered surface glitters almost like water in the moonlight, and in some places as you walk along the roads, especially near Máramangalām, the shells go crackling under your feet as they would by the seashore when the tide is out. This being the last formed portion of the delta, the alluvial stratum is very shallow. The average depth cannot be more than six feet, and at the bottom of tanks I have found it no more than three. Underneath this I invariably found a layer of grit-stone (called by the people “salt-stones”), rarely more than a foot in thickness, composed of the larger grains of sea-sand, such as lie on the surface, mixed with comminuted shells. This had evidently been the surface of the ancient sea-bed, for underneath I invariably came upon beautiful white sea-sand, in smaller grains, containing great quantities of unbroken shells. Doubtless the grit-stone had been formed by the infiltration of the alluvium from above. I found it impossible to ascertain the depth of the sand, or what it rested on, for after digging into it for a few feet the hole always got filled with water, and the water flowed in so fast that baling out was useless. Strange to say, some of the shells I found in this ancient sea-bed retained a portion of their original colour. One in particular—a Conus—looked as if it had been alive only a few years ago. What makes this so remarkable is that this portion of the delta must have been inhabited at least 2500 years ago, and it must have been many ages earlier that the deposition of the alluvium commenced.

I hoped by making excavations in Korkėi and the neighbourhood to find some traces of the Greeks, but in this I was doomed to be disappointed. The ancient level of the village is about eight feet below its present level, which of itself is a proof of great antiquity. When the diggers reached this depth they invariably found traces of human habitations, shreds of Indian pottery, &c., but nothing of the nature I hoped to find. On the surface we found two Sinhalese copper coins (I conclude them to be Sinhalese from the management of the drapery), but the inscriptions were quite obliterated. I also found two images of Budha, sitting, in his usual attitude of contemplation. One of them was out in the fields, the other in the village. I suspected that the latter was worshipped, though it was known to belong to a different religion. The people strenuously denied this, but one morning when I happened to pass I saw a garland of flowers which had been placed by some person round its neck. The person who did so evidently thought that if ever Buddha got his head above water again, he had a chance of being remembered for good! The most interesting things that were found were three of those mysterious sepulchral urns which have hitherto puzzled everybody. The natives know nothing about them, and the common opinion amongst Europeans is that they pertained to a race which died out, but of which no relic remains except these urns. The urns are made of the ordinary pottery of the country, but there are always some little vessels found inside, some of which are beautifully shaped, with a polish or glaze which the potters of these days cannot imitate. Two of the urns I found contained no bones, but only traces of bone-dust; but one, a monster urn, 11 feet in circumference—unfortunately found broken—contained a complete set of entire human bones, including a perfect skull. The circumstances in which this urn was found were very interesting. The people to whom it belonged had dug down through the alluvial soil of the delta, and the grit-stone till they came to the white sea-sand, and in this they had deposited the urn. The grit-stone had then partially re-formed all round, and I found the cavity of the skull filled up with grit-stone. The notion invariably entertained by the natives of these days is that the people buried in these urns were a race of pygmies, but the bones found in this urn were admitted by the natives who were standing about when it was opened to be those of a full-grown man of the usual size. Strange to say, a deputation of women came to my tent one day for the purpose of seeing the bones.

I visited Old Kāyala (Marco Polo’s Caele) twice, and set my excavators at work for a day in a place about two miles from the present village,
which represents only the western boundary of the ancient city. At a depth of three feet beneath the present surface they came on the chunammed floor of a house, but found nothing of importance. The extent of the site of Káyal was so great that it would take a month, instead of a single day merely, to explore it properly. I found, however, the whole surface of the ground, literally for miles, covered with evidences of the perfect truth of Marco Polo’s statements respecting the trade of the place, confirmed by those of the Muhammadan historians. According to those statements, Káyal was frequented by great numbers of vessels from the Arabian coast and from China—(junks)—in one of which latter Marco Polo himself arrived; and accordingly I picked up everywhere on the open plain broken pieces of China porcelain of all qualities, and broken pieces of Arabian pottery. I could easily, if I had chosen, have collected a cartload, but the pieces had been broken again and again by the plough and the feet of bullocks, so that, though the material in each case was obvious enough, all trace of the shape of the article had disappeared. Old Káyal, or what remains of it, is now inhabited almost exclusively by Labbés (native Muhammadans) and Roman Catholic fishermen.

The people of these parts, as generally throughout India, have not the remotest notion of the object Europeans have in view in searching for antiquities. Whatever we may say, they think our real object is to endeavour to discover hidden treasures; and this they consider a very risky business, for all hidden treasures are in the custody of demons, who will not allow them to be rifled with impunity. At Kórkés, before my explorations commenced, many of the people expressed an earnest hope that I would not make any excavations near any temple or image, because, although very likely there might be treasure underneath, the demons in charge would be so enraged that they would destroy the village outright. I assured the people that I would take care not to come near any temple or image, and I scrupulously kept my word. My old friend Manikavasagar of Árumugamangalam professed to have received a dreadful fright some years ago from the demons that watch over hidden treasure, when he helped Mr. Puckler, the then Collector of Tinnevelly, to make some explorations near Káyal. The night after the first day’s exploration a she-demon appeared to him in a dream, and asked him in terrible tones how he dared to meddle with her treasures. In the morning when he awoke, he found—dreadful to relate—that his feet were fastened round the back of his neck in such a way that he was unable to loose them without assistance! I need scarcely add that no further part in the exploration was taken by him. I wanted him to tell me the story; but he was afraid, I suppose, I should laugh at him, and so I failed; but he told it quite gravely to my assistants, and has told the story so often that he evidently believes it himself now. Even Europeans, it seems, are not quite so free from danger as they suppose.

Many years ago there was a Collector of Tinnevelly, it is said, who determined to dig for the treasure which was believed to have been hidden in a certain place by a woman who intended to make use of it in some subsequent birth, and which for the time being, of course, was under the custody of demons. He was warned that something dreadful would happen, but, being an European, he did not care. He pitched his tent near the place, and the whole of the first day was occupied by himself, his peons, and his coolies in digging. At length, as night drew on, they came to a carefully built stone receptacle; and, justly concluding that this was the place where the treasure was hidden, the Collector set a watch over it and went to sleep in his tent, with the intention of opening the stone receptacle the next morning. The next morning came, and the Collector found himself, not in his tent, but in bed in his own bungalow at Palamukott; the tent was found pitched at the other side of the river, and of the excavations that had been made the previous day not a trace remained.

**EXCAVATIONS AT KÁYAL.**

The Cael of Marco Polo having been identified by Dr. Caldwell as Káyal, a port at the mouth of the Támaraparí river, in Tinnevelly, . . . .

The ancient city—whose name signifies a lagoon—was one of those enormous emporiums of the East, the first mentioned of which is Ophir. At Káyal the sea has greatly receded, for the Támaraparí river, rushing down through the clays and rice-fields of Tinnevelly, has, in the course of centuries, made for itself a large delta. The Cael (Kágal) of Marco Polo is thus described by him:—"Cael is a great and noble city, and belongs to Asgar, the eldest of the five Brothér-Kinges." It is at this city that all the ships touch that come from the west, as

*From the appendix to the Rev. Dr. Caldwell’s Second Journal of Evangelistic Work in Tinnevelly, 1876.*

**Vishnuṣthā Naikier** who was installed ruler of Maduras and the adjacent countries of the south in 1462 (a.d. 1559), is spoken of as defeating them. The words of the Chronicle are:—"On coming to Maduras he constructed seventy-two bastions to the fort, and appointed seventy-two Palliyākaras (Paltysas) corresponding with the bastions. He also caused the fort of Tiruchinapalli to be
from Hormos, and from Kis, and from Aden, and all Arabia, laden with horses and with other things for sale. And this brings a great concourse of people from the country round about, and so there is great business done in the city of Cael. The king possesses vast treasures, and wears upon his person great store of rich jewels. He maintains great state, and administers his kingdom with great equity, and extends great favour to merchants and foreigners, so that they are very glad to visit his city. This king has some 300 wives; for in those parts the man who has most wives is most thought of." Marco Polo goes on to speak of the one mother of the five Brothers-Kings of the South India of his day, of whom the chief was the king of Cael, and to all of whom, in their disputes, the mother, who was then alive, acted as a mediator. He also alludes to the use of the betel-leaf in Cael.

The following extracts (dated June 23, Shepherd's-lane—Idéyarkdu, Tinnerelly), from a private letter by Dr. Caldwell, written on the outskirts of Káyál, will be read with interest:—

"I set my coolies last evening to dig for sepulchral urns in the lowest ground in the neighborhood. These are 'jars'—matammatunti—in which a race of people, of whom nothing is known, used to bury. Before long they found one in the deepest part of a tank which is now dry. It was a monster, eleven feet in circumference. Unfortunately it had been so often soaked in water that it was found broken in three. The contents, however, were perfect,—the bones of a man with an exceedingly perfect skull. There is a small hole in one part of the skull, apparently made by a weapon. The grand interest, however, is this. This place is a portion of the Támrápañi delta, and the ancient people had dug right through the alluvium of the delta till they had come to the white sand underneath, in which they had deposited the urn. The upper stratum of the sea-sand has generally turned into a grit-stone, through the infiltration of the alluvium deposited above. The grit-stone accordingly had formed round the urn, and even inside, and the cavity of the skull is filled with compact grit-stone! The teeth are very perfect and complete. Altogether, the skull would be an interesting addition to a naturalist's studio. I have found no traces of the Greeks here, but plenty to prove that the place is of great antiquity. I have had ten coolies digging for several days, and wherever they dig they find nothing till they get to a depth of about eight feet. Then brick floors, &c. are found. The thorough excavation of a place like this would prove very expensive. The Collector sent me a peon, to be present as a sign of Government authorization. I am to send in a list of what I find to the Government.

"A certain Dr. J——, of Berlin, was in Tinnerelly in the beginning of the year. He made a considerable collection of urns, skulls, &c., which he carried off to Germany without communication with the Madras authorities. For this the Collector, it is said, was reprimanded. . . .

"I am taking the greatest possible care not to irritate the people in any way; so I make no excavations near their temples, and have not dug about the numerous images of Búdha, even though they are not now worshipped. There is an image of Búdha near Káyál, which the people have turned back upwards, and the washermen use it for beating their clothes upon!"

"Saturday 24th.—I have been this morning to Káyál again, and returned. This time I went in a palauquin, and did my journey comfortably. I went two miles beyond what now remains of Káyál, and still found myself only in the centre of the remains of the great city of Marco Polo's time. I marked out several places for excavation, and let ten men to do as much work as ten men could do in a day. . . . I intend to cross the mouth of the Támráparul, and see Pínnei-Káyál. . . .

"Yesterday my people found a couple of urns at Máramangalám. One was as large as the one found at Kórkei, but empty. The meaning of that is that it only contained the bone-dust of the dead. The other was a smaller one, which my coolies were able to take out whole. It contained two beautiful little polished kalasams, or vessels, but no bones. The inside is black, and so are the kalasams. . . ." —Athenaeum, 12th August 1876.

**BOOK NOTICE.**


This is the first part issued of a Commentary built. He likewise composed the five independent princes to the south, who acknowledge no earthly superior. "Many of the Palliya-kârîs or Pollyars, constituted by Vahvanáthu Nákeir, exist to the present day. The estates of Páliyams, given on the feudal tenure of rendering military service and defending the bastions of the metropolitan fort allotted to their holders, are all well known; most of them were

on the whole Bible under the title of *Musliharah Fiqha's Bible*. (We must confess that we stumble on the threshold: the word Bible may pass, but

forbidden in the Polygar war, which fills so many pages of Wilks and Hume, and the history and traditions of each, which doubtless survive in the families, would, if collected, throw much light on the antiquities and affairs of the days of the Southern Rígas. —M. J. W.

§ See the last chap., Appendix, to Dr. C.'s Comp. Geasa.
The work is published in London by the Religious Tract Society. It extends to 554 pages royal 8vo, comprising both the text of the New Testament, and notes about equal in extent to the text itself. The whole is in the Roman character. Dissertations on several important points are given. Two carefully constructed maps enhance the value of the work—one presenting Palestine as it was at the Christian era, and another showing the travels of the Apostles.

It indicates progress on the part of missions in India, and a considerable amount of education as prevailing in the native Christian community, when a work of this kind is required. For we presume the Commentary is not intended chiefly for the missionaries, European or American, but for the native churches.

The version adopted is that of the North India Bible Society; the commentary accompanying it is now published for the first time.

We must put a force on our inclinations and refrain from entering on the many and difficult questions connected with the translation of the Scriptures. Is the lastus receptus to be followed even when recent investigation has shown its readings to be inaccurate? How far is it desirable that versions should be literal, striving to give the exact sense even when the idiom of the language is sacrificed? Questions of this kind start up at once; but we reluctantly pass them by.

One of our chief complaints against our own, generally excellent, English version, is the variety of renderings given to the same word. Much of the force of a passage is often, in this way, missed. For example, in 1 John ii. 24 the verb πέντε occurs three times, the repetition being emphatic and significant; but, with ingenious perversity, the English translators dissipate the force of the passage by using three different words—abide, continuus, remain. We have just now turned to the Vulgate, and find it uses maneo once, and permaneō twice, which is a near approach to what we insist on. In the version before us we find two different words employed—basad once, and rashed twice. We object to this, though the rendering is better than that of the English translation. So in Heb. xii. 27, 23, our translation gives two words—shaken and moved—where the Greek, with evident purpose, has only one. The Hindustanī, we are sorry to see, follows here the bad example of the English. Jerome was wiser.

The Commentary—on which, as now, we should especially comment—seems executed with much care and no small success. It is simple, and as brief as is consistent with perspicuity. Thus, on the verse “The Word was made flesh” (John i. 14) it sufficiently explains the meaning, and so supplements, or rather corrects, the somewhat peculiar rendering of the text, Kaldān meūsāAMA bād. And, throughout, the annotations are unpretending, sensible, and such as will recommend themselves to the members of Protestant churches generally.

On the question of style we must express ourselves with some hesitation. We start with a perfect abhorrence of that

“Babylonish dialect
Which learned pedants much affect.”

We shudder when Urdu is stuffed full of Arabic and Persian terms, and when Hindi or Bengali becomes half Sanskrit. Further, we hold that while Urdu and Hindi must both advance, they should do so not on divergent, but if possible on convergent, or at all events parallel lines. Sanskrit and Arabic are wide as the poles asunder. We hope to have, in the future, not an Arabized Urdu and a Sanskritized Hindi, but two dialects of one language not much more apart, perhaps, than the “Johnesooms” of the great lexicographer, and the Saxon English of Addison or Swift. Now we by no means think this Commentary so faulty as many, or even most, Urdu compositions. Still it is higher than we expected or desired. We believe it is somewhat too much so for the native Christians generally, even for those who speak Urdu. To the multitudes of Hindi-speaking natives much of it must be unintelligible. Such, briefly, is our judgment on the style, and we feel bound to express it, although we are fully aware that all the munais, and many of the missionaries, will take a different view.

We are very glad to see this work appear in Roman character. It is to the credit of the missions planted among the Hindi-speaking and Urdu-speaking populations that, instead of the cumbersome Devanāgarī and the rather enigmatical Persian, they should so often employ the clear, compact, and comparatively inexpensive Roman letters. The array of discritical marks looks by no means formidable. The type is small, in order to keep the size of the work within moderate bounds, but the letters are perfectly distinct. The getting up of the whole book is remarkably good, and most creditable to all concerned.

We congratulate the venerable missionary Dr. Cotton Mather, who is, we believe, the translator of the notes and dissertations, and also the editor of the work. Dr. Mather has performed his important task both diligently and successfully.
SANSKRIT AND OLD CANARESE INSCRIPTIONS.

BY J. F. Fleet, Esq. C.S.

(Continued from p. 73.)

No. XXIX.

THIS and the following two inscriptions carry us one step further in the Western Chālukya genealogy, being Sanskrit copper-plate charters of Vinayāditya-Satyārāya, the son of Vikramāditya I., of my last notice.

The present one is from Sir W. Elliot’s facsimile collection, and is marked as having been found at ‘Togurshode’ in the Karnūl District. It consists of three plates, about 9¾” long by 6¾” broad. It is not stated whether the seal of the ring connecting the plates bears any emblem. The characters are the customary Western Chālukya characters derived from the Cave-alphabet, and nearly fully developed into the Old Canarese alphabet. They are not so neatly formed as those of the inscriptions last published by me, and they have a decided slant from left to right. It is also to be noted that the practice as to writing the Annamśura is not uniform; sometimes it is written above the line, as was the rule in the earliest adaptations of the Cave-alphabet, and sometimes—
in āgama (pra)-viśrānța, l. 1; wānāśa, l. 13; munā-śrīnāga, l. 17; and dhakakaha, l. 31,—on, or just a trifle below, the upper line of the writing.

The inscription is dated in the Śaka year 612*, and records a grant by Vinayāditya, made by him in the tenth year of his reign, in celebration of some victory, while encamped on the banks of the Pampā river or lake. The locality is certainly the Hampe, Vijayanagara, or Bijanagar of modern times,—referred to in Sanskrit books by the name of ‘Pampāksheṭra’—on the south bank of the Tungabhadrā, in the Ballāri district. There is a sacred pool at Hampe which is still called ‘Pampāsaravara,’ and Mr. Sanderson, in his Canarese Dictionary, gives ‘Hampe,’ or ‘Pampā,’ as another name of the Tungabhadrā itself. Mr. Garrett, also, in his Classical Dictionary, gives ‘Pampā’ as the name of a river that rises at Rishyamukha in the Dōkkān. And Rishyamukha is the name by which a small hill on the north of

the ruined town of Hampe is still known. Whether ‘Pampā’ is another name of the Tungabhadrā, I cannot say. But this conjunction of names leaves no doubt as to the neighbourhood in which Vinayāditya’s camp was pitched at the time of making this grant, and as to the part of the country that had just been subdued by him.

I cannot trace on the map the villages affected by the grant, or the district,—named in line 28; where, however, there is some doubt as to the exact reading,—in which they were situated. The grant was of certain dues, perquisites, or taxes, called Ṛṣṭiśamahārajamañana and Māraśamahārajamañana. These are Dravidian terms, which I am not able to explain; but one component part of them is plainly the Sanskrit uṣēṣha, ‘gleaning.’

The record of the grant was made by Ramaṇpadavallabha, Vinayāditya’s Minister for peace and war.

In the epithets applied to Vikramāditya I., a clear allusion is made to a confederacy that was formed against him by the three kings of Chōla, Pāṇḍya, and Kērala, and to some interruption of the Western Chālukya rule that was effected by the leader of the Pallavas, the lord of Kāṇchi. I have had occasion to allude to this already, in my introductory remarks to No. XXVIII. of this series. It would seem that the results of the conquest of the ruler of Kāṇchi by Vikramāditya I. were not very decisive or permanent. For we find Vinayāditya again campaigning against the Pallavas, as the leader of his father’s army. And a short inscription at Pattadakal in the Kalādgi District, recently uncovered by me and thus brought to light for the first time, states, almost in so many words, that the great temple there, the temple of Virūpākṣaḥadēva as it is now called, or of Loṅkēśvaradēva as it was then called, was built by Loṅkamahādēvi, the queen-consort of Vikramāditya II., expressly to celebrate another victory over the king of Kāṇchi by her husband, who was the great-grandson of Vikramāditya I.

* According to the original, “six hundred and eleven years of the Śaka (era) having elapsed.”

† Plates xxxvii. and xxxix. of Mr. Burgess’s Archaeological Report for 1873-4.
Transcription.
First plate.

[1] सचि [II]: जयमाळवीधरकं विण्य[कु]राण्यो भोविताण्वं दक्षिणात्मकं दशमं (प) विषाणतः.
[3] रत्नेवायः शस्येचुकमालमस्तम्भमत्सर्वावधियतां कामिकेपत्राः.
[4] राजस्रास्तमाण्यरसः बाकाशरारामायारसः
[5] तार्कारास्तमाण्यरसः चार्कासः चार्कारामायारसः
[6] नां कुलम्बुद्धृष्णेऽर्जुनभार्यानापवाल्नाल्लः च्रीणुपानं.
[8] सामधविप्रिणिवद्विनुवंतकारतिः: कृतसच्चम्मन्विन्यथिविलम्हाराजस:

Second plate; first side.

[10] [ण] राजसोपन्यमरम्माटरामायारमपः [स्व] अर्थाः
[12] [माधी] अयादशभाराकस: मतियहायासादमानवस्माः
[13] वातनावसुधिुणिवितराजायारमपः वितिवर्त[सित]सित[स]
[14] सत्तालिचीन्यस्मापं दुर्गम्यकोषांतः दिगुस्मानानापवाल्नाल्लः
[15] लितादिग्ननस्य हिमकर्कर्तविलम्बुस्तपररतिविलम्बुनेवतुः
[16] पल्लव[प] निपतायारानन्यरपरीशीश्वकारुपास: प्रभाकरकः

Second plate; second side.

[17] [लिङ्गदली] चोलपाप्प्करकर्चदर्णीकरक[व] यमामानान्यपाद:
[18] वन[त] कोहरा पापाणिमुक्तकारिकनपितविनिर्माणकरकमांस: चीतिः
[19] मुनि तथा ष्टुधिदानमन्त्रापणीयाः सुय: विदुरवाख नालि[व] दुःकोषालय:
[20] सेनाधिक्षेत्रायस्तु मुक्तकारादित्यायानामस्तापात्यः समस्तशिपाः
[21] ग्राममानान्त्वित्वानन्देऽर्जुन: अवन्तवसलावस्विचिरिः इव श्री
[22] रामचकुण्जुबुधेण इव नामानुवात्विनाओ इव राजायमवालयः
[23] त इव विनादितमाणसमस्रांविनादितमाणसमस्रांतः श्री
[24] दुर्गस्तुविनादितमाणसमस्रांतः [I] विनादितमः केते समाभेता
[25] दुर्गस्तुविनादितमाणसमस्रांतः दशमो वर्षानस्मानानामस्तापात्यः
[26] [ल] टमाधिकार सुपियनस्मानानायारहर चार्कासः चार्कारामायारसः

Third plate.

[27] व्याख्या श्रीवाप दुर्गाप्रकारणेः: पुराण भीमाभानें स्वभाक्षिकोशायास्तः
[28] लितादिग्ननस्य वर्तमानमुक्तकारादित्यायानामस्तापात्यः
[29] लितादिग्ननस्य वर्तमानमुक्तकारादित्यायानामस्तापात्यः

* There are no marks of punctuation in the original. I § Two letters are illegible with any approach to certainty here.
Translation.

Hail! Victorious is the body, which was that of a Boar, that was manifested of Viśān, which agitated the ocean, and which had the earth resting upon the tip of its uplifted right-hand tusk!

The son of the great king Śrī-Pulakāśivallabha, whose body was purified by ablutions performed after celebrating horse-sacrifices, and who adorned the family of the glorious Chalukyas, who are of the kindred of Mānava, which is praised over the whole world, and who are the descendants of Hārīti, and who are nourished by seven mothers who are the seven mothers of mankind, and who have attained an uninterrupted continuity of prosperity by the protection of Kārttikeya, and who have all kings made subject to them on the instant at the sight of the sign of the Boar, which they acquired through the favour of the holy Nārāyaṇa,—(so) the great king Kṛttivarmā, the favourite of the world, whose pure fame was established in Vanaśī and other territories of hostile kings that had been invaded by his prowess.

His son (so) Satyārāya, the favourite of the world, the great king, the supreme king, the supreme lord,—who acquired the second name of 'supreme lord' by defeating Śrī-Harshavadhana, the warlike lord of all the region of the north.

His dear son (was) Vikramāditya, the supreme lord, the venerable one,—who acquired, only by his impetuousity assisted by his intellect, the appropriate and accumulated regal power of his own family; who illumined the distant regions with the banner of his fame, that was acquired by the conquest of hostile kings who engaged in wars of various kinds that were brought to an end (by him)*; who seized the city of Kānci after the defeat of the leader of the Pallavas, who had been the cause of the humiliation and destruction of that family† which was as pure as the rays of the moon; who rent open with the thunderbolt that was his prowess the proud summits of the haughtiness of the three mountains which were the kings of Chōla, Pāṇḍya, and Kēraḷa; who had the lotuses which were his feet besprinkled with the waters which were the rays of the watering-pot which was the jewelled diadem of the lord of Kānci, who bowed down before no other (but who performed obedience to him); and who was the supreme lord of the whole extent of the earth included within the three oceans.

His son, Vinayāditya-Satyārāya, the favourite of the world, the great king, the supreme king, the supreme lord, the venerable one,—who, having at the command of his father arrested the extremely exalted power of the Pallavas, whose kingdom consisted of three (component) dominions, as the General† did arrest the strength of the Dāitya|| (at the command) of him‡ who bears the young
moon on his crest-tuft, and having pleased his mind by bringing all countries into a state of quiet, was like Yudhishthira on account of his excessive affection, and like Vasudeva on account of his being the beloved of the goddess of fortune, and like Parasurama on account of his being the elephant-god of kings, and like Bharata on account of his being the refuge of kings, thus issues his commands to all people:

"Be it known to you! Six hundred and eleven years of the Saka (era) having elapsed, in the tenth year of (Our) augmenting and victorious reign, at (Our) victorious camp which is located on the bank of the Pampa (river, or lake), on the day of the full-moon of (the month) Kartika, there is given by Us, with the right of enjoyment, to Bhima Sarasvati, who is proficient in all the sacred writings and who knows the Vedas and the Vedangas, the son's son of Devasarmā and the son of Durghasarma, of the lineage of Bharadvaja, the Mahābhārata, the Adityāchāchara at the village of Tēṭo, the Adityāchāchara at the village of Guḷavaḷayā, (and) the Mahābhārata at the village of Varvē, (and) the Mahābhārata at the village of Bātēyū, in the district of Pāḍēkūl. This (grant, or charter) should be preserved by future kings, whether they belong to Our lineage or to other families, as long as the moon and the sun and the earth and the ocean last, just as if it were a grant bestowed by themselves, bearing in mind that the charms of life and riches do are as evanescent as the lightning. And it has been said by the holy Vyāsa, the arranger of the Vedas:—Land has been enjoyed by many kings from Sāgarā downwards; he, who for the time being possesses land, enjoys the fruits of it! It is a very easy thing to bestow a grant oneself, but the preservation of the grant of another is difficult; (if the question is) whether giving or preserving (is the more commendable act), preservation is better than giving! He

is born as a worm in order for the duration of sixty thousand years, who confiscates land that has been bestowed, whether by himself or by another! This charter has been written by Śrī Rāmapūnyavallāha, the High (Minister), who is entrusted with the arrangement of peace and war."

No. XXX.

This is another from Sir W. Elliot's facsimile collection. It is marked as having been obtained through Captain Newbold from the Karṇāl district. The original consists of three plates about 9" long by 4" broad, and the seal of the ring connecting them bears the emblem of a boar. The characters are still more carelessly formed than those of the preceding; so much so that in lines 28 to 42, where many proper names occur, the reading is in many places very doubtful. This is, in fact, the most indistinct specimen of an early copper-plate charter that I have yet seen. The slant of the letters from left to right is still more distinct than in the preceding grant.

The inscription is dated in the Saka year 614, (according to the original, 'six hundred and thirteen years of the Saka [era] having elapsed'), in the third tecō year of Vinayāditya's reign, and, like the preceding, records a grant to celebrate some victory that he had just gained. At the time of making this grant, he was encamped at the village of Eumpundal, and the principal grant is of the village of Musūnpūra. This village was somewhere on the north bank of the Kṛishṇavēṇi, i.e. of the Kṛishṇa after its confluence with the Vēṇi.|| Except thus far, I cannot identify the locality in question; and the other two names in line 25 are very doubtful. The grant was made at the request of Vinayāditya's son, Viṣṇuāditya, who at that time was holding the post of Yuvarāja, and who succeeded his father on the throne. The record of this grant, again, was made by the Peace and War Minister, Rāmapūnyavallāha.

* Krishna.

† Supply, to complete the comparison, the second meaning intended in 'sṛ-ramatātē', viz. 'just as Vāmaśe was the beloved of the goddess Śrī, so, because he was an incarnation of Vīshnu, the husband of Śrī or Lakṣmī.'

‡ In No. 93 of Major Dixon's collection (see below) he is called 'Vinayāditya-Rājaśāraya.'

§ See note to L. 30 of the text; some such word as tās, etc., or perquidēs has to be supplied here.
Transcription.

First plate.

[1] सती [II] नरणारिकणां विष्णुः वराह श्रीमतां संगमेशुर काठीनातपदेन व्याप्ति-
[2] अतुभुवनं। वदु: [II] श्रीमतां संगमेशुर काठीनातपदेन व्याप्ति-
[3] यां हरिरित्युपुबाणां सताल्लेकानिःसामार्येरिविभिःकतिं काठीनातपदेन व्याप्ति-
[4] परिक्रमणेत्रसारिधराणां भगवन्तारायणां सारिधराणां चुलकाणां व्याप्ति-
[5] करिंद्याश्रीएकानिःसामार्येरिविभिःकतिं काठीनातपदेन व्याप्ति-
[6] हरिजनस्य सुदुर्खति: कौशल्यमद्विशस्य ब्रह्महरावस्य ज्ञसारिधराणां चुलकाणां व्याप्ति-
[7] हरिजनस्य सुदुर्खति: कौशल्यमद्विशस्य ब्रह्महरावस्य ज्ञसारिधराणां चुलकाणां व्याप्ति-
[8] हरिजनस्य सुदुर्खति: कौशल्यमद्विशस्य ब्रह्महरावस्य ज्ञसारिधराणां चुलकाणां व्याप्ति-

Second plate; first side.

[1] मेघस्थलीयविष्णुः विक्रमाधित्यस्यरभरभागकतस्य भविष्यानां
[2] यस्मात्सारिधराणि निविवशंस्यमुच्चिन्तारायणाथविभवस्य
[3] विपरेतितिबयानस्य मुखाद्वरातिसर्वपितिवि न समुपलब्धः
[4] कौशल्यास्य ब्रह्महरावस्य ब्रह्महरावस्य ब्रह्महरावस्य
[5] भविष्यपते तुलपतिराजस्य नारिधराणां तरिखककाली:।
[6] पुरस्य प्रभावकुलसालीकित्य विज्ञकेश्वरं यात्रिबरणां (व)
[7] यमनमानः बांहस्य अन्यसारिधराणां कालिपतिनिकुटः
[8] कुडकिणातस्यविभिक चरणकालाः
[9] सिद्धवन्दस्य चर्चस्य सुदु: पितुराय वाशे हेर
[10] सैव सनातनेद्यवल्लभमितस्यवर्तपठतः वैरामः

Second plate; second side.

[1] मथुरायमः समस्तविष्णुप्रभुतस्यभविष्यानांतः अखण्डः
[2] दुहिठिकि इव श्रीमतान्तराण्रुद्वां दित्य नृपकुलसालिके रविधराणां
[3] यवादलति इव विनायास्यश्रीमतास्य विविष्णुप्रभवतस्यभविष्यानां जारिमः
[4] परमेश्वरभागकतस्य नेत्रारायणपतिः [I] विदितस्य को सामवि: विदेदिः
[5] तरंगतेतु शाक्षाक्षातिशुकः परमेश्वरभागकतस्य एकाः
[6] दशं वर्षमें ए पुले तल्लभमितस्य विविष्णुप्रभवाराकरः माः
[7] घनीमास्य विभविष्णुप्रभुतस्य राजविवाहान्या कृत्यकेश्वरः उः
[8] तत्त्वें गतंतवेः केलिस्य श्रीमतान्तराण्रुद्वां नामाः मघो मघो
[9] ब्रह्मणामें दत्तः [I] तें नामग्रंथाधिपतिः [I] कौशल्यास्य रविविष्णुपतिः

The original has no marks of punctuation.

The proper reading, as shown by No. XXIX. l. 31, No. XXXI. I. 19, and No. 6 of Major Dixon's copper-plate granta, Pl. II. a. I. 15 (see below), is 'विशेष-सम-मन्'-&c.
Translation.

Hail! Victorious is the body, which was that of a Boar, that was manifested of Vishnū (१२०, as in No. XXIX.).

The son of the great king Śṛ-Prulakēśī-valabha—whose body was purified (१२१, as in No. XXIX.)—was the great king Kṛttivarmā, the favourite of the world, (१२२, as in No. XXIX.).

His son (was) Satyārśaya, the favourite of the world, the great king, (१२३, as in No. XXIX.).

His dear son (was) Vikramāditya, the supreme lord, the venerable one—who acquired (१२४, as in No. XXIX.).

His son, Vinayāditya-Satyārśaya, the favourite of the world, the great king, the supreme king, the supreme lord, the venerable one,—who, having at the command of his father (१२५, as in No. XXIX.),—thus issues his commands to all people:—

“Be it known to you! Six hundred and thirteen years of the Śaka (era) having elapsed, in the eleventh year of (Our) augmenting and victorious reign, at (Our) victorious camp which is located at the village of Eḷupundai, on the day of the full-moon of (the month) Māgha, at the request of the Yuvāryā Śrī-Vijayāditya, the village of Musūripurā, in the division of Vēlāhipurā (?), in the three Ganyatas, on the north bank of the Kṛishnavērā, is given by us to the Brāhmaṇa (herein) mentioned. Their names and gōtras are declared. To Raviśārmā, of the Kauśika gōtra, who is familiar with two Vēdas; to Āditya, again of the Kauśika gōtra, who is acquainted with the Shāstra which I can make no sense. And such letters as are clear in the latter part of this line do not give any satisfactory meaning.

† There are seven letters here, which I cannot read with any approach to certainty.

†† Similarly, there are eight letters here, of which I can make no intelligible words.

§ Here, again, there are four, or perhaps five, letters, of

Excerpting the p. l. ‘samucca-chita’ in l. 12, for ‘samuccha-chita’ in l. 18 of No. XXIX.
This is from No. 3 of the photographs of copper-plate grants at the end of Major Dixon's collection. The original consists of three plates, and is stated to be at Hārihar in Māisūr; I tried to obtain it to edit from, but failed to trace the owner of it. The original plates would seem to be very well preserved; but the photograph is imperfect in several places, owing to the letters not having been properly filled in with white paint or chalk when it was taken.

The characters are of a much better standard than those of either of the two preceding inscriptions, and do not slant as much. The Anuvādra is uniformly written above the line.

This inscription, again, records a grant made in celebration of some victory gained by Vinayāditya. It is dated in the Saṅka year 617, (according to the original, 'six hundred and sixteen years of the Saṅka [era] having elapsed'), in the fourteenth year of his reign, while he was encamped at the village of Karṇapura near the city of Hārēśha-pura. These places must be somewhere in the neighbourhood of Banaū-si and Hārihar; and possibly 'Hārēśha' should be 'Hārēṣha', and is the old name of 'Hārihar.' The grant was of the village of Kīru-Kāmāsī, or 'the smaller Kāmāsī,' in the Ēdeva-al division and in the Vanaū-si district. The grant was made at the request of Āḷuvārājya, who was probably the hostile king just subjugated by Vinayāditya. I take it that āruha has to be interpreted here as a proper name; but it might also be taken as the present relative participle of the Canarese āru, 'to rule,' in which case āruha-vāja would mean 'the reigning king'; this, however, does not give any suitable sense. The record of this grant, again, was made by the Peace and War Minister, Rāmapuṇyavallabha.

In line 21 the Hāiha-vās are mentioned among the royal races subjugated by Vinayāditya. Lōkama hāḍēvi, the wife of Vikrama-ditya II, the grandson of Vinayāditya, was from this family.
Hail! Victorious is the body, which was that of a Boar, that was manifested of Vishnu, (as in No. XXIX.)

The son of the great king Sri-Pulikēśi-vallabha,—whose body was purified (as, as in No. XXIX.)—was the great king Sri-Kirtti-varma, the favourite of the world, (as, as in No. XXIX.)

His son was Satyāśraya, the favourite of the world, the great king, (as, as in No. XXIX.)

His dear son was Vikramāditya, the supreme lord, the venerable one,—who acquired (as, as in No. XXIX.)

His son, Vinayāditya-Satyāśraya, the favourite of the world, the great king, the supreme king, the supreme lord, the venerable one—who, having at the command of his father (as, as in No. XXIX.), was like Bharata, on account of his being the refuge of kings, and by whom the Pāllavas, the Kālambrhas, the Kēras, the Haihayas, the Vīlas, the Mālavas, the Chōlas, the Pāndyas and others were brought into a similar state of servitude with the Ālur, and others, who were hereditarily (subject to him),—thus issues his commands to all people:

"Be it known to you! Six hundred and sixteen years of the Śaka (era) having elapsed, in the fourteenth year of (Our) augmenting and victorious reign, at (Our) victorious camp, which is located at the village of Karajapata in the neighbourhood of (the city of) Harēshapura, on the day of the full-moon of (the month) Kārtti, at the request of the illustrious Āḷavarāja, the village of Kīru-kāmāsi, in the Edevol division in the Vannavāsi district, is given by Us, with the right of enjoyment, and free from all opposing claims, to Śanāśām, who is thoroughly well versed in the Vēdas and the Vēdāṅgas, the son’s son of Śriśarmā, who performed the Śoma sacrifice, of the Vāṇya-gōra, and the son of Mārasārmā. (Also there is given) an uncultivated (?), field the name is spelt 'Pulikēśi-vallabha.' In II. 3 and 7 of the Ahôla inscription, No. XIII., the reading is distinctly 'Pulikēśi.' In No. XXVII., l. 6, it is 'Pulikēśi-vallabha.'

† See note to l. 21 of the text. † Abhidas; l. 30.
on the west of the village of Pêrgâgamâsi. § And the boundaries of that field (are):—On the north-east, the boundaries of the village of Sirigôdu; coming thence, (the village of) (?) Karvêsurigôdu; thence, (the village of) (?) Pêrdâtu; thence, (the village of) (?) Álége; thence thence, to the east, (the village of) (?) Nêfîrê (?) thence, (the land, or village, called) Karvêpakê; thence turning to the south, ....... -kätâ.† This (grant, or charter) should be preserved by future kings, who are desirous of acquiring fame, whether they belong to Our lineage or to other families, &c. &c! And it has been said by the holy Vêrâsa, the arranger of the Vêdás:—Land has been enjoyed by many kings, from Sâgarâ downwards; &c. &c! It is a very easy thing to bestow a grant oneself, &c; &c! He is born as a worm in ordeuce for the duration of sixty thousand years, &c. &c! This charter has been written by Sêkâmañyavallâba, the High (Minister) who is entrusted with the arrangement of peace and war."

Before leaving this part of my subject, I should notice two more inscriptions of Vinâyâdityâ. —1, No. 5 of Major Dixon’s copper-plate grants. The original is at Sûrab in Maisûr, and seems to be fairly well preserved; but the photograph is too small and indistinct for me to edit from it. Down to ‘ôjâdpayati,’ Pl. II., a, l. 17, the language is the same as in the corresponding part of No. XXIX. now published. It is dated in the Saka year 615, (according to the original, ‘six hundred and fourteen years of the Saka [era] having elapsed’), the thirteenth year of his reign, and apparently on Saturday, the day of the sun’s commencing his progress to the south. It records another grant in celebration of a victory, and is issued from the camp at the village of Chitrâsêdu in the district of Tôravâra or Tôravâra. The grant is made at the request of the Great King Sêki-Chitrâpâda, the son of Upêndra. The name of the village bestowed seems to be Sêhîvog, in the Edevogal division, and near to Vaijyantipura or Vênaâvâsi. The record of this grant, again, is made by Sêkâmapûryavallâba, the Peace and War Minister.—2, No. 99 of Major Dixon’s Collection; a stone-tablet 36’ 6’’ high by 1’ 10’’ broad at Bâlagânwe. The photograph is so small,—only 3’’ by 13’’,—and so blurred, that only a few detached and familiar words can be made out here and there. The language is Old Canarese. It records a grant by one of the Sêndraka family, while Vinâyaditya-Rajâsrâyan was the reigning paramount sovereign. It does not seem to be dated. At the top of the stone is an elephant, standing; this is the earliest stone-tablet that I am aware of with any emblems on it.

PAPER-MAKING IN THE HIMÂLAYAS.


At a time when the scarcity of rags for papermaking, combined with an increased demand for the manufactured article, has set every one seeking for substances wherewith to manufacture, I have thought that a short account of the paper-making in the Himalayas might prove of interest.

The reports on the manufacture of paper in Japan, published as a Parliamentary paper (No. 4 of 1871), have shown how the inner bark of various trees, notably the mulberry, is there used. That used in the Hills of India is from the Daphne papyracea, a shrub abundant at certain heights, and the paper produced is very tough and durable. I almost fear, however, that the material could neither be supplied in sufficient quantity, nor that it would bear the heavy cost of carriage to the coast. I will, however, gather together all I can find on the subject scattered in various works, and then conclude with my own experience in the matter, as for many years I was in the Hills and witnessed the manufacture.

Almost every one who has been residing at

§ i.e. 'the larger Kâlgândâk.'
‖ Pââkhâla, h. 51-2; meaning not known.
* Nêthô, l. 33; meaning not known.
† See note to l. 34 of the text.
‡ Conf.: 'Eddyâruvatâd Bhavata ec,' No. XXIX., l. 22-3, and in the corresponding place in each of the remaining inscriptions.
Nainí Tál, the well-known sanitarium in Kumaon, and has had a garden, must well know the Daphne plant, the bark of which, as the plant grows ready to hand, is stripped off and used for tying up plants, securing trellis-work of 'rangdāl' (or small bamboos), and for all kinds of uses. Many a sportsman, too, has been saved from an unpleasant slide by catching at its tough twigs, off which, however, the bark sometimes slips in the hand, leaving a white slippery core. Still I fear that where a large quantity would be required, as for export, it would be very hard to obtain.

I will now, however, without further digression, proceed firstly to detail the accounts of others.

In *Journal of the Asiatic Society* vol. I., p. 8 is a paper by B. H. Hodgson, Esq., on the native method of making the paper denominated in Hindustan 'Nipalēsec.' It is extracted entire, as it is not susceptible of abridgment:

"For the manufacture of Nipalēsec paper the following implements are necessary, but a very rude construction of them suffices for the end in view:"

"1st. A stone mortar, of shallow and wide cavity, or a large block of stone, slightly but smoothly excavated. 2nd. A mallet or pestle of hard wood, such as oak, and in size proportioned to the mortar, and to the quantity of boiled rind of the paper plant which it is desired to pound into pulp. 3rd. A basket of close wicker-work, to put the ashes in, and through which water will only pass drop by drop. 4th. An earthen vessel or receiver, to receive the juice of the ashes after they have been watered. 5th. A metallic open-mouthed pot, to boil the rind of the plant in. It may be of iron, or copper, or brass, indifferently; an earthen one would hardly bear the requisite degree of fire. 6th. A sieve, the reticulation of the bottom of which is wide and open, so as to let all the pulp pass through, save only the lumpy portion of it. 7th. A frame with stout wooden sides, so that it will float well in water, and with a bottom of a cloth only so porous that the meshes of it will stay all the pulp, even when diluted and diffused in water, but will let the water pass off when the frame is raised out of the cistern."

"The operator must also have the command of a cistern of clear water, plenty of firewood, ashes of oak (though I fancy other ashes might answer as well); a fireplace, however rude; and chiefly quant. sufficit of slips of the inner bark of the paper tree, such as is peeled off the plant by the paper-makers, who commonly use the peelings when fresh from the plant,—but that is not indispensable. With these 'appliances and means to boot,' suppose you take four sors of ashes of oak, put them into the basket above mentioned, place the earthen receiver or vessel beneath the basket, and then gradually pour five sors of clear water upon the ashes, and let the water drip slowly through the ashes and fall into the receiver. This juice of ashes must be strong, of dark brown-like red colour, and in quantity about two pounds; and if the first filtering yield not such a produce, pass the juice through the ashes a second time. Next, pour this extract of ashes into the metal pot already described, and boil the extract; and so soon as it begins to boil, throw into it as many slips or peelings of the inner bark of the paper plant as you can easily grasp, each slip being about a cubit long and an inch wide (in fact the quantity of the slips of bark should be to the quantity of juice of ashes such that the former should float freely in the latter, and that the juice shall not be absorbed or evaporated with less than half an hour's boiling). Boil the slips for about half an hour, at the expiration of which time the juice will be nearly absorbed, and the slips quite soft. Then take the softened slips and put them into the stone mortar, and beat them with the oaken mallet till they are reduced to a homogeneous or uniform pulp, like so much dough. Take this pulp, put it into any wide-mouthed vessel, add a little pure water to it, and churn it with a wooden instrument, like a chocolate mill, for ten minutes, or until it loses its stringiness and will spread itself out when shaken about under water. Next, take as much of this prepared pulp as will cover your paper-frame (with a thicker or thinner coat, according to the strength of the paper you need), toss it into such a sieve as I have described, and lay the sieve upon the paper-frame and let both sieve and frame float in the cistern; agitate them and the pulp will spread itself over the sieve; the coarser and knotty parts of the pulp will remain in the sieve, but all the rest will ooze through into the frame. Then put away the sieve, and, taking the frame in your left hand..."
as it floats on the water, shake the water and pulp smartly with your right hand, and the pulp will readily diffuse itself in a uniform manner over the bottom of the frame. When it is thus properly diffused, raise the frame out of the water, easing off the water in such a manner that the uniformity of the pulp spread shall continue after the frame is clear of the water, and the paper is made.

To dry it the frame is set endwise near a large fire, and so soon as it is dry the sheet is peeled off the bottom of the frame and folded up. When (which is seldom the case) it is deemed necessary to smooth and polish the surface of the paper, the dry sheets are laid upon wooden boards and rubbed with the convex entire side of the conch-shell, or, in case of the sheets of paper being large, with the flat surface of a large rubber of hard smooth-grained wood; no sort of size is ever needed or applied to prevent the ink from running. It would probably surprise the paper-makers of England to hear that the Kachār Bhotiās can make up this paper into fine smooth sheets of seven yards square.

This paper may be purchased [in 1831] at Katmānḍu, in almost any quantity, at the price of seventeen annas sikkā per dhārni of three ārs, and the bricks of dried pulp may be had at the same price for from eight to ten annas sikkā per dhārni. Though called Nipālī, the paper is not in fact made in Nipāl Proper. It is manufactured exclusively in Cis-Himālāy Bhōt, and by the race of Bhotiās denominated (in their own tongue) Ranṣa, in contradistinction to the Trans-Himālāy Bhotiās, whose vernacular name is Soko. . . . . . . To return to our paper-making—most of the Cis-Himālāy Bhotiās east of the Kili river make the Nipālī paper; but the greatest part of it is manufactured in the tract above Nipāl Proper, and the best market for it is afforded by the Nipālī people, and hence probably it derived its name; a great quantity is annually made and exported southwards to Nipāl and Hindustān, and northwards to Saka-yā-Ｇūmba, Digarchi, and other places in Transmontane Bhōt. The manufactories are mere sheds, established in the midst of the immense forests of Cis-Himālāy Bhōt, which afford to the paper-makers an inexhaustible supply, on the very spot, of the firewood and ashes which they consume so largely; abundance of clear water (another requisite) is likewise pro-

curable everywhere in the same region. I cannot learn by whom or when the valuable properties of the paper plant were discovered; but the Nipālīs say that any one of their books now existent which is made of palm leaf may be safely pronounced on that account to be five hundred years old, whereas we may perhaps infer that the paper manufacture was founded about that time. I conjecture that the art of paper-making was got by the Cis-Himālāy Bhotiās via Lhāsā from China, a paper of the very same sort being manufactured at Lhāsā, and most of the useful arts of these regions having flowed upon them, through Tibet, from China, and not from Hindustān.

"P.S." (abridged.) "Dr. Wallich has fully described (Asiatic Researches, vol. XIII. p. 387) the paper-plant. 'The raw produce or pulp (beat up into bricks) has been sent to England, and declared upon competent authority to be of unrivalled excellence for the manufacture of that sort of paper upon which proof engravings are taken off.'

I subjoin the botanical description of the paper-producing plant, with a few remarks for the reader who may not be a botanist.

As far as my own experience goes, this plant is but small, being a shrub of generally three to four feet; although, I am told, it often grows higher. The thickness of the stem is not generally greater than one's finger, and it would bear cutting down every year; although of course by this process, in such a cold climate as that in which it grows,—at 5000 to 9000 feet above the sea-level,—it should properly be left some two or three years to grow up again. Even without maceration in water the inner as well as the outer bark is easily separated from the wood. For tying purposes, both inner and outer bark are used at the same time.

The leaves are small and glabrous, being somewhat glossy; and the flower is insignificant, but with a slightly pleasant odour. The berries, which come on the tree in April to June, are showy, red, and very acid. It will grow where there is very little soil,—preferring, however, like most plants, leaf-mould caused by the decomposition of the fallen oak-leaves,—and has a stout hold by its fibrous roots in the rocks below. As I have never visited Nipāl and the forests spoken of by Mr. Hodgson, I have never seen it growing in great profusion, but it is scattered
over a wide area, being found, as briefly put by Mr. Edgeworth, 'from Bhutan to Chamba,' in Major Madden's paper (Journ. R. As. Soc. vol. XVII. Pt. 1. p. 368) on the Turace and outer mountains of Kumaoon, he speaks of both the white and purple flowering varieties of the *Daphne cannabina.*—"*śē bāruṇ,*" a synonym of *peppreca, as being found at Naini Tal; also the *Daphne sericea* or "*Chumlia.*" He adds that the Nepalese paper is made from the *Witenremia salicifolia* of Jacqumot, and from the purple flowering variety of *D. cannabina.* There must be many other inner banks of shrubs on the hills which would make paper; but until these have been tried it is of no use to speak of them.

Moorecroft, the well-known Himalayan traveller, in *Asiatic Researches,* vol. XII. p. 373, speaks of the plant, but he merely imagines that the paper is made from a shrub not unlike butcher's-broom (*C.*), called "*Setharū.*" He adds that it is strong, and used for *handīs* (or bills of exchange). A glance at the flower will show that he could not have been much of a botanist. In vol. XIII. p. 335 of the *Asiatic Researches* is a paper by Dr. Wallich—"Description of some rare Indian plants." In this, "*Daphne cannabina*" (Loureiro?) is described in nearly the same terms as those used by Decandolle and above quoted. The English observations appear worthy of quotation, as our notices of this plant are in general very scanty.

"Among the extensive and constant supplies of plants and weeds from Nipal which the Botanic Gardens (Calcutta) owe to the liberality of the Honourable Edward Gardner, Resident at Katmandou, are also specimens and plants of the paper shrub, which, I am informed by this gentleman, grows very commonly in that country, and when in flower is exquisitely fragrant. It appears that there are two varieties—one with perfectly white, the other with reddish flowers; both are used for ornament and for the manufacture of paper, of which I am enabled to present to the Society's museum specimens of various dimensions and texture. The common kind measures generally about two feet square. The first kind measures ten feet in length and four feet in breadth, and it is manufactured chiefly in Doli, a province to the eastward of Kumaoon. It approaches in softness and size to that which is made in China, and it is not improbable that some of the latter may be produced from the same material. Loureiro mentions that paper is manufactured in the neighbouring kingdom of Cochín-China from the bark of *Daphne cannabina,* which seems to differ only in having opposite leaves—a circumstance which may perhaps be owing to culture. It comes extremely near to *D. odorata* of Thunberg and *D. indica* of Osebeck, which (at least that described in the *Flora Cochín-chinensis*) Dr. Sims, with great propriety, suggests may be only a variety of the former. The question respecting the identity or difference of these three plants can be settled only by those who have the means of comparing them.

"I am indebted for an account of the manner of preparing this paper from the bark of this charming shrub, and for some parts of the description given above, to the communications of Lieut. H. R. Murray, and to the following notes extracted from the official correspondence of that gentleman with the Military Board at Calcutta:

""The *śē bāruṇ,* or paper shrub, is found on the most exposed parts of the mountains, and those the most elevated and covered with snow, throughout the province of Kumaoon.

"In traversing the oak forests between Bhimā and Rāmrā, and again from Almōrā to Champāvat, and down towards the river, it has come under the immediate observation of the writer of these communications that the *śē bāruṇ,* or paper plant, only thrives luxuriantly where the oak grows; so that it is not likely that it will succeed in the plains. It is hardy, and attains a height of five or six feet, blossoming in January and February, and ripening its aerial red fruit about the end of April. The paper prepared of its bark is particularly calculated for cartridges, being strong, tough, not liable to crack or break,—however much bent or folded—proof agains being moth-eaten, and not in the least subject to dampness from any change in the weather; besides if drenched or kept in water for any considerable time it will not rot. It is invariably used all over Kumaoon, and in great request in many parts of the plains for the purpose of writing *nābā-nāmā,* or genealogical records, deeds, &c., from its extraordinary durability. It is generally made about one yard square, and of three different qualities. The
best sort is retailed at the rate of 40 sheets for a current rupee [1s. 10d.], and at wholesale 80 sheets. The second is retailed at the rate of 50 sheets for a current rupee, and 100 at wholesale. The third is of a much smaller size, is retailed at 140 sheets, and wholesale 160 to 170 for the rupee. The following is the very simple method of manufacturing this paper:

"After scraping off the outer surface of the bark, what remains is boiled in fair water with a small quantity of the ashes of the oak,—a most necessary part of the ingredients, which have the effect of cleaning and whitening the stuff. After the boiling, it is washed, and immediately beat to a pulp with small mallets on a stone, so that when mixed up in a vat with the fairest water it has the appearance of flour and water. It is then spread on moulds or frames made of common bamboo mats."

Thus ends Wallich's notice of this interesting plant.

From what has been here written, the general inference would appear to be that the pulp, in bricks or otherwise, could not be procured in any large quantity for the supply of paper factories; although, as in many other cases, it might be employed to usefully supplement existing and available materials.

Perhaps the Society of Arts was the medium through which, as Mr. Hodgson states, the pulp was supplied to the English manufacturers, who pronounced so favourably upon it, or it may have been through the Court of Directors.

Near the residence of a Lāmā at Kardang, in Lāhūl, we saw a number of Bhotīs making paper from the bark of a tree they say they get in Kullū, called "Baji," a species of Daphne. A number of people were beating it into a pulp, which others made into round balls; and, a little further on, the paper was being made in oblong and square forms of a large size, entirely for the purpose of having religious books printed on it, and not for sale. The form was made of a light wooden frame, covered with rather a coarse cloth, on which the pulp was mashed. I saw a quantity of the paper drying, but not the process of putting it on the cloth.

NOTES ON THE CAVE OF PANCHALEŚVARA IN MOUGE BHAMBURDE, TALUKĀ HAVELI, ZILLĀ PUṆĀ.

By W. F. Sinclair, Bo. C.S.

This cave is mentioned by Dr. Wilson in his first Memorandum on the Ancient Remains of Western India, and by Mr. Fergusson, who gives a woodcut from a sketch by Daniell," tolerably accurate as representing the style of architecture, but failing as regards the general appearance of the place. It has also been at least twice photographed, but I am not aware that any copies are now in print. During the past monsoon I had an accurate plan taken of it, which is now with the Archaeological Surveyor, and I think the following notes may be useful.

It is in "a rocky hillock forming a gentle

swell of the ground" close to the cattle bazaar of the village of Bhamburde, opposite Puṇā, immediately north of a small hill crowned by a Muhammadan pirāstähān, and east of a large quarry.

The entrance is through a tunnel about twenty feet long and five wide. This—which has suffered a good deal from time, and is now partly supported by masonry—opens into the east side of a court averaging 50 feet north and south by 90 east and west, and ten feet below the surface of the ground around. The centre of this court is occupied by the Nandi pavilion, which is remarkable and, I believe, unique.† It is hewn

† A square pavilion stands in front of the large Śiva cave at Ambā or Mominābhāb.—Ed.
out of the rock in situ, and was originally supported by twelve pillars round the outside, and four in square in the centre. The four eastern pillars have come down during the last five years, with that part of the roof which they supported. Between the outer circle and inner square of pillars is an annular cistern about two feet deep, which was within my time kept filled with water. The Nandi and four inner pillars rest upon an insulated plinth or pedestal in the cistern. The roof of this pavement is externally carefully smoothed and dressed into the shape of an umbrella, except at the very top; where the original rock surface remains,—not having been high enough, apparently, for the architect to finish his design. There is no trace of his having made any structural addition, either here or over the main cave. The rest of the courtyard is almost filled up by a modern well and garden.

The façade of the cave occupies the whole west side of the court, and is 96 feet long, exclusive of the thickness of two pilasters. These and eight free-standing pillars, plain and square, with bracket capitals, support the roof in front. The caves are very narrow, and dressed below; the entrance, a flight of five steps up from the court, and three down again into the cave, is between the centre pillars. The outer steps are flanked by two stone tigers couchant, hewn in situ. An aisle eight feet wide separates the front row of pillars from another precisely similar, having a great false architrave; and nine feet farther in is a third row of the same character, but having only three pillars and a pilaster to the south of the central interval, as the south side of the cave here contracts eleven feet at a right angle, the north side retaining its direction. Between the third pillar from the south and fourth from the north is a small Nandi hewn in situ; and 6½ feet inside of this third row of pillars is the shrine, containing three cells hewn in a mass of rock 39 feet long in front by 27½ feet deep to rear, left standing from floor to ceiling. The central cell is occupied by the linga of Mahadeva Panchalesvara; to his left is Bhavani, to his right Gaṇapati. A wide and dark passage leads round the back of the shrine, and it would seem that the architect meant to have supported all this part of the cave with pillars and pilasters symmetrical with those in front; but much of the work remains merely blocked out. The maximum depth of the cave (in the north-west corner) is 78 feet. The northern section is now divided from the rest by a mud wall. Between the pilasters on the true north wall I found some traces of figures,—whether blocked out for sculpture, or destroyed, it was impossible to say,—and thought I recognized the outline of the Śaiva Aṣṭa Mātrā. Below them were a few conventional ornaments, especially that derived from the Chaitya, and found in many Hindu caves, as at Elephanta. On the faces of the great Nandi's island-pedestal are panels of a pattern which suggests a similar derivation from the Buddhist rail. There are no other sculptures, but a few unintelligible marks in the south wall, and I found no inscription whatever. There is a small cell; the front supported by two pillars, in the south-west corner of the court; and in the hill, about a mile behind, there are three or four more, which are mere square cells. Modern Hinduism has the whole set in full possession, has adorned the cave of Panchalesvara with marvellous frescoes, and even hewn new images in the cells on the hill. There is nothing to show that the great cave has not always been, as now, a Śaiva temple. As regards its chronological position we have but little evidence. The long open front and rows of pillars point to the period of the Bādāmi caves; the Nandi pavilion hewn in the court reminds one of Elora and the solid shrine of Dhokeśvara, which is in fact the nearest Brahmanical cave (68 miles off as the crow flies), and the one which to my mind presents most points of affinity. All of these, however, are much more ornate than the cave of Panchalesvara, which, for its originality and vigour of design, deserves to be a good deal better known than it is, though lying at the very doors of one of the largest European stations in India.

THREE KÖNGŪ INSCRIPTIONS.*

BY THE REV. F. KITTEL, MEERAKARA.

The following Old Kannarese inscriptions in

* Cf. Ind. Ant. vol. I. pp. 360 et seq.; vol. II. pp. 155 et seq.; vol. III. pp. 292 et seqq., p. 302. As evinced by the the letters of the period (resembling those of pronunciation of Kannarese, Köög, and other peoples, the name of the country is Kōög (not Köög with the long
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the Kadamba inscriptions]) are from three stone-tablets in the woods of Kiggatnadu, the south-eastern taluk of Kodagu (Coorg). They are in places neighbouring the Lakshminathriver, which enters the Kaveri beyond the frontiers of the province. No. I is in the lands of Ferga or Peggur (i.e. "big village"), No. II. in those of Biliur or Baliur (i.e. "bright village"), and No. III. in those of Kotur (i.e. "well-arranged village") in the Lakshminath jungle. Neither Lakshmi (i.e., probably, "high tank") nor Kotur are mentioned in the grant, but Kalna or "stone district") is, a name which seems to be now forgotten. The great river in Nos. I. and II. perhaps is the Lakshminath river, which is still so called, with this difference only, that other Kanarese terms are used, viz. dödghöl ('great river') instead of péddör; another possibility, however, is, that the Kaveri (i.e. "red bank") is meant. The Vasis, or Jain temple, for which grant No. I. was intended, was never built. At Bili-ur, not far from the stone-tablet that originally stood on the

Sanadi), an inhabitant of that country, now-a-days fluent in the Koyambut (Chambatt) dialect, is called a Kodagu. Thus also Kodagu (Coorg) is the country, and Kodagu a native of Coorg. Kolligai, Koligai, Kolligai are Sanskritised forms. Thomas Kolligai and Kodagu more than probably have the same root (Kol), there seems to be no historical proof for the identity of the names. Among the Kolligas of our time there is a well-known family called the Kolligai house,—a secondary evidence as to the influence of the Kolligas over at least a portion of Coorg. It would be of some interest to know in whose document Kodagu is first mentioned. As the Kolligas do not possess the sounds of the now obsolete letters g and d in their dialect, it does not appear to be so old as these; the Baliga and the Nalki hill still retain these sounds in their language.

† See Ind. Ant. vol. V. p. 357.

‡ People of Ferga told me that this No. I. had been inspected by Mr. L. Rice; see Ind. Ant. vol. II. p. 155. Cf. Dr. Barnell's Bo. Ind. Palaeog. p. 27, n. 1.

§ Cf. Loeki in (or Lakshmi), Ind. Ant. vol. II. pp. 300-303.

Perrmannandi (or Perramandi)—the doubling of the consonant after the vepha being optional, if this is preceded by a short vowel; cf. Sadhabhinda, Mangalore edition, p. 140) is Perrmannandi, the great one's foot,' a term homonymically used instead of "the great one himself." In Kanarese poetry, "I tell you your foot or feet" is frequently used for "I tell you," Auk, the foot, or ojaya, the feet (twice in the present inscriptions), are often personified in Kannada, Tamil, and Malayalee, so that the terms also by themselves mean "master," see e.g. ojaya in this sense affixed to the name of pursa; Gurusvajja, Guruvasvajja, Dimmasvajja, in the inscriptions at Belur, p. 324; cf. sayati, "summits of foot," i.e. teacher, ittari, "short foot," i.e. ascetic). Perrmannandi is equivalent to the Purrumali (or Purrumandu) name, with which they honoured the Chola, Chola, and Paliu kings. A play upon the title of Perrmannandi we find in the "swarmapadavarthā Perrmannandi," of No. II.—i.e., "the great one's foot that is free from (any) obligations to all the (other) feet." Ind. Ant. vol. IV. p. 396, an inscription of a.d. 1655-6 in the text

brink of a large trench (kuva or nga), but at present lies in it, is a small Jindilaya of unpolished stone, quite filled with white-ants' nests. The name of the trench, Püna or da nga, nobody seems to remember.

The general title of the donor or donors, Perrmannandi (i.e. "potentate"), occurs in each of the grants. Apparently his real name, or the name of one of them, Rāchamallā, is given in No. I.,—from which it might be concluded that here (Sātyavākya) Kōnigī or Kōnigīvarma dharmamahārāja dhirāja, which, like Perrmannandi, is also in each grant, is nothing but a name of the dynasty, at the head of which, as is known, stands Kōnigīvarma dharmamahārāja dhirāja, who has no successor of that name in the idānas down till a.d. 777. The Sātyavākya in the beginning of the title perhaps means the same as, in grant No. II., the Sātyavākya added to Jīnālaya or the Jaina doctrine.†

The inscription No. II. bears the date of S. S. 809 (a.d. 857), so that its donor lived one hundred and ten years after Prithvī Kōṁ contains the expression "the Chālukya king Gāṅga Perrmannandi Vikramakīrityaśevasa in a note is added "Gāṅga perrmannandi or Gāṅga pemmānadi was also adopted as a Kadamba title." See p. 210. There seems to be no doubt that here and in the Kiggatnadu inscriptions the same title is meant, a writer, for the sake of the metre, may have lengthened the Kanarese Pemmānadi in Pemmānadi, in Kannada (Tamil, and Malayalee), as indicated by the diacritical mark, also the letter i is short (e.g. pumma; see also Pēra, Pēma, Pēmā, Hūmādi in the genealogy of the Chālukyas in Sanskrit Inscriptions, &c. by J. F. Fleet, Esg. Bo. C.S.S., reprinted from the Jour. Bo. Ind. Rel. Soc. pp. 321; cf. also the village Pērga, i.e. Ferga); only when the secondary adjective pīva (i.e. "great") forms a part of a word, as in pīva, pīva, "great virtue," in grant No. I., i. 1, 15, in a compound is followed by a vowel, its e becomes e (i.e. long; see Ś江淮rāmāviśaṇeṇa, pp. 230, 314). If no linguistic license has taken place as to the form of Pērmānadi, the first part of the title is simply taken from the Malāśa Pērmānadi or Fērmān.

† The proper name Rāchamallā figures also in Lāgga legends, e.g. in the story of king Bhūravas of Sānajña, by Nājajita, wherein (chapter I. v. 305) two Lāggaśitas of that name are introduced. In Tēnāru viṣṇa rāja. In the abstract from the list of the Kōğiṇīs in Rājendar, Ind. Ant. vol. I. pp. 331 et seq., there appears, as the next successor of the donor of the Nāgaśita grant (of a.d. 777), a Rāja Malladeva I., the younger brother of his predecessor, and as the fourth ruler after him, and the second after Sātyavākya rāya (Rāya Malladeva II. is mentioned, in whose reign, a.d. 894, a temple was built upon some land in the Vērī, and who was the last king of the dynasty?). The inscription of 891 is only seven years in advance of the date in No. II. of the present plates.

* This supposition becomes more plausible from the circumstance that after a.d. 777 the name of Kōṇigī (Kōṇigī, Kōṇigī-varma) is not met with in the genealogical abstract.

† The abstract says of Sātyavākya:rāya: "He was never failing in truth, hence he obtained the title of Sātyavākya:rāya."
has the same titles attached to his name. **Koḷājaṁpu**ra of Coorg No. I. is written exactly as in the Kīḍambha grant; the Koḷājaṁpu of Nos. II. and III. (Koḷājaṁprabhy syncope) is the Kuvaḷājaṁpu of the Chālukya grant. On the common epithet of Pērmāṇāḍi some remarks are already made in a note.

After such identity it is only natural to find that "the 96,000 royal representatives of the countries" (saṁpratīlaṁsu vikṣaprabhārajya) of the Nāgamaṅgala grant, or, as they are briefly styled in Coorg Nos. I. and II., "the 96,000 people," are also adduced in the said Chālukya grant. The Māḷēpa (Māḷapas, Malavas), however, who at the time of Pērmāṇāḍi I. (A.D. 950-51), the subordinate of the Chālukya king Vikramādiya II., were the enemies of the Chālukyas, and in later times (towards the end of the 12th century) of the Kāḍamba chieftains of Govē, and probably also of king Viṭaballāja of the Hōysāḷas (A.D. 1193)*, in the Kīḍambha grants appear as the friends of the Kōṅgaś.

The emblem of No. III. is simply an elephant, which combined with others appears also at the top of the tablets I. and II.:—

---

**On No. 1.**

---

**On No. 2.**

---

2. *Cl. Peddāry,* ‘the great river,’ in the present inscriptions.
4. The last form of the name occurs also in another inscription, according to note 2, p. 203, vol. *Cl. Peddāry*; it often changes place with s, as does l with l.
5. See the reprint of Mr. Fleet’s paper, p. 16.
The meaning of the text in a few instances remains to be settled; I have refrained from giving any tentative explanations. The translation is as literal as possible.

I.

Svasti śakunipakātātisavataraśarasatānā
gā...tanāya śaśaraśīva śisārū pravattisē svasti satyavāka Kōṇaġiṣivarmanmadharmanāma...rājādhirāj Kōḷaḷapuraṇavēvara-Nandagirināthasrīmat Rāchamalla Pērmmanadigal tadvarshayaṇantarāpālguṇasātipakaghata Na-śālīsvaruān talpadēvasamagē svatisamastāvairagajagadātāpya "kumbhkāmabhastalasphatitāmargiyasakalapraghaṇabhākārakā...śćenivasītadakāmmadandaśājanājapraṇāhānmed chinnanāśīnādapī śāhāranāṇām śrīmat rākkaśī Bûlādēvyāṇālāttirī bhuddramam-śṭā Jinaśāsana śī Bûlājīvāśigalappa śī Vīra-senamī śī thātādeva varāśīyau nhū śī Gōnasenapāndītahastākāraka varāśīhār śrīmat A-nanvīryayānīgū Pērggadūra prā-prāvdgānumaṇabhaṭṭarāsaśībhāgya pāvardaradarki sa-is-bhāntaraśī sā śāmita pāhānaśīrīvīhūma naśinnā sā śāhaṇābhāptakānakkuśī nāmadeśī kēdaśīvērggī pīrū ānā Jnadandipadiyayana likhitāma Pīrakōlaṇa basadiya śāsanaṃ.

Translation.

Hail! When the īśvara year which was (the eightieth one in connection with ?) the hundreds of the years that had passed since the time of the Śakakīng (Ś. S. 780 ?) was current;—hail! Sātyavāka Kōṇaģiṣivarma, the supreme king of virtuous sovereigns; the excellent lord of Kōḷaḷapura; the protector of Nandagiri; the fortunate Rāchamalla,

the Pērmmanadigal; when the Nandiśvara (day) of the bright lunar fortnight of (the month) Phālguṇa in that year was the chair-day;—hail! when he who is terrible by being adorned with a strong right arm in which rests the sword that is formidable when (he) seizes the precious pearls that burst forth out of the globes of the proud globe-bearers, (viz.?) the troops of the elephants of all enemies, (and?) who is pleased with him who carries the ball-platter of gold (?), was ruling over the rich shores of the great river of Rākshasas;—prosperity to Jina's order!—the fortunate A-nanvīrya Ayya, who was the beloved disciple of the Bhūtāraka Śrī Gōnasena Pāndita that was the beloved disciple of Śrī Vīra-senā Śīdhamāṭevā, who was an inhabitant of Śrī Bēlgōla, obtained (them, the village, &c.,) so that the village of Pērggā as well as the new rent because (his) acquisition not to be meddled with. Regarding this (there are) these witnesses: the ninety-six thousand people, the fire (tributary) chiefs, the seven ascetics of the great river, and the eight farmers. They who guard this (are) the four Maḷēpas, the five hundred people, and the five spokesmen. Any one who destroys the grant of the sovereign of Śrīpurā becomes guilty of destroying Bērāṇā, a thousand Brāhmanas, a thousand brown cows, (and) of the (other) five great crimes; to any one who guards this (acrees) great virtue. Čhandaṇandi Ayya's writing. Grant of the temple of the village of Pērggā.

II.

1Bhadrastun Jinaśāsana Śakunipija Śla-kālasāvataraśarasatānābhāttenyā varsha-pīn pravatisutirē svasti satyavāka-Kōṇaģiṣivarmanmadharmanamah Kāṛaṇiḥādhirāja-Kōvallapuraṇavēvara Nandagirināthāsriṃa-Pērmmanadigalā bājībhāshkeśaṃgyā daṇīnaṃ...

inscription, but still too far to harmonize with the year of the king's coronation mentioned therein, if the same king is to be understood.

† In Kōṇaṇi before g the varga letter is used instead of the bindu.

§ Letters in italics denote that their value is doubtful; hence continua ('of gold') may be mauna ('of food').

|| Regarding the final īna see Śīdhamāṇadigala, p. 189.

† A slip of the chisel, instead of Bāraśāśi, as appears from No. II.

* A slip of the chisel, instead of Bāraśāśi, is used.

+ People generally say Bēlgōla, which is the same ('bright or clear tank').

† The nasal before g in Kōṇaṇi is expressed by the bindu.
five hundred people, and the five spokesmen (are) the guardians of it. Any one who destroys this becomes a person that is guilty of destroying Bārnās, a thousand pālās, or a thousand brown cows, (and) of the (other) five great crimes. The teacher Seja’s writing. Bālī ēr pays eighty gold (coins) of full weight, as well as eight hundred (measures cf) paddy.

III.

1Svasti satyavākya Kōnguivarmanā
2dharmamahārajadhīrājāν Kōva
3jalapavavāravaraṇa Nandagiriṇāthān
4śrīmat Pērmmanadigal Jejāla
5Erēyaṅgā Vaṇḍana一幕go Pērmmanad
6di vattasānti biṣṇu sātikramā
7vandādē śāhīyada pūmanbatta
8gadynāpůṇnāh biṣṇu bhatamumā yllā
9kālakānā sānaṃga bi
10itar Bummayyanakkana māṅgalam
11Erēyaṅgā gā Kaḷnādu māhāśī.

Translation.

Hail! Satyavākya Kōnguivarmanā, the supreme king of all the virtuous sovereigns; the excellent lord of Kōvaśapura; the protector of Nandagiri; in the eighteenth year when the kingdom-inauguration of the fortunate Pērmmanadī was being performed, on the lucky fifth day of the month Phālguṇī, Pērmmanadī, who is free from obligations to all the (other) feet, gave even the twelve hamlets (that formed) Bīḍī ēr on the shores of the great river, for the Jina temple of the Word of Truth of the Peṅgh treucht, to Sarvanandīdeva, who was a disciple of Sivaṇandi, the Bhatārā of the established truth. The ninety-six thousand people, the five (tribal) chiefs, the seven ascetics of the great river, and the eight farmers (are) the witnesses regarding this. The thousand Māḷēpas, the great company of European scholars, the equally attractive field of architectural art was not long wanting in enthusiastic explorers, and the blank left by the neglect and ignorance of the two preceding centuries of European settlement and conquest was rapidly filled up. It was then discovered that, however

BOOK NOTICE.

The syllable pa was at first omitted in the original, and afterwards, though not clearly, inserted below its place in the line.

The letter pā is not in the line, but something unreconizable appears below its place.

According to No. 1 and to the meaning that is required, the sō (expressed by a bīdu) in the original before manyā &c. is a slip of the chisel.

From this it appears to follow that the Coorg Māḷēpas, or large tribes, originally were intended for landmarks.
ever strong might be the claims of India to an old and high civilization, there were no material evidences of it which could claim a place beside the similar memorials of Egypt, Assyria, and Greece.

This achievement was accomplished by the labours of Buchanan, Wilson, Sykes, Mackenzie, and Prime, not to mention other names nearly as great; but it was reserved for a later writer, Mr. James Fergusson, to leave the limited field of more or less provincial inquiry, and to bring together, in one comprehensive body, the complete results of all that had been effected by the several preceding investigators.

When one considers the influence the religions of the Indian races have on all their actions and aspirations, and the aid to a proper comprehension of such influence which is afforded by an intelligible acquaintance with the architectural remains of the country, the Government and the public alike are under a deep debt of obligation to one who has done, and is doing, so much in this important sphere of knowledge. And the feeling of obligation must be accompanied by a large admiration for the learning and energy of a writer who has effected single-handed, without Government assistance, not only the first popular introduction of the subject to the European and Asiatic public, but who, after a lapse of upwards of thirty years, still maintains his position as the sole and most able instructor of the world in this section of antiquities. The effect which the writings of Mr. Fergusson have had on the knowledge and taste of the present generation is admitted great; numbers must owe to his architectural works their first awakening from the ignorance or indifference about the country and its peoples which distinguishes but too many of the European residents of this country.

The learned societies of Europe and the East have long acknowledged all this by every means in their power; but the general public has few opportunities of doing so, and we have therefore thought it fit to preface this brief notice of the work under review with some tribute of admiration and respect for one who has done so much to aid in the intelligent government of India, and to render attractive the country in which so many thousands of his countrymen have to find their homes.

It is impossible to deal here in any adequate way with the subject-matter of a work of this description. The space of the Quarterly Review would scarcely allow that to be done. It will only be practicable to refer briefly to the more marked features of the book, and to point out its unique and indispensable character for the purposes alike of the resident and of the European traveller.

Mr. Ferguson's *History of Architecture* first appeared in 1855, as part of his well-known *Hand-Book*. A new edition, very liberally enlarged, appeared in 1862, also as part of a similar general *History of Architecture in all Countries*. The present is therefore a third revision; but it has borne such an entire remodelling, and has been so considerably added to, that it is practically and professedly a new and distinct work. The bulk of it, or more than 600 pages out of 750, is taken up by the Indian styles, to which the following remarks will almost exclusively refer; but these sections devoted to Barmah, Siam, Cambodia, Java, and China are quite as complete as existing materials permit, and important as the best extant authority for the architectural history of the countries to which they refer.

The great features of the work are that it does not confine itself to the mere technicalities of architectural science, and that it expresses small sympathy with those who look at the knowledge of the exterior phases of structural art merely as so many means of aesthetic enjoyment, and as ends in themselves. On the contrary, while fully satisfying the reader who may take up the work with no higher objects than those we have indicated, it aims at the broader and deeper task of illustrating and explaining, in the full spirit of modern architectural inquiry, the entire body of Indian history and progress. To effect this is a Titanic operation, demanding a very familiar comprehension of the varied results of the philosophical, ethnological, and mythological researches of the last century, as well as a personal acquaintance with much of the area of a great country still insufficiently supplied with communications; but, vast as the toil involved may be, it has been gone through with never-failing freshness, and with results which speak plainly for themselves.

To proceed to particulars: the illustrations—which, with a few exceptions, are of the extreme beauty and accuracy of the earlier editions—have been increased in number from 200 to 400, and there are two good maps in which the principal non-Mahommedan architectural localities are plainly laid down in colours. If we mistake not, these maps are the first of their kind, and will be found of the utmost value. The body of the text is preceded by an Introduction in which the origin, movements, and statistics of the pagan races are clearly and laboriously disentangled from the repelling difficulties in which they have, so far as the general reader is concerned, so long lingered; and at the end of the book about 50 pages are devoted to the disputed points of Indian chronology, which necessarily affect so closely the whole
framework of the author's conclusions. The rest is divided into seven Books, the two first and the last of which (those, namely, relating to the Buddhist, Jaina, and Indo-Saracenic styles) apply more or less generally to the whole country, and derive their titles from the respective creeds which have now, or had formerly, similar universal lodgment; while the remaining four books (those, namely, devoted to the Himalayan, Dravidian, Chalukyan, and Northern or Indo-Aryan styles) are limited by the geographical or ethnical boundaries which the titles themselves define.

As the oldest existing works are those of the Buddhist period, the author commences with them, and this section will be found to be a marked advance on the previous editions, both in text and illustrations. It is still impossible to announce the discovery of any remains anterior to the time of Aśoka, or the second half of the third century before Christ, but the work which has been done in filling up the gaps behind that starting-point in the architectural history of India is great and important. First and foremost it is shown that the store of information we have derived from the beautiful and peculiar large railings has been unexpectedly and largely increased by General Cunningham's discoveries at Barhut, in the state of Rewa. The rail found at this spot is said to date 200 B.C., and offers to furnish us with as full information of the worship and life of that remote age as do the richly sculptured similar works, of a later period, at Sanchi, Amravati, and elsewhere. Next, there are fresh illustrations and particulars of the gloomy and impressive Chaitya caves at Bhāja, Bejū, Nāsik, and other places on the western side of India—excavations which are also believed to be prior to the Christian era; and, finally, plans are furnished, with all that can be made out, of the remains of the extensive structural monasteries of the Panjab, which may be found to be almost as old, and which offer to settle so many points of complexity left undetermined by the examination of the cave examples. The last-mentioned discoveries have attracted more popular attention than such matters usually do, owing to the marked traces they disclose of Grecian influence in their orders and sculpture, and would attract more if most of the objects found were not buried in the Lahor museum. The foregoing are merely the more prominent features of novelty in the Buddhist section. It is quite impossible here to say more, as every page teems with facts or illustrations which bring this remote period of the history of India much nearer to us than has yet been effected for that of some much later times.

The second Book deals with the Jaina styles, to which we believe the author was the first to direct the attention they deserve, not only on account of their beauty in arrangement and ornament, but also for their present significance as the architectural expressions of a peculiar and wealthy sect whose building tendencies have not been exhausted by the passage of two thousand years. In the earlier editions of his book Mr. Fergusson was unable to point to any Jaina work earlier than the eleventh century, but he now shows that discoveries at Mathūrā may be reasonably expected to throw back the date, perhaps to the first or second century before Christ. If research proceeds at this pace, and is followed up by intermediate supporting facts, we shall shortly be better acquainted than we are at present with the exact relations of Buddhism and Jainism, and we shall stand face to face with a style which can boast alike of a remote antiquity and a present active progression and development. The history of the Jaina styles, if it is ever completed, may place us in possession of one of the most remarkable chapters in the architectural history of the world.

The clusters of temples reared by this sect at Bāhūtā, Gîmnār, Ābu, and Parasnāth are among the most striking groups India anywhere affords, and the beauty of individual examples ranges from that of the smallest shrines to that of the massive and lofty towers which still crown the summit of the fortress of Chittor, in Rājputāna. All will be found effectively illustrated and treated by Mr. Fergusson, as well as accompanied by an exposition of the history and belief of their founders. There is one effective feature in the Jaina temples—shared in to some extent by those of the Chalukyan style—which reminds one strongly of the Ptolemaic structures of Egypt. We refer to the half-length screens placed in front of or between the pillars of the porticos. Those who some years ago tried so hard to find resemblances between the Egyptian and Indian styles can hardly have failed to notice this, but we do not remember their having done so.

Book III. ranges over the entire extent of the Himalayas, not omitting the utterances of some hope that the architectural treasures of Tibet will not much longer remain sealed to the subjects of the—in that direction—powerless Empress of India. With respect to Kaśmir there is small novelty, but the Nepalese and Gangār divisions for the first time take their proper place, and are copiously illustrated.

Of the Book devoted to the Dravidian style, it is only needful to point to the last chapter, relating to the civil examples, as the remainder of this part of the work deals with ground already well trodden,
though it will by no means be exhausted until a successor to Colonel Mackenzie appear.

The Chālukyan style has received only quite a recent recognition, and a great deal yet remains to be revealed regarding it; but we think it is destined to take a very high place in popular favour. The specimens of it range upwards from the Kṛishṇa to the Maḥānādi and Taptī. None of the Kṛishṇa examples are of much antiquity, but all, without exception, are of considerable originality and very great beauty of detail, and a greater contrast could not be imagined than that between these tasteful and lavishly decorated structures and some of the more or less clumsy and repulsive—though otherwise interesting and important—buildings of Orissa, whose boundary they touch on the north-east. We must confess we have personally a strong admiration for the Chālukyan style, and the Bombay presidency is to be congratulated on possessing so fair a share of its examples, if suitability to European taste is to be any criterion in our judgment of Indian architecture.

The next Book, containing the history of what the author calls the Northern or Indo-Āryan style, is much longer than the foregoing, as it embraces the immense area between the Indus and Brahmputra west and east, and the Himalayas and Vindhya north and south,—not without extending here and there into the ground appropriated principally by other orders. The author explains why he has adopted this title for the style that prevailed among the Hindus in Northern and Central India from the seventh century to the present day; but, although we cannot presume to offer a better name for it, we think the alternative term Indo-Āryan is much wanting in distinctiveness, as it embraces alike the structural Hindu works of the North-West Provinces, Orissa, and Central India, as well as some of those of Dīravāḍ, and the Brāhmaṇical rock-cuts temples of that district and of the western presidency generally. This important section contains much that we cannot pretend to have yet done more than skinned, and we would only point to its multitude of illustrations, and its merits as containing, amongst other novelties, the results of Rājendra-kāṇa Mitra’s researches in the north-east, and of those of the Bombay Archaeological Survey in the south-west; while in this instance, as in others, the chapter on the civil architecture is new and attractive.

It only remains to refer to the book devoted to the Muhammadan orders. Although the examples of the works of the Pāthāns and Mughuls are so wide-spread and striking, they have been less fortunate in illustration than the provincial styles of Bījāpur and Ahmadābād, and Mr. Ferguson’s account of them—in the continued absence of adequate illustrations in the Bengal Archaeological Reports—must long remain our only means of enlightenment. It omits illustrations of none of the more important groups—those, namely, of Ghaznī, Dīlī, Jaunpur, Bengal, Gujārāt, Mālwā, Kurla, and Bijāpur; and, under two or three of these heads there are material additions, both in text and drawings—mostly the entire work of the author himself, as it is not necessary to remind the readers of this journal that Mr. Ferguson’s labours are nowhere confined to mere compilation or criticism of the work of others: he is always equally at home in the Buddhist, Jain, Hindu, and Saracenic styles, and has his own materials and long-digested conclusion in all cases. Chief among the new features of this Book is a complete set of drawings—elevation, plan, and section—of the great Tomb of Akbar at Sikandra, near Agra—a work which has hitherto never been properly dealt with.

With respect to our knowledge of the main features and principal examples of the Muhammadan styles little now remains to be performed, but a great deal yet remains to be done in detail. The province of the Panjab, for instance, which contains one of the old capitals—Lāhōr, surrounded by Mughal monuments of the greatest historical interest and beauty,—is entirely unknown to the architectural public, and apparently will long remain so, although even some of its minor cities, such as Multān and Sirhind, contain buildings second to none in interest in their proper grade. The coloured tile-work decorations of Lāhōr and Multān have yet to be illustrated, and it may be predicted that they will delight those who admire that vivid and beautiful, though perishable, class of ornament.

When commencing our remarks it was stated that they would be limited to the Indian section; but we cannot close without some reference to the author’s chapter on the architecture of the island of Java. This will prove of absorbing interest to those who are unacquainted with the previous editions of the work, or with the Dutch and other books from which the information is drawn. We are so accustomed to consider the Indian races as non-maritime and unenterprising beyond the seas, that, although many years have elapsed since the discovery of the Indian origin of the Javan works, the new facts and illustrations now furnished by Mr. Ferguson cannot fail to be widely acceptable, and to heighten the interest which has always been felt in this romantic chapter in the history of Eastern architecture. Not the least valuable and curious feature of the remains of Java
is that of the disclosure of traces of tree and serpent worship,—two forms of early religious veneration which are apparently destined to afford a wide ground of controversy for some years to come,—a ground which Mr. Ferguson has hitherto made peculiarly his own. Many of the new illustrations in this volume, although inserted for other purposes, would serve as additions to those of the author's great special work on this subject,—of Tree and Serpent Worship.

Lahor.

W. S.

MISCELLANEA.

DONATION OF ORIENTAL MSS. TO THE EDINBURGH UNIVERSITY.

Mr. John B. Bailie, of Leya, has presented to the University a fine collection of Persian, Arabic, and Sanskrit manuscripts, formed by his grandfather, Lieutenant-Colonel John Bailie, who wished them made heirlooms of his estate of Leya. His representatives, however, being desirous that they should be placed in some public institution, have handed them over to the University of Edinburgh under certain conditions, one of which is that they are to be kept separate as the "Leya Collection." Among them is a complete copy of the Mahābhārata in the form of a roll 223 feet long, 5½ inches wide, profusely illustrated in colours and gold, representing scenes from the poem. The writing (Devanāgarī character) is very minute, there being twelve lines in each inch. This MS. is perhaps one of the most beautiful of the kind that has reached this country. Another fine MS. is a copy of the Shāh Nāmeh of Ferdowsi, also richly illustrated with illuminations of Oriental scenes. The rest of the collection consists of historical works, firmāns beautifully illuminated, &c., and numbers in all about 125 volumes.

Scotsman.

TRANSLATION OF A JAPANESE SONG.

The woods are green in summer time,
And bright with blossoms gay;
The murmur of the happy leaves
Sounds all the golden day.

But here a tree, by lightning struck,
Is black, and bent, and bare;
It lifts its arms like phantom fell,
And dims the sunny air.

A bird, that built its dainty nest
'Mong branches blossomed-o'er,
Still sings upon the withered bough
As blithely as before.

O fond and faithful as the bird
That haunts the leafless tree,
Though darkest clouds of sorrow came
My sweet love stayed with me!

* पाटेन पत्रांकाले नेपालमा भए। p. 229a.
are roots. This is a connotative definition. After finishing his explanation in this way, Patanjali says, "Well, then, if we have got a connotative definition now, the enumeration should not be made," which means that the purpose of a connotative definition and enumeration is the same, viz. the explanation of a term. In the same manner the word nāḍīta is explained in I. 4. 56. This is an adhikāra, wherefore the term is to be repeated in each of the śūtras that follow, up to I. 4. 97; and the sense is that all the particles contained in these śūtras are nāḍītaś. Upasūrga is defined, i.e. explained by enumeration, in I. 4. 59. As to pratāpyata it is defined in III. 1. 1. This also is an adhikāra, and by this adhikāra we are told a name is given to certain things which are set forth in the following śūtras, to which the adhikāra extends.† Bhavishyat and Vartamaṇa are no sanjādo, or technical terms, of Pāṇini,—they are no more so than the words bhūta, adhyatama, and paroksha, which are also used. The same remark applies to auto, pratadhana, and pratyatma. Anuvṛddha, like visēśa, is merely the name of a sound, and is not a sanjād, the object of which in Pāṇini's grammar is abbreviation, or to be able to state much in a short compass.

Then follow terms which, according to the theory, Pāṇini should not define, but as a matter of fact he does. Dr. Burnell gives reasons why he does, the chief of which is that Pāṇini's new anubandhas and the pratyākāra śūtras rendered the definition of these terms necessary. Prof. Goldstücker's theory is that Pāṇini does not define those terms which admit of an etymology and which are "known and settled otherwise." Now these terms have an etymology, were settled by the previous grammarians, were known before Pāṇini, Pāṇini uses them in the same sense, and there is no difference whatever; why, then, should he define them if the theory be true? What difference does his new system of anubandhas and the pratyākāra śūtras make? He would be justified in defining them only if he used them in a different sense. But this is not the case. And if his new anubandhas make any difference, why should he not define the names of cases, prathāndha, devītya, etc. where also he has got new anubandhas. There are also some terms with the definition of which his innovations have nothing to do, but still he defines them notwithstanding they were used by writers who are believed to have preceded him. Pāṇini defines sanātita as parah sanātitaśreṣṭha (I. 4. 109), and these are exactly the words in which Yāska explains the term.§ Yāska uses the terms abhyasa and abhyāsa, also, and in Pāṇini's definition of them there are no anubandhas or pratyākāraś. The first of these observations will also stand against the reason advanced by Dr. Burnell for defining anuvṛddha. Pāṇini's definition of śāntarūḍha he considers to be no definition. I do not see why. It is as good a definition as that of yuga or evaṣīṭi. The sense of the śūtra (II. 3. 48) is, "the first case as used in addressing is called śāntarūḍha." In the definition of upadrutabhāya Dr. Burnell thinks that the reason given in the Mahābhāṣya for the use of aloha is to avoid making it apply to the indicatory letters. I do not find this reason in that work. The quotation given in the footnote to support the statement means quite another thing. Its purport is this:—A question is raised whether the "aloha is to be taken as an adjective to antya." The answer is, "Yes, it deserves to be so taken." What follows is a vārśikā setting forth an objection against this construction. The objection is, "If aloha is to be taken as an adjective to antya, there should be a prohibition against the application of the term to a collection of letters," i.e. in this construction, the sense of the śūtra is, "what precedes the last letter (lit. the end in the shape of a letter) is upadrutabhāya," in which case the term would apply to the two letters of the root kṣa. A long discussion follows, with which we have nothing to do at present. I need say nothing more.

PĀNINI, HIS PLACE IN SANSKRIT LITERATURE; an Investigation of some Literary and Chronological Questions which may be settled by a Study of his Works. By Theodor Goldstücker: London, Trübner & Co.

Dr. Goldstücker is undoubtedly one of the most learned, laborious, and accurate European Sanskrit scholars we have known, and the wider and, in many cases, precise knowledge he has shown of Indian grammatical literature is particularly striking to a Hindu, especially when we call to mind that he has not had the advantage of oral instruction, which is available only in India. Of course a minute knowledge of the complicated and subtle speculations of Indian grammarians can only be acquired after a hard study of at least five years, and from a Pandit-teacher. But much of what they have written is barren and useless, and no European Sanskritist, or Indian scholar of the new stamp, would consider it worth his while to study it. The doctor's critical acumen, the skill with which he has brought together stray facts to illustrate and

† p. 38, l. 4. Roth's ed.  †† p. 40, l. 2 from bottom ; p. 41, l. 3 ; p. 74, l. 2 ; p. 83, l. 2 from bottom ; p. 94, l. 8.
prove his points, and the success with which he has combated the opinions of several scholars, command our admiration, though we are rather inclined to think he has handled some of his German friends somewhat roughly. His book is, however, not without its weak points, and there are three or four places where it appears to us to be particularly so. It is not our intention at present to write an elaborate review of it, but we will notice one point which bears materially on his theory about Pāṇini, the Indian grammatical legislator.

At page 186, Dr. Goldstucker lays down the four following propositions:

1. That his (Pāṇini's) Grammar does not treat of those sanjūdas or conventional names which are known and settled otherwise.

2. That this term sanjūda must be understood in our rule to concern only such conventional names as have an etymology.

3. That it applies also to grammatical terms which admit of an etymology, but not to those which are merely grammatical symbols.

4. That such terms as fi, gu, and bha were known and settled before Pāṇini's Grammar, but that nevertheless they are defined by Pāṇini, because they are not etymological terms.

These four statements contain, according to Dr. Goldstucker, the principles which guided Pāṇini in the composition of his work, and are deduced as conclusions from one of his sūtras, Patanjali's Bhāshya on it, and Kātyāyaṇa's gloss on the latter. Leaving these points for fuller examination at the end, let us in the first place consider if these principles are worthy of being made the basis of a stupendous grammatical superstructure, and bear an air of truthfulness about them, or if there is any external evidence to support them.

According to the first two statements, Pāṇini does not propose to teach sanjūda, and such sanjūdas only have an etymology. Does he, then, propose to teach sanjūda, which are without etymology? The "only" would show that he does propose this. What then, is meant by sanjūda without etymology? Are such sanjūdas as Panchadās, Varsadās, Āṅgās, which are given by the commentators as instances of this sūtra and the previous one to which it refers, and which, therefore, are the sanjūdas Pāṇini, according to them, does not propose to teach, are these sanjūdas, we ask, without etymology? If they are, according to Dr. Goldstucker, Pāṇini should teach them. If they are not, no instance can be given of a word existing in the language which is a sanjūda without etymology. If we bear in mind that two schools of etymology existed in India, viz. śvyāpatī pākeha, according to which all words have an etymology, and śvyāpatī pākeha, according to which some have, and some have not, and that Pāṇini belonged to the latter, as is asserted and believed by all sūtras, such words as panchadās and āṅgās are sanjūdas without etymology. And if this be joined with Dr. Goldstucker's statement it will follow that Pāṇini should teach them. But as a fact he does not, if we believe the commentators.

Now with regard to the śvyāpatī pākeha, we see that the rule in question contradicts its doctrine, according to that pākeha all words, sanjūdas included, have etymology, while the rule makes a distinction between words with and words without etymology. If we suppose, then, that Pāṇini belonged to this pākeha, and at the same time that he observed the rule given by Dr. Goldstucker, we must either suppose him to have possessed an extremely illogical mind, or not to have proposed such a rule for his guidance. Upon either view of etymology, therefore, we maintain that the rule laid down in statements Nos. 1 and 2 could not have been followed by Pāṇini.

We perfectly agree with statement No. 1 if it be separated from No. 2, and not interpreted according to the sense of the word sanjūda given in the latter.

In the next two statements, this rule is applied to grammatical sanjūdas. Such as are settled are not to be defined, but an exception is to be made in favour of such as have no etymology, e.g. fi, gu, bha, &c. We see no reason why Pāṇini should select for definition, out of settled sanjūdas, such as have no etymology. For, both those with and those without etymology are settled, i.e. have a fixed meaning. The mere circumstance of some sanjūdas having etymology, which may be considered as the reason why they are not to be defined, is immaterial, as the presence of etymology in the one case is nearly the same thing as its absence in the other. The etymology of a technical term is not sufficient, to explain its sense, and in some cases it affords no clue to it whatever. How can the etymology of the terms ḫaṣṭhodium, ṛṣṭyāṇa, &c. enable one to understand their grammatical signification? In so far them, as words with etymology are used in philosophical treatises in a sense different from the etymological, or from that they have in common language, they are in the same predicament as unmeaning words, such as fi, gu, &c. We see, therefore, no reason why Pāṇini should have selected the latter for definition, and not the former.

Having laid down this theory about Pāṇini's technical terms, Dr. Goldstucker proceeds to test its accuracy with reference to several sanjūdas which he knows were settled before Pāṇini's time, such as ṛṣṭyāṇa, ṛṣṭyang, devadāsa, tatpurāsa, &c.
&c., and finds that he has not defined them, as they have an etymology. He then mentions other sanjñās, such as karmadārāya, sanjoga, anumānā, krama, dṛṣṭa, udātta, anudātta, &c., and since they are defined and possess etymology, he concludes that they must have been first used by Pāṇini himself. We cannot help thinking that there is here an instance of the fallacy of reasoning in a circle, or of the Anyonyādhyāna of Hindu logicians. In order that Dr. Goldstücker's theory may be true, it is necessary that these defined sanjñās possessing etymology should be inventions of Pāṇini, and they are inventions of Pāṇini because the theory is true. Or, in plainer terms, the theory is true because these defined sanjñās are Pāṇini's inventions, and they are Pāṇini's inventions because the theory is true. These defined sanjñās may have been settled before Pāṇini's time, in which case the doctor's theory would be false. And in fact we have reason to believe that such sanjñās as krama, dṛṣṭa, udātta, anudātta, &c. were invented before Pāṇini. We are sorry we have not got any treatise on Śikṣā to refer to just now, but considering that the names for accents and for long and short vowels must have been very early invented by grammarians, as they are the most elementary distinctions, and likely to strike a linguistic philosopher before many others, and bearing also in mind that if different terms for these had existed before Pāṇini, they would not have been altogether lost, and we should have known them, we are inclined to believe that the names in question were settled before his time. Dr. Goldstücker himself mentions one such word (ििि), and is not inclined to disbelieve that there may be many more. But the supposition he makes, to save his theory, that Pāṇini used them in a sense somewhat different from that in which they were before used, has, in our opinion, no basis.

We have all along used the word definition in Dr. Goldstücker's sense. He seems to understand by the term definition such a definition as is commonly given in European books, viz. that which unfolds the connotation or comprehension of a term. But the principal object of a definition is to point out or distinguish certain things (definition) from the rest, and this may be done in other ways than by unfolding the connotation. Unfolding the extension or denotation is often an easier process, and may in several cases be resorted to. Even European logicians call this latter a definition, no less than the former. Sanskrit writers do not confine themselves to the former, but frequently use the latter and several other kinds. For instance, in Vīśvanātha Pachānana's Mukīdālati (p. 71 Asiatic Society's edition) the fallacy anāikdāñika is defined as that which is any one of Śādhrana, &c., i.e. anāikdāñika is either Śādhrana, Addhārana, or Anupasamādhrin. The fallacy is thus defined by enumerating its several kinds. We need not stop here to quote other instances. Any one who takes the trouble will find many in any Sanskrit philosophical treatise. What we maintain, then, is that, so far as this view of definition is concerned (and we are convinced that that is the Hindu view), Pāṇini has defined the terms pratyaya, tātparāśa, bahuṣṭi, &c., which Dr. Goldstücker says he has not; but he has defined them by enumerating the several kinds or individuals contained under them. To Hindu writers such a definition is as good as the other, especially when the latter is difficult to give. We think Pāṇini in defining terms by enumeration was not guided by any such rule as the learned doctor lays down, but he simply consulted his own convenience. When he found it difficult to give a connotative definition, he gave a denotative one. How difficult would it have been to give a connotative definition of bahuṣṭi, for instance, containing as it does such compounds as उपस्रुता, ज्ञान, उपमाध्यम, so different from such a one as क्षेत्रनाम.

We now proceed to examine the principal evidence upon which Dr. Goldstücker's theory is based. As we said before, he quotes a sūtra of Pāṇini, the bhāṣya on it, and Kaiyāṭa's gloss on the latter, and deduces his theory from these. When we read this portion of the book for the first time, we were surprised to find that the doctor had not understood one of the passages correctly. The sūtra referred to is विस्तृतपदिका शास्त्रायां, &c. Dr. Goldstücker's translation:—"Such matter will not be taught by me, for it falls under the category of conventional terms which are settled (and therefore do not require any rule of mine);" literally, "for it has the authority of a sanjñā or conventional term."

This translation is generally correct. We would, however, translate it more closely, thus:—"About that no rule ought to be made, or, that should not be taught, for [the knowledge derived from] the meaning of conventional terms in common usage is an authority in itself." The word sanjñā is explained by Patanjali as सद्याय, which again Kaiyāṭa interprets by समालोचन, समालोच, &c.; i.e. knowledge obtained (from usage). In a note on that portion of the Siddhānta Kaumudi (Cowell's edition), where this sūtra is explained, we find the following:—संज्ञानो लोकमत्योगमिषय सन्यद्वारा, "sanjñā—that is, usages—are here an authority or evidence."

The bhāṣya on this sūtra is as follows:—किं या
And Dr. Goldstücker's translation of this is as follows:—

"The question of Patanjali is suggested by the rule of analogy. His answer is in the negative because the context itself has greater weight than (more) analogy. Now, though such terms as śī, ghu, bha, and the like, are settled terms, this circumstance would not have been a sufficient reason in an etymological work (like that of Pāñjini) for leaving them untaught, for they have no etymology. 'Understanding' (as Patanjali paraphrases sanjñā), means mentally entering into, understanding the component parts of a word (or it means the words which admit of this mental process)."

In the first sentence of this, the word analogy is not, we think, a correct translation of sanjñā, though it will do. "Proximity" is the word that is equivalent to it, and it ought to have been used here, for a reason which we shall presently explain. But it is the third sentence that is the most objectionable of all. We have no hesitation in saying that the translation here is totally wrong, and it is upon this misapprehension of the sense of the original that the doctor's peculiar theory is based. We hope our readers will excuse us for the assurance with which we speak; for we feel that no native scholar acquainted with grammatical phraseology would ever think of translating or interpreting the passage thus.

As Dr. Goldstücker translates it, he appears to connect the nouns sanjñā and sanātani with the genitive vibhūti, and renders the former by "being settled." But vibhūtis ought really to be taken with the genitive vibhūti, and the then the translation would be "for leaving vibhūti untaught," instead of "for leaving them (i.e. śī, ghu, bha, &c.) untaught," as the Doctor translates it. vibhūti is rendered "an etymological work," which, if one remembers what the sūtra is about, he will at once see is altogether wrong.

The word can by no stretch of sense mean that vibhūti means here a rule, as it frequently and primarily does, and not a work. Various instances may be quoted in support of this, the last is of the verse about Usadhi, vibhūti vibhūtayā, being one. vibhūti is rendered as "having no etymology," for which, however, there is not the slightest authority. vibhūti never means etymology; it means connection. Besides, from the context it is clear that the sentence cannot have the sense Dr. Goldstücker attaches to it. For, the whole subject..."
reading the *śūtra* in question, he will be led to think first of them (the grammatical names) rather than of any other, on account of their proximity to or connection with the science he is studying. In order, therefore, to avoid all such confusion, he proposes the question, and answers it by saying—"No." Why not? (çe) Because," says Kāliyā, ("संज्ञांकितानि सम्बन्धम्") the authority of the grammatical *sāṃjña* *tī, ghu, bha, &c.* (रीतिक्रियानि संबंधम्) is no reason (as the authority of *sāṃjña* in common language such as *Pancâlīcā, Nyâśa, &c.*) is why *पुजनतत्त्वालयम्* (is śūtra or rule expounding that when a termination is elided by the use of the term *tūr* the gender and number are like those of the base) (अध्ययनम्) should not be taught. And why is it no reason? (सवर्णसत्वत्) Because there is no connection) (i.e. no connection between such *sāṃjña* as *tī, ghu, &c.* and *पुजनतत्त्वालयम्*). This is the whole sense of the three quotations. *Pūjākāra, i.e.* like the base, is the word used by Pāṇini in the last but one śūtra (स्तंभवतः) &c., and Kāliyā first adds the word *tīvat* to it, when the whole means "the being like the base," and then the word "शास्त्र" a rule, and thus the expression "पुजनतत्त्वालयम्" signifies literally "the rule about the being like the base," and not an "etymological" work, as Dr. Goldstücker understands.

It will thus be apparent that Dr. Goldstücker's theory is based upon a misapprehension of a passage in Kāliyā, and now that we have explained its true sense, and have also shown that the theory is not supported by any external evidence, it must, we think, be given up. The first of the doctor's four propositions if separated from the second we agree with, as we have already intimated. Dr. Goldstücker's opinion, that the *sāṃjña* *tī, ghu, and bha* were known before Pāṇini's time, may be true, for though we know, it does not at all follow from anything in the passages commented on. He was, no doubt, led to it by the expression "पुजनतत्त्वालयम्" which he renders by "such terms as *tī, ghu, bha*, are settled terms." We would translate it as the authority of such *sāṃjña* or terms as *tī, ghu, bha*, &c., and this authority they derive from their having been used and defined by Pāṇini. The whole grammatical literature based on his work does not admit the authority of any other person except him, his continuator and critic Kātiyā, and his bhashyakāra. And even if we take Dr. Goldstücker's translation, the expression "are settled terms" does not necessarily mean "settled" before Pāṇini's time, or by any other person than Pāṇini himself.

* Puṣkara is explained as पुजुत्त्रि, because in a word the sense of the base is intimately joined to that of the पुजुत्त्रि or tēr-
We must here close our remarks; our space does not admit of a more lengthened notice, at least for the present. We hope our observations will be calmly and patiently attended to by European Sanskritists. In several cases, though not in all native students of Sanskrit have a greater right to be listened to than Europeans. We are also desirous that these few remarks should not give pain to Dr. Goldstücker, who, especially by his articles on our religious difficulties published in the Westminster Review, has shown himself to be our decided friend, who sympathizes with our fallen condition, and is ready to help us by his friendly advice in our race towards a brighter future.

THE FRAGMENTS OF THE INDIKA OF MEGASTHENES.

Collected by Dr. E. A. Schwanbeck: Bonn, 1846.

TRANSLATED BY J. W. MccrinDel, M.A. GOVERNMENT COLLEGE, PATNA.

INTRODUCTION.

India to the Ancient Greeks, even till a comparatively late period in their history, was all but a terra incognita. It is scarcely so much as mentioned by name in their greatest poets, whether epic, lyric, or dramatic. They did not, in fact, become distinctly aware of its existence till the time of the Persian wars. The first historian who speaks clearly of it is Hekataios of Miletos (B.C. 549-486), and fuller accounts are preserved in Herodotus and in the remains of his contemporary Ktesias, who having lived for some years in Persia as private physician to king Artaxerxes Mnemon, collected materials during his stay for a treatise on India, the first work on the subject written in the Greek language. His descriptions were, unfortunately, vitiated by a large intermixture of fable, and it was left to the followers of Alexander to give to the Western world for the first time fairly accurate accounts of the country and its inhabitants. The great conqueror, it is well known, carried men of learning with him to chronicle his achievements, and describe the countries to which he might carry his arms, and among his officers there were some who could wield the pen as well as the sword. Hence the expedition produced quite a crop of narratives and memoirs relating to India, such as those of Baeb, Diogenes, Nearchus, Onesikritos, Aristobulos, and Kallisthenes. These works are all lost, but their substance is to be found condensed in Strabo, Plinius, and Arrianus. Subsequent to these writers were some others, who made considerable additions to the stock of information regarding India,—as Démachos, who resided for a long time in Palibothra, whither he was sent on an embassy by Seleukos to Allitrocha-

dés, the successor of Sándrakottos; as Pátraklés, the admiral of Seleukos, who thought that India could be circumnavigated, and who is called by Strabo the least mendacious of all writers concerning India; as Timostrhenes, admiral of the fleet of Ptolemaios Philadephos, and author of a work on harbours; and, lastly, as Megasthenes, whose work on India was the principal source whence succeeding writers drew their accounts of the country. This work, which appears to have been entitled Ῥα ἔρα, no longer exists, but it has been so often abridged and quoted by the ancient writers that we have a fair knowledge of the nature and arrangement of its contents. Schwanbeck, with great industry and learning, has collected all the fragments that have been anywhere preserved, and has prefixed to the collection an Introduction in Latin, the contents of which he has exhibited under the following heads:

I. De cognitione India, qualis ante Megasthenem apud Graccos fuerit.

II. De Megasthenes—

1. De Indico Megasthenis itinere.
2. De Indicos Megasthenes, corumque argumento.
3. De fide Megasthenis, auctoritate et pretio.

III. De Scriptoris ita qui post Megasthenem de Indiis scriptos.

From this Introduction, and from another, written also in Latin, by C. Müller, the editor of the Geographi Graeci Minores, the following extracts are translated.

Megasthenes was sent, as is well known, by Seleukos Nikator, on an embassy to Sándrakottos (Chandragupta), king of the Práti, whose capital was Palibothra. Our first extract (from Müller) throws light on the relations which existed between these two sovereigns, and also on the
disputed point how far Seleukos had carried his arms into India when he attempted its conquest:—

"Justinus (xv. 4) says of Seleukos Nikator,

He carried on many wars in the East after the division of the Macedonian kingdom between himself and the other successors of Alexander, first seizing Babylon, and then reducing Baktria, his power being increased by the first success. Thereafter he passed into India, which had, since Alexander's death, killed its governors, thinking thereby to shake off from its neck the yoke of slavery. Sandrokottos had made it free; but when victory was gained he changed the name of freedom to that of bondage, for he himself oppressed with servitude the very people which he had rescued from foreign dominion. . . . Sandrokottos, having thus gained the crown, held India at the time when Seleukos was laying the foundations of his future greatness. Seleukos came to an agreement with him, and, after settling affairs in the East, engaged in the war against Antigonos (302 B.C.)."

"Besides Justinus, Appianus (Syria, c. 55) makes mention of the war which Seleukos had with Sandrokottos or Chandragupta a king of the Prasias, or, as they are called in the Indian language, Prachyas. He (Seleukos) crossed the Indus and waged war on Sandrokottos, king of the Indians who dwelt about it, until he made friends and entered into relations of marriage with him. So also Strabo (xv. p. 724):— Seleukos Nikator gave to Sandrokottos (i.e. a large part of Arachis). Conf. p. 659:— The Indians afterwards held a large part of Aria, (which they had received from the Macedonians), into entering into marriage relations with him, and receiving in return five hundred elephants" (of which Sandrokottos had nine thousand—Pliny, vii. 23-5) and Plutarch, Alex. 62:—

"For not long after, Androkottos, being king, presented Seleukos with five hundred elephants,

*The adjective παρακοτος in Αίλεαν On the Nature of Heraclea, xvi. 30 (Megasthenes, Fragm. 13. 418.) bears a very close resemblance to the Indian word Prachyas (that is, 'dweller in the East'). The substantive would be Prachus, or Sandrokottos (Megasthenes Indica, p. 82) thinks that this reading should probably be restored in Stephana of Byzantium, where the MSS. exhibit Παρακοτος, a form intermediate between Παρακοτος and Παρακοτος. But they are called Παρακοτος by Strabo, Arrianus, and Pliny; Παρακοτος in Plutarch (Alex. chap. 62), and frequently in Αίλεαν; Παρακοτος by Nicolaos of Damascus, and in the Florilegium of Stobaeus, 37, 83; Πρακοτος and Πρακοτος are the MSS. readings in Diodorus, xiii. 28; Praksitis in Curtius, IX. ii. 3; Prasidas in Justinus, XII. vii. 9. See note on Fragm. 13.

Moreover, Schwanbeck calls attention (p. 14) to the word 'Aρακότος, where when he says, somewhat inaccuracy, that Sandrokottos was king of the Indians around the Indus (τος παρακοτος των Αρακότων) he seems to mean that the war was carried on by the boundaries of India. But this is of no importance, for Appianus has τος παρακοτος αδρων and with six hundred thousand men attacked and subdued all India." Phylarchos (Fragm. 29) in Athenaeus, p. 18 D, refers to some other wonderful presents as being sent to Seleukos by Sandrokottos.

"Diodorus (lib. xx.), in setting forth the affairs of Seleukos, has not said a single word about the Indian war. But it would be strange that that expedition should be mentioned so incidentally by other historians, if it were true, as many recent writers have contended, that Seleukos in this war reached the middle of India as far as the Ganges and the town Palimbothra,—may, even advanced as far as the mouths of the Ganges, and therefore left Alexander far behind him. This baseless theory has been well refuted by Lassen (De Pentap. Ind. 61.), by A. G. Schlegel (Biblioth. Calend. 1829, p. 31; yet see Benfey, Erach. u. Griber. Encycl. v. Indien, p. 67), and quite recently by Schwanbeck, in a work of great learning and value entitled Megasthenes Indica (Bonn, 1846). In the first place, Schwanbeck (p. 13) mentions the passage of Justinus (L. ii. 10) where it is said that no one had entered India but Semiramis and Alexander; whence it would appear that the expedition of Seleukos was considered so insignificant by Trogus as not even to be on a par with the Indian war of Alexander.† Then he says that Arrianus, if he had known of that remote expedition of Seleukos, would doubtless have spoken differently in his Indica (c. 5. 4), where he says that Megasthenes did not travel over much of India, 'but yet more than those who invaded it along with Alexander the son of Philip.' Now in this passage the author could have compared Megasthenes much more suitably and easily with Seleukos.‡ I pass over other proofs of less moment, nor indeed is it expedient to set forth in detail here all the reasons from which it is improbable of itself that the arms of Seleukos ever reached the region of the Ganges. Let us now examine the passage

"If Ινδιος, 'of the Indians around it,' as Schwanbeck himself has written it (p. 13).

† The following passage of the Indian comedy Madrakahana seems to favour the Indian expedition:—"Meanwhile Kusumapura (i.e. Pataliputra, Palmyrabad) the city of Chandragupta and the king of the mountain regions, was invested on every side by the Kiratas, Yavanas, Kambjas, Perisians, Baktrians, and the rest," but "that drama" (Schwanbeck, p. 18), "to follow the authority of Wilson, was written in the tenth century after Christ,—certainly ten centuries after Seleukos. Where even the Indian historians have no authority in history, what proof can dramas give written after many centuries? Yavanas, which was also in later times the Indian name for the Greeks, was very anciently the name given to a certain nation which the Indians say dwelt on the north-western boundaries of India; and the same name (Mann, x. 44) is also mentioned with the Kambjas, the Sakas, the Paradas, the Paliavas, and the Kiritas as being corrupted among the Kairtaras. (Conf. Lassen, Zeitschrift für die Kunde des Morgenlandes, III. p. 346.) These Yavanas are to be understood in this passage also, where they are mentioned along with those tribes with which they are usually classed.
in Plinius which causes many to adopt contrary opinions. Plinius (Hist. Nat. vi. 21), after finding from Diogoras at Baot the distances of the places from Portus Caesarii to the Hippaeus, the end of Alexander’s march, thus proceeds:—The other journeys made for Seleucus Nikator are as follows:—One hundred and sixty-eight miles to the Hesidurus, and to the river Jomanae as many (some copies add five miles); from thence to the Ganges one hundred and twelve miles. One hundred and nineteen miles to the Rhodophas (others give three hundred and twenty-five miles for this distance). To the town Kalinipaxa one hundred and sixty-seven. Five hundred (others give two hundred and sixty-five miles), and from thence to the confluence of the Jomanae and Ganges six hundred and twenty-five miles (several add thirteen miles), and to the town Palimbthora four hundred and twenty-five. To the mouth of the Ganges six hundred and thirty-eight’ (or seven hundred and thirty-eight, to follow Schwanbeck’s correction)—that is, six thousand stadia, as Megasthenes puts it.

“The ambiguous expression religian Seleucos Nikator peragrotet sunt, translated above as ‘the other journeys made for Seleucus Nikator,’ according to Schwanbeck’s opinion, contain a dative ‘of advantage,’ and therefore can bear no other meaning. The reference is to the journeys of Megasthenes, Démachos, and Patroklè, whom Seleucus had sent to explore the more remote regions of Asia. Nor is the statement of Plinius in a passage before this more distinct. (‘India,’) he says, ‘was thrown open not only by the arms of Alexander the Great, and the kings who were his successors, of whom Seleucus and Antiochus even travelled to the Hyrcanian and Caspian seas, Patroklè being commander of their fleet, but all the Greek writers who stayed behind with the Indian kings (for instance, Megasthenes and Dionysios, sent by Philadelphia for that purpose) have given accounts of the military force of each nation.’ Schwanbeck thinks that the words circumstantias eliam . . . Seleucos et Antiochus et Patroklè are properly meant to convey nothing but additional confirmation, and an explanation how India was opened up by the arms of the kings who succeeded Alexander.”

“The following statements,” continues Müller, “contain all that is related about Megasthenes:

“Megasthenes the historian, who lived with Seleucos Nikator,”—Clem. Alex. p. 132 Syli. (Fragm. 43); ‘Megasthenes, who lived with Sibyrtios || the satrap of Arachosia, and who says that he often visited Sandrotkotos, king of the Indians,’—Arrian, Epoch. Alex. v. vi. 2 (Fragm. 2);—Tu Sandrotkotos, to whom Megasthenes came on an embassy,—Strabo, xv. p. 702 (Fragm. 25);—Megasthenes and Démachos were sent on an embassy, the former to Sandrotkotos at Palimbothra, the other to Aéla to chadès his son; and they left accounts of their sojourn in the country,—Strabo, ii. p. 70 (Fragm. 29 note); Megasthenes says that he often visited Sandrotkotos, the greatest king (vdrókojê; v. Bohlen, Alloc. Indien. l. p. 19) of the Indians, and Póros, still greater than he:—Arrian, Ind. c. 5 (Fragm. 24). Add the passage of Plinius, which Solinus (Polybius. c. 60) thus renders:—Megas- thenes remained for some time with the Indian kings, and wrote a history of Indian affairs, that he might hand down to posterity a faithful account of all that he had witnessed. Dionysios, who was sent by Philadelphia to put the truth to the test by personal inspection, wrote also as much.”

“From these sources, then, we gather that Megasthenès was the representative of Seleucus at the court of Sibyrtios, satrap of Arachosia, and that he was sent from thence as the king’s ambassador to Sandrotkotos at Palimbothra, and that not once, but frequently—whether to convey to him the presents of Seleucus, or for some other cause. According to the statement of Arrianus, Megasthenes also visited king Póros, who was (Diod. xiv. 14) already dead in 317 B.C. (Olymp. CXIV. 4.) These events should not be referred to the period of Seleucus, but they may very easily be placed in the reign of Alexander, as Bohlen (Alloc. Indien. vol. I. p. 68) appears to have believed they should, when he says Megasthenes was one of the companions of Alexander. But the structure of the sentences does not admit of this conclusion. For Arrianus says, ‘It appears to me that Megasthenes did not see much of India, but yet more than the companions of Alexander, for he says that he visited Sandrotkotos, the greatest king of the Indians, and Póros, even greater than he (en Nàpov érrr voucúr práoum).’ We should be disposed to say, then, that he made a journey on some occasion or other to Póros, if the obscurity of the language did not lead us to suspect it a corrupt reading. Lasten (De Pentap. pp. 44) thinks the mention of Póros a careless addition of a chance gained the satrapy of Arachosia in the third year of the 11th Olympiad (A.C. 223), and was firmly established in his satrapy by Antigone (Arrian, De Success. Alex. i. 26, ed. Didot). He joined Eumenes in 315 (Diod. xiv. 14. 6), but being called to account by him he sought safety in flight (ibid. xix. 23. 4). After the defeat of Eumenes, Antigone delivered to him the most troublesome of the Argyrapydes (ibid. C. xlviii. 3). He must have afterwards joined Seleucus.
transcriber, but I prefer Schwanbeck's opinion, who thinks it should be written καὶ Πάρου ἐν τοίῳ μέξων, 'and who was even greater than Póros.' If this correction is admitted, everything fits well.

"The time when he discharged his embassy or embassies, and how long he stayed in India, cannot be determined, but he was probably sent after the treaty had been struck and friendship had sprung up between the two kings. If, therefore, we make the reign of Sandrokottos extend to the year 288, Megasthenes would have set out for Palimbothra between 302 and 328. Clinton (P.H. vol. III. p. 482) thinks he came to the Indian king a little before B.C. 302.'"

While the date of the visit of Megasthenes to India is thus uncertain, there is less doubt as to what were the parts of the country which he saw; and on this point Schwanbeck thus writes (p. 21)—

"Both from what he himself says, and because he has enumerated more accurately than any of the companions of Alexander, or any other Greek, the rivers of Kābul and the Panjāb, it is clear that he had passed through these countries. Then, again, we know that he reached Pātaliputra by travelling along the royal road. But he does not appear to have seen more of India than those parts of it, and he acknowledges himself that he knew the lower part of the country traversed by the Ganges only by hearsay and report. It is commonly supposed that he also spent some time in the Indian camp, and therefore in some part of the country, but where cannot now be known. This opinion, however, is based on a corrupt reading which the editions of Strabo exhibit. For in all the MSS. of Strabo (p. 798) is found this reading:—"γεγομένοις ὑπὸν ἐν τῷ Σαντροκοττῷ περιβολή ἔχουσιν ἡ Ἔλλατη, τεταρτάματα μυριά-γυνών πλέοντος ἕρωμα, μηλιών ἡμέραις δια μικρῶν κλήματα πλείων ἢ δικοσίων δραχμῶν δια.\[9.42.10\]

'Megasthenes says that those who were in the camp of Sandrokottos saw,' &c. From this translation that given by Guarni and Gregorio alone is different. They render thus:—'Megasthenes refers, quum in Sandrocoiti castra venisset... vidisset,' 'Megasthenes relates that when he had come into the camp of Sandrokottos, he saw,' &c. From this it appears that the translator had found written γεγομένους. But since that translation is hardly equal in authority even to a single MS., and since the word γεγομένους can be changed more readily into the word γεγομένους than γεγομένους into γεγομένους, there is no reason at all why we should depart from the reading of all the MSS., which Casaubon disturbed by a baseless conjecture, contending that γεγομένους should be substituted,—insomuch as it is evident from Strabo and Arrianus (V. vi. 2) that Megasthenes had been sent to Sandrokottos,—which is an argument utterly futile. Nevertheless from the time of Casaubon the wrong reading γεγομένους which he promulgated has held its ground."

That Megasthenes paid more than one visit to India Schwanbeck is not at all inclined to believe. On this point he says (p. 33)—

"That Megasthenes frequently visited India recent writers, all with one consent, following Robertson, are wont to maintain; nevertheless this opinion is far from being certain. For what Arrianus has said in his Expecl. Aret. V. vi. 2,—Πολλάκις δὲ λέγει (Μεγαθηνῆς) Ἰδιωτικὰ παρὰ Σαντροκόττων τῶν Ἰδίων Βασιλέως, does not solve the question, for he might have meant by the words that Megasthenes during his embassy had frequent interviews with Chandragupta. Nor, if we look to the context, does any other explanation seem admissible; and in fact no other writer besides has mentioned his making frequent visits, although occasion for making such mention was by no means wanting, and in the Indika itself of Megasthenes not the slightest indication of his having made numerous visits is to be found. But perhaps some may say that to this view is opposed the accurate knowledge which he possessed on all Indian matters; but this may equally well be accounted for by believing that he made a protracted stay at Pātaliputra as by supposing that he frequently visited India. Robertson's conjecture appears, therefore, uncertain, not to say hardly credible."

Regarding the veracity of Megasthenes, and his value as a writer, Schwanbeck writes (p. 59) to this effect:—

"The ancient writers, whenever they judge of those who have written on Indian matters, are without doubt wont to reckon Megasthenes among those writers who are given to lying and least worthy of credit, and to rank him almost on a par with Ktésias. Arrianus alone has judged better of him, and delivers his opinion of him in these words:—'Regarding the Indians I shall set down in a special work all that is most credible for narration in the accounts penned by those who accompanied Alexander on his expedition, and by Nearchus, who navigated the great sea which washes the shores of India, and also by Megasthenes and Eratosthenes, who are both approved men (δοκιμῶν ἀνδρῶν).' Arr. Expecl. Aret. V. vi."

"The foremost amongst those who disparage him is Eratosthenes, and in open agreement with him are Strabo and Pliny. Others, among whom is Diodorus, by omitting certain particulars related by Megasthenes, sufficiently show that they discredit that part of his narrative."

† Regarding the manner in which Strabo, Arrianus,
"Strabo (p. 70) says, 'Generally speaking, the men who have hitherto written on the affairs of India were a set of liars.—Démachos holds the first place in the list, Megasthenes comes next; while Oneikritos and Nearchos, with others of the same class, manage to stammer out a few words (of truth). Of this we became more convinced whilst writing the history of Alexander. No faith whatever can be placed in Démachos and Megasthenes. They coined the fables concerning men with ears large enough to sleep in, men without any mouths, without noses, with only one eye, with spider legs, and with fingers bent backward. They renewed Homer's fables concerning the battles of the cranes and pygmies, and asserted the latter to be three spans high. They told of ants digging for gold, and Pans with wedge-shaped heads, of serpents swallowing down oxen and stags, horns and all,—meantime, as Eratosthenes has observed, accusing each other of falsehood. Both of these men were sent as ambassadors to Palimbothra,—Megasthenes to Sandrokottos, Démachos to Amintochadès his son,—and such are the notes of their residence abroad, which, I know not why, they thought fit to leave.

"When he adds, 'Patrikles certainly does not resemble them, nor do any other of the authorities consulted by Eratosthenes contain such absurdities,' we may well wonder, seeing that, of all the writers on India, Eratosthenes has chiefly followed Megasthenes. Pliny (Hist. Nat. VI. xxi. 3) says: 'India was open to him . . . even by other Greek writers, who, having resided with Indian kings,—as for instance Megasthenes and Dionysius,—made known the strength of the races which peopled the country. It is not, however, worth while to study their accounts with care, so conflicting are they, and incredible.'

Schwanbeck remarks:—"Strabo, and—not unlike to Strabo—Arrianus, who, however, gave a much more carefully considered account of India, abridged the descriptions of Megasthenes, yet in such a way that they wrote at once in an agreeable style and with strict regard to accuracy. But when Strabo designed not merely to instruct but also to delight his readers, he omitted whatever would be out of place in an entertaining narrative or picturesque description, and avoided above all things that would look like a dry list of names. Now though this may not be a fault, still it is not to be denied that those particulars which he has omitted would have very greatly helped our knowledge of Ancient India. Nay, Strabo, in his eagerness to interest, has gone so far that the topography of India is almost entirely a blank in his pages.

"Diodorus, however, in applying this principle of composition has exceeded all bounds. For as he did not aim at writing learnedly for the instruction of others, but in a licentia naturae, so as to be read with delight by the multitude, he selected for extract such parts as best suited this purpose. He has therefore omitted not only the most accurate of his narrations of fact, but also the fables which his readers might consider as incredible, and has been best pleased to describe instead that part of Indian life which to the Greeks would appear singular and diverting . . .

"Nevertheless his epitomes is not without its value; for although we do not learn much that is new from its contents, still it has the advantage over all the others of being the most coherent, while at the same time it enables us to attribute with certainty an occasional passage to Megasthenes, which without its help we could but conjecture proceeded from his pen.

"Since Strabo, Arrianus, and Diodorus have directed their attention to relate nearly the same things, it has resulted that the greatest part of the Indika has been completely lost, and that of many passages, singularly enough, three epitomes are extant, to which occasionally a fourth is added by Pliny.

"At a great distance from these writers, and especially from Diodorus, stands Pliny: whereas it happens that he both differs most from that writer, and also best supplements his epitomes. Where the narrative of Strabo and Arrianus is at once pleasing and instructive, and Diodorus charms us with a lively sketch, Pliny gives instead, in the holdest language, an ill-digested enumeration of names. With his usual wonderful diligence he has written this part, but more frequently still he writes with too little care and judgment,—a fact of which we have already seen numerous instances. In a careless person as is usual, he commends his authors, so that if you compared his accounts of Taproban and the kingdom of the Pasi you would think that he had lived at different periods. He frequently comments on Megasthenes, but more frequently seems to transcribe him without acknowledgment."—pp. 56-55.
Indian, since they had originated in an intermixture of tribes, or since they did not sufficiently follow Indian manners, and especially the system of caste, so roused the common hatred of the Indians that they were reckoned in the same category with the barbarians, and represented as equally hideous of aspect. Accordingly in the epic poems we see all Brahmanical India surrounded by races not at all real, but so imaginary that sometimes it cannot be discovered how the fable originated.

"Forms still more wonderful you will find by bestowing a look at the gods of the Indians and their retinue, among whom particularly the attendants of Kuvera and Kertiksha are described in such a manner (conf. Mahab. ix. 2555 et seq.) that hardly anything which it is possible for the human imagination to invent seems omitted. These, however, the Indians now sufficiently distinguish from the fabulous races, since they neither believe that they live within the borders of India, nor have any intercourse with the human race. These, therefore, the Greeks could not confound with the races of India.

"These races, however, might be more readily confounded with other creatures of the Indian imagination, who held a sort of intermediate place between demons and men, and whose number was legion. For the Rakshasas and other Pisachas are said to have the same characteristics as the fabulous races, and the only difference between them is that, while a single (evil) attribute only is ascribed to each race, many or all of these are assigned to the Rakshasas and the Pisachas. Altogether so slight is the distinction between the two that any strict lines of demarcation can hardly be drawn between them. For the Rakshasas, though described as very terrible beings, are nevertheless believed to be human, and both to live on the earth and take part in Indian battles, so that an ordinary Indian could hardly define how the nature of a Rakshasa differs from that of a man. There is scarcely any one thing found to characterize the Rakshasas which is not attributed to some race or other. Therefore, although the Greeks might have heard of these by report,—which cannot be proved for certain,—they could scarcely, by reason of that, have erred in describing the manners of the races according to the Indian conception.

"That reports about these tribes should have reached Greece is not to be wondered at. For fables invented with some glow of poetic fervour have a remarkable facility in gaining a wide currency, which is all the greater in proportion to the boldness displayed in their invention. Those fables also in which the Indians have represented the lower animals as talking to each other have been diffused through almost every country in the world, in a way we cannot understand. Other fables found their way to the Greeks before even the name of India was known to them. In this class some fables even in Homer must be reckoned,—a matter which, before the Vedas were better known, admitted only of probable conjecture, but could not be established by unquestionable proofs. We perceive, moreover, that the further the epic poems of the Greeks depart from their original simplicity the more, for that very reason, do these fables creep into them; while a very liberal use of them is made by the poets of a later age. It would be a great mistake to suppose that those fables only in which India is mentioned proceeded from India; for a fable in becoming current carries along with it the name of the locality in which the scene of it is laid. An example will make this clear. The Indians supposed that towards the north, beyond the Himâlaya, dwelt the Uttarakuru, a people who enjoyed a long and happy life, to whom disease and care were unknown, and who revelled in every delight in a land all paradise. This fable made its way to the West, carrying with it the name of the locality to which it related, and so came to pass that from the time of Hesiod the Greeks supposed that towards the north lived the Hyperboreans, whose very name was fashioned after some likeness to the Indian name. The reason why the Indians placed the seat of this happy people towards the north is manifest; but there was not the slightest reason which can be discovered why the Greeks should have done so. Nay, the locality assigned to the Hyperboreans is not only out of harmony, but in direct conflict, with that conception of the world which the Greeks entertained.

"The first knowledge of the mythical geography of the Indians dates from this period, when the Greeks were the unconscious recipients of Indian fables. Fresh knowledge was imparted by Skyllax, who first gave a description of India; and all writers from the time of Skyllax, with not a single exception, mention those fabulous races, but in such a way that they are wont to speak of them as Ethiopians; by doing which they have incurred obloquy and the suspicion of dishonesty, especially Ktisias. This writer, however, is not at all untruthful when he says, in the conclusion of his Indika (38), that he omits many of these stories, and others still more marvellous, that he may not appear, to such as have not seen these, to be telling what is incredible; for he could have described many other fabulous races, as for example men with the heads of tigers (yaghranuchds), others with the necks of snakes.
(eyalagrapades), others having horses' heads (tirangamadanda, akamucchada), others with feet like dogs (kreppades), others with four feet (chatukshupada), others with three eyes (triaereta), and others with six hundred.

"Nor were the companions of Alexander able to disregard these fables,—in fact, scarcely any of them doubted their truth. For, generally speaking, they were communicated to them by the Brahmanas, whose learning and wisdom they held in the utmost veneration. Why, then, should we be surprised that Megasthenes also, following examples so high and numerous, should have handled these fables? His account of them is to be found in Strabo 7:11; Pliny, Hist. Nat. vii. 2. 14-22; Solinus 52." (Sch. p. 6.)

Schwanbeck then examines the fables related by Megasthenes, and having shown that they were of Indian origin, thus proceeds (p. 74):—

"The relative veracity of Megasthenes, then, cannot be questioned, for he related truthfully both what he actually saw, and what was told him by others. If we therefore seek to know what reliance is to be placed on any particular narrative, this other point must be considered, how far his informants were worthy of credit. But here no ground for suspicion exists; for on those matters which did not come under his own observation he had his information from those Brahmanas who were the rulers of the state, to whom he again and again appeals as his authorities. Accordingly he was able not only to describe how the kingdom of the Prasati was governed, but also to give an estimate of the power of other nations and the strength of their armies. Hence we cannot wonder that Indian ideas are to be found in the books of Megasthenes mixed up with accounts of what he personally observed and with Greek ideas.

"Therefore to him, as to the companions of Alexander, it cannot be objected that he told too much. That he did not tell too little to give an adequate account of Indian affairs to Greek readers we know. For he has described the country, its soil, climate, animals, and plants, its government, and religion, the manners of its people and their arts,—in short, the whole of Indian life from the king to the remotest tribe; and he has scanned every object with a mind trained and unprejudiced, without overlooking even trifling and minute circumstances. If we see any part omitted, a little only said about the religion and gods of the Indians, and nothing at all about their literature, we should reflect that we are not reading his veritable book, but only an epitome and some particular fragments that have survived the wreck of time." (p. 75)

"Of the slight mistakes into which he fell, some are of that kind into which even the most careful observer may be betrayed, as for instance his incorrectly stating that the Vipasa pours its waters into the Trava. Others had their origin in his misapprehension of the meaning of Indian words; to which head must be referred his assertion that among the Indians laws were not written, but everything decided by memory. Besides he alleges that on those Brahmanas; who had thrice erred in making up the calendar silence for the rest of their lives was enjoined as a punishment. This passage, which has not yet been cleared up, I would explain by supposing that he had heard the Indian name adhutia, a name which is applied both to a taciturn person and to any ascetic. Finally, some errors had their source in this, that he looked at Indian matters from a Greek's point of view, from which it resulted that he did not correctly enumerate the castes, and gave a mistaken account of the Indian gods and other matters.

"Notwithstanding, the work of Megasthenes—in so far as it is a part of Greek literature and of Greek and Roman learning—is, as it were, the culmination of the knowledge which the ancients ever acquired of India: for although the geographical science of the Greeks attained afterwards a perfect form, nevertheless the knowledge of India derived from the books of Megasthenes has only approached perfect accuracy the more closely those who have written after him on India have followed his Indika. And it is not only on account of his own merit that Megasthenes is a writer of great importance, but also on this other ground, that while other writers have borrowed a great part of what they relate from him, he exercised a powerful influence on the whole sphere of Latin and Greek scientific knowledge.

"Besides this authority which the Indika of Megasthenes holds in Greek literature, his remains have another value, since they hold not the last place among the sources whence we derive our knowledge of Indian antiquity. For as there now exists a knowledge of our own of ancient India, still on some points he increases the knowledge which we have acquired from other sources, even though his narrative not seldom requires to be supplemented and corrected. Notwithstanding, it must be conceded that the new information we have learned from him is neither extremely great in amount nor weight. What is of greater importance than all that is new in what he has told us, is—that he has recalled a picture of the condition of India at a definite period,—a service of all the greater value, because Indian literature, always self-consistent, is wont to leave us in the greatest doubt.
It is yet an unsettled question whether the Indika was written in the Attic or the Ionic dialect.

FRAGMENT I.
OR AN EPITOME OF MEGASTHENES.
(Diod. II. 35-42.)

(35.) 1India, which is in shape quadrilateral, has its eastern as well as its western side bounded by the great sea, but on the northern side it is divided by Mount Hemódes from that part of Skythia which is inhabited by those Skythians who are called the Saka; while the fourth or western side is bounded by the river called the Indus, which is perhaps the largest of all rivers in the world after the Nile. 2The extent of the whole country from east to west is said to be 28,000 stadia, and from north to south 32,000. 3Being thus of such vast extent, it seems well-nigh to embrace the whole of the northern tropic zone of the earth, and in fact at the extreme point of India the gnomon of the sundial may frequently be observed to cast no shadow, while the constellation of the Bear is by night invisible, and in the remotest parts even Arcturus disappears from view. Consistently with this, it is also stated that shadows there fall to the southward.

*India has many huge mountains which abound in fruit-trees of every kind, and many vast plains of great fertility—more or less beautiful, but all alike intersected by a multitude of rivers. 4The greater part of the soil, moreover, is under irrigation, and consequently bears two crops in the course of the year. It teems at the same time with animals of all sorts,—beasts of the field and fowls of the air,—of all different degrees of strength and size. 5It is prolific, besides, in elephants, which are of monstrous bulk, as its soil supplies food in unsparing profusion, making these animals far to exceed in strength those that are bred in Libya. It results also that, since they are caught in great numbers by the Indians and trained for war, they are of great moment in turning the scale of victory.

(36.) 7The inhabitants, in like manner, having abundant means of subsistence, exceed in consequence the ordinary stature, and are distinguished by their proud bearing. They are also found to be well skilled in the arts, as might be expected of men who inhale a pure air and drink the very finest water. 8And while the soil bears on its surface all kinds of fruits which are known to cultivation, it has also under ground numerous veins of all sorts of metals, for it contains much gold and silver, and copper and iron in no small quantity, and even tin and other metals, which are employed in making articles of use and ornament, as well as the implements and accoutrements of war.

9In addition to cereals, there grows throughout India much millet, which is kept well watered by the profusion of river-streams, and much pulse of different sorts, and rice also, and what is called bosporum, as well as many other plants useful for food, of which most grow spontaneously. 10The soil yields, moreover, not a few other edible products fit for the subsistence of animals, about which it would be tedious to write. It is accordingly affirmed that famine has never visited India, and that there has never been a general scarcity in the supply of nourishing food. 11For, since there is a double rainfall in the course of each year,—one in the winter season, when the sowing of wheat takes place as in other countries, and the second at the time of the summer solstice, which is the proper season for sowing rice and bosporum, as also sesamum and millet—the inhabitants of India almost always gather in two harvests annually; and even should one of the sowings prove more or less abortive they are always sure of the other crop. 12The fruits, moreover, of spontaneous growth, and the esculent roots which grow in marshy places and are of varied sweetness, afford abundant sustenance for man. 13The fact is, almost all the plains in the country have a moisture which is alike genial, whether
it is derived from the rivers, or from the rains of the summer season, which are wont to fall every year at a stated period with surprising regularity; while the great heat which prevails ripens the roots which grow in the marshes, and especially those of the tall reeds.

But, further, there are usages observed by the Indians which contribute to prevent the occurrence of famine among them; for whereas among other nations it is usual, in the contests of war, to ravage the soil, and thus to reduce it to an uncultivated waste, among the Indians, on the contrary, by whom husbandmen are regarded as a class that is sacred and inviolable, the tillers of the soil, even when battle is raging in their neighbourhood, are undisturbed by any sense of danger, for the combatants on either side in waging the conflict make carriage of each other, but allow those engaged in husbandry to remain quite unmolested. Besides, they neither rage an enemy’s land with fire, nor cut down its trees.

India, again, possesses many rivers both large and navigable, which, having their sources in the mountains which stretch along the northern frontier, traverse the level country, and not a few of these, after uniting with each other, fall into the river called the Ganges. Now this river, which at its source is 30 stadia broad, flows from north to south, and empties its waters into the ocean forming the eastern boundary of the Gargaridae, a nation which possesses a vast force of the largest-sized elephants. Owing to this, their country has never been conquered by any foreign king: for all other nations dread the overwhelming number and strength of these animals. [Thus Alexander the Macedonian, after conquering all Asia, did not make war upon the Gargaridae,† as he did on all others; for when he had arrived with all his troops at the river Ganges, and had subdued all the other Indians, he abandoned as hopeless an invasion of the Gargaridae when he learned that they possessed four thousand elephants well trained and equipped for war.] Another river, about the same size as the Ganges, called the Indus, has its sources, like its rival, in the north, and falling into the ocean forms on its way the boundary of India; in its passage through the vast stretch of level country it receives not a few tributary streams which are navigable, the most notable of them being the Hupanis, the Hudaspe, and the Aksines. Besides these rivers there are a great many others of every description, which permeate the country, and supply water for the nurture of garden vegetables and crops of all sorts. Now to account for the rivers being so numerous, and the supply of water so superabundant, the native philosophers and proficient in natural science advance the following reasons:—They say that the countries which surround India—those of the Scythians and Bactrians, and also of the Aryans—are more elevated than India, so that their waters, agreeably to natural law, flow down together from all sides to the plains beneath, where they gradually saturate the soil with moisture, and generate a multitude of rivers.

A peculiarity is found to exist in one of the rivers of India,—that called the Silla, which flows from a fountain bearing the same name. It differs from all other rivers in this respect,—that nothing cast into it will float, but everything, strange to say, sinks down to the bottom.

It is said that India, being of enormous size when taken as a whole, is peopled by races both numerous and diverse, of which not even one was originally of foreign descent, but all were evidently indigenous; and moreover that India neither received a colony from abroad, nor sent out a colony to any other nation. The legends further inform us that in primitive times the inhabitants subsisted on such fruits as the earth yielded spontaneously, and were clothed with the skins of the beasts found in the country, as was the case with the Greeks; and that, in like manner as with them, the arts and other appliances which improve human life were gradually invented, necessity herself teaching them to an animal at once docile and furnished not only with hands ready to second all his efforts, but also with reason and a keen intelligence.

The men of greatest learning among the

† Conf. Lassen, Pentaplot. 10.
‡ Conf. Fragn. xxi in Ind. Ant. vol. V. p. 88, c. vi. 2-3.
∥ Conf. Fragn. xlii.
Indians tell certain legends, of which it may be proper to give a brief summary. They relate that in the most primitive times, when the people of the country were still living in villages, Dionysos made his appearance coming from the regions lying to the west, and at the head of a considerable army. He overran the whole of India, as there was no great city capable of resisting his arms. The heat, however, having become excessive, and the soldiers of Dionysos being afflicted with a pestilence, the leader, who was remarkable for his sagacity, carried his troops away from the plains up to the hills. There the army, recruited by the cool breezes and the waters that flowed fresh from the fountains, recovered from sickness. The place among the mountains where Dionysos restored his troops to health was called Mēros; from which circumstance, no doubt, the Greeks have transmitted to posterity the legend concerning the god, that Dionysos was bred in his father's thigh. Having after this turned his attention to the artificial propagation of useful plants, he communicated the secret to the Indians, and taught them the way to make wine, as well as other arts conducive to human well-being. He was, besides, the founder of large cities, which he formed by removing the villages to convenient sites, while he also showed the people how to worship the deity, and introduced laws and courts of justice. Having thus achieved altogether many great and noble works, he was regarded as a deity and gained immortal honours. It is related also of him that he led about with his army a great host of women, and employed, in marshalling his troops for battle, drums and cymbals, as the trumpet had not in his days been invented; and that after reigning over the whole of India for two and fifty years he died of old age, while his sons, succeeding to the government, transmitted the sceptre in unbroken succession to their posterity. At last, after many generations had come and gone, the sovereignty, it is said, was dissolved, and democratic governments were set up in the cities.

(39.) Such, then, are the traditions regarding Dionysos and his descendants current among the Indians who inhabit the hill-country. They further assert that Hērakleēs was also born among them. They assign to him, like the Greeks, the club and the lion's skin. He far surpassed other men in personal strength and prowess, and cleared sea and land of evil beasts. Marrying many wives he begot many sons, but one daughter only. The sons having reached man's estate, he divided all India into equal portions for his children, whom he made kings in different parts of his dominions. He provided similarly for his only daughter, whom he reared up and made a queen. He was the founder, also, of no small number of cities, the most renowned and greatest of which he called Palibothra. He built therein many sumptuous buildings.

---

† Fragment I. B.
Diss. III. 65.

Concerning Dionysos.

Now some, as I have already said, supposing that there were three individuals of this name, who lived in different ages, assign to each appropriate achievements. They say, then, that the most ancient of them was Indos, and that as the country, with its genial temperature, produced spontaneously the vine-tree in great abundance, he was the first who crushed grapes and discovered the use of the properties of wine. In like manner he ascertained what culture was requisite for figs and other fruit trees, and transmitted this knowledge to after-times; and, in a word, it was he who found out how these fruits should be gathered in, whence also he was called Lēnaios. This same Dionysos, however, they call also Katakogon, since it is a custom among the Indians to nourish their beards with great care to the very end of their life. Dionysos then, at the head of an army, marched to every part of the world, and taught mankind the planting of the vine, and how to crush grapes in the winepress, whence he was called Lēnaios. Having in like manner imparted to all a knowledge of his other inventions, he obtained after his departure from among men immortal honour from those who had benefited by his labours. It is further said that the place is pointed out in India even to this day where the god had been, and that cities are called by his name in the vernacular dialects, and that many other important evidences still exist of his having been born in India, about which it would be tedious to write.
palaces, and settled within its walls a numerous population. The city he fortified with trenches of notable dimensions, which were filled with water introduced from the river. 27 Herakles, accordingly, after his removal from among men, obtained immortal honour; and his descendants, having reigned for many generations and signalized themselves by great achievements, neither made any expedition beyond the confines of India, nor sent out any colony abroad. 28 At last, however, after many years had gone, most of the cities adopted the democratic form of government, though some retained the kingly until the invasion of the country by Alexander. 29 Of several remarkable customs existing among the Indians, there is one prescribed by their ancient philosophers which one may regard as truly admirable: for the law ordains that no one among them shall, under any circumstances, be a slave, but that, enjoying freedom, they shall respect the equal right to it which all possess: for those, they thought, who have learned neither to dominion over nor to cringe to others will attain the life best adapted for all vicissitudes of lot; for it is but fair and reasonable to institute laws which bind all equally, but allow property to be unevenly distributed.

(40.) The whole population of India is divided into seven castes, of which the first is formed by the collective body of the Philosophers, which in point of number is inferior to the other classes, but in point of dignity preeminent over all. For the philosophers, being exempted from all public duties, are neither the masters nor the servants of others. 30 They are, however, engaged by private persons to offer the sacrifices due in lifetime, and to celebrate the obsequies of the dead: for they are believed to be most dear to the gods, and to be the most conversant with matters pertaining to Hades. In requital of such services they receive valuable gifts and privileges. 31 To the people of India at large they also render great benefits, when, gathered together at the beginning of the year, they forewarn the assembled multitudes about droughts and wet weather, and also about propitious winds, and diseases, and other topics capable of profiting the hearers. 32 Thus the people and the sovereign, learning beforehand what is to happen, always make adequate provision against a coming deficiency, and never fail to prepare beforehand what will help in a time of need.

The second caste consists of the Husbandmen, who appear to be far more numerous than the others. Being, moreover, exempted from fighting and other public services, they devote the whole of their time to tillage; nor would an enemy coming upon a husbandman at work on his land do him any harm, for men of this class, being regarded as public benefactors, are protected from all injury. The land, thus remaining unvagued, and producing heavy crops, supplies the inhabitants with all that is requisite to make life very enjoyable. 33 The husbandmen themselves, with their wives and children, live in the country, and entirely avoid going into town. 34 They pay a land-tribute to the king, because all India is the property of the crown, and no private person is permitted to own land. Besides the land-tribute, they pay into the royal treasury a fourth part of the produce of the soil.

The third caste consists of the Shepherds and Peasants. 35 Of these some are armourers, while others make the implements which husbandmen and others find useful in their different callings. This class is not only exempted from paying taxes, but even receives maintenance from the royal exchequer.

The fifth caste is the Military. It is well
organized and equipped for war, holds the second place in point of numbers, and gives itself up to idleness and amusement in the times of peace. The entire force—men-at-arms, war-horses, war-elephants, and all—are maintained at the king's expense.

The sixth caste consists of the Overseers. It is their province to inquire into and superintend all that goes on in India, and make report to the king, or, where there is not a king, to the magistrates.

The seventh caste consists of the Councillors and Assessors,—of those who deliberate on public affairs. It is the smallest class, looking to number, but the most respected, on account of the high character and wisdom of its members; for from their ranks the advisers of the king are taken, and the treasurers of the state, and the arbiters who settle disputes. The generals of the army also, and the chief magistrates, usually belong to this class.

Such, then, are about the parts into which the body politic in India is divided. No one is allowed to marry out of his own caste, or to exercise any calling or art except his own: for instance, a soldier cannot become a husbandman, or an artisan a philosopher.

India possesses a vast number of huge elephants, which far surpass those found elsewhere both in strength and size. This animal does not cover the female in a peculiar way, as some affirm, but like horses and other quadrupeds.

The period of gestation is at shortest sixteen months, and at furthest eighteen. Like mares, they generally bring forth but one young one at a time, which the dam suckles for six years.

Most elephants live to be as old as an extremely old man, but the most aged live two hundred years.

Among the Indians officers are appointed even for foreigners, whose duty is to see that no foreigner is wronged. Should any of them lose his health, they send physicians to attend him, and take care of him otherwise, if he dies they bury him, and deliver over such property as he leaves to his relatives. The judges also decide cases in which foreigners are concerned, with the greatest care, and come down sharply on those who take unfair advantage of them. [What we have now said regarding India and its antiquities will suffice for our present purpose.]

BOOK I.

FRAGMENT II.

ARAB. EXPED. ALEX. V. 6. 2-11.

Of the Boundaries of India, its General Character, and its Rivers.

According to Erastosthenes, and Megasthenes who lived with Siburtios the satrap of Arachosia, and who, as he himself tells us, often visited Sandrakottos the king of the Indians, India forms the largest of the four parts into which Southern Asia is divided, while the smallest part is that region which is included between the Euphrates and our own sea.

The two remaining parts, which are separated from the others by the Euphrates and the Indus, and lie between these rivers, are scarcely of sufficient size to be compared with India, even should they be taken both together. The same writers say that India is bounded on its eastern side, right onwards to the south, by the great ocean; that its northern frontier is formed by the Kaukasos range as far as the junction of that range with Taurus; and that the boundary towards the west and the north-west, as far as the great ocean, is formed by the river Indus.

A considerable portion of India consists of a level plain, and this, as they conjecture, has been formed from the alluvial deposits of the river, inferring this from the fact that in other countries plains which are far away from the sea are generally formations of their respective rivers, so that in old times a country was even called by the name of its river. As an instance, there is the so-called plain of the Hermon—a river in Asia (Minor), which, flowing from the

and others have continually drawn analogies between Egypt and India. — Wheelock's Hist. of India, vol. i. p. 169, note 34. — Conf. Fragn. xxxix.

† For some remarks on this point see Blochmann's translation of the Atha-Alebar, p. 119.

‡ Conf. Epit. ad init.

§ The name of Chandragupta is written by the Greeks Sandrokottos, Sandrakottas, Sandrakottos, Androkottos, and (best) Sandrakuptos. Cf. Schlegel, Bibl. Ind. I. 146, Schwanenbeck, p. 12, n. 6.
THE INDICA OF MEGASTHENES.

Mount of Mother Dindumâmâ, falls into the sea near the Æolian city of Smyrna. There is also the Lydian plain of the Kaústros, named after that Lydian river; and another, that of the Kaíkos, in Mysia; and one also in Caria,—that of the Maíandros, which extends even to Miletos, which is an Ionian city. [As for Egypt, both the historians Herodotos and Hekataeo (or at any rate the author of the work on Egypt if he was other than Hekataeo)] alike agree in declaring it to be the gift of the Nile, so that that country was perhaps even called after the river; for in early times Aiguptos was the name of the river which now-a-days both the Egyptians and other nations call the Nile, as the words of Homer clearly prove, when he says that Meneleás stationed his ships at the mouth of the river Aiguptos. If, then, there is but a single river in each plain, and these rivers, though by no means large, are capable of forming, as they flow to the sea, much new land, by carrying down silt from the uplands, where their sources are, it would be unreasonable to reject the belief in the case of India that a great part of it is a level plain, and that this plain is formed from the silt deposited by the rivers, seeing that the Hermos, the Kaústros, and the Kaíkos, and the Maíandros, and all the many rivers of Asia fall into the Mediterranean, even if united, would not be fit to be compared in volume of water with an ordinary Indian river, and much less with the greatest of them all, the Ganges, with which neither the Egyptian Nile, nor the Danube which flows through Europe, can for a moment be compared. Nay, the whole of these if combined all into one are not equal even to the Indus, which is already a large river where it rises from its fountains, and which after receiving as tributaries fifteen rivers all greater than those of Asia, and bearing off from its rival the honour of giving name to the country, falls at last into the sea.*

FRAGM. III.

Arr. Indica, II. 1. 7.

Of the Boundaries of India.*

(For this fragment see Indian Antiquary, vol. V. p. 86, chap. II.)

FRAGM. IV.

Strabo, XIV. i. 11,—p. 689.

Of the Boundaries and Extent of India.†

India is bounded on the north by the extremities of Tauros, and from Ariana to the Eastern Sea by the mountains which are variously called by the natives of these regions Parapamisados, and Hemos, and Himatos,§ and other names, but by the Macedonians Kaukasos.|| The boundary on the west is the river Indus, but the southern and eastern sides, which are both much greater than the others, run out into the Atlantic Ocean.¶ The shape of the country is thus rhomboidal, since each of the greater sides exceeds its opposite side by 3000 stadia, which is the length of the promontory common to the south and the east coast, which projects equally in these two directions. (The length of the western side, measured from the Kaucasian mountains to the southern

* Strabo, XVI. i. 33, p. 700.—[All the rivers mentioned (the last of which is the Hupanos) unite in one, the Indus.] They say that fifteen considerable rivers, in all, flow into it.† Conf. Epit. 1, and for notes on the same see Vol. I. p. 330.—En.

§ Schmieder suggests Timor in Ariana. ¶ i.e. The Himalayas. || The world was anciently regarded as an island surrounded by the Atlantic Sea.
sea along the course of the river Indus to its mouths, is said to be 13,000 stadia, so that the eastern side opposite, with the addition of the 8000 stadia of the promontory, will be somewhere about 16,000 stadia. This is the breadth of India where it is both smallest and greatest.] The length from west to east as far as Pali-bothra can be stated with greater certainty, for the royal road which leads to that city has been measured by schoeni, and is in length 10,000 stadia.* The extent of the parts beyond can only be conjectured from the time taken to make voyages from the sea to Pali-bothra by the Ganges, and may be about 6000 stadia. The entire length, computed at the shortest, will be 16,000 stadia. This is the estimate of Eratosthenes, who says he derived it principally from the authoritative register of the stages on the Royal Road. Herein Megasthenes agrees with him. [Ptolemais, however, makes the length less by 1000 stadia.] Conf. Arr. Ind. iii. 1-5.

FRAGM. V.
Strabo. II. i. 7.—p. 69.
Of the Size of India.

Again, Hipparchos, in the 2nd volume of his commentary, charges Eratosthenes himself with throwing discredit on Ptolemais for differing from Megasthenes about the length of India on its northern side, Megasthenes making it 16,000 stadia, and Ptolemais 1000 less.

FRAGM. VI.
Strabo. XV. i. 12.—pp. 688-690.
Of the Size of India.

[From this, one can readily see how the accounts of the other writers vary from one another. Thus Ctesias says that India is not of less size than the rest of Asia; Onesikritos regards it as the third part of the habitable world; and Nearchos says it takes one four months to traverse the plain only.] Megasthenes and Démachos incline to be more moderate in their estimate, for according to them the distance from the Southern Sea to Kaukasos is over 20,000 stadia.—[Démachos, however, allows that the distance in some places exceeds 30,000 stadia. Of these notice has been taken in an earlier part of the work.]

FRAGM. VII.
Strabo. II. i. 4.—pp. 68-69.
Of the Size of India.

Hipparchos controverts this view, urging the futility of the proofs on which it rests. Ptolemais, he says, is unworthy of trust, opposed as he is by two competent authorities, Démachos and Megasthenes, who state that in some places the distance from the southern sea is 20,000 stadia, and in others 30,000. Such, he says, is the account they give, and it agrees with the ancient charts of the country.

FRAGM. VIII.
Strabo. II. i. 19.—p. 76.
Of the Size of India.

With Megasthenes the breadth of India is its extent from east to west, though this is called by others its length. His account is that the breadth at shortest is 16,000 stadia, and its length—by which he means its extent from north to south—is at the narrowest 22,300 stadia.

FRAGM. IX.
Strabo. II. i. 19.—p. 76.
Of the setting of the Bear, and shadows falling in contrary directions.†

Again, he [Eratosthenes] wished to show the ignorance of Démachos, and his want of a practical knowledge of such subjects, evidenced as it was by his thinking that India lay between the autumnal equinox and the winter tropic, and by his contradicting the assertion of Megasthenes that in the southern parts of India the constellation of the Bear disappeared from view, and shadows fell in opposite directions, phenomena which he assures us are never seen in India, thereby exhibiting the sheerest ignorance. He does not agree in this opinion, but...
accuses Déimachos of ignorance for asserting that the Bears do nowhere in India disappear from sight, nor shadows fall in opposite directions, as Megasthenes supposed.

Fragm. X.


Of the Setting of the Bear.

Next [to the Pārśī] in the interior are the Mōnedēs and the Sūrī, to whom belongs Mount Māleus, on which shadows fall towards the north in winter, and in summer to the south, for six months alternately. § The Bears, Bāstōn says, in that part of the country are only once visible in the course of the year, and not for more than fifteen days. Megasthenes says that this takes place in many parts of India.

Conf. Solin, 52. 13:—

Beyond Pālībothra is Mount Māleus, on which shadows fall in winter towards the north, and in summer towards the south, for six months alternately. The North Polar is visible in that part of the country once in the course of the year, and not for longer than fifteen days, as Bāstōn informs us, who allows that this occurs in many parts of India.

Fragm. XI.

Strabo, XV. i. 29, p. 603.

Of the Fertility of India. ||

Megasthenes indicates the fertility of India by the fact of the soil producing two crops every year both of fruits and grain. [Eratosthenes writes to the same effect, for he speaks of a winter and a summer sowing, which both have rain; for a year, he says, is never found to be without rain at both those seasons, whereas ensues a great abundance, since the soil is always productive. Much fruit is produced by trees; and the roots of plants, particularly of tall reeds, are sweet both by nature and by coction, since the moisture by which they are nourished is heated by the rays of the sun, whether it has fallen from the clouds or been drawn from the rivers.

§ "The Mandī would seem to be the same people as the Mōnedēs of Pliny, who with the Sūrī occupied the inland country to the south of the Pālībothra. As this is the proper situation of the country of the Mōnedēs and Sūrīs, I think it quite certain that they must be the same race as the Mōnedēs and Sūrī of Pliny. In another passage Pliny mentions the Māleus and Mandī as occupying the country between the Cālingu and the Gangas. Amongst the Māleus there was a mountain named Mālūs, which would seem to be the same as the famous Mount Māleus of the Mōnedēs and Sūrīs. I think it highly probable that both names may be intended for the celebrated mount Mandar, to the south of Bāhāgulār, which is fabled to have been used by the gods and demons at the churning of the ocean. The Mandī would identify with the inhabitants of the Māhāmādī river, which is the Manāda of Ptolemy. Eratosthenes uses here a peculiar expression: for what is called by others the ripening of fruits and the juices of plants is called among the Indians cōctiō, which is as effective in producing a good flavour as the coction by fire itself. To the heat of the water the same writer ascribes the wonderful flexibility of the branches of trees, from which wheels are made, as also the fact of there being trees on which wool grows.[] Conf. Eratosth. op. Strabo. XV. i. 18, p. 699—

From the vapours arising from such vast rivers, and from the Étōsian winds, as Eratosthenes states, India is watered by the summer rains, and the plains are overflowed. During these rains, accordingly, flocks of sheep, also sesamum, rice, and bozorum, and in the winter time wheat, barley, pulse, and other esculent fruits unknown to us.

Fragm. XII.

Strabo, XV. i. 37—p. 703.

Of some Wild Beasts of India.

According to Megasthenes the largest tigers are found among the Pārśī, being nearly twice the size of the lion, and so strong that a tame tiger led by four men has been seized by a mule by the hinder leg and dragged it to him. The monkeys are larger than the largest dogs; they are white except in the face, which is black, though the contrary is observed elsewhere. Their tails are more than two cubits in length. They are very tame, and not of a malicious disposition: so that they neither attack man nor steal. Stones are dug up which are of the colour of frankincense, and sweeter than figs or honey. In some parts of the country there are serpents two cubits long which have membranous wings like bats. They fly about by night, when they let fall drops of urine or sweat, which blister the skin of persons not on their guard, with putrid sores. There are also winged scorpions of an extraordinary size. Ebony grows there. There are also dogs of

The Mālūs or Māleus would therefore be the same people as Ptolemy's Mandar, who occupied the right bank of the Gangas to the south of Pālībothra, or they may be the people of the Rajamālī hills who are called Māleus. The Sūrī of Ptolemy are the Sabarīs of Ptolemy, and both may be identified with the aboriginal śavara or Sārīs, a wild race of woodcutters who live in the jungles without any fixed habitation."—Cunningham's Anc. Geog. of India, pp. 508-9.

1 Conf. Epit. 5, 9.
3 λίνος, perhaps the λίνος ὑδρός Σεββίπων of Arian.
4 Βούκαρος—Strabo XV. i. 18.
great strength and courage, which will not let go their hold till water is poured into their nostrils: they bite so eagerly that the eyes of some become distorted, and the eyes of others fall out. Both a lion and a bull were held fast by a dog. The bull was seized by the muzzle, and died before the dog could be taken off.

FRAGMENT XIII.‡


Of Indian Ape.

In the country of the Prasii,§ who are an Indian people, Megasthenes says there are apes not inferior in size to the largest dogs. They have tails five cubits long, hair grows on their forehead, and they have luxuriant beards hanging down their breast. Their face is entirely white, and all the rest of the body black. They are tame and attached to man, and not malicious by nature like the apes of other countries.

FRAGMENT XIV.


Of Winged Scorpions and Serpents.

Megasthenes says there are winged scorpions in India of enormous size, which sting Europeans and natives alike. There are also serpents which are likewise winged. These do not go abroad during the day, but by night, when they let fall urine, which if it lights upon any one's skin at once raises putrid sores thereon. Such is the statement of Megasthenes.

FRAGMENT XV.

Strabo. i. 56.—pp. 710-711.

Of the Beasts of India, and the Reed.

He (Megasthenes) says there are monkeys, rollers of rocks, which climb precipices whence they roll down stones upon their pursuers.

* Most animals, he says, which are tame with us are wild in India, and he speaks of horses which are one-horned and have heads like those of deer; and also of reeds some of which grow straight up to the height of thirty organia[,] while others grow along the ground to the length of fifty. They vary in thickness from three to six cubits in diameter.

FRAGMENT XV.B.


Of some Beasts of India.

In certain districts of India (I speak of those which are most inland) they say there are inaccessible mountains infested by wild beasts, and which are also the haunts of animals like those of our own country except that they are wild; for even sheep, they say, run wild there, as well as dogs and goats and oxen, which roam about on their own pleasure, being independent and free from the dominion of the herdsman. That their number is beyond calculation is stated not only by writers on India, but also by the learned men of the country, among whom the Brahmins deserve to be reckoned, whose testimony is to the

† FRAGMENT XIII. B.


Of Indian Ape.

Among the Prasii in India there is found, they say, a species of ape of human-like intelligence, and which is to appearance about the size of Hurkisan dogs. Nature has furnished them with forelocks, which one ignorant of the reality would take to be artificial. Their chin, like that of a satyr, turns upward, and their tail is like the potens one of the lion. Their body is white all over except the face and the tip of the tail, which are of a reddish colour. They are very intelligent, and naturally tame. They are bred in the woods, where also they live, subsisting on the fruits which they find growing wild on the hills. They resort in great numbers to the suburbs of Latag, an Indian city, where they eat rice which has been laid down for them by the king's orders. In fact, every day a ready-prepared meal is set out for their use. It is said that when they have satisfied their appetite they retire in an orderly manner to their haunts in the woods, without injuring a single thing that comes in their way.

§ The Prasii (i.e. Easterns) are called by Strabo, Arrian, and Pliny Παραντι, Prasii; by Plutarch (Ael. 62) Παραντι, a name often used by Aelian also; by Nicolaus Damaicus (ap. Stob. Flor. 37, 55) Παραντι; by Diodorus (xvii. 55) Παραντι; by Curtius (IX. 2, 18) Παραντι; by Justin (xii. 6, 9) Παραντι. Megasthenes attempted to approximate more closely to the Sanskrit Praksha, for here he uses Πρασκάσω. And it appears that Πρασκάσω should be substituted for Παραντι in Stephan. Byzant., since it comes between the words Πρασκάσω and Πρασκάσω. Schwanbeck, p. 28, not 6.

II The organia was four cubits, or equal to 6 feet 1 inch,
Fragm. XVI.

Of the Bow-Constructor.

According to Megasthenes, serpents in India grow to such a size that they swallow stags and bulls whole.
Solinus, 52. 85. 7.
So huge are the serpents that they swallow stags whole, and other animals of equal size.

Fragm. XVII.

Of the Electric Eel.

I learn from Megasthenes that there is in the Indian Sea a small kind of fish which is never seen when alive, as it always swims in deep water, and only floats on the surface after it is dead. Should any one touch it he becomes faint and swoons,—nay, even dies at last.

other animals to approach it, and is good-natured towards them, though they say that with its congeners it is rather quarrelsome. The males are reported to have a natural propensity not only to fight among themselves, by butting with their horns, but to display a like animosity against the female, and to be so obstinate in their quarrels that they will not desist till a worsted rival is killed outright. But, again, not only is every member of the body of this animal endowed with great strength, but such is the potency of its horn that nothing can withstand it. It loves to feed in secluded pastures, and wanders about alone, but at the rutting season it seeks the society of the female, and is then gentle towards her,—nay, the two even feed in company. The season being over and the female pregnant, the Indian Kartascha again becomes ferocious and seeks solitude. The foals, it is said, are taken when quite young to the king of the Praii, and are set to fight each other at the great public spectacles. No full-grown specimen is remembered to have ever been caught.

(21.) The traveller who crosses the mountains

Fragm. XVIII.

Of Taprobane.*

Megasthenes says that Taprobane is separated from the mainland by a river; that the inhabitants are called Palaiogonoi, and that their country is more productive of gold and large pearls than India.
Solinus, 53. 3.
Taprobane is separated from India by a river flowing between: for one part of it abounds with wild beasts and elephants much larger than India breeds, and man claims the other part.

Fragm. XIX.

Antigom. Casyt. 647.
Of Marine Trees.

Megasthenes, the author of the Indika, mentions that trees grow in the Indian Sea which skirt that frontier of India which is most inland meets, they say, with ravines which are clothed with very dense jungle, in a district called by the Indians Koronda†. These ravines are said to be the haunts of a peculiar kind of animal shaped like a satyr, covered all over with shaggy hair, and having a tail like a horse’s, depending from its rump. If these creatures are left unmolested, they keep within the coppices living on the wild fruits; but should they hear the hunter’s halloo and the baying of the hounds they dart up the precipices with incredible speed, for they are habituated to climbing the mountains. They defend themselves by rolling down stones on their assailants, which often kill those they hit. The most difficult to catch are those which roll the stones. Some are said to have been brought, though with difficulty and after long intervals, to the Praii, but these were either suffering from diseases or were females heavy with young, the former being too weak to escape, and the latter being impeded by the burden of the womb.—Conf. Phl. Hist. Nat. VII. 2. 17.

* This island has been known by many names—

1. Lūkka.—The only name it goes by in Sanskrit, and quite unknown to the Greeks and Romans.
2. Simandu or Palaisimandu.—Probably a Greek form of the Sanskrit Pali-Simanta. This name had gone out of use before the time of Ptolemy the Geographer.
3. Taprobane.—Supposed to represent the Sanskrit Tamparangi (‘red-leaved’ or ‘oyster-coloured sand’), a slightly altered form of the Pali Tambraparni, which is found in the inscription of Ashoka on the Girnar rock. Vide note, vol. V. p. 272.
4. Salice (perhaps properly Saline), Serendivus, Sirlediba, Serendib, Zelua, Ceylon. These are all considered to be derivatives from Sīhala, the Pali form of Sīhala, ‘the abode of lions.’ The suffix -a represents the Sanskrit dya, ‘an island.’

† Lassen has tried to account for the name Palaiogonoi thus (Dissert. de insula Taprob. p. 9): “We must suppose that Megasthenes was acquainted with the Indian myth that the first inhabitants of the island were said to have been Rākshasas or giants, the sons of the progenitors of the world, whom he might not inaptly call Palaiogonoi.” Against this it may be remarked that, by this unusual term and so uncommon, Megasthenes meant to name the nation, not describe it; and next that Megasthenes is not in the habit of translating names, but of rendering them according to sound with some degree of accuracy; lastly, that, shortly after, we find the name of Taprobane and of its capital Palaiogonos, quite like Palaiogonos. Accordingly as Lassen explains Palaiogonos, the name of the capital, by the Sanskrit Pali-Andhiti (‘head of the sacred doctrine’), I would also prefer to explain the name of the Palaiogonoi from the Sanskrit Pali-jandha (i.e. ‘men of the sacred doctrine’).—Schwanbeck, p. 83, n. 35.

† V. L. Küloevitz.
FRAGMENT XX.
Arr. Ind. 4. 2-3.

Of the Indus and the Ganges.
See translation of this in Ind. Ant. vol. V. pp. 86-87.

FRAGMENT XXI.
Arr. Ind. 6. 2-3.

Of the River Silas.
For translation see Ind. Ant. vol. V. p. 88.

FRAGMENT XXII.


Of the River Silas.

There is in India a river called the Silas, named after the fountain from which it flows, on which nothing will float that is thrown into it, but everything sinks to the bottom, contrary to the usual law.

FRAGMENT XXIII.
Arr. Ind. 5. 2.

Of the River Silas.

(Megasthenes says) that in the mountainous country is a river, the Silas, on the waters of which nothing will float. Deimokritos, who had travelled over a large part of Asia, disbelieved this, and so does Aristotle.

FRAGMENT XXIV.

Of the Number of Indian Rivers.
For translation see Ind. Ant. vol. V. p. 87.


The Prinas|| and the Cainas (a tributary of the Ganges) are both navigable rivers. The tribes which dwell by the Ganges are the Calingas,|| nearest the sea, and higher up the Mandaei, also the Malli, among whom is Mount Mallus, the boundary of all that region being the Ganges. Some have asserted that this river, like the Nile, rises from unknown sources, and in a similar way waters the country it flows through, while others trace its source to the Skythian mountains. Nineteen rivers are said to flow into it, of which, besides those already mentioned, the Comochates, Erannobas, Cosaoagus, and Sonus are navigable. According to other accounts, it bursts at once with thundering roar from its fountain, and tumbling down a steep and rocky channel in a lake as soon as it reaches the level plain, whence it issues forth with a gentle current, being nowhere less than eight miles broad, while its mean breadth is a hundred stadia, and its least depth twenty fathoms.||

Solin. 52. 6-7.

In India the largest rivers are the Ganges and the Indus,—the Ganges, as some maintain, rising from uncertain sources, and, like the Nile, overflowing its banks; while others think that it rises in the Skythian mountains. In India there is also the Hupanis, a very noble river, which formed the limit of Alexander's march, as the altars set up on its banks testify.|| The least breadth of the Ganges is eight miles, and the greatest twenty. Its depth where least is fully one hundred feet.

Conf. Fragm. XXV. 1.

Some say that the least breadth is thirty stadia, but others only three; while Megasthenes says that the mean breadth is a hundred stadia, and its least depth twenty fathoms.

Ptolemy of Geuthwâl, in lat. 30° 54', long. 7° 7', issuing from under a very low arch, at the base of a great snow-bed, estimated to be 300 feet thick, which lies between the lofty mountains termed St. Patrick, St. George, and the Pyramyd, the two higher having elevations above the sea, respectively, of 22,276 and 22,514 feet, and the other, on the opposite side, having an elevation of 21,879. From the brow of this curiously snow-covered wall and, immediately above the outlet of the stream, large and hoary icicles depend. They are formed by the freezing of the melted snow-water at the top of the bed; for in the middle of the day the sun is powerful, and the water produced by its action falls over this place in cascade, but is frozen at night. At Sikkur the river may be said to break through the 'Himalaya Proper,' and the elevation of the waterway is here 7,998 feet. At Depsag it is joined on the left side by the Alakmands.||

From Depsag the united stream is now called the Ganges... Its descent by the Dehau Dûn is rather rapid to Hâpdwâr... sometimes called Gaâgâdâwâna, or the gate of the Ganges, being situated on its western or right bank at the southern base of the Sirkhil range, here intersected by a ravine or gorge by which the river, finally leaving the mountainous region, commences its course over the plains of Hindustan. The breadth of the river in the rainy season is represented to be a full mile.||

The same as the Hupanis or Siutlaj.
BOOK II.

FRAGM. XXV.
Strab. XV. i. 35. 36.—p. 702.
Of the city Pataliputra §

According to Megasthenes the mean breadth (of the Ganges) is 100 stadia, and its least depth 20 fathoms. At the meeting of this river and another is situated Palibothra, a city eighty stadia in length and fifteen in breadth. It is of the shape of a parallelogram, and is girded with a wooden wall, pierced with loopholes for the discharge of arrows. It has a ditch in front for defence and for receiving the sewage of the city. The people in whose country this city is situated is the most distinguished in all India, and is called the Prasii. The king, in addition to his family name, must adopt the surname of Palibothra, as Sandrakottos, for instance, did, to whom Megasthenes was sent on an embassy. [This custom also prevails among the Parthians, for all are called Arsakai, though each has his own peculiar name, as Orodes, Phraial, or some other.]

Then follow these words:—

All the country beyond the Hapana is allowed to be very fertile, but little is accurately known regarding it. Partly from ignorance and the remoteness of its situation, everything about it is exaggerated or represented as marvellous: for instance, there are stories of the gold-digging ants, of animals and men of peculiar shapes, and possessing wonderful faculties; as the Sires, who, they say, are so long-lived that they attain an age that is beyond two hundred years. They mention also an aristocratical form of government consisting of five thousand councillors, each of whom furnishes the state with an elephant.

According to Megasthenes the largest tigers are found in the country of the Prasii, &c. (Cf. Fragm. XII.)

FRAGM. XXVI.
Arr. Ind. 10.
Of Pataliputra and the Manners of the Indians.

It is further said that the Indians do not rear monuments to the dead, but consider the virtues which men have displayed in life, and the songs in which their praises are celebrated, sufficient to preserve their memory after death. But of their cities it is said that the number is so great that it cannot be stated with precision, but that such cities as are situated on the banks of rivers or on the sea-coast are built of wood instead of brick, being meant to last only for a time,—so destructive are the heavy rains which pour down, and the rivers also when they overflow their banks and inundate the plains,—while those cities which stand on commanding situations and lofty eminences are built of brick and mud; that the greatest city in India is that which is called Palibothra, in the dominions of the Prasii, where the streams of the Erannobos and the Ganges unite,—the Ganges being the greatest of all rivers, and the Erannobos being perhaps the third largest of Indian rivers, though greater than the greatest rivers elsewhere; but it is smaller than the Ganges where it falls into it. Megasthenes informs us that this city stretched in the inhabited quarters to an extreme length on each side of eighty stadia, and that its breadth was fifteen stadia, and that a ditch encompassed it all round, which was six hundred feet in breadth and thirty cubits in depth, and that the wall was crowned with 570 towers and had four-and-sixty gates. The same writer tells us further this remarkable fact about India, that all the Indians are free, and not one of them is a slave. The Lakademonians and the Indians are here so far in agreement. The Lakademonians, however, hold the Helots as slaves, and these Helots do servile labour; but the Indians do not even use aliens as slaves, and much less a countryman of their own.

FRAGM. XXVII.
Strab. XV. i. 53-56.—pp. 709-10.
Of the Manners of the Indians.

The Indians all live frugally, especially when in camp. They dislike a great undisciplined multitude, and consequently they observe good order. Theft is of very rare occurrence. Megasthenes says that those who were in the camp of Sandrakottos, wherein lay 400,000 men, found that the thefts reported on any one day did not exceed the value of two hundred drachmas, and this among a people who have no written laws, but are ignorant of writing, and must therefore in all the business of life trust to memory. They live, nevertheless, happily enough, being simple in their manners and frugal. They never drink wine except at (Sirica) in Eastern Mongolia and the north-east of China, but it has also been sought for in Eastern Turkestan, in the Himalaya towards the sources of the Ganges, in Assam, and even in Pogu. The name is first met with in Ktesias.
Their beverage is a liquor composed from rice instead of barley, and their food is principally a rice-pottage. The simplicity of their laws and their contracts is proved by the fact that they seldom go to law. They have no suits about pledges or deposits, nor do they require either seals or witnesses, but make their deposits and confide in each other. Their houses and property they generally leave unguarded. These things indicate that they possess good, sober sense; but other things they do which one cannot approve: for instance, that they eat always alone, and that they have no fixed hours when meals are to be taken by all in common, but each one eats when he feels inclined. The contrary custom would be better for the ends of social and civil life.

Their favourite mode of exercising the body is by friction, applied in various ways, but especially by passing smooth ebony rollers over the skin. Their tombs are plain, and the mounds raised over the dead lowly. In contrast to the general simplicity of their style, they love finery and ornament. Their robes are worked in gold, and ornamented with precious stones, and they wear also flowered garments made of the finest muslin. Attendants walking behind hold up umbrellas over them: for they have a high regard for beauty, and avail themselves of every device to improve their looks. Truth and virtue they hold alike in esteem. Hence they accord no special privileges to the old unless they possess superior wisdom. They marry many wives, whom they buy from their parents, giving in exchange a yoke of oxen. Some they marry hoping to find in them willing helpmates; and others for pleasure and to fill their houses with children. The wives prostitute themselves unless they are compelled to be chaste. No one wears a crown at a sacrifice or libation, and they do not stab the victim, but strangle it, so that nothing mutilated, but only what is entire, may be presented to the deity.

A person convicted of bearing false witness suffers mutilation of his extremities. He who mains any one not only suffers in return the loss of the same limb, but his hand also is cut off. If he causes an artisan to lose his hand or his eye, he is put to death. The same writer says that none of the Indians employ slaves; [but Onesikritos says that this was peculiar to that part of the country over which Musikanos ruled.]

The care of the king's person is entrusted to women, who also are bought from their parents. The guards and the rest of the soldiers attend outside the gates. A woman who kills the king when drunk becomes the wife of his successor. The sons succeed the father. The king may not sleep during the daytime, and by night he is obliged to change his couch from time to time, with a view to defeat plots against his life.

The king leaves his palace not only in time of war, but also for the purpose of judging causes. He then remains in court for the whole day, without allowing the business to be interrupted, even though the hour arrives when he must needs attend to his person,—that is, when he is to be rubbed with cylinders of wood. He continues hearing cases while the friction, which is performed by four attendants, is still proceeding. Another purpose for which he leaves his palace is to offer sacrifice; a third is to go to the chase, for which he departs in Bacchanalian fashion. Crowds of women surround him, and outside of this circle spearmen are ranged. The road is marked off with ropes, and it is death, for man and woman alike, to pass within the ropes. Men with drums and gongs lead the procession. The king hunts in the enclosures and shoots arrows from a platform. At his side stand two or three armed women. If he hunts in the open grounds he shoots from the back of an elephant. Of the women, some are in chariots, some on horses, and some even on elephants, and they are equipped with weapons of every kind, as if they were going on a campaign.

[These customs are very strange when compared with our own, but the following are still more so;] for Megasthenes states that the origin, leads a life of seclusion very similar to that of Sandrokottos. He changes his bedroom every night, as a safeguard against sudden treachery.
tribes inhabiting the Kaukasos have intercourse with women in public, and eat the bodies of their relatives, and that there are monkeys which roll down stones, &c. (Fragm. XV. follows, and then Fragm. XXIX.)

Fragm. XXIX.

Strab. XV. i. 57—p. 711.

Of fabulous tribes.

But deviating into fables he says there are men five spans and even three spans in height, some of whom want the nose, having only two orifices above the mouth through which they breathe. Against the men of three spans, war, as Homer has sung, is waged by the cranes, and also by partridges, which are as large as geese. These people collect and destroy the eggs of the cranes, for it is in their country the cranes lay their eggs, and thus the eggs and the young cranes are not to be found anywhere else. Frequently a crane escapes having the brazen point of a weapon in its body, from wounds received in that country. Equally absurd is the account given of the Enatókokis, of the wild men, and of other monsters. The wild men could not be brought to Sandrakottos, for they refused to take food and died. Their heels are in front, and the instep and toes are turned backwards. Some were brought to the court who had no mouths and were tame. They dwell near the sources of the Ganges, and subsist on the savour of roasted flesh and the perfumes of fruits and flowers, having instead of mouth

Fragm. XXVII. B.

Hiler. V. l. ii. 1.

The Indians neither put out money at usury, nor know how to borrow. It is contrary to established usage for an Indian either to do or suffer a wrong, and therefore they neither make contracts nor require securities. Conf. Suid. V. 188.

Fragm. XXVII. C.

Nicol. Danasc. 44; Stob. Serm. 42.

Among the Indians one who is unable to recover a loan or a deposit has no remedy at law. All the creditor can do is to blame himself for trusting a rogue.

— Herodotus (bk. iii. 38, 99, 191) has noted the existence of both practices among certain Indian tribes.

— Cf. Strab. II. i. 9—p. 70.—Déémachos and Megasthenes are especially unworthy of credit. It is they who tell those stories about the men who sleep in their ears, the men without mouths, the men without nostrils, the men with one eye, the men with long legs, and the men with their toes turned backward. They renewed Homer’s fable about the battle between the Cranes and the Pygmies, asserting that the latter were three spans in height. They told of the ants that dig for gold, of Pans with wedge-shaped heads, and of serpents swallowing down oxes and stags, horns and all.—the one author meanwhile accusing the other of falsehood, as Eratosthenes has remarked.

— Ktesias in his Indika mentions Pygmies as belonging to India. The Indians themselves considered them as belonging to the race of the Kirátas, a barbarous people who inhabited woods and mountains and lived by hunting, and who were so diminutive that their name became a synonym for dwarf. They were thought to fight with rattles and eagles. As they were of Mongolian origin, the Indians represented them with the distinctive features of that race, but with their repelleness exaggerated. Hence Megasthenes spoke of the Amuktrées, men without noses, who had merely breathing-holes above the mouth. The Kirátas are no doubt identical with the Syrtes of Plinius and the Kirkhediai of the Periptus M. Straboni.
orifices through which they breathe. They are distressed with things of evil smell, and hence it is with difficulty they keep their hold on life, especially in a camp. Referring to the other monstrousities, the philosophers told him of the Okupedes, a people who in running could leave the horse behind; of the Enotokoiatai, who had ears reaching down to their feet, so that they could sleep in them, and were so strong that they could pull up trees and break a bowstring.

Of others the Monomatoi, who have the ears of a dog, their one eye set in the middle of their forehead, the hair standing erect, and whose breasts shaggy; of the Amukteres, also a people without nostrils, who devour everything, eat raw meat, and are short-lived, and die before old age supervenes. The upper part of the mouth protrudes far over the lower lip. With regard to the Hyperboreans, who live a thousand years, they give the same account as Simónides, Pindaros, and other mythological writers. The story told by Timagenes, that showers fall of drops of copper, which are swept together, is a fable. Megasthenes states—what is more open to belief, since the same is the case in Iberia—that the rivers carry down gold dust, and that a part of this is paid by way of tribute to the king.

In their intercourse with the Indians after the expedition of Alexander, the Greeks became acquainted with these fictions of Hellenistic poetry, as well as with a good many other stories which made India look upon India as a land of prodigies. Megasthenes, like Ktesias before him, had collected a great number of such stories, and either from his memoirs or from contemporary narratives, such as that of Démachus, the fable of the Uttarakuru had spread to the West, since, from what Pliney tells us (vol. 17, p. 316) one Amomptus had composed a treatise regarding them analogous to that of Hecataeus regarding the Hyperboreans. It is certainly from this treatise of Amomptus that Pliney borrows the two lines which he devotes to his Attacora, that is a girdle of mountains warmed with the sun and sheltered from the blasts of winter winds, and that they enjoyed, like the Hyperboreans, an eternal spring.

Gens hominum Attacorarum, apricis ab omni noxio affluat, sedus collibus, aestim, qua Hyperbolearum dormit, tempera. (Plin. loc. cit. Anmianus Marcellinus, xviii. 6, 64.) Wagner transfers this description to the Sēra in general, (of whom the Uttarakuru is a part of the same), and some modern critics (Mannert, vol. IV. p. 259, 1875; Förster, Haush. der alten Geogr. vol. II. p. 472, 1344) have believed they could see in it a reference to the great wall of China.) We see from a host of examples besides this, that the poetic fables and popular legends of India had taken, in passing into the Greek narratives, an appearance of reality, and a sort of historical consistency. (Étude sur la Géographie Grecque et Latine de l’Inde, pp. 413-414.)

The same author (p. 412) says, "Among the peoples of Sēra, Ptolemy reckons the Uttarakuru, a name which in Pliney is written Atacoros, and which Ammianus Marcellinus, who copies Ptolemy, distorts into Opatocoros. There is no difficulty in recognizing under this name the Uttarakuru of Sanskrit books." Schwabheil (p. 70) quotes Lassen, who writes somewhat to the same effect:—"Uttarakuru is a part of Sēra, and as the first accounts of India came to the West from Sēra, perhaps a part of the description of the peaceful happy life of the Sēra is to be explained from the circumstances of the Uttarakuru. The story of the long life of the Sēra may be similarly explained, especially when Megasthenes reckons the life attained by them 1000 years. The Mahābhārata (VI. 204) says that the Uttarakuru live 1000 or 10,000 years. We conclude from this that Megasthenes also wrote of the Uttarakuru, and that he not improperly rendered their name by that of the Hyperboreans." (Zeitschr. II. 67.)

1 Not Spain, but the country between the Black Sea and the Caspian, now called Georgia.
The Fragments of the Indika of Megasthenes.

Of fabulous races.

According to Megasthenes, on a mountain called Nulo § there live men whose feet are turned backward, and who have eight toes on each foot; * while on many of the mountains there lives a race of men having heads like those of dogs, who are clothed with the skins of wild beasts, whose speech is barking, and who, being armed with claws, live by hunting and fowling; || Ktesias asserts on his own authority that the number of these men was upwards of 120,000, and that there is a race in India whose females bear offspring but once in the course of their life, and that their children become at once grey-haired.

Megasthenes speaks of a race of men among the Nomadic Indians who instead of nostrils have merely orifices, whose legs are contorted like snakes, and who are called Scyrtes. He speaks also of a race living on the very confines of India on the east, near the source of the Ganges, the Astomi, who have no mouth; who cover their body, which is all over hairy, with the soft down found upon the leaves of trees; and who live merely by breathing, and the perfume inhaled by the nostrils. They eat nothing, and they drink nothing. They require merely a variety of odours of roots and of flowers and of wild apples. The apples they carry with them when they go on a distant journey, that they may always have something to smell. Too strong an odour would readily kill them.

Beyond the Astomi, in the remotest part of the mountains, the Triphasmides and the Pergames are said to have their abode. They are each three spans in height—that is, not more than seven-and-twenty inches. Their climate is salubrious and they enjoy a perpetual spring, under shelter of a barrier of mountains which rise on the north. They are the same whom Homer mentions as being harassed by the attacks of the cranes. * The story about them is—that mounted on the backs of rams and goats, and equipped with arrows, they march down in spring-time all in a body to the sea, and destroy the eggs and the young of these birds. It takes them always three months to finish this yearly campaign, and were it not undertaken they could not defend themselves against the vast flocks of subsequent years. Their huts are made of clay and feathers and egg-shells. * Aristotle says that they live in caves, but otherwise he gives the same account of them as others. ||

* From Ktesias we learn that there is a people belonging to this race, which is called Pandore and settled in the valleys, who live two hundred years, having in youth hoary hair, which in old age turns black. On the other hand, others do not live beyond the age of forty—nearly related to the Macrobius, whose women bear offspring but once. Agatharchides says the same of them, adding that they subsist on locusts, and are swift of foot. * Clitarchus and Megasthenes call them Mandi, and reckon the number of their villages at three hundred. The females bear children at the age of seven, and are old women at forty.*

Of the race of men without mouths.†

For how could one find growing there that Indian root which Megasthenes says a race of men who neither eat nor drink, and in fact have not even mouths, set on fire and burn like incense, in order to sustain their existence with its odorous fumes, unless it received moisture from the moon?

Near a mountain which is called Nulo there live men whose feet are turned backwards and have eight toes on each foot. Megasthenes writes that on different mountains in India there are tribes of men with dog-shaped heads, armed with claws, clothed with skins, who speak not in the accents of human language, but only bark, and have fierce grinning jaws. [In Ktesias we read

§ V. L. Nulo.
|| Called by Ktesias Kusamphadon, and in Sanskrit Sundumada or Sundumadha.
¶ Possibly we should read Pandai, unless perhaps

Plutarch, de faecis in orbe luc. (Opp. ed. Reisch. tom. ix. p. 701.)

* Conf. Fragm. L. 21, LI.
† Conf. Fragm. XXIX. 9, XXX. 9.
SANSKRIT AND OLD CANARESE INSCRIPTIONS.

BY J. F. FLEET, Bo. C.S.

(Continued from p. 94.)

I propose henceforth to transcribe the original texts of my inscriptions into Roman characters. The system of transliteration to be followed is this:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sanskrit</th>
<th>Canarese</th>
<th>Transliteration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>अ</td>
<td>अ</td>
<td>a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>आ</td>
<td>आ</td>
<td>a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ह</td>
<td>ह</td>
<td>h</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>हे</td>
<td>हे</td>
<td>he</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>हि</td>
<td>हि</td>
<td>hi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>हू</td>
<td>हू</td>
<td>hu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ह्र</td>
<td>ह्र</td>
<td>hr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>हौ</td>
<td>हौ</td>
<td>ho</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>हे</td>
<td>हे</td>
<td>he</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>हू</td>
<td>हू</td>
<td>hu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ह्र</td>
<td>ह्र</td>
<td>hr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>हौ</td>
<td>हौ</td>
<td>ho</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Visarga.*

| य        | य        | y   |
| ध        | ध        | dha |
| न        | न        | na  |
| भ        | भ        | bha |
| म        | म        | ma  |
| व        | व        | va  |
| ह        | ह        | ha  |

A single hyphen will be used to separate bases in composition, as far as it is desirable to divide them. It will readily be seen where the single hyphen is only used in the ordinary way, at the end of a line, to indicate that the word runs on into the next line.

A double hyphen will be used to separate words in a sentence, which in the original are written as one word, being joined together by the rules of Sandhi. Where this double hyphen is used, it will be understood that a final consonant and the following initial vowel or consonant-and-vowel are in the original expressed by one complex sign. Where it is not used, it will be understood of the orthography of the original,—1, that, according to the stage of the alphabet, the final consonant either has the modified broken form, which, in the oldest stages of the alphabet, was used to indicate a consonant with no vowel attached to it, or has the distinct sign of the Virâna attached to it;—and 2, that the following initial vowel or consonant has its full initial form.

On the subject of the Virâna, I have to remark that it is expressed in two ways in the Old Canarese alphabet, as it stood when fully developed from the Cave-alphabet:—1, less commonly, by a slight modification of one of the forms of the
vowel ś or s as written above a preceding consonant. Compare, for instance, in the facsimile plate of No. I. of this series*, the form of the vowel ś in kūla kūlā, l. 20, and in śaṅkuv-śōla, and pūrṇidhīnḍraṇā, l. 21, with the sign for the Vīrdma attached to the final u twice in śōla and pūrṇidhīnḍraṇā, l. 21; and compare, in the facsimile plate of No. II.†, the form of ś in saṅkālaṇī, l. 12, with the sign for the Vīrdma attached to the final ś in gābyāl, l. 35. The modern Canarese sign for the Vīrdma is derived directly from this modification of the vowel ś or s. And 2, more commonly, by either of the two later signs used for the vowel ś as written with a preceding consonant.‡ Usually the form of ś made use of in this way is that which is written entirely on the line, as in the modern characters; as instances, see the Vīrdma attached to the final ś in nēla-vālina, l. 25, and to the final ś in pādvaśaḥ and bhōgyal, l. 40, of No. IX.§, and to the final ś of śrīmat in l. 6 of No. XXXIII. below. It is but rarely that the second and older form of ś—which is sometimes entirely subscript, and sometimes partly so, commencing below the line and running up to the top of it,—is used for the Vīrdma. Instances of it will be found in l. 9 and l. 12 of the following inscription, No. XXXII. And as used to represent the vowel ś, it will be found in the facsimile plate of No. I., in kūla-śākasa and Chāluky-śōharasya, l. 4, and Viṣṇu-śāyita and Muni-śaṇka-śōjya, l. 27, and in the facsimile plate of No. II., in Shatālīgā-śeṣirāvīmāna Mahā-śakavānī Pradēṣa-śāhāramuśaśahā-śāhārasya, l. 22-4. As a peculiarity in the use of the vowel-sign ś for the Vīrdma, I may mention that I do not find it used with a final ś. Having regard to the number of forms in which ś occurs as a termination in modern Canarese, while in the older dialect the same forms were shorter by one syllable and ended in a consonant, this use of the vowel ś to represent the Vīrdma must have played an important part in the development of the language. In Old Canarese, the scansion of metrical passages shows that, with very few exceptions, it was only an orthographical sign. In prose passages, where no such test can be applied, I have hitherto treated it as an orthographical sign, or as a vowel, according to the age and general style of the particular inscription. But, in some few cases, the metrical text shows that, even when used as an orthographical sign, it was liable to be vocalized, if required to make up the metre;—e.g. in l. 6-7 of No. II. of my Dēvagiri-Śārava inscriptions, Jour. Br. R. As. Soc., No. xxxiii., vol. XII., p. 11, we are obliged, for the sake of the metre, to pronounce, as written, Śrī-Śāhārasya-Śrī-Śakavānī-Kaśmīrī-Śāhārasya-Śrī-Śakavānī-Śrī-Śakavānī, &c., and in l. 16 of the same, Śrī-Śāhārasya-Śrī-Śakavānī-Kaśmīrī-Śāhārasya-Śrī-Śakavānī-Kaśmīrī, &c., and in l. 27 of No. IV. of the same set Brahma-śāhāramuśaśahārasya, &c. In order to have constantly in view the importance of this vowel-sign ś as used for the Vīrdma, I shall represent it in my transcriptions by the italicized ś, and, vice versa, by the ordinary 'ś' in italicized quotations. In metrical passages, it may then be vocalized or not according to the exigencies of the metre; while, in prose passages, it will be treated as an orthographical sign, or as a vowel, according to the opinion formed by the reader of the linguistic stage of the inscription.

One sign remains to be noticed, the Anagraha, which indicates the elision of an initial ś. It is of very rare occurrence in inscriptions, and the only instance that I can call to mind is the Gadag inscription published by me at Vol. II., p. 299. Wherever it occurs, it will be most convenient to represent it by its own Dēvaśāgari sign, ś, as in that transcription.

No. XXXII. This is an inscription in the Old Canarese characters and language from Kaśāgari of the Bādami District. It is on the front or north face of one of a row of stones forming the entrance to the steps at the north end of the small tank under the wall of the fort. The emblems at the top of the stone, which is fixed upright in the ground, are:—In the centre, a cow and calf; above them, the sun, with a śaṅkha above it; and on the left of the centre, a curved sword, with the moon above it. They are only roughly cut, in outline. On the right of the centre there are no emblems. The inscription covers 1'6" high by 1'4" broad. The average size of the letters is 3'4". The characters are well-formed types of the period to which they belong, and call for no remark, except that the subscript form of the vowel ś is used to represent the Vīrdma in lines 9 and 12.

The inscription is dated in the twenty-first year of the Western Chālukya Vikrama

---

* Vol. IV., p. 179.
‡ The third and oldest sign, a crook attached to the consonant and turned downwards, occurs in some of the oldest Old Canarese inscriptions, but it is strictly a character of the Carv-alphabet class. I have never found it used to represent the Vīrdma.
§ Vol. V., p. 15.
† The orthography of the name is very doubtful; but, as far as I could ascertain, this is the correct form. Kēri, 'street'; and kēre or kēri (old form, kēte), 'tank'; are common terminations in the names of Canarese villages, and, owing to carelessness in writing, are very liable to be confused one with the other.
is a larger tank, on a slightly higher level,—which, if repaired, would, when full, include the preceding in itself,—formed by an embankment running to the south from just below the south-east corner of the fort. And thirdly, about a quarter of a mile away to the south-east of the preceding, and on a lower level, there are the remains of a large embankment, now breached and quite useless, which, when in repair, evidently formed a tank of very considerable area. This must be the "larger big tank" referred to in the inscription.

**Transcription.**

Srīmaḥ-Chāluṃkya-Vikrama-varṣa-
Dhātu-sāvatsarāda Chai-
tra su(a)ddha 5 Ādiyāvāra-d-andu śrimad-A-
[a] y-nūrvvarūn tava(ma)ge nādeva suṃkamaṇi
[p] piriya pēr-ggereg-a-chandar-ārka-tāram
[b] banām bitāru Kramañ diñd-ān idān-eyde
[k] kīva puruṣāngā-āyuṇa jaya-āriyuka-
[m] akke yidaṇ käyade käyva pāpige Ku-
[b] rukshaṭrāṅgaḷolu Bāyarāsiyolu er-kkā-
[t] muniṃlirāṇa kavileyānu Vēlādyāḷiṇa kō
[n] nund-ōṅ(ṁ) d-ayasha(ṁ) sarggum-īd-emānu sāri-
[d] dāpū-du i śail-ākhaṛaṇa dhātrīyolu
[i] Śōlka Sva-dattāṃ(ṭāṃ) para-dattāṃ(ṭāṃ) vā yō ha-
[r] ret(ṭ)ā vasundhara(ḥ)ūn | sa(ḥ)aḥbhir-vvarasēṭ-aṣa-
[s] śrā(ṣrā)ṇi viṣāṭāṃ

**Translation.**

Hail! On Sunday, the fifth day of the bright fortnight of (the month) Chaiṭra of the Dhātu sāvatsarā, which was the twenty-first of the years of the glorious Chāluṃkya Vikrama, the honourable Five-hundred made over the impost, that was payable to them, to the larger big tank, for as long as the moon and sun and stars might last.

This writing on stone proclaims in the world,—"May there be long life and victory and wealth to the man who well preserves this (grant) in continuation; (but) to the wicked man, who fails to preserve it, (may there attach) the disgrace of slaying two cores of saints, or of tawny-coloured cows, or of (Brähmans) well versed in the Vedas, at Kurukṣetra or Bāṇarāsi!"! He is born for the duration of sixty thousand years as a worm in ordure, who confiscates land that has been given, whether by himself or by another!

There is another inscription requiring notice at Kāṭṭagāri,—on part of a stone-tablet near the shrine of the god Hanumānṭa in the fort. It is in the Old Canarese characters and language, and a transcription of it is given in the Elliot MS. Collection, vol. I., p. 659.

The emblems at the top of the stone are:—In the centre, a līṅga and officiating priest; on its right, a cow and a calf, with the sun directly above them and towards the edge of the stone;
STONE-TABLET INSCRIPTION AT KAṬṬAGÉRI. SAKA 1018.
and on its left, a figure of Basava, with the moon above it. The fragment contains 19 lips, more or less imperfect, of about 25 letters. The rest of the stone is lost, and the fragment that exists has recently been broken in two, since the time when Sir W. Elliot's copyist visited it. After the usual introductory verse in praise of the god Ṣambha, the inscription begins by referring itself to the time of the Chālukya king (Vikramādiyā) Tribhuvanamalladēva, when he was ruling at the capital of Kalyāṇa. It then mentions his subordinate, the Mahāpradhana or Prime Minister Nārāṇayya, the Daṇḍaṅgaṅka, who was governing the district of Bāgadage. Among the titles given to Nārāṇayya, i.e., Nārāyaṇa, are 'the supreme chief' of Great Chieftains, who has attained the five mahādādaret, 'the choice elephant of Aṇaṇa', and 'the head of (the family of) Bhāṇasu.'

It then proceeds, in line 16, to introduce and describe the grantee; but the part of the stone containing his name, and the date, and the details of the grant, is lost.

No. XXXIII.

This is another Western Chālukya inscription, in the Old Canarese characters and language, on a stone-tablet standing in front of a partially ruined temple near the centre of the embankment of the tank at Bādāmi. The emblems at the top of the stone are:—In the centre, a figure of Jīnēndra, seated on a pedestal with a trough to receive and carry off the water poured over the image in the performance of abhiṣēka or 'ablution'; on its right, a cow and calf, with the sun above them; and on its left, towards the top of the stone, the moon. The tablet measures about 7' 9½' high by 1' 10½' broad, and the inscription covers about 3' 6½' of the total height. The average size of the letters is 2'. The characters are neatly formed types of the period to which they belong, and call for no remark, except that the use of the old is an affectation of archaisms in an inscription of this date. The tablet is of sandstone, and the surface is very much abraded. Not many letters are absolutely illegible; but in many instances only very faint, though distinctly perceptible, traces of letters remain, and the whole of the writing has become very shallow. This prevented my taking a paper cast of this inscription, and, from the same cause, the photographs of this inscription given at Pl. 15 of Mr. Hope's Collection represents it very imperfectly; when the stone was photographed, only such letters as were quite clear were filled in with chalk, and many of them were filled in and developed wrongly. The temple in front of which the tablet stands is evidently originally a Jain building, and must be the temple of the god Yōgēśvara, referred to in the inscription, to which the grant was made. It has been subsequently adapted, and is now used, as a temple of Elīma. It is of no size or architectural pretensions.

The inscription records how, in the second year of the reign of Jagadekamalla, the Siddhārtthi saṅvatāra, two of his subordinate Daṇḍaṅgakas, Mahādēva and Pāladeva, at the request of a certain noble named Rāmadēva, allotted to the temple a yearly grant of ten gadyānas out of the proceeds of the tax or impost called Siddhāgaya. There are two Jagadekamallas in the Chālukya genealogy,—Jayasinha II., whose date, by Sir W. Elliot, is Saka 940 to 962, and the eldest son and successor of Somēśvaradeva III., whose title only, and not his proper name, is given in the inscriptions, and whose date, by the same authority, is Saka 1060 to 1072. There being thus an interval of exactly one hundred and twenty years, or two cycles, between the commencement of the reign of each Jagadekamalla, the name of the saṅvatāra and the year of the reign still leave the date of
the inscription doubtful. But I find from the Elliot MS. Collection that the title ‘glorious and valorous universal emperor’* is never assumed by Jayasimha II., and, on the other hand, is almost always included among the titles of the successor of Somesvara dèva III. Accordingly, this inscription is of the time of the second Jagadeka malla, and the date of it is Saka 1061 (A.D. 1139-40), which was the Siddharthi samavatsara.

While on this subject I may mention that I am somewhat inclined to think that Jagadeka malla is the title, not of a son of Somesvara dèva III., but of a brother of his—probably a younger brother—named Jayakarna. Jayakarna is not mentioned by Sir W. Elliot, but his name occurs in one of my Ratta inscriptions, in which he is stated to be a son of Vikramaditya, and also in a fragment of a Western Chauluka inscription recently discovered at Karadi in the Hungund Taluk of the Kaladgi District. The Karadi fragment was found in a Jain Basti which has been converted into a Vihara temple of the god Rama linga. It is a very old building, with a roof of sloping slats, now almost buried under the centre of the village, the level of which has been gradually rising for centuries past from the accumulation of dust, ruins, &c. The upper part of the tablet is lost. The fragment has 22 lines, of which several at the top are imperfect where the stone was broken, of about 27 letters each. The characters and language are Old Canarese. The inscription is very much abraded. The date is lost, with the missing upper portion of the stone. But the inscription refers itself to the time of some Mahadiminga or Great Chieflain who was the minister of (the Chauluka) king Jayakarna dèva, and records grants made by the Govinda, or village-headman, Chavaña, and others, to the temple of the god Kêsava.

In this inscription, Jayakarna's name is misspelt 'Jayakharna.'

**Transcription.**

[1] Nama[mah] Śrī-Vasudevāya bhoginē yōga-mūrta-
[2] yō | Har-śvarāya satyāya nityāya
[6] jaka Chāluky-ābharaṇa [Śrī]matu-pratipa-chakra-
[7] varttii Jayadegamaladēv[a]ra vijaya-rājya-un-
[11] gan-Aṅgaja-kalpaṁ kōvida-śuka-sahakāraṁ dē-
[12] vain Śrī-Kalidāsa-daṇḍādhīnaṁ || Samadhigna-paṁ-
[13] [cha]-mahāsābda-mahāsā[mah]ṁt-[dhi]pati mahā-
[14] prachiṇda-daṇḍanāyaka samast-ādikāri mane-
[15] vērggaḍe Kālīm[a]raṁ || ne[?]gajda[?] Kālīdā-
[16] sa-chamāṁnathan=ātada || su-ja-
[17] n-naka-nilayaṁ Śrī-nā || dhīsaṁ || Matt-ante Kā-
[18] lim-arasaṁ-nttamama || Mahādvā-chamī-
[19] p-ottaman-udagra-mahimaṁ mitt-ēbha-bālaṁ vīraṁ-
[20] ryya || Īṃ-mesida Mahādvā-daṇḍanāyakanun Pā-
[21] ladēva-daṇḍanāyakanun Chālukya-Jagadekamall-
[22] varisada erade[da]naya Siddhārthi-samavatsara Kārtti-

---

* śrīmat-pratipa-chakravarti; II. 6-7 of the present inscription.
‡ One or two letters are quite illegible here.
§ Eight or nine letters are quite illegible here.
* Six or seven letters are quite illegible here.
* Five or six letters, representing eight short-syllable-variants, are quite illegible here. Probably the original stood uttama-ra-puram-veda. 
Translation.

Reverence to Śrī-Vāsudevaj, who is full of enjoyment, who is the very incarnation of the practice of religious abstraction of the thoughts, who is the lord Hāra, who is true, who is eternal, and who is the supreme spirit!

Hail! While the victorious reign of the glorious and valorous universal emperor Jaga-deka-malla-deva,—the asylum of the universe, the favourite of the world, the supreme king of great kings, the supreme lord, the most venerable, the glory of the family of Satyāśraya, the ornament of the Chājukya,—was continuing with perpetual increase, so as to endure as long as the moon and sun and stars might last:

He, who subsisted, (as if he were a bee), on the lotuses which were his feet, the honourable Śrī-Kālidāsa, the Commander of the forces,—who was the favourite of the goddess of fortune; who was spotless; who was a very bee at the lotuses which are the feet of Brahma; who was almost like Aṅgaja; and who was a very mango-tree to the parrots which were learned people. The famous Kālidāsa, the leader of the forces, the supreme chief of Great Chieftains, who has attained the five Mahāśabdas; the most fierce Dandaṇayaka; the general incontinently; the head of the family†; the noble Hāra, the sole abiding-place of good people; of the goddess of fortune; the supreme lord of...

And to the noble Kālīma (was born an excellent son) Maha-deva, the best of the leaders of armies; possessed of eminent greatness; as strong as an elephant in rut; of refined behaviour; of great bravery.

On Monday, the thirteenth day of the bright fortnight of (the month) Kārttika of the Siddharthi suhvatavara, which was the second of the years of the Chājukya Jaga-deka-malla,—the Dandaṇayaka Mahā-deva, who has been thus described, and the Dandaṇayaka Pāladēva, at the request of the noble Hāra, the head; man, alloted to (the temple of) the god Yogyāva, which Paramānandadeva, the head of the heart of those who practise religious abstraction of the thoughts, had caused to be built, ten gadyāmas of gold out of the (impost called) Siddhāya of Bādāvi, for as long as the moon and sun might last, saying that they were to be paid year by year.

This writing on stone proclaims in the world,—"May there be long life and victory and wealth to the man who well preserves this (grant) in continuation; (but) to the wicked man, who fails to preserve it, (may there attach) the disgrace of slaying two cowries of saints, or of tawny-coloured cows, or of (Brahma) well..."
versed in the Vēdas, at Kurukshetra or Vārānāsi."

Among the numerous other inscriptions at Bādāmi, there is only one more of the later kings of the Western Chālukya dynasty. It is on a fragment of a black stone tablet, leaning against the east wall in the yard of Shāriś Khān’s house, just below the embankment of the tank, at the south-east corner of the town. It is in the Old Canarese characters and language, in well-formed letters of from the tenth to the twelfth century. There are remains, more or less imperfect, of 27 lines, of about 39 letters each; the rest of the stone is lost. It begins with the Vaiśhāvīna invocation Ja-yat-srivashjātan Vaiśākha, &c., and is undoubtedly a Chālukya inscription; but, after this, hardly a connected passage is now legible anywhere, and I could not trace the name of the king, the date, &c. The emblems at the top of the stone are somewhat unusual:—In the centre three standing gods,—Bṛahma, Viṣṇu, and Śiva; on their right, a seated Gānapati; and on their left, a cow and calf.

SUBSTANCE OF TWO SĀNASAS IN SIR WALTER ELLIOT’S COLLECTION OF SOUTH-INDIAN INSCRIPTIONS.

BY THE REV. R. CALDWELL.

The originals are on copper plates, preserved in the Temple at Tirunīppānasam, in the zamindāri of Śivangai, district of Madura.

The language is generally Tamil; but the introductory portion of No. I is Sanskrit, in old Grantha characters.

No. I.*

"Svasti Śrī! The first thing that made its appearance was Water. Upon the water Hari slept, reclining on Śesha. From Hari’s navel, Brahmā, the Creator of the world, spontaneously appeared. From him Atri was born. From Atri’s eyes the Moon appeared. The Moon’s son was Budha. From him arose Pururavas, and from Pururavas the Pāṇḍya lords. Rāja Gambhirā Déva, in order to settle the boundaries of the district called by his name [see below], after ascertaining from Sundaresvara [Śiva of Madura] the proper juncture of time for doing so, in his 25th year, in the month of Mārgāli [December—January], in the dark fortnight, on Saturday, in the yoga called Svāti, ordered an elephant to be let loose [whatever path the elephant took to be regarded as the divinely appointed boundary]."

The above in Sanskrit verse; what follows is in Tamil:

"In the 13th year, 4964th day, of the lord of the earth, Śrī Kōchchadei [royal ascetic—Rājarṣi?] Varmā, emperor of the three worlds, Śrī Kulaśekhra Déva, (who

sits on on a royal throne surrounded by, &c., praised by, &c., possessed of such and such good qualities, promoter of such and such pious actions,) he [that is, apparently, Rāja Gambhirā Déva] seated on the altar-scytch in the sacred sleeping-chamber of the temple at Mādacu-lāma, East Madura, in the flourishing Chōja country, out of the 1200 shares into which the village [or district] called Rāja Gambhirā chatur-vedi māngalām, in the district of Rāja Gambhirā-vaḷa-Nādu, were divided, including ten villages, each of which is fully described, grants 1080 of those shares to 1080 Bhātās, and 120 shares to the temple, for the subsistence of the temple Brāhmaṇa; and for the confirmation of the same, at the request of Śrī Śāstrī Bhaṭṭāraka, issues this śāsana, duly attested by many witnesses."

Reference is made in several places in this śāsana to the measurement of land by, the measuring-rod of Vāra Pāṇḍiya. This Vāra Pāṇḍya must have preceded Kulaśekhara Déva, and probably there was a considerable interval of time between the two. A Vāra Pāṇḍi, doubtless a later prince of that name, succeeded to the throne of Madura in A.D. 1437. This is the only Vāra Pāṇḍi whose date is known as yet with certainty. The "Vāra Pāṇḍi" mentioned in the Singhalese annais (Mādhava) was not a predecessor of Kulaśekhara, but a rival and successor. His date was probably about A.D. 1175 (see my Dravīḍa Comparatıve Grammar, p. 535). The Kulaśekhara of this inscription is not styled Pāṇḍiya Déva, but simply
Déva; and it is worthy of notice that the Singhalese annals represent the Kulasékhara who was driven away by the Singhalese army, and in whose stead Víra Pándí was placed on the throne, as a person who did not belong to the Pándya race. He was, apparently, a Chól{a} prince, and it may be remarked that, in accordance with this, Madura, though the Pándya capital, is described in this inscription as belonging to the Chól{a} country. If the Kulasékhara of this inscription were the same person, his date would be about a.n. 1170.

The Rája Gambhir{a} Déva of this inscription is not represented as a Pándya. He was evidently a feudatory of Kulasékhara Déva, and as the district called by his name is included within the ancient limits of the Rámád zamindári, Sírànggái not then being independent, he may have been the Sírunggápati, or guardian of Rámá’s bridge, of that time,—that is, the Rámád zamindár, who has always been regarded as a sort of royal personage in his own domains.

ON ANCIENT NÁGARÍ NUMERALS.

To the Editor of the "Indian Antiquary."

In his note on the ancient Nágarí numerals, Dr. Bühler expresses his conviction that "the old idea of Prinsep, according to which the figures were to be representatives of the initial letters of the cardinal numerals, has to be given up." I feel confident that few scholars of the present day will be disposed to controvert the opinion of my learned friend. It is evident at first sight that the figures for one, two, three are nothing else but modifications of one, two, three strokes, and have nothing whatever to do with the initial letters of eka, dévi, tri.

The figure of the fourth numeral reveals its own origin by its oldest form. Pándít Bhagrānvádi Indraji, in his most interesting paper on the ancient Nágarí numerals, makes no mention of the fact that the figure of four occurs in one of the Aśoka inscriptions; yet the fact is so important, for many reasons, that I think it worth while to draw attention to it.

Thanks to General Cunningham, we know a part of the Khali inscription. There we read, ll. 4 seq.

\[\text{A} (\text{mt}) \text{yogé náma Yóna (Idjya) pala čha táma A (mt) yogé náma (r. Antiyogé) chátálli 4 lájána T valam ngáma A (Antikóna) náma Mák náma Aliyagasáda náma.}\]

† On a single plate, of the same size as those of No. L, engraved on both sides.—En.
‡ Ind. Ant. vol. VI. p. 48.

The figure for four in this inscription is a simple cross. The device of indicating the number four by a cross is so natural, and ingenious at the same time, that any comment may be held to be superfluous. Nor will it be necessary to show that all the later forms of 4 in Nágarí are the direct offshoots of the ancient sign, such as we find it in the Aśoka edict.

The figure for five is, as may be inferred from the Valabhi writing, and still more clearly from the ancient Kávī sign, nothing else but four with the addition of one stroke or curved line. The form of 4 in Kávī is \(\text{४}\), that of 5 is \(\text{५}\).

Bühler thinks that the figures were invented by Bráhmans, not by Buddhists. I agree with him in the main, but cannot forbear remarking that the words in which he has couched his opinions are liable to misapprehension. How do we know that the Hindus invented their anukas after the rise of Buddhism? Why should the figures have been unknown before the rise of Buddhism, which, after all, is an Indian invention itself, and no exotic plant?

H. KERN.

Leiden, March 11.

VÁKPATIRÁJA.

At page 52 of Indian Antiquary, vol. VI. the following occurs as a note to an inscription of...
Vākpatī Rāja, the grandfather of the celebrated Bhoja Rāja of Dhārā, translated by my friend Mr. N. J. Kirtane:—

"This Vākpatī inscription may assist in settling the date of Bhavabhūti if the assertion of Kalhaṇa in the Rājatarangini be true:—"

"कविवाचकोकर्तराजीभवधुमीन्हि
तत्कालिनितिविपलयाः।"

Allow me to correct an obvious error. This Vākpatī Rāja king of Dhārā has nothing to do with Vākpatīrāja the poet of Kanjō and the protégé of Yaśovarman, who lived at least four centuries before the time of Vākpatī Rāja the king. Like many other statements of Kalhaṇa made in the Rājatarangini, that most useful work, the lines quoted are indeed valuable. They show that Vākpatī the poet and Bhavabhūti were contemporaries, and were both patronized by king Yaśovarman. This is corroborated by a certain passage (already published by Prof. Bhāgāṅkār in a Prākrit poem of Vākpatī’s, entitled the Gaudavadikā, or ‘the killing of the Gauda king,’ lately discovered by Dr. Bühler, and now undergoing preparation for the press by me.

SHANKAR P. PANDIT.

Nudebīdhā, 23rd March 1877.

NURHAGS AND DUKHMAS.

Sir,—In Mr. James Ferguson’s invaluable work on Rude Stone Monuments he describes as follows (pp. 427 et seqq.) a class of remains found in the island of Sardinia, and nowhere else, called Nurhags:—

“Nurhag is easily recognized and easily described. It is always a round tower, with sides sloping at an angle of about ten degrees to the horizon, its dimensions varying from twenty to sixty feet in diameter, and its height being generally equal to the width of the base. Sometimes they are one, frequently two, and even three stories in height, the centre being always occupied by circular chambers, constructed by projecting stones forming a dome with the section of a pointed arch. The chamber generally occupies one-third of the diameter, the thickness of the walls forming the remaining two-thirds. There is invariably a ramp or staircase leading to the platform at the top of the tower.”

Mr. Ferguson then proceeds to give numerous illustrations and details, among which, as bearing upon my argument, I shall only notice the fact that there are remains of at least three thousand of these buildings in the island.

Next he proceeds to discuss, with less than his usual decision (the external evidence being nil), the purpose for which these buildings were erected. “Generally,” he says, “it is assumed that they were fire-temples, from their name,—śir in the Semitic languages signifying ‘fire’,—but more from their construction,” which he admits to favour this view, but adds, “Why so numerous? We can count upon our fingers all the fire-temples that exist, or ever were known to exist, in fire-worshiping Persia; and if a dozen satisfied her spiritual wants, what necessity was there for three thousand, or probably twice that number, in the small and sparsely inhabited island of Sardinia.” (p. 432.) Finally he appears rather to favour the view that they were tombs, and is certain that if so, “they were those of a people who, like the Persians of the present day, exposed their dead to be devoured by the birds of the air,” and that such towers would answer in every respect perfectly to the Towers of Silence of the modern Persians; and the little side-chambers in the towers would suit perfectly as receptacles of the denuded bones when the time arrived for collecting them.”

The necessity of sparing your space has obliged me to give only the heads of Mr. Ferguson’s argument, and that in a maimed and disjointed fashion. What I have now to point out is that there is no inconsistency between the Fire-temple and Tower of Silence theories. The Nurhags may have been both at once.

A modern Tower of Silence is always a round tower with sides nearly perpendicular to the horizon, its dimensions varying from thirty to sixty feet in diameter, and its height being generally equal (including the parapet) to about three-fifths of the base. (These dimensions are rough estimates, and open to correction.) They are always one story in height, the centre occupied by a circular chamber, and the top by a parapeted platform. There is invariably a stone external staircase leading to the platform. And there is invariably, close by, a small solid Fire-temple. The following rough dimensions are those of one attached to a tower near Kalyāṇa in the Thādrī collectorate:—On a foundation of trap-rock there is a plinth of coursed rubble one foot high and 13 feet 6 inches square, and on this another two feet high and 13 feet square. Three stone steps ascend the double plinth to the Fire-temple, which is of brick and mortar, nine feet square outside and seven inside, set back to within eighteen inches of the rear (or western) edge of the plinth. The walls are 5 feet 6 inches high, and surmounted by a roof apparently of about half that height, and the same thickness, forming (if the term be admissible) a curvilinear pyramid. In the west side is a niche for the sacred lamp; in the
east a door 43 inches high in opening, and 26 wide, surrounded by a small cornice (the only ornament about the building), and flanked by two small bull's-eye ventilators.

It is obvious that if such a building were combined with the Tower, instead of erected beside it, the resemblance to the N u r h a g would be very close,—quite as close as that of a modern Hindu temple to one of the tenth century A.D. It may be added that as the Towers of Silence are abandoned, and new ones built, every thirty or forty years, a population practising this method of sepulture would not take many centuries to erect three thousand of them. I hope some writer better acquainted than myself with fire-worship in Iran and India will correct any errors which I may have fallen into, and supplement my deficiencies, but that in any case I may prove to have advanced one step towards the solution of this curious problem.

BOOK NOTICES.

The ARCHAEOLOGY and MONUMENTAL REMAINS of DELHI.
By Carr Stephen, late Judge of the Court of Small Causes, Delhi. 1 vol. (with photographs). Ludhiana Mission Press, 1870.

Delhi has long claimed a monograph which shall do justice to its historical prec眚ence, commercial importance, and architectural magnificence. The materials for such a work exist in abundance, and the present time too would have been one peculiarly fitting for such a publication. It has, however, been left to a private individual to do for the city, with some degree of completeness, what was obviously so long required to be done.

The materials for the reconstruction of Hindu Delhi, both in monuments, coins, and manuscripts, are exceedingly scanty. Unless the Archaeological Survey or some wealthy antiquarian undertakes excavations at the supposed site of Indraprastha, and at the more modern city of which the massive walls still encircle the Kuth Minâr, we must be content to remain profoundly ignorant of the events of the 2700 years of conjectured existence which preceded the capture of the city by the Muhammadan contemporaries of our king Richard I. All that is known of Hindu Delhi will be found collected by General Cunningham in the first volume of his Archaeological Reports.

Of later times there is no lack of record. The Kuth Minâr marks with unfading freshness and dignity the exultant feeling of the first Muslim conquerors; and all around are the mosques, palaces, and tombs of every succeeding generation. Nor is the record confused, even in the remotest times, to these large and solid works. In the ditch of Kila Rai Pithora still exists the grave of the man who led the assault in 1191, and who was killed at the head of the storming party.

The notices of the city in Muhammadan authors are necessarily very numerous, and are sufficiently exact to be of great use to European investigators; they are now familiar to the English reader through the labours of Elliot and Dowson. But the city was also frequently visited, and occasionally described, by Europeans during the last three hundred years. It may have been visited even earlier by them, as Rabruquis, who wrote in the thirteenth century, mentions that Europeans were then in the service of the great Tâtâr Kâns of Central Asia, as they were in the following century,—the notorious Sir John de Mandeville having been thus employed during part of his chequered career. It is quite justifiable to conjecture that some of these adventurers found their way to northern India and Delhi, as they afterwards did to the western coast in the galleys of the Turks (see Webbe's Travels in Arber's Reprints).

The Englishman Newberry must have passed through Delhi about 1585-86 when he parted company with Fitch, at Agra, to proceed to Persia via Lahor. Eighteen years afterwards (1603), and fire after the establishment of the English East India Company, John Mildenhall passed the opposite way, from Lahor to Agra. Salbank, who was in the neighbourhood in 1609, mentions the place, but does not seem to have been there. In 1611 Finch visited Delhi, and has left a lengthy account of it, which has been useful to living antiquaries. Tom Coryat came shortly afterwards, and is apparently responsible for some of the absurdities which appeared in the contemporaneous descriptions of Sir Thomas Roe, Terry, Sir Thomas Herbert, and others. John Albert de Mandelslo, a gentleman in the service of the Duke of Holstein, travelled from Agra to Lahor in 1638, but does not refer to Delhi, though he describes Agra at some length. As Delhi was then the capital of Shâh Jâhân, Mandelslo cannot have avoided it. This deficiency, however, if it really exists, is supplied by Tavernier, who was in India at various times between 1638 and 1669, and has left, from personal observation, a long account of Delhi, which he calls 'Gehanabad.' His contemporary Bernier, as physician to the emperor Aurangzeb, was likewise some time in the city, and has left the vivid and minutely detailed description.
which is so well known. About the same time (1631) De Lajé’s description of the city appeared. In 1717 the Emperor Farakshir received at Delhi a deputation from the East India Company, and the descriptions left by Tieffenthaler, Franklin, and others, towards the end of the eighteenth century, close the accounts we have of the city while its Moghul rulers possessed any remnant of authority.

The present century has necessarily been prolific in general descriptions of the old and modern cities; but, excepting those of Heber (1824), Jacquemont (1831-32), Sleeman (1844), Mrs. Colin Mackenzie (1847), Bayard Taylor (1853), and Norman Macleod (1868), most of them are already forgotten, and none of them are of much service to the archaeologist. Antiquaries, however, were not backward in so important a field. In 1801 Colebrooke attacked the inscriptions on the Delhi pillars, and thereafter, in the Asiatic Society’s Journal and elsewhere, the archaeology of the city continued to receive due treatment by such investigators as Prinsep, Thomas, Cunningham, Campbell, Tremlett, and Sâyây Ahmad. In 1847 the local interest in the subject had become so general that the Dehli Archæological Society was formed, and this body published a journal which, so long as it lasted, was a mine of special information. The year 1855 produced the results of Mr. J. Fergusson’s examination of the Muhammadan monuments. This was principally directed to architectural objects, but was important as the first attractive introduction of the subject to the home public.

In 1862-63 General Cunningham, then Archaeological Surveyor to Government, went over the ground, and issued a report which besides containing much that was new, collected the results of all the previous piecemeal inquiries. This publication was wanting in illustrations and plans, and did not treat any but the more important questions in detail, but it has been the basis and guide of later investigators. It was supplemented in 1874 by Mr. Beglar, of the Archaeological Survey; but as he principally confined himself to the further elucidation of a few fundamental points, such as the sites of the successive cities and the origin of the Kutb Minâr and Masjid, there still remained a great deal to be done, both in exploration of the Hindu remains, and in the detailed examination of those of the Muhammadans.

At this stage the work was taken up by Mr. Carr Stephen, who has confined his labours closely to the historical and architectural branches of the antiquities of Delhi. His work is destitute of proper maps and plans (the only maps being two indifferent copies of the old sketches of General Cunningham, and the only plan a bad copy of one by Mr. Fergusson of the palace of Shâh Jehân); there are no illustrations besides the photographs; there is no bibliography; and the index is very imperfect; but what the author has undertaken he has done thoroughly well. We have tested his measurements and descriptions, and found them invariably correct. His authorities are generally quoted, and his dates well supported; and, most creditable of all, he has firmly avoided the tall writing to which Delhi, of all other cities in India, invites the unwar. Mr. Carr Stephen, too, has refrained from the incongruous parallels which are so much the fashion, and which led not long ago to the neglected and mutilated Shalamar garden at Lâhor being styled the “Versailles of the Panjâb”! Imagine a Versailles without a palace, without a picture gallery, without fountains, and without parterres! Delhi has been without much unfitness described as the Rome of Asia, but parallels should cease there. It is but bare justice to say of Mr. Carr Stephen’s book that the traveller, unless he be provided with General Cunningham’s Reports, cannot properly appreciate the city without it. The book, so far as it goes, is a decided acquisition, and the appreciative reader will regret that it does not contain six hundred pages, instead of less than half that number.

It is refreshing, in the first place, to find a Government officer resident at Delhi taking the trouble to perform the tiresome work which has been done in this case, as neither the European community nor occasional visitors impress one as caring much for this architectural paradise. Most persons deem two days sufficient for “doing” the forty-five square miles of ruins. Under these circumstances it is not surprising that the Panjâb Government can only afford an annual budget allotment of two or three thousand rupees for the repair of the monuments of the old capital, while as many lâkhs are being lavishly spent on Gothic structures of very questionable correctness and taste at Lâhor. It must not be understood from this remark, however, that we are ungrateful for what Government has done. On the contrary, it has laid the public under much obligation by fitting up or building very comfortable banâras at the Kutb, Tughilkâbd, and Humâyûn’s tomb; free access is allowed to the Lâl Kidâ; and fees are nowhere demanded. Government probably spends quite as much money on the preservation of old Delhi as the public demands.

The specialties of Mr. Carr Stephen’s work are the numerous and new translations of Muhammadan inscriptions; some judicious criticisms of former attempts to fix the sites of the Pathân cities;
descriptions of little known and, in some instances, unidentified buildings, such as the tombs of the Sayyid and Lodí kings; a rather full account of the royal and other cemeteries at the village of Mahranú; and the production of a readable description of the principal Moghul public buildings of the modern city. Generally speaking, the author has, while collecting and condensing all that has been written by others, supplied the deficiencies in detail left by General Cunningham and his assistants. In this way the work done in the shape of dry but useful specifications and measurements is immense, and a marked feature of the book,—quite two hundred distinct sites and monuments being thus placed beyond the hazard of the entire effacement which sooner or later accompanies the advantages of British rule.

With respect to Láli Kot (the first of the forts of old Dehli), Mr. Carr Stephen differs from General Cunningham, as others have done, and apparently with justice. Our author disbelieves altogether in its existence as a fortress. It is questionable, however, whether his agreement with General Cunningham in regard to the southern boundary of Dehli Shersháhi (the last Pathán capital) can be accepted as final until he disposes of the insurmountable stumbling-block of the so-called Lál Darwáza, nearly opposite Dinpanah. This gateway (which should not be confounded with the other Lál Darwáza of Dehli Shersháhi, which is more properly called the Kábuli Darwáza, and stands opposite Firuz Sháh's Kotla) is situated more than a mile within General Cunningham's southern boundary, and it impresses one on inspection either as a grand-port of the southern wall, or the remains of some inner rampart. Although the southern boundary wall of Shér Sháh's capital may be fixed below Humáyún's tomb, on the authority of Finch and others, no traces of it have been found there; and, until something tangible is discovered, one is warranted in considering the Lál Darwáza near Dinpanah as marking the real southern boundary of the walled city, and the streets and the buildings so plainly marked outside it as extramural suburbs. The author agrees with General Cunningham with respect to the site of Siri (the city of 'Alau'd-dín Khilji, the conqueror of the Dákhan and the second king of the third Pathán dynasty), and disposes for ever of the attempts made to fix it near the Keth.

In the cases of most of these city sites Mr. Carr Stephen has omitted to perform one useful task,—that, namely, of describing the ground as it now lies under cultivation or mounds of ruins. He has preferred the more attractive duty of treating of the appearance and remains of the solid public buildings scattered over their areas. This reminds us of the extreme want there is of a large scale archaeological map of old Dehli. That of Lieutenant Burgess, plotted from a survey in 1849–50, is the only one existing that we are aware of. It is good so far as it goes, but the boundaries of some of the cities are unreliable, and it not only omits to mark important standing buildings, but is also on too small a scale to allow of the location of streets and of minor ruins being delineated.

We have already referred to some of the deficiencies of the book. To these must be added the want of any mention of the canals; the gardens (including the famous Shalamar); the palaces of nobles in the modern city; and of such buildings as the Jaina temple and Badli-ká-Sarai. Generally, too, the modern city is not described in sufficient detail. All the important Moghul buildings are specified, but there is little or no account of the streets as they now lie compared with those of former times, and there is nothing about the baths, wells, sarais, sewers, and other domestic works, which, taking Lábor as an instance, are so curious in Mahommedan cities.*

The canals were well worthy of a page or two. The walled gardens have of late years so rapidly decreased in number that, unless they are described and measured at once, all trace of them will be lost. When last in Dehli, in 1873, we had difficulty in finding Shalamar at all, and when we got there we found the famous Imperial Garden had almost disappeared. All that remained was an angle of the enclosure wall, surmounted by a common plaster-domed pavilion, and two paltry baradíras, one of which a local agriculturist dignified by the name of Sháh Mázlí. The remains of some of the minor gardens are much more splendid, several having imposing gateways of fine material. Not far from Shalamar is Badli-ká-Sarai, rendered famous by the engagement of June 1857. It is a small rectangular enclosure, with massive high battlemented walls of brick. It reeked with smoke and filth.

Had space allowed, we should have liked to enter into some discussion of the very numerous points in the archaeology of Dehli yet remaining unsettled. Every page of such a work as that under notice reminds one of how much remains to be done, but any attempt of the kind would be impossible here.

* To this list of deficiencies we add a few blemishes which have escaped detection in the proofs. The Hans'Alaí can scarcely have had a "stone and masonry wall" (p. 88). The foundations, not the walls, of the Kála Mójíd must be "six feet deep" (p. 149). The "stump" of Firuz Sháh's cupola, which is referred to (p. 63) as being on the fifth story of the Kuth Mínár, must mean the flim or talaís. If octagonal pavilions "manned" the walls of the garden of Jeláblár, Kegam (p. 386), they are to be envied. At p. 102 there is a "cylinder with 16 sides."
Mr. Ferguson is well able to defend himself when he requires it, but we cannot refrain from noticing with dissent Mr. Carr Stephen's remark that Mr. Ferguson has committed himself to statements, about the doings of British officials at Delhi, which cannot be accepted. We consider Mr. Ferguson has been astonishingly moderate in his denunciation of European Vandalism. The ignorant destroyer has done his worst there, to the eternal disgrace of the British reputation for taste. Without going further a-field, the first thing one sees on entering Delhi by railway is a mutilation of the walls of the Fort,—the walls which prompted the warm admiration of Heber,—in order that one or two honey-combed guns may have a clear sweep across the bridge. In respect to these barbarities the mouths of state officials are shut, and it becomes indispensable that independent writers like Mr. Ferguson should speak the truth, while there is an enlightened government, both here and at home, able and willing to put down these acts of ruthless destruction.


The two works noted above deal with the same region, but are of very different pretensions and character. Dr. Bellew is an almost official writer, who has already related the adventures of two important Missions, has distinguished himself in the philology of Khursân and Mêrân, and been highly honoured by the Government he serves. It would be natural to expect from his powers, experience, and opportunities a work which should be a eade-mecum to future travellers and inquirers. The hope would be grievously disappointed by the volume before us. It contains no map (a sine quâ non of a good book of travels), though the author might surely have made use of the researches of his comrade, Captains Trotter and Biddulph and Colonel Gordon. It has no illustrations, though the Mission included draughtsmen and photographers; and it has no index. The book may, for the purpose of review, be divided into two parts,—the itinerary of the Mission, and the author's ethnological opinions and historical researches. The former may be briefly dismissed, as the most part of it furnishes but little information not already before the public, and Dr. Bellew himself appears to think that the interchange of the regulation civilities between Raja, Resident, and Envoy at Srînagar are quite as worthy of note as any other event of their travels. The other portion, however, requires some notice.

It is, in the first place, very hard upon the 19th century that its now declining days should be insulted with a rouchâfê of the wildest dreams of Tod and Wilford; with nonsense about the "pure Caucasian, the representative of the original Saka, Sui, or Sâce who were pushed up from the plains by kindred tribes of the Yuchi, Getse, Jatta, or Goth"! who, according to our author, "in the west transplanted to the soil of their adoption, as in Gothland, Jutland, England, Saxony, &c. [Saxony from Saka!] the names of their colonizing tribes; and in the south," to cut a long story short, christened Banâras Kâsî, after Kâshghâr, Herat after Yâr-kand, and Katak in Orissa after an elder sister in Turkestân! At least so Dr. Bellew ventures to conclude "from the similarity of the names, and the historical record of the emigration," a document about which he is provoking enough to give us no further information. His researches, however, into the history of the country in times rather more within the ken of modern man are apparently reliable, and would be useful if they were comfortably sorted out into an appendix. But they are, throughout the work, intermixed with the itinerary, as never were victuals in a pie; so that the bewildered reader emerges from the flockings and fightings of the children of Chinghiz Khân into the festive hall of the Maharâja of Kashmir, or the crowded camp of the Mission, whence, at the sight of some wayside monument, the doctor drags him off again into the civil troubles of the "Khitay" and "Mughol." It would perhaps be too much to ask for systematic orthography in such a work,—at any rate it would be fruitless, and it is something that Dr. Bellew no longer calls the race of the Prophet "Saggîda."

In wading through this confused medley of travel, history, and speculation we have been much assisted by Mr. Drew's work. It is, and pretends to be, no more than a useful manual of the dominions of the house of Jamî; but it has been very carefully and systematically compiled, has a good map and index, and a number of illustrations, some of which are beautiful, especially the pretty centre-piece on the cover (re-appearing in black and white on p. xiii.), and all clear. Some of the modest outlines of mountain scenery could, one would think, almost be used as maps; and the whole work is of a sort most valuable to the traveller and student.

W. F. S.
The subjoined three edicts form part of the splendid discoveries which General Cunningham has been making in Northern and Central India during the last years, and will shortly be published in facsimiles in the first volume of his Corpus Inscriptionum Indicarum. General Cunningham sent me last autumn plate XIV. of his work which contains them. With the help of a photograph also furnished by him I soon succeeded in deciphering the very simple Sahasrām edict. But the more important Rūpṇath inscription I was unable to make out completely until I received two rubbings, which General Cunningham was good enough to take at my request. On my communicating my final results he very generously gave me permission to publish the text with my translations, and thus enabled me to make these most important inscriptions at once generally accessible.

The great historical value of the new edicts lies herein:—

1stly—that they absolutely fix the length of time which elapsed between Buddha’s nirvāṇa and Asoka;

2ndly—that they prove the accuracy of the chronology of the southern Buddhists, as far as India is concerned;

3rdly—that their date, together with the information of the Greek historians, prove Buddha’s nirvāṇa to have taken place between the years 483-82 and 472-71 B.C.; and

4thly—that they indicate the direction in which future efforts to find the exact date of Buddha’s nirvāṇa ought to be made.

These assertions may appear bold and over-confident, as the inscriptions neither give the name of the king who caused them to be inscribed, nor show any of the common epithets of Buddha. But nevertheless I feel confident that a careful consideration of the contents of the edicts will cause their correctness to be admitted.

In the Sahasrām inscription a person who calls himself ‘the Beloved of the gods’ states that he was for a long time an upāsaka, or worshipper, without exerting himself much for his faith; that afterwards, in consequence of strenuous exertion during a year and more, he made the inhabitants of Jambudvipa, i.e. India, abjure the gods in whom they believed formerly. He then quotes a passage in favour of exertion from a ‘sermon,’ and adds that this sermon was delivered by the Vīṇvita, the Departed, two hundred and fifty-six (years) before, and that its substance has been incised on rocks and stone pillars. In the Rūpṇath edict ‘the Beloved of the gods’ enlarges the first two statements by adding that the time of his being an upāsaka included more than thirty-two years and a half; and that during the period of exertion, lasting upwards of a year, he was a member of the saṅgha, or of the community of ascetics. This last point is also preserved in the fragment of the Bairat inscription. In the date the Rūpṇath edict shows, besides, an important addition. It says, ‘256 (years) from the departure of the Satā, the Teacher.’

Now it is quite clear that the individual who calls himself ‘the Beloved of the gods’ must be a king. For, the fact that this epithet occurs before the names of the three kings Piyaśāsi Asoka, Daśaratha, and Tishya, and that in the Jangada separate edicts it is used by itself to denote the first ruler, proves that it was an ancient royal title corresponding nearly to the modern ‘by the grace of God,’ and the Roman Augustus, and was used in the third century before Christ. Secondly, the boast that the writer caused a change of religion throughout India,—the result not of his greatness, but of his zeal,—and that he caused the matter of the sermon to be incised on rocks and pillars, can only proceed from a great ruler, who held the whole or a great part of India in subjection. Both the title of the writer, and the alphabet which the edicts show, make it very probable that this king belongs to the third century before Christ, and to the Mañjarā dynasty. For it has hitherto not been proved that the title was used by later kings, or that the so-called Asoka or Lāṭ characters were adopted by any one but the Mañjaras, their subjects and contemporaries.

The next point to be determined is the faith to which the writer belonged. The statements that he destroyed the belief in the gods until then considered to be true, and that he was first an upāsaka or śrāvaka, and later a member of the saṅgha, show that he must have been either a Buddhism or a Jainism. Both these sects
apply the former two terms to their lay brethren, and the latter to the brotherhood of their ascetics. If thus the choice lies between the Jainas and Bauddhas, it cannot be doubtful that the latter are meant. For though the Jainas existed in the third century before Christ, and even occur in Piyadasi-Akoka’s inscriptions under their ancient name Nigātha, i.e. Nirgranthas, * no proof has hitherto been found for their own assertion that they were patronized by one of the Maurya kings; on the contrary, there is every reason for adhering to the generally received opinion that both Aoka and his grandson Daśaratha, and the other later Maurya princes, were Buddhists or patrons of Buddhism.

If the ‘Beloved of the gods’ was a Buddhist, it follows that the sermon which he quotes must be a Buddhist sermon, and the Viśuṭha of the Sahasrām edict, or Vṃuṭha of the Rūpṇāth edict, must be the Buddha himself. The word is not one of the common names of Śākyamuni, but its etymological import is such as to make it a fitting epithet for him. I take Viśuṭha for a representative of Sanskrit viśvītta, and of Pali vihutta or vihutto. As not one of these or of the formerly published inscriptions of Piyadasi shows double letters, but always substitutes single ones,† Viśuṭha is in reality equivalent to Viśuṭha, and is similar to the Pali vihutta only by the aspiration of the second t. This difference, however, does not matter much. For, firstly, there are other instances of irregular aspirates in the language of the edicts. Thus we have kicchī, ‘something’, for Sanskrit kinchit and Pali kicci.§ Secondy, the letter r causes in Pali sometimes the aspiration of a preceding t, e.g. in tattha = tatra, ‖ and it is therefore not astonishing that the vowel ri should have exercised the same influence in a cognate dialect.

But irrespective of these phonetic considerations the identity of viśuṭha with Sanskrit viśvītta becomes almost certain from the immediately following sentence of the Sahasrām edict, dwē saṃvāhādityatā viśuṭha,—

literally ‘two hundred (years) exceeded by fifty-six have elapsed.’ The sense of this passage, which is further confirmed by the phrase of the Khandagiri inscription (line 5) ‘tathā viśuṭha vasa, ‘then after a year had elapsed,’ makes it impossible to take Viśuṭha for anything else than viśvītta or rather viśvītta (nom. dual neuter). As these two examples, as well as the etymology, show, Viśuṭha, if applied to a person, means originally ‘the Departed,’ or ‘he who has passed away.’* Such a name fits Śākyamuni very well, as he is considered to be the first who passed away beyond the circle of births. The Rūpṇāth form viṃuṭha arose, in my opinion, from the substitution of n for s, and the consequent change of the i of the prefix vi to y in accordance with the laws of Sanskrit phonetics. Its linguistic thō has been caused by the lost ri, which in Pali too, as the form ratto shows, has the same effect.†

From the identification of the Viśuṭha, the preacher of the sermon, with Śākyamuni, it follows further that the era in which the inscriptions are dated is that of the Nirvāṇa. For, the ti, i.e. iti, which stands at the end of the sentence dwē saṃvāhādityatā viśuṭha iti, shows that it is governed by the preceding sentence, iyam sad vace viśuṭhena. Anybody who is acquainted with the use of the Sanskrit iti will see the truth of this remark, and will translate idam aśravanan viśvītta (kṛitam) dvīṣeṣaḥ adhikārata iti, by ‘this sermon was preached by the Departed two hundred and fifty-six years ago.’ The date of the Rūpṇāth inscription confirms the above explanation. It says, 256 sata-vīśvād iti (i.e. iti), lit. ‘256 from the departure of the Sata, thus.’ Here the word sata requires special notice. It may stand for Sanskrit sata, 100, or, as the inscription does not note double consonants for saptan, ‘seven,’ sāta, ‘able,’ sāpta, ‘cursed,’ or, as the inscription frequently leaves out the anuvātra, for sata, i.e. sat, pres. part. of as, ‘good,’ sāta, ‘quiescent,’ ērānta, ‘tired,’ or, finally, because the inscriptions do not always aspire t followed by r or preceded by s,§ for sātra, ‘praised,’ sāstra, a ‘weapon,’ śāstra,

* See Lassen, Ind. Ant. vol. II. p. 468, 2nd ed., and Delhi separate edict, l. 5.
† According to their accounts, Sāmpratī or Sampadi, the son of Kunala and grandchild of Aoka, covered the earth with Jania chaityas. See, e.g., Hemachandra, Parāśikā-pravarsa, Saraga X, XI.
‡ Compare, e.g., ‘diyāṭāpan,’ with Pali diyāṭāpan, tata with Pali tattha, etc., with Pali sūha, etc.
§ Compare also the irregular aspirates in Pali words, like kuntha, phalita, &c. enumerated by E. Kuhn, Beiträge zur Pali Grammatik, p. 46.
[June, 1877.]

[Compare Kuhn, loc. cit. p. 50.]

[Journal As. Soc. Beng. vol. VI. p. 1090.]

[Another possibility to explain Viśuṭha as a corruption of viśvītta, and to take this as a synonym of viśvītta, Pali viṭṭha, I reject on account of the two cases where it is construed with the word vasa, ‘a year.’]
institutes of science,' and śāstri, 'a teacher.' I select from these numerous possibilities the last explanation, because in Pali suttu = Sanskrit śāstri is a common designation of Śākyamuni. The translation of the date is therefore, "256 (years) since the departure of the Teacher (have elapsed)." The final ta, which I believe to represent ti, indicates here probably that the inscription is finished.

The result which has now been gained is that the inscriptions proceeded from a Mauryan king, or from a contemporary of the Mauryas, who was a Buddhist lay-brother during thirty-two years and a half, and a member of the saṅgha for upwards of a year, i.e. who was a Buddhist for more than thirty-three and a half, and that in the thirty-fourth year of his adherence to the Buddhist faith 256 years after the Nirvāṇa had elapsed, or in other words the 257th year after the Nirvāṇa corresponded to the second half of the 34th year after his conversion.

Now we know of no Indian princes who made any great efforts for Buddhism in the third century after the Nirvāṇa besides Aśoka and Dāsaratha, his grandson. But the latter cannot be the author of the inscriptions, as he reigned only seven years. There remains, therefore, nobody but Aśoka, whose reign lasted more than thirty-seven years. This inference is fully confirmed by the Mahāvaṃśa, which, provided a certain line of interpretation is adopted, gives the years of Aśoka's reign after his conversion as upwards of 34, and places his death in 257 Buddha.

The chronological dates regarding Aśoka which occur in the Ceylonese chronicle are as follows:

1. Interval between Bindusāra's death and Aśoka's abhisheka. . . . . (upwards of) 4 years.¶
2. Interval between Aśoka's abhisheka and his conversion to Buddhism. . . . . (upwards of) 3 years.⋆
3. Conversion of Tiṣṭhāya, the Uparāja . . . . in the 4th year of Aśoka's reign.+†
4. Ordination of Mahendra and Sanghamitra . . . . in the 6th year.‡

5. Death of the Sthaviras Tiṣṭhāya and Sumanas. . . . . in the 8th year.
6. The third Buddhist convocation . . . . in the 17th year.¶
7. Planting of the Bodhi-tree in Ceylon. . . . . in the 18th year.
8. Death of queen Asandhimitra . . . . 12th year after the last event.
9. Aśoka's marriage with her attendant. . . . . 4th year after the last event.
10. Destruction of the Bodhi-tree. . . . . 3rd year after the last event.
11. Death of Aśoka. . . . . 4th year after the last event.
12. Total of Aśoka's reign . . . . 37 years.||

There are two points connected with these dates which require consideration, viz. if the years of Aśoka mentioned under Nos. 3-7 are to be counted from the death of Bindusāra or from Aśoka's abhisheka, and, secondly, how the dates under 8-11 can be reconciled with the statement No. 12, that Aśoka ruled 37 years.

As regards the first question, the common custom of the Hindus to reckon the years of their kings from the date of their abhisheka, and not from their actual accession to the throne, is a strong argument for taking all the years mentioned under Nos. 3-7, as well as the total under No. 12, to refer to the period after Aśoka's abhisheka. This argument is further strengthened by the consideration that if the 4th year, in which Aśoka's brother Tiṣṭhāya entered the saṅgha, and the 6th year, in which his (Aśoka's) son Mahendra and his daughter Sanghamitra were ordained, had to be counted from Bindusāra's death, both these events would fall before Aśoka's conversion to Buddhism. For his conversion cannot have taken place earlier than the 8th year after Bindusāra's death. Now Indian princes were, and are, no doubt, great latitudinarians in religious matters, and it would not be extraordinary to find that the brother of a Brahmanical king had turned Buddhist with his sanction. But it seems extremely improbable that a Brahman should persuade, or even give permission to, a son and a daughter to become ascetics of another sect than his own. For this reason also I can come to no other conclusion.

Turnour translates catusahi vassēhi (V. 20) wrongly by 'in the fourth year'.
† Mahā, V. 163-172.—Turnour, p. 34.
‡ Mahā, V. 215.—Turnour, p. 37.
§ Mahā, V. 296.—Turnour, p. 42.
¶ For the last dates see Mahā, XX. 1-6.—Turnour, p. 122.

† Veda Children's Pali Dict. s.v.
but that the dates of Tishya’s and of Mahendra’s and Sanghamitra’s ordinations fall in the 4th and 6th years after Ashoka’s abhiseka, i.e. in the 1st and 3rd years after his conversion. If that is conceded in the case of these two events, it follows that all the other dates have to be taken in the same manner. The second question—i.e. how the dates given under 8-11 are to be reconciled with the statement under 12, that Ashoka reigned 37 years—has attracted the attention of Professor Lassen, who is of opinion that the Mahâvamśa contradicts itself. He maintains that as the death of Asandhimitra fell in the 12th year after the 18th year of Ashoka’s accession, the marriage of Ashoka in the 4th year after that event, the destruction of the Bodhi-tree in the 3rd year after the marriage, and the death of Ashoka in the 3rd year after the destruction of the Bodhi-tree, the total of Ashoka’s years ought to be 41, instead of 37. The Mahâvamśa certainly does express itself very loosely, but still its statements may be reconciled with each other. For it does not assert that the last four events took place at intervals of 12, 4, 3, and 4 years, but at intervals of

11 years + x months or days.
3 years + x
2 years + x
3 years + x

Nor does it say that the Bodhi-tree was sent to Ceylon 18 years after Ashoka’s abhiseka, but in the 18th year, i.e. after 17 years and x months or days had elapsed. If we now assume that the number of the months or days in excess of the full years elapsed on the occurrence of each of the last five events does amount to more than one entire year and to less than two entire years, and if we concede that, as Thurney and others have already conjectured, the total of Ashoka’s reign, 37 years, refers only to the number of completed years, and leaves out odd months and days, then the two statements will agree perfectly. In order to make my meaning plainer, I will, merely for argument’s sake, put down definite figures for the unknown number of months or days, and the agreement of the two statements will appear at once:

Yrs. m.

(8) Asandhimitra died in the 12th year after that .......................... 11 7
(9) Ashoka married her attendant in the 4th year after that ............... 3 3
(10) The Bodhi-tree was destroyed in the 3rd year after that .............. 2 4
(11) Ashoka died in the 4th year after that ........................................ 3 1

The total of Ashoka’s reign was then... 37 10 and that is just what the Mahâvamśa says, provided its total 37 is taken to refer to completed years only.

The figures assigned for the months are, as I have stated, entirely fictitious, and, as far as the statements of the Mahâvamśa are concerned, the surplus over 37 years may be just as well ten days as ten months. But it seems obvious to me that the above interpretation of the passage is more accurate, and more in accordance with the literal meaning of the text than that proposed by the Tilak, which declares it necessary to avoid counting the last year of each period twice.*

If we now turn to consider the adjustment of Buddha’s years and of Ashoka’s, we shall again find an element of uncertainty in the statement of the Mahâvamśa. But it will also appear that, under certain suppositions which the text by no means disallows, the statements of the Mahâvamśa and of those of the new inscriptions completely agree. The Mahâvamśa says, V. 21, that 218 years after the Nirvana had passed when Ashoka’s abhiseka took place. This obviously means, according to our manner of expressing ourselves, that the abhiseka was performed in 219 a.e. The text leaves it doubtful if the 218th year had only just closed, or if a number of months had elapsed since its completion. On this point, regarding which, I repeat it, no certainty can be gained from the Mahâvamśa, as well as on the other point, which according to the preceding discussion is equally uncertain, the amount of the excess over the total of 37 years, depends the determination of the year of the Nirvana in which Ashoka died. If at the time of the abhiseka 218 years of the Nirvana plus a few months, say two or three only, had elapsed, and if the excess of months over the total...
of 37 years of Aśoka's reign amounts likewise to a few months, say two or three only, then the death of Aśoka will fall in the year 256 of the Nīrāma. For 218 years and 2 months + 37 years and 2 months makes 255 years and 4 months. Under this supposition Aśoka died in the first half of the year 256 of the Nīrāma.

But if many months, say 10 or 11, of the 219th year of the Nīrāma had passed at the time of the abhibhēka, and if many months, say ten or eleven, have to be added to the total of the years of Aśoka's reign, then his death falls in the year 257 after the Nīrāma. For 218 years and 11 months + 37 years and 11 months makes 256 years and 10 months. It is also apparent that in order to bring about an agreement between the inscriptions and the Mahāvamsa this second interpretation has to be adopted. For only in case Aśoka died towards the end of 257 a.e. will it be possible to allow that he may have caused an inscription to be inscribed when 256 years after the departure of the Teacher had passed.

Now only one more point, the probable date of Aśoka's conversion, remains to be considered in order to complete the agreement between the inscriptions and the Mahāvamsa. The equation of the former is 33 years 6 months and 2 days = 256 a.e. + 2 months or days. The Mahāvamsa says, V. 34, "The father of Aśoka," being of the Brahmanical faith, used to feed (daily) sixty thousand Brahmans. He himself did so for three years." Now this may mean either that the interval between Aśoka's abhibhēka and his conversion was filled by three years exactly, or that some months and days have to be added. The equation in the new inscriptions makes it necessary to add at least eight months, because the middle of the thirty-fourth after the conversion could not fall under any other supposition in the 257th year after the Nīrāma. But if this addition is made, the dates of the inscription and of the Mahāvamsa agree perfectly. For then we obtain—

Aśoka's abhibhēka 218 years after the Nirāma and say 11 months, i.e., at the end of 219 a.e.

Aśoka's conversion 3 years after the abhibhēka and say 8 months, i.e., in the middle of 223 a.e.

Date of the inscriptions 33 years and 6 months and odd days after conversion, i.e., in the beginning of 257 a.e.

Death of Aśoka 37 years and say 10 months after abhibhēka, i.e., in the end of 257 a.e.

The agreement which has thus been shown to exist between the inscriptions and the Mahāvamsa is, in spite of the uncertainty introduced by the neglect of the odd months in the latter work, sufficiently close to prove that the Mahāvamsa's statements regarding the history of India and of the beginnings of Buddhism are more than fanciful inventions of the monastic mind. They must be regarded as genuine historical dates, derived from contemporary evidence.

The necessary consequence of this discovery is that all attempts to adjust the Ceylonese chronology to that of the Greeks by means of a reduction or of a lengthening of the distance between the Nīrāma and Aśoka have to be given up. Henceforth it must be accepted as a fact that the abhibhēka of Aśoka took place in 219 a.e., and that he was alive in the beginning of 257 a.e. If the identification of Aśoka's grandfather Chandragupta with the Sandrokyptos of the Greeks, and Aśoka's own relations to Antiochus, the Antiyoka or Antiyoga of the rock inscriptions, prove that the Ceylonese date of the Nīrāma 543 B.C. has been placed 60 to 70 years too early, the fault must lie either in the period after Aśoka, or in the adjustment of the dates of the Indian history and of the Ceylonese kings. It is possible that either some kings have been erroneously inserted after Dvārādhāpiya Tishya, the contemporary of Aśoka, or that the reigns of Tishya, as well as of his predecessor and successors, have been intentionally expanded. The latter alternative seems to me most likely, because, as Mr. Turnour+ and other Orientalists have shown, the dates of Pāṇḍu-kabhaya of Muṭaśiva and of his four sons, are extremely suspicious. It seems impossible that these kings, who represent three generations, should have reigned 200 years. This suspicion becomes stronger through other circumstances, especially through the fact that Vijaya's landing is made to fall on the day of the Nirāma. I am not prepared to risk any definite statement as to the manner in which the reigns of the Ceylonese kings ought to be reduced, or on the exact amount of the reduction, as I think it very likely that Dr. P. Goldschmidt's collection of Ceylonese inscriptions will completely clear

† Mahāv. Intro, p. 221.
up the question. For all practical purposes
the date for the Nīrāvā, 477-78 a.d., fixed by
Professor M. Müller, by General Cunningham,
and others, is perfectly sufficient. The new inscrip-
tions show that it cannot be very far wrong.
The two outside termini for the beginning of
C h a n d r a g u p t a’s reign are 321 b.c. on the
one side, and 310 b.c. on the other. For this
reason, and because the Ceylonese date for the
beginning of the Mauryas, 163 a.d., must now be
considered to be genuine, the Nīrāvā must fall
between 483-82 b.c. and 472-71 b.c. If, therefore,
the date 477-78 for the Nīrāvā should eventually
be proved to be wrong, the fault cannot be
more than five or six years on one way or the other.

Certainty regarding the date of the Nīrāvā,
as already stated, will probably be obtained
from the Ceylonese inscriptions. But there is
a chance that the same goal may be reached by a
different road. If a perfectly trustworthy ac-
count of the interval between Asoka’s death
and the beginning of the Vikrama or of the
Śaka eras could be obtained either from Indian
inscriptions or from books, then the question
would also be solved. I must add that an
account of this kind exists, though I should be
sorry to call it trustworthy on the evidence
hitherto adduced. The Śvetāmbara Jainas place
Mahāvīra’s nirvāṇa in 470† before the era of
Vikramaditya 56-7 b.c., and the beginning of the
Mauryas in 216 after Mahāvīra, or in 311
b.c. This date agrees well enough with the state-
ments of the Greeks, and I should be prepared
to adopt it if the manner in which the Śvetām-
baras arrived at it agreed with the Buddhist
chronology, and the age of the gāthā in which
it occurs were better authenticated. But the
Jaina account of the dynasties in the 6th and
5th centuries b.c. differs from those of the
Buddhhas and of the Brahmins. The gāthā
says that Mahāvīra died on the night in which
king Pālaka of Ujjain was installed
on the throne; that Pālaka ruled 60 years;
that, next, the Nandas held India for 155
years, and that the latter were succeeded by
the Mauryas. Thus the Śiṣunāgas are left out
altogether—a point which makes the dates
suspicious. Under these circumstances I give
the Jaina account merely as a curiosity, and in order
to warn against its being used, without further
inquiry, as a means to find the exact date of
Chandragupta’s accession and of the Nīrāvā.

The additions to the history of the last years
of Asoka which the new inscriptions furnish
are of great interest. We now hear for the first
time that Asoka’s zeal for the Buddhist faith
produced towards the end of his reign something very like bigotry. His boast that he caused
the people of Jambudīpa to abjure their an-
cient gods, which probably must be taken to
mean only that he did his best to bring about
such a result, stands in strange contrast to his
earlier toleration.§ The change finds its ex-
planation partly in the increasing age of the
monarch, and the domestic difficulties which,
both according to Buddhistic and Jaina ac-
counts, he had with the queen whom he married
after Asandhimitra’s death, and partly by his turning ascetic. This fact is likewise
new and of great interest, as Asoka, in spite
of his asceticism, apparently continued to govern
the country. It indicates that the Buddhists
allowed, just like the Jainas in exceptional
cases, an intermediate stage between the Śrā
kasas or lay brethren and the Bhikshus or monks.
The Gujarāt chroniclers assert that the Chau-
lukya king Kumārapāla, to whom they
even give the title saṅghādhipati, ‘lord of the
Saṅgha,’ took at various periods of his reign
vows of continence, of temperance, of abstention
from animal food, and of apratigraha, i.e. to re-
nounce the confiscation of the heirless property
of Vānās. I am not aware that other instances
of royal Bauddha ascetics occur who continued
to administer the affairs of their kingdoms.

There is yet another question for which the
new inscriptions are of the utmost importance,—
the history of the ancient Nāgari numerals.
Hitherto the oldest inscriptions showing them
were the Mathurā inscriptions of Kaniśhka,
The Śālavahana inscriptions on the Nāṅgahat,
and the inscriptions of the Andhrabhrityas.
It is satisfactory to find now that these num-
ernal signs are contemporaneous with the
numerous Gujaraticisms, show. The Śvetāmbara
date the era of Vikramaditya 56-7 b.c. when they say 470
before Vikrama. The Dogarbaras place Mahāvīra’s
nirvāṇa in 905 before Vikrama, and refer to the so-called
Śaka era.

Soc. vol. IX. p. 147. Kern in his Jaartekst, p. 39, gives
466 before Vikrama as the date of Mahāvīra’s nirvāṇa, on
the authority of Professor Weber’s extracts from the Śa-
ṭrasyāmāśādīśu. That work is a wretched forgery by
some one of the 13th or 14th century, as the chapter
on Kumārapāla of Ashvalayana, 1144-74 a.d., and the
numerous Gujaraticisms, show. The Śvetāmbara mean
the era of Vikramāditya 56-7 b.c. when they say 470
before Vikrama. The Dogarbaras place Mahāvīra’s
nirvāṇa in 905 before Vikrama, and refer to the so-called
Śaka era.

§ See Lassen, Ind. Alt. vol. II. p. 276, 2nd ed.
oldest known form of the Indian alphabet. But the form of the sign for 200 is still more important, as it furnishes the clearest proof for the correctness of Pandit Bhagvanâlal Indrajî's discovery of the syllabic origin of the Nâgârî numerals. The sign for 200 employed in the Sahasrá Edict is 女足, and, if the right-hand side-stroke denoting the second hundred is left out of consideration, closely resembles the sign for 100 in the Nânâghât inscriptions and the fifth Gupta sign. But in the Rûpânâ Edict the common sign for the syllable su श shows its stead, showing, however, an unusual elongation of the left-hand vertical stroke. It is obvious that the elongation of the vertical stroke serves to show the same purpose as the side-stroke in the Sahasrá Edict, i.e., to denote that 200, not 100, must be read. But the fact that the common sign for the syllable su श is employed, instead of the differentiated form used in the Sahasrá Edict, proves that the engraver knew it to be a syllable, and pronounced it as such.

I take this opportunity to give an attempt at an explanation of the very curious fact that in the syllabic notation of numerals 200 is expressed by the syllable su or su plus one stroke, and 300 by su or su plus two strokes, which latter are attached, according to the fancy of the writer, either at the right-hand side both high up and low down, or even placed at the top. This manner of notation is not easily explicable on the supposition that the side-strokes represent auka of figures. For in that case we ought to find two side-strokes for 200, and three for 300. I propose, therefore, to take them as marks intended to show that in the case of 200 the syllable su had to be pronounced long, su, and in the case of 300 pluta, i.e., su-ū. This explanation holds good for the Andhrâbhritya and Vâkastaka signs for 1,000, 2,000, and 3,000 also, which may be read dhü, dhâ, and dhâ-ū, respectively. It is confirmed by the fact that in the case of 400 the sign for the syllable expressing 4, khka or ki according to Bhagvanâlal, is attached to su. The Hindu grammarians allow syllables of three vâdâs only, and it was therefore impossible to employ an additional stroke in order to denote 400.

The sign in the two edicts for 50 also deserves attention. Rûpânâ shows the form used in the Kshatriya and VâBahî inscriptions, while Sahasrá gives that of the Eastern plates and of the MSS.

Inscription on a Rock at Sahasrá.

From General Cunningham's facsimile, revised according to photograph.

Transcript and Restoration of the Sahasrá Edict.*

Devânanâ piye hevâh शह सतीलकाँ अन्ति-

yâni savachhalâni, ami upâske sumi, na cha bāḍhaṁ palakaṁite.—1—
Savimchale saðhiko 1, ami ñ sumi bāḍhaṁ palakaṁ[ī]e[a].

L. 1. The facsimile and photograph show that seven or eight syllables have been lost. The restoration of the first six is absolutely certain on account of the identical readings of R. and S. [adhit]yâna is less certain. I take it for a representative of adhitidans, caused by the change of s to h and its subsequent loss, just as in Panâhî (h)th, thirty, and īkṣatī, thirty-one.
Etena cha antalena | jambudipaśi anamisaṁ
deva[h]suṁ, ta—2—
muniṣā | nisasmā deva kaṭa. | Paḷa[kamasi hi]
iyaṁ phale[n]o cha | iyaṁ mahatā-vachka-
kiy pāvatave. | Khudakena hi pala—3—
kamīnena vipule snag[e] | sa[kiye āḍañcha yita[v]e].
Se etaye athāya iyaṁ sāvane. | khudakā cha uḍalā cha pa—4—
lakamāna, niṣṭa pi chaṁ jānaṁtu; | chila-
thātike cha palakame hoto. | Iyaṁ cha athe
vadhisaṭi; | vipulaṁ pi cha vadhisati, —5—
diyādhyāya avaladhiyena diyaḍhyāya vadhisaṭi |
iyaṁ cha savane vuvuthena; | duve sapaṇ-
naḷati. —6—
Satā vivutha ti (saśa phra) 256. Ima cha athān
pavatesu likhāpaya thāya; | yata[v]a ā. —7—
Thi heti sīlāṁbhā bhata pi likhāpaya thān-
y. —8—

Translation.
The Beloved of the gods speaketh thus: (iś) [more than thirty-two] years [and a half] that I am a worshipper (of Buddha), and I have not exerted myself strenuously. (It is) a year and more [that I have exerted myself strenuously]. During this interval those gods that were (held to be) true gods in Jambudvipa have been made (to be regarded) men and false. Forthrough strenuous exertion comes this reward, and it ought not to be said to be an effect of (any) greatness. For even a small man who exerts himself can gain for himself great rewards in heaven. Just for this purpose a sermon has been preached: "Both small ones and great ones should exert themselves, and in the end they should also obtain (true) knowledge. And this spiritual good will increase; it will even increase exceedingly; it will increase one (size) and a half, at least one

L. 2. Read saṁvatsare. Six or seven letters have been lost. A and B. have two sentences, corresponding to this lacuna, containing sixteen letters. C. can have had one sentence only. The sense requires the sentence given above. Read saṁvatsare, according to B. Read devā-husaṁ, as A. has devā-husa and a verb is required. The vertical stroke in the facsimile is the left-hand part of the A. This emendation I owe to Paṇḍit Bhāvanālī Lande. Read for āsa, according to B.
L. 3. Read deIA. The praecan before the lacuna is probable from the photograph. The restoration is certain on account of the corresponding passage in K., which here, as everywhere, substitutes the root paktu for paktuṁ. The second and third lacunae have been filled in according to B.
L. 4. Restorations according to B. and C.—Read sācane.
L. 5. Read cha jānaṁtu.
L. 6. Read sācane; the facsimile has data, but according to the photograph duve, which the sense requires, is at least probable, if not certain.

Restoration suggested by the fact that two syllables have been lost, and a relative pronoun is desirable, though not absolutely necessary. The date was then read by General Cunningham before I received the inscription. But I rather think the marks in the impression are accidental scratches.

L. 1. Read saṁvatsare, the letter A looks blurring and is a mistake for ṇ. For paktu read ṇaṁ. There is a faint mark between a and ki which may be =, and a tukā is required as synonymous for upākā; when white is a possible reading, as the letters appear to be half effaced. The reading given above is supported by B.
L. 2. Under the ed of devā-husa there is a vertical stroke, resembling an ṇ. Probably it is intended to indicate the absorption of the initial n of kuṇa, and is the oldest form of the Aṅgika S. Read eva for ed. A letter may have stood between kuṇa and ki, but I cannot think of the marks in the impression are accidental scratches.

L. 5. Read paktuṁ, the long ṅ in paktu is not quite certain.
L. 5. Read lekhāpeta ṣaṁki i; tapaṭayi I for ṇ; but possibly the reading on the stone may be tapaṭayi; as the lower part of ed does not quite form a circle. Possibly paṭayen. The two last figures of the date had been read by General Cunningham before I received the inscription.
L. 6. Probably is for ā to be read.
have now been abjured. For through exertion (comes) this reward, and it cannot be obtained by greatness. For a small (man) who exerts himself somewhat can gain for himself great heavenly bliss. And for this purpose this sermon has been preached: “Both great ones and small ones should exert themselves, and should in the end gain (true) knowledge, and this manner (of acting) should be, what? Of long duration. For this spiritual good will grow the growth, and will grow exceedingly, at the least it will grow one (size) and a half.” And this matter has been caused to be written on the hills; (where) a stone pillar is, (there) it has been written on a stone pillar. And as often as (man brings) to this writing ripe thought, (so often) will he rejoice, (learning to) subdue his senses.§ This sermon has been preached by the Departed. 256 (years have elapsed) since the departure of the Teacher.

Transcript of the Bairat Edict.||

Devānām piye aha sātī[lekāṇi] .

§ The original has a double meaning. The other meaning is, “And as often as (a man seasons his) boiled rice with this condiment he will be satisfied, falling into a state of savasana, i.e. that state of intense satisfaction and repose in which he closes his eyes from pleasure, and suspends the activity of the senses generally.

Materials used: Cunningham’s Corp. Inschr., vol. I, plate XV; and a cloth copy made by Pandit Bhārgavālī Indrajit.

L. 1. Cloth copy; devānām. The remnants of three letters towards the end of the line are also from the latter.

L. 2. Corp. Inschr.: paka. Cloth copy shows lower part of m(a). Corp. Inschr.: bddhī. Cloth copy has remnants of these letters towards the end of the line.

L. 3. Corp. Inschr.: pāyaga aṣe and bddhī. In the cloth copy the top of aṣe is wanting.


Athaṃ, S. 7; athāya, S. 5, B. 4, atha; S. 5, R = Sansk.artha, Pali atha: compare Dhāuli IV, V, VII, etc. and pillar edicts.

Aha, R. 4 = Sansk. aṣṭi: compare Dhāuli IX, I, etc.

Aha, S. 7 = Sansk. antāti.

Aha, B. 5 = Sansk. ante.

Apāda dhiyend, R. 4 = Sansk. appārdhiyena.

Amaś, R. 2 = Sansk. amāśa.

Amaśā, B. 4 = amāśā + namu.

Amaśā, S. 3, mistake or vicarious form for amāśā = Sansk. amāśa: compare regarding nasalization, Kuhn, Beiträge Pali Gram. p. 33, and Dhāuli II. 3. Amaṇi = dīnī = yāni, etc.

Avahāra, S. 6 = Sansk. avārkhya.

Avadhāra, R. 6 = Pali ṣaṭho: see Childers’ Dict. s.v. For the change in the quantity of the initial d compare Kuhn, loc. cit. pp. 22-30, Dhāuli IX, 1, abhāsena = ṣaṭho, etc.

Ahuṣāna, ahuṣa: see hauṣa, hauṣa.

Avadhāra, R. 3, mistake for ṣaṭho = Sansk. ṣaṭha: compare Giṇṇār VI. 12.

Avaśa, S. 6 = Sansk. avādha.

Avaśa, B. 6 = see the preceding, and compare Dhāuli IX, 7, etc.

Aha, S. I, K. 1, B. 1 = Sansk. dha.

Ima, S. 7 = imāṇa = Sansk. imāṇa.

Imāṇa, R. 2 = Sansk. amāṇi: compare Giṇṇār III. 3.

L. 5. Corp. Inschr. begins the line kha ti, the cloth copy shows o clearly. Corp. Inschr.: sāpādāna. I think sāpādāna should be read, as the word forms a compound with vachakayā. Read [pala] jamanāmpāla, i.e. S. 6, avādha: see Childers’ Dict. s.v. For the change in the quantity of the initial d compare Kuhn, loc. cit. pp. 22-30, Dhāuli IX, 1, abhāsena = ṣaṭho, etc.

L. 7. Cloth copy omits an(a), shows half a ta instead of ni in chalaṅīṣa(ke), and omits tu in (w)puluṣa.

L. 8. Cloth copy: dvayaḥ, sāpādāna, and omits the numeral signs. I must confess that I doubt the correctness of the latter, on account of their position.

The references to the published edicts refer to Mr. Burgess’s Giṇṇār facsimiles, and to the plates of Cunningham’s Corp. Inschr. Ind. vol. I, which he has kindly forward to me.
Iya, R. 4 = iyam.
Iya, S. 3, 5, 6; R. 3 = Sansk. ayam and idam; compare Khālet XII. 13, iyam mule; Delhi III. 17, iyam kṣayta, &c.
Uddāda, S. 3, R. 3, B. 6 = Sansk. uddāda, Pali uddāda.
Upāsaka, S. 1, B. 2 = Sansk. upasakah, Pali upaisalak.
Etāy a, S. 4 = Sansk. etasma; compare Girnār III. 3, &c.
Etān, R. 5 = Sansk. etana.
Etāya, R. 3 = edake.
Etan, S. 2 = Sansk. etana.
Eso, R. 2, B. 4 = Sansk. esha, Pali eso; compare Dhauli sep. ed. I. 2, &c.
Eso, R. 2, probably a mistake for eso or see.
Eso, S. 5 = Sansk. eso, Pali eso, Māgadhi eso.
Kaf, S. 3, R. 2 = Sansk. kṛtā, Pali katā; compare Dhauli V. 3, &c.
Kaf, R. 3, 5 = Sansk. kriya (neuter); compare Dhauli V. 1, &c.
-Katu, in yava-katu, R. 5 = Sansk. kriyata and Pali khattuña.
Kapi, R. 2, 3 = Sansk., Pali, kṣaya,—possibly a mistake for kīpi.
Kālāya, R. 2 = kālāya with sense of kāle.
Kāti, R. 4 = Sansk. kānita, Pali kānī; rock educe usually kānī, but Khālṣiṇi, face XIII. 12 kāti.
Khada, S. 4, R. 3, B. 6 = Sansk. kehadṛakah, Pali khuddakak.
Khadan, S. 3, -konda, R. 2 = Sansk. kehadṛakaṇa.
Cho, S. 1, 2, 4, 5, 6, 7; R. 1, 2, 3, 4, 5; B. 3, 6 = Sansk. and Pali cha.
Chān, S. 5, mistake for cha.
Chā, B. 6, mistake for cha.
Chāra, R. 4 = Sansk. chāra, Pali chāra, chāra, chārata, chārītā, chārītika, Pali chārītikko.
Chārattika, S. 5; see the preceding; compare Dhauli V. 8, VI. 6.
Chārattik (ke), B. 7; see the preceding.
Chak, R. 1 = Sansk. tu; compare Dhauli VI. 7, sep. ed. I. 10.
Chakachāre, R. 1 = Sansk. cārttaka, possibly a mistake for cavana"; but compare kākhati = kākhati = Sansk. kākhati, in the pillar edicts.
Janamātu, B. 7; probably a mistake for jāṇamātu.
Janabūdāpāsī, R. 2, B. 4 = Sansk. jambutāpāsī, Pali jambudāpāsī.
Janabūdāpāsī, S. 2; see the preceding.
Ta, S. 2, mistake or vicarious form for te, which see.
Ta, R. 6, for ti = Sansk. tī.

Ta, S. 8 = Sansk. tatra, Pali tattha; compare Delhi sep. ed. 3, &c.
Ta, R. 5; probably a mistake for tapayati = Sansk. tārpayati, Pali tampati.
Tō, S. 7, R. 3, B. 6, 7 = Sansk. tō, Pali tō.
Te, R. 2 = Sansk., Pali to (nom. pl. m. of tād).
Thayi, S. 8, probably for athayi = Sansk. athadhaḥ (1st per. sing. aor. act. of aṭhā).
Thayi, S. 8, a variant of the preceding.
Dhāni, R. 2 = Sansk. idāni, Pali iñāni.
Dīyaḍhiya, S. 6, R. 4, B. 8 = Sansk. dīyaṛdham, Pali dīyaḍham; compare dīyaṛdha, Khālṣiṇi XIII. 35.
Dīyaḍhiya, S. 6; a vicarious form for the preceding.
Dva = Sansk. dve, Pali duce.
Devā, S. 3, R. 4, probably mistake for devā.
Devā, S. 3, R. 2 = Sansk. devāh.
Devāna, B. 1 = Sansk. devānām, Pali devānām.
Devānām, S. 1, R. 1, a mistake or variant for the preceding.
Na, S. 1 = Sansk., Pali, sa.
No, S. 1, 3, R. 1, 2, B. 2, 5 = Sansk., Pali, no; compare Dhauli V. 3, &c.
Paka, L. 5 = Sansk. pako, Pali pako.
Pakato, R. 1, 2 = Sansk. prakārāṇa, Pali pakanto, but without the meaning of pārkaranta.
Pakamāmātu, R. 3 = Sansk. prakārāṇa, Pali pakamantu.
-Paka māsi, R. 2 = Sansk. prakārama.
Pakāra, R. 3 = Sansk. prakāraḥ, Pali pakaro, but possibly a mistake for pakārae.
Papay or papayō, B. 3 = Sansk. prājyata.
-Papita, R. 1 (in saṅgha-pa) = Sansk. prājvata,
Parumāminend, R. 3, mistake for pakama-minend = Sansk. prakramāṇena.
Palakaṇṭha, S. 1, 2 = Sansk. prakārānta, Pali parakanta,
Palakamātu, B. 6, a variant of the following.
Palakamātu, S. 5 = Sansk. prakramānta, Pali parakkamanta; compare also Dhauli VI. 6, &c.
Palakamāminend, S. 3, 4 = Sansk. prakramāṇa; for the termination -mina compare sampatāpdayāminē, Dhauli sep. ed. I. 15.
Palakamāminend, S. 3, 4 = Sansk. prakramāṇa, Pali parakamāṇa; compare Dhauli VI. 7.
Parumāminend, B. 4, 5, a mistake for pakamāminend.
Pavatīṣu, R. 4, a variā lectio for the following.
Pavatesu, S. 7 = Sansk. pavatesu, Pali pabbatesu.
Pakād, R. 1, a mistake for kād.
Pāpotaev, R. 2 (in mahatādē) = Sansk. pāpotaevam, but formed from a new root, pāpo: compare Pali pappota, and pāppa, Delhi VI. 3.

Pāpotaev, S. 3 = Sansk. pāpotaevam: for the lengthening of the first syllable compare Pali ṗāppanam.

Pi, S. 5, 8, R. 3, B. 6 = Sansk. api, Pali pi.

Pīpu ṇe, R. 3, a mistake for pīpu ṇe.

Pī ṇe, S. 1, R. 1, B. 1 = Sansk. piṇa, Pali pīya.


Bādha, S. 1, B. 2, 3 = Sansk. bādhām: compare rock edicts VII, end.

Bādha, R. 1, R. 2, B. 1 = Sansk. bādhām: compare rock edicts VII, end.

Ma, S. 3 = Sansk. māyā: compare Daihali VI. 1, B. 2, ed. 3.

Mā na, R. 2 = māna = Sansk. mānāt.

Mahanā, S. 3, R. 2 = Sansk. mahānā, Pali mahānā.

Mahanā, S. 5 = Sansk. mahānā, compare Var. IV. 22.

Mīsā, S. 3 = Sansk. mīsām. For the meaning of mīsadā kri see Pet. Dict. s. v. mīsa.

Munī, S. 3 = Sansk. munīṣṭha: compare Daihali II. 3, etc.

Yā, R. 1, B. 2 = Sansk. yā, Pali ya.

Yavata, R. 5 = Sansk. yavatāvam, Pali yavatāvā.

Yi, R. 2 = Sansk. ya (nom. pl. m. of ya).

Lakṣāpata, R. 5, a mistake for lakṣāpata.

Lakṣāpata, S. 3 = Sansk. lakṣāpata, or lakṣāpata, -yaḥ = ya = compare Pali lakkhāpēti, and for the construction of thēd with the absolutive, Childers' Dict. s. v. līkṣāpā, līkṣāpā.

Lakṣāpata, R. 4 = Sansk. lakṣāpata: compare Daihali II. 3, loppabha and loppabha = Sansk. rōpidha.

Vādhi, R. 4 = vāddhām (acc. sing.), Pali rāddhām.

Vāchak, S. 5, -kya, S. 3 = Sansk. vāchakāva, enlarged by the suffix -kya (?).

Vadhāsi, S. 5, R. 4, B. 7, 8 = Pali vadhāsi: compare pillar edicts, e.g. Delhi I. 6, & c.

Vadhāsi, R. 4, a vicarious form for the preceding.

Vavajā, S. 5, Pali, vavajāna: see Childers' Dict. s. v. See also rock edicts III, end. As to i represented by a, see Kuhn, loc. cit. p. 24, and compare Khālāl XIII. 38, vavajāna = vavajāna.

Vavajā, R. 5, probably a mistake for thāджā ta = astadhī (sthitā) iḥi.

Vā (d) a, R. I = Sansk. varahdi.

Vā (d) a, S. 2 = Sansk. varahdi suṣum: compare above, nanā.

Vā, S. 7 = Sansk., Pali, ed.

Vāda, R. 4, possibly a mistake for vālā: but = Sansk. paratā : compare pillar edict pālān = pārātrikam.

Vālā, R. 4 = Sansk., Pali, vālām.

Vālā, S. 5, B. 8 = Sansk. vālām.

Vālā, S. 4, B. 6 = Sansk. vālāh: compare also vālā, and rock edicts VII.

Vārā, R. 5 (in savara) = Pali vārā.

Sansk. vārātha.

Vārā, R. 6 (in savara) = Sansk. vārātha.

Vārātha, S. 7 = Sansk. vārāthā, Pali part. of rāth, is sometimes vārāth: compare also Khālāl IV. 1. 5, Jour. Beng. Dr. R. As. Soc. vol. VI, p. 1050, tatho vārāthā.

Vārātha, S. 7 = Sansk. vārāthā, Pali part. of rāth, is sometimes vārāth: compare also Khālāl IV. 1. 5, Jour. Beng. Dr. R. As. Soc. vol. VI, p. 1050, tatho vārāthā.

Vārātha, S. 7 = Sansk. vārāthā, Pali part. of rāth, is sometimes vārāth: compare also Khālāl IV. 1. 5, Jour. Beng. Dr. R. As. Soc. vol. VI, p. 1050, tatho vārāthā.

Vārātha, S. 7 = Sansk. vārāthā, Pali part. of rāth, is sometimes vārāth: compare also Khālāl IV. 1. 5, Jour. Beng. Dr. R. As. Soc. vol. VI, p. 1050, tatho vārāthā.

Vārātha, S. 7 = Sansk. vārāthā, Pali part. of rāth, is sometimes vārāth: compare also Khālāl IV. 1. 5, Jour. Beng. Dr. R. As. Soc. vol. VI, p. 1050, tatho vārāthā.

Vārātha, S. 7 = Sansk. vārāthā, Pali part. of rāth, is sometimes vārāth: compare also Khālāl IV. 1. 5, Jour. Beng. Dr. R. As. Soc. vol. VI, p. 1050, tatho vārāthā.

Vārātha, S. 7 = Sansk. vārāthā, Pali part. of rāth, is sometimes vārāth: compare also Khālāl IV. 1. 5, Jour. Beng. Dr. R. As. Soc. vol. VI, p. 1050, tatho vārāthā.

Vārātha, S. 7 = Sansk. vārāthā, Pali part. of rāth, is sometimes vārāth: compare also Khālāl IV. 1. 5, Jour. Beng. Dr. R. As. Soc. vol. VI, p. 1050, tatho vārāthā.

Vārātha, S. 7 = Sansk. vārāthā, Pali part. of rāth, is sometimes vārāth: compare also Khālāl IV. 1. 5, Jour. Beng. Dr. R. As. Soc. vol. VI, p. 1050, tatho vārāthā.

Vārātha, S. 7 = Sansk. vārāthā, Pali part. of rāth, is sometimes vārāth: compare also Khālāl IV. 1. 5, Jour. Beng. Dr. R. As. Soc. vol. VI, p. 1050, tatho vārāthā.

Vārātha, S. 7 = Sansk. vārāthā, Pali part. of rāth, is sometimes vārāth: compare also Khālāl IV. 1. 5, Jour. Beng. Dr. R. As. Soc. vol. VI, p. 1050, tatho vārāthā.

Vārātha, S. 7 = Sansk. vārāthā, Pali part. of rāth, is sometimes vārāth: compare also Khālāl IV. 1. 5, Jour. Beng. Dr. R. As. Soc. vol. VI, p. 1050, tatho vārāthā.

Vārātha, S. 7 = Sansk. vārāthā, Pali part. of rāth, is sometimes vārāth: compare also Khālāl IV. 1. 5, Jour. Beng. Dr. R. As. Soc. vol. VI, p. 1050, tatho vārāthā.

Vārātha, S. 7 = Sansk. vārāthā, Pali part. of rāth, is sometimes vārāth: compare also Khālāl IV. 1. 5, Jour. Beng. Dr. R. As. Soc. vol. VI, p. 1050, tatho vārāthā.

Vārātha, S. 7 = Sansk. vārāthā, Pali part. of rāth, is sometimes vārāth: compare also Khālāl IV. 1. 5, Jour. Beng. Dr. R. As. Soc. vol. VI, p. 1050, tatho vārāthā.

Vārātha, S. 7 = Sansk. vārāthā, Pali part. of rāth, is sometimes vārāth: compare also Khālāl IV. 1. 5, Jour. Beng. Dr. R. As. Soc. vol. VI, p. 1050, tatho vārāthā.

Vārātha, S. 7 = Sansk. vārāthā, Pali part. of rāth, is sometimes vārāth: compare also Khālāl IV. 1. 5, Jour. Beng. Dr. R. As. Soc. vol. VI, p. 1050, tatho vārāthā.
BOOK NOTICE.

La Langue et la Littérature Hindoustani en 1876:
Revue annuelle. Par M. Garcia de Tassy, membre de l'institut, professeur à l'école spéciale des langues orientales vivantes, président de la société asiatique, &c.

So far as we are aware, there is no publication either in India or in Europe, from which the state of Hindustani literature may be so distinctly ascertained, year by year, as from the Revue of M. Garcia de Tassy, where not only the books, but all the newspapers and societies which spring into existence are registered in detail. The number of reprints, translations, and original works this year is as large as usual, if not larger; this holds good also of their contents,—religion, history, science, with fiction both in prose and poetry, the latter prevailing. Both natives and Europeans appear to have signaled themselves more than previously by their publications.

The Hindi Ramayana of Tulsiidas prepared by F. S. Growse—not a translation, nor even an imitation, of that of Valmiki, although dealing with the same subject—will no doubt be appreciated. Dr. Bähler has brought from Kashmir Chand's Fritviraj Rasu, which is important from a historical as well as a philological point of view, and ought to be published. As to the Adigrantha of the Sikhs, which Dr. E. Trump is engaged in translating, 300 pages of it, preceded by an introduction, have been printed. Mr. J. Beames has introduced to the notice of Europeans a new Hindu bard, giving a few pages of text and translations in the Journal of the Asiatic Society of Bengal (Part I, No. 3, 1875); but the whole work, in praise of Jagat Singh, who revolted against the Mogul emperor Shah Jahan, occupies a small 4to volume of 105 pages. The Yajur Veda in Sanskrit, with a commentary in Hindi, was published by Girirascal, Raja of Bansa, and printed in that town. It is curious to note that at present several Hindi works formerly edited in Persian characters are being printed in Devanagiri; of these are the translation of the "Thousand and One Nights," the Bakhshali, and the Tolakadnai.

Among larger works, such as the Mutzakab al-tarikhi, translated from Persian into Urdu, pp. 545; the Madan-al-hikmat, "Mine of wisdom," a treatise on medicine in Urdu and English, pp. 499; and among other books, treatises on astrology and talismans—the Sangraha Siromani, 596 pp., and the Indarjal, 304 pp.—would imply that superstitious practices are not expected to die out soon. And besides treatises on hygiene and physical geography produced after European models, some Hind and some Urdu versions of Bain's Mental Science, Fowler's Logic, Taylor's Ancient History, and Huxley's Physiology, are also announced. Lastly, the progress of Dr. S. W. Follen's large Urdu Dictionary, several fascicles of which have appeared, together with an improved edition of the first of them, is also encouraging; the learned author is uninterruptedly engaged in his colossal labour, and will in course of time, no doubt, bring it to a prosperous end.

Periodical literature appears also to be on the increase, especially as printed matter can be brought out very cheaply by lithography, and editors are not sanguine in their aspirations for subscribers; thus, for instance, the Panjabi says, concerning the journal published by the Anjuman of Kasur, in the Lahore zillah:—"The monthly journal published by the Anjuman has 325 subscribers, which number ought to satisfy us." The number of newspapers has increased since last year by more than 30; but, as is annually the case, many of them will soon again disappear and make way for others. A long time is required for a journal to take firm root; those who demand quick returns, and are not prepared to make any sacrifices, must quickly retire from the arena.

The Revue terminates, as usual, with a necrology. The first place is assigned to Dr. Wilson, and is followed by a notice of Dr. M. Haug.—During the same year with Drs. Wilson and Haug, also Riddha Kishon or Rao Kishon, a former tutor of the Maharaja Dhulip Singh, died; he was a good Sanskrit scholar—and one of the most fertile of Hindustani poets.—Edward Thornton died on the 24th December 1875, at the age of 77 years. He was for several years the editor of Allen's Indian Mail, and is well known by his History of the Oriental Empire of India, as well as by his Gazetteers of Sind and of India. During the
same year also Francis Johnson, the author of the most extensive Persian dictionary, expired. He occupied during 31 years the chair of Sanskrit, Telugu, and Bengali at Haileybury, where he had been installed at the age of 54, and remained till 1855, when he was succeeded by Mr. Monier Williams, now Professor of Sanskrit at Oxford. He was endowed with a prodigious memory and great talents for languages. His two editions of the Hitopadesa, with text, translation, and vocabulary, his select pieces from the Mahabharata, his editions of the Meghaduta and of the Gulistan, are valued by students of Sanskrit or Persian. On the 4th January 1876 M. Jules Mohl, President of the Asiatic Society of Paris, editor and translator of the Shahnameh, died. On the 25th July 1876 Robert Childers expired, at the age of 33. On the 10th August of the same year Edward William Lane died, at the age of 75 years. He is well known as the author of the Manners and Customs of the Modern Egyptians, and the translator of the Thousand and One Nights with extremely valuable notes; but his chief work—over which he died—was his Arabic and English Lexicon, a treasure of vast erudition, of which five volumes are already published, and the sixth is in the press, while the seventh and eighth will be edited from the manuscripts left by the author.—E.R.

ON THE KRISHNAJANMASHTAMI, OR KRISHNA'S BIRTH-FESTIVAL.

BY PROF. A. WEBER, BERLIN.

Read in the Royal Academy of Sciences, Berlin, 17th June 1867.*

(Translated from the German by E. Reibitzky.)

Since I communicated to the meeting of philologists at Erlangen (1851) "some data relating to Krishna's birth-festival,"† a very rich mine of new materials on this subject has become accessible to me, to arrange and utilize which the time has perhaps arrived.

In the first place these sources are themselves to be indicated, and the manner in which the subject is treated in them is to be discussed (§ 1), whereby particular aspects of it will be at once specially illustrated, so that only a brief retrospect will afterwards suffice. To the elucidation of the ritual of the festival itself (§ 2) an investigation concerning the origin of the festival (§ 3), or rather of Krishna-worship in general, as well as on the pictorial representations connected therewith, will then be added (§ 4).

§ 1. The Sources.

In order to obtain a chronological standpoint, I adduce, in their first instance, in their proper order, the texts referable to fixed authors, or rather those the period of whose compositions in any way be fixed, and only afterwards deal with the works not allowing of being ascribed to a fixed author. For though the works belonging to this latter class are just those quoted in the texts to be first treated of, they are still, at present, with the exception of the passages actually quoted from them, devoid of definite chronological value. Their higher antiquity in general is no voucher that in single instances considerable additions or other alterations have not crept into the texts, especially in those sections which cannot yet be pointed out in their acknowledged texts, and appear merely as pieces detached from them, though with a claim to belong to them.

Accordingly the oldest chronologically fixed text making mention of the festival is the Vratashtaka of Hemadri,† written perhaps at the end of the thirteenth century, and representing the various festival-days of the Brahmanic ritual according to the order of the lunar

---

* As the printing of the page could only be begun after a considerable time, it became possible to utilize, or rather to interweave, several communications or publications of later date.—Thus, e.g. the number of the Athenaeum of 10th Aug. 1867, mentioned in the beginning of § 3, and others.


‡ Conf. Wilson's Mackenzie Coll. vol. I, pp. 32; Burnouf, Bkg. Pér. tom. I, pp. xxvi-xxvii; my Catalogue of the Berlin Sanskrit MSS., p. 332-343; A. Reibitzky, Catalogue, p. 377. There are several Hemadris. The patron of Vopadaeva bearing this name was minister to king Rama Chandra of Devariga. But a commentator on Vopadaeva at the court of a king Rama Raja was also called Hemadri (A. Reibitzky, Catalogue, p. 334). Our Hemadri, son of Chaudara, styles himself minister (suraundersvara, skt. kashyapa) of a king Mahadeva, by whose command he composed the Chaturvarshikasti- mant, the first part of which is the Vratashtaka. I determine his age from the circumstance of his being quoted several times by Madava in the Kalingasarga. Rakhuandana also mentions him in the beginning of his Tithi-tattvam before the latter.) One of our MSS. of the second section of the Chaturvarshikasti-bana, the Daksahana, is dated seventh 1453 A.D. 1379. (Conf. the first leaf of this facsimile added to the Cat. of the Berlin Sansk. MSS.) Besides the Chintasam, king Mahadeva caused also the Kama-kshema and the Kalpadruma to be prepared (see v. 12 of the Intro. to the Vratashtaka and to the Daksahana).

By this both the works of Vopadaeva bearing these names can scarcely be mean, as the other data do not agree.
of the festival is the Kālanirṇaya of Madhavāchārya (M.), minister of king Vukapā, of the second half of the fourteenth century. Here the festival is explained in vv. 65-75 of the introductory kārikā, or rather in the fourth section of the work itself, with very great detail — however, in harmony with the character of the whole work, not according to its ritual, but according to its calendar relation, yet with the insertion of numerous quotations from earlier works. The author begins with statements from the Purāṇas which concern the high significance and the all-sin-expiating force of the Jamādhāna festival; partly they threaten with severe punishments those who neglect it or the obligatory fast enjoined therewith — thus three passages from a Śāńhitā, the Bhaṭaviṣayatpurāṇa, and

§ On account of the quotations to be made hereafter, I insert the following abbreviations by which I designate the several texts of the Bhaviṣyā, or rather the Bhaviṣyottara Purāṇa —

O. = Balam fittings 124 (O1) and 126 (O2)
Sa. = Sañhitās, the three texts of this class which are at my disposal in Śāñhakā’s Vṛataśāstra (all three also in Viśvānātha’s Vṛatarasayisūrya, etc. 1-3)
B. = Bhalja’s tabular arrangement
C. = Chambers 724 (Ca = fol. 13-34)
D. = Chambers 816
Also the other abbreviations may be here inserted in one view, because they will also be often used —

M. = Madhava (Kālanirṇaya)
A. = Alaviśasākāra (Nirāyasağha ṇālīītā)
R. = Raghunandana (Jananandamālāstava).
N. = Nalakaṅgha (Samayasyaṅkha)
S. = Śāñhakā (Vṛataśāstra; three Bhaviṣyā texts of which are Sa., Blh., etc.)
K. = Kamalākara (Nirāyasaṅkha)
Bh. = Bhumiśvānavārā (Śāñhitās, Śāñhakā, Vṛataśāstra)
V. = Viśvānāthā (Vṛataśāstra; three Bhaviṣyā texts of which are Sa., etc.
Mā. = Mākrikā (J. = fol. 27a-29b)
U. = Janandakāla, etc., tabular arrangement
Kā. = Kālanirṇaya (Bhalja’s tabular arrangement)
Śā. = Bhalja’s Adhikāra (Śāñhitās, Vṛataśāstra)
V. = Chambers 640
R. = Bhalja, Fr. 85 especially refer to Śāñhakā as their source.

According to Lassen, Ind. Alt. IV, p. 168 (97), this prince of Viṣṇu, who reigned from about 1305-1370, Mādhava, in the introduction to the Kālanirṇaya, mentions that, after completing his commentary on the Dharmanātha Parāśāstra (see Aufrecht, Catalogus, p. 361), he began to compose this work, the Kālanirṇaya. From the introductions to the commentaries on various Veda writings ascribed to him and to his brother Śāñhakā, their later composition, or rather the following order of them, further appears — the first place is occupied by the explanation of the two Mādhas, Praveṣātmanāsādha (conf. v. 9 of the Intro. to the Jāmaśāmyamādha, and the visitors thereto, pp. 13, 15, ed. Goldthorpe), then follows the commentary on the Viṣṇu, on the Rājaveda, on the Rājāvata, on the Śāñhitā, on the Sāмāyika, on the Śāñhitā, on the Śāñhitā, on the Śāndikī. As in the beginning of all these works, or rather commentaries, King Bhukra (or rather Bhukra) is mentioned as the author, he must probably have reigned more than five years! At the conclusion of the introduction to the commentaries on the first part of the Śāñhitās, Mādhava calls himself the son of Śāñhakā (poṣṭakāṅkha Mādhasena Śāñhitāsamudāya, Berl. MS. Orient. fol. No. 432), whilst elsewhere, as in the introduction to the commentary on the Parāśāstra (Aufrecht, loco citato), and in other places his father is called Māyanā (a colonia of 24 learned Brāhmans who cooperated in the composition of the works bearing the name of Mādhava, see also in the Münchener Gel. An., 1853, p. 404, or rather the inscription communicated by Major Jacob in the Journ. Br. R. Ass. Soc. vol. IV, p. 116. As, moreover, this inscription states concerning him that, while temporarily entrusted with the government of the central and southern district of Jayantī, he had conquered Gana (now Goa), the capital of the Konkana, where he issued the still existing grant of 25 estates situated in the district of Kuchen (now Kochi), and which were henceforth to be called ‘Mādhava-town,’ as monument of his conquest in the 1313th Śaka year (a.d. 1391, just 107 years before Vasco da Gama’s arrival), the question is not out of place whether an acquaintance with Syrian Christians, who were so numerous in that very district, has not exerted some influence on the special emphasis imparted by him to the Krīsṇa-vināśaḥ-bhūtaṇda. There was, according to all appearances, just in this southern part of India, where at that time also the Jaina exerted considerable influence, a particularly favourable soil for a certain syncretism of religious systems at that period; as appears, among other circumstances, also from that commingling of the Viṣṇu-cultus with Siva-worship as manifested in the name Harihara borne by a brother and a nephew of king Bhukra: conf. Lasses, Ind. Alt. IV, pp. 171, 172. This may have been in a measure commendable simply on patriotic and political grounds, as in opposition to the invasion of Moors, against whom these princes had to contend. — According to Mādhava’s commentary (Introduction to the Kālanirṇaya, Cal. 1866, p. 205), Mādhava composed the Sāmāyika-bhūtāṃśa a.d. 1335; it is unknown to me on what this statement rests. Conf. also Cobet, Misc. Rerum excol. I. p. 301; Columbus, De verbo Mādaki, p. 19. — Germann, in his edition of Ziegenbalg’s Genealogie der Malabar. Götter (p. 118), has confounded our Mādhava with an older namesake (born Saka 1121 a.d. 1599), who appears as a very early promoter of Krīsṇa-worship but whose real name is Ānandatīrtha. See, op. the latter, Wilson’s Select Works, vol. I. pp. 139-141 (ed. Root, where among other things, curiously enough, also a Bṛhadāṣṭaka is added); Burnouf, Bṛhadāṣṭaka, vol. I. pp. 117-139; Finalled, Deb. Geometricus Index of the Ind. Philos. Systems, pp. 94-95.

[Compare at present Burnell, Paṇini Brāhmāṇa, Pref. pp. vii-xiv. A. W.]
the Skandapurāṇa; and on the other hand they promise very special rewards for the fulfillment of a peculiarly meritorious form thereof, which is called Jayanti. Wherefore, namely, the solemn festival, i.e. the eighth day of the dark half of the last quarter of the month Śrāvana (July–August) is connected with the star Ṛohini, Aldebaran]—thus five passages from the Viṣṇudharmottara, Vaiśṇav-ptra, Pādaṃśupāṇa (fol. 73b), Skandaśupāṇa, and Bhavishyottarapurāṇa. Afterwards he quotes for the Jayanti a variety of different passages from the Purāṇas and similar works, with detailed information on its special relations: thus from the Viṣṇudharmottara, the Sanatkumārasaṃhitā (fol. 79a), the Śkaṇḍa: for some do not celebrate it in Śrāvana (nabhas, July–August) but in Pauṣāṇapada (nabhasya, Bhādra-pada, August–September), those, namely, who end the month with the full moon, or rather cause it to begin with the dark half, with whom, accordingly, the dark half following the full moon of Śrāvana no longer belongs to Śrāvana, but to Pauṣāṇapada; for this there are also two passages, from the Viṣṇu-purāṇa and from the Vaiśnava-saṃhitā. With this is connected a detailed explanation of the question (fol. 79a–82b) whether, considering the higher position, or, rather, larger effectiveness and bearing of the Jayantīvata, the same ought not to be entirely separated from the Kṛishṇajanmāśṭamīvātra, in favour of which latter doctrine the author finally decides, with a display of much mindāśī learning, on five different grounds, namely: nāma-bhāttā, nimitta-bhāttā, rūpabhāttā, sūdhāmśī-śvetabhāttā, nīrdeśabhāttā cha. Here his statement based on the third ground, rūpabhāta (fol. 80a), is of particular interest, namely, that the essence of the Jāmāśṭamī celebration consists only in the fast (upāsvaṁśuṁnaṁ tasya saṁśaya) enjoined for it; whereas in the Jayanti celebration, the erection of a shed, watching
through the night, distribution of images, etc. (nāḍapāramāṇa-jagārana-pratimānādānā) take place; he adduces for this (fol. 81a) several quotations from the works quoted before, with the exception of the Naradāyasaṅghitā, which after all are not very much to his purpose.*

Then on the fourth ground, according to which at the simple Jāmāṭhāmaitrī celebration only punishments for its neglect are threatened, whilst at the Jayanta special promises of rewards are also proffered for the celebration of it, the author, curiously enough, adduces no statements of the latter kind (conf., e.g., above, p. 169), but only threats of punishments in case of non-celebration,† particularly from the Skandapurāṇa (fol. 81a).

Lastly, the fifth ground is that in Bhūjā the Jāmāṭhāmaitrī is mentioned together with the Jayanta, and therefore directly separated from it.‡

On this the author (fol. 83a) determines the season of the festival more closely, and places it, or rather its determinative, the meeting (yoga) of the black eighth (either in Śravaṇa or Bhādra) with Rohini, on the ground of corresponding statements in the Vasishṭhaśaṅghitā in the Viśvānuḥsaṅgha, Ādiyapurāṇa, Vardhaṇaśaṅghitā, Viśvānuḥkarmottara (fol. 83b), Yogāstāvatāra at midnight (ardharatrāśa mukhyakālāvatāma) and, in order to be quite accurate, at one kāla (1 of a ghaṭikā = 8 seconds) before and after it; or also, as it is difficult to conceive so short an interval of time (kalāṇā tiṣṭhakārmatena darlaksyate) at a whole ghaṭikā (24 minutes) before, and a half of the same after midnight; on the authority of

might otherwise be probable, is really meant (see a cognate text below, p. 166 in Al.).

[Vasishṭhaśaṅghitāyam (Vasishṭha, B. N.); abhuma rohinyaṁ niṣyārthayato (also N.K., niṣārthā, B.) diriya yad mukhyakālā ca khyāta (thus also K., kālaṁ a viṣṇuyam, R.), tatra jāto naḥmav svgāyam iti]


[Ādiṣṭhāpana (Ādiṣṭhāpī) A. R.; Āsaṉī maṇḍapī K. according to Hombūrī, under addition, namely of yuganitānta of the following hemistich: rōhiniśaṁyudopāyaya sarvāyugāhavāyinī (mahā)]

ardhātrād adhā nāḍhaṁ kalāyāḥ pi (ṛ. k.) pi yadvat yad yathā vyayati (yad yathā vyayati, R. K.)

[Vasishṭhaśaṅghitāyam]: niśyārtho rohīnīyāṁ naḥ kālaṁ (nārāī, K.); krīṣṇaśaṅkalaḥ yathā (yathā) aśravaḥ pāraśpatārgya kalāyāḥ pi (ṛ. k.)

[Vāṃśīṣhāṣṭikāyam]: yathā yathā viṣṇuvatā vartate iti sīrāgā sākṣatā bāhūḥ yathūḥ bāhūḥ, Cānd.: kalā yathā prāmāṇyāḥ pārśvāyugāyena uttarāśādāna cha vartanā kālina yathāvya]

[Vāṃśīṣhāṣṭikāyam]: rohīnīśaṁyudopāyaya sarvāyugāhavāyinī (mahā)

ardhātrād adhā nāḍhaṁ kalāyāḥ pi (ṛ. k.) pi yadvat yad yathā vyayati (yad yathā vyayati, R. K.)

[Tīrthānta Jāmāṭhāmaitrī nāḍhaṁ kalāyāḥ pi yadvat yathā vyayati (yad yathā vyayati, R. K.)

[This passage is quoted in Al. under Jāmāṭhāmaitrī as occurring in the Ādīṣṭhāpī (see above); it is, however, on the other hand, by B. N. 276, as hero, referred back to the Viśvānuḥkarmottara, by R. also more particularly to the Bhavishyasūryapuṇḍara and Vāṃśīṣhāṣṭikāyam, both of which, however, read the second hemistich of the first verse (conf. supra, the quotation from the Ādiṣṭhāpī and the following one from Vāṃśīṣhāṣṭikāyam) ardharatrād adhā (as Ādiṣṭhāpī; R. 26) cites these verses from the Skandha).]

Yogāsṛavā (whereby usually Yajñavalkya is meant, which, however, does not suit here): rohiniśaṁ yathā kalāyāṁ naḥ ca śravaṇaḥ adhā (as Ādiṣṭhāpī; R. 26) cites these verses from the Skandha).

[Śatā (i.e. Yogāsṛava) padeḥ kārṣṇaṁ aha: ardharatrād adhā nāḍhaṁ kalāyāḥ pi yadvat yathā vyayati (yad yathā vyayati, R. K.)

[Tīrthānta Jāmāṭhāmaitrī nāḍhaṁ kalāyāḥ pi yadvat yathā vyayati (yad yathā vyayati, R. K.)

[This passage is quoted in Al. under Jāmāṭhāmaitrī as occurring in the Ādīṣṭhāpī (see above); it is, however, on the other hand, by B. N. 276, as hero, referred back to the Viśvānuḥkarmottara, by R. also more particularly to the Bhavishyasūryapuṇḍara and Vāṃśīṣhāṣṭikāyam, both of which, however, read the second hemistich of the first verse (conf. supra, the quotation from the Ādiṣṭhāpī and the following one from Vāṃśīṣhāṣṭikāyam) ardharatrād adhā (as Ādiṣṭhāpī; R. 26) cites these verses from the Skandha).]
the Jayanti form (fol. 84b), because the star Rohini belongs to those (see Ind. Stud. X. 306) the connection whereof with the moon lasts throughout 1 Nyathāyam. The principal question after all is, How in all these cases is the fast to be placed?

As a closer discussion of these specialties will mean for us too far, I shall content myself with the subjoined quotations from the Vishnuhādaya (fol. 83b), Adityapurāṇa (fol. 85b), Viṣṇudharma, Gṛda-Padma-Brahma-vainara (fol. 86a) and Skanda-Purāṇa.

After further briefly elucidating a special brightening of the sacredness of the Jayanti celebration by quotations from the Padma (fol. 86b) and Skanda-Purāṇa, as well as from the Viṣṇudharmottara, this viz. in the case when it falls on a Monday (svanavāsā) or Wednesday (svanadāra), the author turns in conclusion to the pāraya, i.e. to the infringement of the fast enjoined by the festival on the day.

The examination of the Viṣṇudharmottara, as it is one of the older dharmākāra texts, would here be of special importance (conf. particularly also Bühler's remark in the Z. der D. M. G. XXI. 321) but according to R it is to be read Viṣṇudharmottara, whereby the quotation considerably loses in interest, as the aforesaid part of the Viṣṇudharmottara is evidently of a much later date than the Viṣṇudharmottara itself.

Brāhmaṇavāsa:—vajanyā pratyayataṃ saṃkarṣasanaḥ saṃkarṣastāḥ sangamāṃkṣatāḥ (All. K.) pratyayataṃ karṣṣatāḥ (All. K.); avākṣati bhūtāyaḥ sā rājaḥ, yānā nāma Dvakṣāṃkṣatāḥ.


Sandhyāvadāna (so also N. 236, K.; Padma-Purāṇa All. K.): udāya cha ahaṃkṣatāḥ saṃjñānaḥ saṃjñānaḥ bhūtāyaḥ (All. K.; Padma-Purāṇa All. K.) pratyayataṃ karṣṣatāḥ (All. K.); avākṣati bhūtāyaḥ sā rājaḥ, yānā nāma Dvakṣāṃkṣatāḥ.

We have already above (p. 165) the quotation from the Padmapuruṣottama (priyāyati); but here yet a fourth hemistic is added (...veṣṭikāh) — pinum navamuktih kula-koṣaḥ tumuktibhiḥ.
following (pāramana). The general rule is that the pāramana falls in the forenoon; consequently, as breakfast is here subjected to exception, it is strictly incumbent that it should not take place as long as there is a remnant of the eighth (i.e. of the titthi) or of the star (bha, namely, rohini) (fol. 87a), but this again with the further observation that the pāramana is not allowed to take place in the night, but restricted to the day-time, so that in case either the titthi or the nakshatram should extend into the night, the pāramana is, without reference to it,† to commence before, or at the termination of the festival (utsavāvante) itself.§

The third work among those approximately fixed in chronological order is the sort of calendar handbook Nīrṇayānirita (see Vorz. d. Berl. Sans. H. S. pp. 381-2, Chambers 560 (fol. 31b-34a)), which was composed by order of a Sūryasena by Allādānātha (= AL), probably in the fifteenth century, as it is quoted by R. (e.g. vol. I. pp. 32-33 in the latter passage even before Madhava, immediately after Homādri). The representation of the Janmāśātami there-in (in śravaṇa) begins with numerous quotations, containing threats of penalties for those who eat on the birthday of Kṛṣṇa, and similarly disproportionate promises of rewards for those who observe the fast.‖ A representation of 18 different ways, in which the festival day in its simple and in its Jayanti form may be related to the preceding and following date (the seventh and the ninth) as śuddhā, viśuddh (see p. 165, n. ‡), &c., is appended to this, as well as statements concerning the correct termination of the pāramana: both with the production of all kinds of quotations, and in general in concert with what has been added above from Mādhava. Among others, a quotation from the Mārkaṇḍeya is new:—

pradānapāyena samyuktā kriṣṇa navāhānā cha ।
Jayantiūnā naśa proktā hāya upasyaḥ
dhāpaḥāta ।

as well with regard to this context of the words (though the first hemistich with the variant "patarkhāpa" occurs, according to M. — see above, pp. 163, 165 — also in the Vishnuharmottara, and together with pāda 4, also in the Vishnuharaśya); as in its being attributed to the Mārkaṇḍeya, whereby no doubt the Mārkaṇḍeya Purāṇa is meant (but I have not found there any passage of the sort).

By tad uktam, among others, also the following new quotations are introduced:—

rohini samyutā chayāya viklāubhiḥ samuṣṭiḥ ।
vīyoge pāramanā kuryur munaḥ brahma-viśuddhaḥ iti ।

and (conf. herewith the verse from Bṛigu in M. above, p. 164)—

Kriṣṇaḥaṣṭami Skandaśaśeṣhī Śivādītiḥ(6) Chaturdāśi etāṁ pāravayāḥ kāryāśī tithyante
dhāpaḥ bhaved iti ।

and by Nīgama ‘pi:

pāravāyād vittikāḥ tūṇaḥ cha iṣṭaṇānaḥ
dhāpaḥ bhaved iti ।

No mention whatever is made of the ritual part of the festival.

As the fourth among those fixed approximately in chronological order, the Janmāśātami—

† The beginning of a titthi in the night is considered as evil import (tāmās, doomed to darkness), that in the day as favorable (tājas, light):—tithā cha Brahmaśaṭa-varte (fol. 87b): sayurvṛṣa evopavāke śvā divā pāramanā

||

§ For this calendar-like representation of Mādhava's, conf. also Wilson's (in his Ps. Works (ed. Ross), I. 23-129; III. 70 (from the Padmanārada), 129 (from the Brahmansāstraṭaparīṇa).
tattvam of Raghunandana (=-R.) may follow, whom Bühlcr, in his Introd. to the Digest of Hindu Law, p. x., lately edited at Bombay by him and R. West, assigns to "the beginning of the sixteenth century."* This tattva is considered to be the eighth section of a large work printed at Serampore in 1834, in 2 vols., under the title of Institutes of the Hindu Religion, though it is only a separate portion of the seventh section of the tilhitisra (see vol. I. pp. 25-34). According to the plan of the whole, the festival is here also treated chiefly from its place in the calendar, yet the ritual also is specially elucidated in the beginning. The discussion begins with two verses from the Brāhma and the Viśnua Purāṇa, relating to the double month-date of the festival.* By means of the passage from the Vardhasamājī (see above, p. 166), which claims the name Jayanti specially for the so-called variety of the festival here discussed, R. then rejects the opinion broached in the Devaspurnya of Vāchaspāti Miśra—conf. fol. 50a of the Oxford MS. in Aufrecht's Catal. p. 2735, according to which this name would belong to each second quarter of one of the twelve months in the case of its conjunction with Rohiṇī. Then follow some verses, to glorify the miraculous power of the festival, from the Brāhmaśaivarta Purāṇa.† According to the Gārdh Purāṇa midnight is the correct time for the worship (pājā) to be paid to the god, the ritual of which is then described in a collection of passages from the Bhaviṣya and from the Bhaviṣyottara Purāṇa, which, however, the author has not taken directly from these texts themselves, but from other works, and partly from one which is called Sauatrara-pradipī (the author of which is by Aufrecht, p. 326, designated as a prāchāguru). This pājī is said to be only an aṣam or secondary celebration by the celebration of the day on which the meritworthiness is enhanced, whilst the chief part of it (prāttā, nam) is the fast, as set forth in a passage from the Brāhmaśaivarta.§ This is followed by a second and more detailed description of the ritual of the festival, first of the prayers, &c. to be addressed to the god on the day before the fast, in quotations from the Gargī and Bhaviṣyottara Purāṇa, which are taken from the Rājamārtanda, and the Krīyakachāntānami, and secondly, of the formalities to be observed on the fast-day itself from the morning, and on the day after it, which are likewise described in quotations from the same Purāṇas (partly on the ground of their mention in the Sauatrara-pradipī). From the middle of p. 29 the calendrical examination (vratikāla) of the festival begins with the discussion of the correct time for the pārāṣam. The quotations are essentially the same as in Mādhava, but with the addition of a few more of the same kind from the Brahmāṇḍapurāṇa, Pārśuara, Viśeṣha, Paitihāsika, and Viśnua Purāṇa. † R. also assigns some verses

* He is similarly placed by Aufrecht, in his Catalogue, p. 291b, between a.d. 1430 (Rāyamukta) and 1612 (Kamākara). According to Wilson (Posth. Works, I. 60), Raghunandana lived "less than a century ago" (this was written in 1840), but is decidedly erroneous (nor is the number of his tattvas 13, but 25).

† That is, according as the month begins with the black or the white half, it falls into the bhādrapada or into the svārana (nīthana); the former is the same, the latter the maṃgala manner (see above, p. 169). The quotations are—

"atha bhādrapadāmśaṁ kriṣṇāḥṣaityaṁ khalan yuge | ashtāvasatame mārtandam ca devaṁ saḥ | kriṣṇaḥ nāme śivam vikalpaṁ dhanurjñānaṁ, tarpaspatīnayaṁ, gopakshayām saṁhitām." —Vaisṇavpurāṇa, mahāanityaṁ prāti bhagavatōdayaṁ (Wilson, Vaiśv. V. i. p. 409);
 prerjyottādha ca nām bhaṅgaṁ kriṣṇaṁ saṁhitām aham niśtaṁ (maññati śr.).

‡ Brahmacakīrīvītah (as mac.):—

B. B. The veda-pedha yāt phalena smaṇṣapājanaṁ (phalena bhādhapadāṁ śaṁ khalan yuge bhavaṁ māntreṇa);

tāthā asayaṁ tāman vārāṁ práyaṁchātraṁ yah pālîkāṁ prayaṁchātraṁ (Gayaśrīśrīnaṁ kriṣṇaṁ tātan sādāhāṁ na 'tra saññāṁ)

I kriṣṇāḥṣaityyaṁ tu rohibāya āraṉācatre 'rehaṁ harēḥ iti Gūḍrāḷa

§ Brahmacakīrīvītah

Navānāh, maitreyaṁ 'pi bhaktāṁ vīttaṁ varjanoṁ, kriṣnetsaipavākṣoṁ prati bhavati Mādaḥānaḥ [1].
to other texts than M. (see the observations above on the respective passages).

The fifth place may be assigned to the Samayamukha of Nilakantha (N.) the son of Sankarabhaṭṭa, who lived, according to Bühler (loc. cit., p. viii.) "about 1600 A.D." Here, too, the calendar side of the festival is especially favoured. A few new quotations, e.g. from the Śkanda and the Saiva Purāṇa, are here added to those already known. According to the view of the author, in the first place the fast (upaśa) and the worship (pūja) of the god are of equal import, both being (pradhānak) essential parts of the festival. At length he arrives at an opposite result to that of Raghunandana,—on the assumption that the pūja is the pradhānak, and the fast, on the contrary, only an aśūnam, or secondary constituent part of the festival. Besides this no material difference appears in the discussion of the calendaric relations, and the quotations are also the same.§ But that the author enters more particularly upon the relation of Jayaṃti to Mercury, or rather to the day of Mercury (Wednesday), and appeals to the explanation of this which occurs in the Devatāmaraṇa. After this he turns against the supposition of Mādhava that the simple and the Jayaṃti form of the festival are to be considered as two different eras, &c. This is followed by a description of the ritual of the festival itself (Janmashtami-vatapradīṇaḥ, fol. 32a-b) with the insertion of verses which we have already met in E. among the quotations from the Bhaśiyā Purāṇa and Gāruda Purāṇa. He closes with the explanation of the pārānam-breakfast on the next day, with constant polemics against Mādhava, into which we cannot enter more closely here.

The sixth may follow here on account of re-

The author, in the name of the Vrataṅka of Śāṅkara (= Ś.), Śāṅkara being a son of the above Nilakantha (see Aufrecht, Cato, p. 260, 261; my Verz. der Berl. H. S. p. 333). Whilst in the works hitherto mentioned,—of course excepting Hemādri, who is, unfortunately, not at our disposal—the calendar part of the question forms the chief object, the discussion—we find here, in conformity with the character of the work, the ritual side of it specially advanced. Only at the beginning of the detailed examination (Chambers 83, fol. 151a = A., and Chambers 64, fol. 16b = B.) is the calendaric question briefly discussed by the author (in A. to fol. 139a), or rather dismissed by him with a reference to the Samayamukha of his father (the views of the grandfather are also alluded to). After this first brief description of the ritual of the festival (Janmā-

Seventhly, the Nirgāyātisrī of Kamalākara (= K.) composed A. p. 1612 (see Aufrecht, Cato-

The author of which he designates here by the name of guru: prapāyitā chaturvṛttyāvādaḥ samhayātṛ stockāh. Accordingly, not the work of Vachanputi is meant (see above, p. 167), but one of the same name by Śāṅkara, the father of Nilakantha,—see Aufrecht, Cato, p. 291. (The passage is cited more closely in S. iti pātra nākha-

§ But that the author enters more particularly upon the relation of Jayaṃti to Mercury, or rather to the day of Mercury (Wednesday), and appeals to the explanation of this which occurs in the Devatāmaraṇa. After this he turns against the supposition of Mādhava that the simple and the Jayaṃti form of the festival are to be considered as two different eras, &c. This is followed by a description of the ritual of the festival itself (Janmāśthaṃvataprabhāṣāḥ, fol. 30a-b), with the insertion of verses which we have already met in E. among the quotations from the Bhaśiyā Purāṇa and Gāruda Purāṇa. He closes with the explanation of the pārānam-breakfast on the next day, with constant polemics against Mādhava, into which we cannot enter more closely here.

The sixth may follow here on account of re-

The author, in the name of the Vrataṅka of Śāṅkara (= Ś.), Śāṅkara being a son of the above Nilakantha (see Aufrecht, Cato, p. 260, 261; my Verz. der Berl. H. S. p. 333). Whilst in the works hitherto mentioned,—of course excepting Hemādri, who is, unfortunately, not at our disposal—the calendar part of the question forms the chief object, the discussion—we find here, in conformity with the character of the work, the ritual side of it specially advanced. Only at the beginning of the detailed examination (Chambers 83, fol. 151a = A., and Chambers 64, fol. 16b = B.) is the calendaric question briefly discussed by the author (in A. to fol. 139a), or rather dismissed by him with a reference to the Samayamukha of his father (the views of the grandfather are also alluded to). After this first brief description of the ritual of the festival (Janmāśthaṃvataprabhāṣāḥ) as contained in the work of his father from which it is entirely transcribed (fol. 139a-141b in A.), there follow three detailed metric representations of it:—first one taken by Hemādri from the Bhaśiyā Purāṇa (fol. 141b to 145b = Sa.), then a second (= Śk.) introduced by the words atha śākṣṭācāra-prabhāṣāḥ kathā, and indicated at the conclusion (fol. 145b) as taken from the Bhaśiyātattva; and lastly, a third (= Śc.), which is likewise marked at the end as taken from the latter work, under the special title janmāśthaṃvataprabhāṣāḥ. More on these three texts will be said in the course of this treatise.

Seventhly, the Nirgāyātisrī of Kamalākara (= K.) composed A. p. 1612 (see Aufrecht, Cato-

The author of which he designates here by the name of guru: prapāyitā chaturvṛttyāvādaḥ samhayātṛ stockāh. Accordingly, not the work of Vachanputi is meant (see above, p. 167), but one of the same name by Śāṅkara, the father of Nilakantha,—see Aufrecht, Cato, p. 291. (The passage is cited more closely in S. iti pātra nākha-

The author, in the name of the Vrataṅka of Śāṅkara (= Ś.), Śāṅkara being a son of the above Nilakantha (see Aufrecht, Cato, p. 260, 261; my Verz. der Berl. H. S. p. 333). Whilst in the works hitherto mentioned,—of course excepting Hemādri, who is, unfortunately, not at our disposal—the calendar part of the question forms the chief object, the discussion—we find here, in conformity with the character of the work, the ritual side of it specially advanced. Only at the beginning of the detailed examination (Chambers 83, fol. 151a = A., and Chambers 64, fol. 16b = B.) is the calendaric question briefly discussed by the author (in A. to fol. 139a), or rather dismissed by him with a reference to the Samayamukha of his father (the views of the grandfather are also alluded to). After this first brief description of the ritual of the festival (Janmāśthaṃvataprabhāṣāḥ) as contained in the work of his father from which it is entirely transcribed (fol. 139a-141b in A.), there follow three detailed metric representations of it:—first one taken by Hemādri from the Bhaśiyā Purāṇa (fol. 141b to 145b = Sa.), then a second (= Śk.) introduced by the words atha śākṣṭācāra-prabhāṣāḥ kathā, and indicated at the conclusion (fol. 145b) as taken from the Bhaśiyātattva; and lastly, a third (= Śc.), which is likewise marked at the end as taken from the latter work, under the special title janmāśthaṃvataprabhāṣāḥ. More on these three texts will be said in the course of this treatise.
in its calendric aspect, with a thorough investigation of the controversy started by Hemādri and Mādhava, whether the simple and the Jayanti form of the festival are two different vrata. The quotations adduced from the Purāṇas are mostly those already known, but a few other works and authors are also added, e.g., Anantaḥkṛta, Chūḍāmaṇi, Madanarāśī, &c. (see Aurench, loc. cit. pp. 277-280); the differing views of the Gauḍās and Maithilas are particularly reflected upon several times (once, e.g., in the following order: Madanarāśī, Nīrā∩ayānirūtā, Nāṁabhaṭṭa Gaudā-Maithilagranthādhouette). According to a statement in the Madanarāśī, purporting to have been taken from the Vāhni Purāṇa, the festival may also be celebrated every month on every "eighth," whoever does this throughout a whole year is promised an abundant reward. The description of the festival itself (fol. 24b-25a) is based on the Bhāvishya Purāṇa, or rather on Hemādri’s quotation from it.

The eighth place may be assigned to Bhāṭṭo-ji Dīkṣita’s (Bhd.) Saṅkhepatītiṁśirṣaya (Chambers 625). According to Colebrooke’s Misc. Ess. II. 12 (1801) the author lived “between one and two centuries ago;” and according to Hall (Index, p. 156) not much before a.d. 1676. He puts together the calendric statements in a compressed form (fol. 9b to 10a), referring to the antagonistic views of Hemādri and Mādhava in respect to the Jayanti (Hemādritis tu: Jayantirotaratah na bhinnam.) The celebration of the festival is touched on by him, as he refers to the reader to Hemādri.

In the ninth place the Vṛatādāya (Fr.) of Viśvanātha, composed at Banaras a.d. 1736, is at least briefly to be mentioned. The section treating of the subject presents, however, almost nothing particular, but is, with a few omissions, or additions, identical with the corresponding passage in the Vrataṅka of Saṅkhara. It has been directly taken without acknowledgment.

In the tenth place the description of the festival is to be mentioned which occurs in a ritual of the Vaiṣṇava, calendrically arranged bearing the name Māṇikriya (Mr.) (Chambers 262, Catal. of the Berlin Sanskrit MSS. p. 335). It is entirely of a ritual character (fol. 32-33), and breaks off abruptly. Here the Jayanti form of the festival is treated quite separately (fol. 25c-26a = J), and is placed, moreover, on the twelfth; see the remarks made on this in the course of this treatise in connection with the statements from the Vaiśāna Purāṇa. The date of the work is not known.

In the eleventh place, I mention the Janmāṁtī-vrataodyāpanam (Ud.), which treats exclusively of the festival in question, and which exists in a Berlin MS. (Chambers 606 f. fol. 9), without date, but evidently modern. It is composed in prose, of a purely ritual kind, and contains one reference to the Bhāgavata. Conf. herewith what has already been observed in the Z. der D. M. G. VI. 93, Catal. of the Berlin Sanskrit MSS. p. 338. Devaki is, on the occasion of a pājā dedicated to her, invoked under various names belonging to Durgā, finally even as Durgā herself.

The twelfth place may be occupied by the Dharmavijñana of Kaśināthopāhyāya (Kd.), though composed only in a.d. 1790, but is highly valuable for its rich contents. Here the festival is considered in two parichhedar. fol. 17b to 22a of the Bombay edition; first, namely, from a calendar view, with an accurate statement of the time measured by nadi and pala (to fol. 19b), and then from a ritual aspect. In both respects the author adheres to the above, p. 164,—whilst under both names the same work ought to be understood, we are evidently to conclude from this that two such Purāṇas existed.) Lastly, a quotation from Viṣṇu—jaṁnatāṁḥ svapnavoraviddhām sarvakām sakulām api vīrāya navamśabdhau upahṣya vratam śchard iś iti

* mandanāntare Vaiṣṇavopārtha: pratītmaṇī ca (te) pōjaśaṁtanāṁ yah karīṣhyaḥ | maṇḍa chaiva khyānim sa sampāpyasya avamāyayā | tathār | aṁśu vidhiṁ yas tu pratītmaṇi maravicā | karoti vratam pūraṇakṣaraṇam uṣṇājanam harsaḥ | dadiśchayam [manaspītirītāmrītā] | rataśye alaṁkṛtāṁ

† It embraces fol. 96a-104b of the Bombay edition (on which see Z. der D. M. G. XVII. 782) and fol. 19a-19b of the Oxford MS., on which see Aurench, Catalogue, p. 396c.
description given in the *Kautsubha* of Śrīmad-Aṅamatdeva (fol. 19a-21b), or rather to the views of Mādhava, once with a polemic glance at Nṛṇayāsinindhu (19a). He gives, however, also some new indications, e.g. he remarks that the festival is at present celebrated in the Mahārāṣṭra country under the name Gopālakāśa. The *Purāṇa* quotations are wanting.||

Lastly, I mention the article *Janadisthāna* in vol. II (1827) of Rādhākānta Deva's *Sabalakalpodrama* (Śk.), which however appears to be really only an extract from R.

With this closes the series of works directly fixed in a chronological order, or at least referable to a certain author (whose name is, however, not known in the case of the tenth and eleventh).

Now we come to the texts of uncertain times adduced in the above-mentioned works as sources for their own representations. These mostly belong to the *Purāṇa* literature, either directly, or as quotations from the *Agni* (K. Kā. Śk.), Āditya (Ādī R.), Garuḍa, Pādma, Brahma (R. K.), Brahmacarīvara, Brahmāṇḍa (R. N. K.), Bhavishya (śayat M. N.), Bhavishyottara, Markandeya (Ā.), Vaiṣṇa, Vayu (R.), Vaiṣṇava (R.), Saiva (N.), Skanda-Purāṇa, or at least works of a similar kind (which are probably to be considered as parts of particular *Purāṇa*), such as the quotations from the *Nārāyaṇa*, *Vārāha*, and *Sahajendrā-Saṅghita*, and from the *Vaiṣṇavahṛṣya*. Besides, however, several works apparently also belonging to the literature of the *Svāyamprajās* are quoted, such as *Purāṇa* (Ā.), according to M. however the passage stands *purāṇa†*†, Pārśvanātika (R.), Bṛhatya, *Pāippa*; *Vaiṣṇavī* (more strictly *Vas*., *Saṅghita*, *Vaiṣṇava†*, and *dharmottara†*, Vaiṣṇā (K.)) Now almost all these works, only those excepted for which I have just now adduced another authority within parentheses, have already been utilized by M. at the end of the fourteenth century as sources for the celebration of the *Kṛśna†*†. And some of these books, such as the *Bṛhatya Purāṇa*, *Garuḍa Purāṇa*, *Vaiṣṇava Purāṇa*, and *Agni Purāṇa*, are traceable yet one century earlier as already utilized in this manner by Hemādri. Now it will, I think, not be going too far if we assign to a work quoted in the 13th and 14th century, and claiming to be a *Purāṇa* or *Svāyamprajā*, an age from two to three centuries earlier, whence the eleventh century would be obtained as the period for which the celebration of the festival appears to vouch for certain. Moreover, the consensus of so numerous works of this kind leads us, after all, probably somewhat higher, since such an universal acknowledgment of the festival appears to warrant the conclusion that it was at the time of their composition a generally received one, whence again the further suggestion presents itself, that the institution, or rather the introduction of it, belongs to a yet earlier time.

In this respect notice is to be taken of the circumstance that among the quotations adduced as authorities the *Bṛhatya Purāṇa* is entirely wanting. This is the more surprising, as just this *Purāṇa*, especially the tenth book of it, constitutes the real text-book of the *Kṛṣṇa* sect. But according to all appearances the celebration of the festival does not actually occur in it. From this the conclusion might perhaps be ventured that the festival had no existence at the time when the *Bṛhatya Purāṇa* was composed. Such a result, however, falls to the ground simply from the circumstance that the grammarian Vopaḍeva—to whom Colebrooke, with Wilson and Burnouf, ascribes the composition of this *Purāṇa* in its present form†—was a contemporary of the author in whom we are able to point out the

† The Sāntākāra-kautubhabhāṣa of this author (see *Cit.* of the Berlin Sanskrit, M.S., p. 301) which I have before me, also in a Bombay (1861) edition (see *Z. der D. M. O. XVII. 763*), cannot be here meant. Anuferchi (*Catalogue*, 2720) mentions also another work of this author, the title whereof terminates also with the word kautubhar (raja-dharma). Probably he composed a larger work named *Sāntākāra-kautubhakāśa*, of which both the above-mentioned works are only sections.

§ We find several verses recurring in O., *Sā*, *A*., and in fol. 21 b two entirely new quotations from the *Agniπūrṇa* and from the *Bṛhatya* (see below, § 3).

The material of the *Bṛhatya-purāṇa* Purāṇa is by Wilson (*Vaiṣṇava Purāṇa*, ed. Hall, I. ltr.) designated as referable to a period probably prior to the Mahāmaddan conquest; also the *Agni Purāṇa* belongs, according to its materials, to the oldest Purāṇas,—ibid. p. 112.

* Excepting the entirely modern texts *Ud.* (Ma) and Kā. In D likewise a secondary section purporting to be taken from the *Bṛhatya-purāṇa*, the citation from the *Bṛhatya-purāṇa* is indicated indeed as a part of the celebration itself; but there is no mention here, as in *Ud.* (Ma) of a description of the festival in the *Bṛhatya*, only some sayings, or rather sections, are utilized for it. And the quotation in Kā. only refers evidently to a secondarily added and unimportant ceremony.

The period of the birth is described in detail, X. 3. 1-8, but without giving any date; it is only mentioned that it took place under the star Rukmi and at midnight; *v. 1 parvya eva ṣaṁnaya-patīkaraṇam (schol.: aṣaṇā (sic) nābhadhyajendra yamā pravṛttam, tasya rukmikasaḥ, rukmi nanakaranaḥ) and v. 7 bhenva tama-ubhāde śivalaḥ.* But neither there, nor in X. 4. 4 seq. after the death of Karna, at which time the *Bṛhatya* begins to place the institution of the festival, do I find any remarks about it.

first dated representation of the festival, namely, Hemâdri, the author of the Chaturvargchântamanî. Therefore it must have been another reason which led to the omission of the festival in the Bhâg. Pur.|| I would propose the following explanation:—In the Bhâg. Pur. we have the modern turn of the Krishna-cultus, which chiefly concerns the amours of Krishna, and where the mother of the god gradually retires in course of time more and more into the background; whereas, on the other hand, as we shall see, in the celebration of the Janudâstami the mother comes specially into the foreground,—she plays a chief part in it, whereas no notice at all is, or rather can be, taken of the amours of Krishna, since he still appears as a baby at his mother's breast. I do not hesitate to notice here a particularly archaic moment of the celebration, the more so, since, as will appear further on, even here the endeavour has in course of time manifested itself to repress this side of it, and to offer the tribute of the celebration to the god alone, without his mother.

Among the Purâṇas quoted as authorities for the festival, the Bhavishya (or Bhavishyât), and the Bhavishyottara Purâna occupy throughout the most prominent position. With reference to the verification of the quotations in question, unfortunately, peculiar ill luck prevails. As far as in the first instance the Bhavishya Pur. is concerned, the Oxford MS. of it (see Aufrecht, Catalogus, pp. 30-33) breaks off in the representation of the Festival calendar just with the seventh (exactly like our MS. of Hemâdri's Vrata-khaṇḍa); the immediately following section of the eighth, in which the Janudâstami celebration ought to be represented, is wanting.* Further, the Bhavishyottara Purâna, evidently a supplement to it, is indeed before me in MS. (see Catal. of the Berl. Sâukh. MSS., pp. 133-7), but contains nothing about this festival in the section treating of the festivals on the "eighth." According to all probability, we have here to deal, however, only with an omission on the part of the copyist; for, according to Aufrecht (Catalogus, pp. 34-36), both the Oxford MSS. of the work actually contain a chapter on the Janudâstami, whilst our MS. gives in lieu of it a chapter on the somâsthânam, which is thus twice represented therein.† For this a double explanation presents itself: the writer was either a Śaiva, and therefore intentionally interpolated in lieu of the Krishna festival a Rudra festival (which the somâsthânam communicated by him is), or—as his name, Râmâjî contradicts this—the MS. from which he copied was defective. This defect appears, however, to have been noticed finally on the delivery of the MS., and the writer may have had to answer for it, because after the date of the copy has been stated, yet 7¼ verses more are added (see my Verz. der Berl. Sâukh. H. S. p. 137), which, although in an extremely unsatisfactory manner, really concern the Krishna festival, so that the suspicion arises that the

---

* On the probable difference of his personality from that of Vopadeva's patron who bore the same name, see what has been remarked above, p. 161. The synchronism of both men is meanwhile secured otherwise, nor is it entirely beyond the bounds of possibility that an identity of personality may yet at last result. The author of the Chaturvargchânta calls himself the minister of king "Mahâdeva"; on the other hand, only later texts designate the patron of Vopadeva as the minister of a king Râma-chandra of Deragiri, but nothing of the kind is said by himself. That, however, at the time of the Chaturvargchânta, one Bhâgavata Purâna already existed appears by the quotations made therefrom, which occur in it (see, for instance, Aufrecht, Catal. p. 33b).

† According to the testimonia a silentio cannot, as in this case, also be drawn from the non-mention of the festival in the Veda-s Ārama, according to Wâlach, I. exi. ed. Milne, compared about the middle of the eleventh century), or in the Harivamsa.

‡ In the Nârada Pâñcharatâ, e.g., Krishna is often represented as the son of Devakî (see III. 7. 13. 2. 14. 3. 34, 35 IV. 1, 12. 5. 30. 3. 8. 13. 3. 55, 83); besides mentioned only once (III. 7. 32): allusion to Krishna's birth and childhood is, after all, made only occasionally in the enumeration of his epithets (IV. 1, 15. 17. 8. 14), as could not, of course, be otherwise expected in a work which essentially glorifies him in an esoteric manner as the highest god.

* It might perhaps be supposed, as this occurs twice,
copyist has on his part needlessly stitched together these verses in order to make up for the blamed defect.† However the case may be, the ritual texts beginning from Hemadri all unanimously point to the Bhavishya and to the Bhavisyottara Pur. as the chief sources for the celebration of the festival; hence there is no doubt that they are actually to be considered as such, and that accordingly the Oxford MSS. of the last-mentioned Purâna justly contain the Jannâsthami chapter as a portion of the work. For a copy of this chapter from both MSS. I am indebted to the kindness of one of my former students, Hermann Brunnerhofer, residing at present in Oxford. Unfortunately both these MSS. are of recent date, the one (Wilson 126) having been copied at the end of the last century, and the other (Wilson 124) as late as 1826. They are also rather incorrect, but nevertheless closely agree with each other (|= O.), both assigning to the chapter the same 67 verses. A comparison of their contents with other texts on the Jannâsthami now before me in a detached form as sections of the Bhavisyottara, or rather the Bhavishya Pur., leads to the conclusion that it is, on the whole,—of course excepting very numerous differences in detail,—identical with that text which Śaṅkara (=Sa, or rather after him again Vrātārāja = Sa.) and, in the Bhavisyottara Pur., but in 78 versus.§ On the other hand, the two texts adduced by Śaṅkara from the Bhavisyottara Purâna (Śb., Śc.) have nothing in common with the Oxford text.|| Further, among the other texts of this kind occurring separately in the Chambers collection, and designated in their final signatures as having been taken from the Bhavisyottara, there is, firstly, one which in reality almost wholly corresponds with the Oxford text (Chambers 724 (= C.), and further a second (Chambers 793 (=B.), which shows that at least in the first ten of its 87 verses close relations, whereas afterwards it differs entirely, and shows again a few closer points of contact only in the description of the festival itself. These latter coincidences then occur again also in the third text of this kind (Chambers 816 = D., written A.D. 1654), and are therefore evidently to be recognized as a common original stock; as to the rest, however, this third text is quite different from the Oxford text, whilst on the other hand some verses of it recur partly in B., and partly in Sa., Śb.

Now the question is how this discrepancy is to be explained. In the first place, by the fact that the Jannâsthami appears to have been treated in both works,—in the Bhavishya as well as in the Bhavisyottara Purâna; and that in consequence of the similarity of names and the identity of the subject, in citations as well as in larger independent extracts from these two works, the confusion of the one with the other easily arose. Further, particular stress is doubtless to be laid also on the circumstance that all the Purānas texts in general are, so to speak, in a fluent state, easily allowing of interpolations as well as of alterations; especially it may often have been the case that refuge was taken under the authority of the name of

† These verses are—

‡ They correspond as follows—

§ They are—

|| The saṃśas and tārās in the beginning of these verses are characteristic, as they point to a preceding question which had probably been addressed to the unfinished抄本...

Accordingly the following verses are peculiar to O.—

|| In the Vrātārāja (Śc. 2, 3), indeed, the second of them (Śc. 3) is at the conclusion designated as taken from the Bhavishya, not from the Bhavisyottara. No source whatever is given at the conclusion of Śc. 1 and Śc. 2, so that Viśvanātha appears to have considered all the three texts as taken from the Bhavishya. No reference to Hemadri occurs in Śb., Śc.
some Purāṇas for sectarian purposes, and that any special elaboration by utilizing older constituent parts was perhaps bluntly designated as a section of such a Purāṇa. Hence it will always be necessary to be very cautious in using texts of any only so-called Purāṇas, in their final signatures; and only such passages of this sort as may be supported by being quoted as parts of a particular Purāṇa also in other works can with certainty be used as being original.

Now if we compare the quotations adduced in the ritual texts from the Bhavisya (Bhavisyaat M., N.), and the Bhavisyottara Pur., with those texts just purporting to belong to these Purāṇas (O, Sa., C, B, D, Sb, Sc), it first appears that a not inconsiderable part of those quotations does not occur in them. This, at all events, may very likely be attributed to the fact that they have been taken from the yet wanting JamProvida section of the Bhavisya Pur.; though of course yet other circumstances may have cooperated to effect this. Further, those quotations which can be identified, though with numerous and considerable variants, yield the following result —

The far preponderating number of them is taken from O, Sa., C, mostly indeed from the verses common to these three texts; some, however, also from verses peculiar either to O or to Sa. (C has but few of this kind).* Also from B. a few verses are quoted; also a certain number of verses from D.; the latter are, however, mostly attributed directly to other Purāṇas than to the Bhavisya, or Bhavisyottara.† Lastly, of Sb and Sc. I find no verses at all quoted which are peculiar to them alone. Or, in other words, O, Sa, C are really ancient Bhavisya or Bhavisyottara texts. B. D, Sb, Sc, on the contrary, are, in comparison with them, of secondary origin, although they contain ancient portions.

Now, as these texts on the JamProvida celebration which are assigned to the Bhavisya, or the Bhavisyottara, constitute in reality the chief basis of our knowledge of this festival, I think it proper, before I proceed, to examine them individually according to their principal features.‡

1. In Chap. 48 of the Bhavisyottara Purāṇa in the texts of both the Oxford MSS. (= O.) compared with Chambers 724 (= C.)§ and Śāṃkara’s Vrātārka, fol. 141b-145b (= Sa),|| Krishna himself instructs Yudhishthira on his own establishment of the festival of his birth-celebration (JamProvida) which ensued after Kaśinā’s death in Mathurā. He had instituted it on the occasion when, taken into the lap of his mother Devaki with tears of joy, and tenderly embraced by his father Vasudeva, for the sake of the people arriving in rejoicing crowds, and, at the fervent requests of all castes, also of Śudras and other believers (dharmaśaya). He had ordered it to take place (vv. 11-19), at midnight the eighth of the black half of Bhadrapada, whilst the sun is Leo, and the moon in Taurus (Vrischik), or more definitely in the pradāyati pūjaka (i.e. Rohiṇī, Aldobaran). At Yudhishthira’s request (vv. 20-21) Kṛiṣṇa then explains to him the details of the celebration.—The same begins with taking the vow to fast at the break of the day in question, after the necessary cleansing of the teeth (so that no remnants of food are left on them); at noon a bath in pure water, in a river, or elsewhere; then the erection of a beautiful inlying-house (āśītika),¶ provided with all

by him without special statement whence they are taken, merely by purāṇa or smṛtipi. Also the verses elsewhere quoted from D., namely, 112, 114-118, 129-131, 138, are adduced (especially in Bhd. Ms., only 115 also in K. and 133 in RNX) without giving any special source (therefore not as taken from the Bhavisya).


§ Vis. of the 2nd section of the MS. A section in prose but mixed with 28 verses, mostly again occurring in D. in the same order, which comprises an other representation of the worship (pūjāvidhi) to be addressed to Kṛiṣṇa. Some of these verses occur to have found a place again also in the 2nd section (which I call C.), but are wanting; these are the verses 440-85 of the Oxford text. In consequence of this and of some other differences C. has only 62, not 67 verses.

¶ Vis. of the 2nd section of the MS. A section in prose but mixed with 28 verses, mostly again occurring in D. in the same order, which comprises an other representation of the worship (pūjāvidhi) to be addressed to Kṛiṣṇa. Some of these verses occur to have found a place again also in the 2nd section (which I call C.), but are wanting; these are the verses 440-85 of the Oxford text. In consequence of this and of some other differences C. has only 62, not 67 verses.

|| = Vṛṣṭarāja, fol. 92r-100v (Sa 1).

‡ Conf. K. III. I, fol. 6a, Śāṃkaraṇātakha fol. 56a, K. IV. III. I, fol. 188.
appurtenances of ornaments, amulets, &c., for Devali in the shape of a cow-stall, or rather shepherd-house (gokulavan), filled with shepherdesses. In the centre a couch (paravanaka): on it an image of Devali as just delivered, slumbering, with Krișna likewise sleeping as a suckling on her breast. Also Yaśodā is to be represented as just delivered of a beautiful girl (pratisūtra varakanyākā). Gods and genii of every kind are to be represented as soaring in the air. Vasudeva armed with sword and shield stands at hand;* likewise singing Aparasas and dancing Gandharas. Also the snake Kāliya is to be portrayed in its Yamunā bed. Then follows an adoration of Devali (vv. 38 seq.) with incense, fruits, delicacies, and flowers, whilst certain formulas are recited, which are omitted when the celebration is carried on by women or Sūdras. According to the view of some (vv. 43 seq.), an honour-gift (aryaga) to the moon is added to this, when it rises, and is offered to it after prefatory name-prayers† and consecrated presents to Hāri (Vishṇu), with a concomitant formula invoking the moon in connection with Rohini (v. 52). At the same time the god himself (i.e. Hāri, strictly Kriṣṇa), the moon with Rohini, the parent-gods Deva, Vasudeva, and Yaśodā-Nanda, as well as Bala-deva (Kriṣṇa’s brother), are placed on a sacrificially arranged spot, namely a heap of earth, sitamāla,† and worshipped. At midnight, the moment when Kriṣṇa’s birth took place, a ghī-present, called vasaṅkā, is sacrificed; next follows the birth-ritual, called varthāpanam,[ the adoration of the goddess Shashti,‡ and also in the night the ceremony of giving the name. Then at the break of day on the ninth, in breaking the fast, just as great a feast (mahotsava) as to “me” (Kriṣṇa) is to be offered to Bhagavati (Devali), in connection with abundant feeding and largesses to the Brāhmans, who are afterwards to be dismissed with prayers to Kriṣṇa. The conclusion (beginning from v. 60) consists of high praises to those who thus understand how to celebrate the mother and the son, and who hold the Jana-āśā labha either themselves in their own houses, or at least participate in its celebration by others.

(2) Chambers 7934 (= B.), in 87 verses.

The beginning (to v. 10) agrees essentially with the Oxford text (as far as v. 14).* But in place of immediately entering on the description of the festival, Kriṣṇa here first premises (vv. 11-36) a condensed history of his birth, and of the events following thereon, till the death of Kansa.† Then follows the special statement

* According to C. Sās also the sleeping watchman of Devali, the servants of Kansa, are to be represented, as well as the various Dīnāsas, whom, according to the legend, the child Kriṣṇa had vanquished.
† Name-prayers (anāmāntro) are repeated by mentioning a deity’s name followed by an exclamatory salutation to the same. The consecrated gifts here consist of bath-water (rakshana), the love-gift (gandha), flowers, &c., sandalwood, sacred lotus-flower (sura), and scarves (śaivā), &c., etc., &c.
‡ It is to be made one hand high and quadrangular (shk.).
§ On the erection thereof by means of the pākiṣka bhākāntika, see G. Wallis, I, 9, 10, and Stenacher, De Domesticis Indorum Ritibus, pp. 12 seq. (Bresl. 1860).
† Vasodā means literally “a pouring of wine.” A ceremony of this name plays a special part in the Vedic ritual, namely in the Satāmakrīyā belonging to the yajñamudrā. The offering above is evidently an imitation of it (just as the form of some of the mantras also is adapted to that of the mantras of the Satāmakrīyā).
§ Varadāpana is used here in the text itself (OC. 105. 115. 80) in the same sense as the yaśas dīṅga ṣravāya Devali tehi janmāṅgadaḥ: tathā dhārāḥ dhanāḥ varadāpana teva ṣravāya has in the last yajñas also the same elucidation. According to Chambers, 362 (d. B. d. B. d. B. p. 314), varadāpana is the name for a certain beneficentary ritual of the birth-rite (pratīṣṭhāpana), which is, in the first year to be performed every month (parvatāpana), as explained in Kṣ. III. 2, 236, where it is explained as dhāraṇābaḥ dhāraṇā labhaḥ varadāpanā labhaḥ. The word is explained, but probably erroneously, directly by the sūtra, the Viv. 219. 224, which reads dhāraṇā varadāpana is the cutting of the Evelyn’into in the month of May, the birthday of Kriṣṇa. After his birth in the eighth month I showed myself first to my ascetic parents in my true Vishnu form, and then ordered Vasudeva to change me for the girl just born on the other side of the Yamunā, and then to my mother; the boy was to be brought to the Yamunā’s shepherd-house (gokul). The watchmen became inexcusable. The bolts of the apartment opened spontaneously, the Yamunā allowed Vasudeva to pass through her waters. After the exchange, the girl, now reposing on Devali’s couch, cried loudly. The watchmen arrived

† The MSS. correspond with each other as follows—

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>O</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>O</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>O</th>
<th>B</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>16h</td>
<td>11v</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2a</td>
<td>3b</td>
<td>7a</td>
<td>5a</td>
<td>13b</td>
<td>14b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4a</td>
<td>3b</td>
<td>8b</td>
<td>9b</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>14a</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* "The gods, venerated by Kansa, came [or, met] to Vaikuṇṭha, and brought information about his keeping his sister Devaki imprisoned, who was married to Vasudeva son of the śatri Yadava, and that he had, on the strength of a prophecy that her eighth child would kill him, slain already six. Hereon I resolved to enter into Devali’s lap myself, and ordered Māya to take birth in Yaśodā, the wife of the husband Nanda. After my birth in the eighth month I showed myself first to my ascetic parents in my true Vishnu form, and then ordered Vasudeva to change me for the girl just born on the other side of the Yamunā. It is reported, for the girl was to be reared as a girl, and that the child was to be brought to the Vaykuntha. This was also the case with Kansa’s son, who was to be brought to the Yamunā as a girl."
of the date of the birthday (vv. 31-39). To this are added glorifications of the festival-celebration (vv. 40-66), especially under the name Jayanti. Already the kings of antiquity from Ambarisha to Sumantu, and the oldrishis and sages from Vasishtha to Valmiki (krītān Rāmāyanaḥ yena viśṇoṁ charitāṃ utamam), have kept this festival. Threats to him who does not fast on that day, or keep the festival (vv. 60 seq.)

The description of the celebration itself (vv. 67-82) is very brief, but agrees pretty closely with the Oxford text. The statement that at midnight a cow rich with milk is to be given away with her calf (v. 80) is new; and that this is to be followed by songs, music, dancing, and listening to the narrative of Kṛiṣṇa's birth. The vardhīpanam &c. follows only after this. The conclusion (vv. 83-87) consists of new promises for the celebration of the festival; and their purport, as well as partly also the context, agrees closely with the final verses of the Oxford text.

(3) Chambers 816 (= D.) in 173 verses; written A.D. 1654.

Instruction of Nārada by Brahmā on the greatness of the Jayanti festival. First its glorifications to v. 23, whereof many verses are identical with B. (4). Then (till v. 34) various calendrical determinations (asitā śrāvaneśa 'śtaṇī, Wednesday, and rohini), among which there are many verses occurring in M. but quoted from other Purāṇas (see above, p. 173). Again promises for the celebration, and on the other hand threats for non-observance, of the fast (till v. 54). Next follows a legend about the mighty king Harischandra whom Brahmashri Skanda, or, as he is also called, Sanatkumāra, informs about the reasons of his glory, which is inconceivable to the king himself; stating that having formerly, in an earlier birth as a Vaiśya in Kanyakubja, been suddenly seized with religious zeal at the sight of the preparations (vv. 82 seq.) for a celebration of the Jayanti festival at Vārāṇasi, arranged by Chandravati, the daughter of the Kāśi king Indrayama, he had gratuitously given away for it flowers, and had also kept the fast itself. At the question of Harischandra about the way and manner of this celebration, he then gives him the details of it (vv. 92-150), partly analogous with the statements of the Oxford text but also with considerable variations. After the bath about noon, first a pitcher (ghata) adorned with five jewels and filled with holy water is to be set up, and over it a vessel (pātra) made of gold, silver, copper, or plaited of reeds, and on this again a golden image of the god is to be placed which represents him as he sucks the breast of the mother, presses the nipple with the hand, and often lovingly looks up to the countenance of the mother. Only now, and not before, the falling-in house of Devaki is to be erected, in order thereby to represent by it the history of the Hari race as well as the shepherd's house. Then Hari is to be honoured with flowers and fruits under recitals of the (Vedic) Purāna śūkta. In a flower-architecture (pūshpārangapikā) song, music and dancing takes place. The thousand-name prayer is to be recited, the "liberation of the elephant," the acts of the Vishnu-(=Kṛiṣṇa) child, and the various śaṅcaras are to be narrated. In the night, prayers follow to Devaki, who is to be considered equal to Aditi (111-116), and to her son Hari (117-125), as reposing in the lap of his mother (madhir uttānās aṣṭottamam, 118), and to be honoured by all kinds of consecrated gifts (parīkṣes, &c.). Also the name-prayer is to be addressed to the Govinda placed on the copper vessel (pātra tāmramayogasikti, 126). When the moon rises, an argha-gift to Kṛiṣṇa and Devaki is presented, which consists of a coconut and a shell; and then a similar present to the moon, consisting of water with flowers, roasted barley, and sandal placed in a shell. (The birth-ritual about midnight is not mentioned here.)

O. B. O. B. O. B.
---
22 676, 668 28a 765 73a 74a
23 616, 74a 22a 73a 74a
24 616, 74a 22a 73a 74a
25 616, 74a 22a 73a 74a
26 616, 74a 22a 73a 74a
27 616, 74a 22a 73a 74a

but of course with all sorts of variants.

Conf. particularly vv. 83b, 84b, 85, with O. 655, 649, 63.

The MSS. correspond with each other as follows:

B. D. B. D. B. D.
---
1 2 2 2 2 2 2
3-43 3-5 28a, 64a 71a 72a 72a 72a
45 616, 74a 22a 73a 74a
48 7 7 7 7 7 7

* appended to ekā mahābhāratam, see Cat. of the Pā. MSS. 11 as a portion of the Mahābhārata; Aufrecht, Catal. of the Pā. MSS. 56, 69b, also chap. 84 of the Yasama Purāṇ.
Then the night is further to be spent in all kinds of amusements, dance, music, song, &c., listening to the history of Devaki’s son, especially to the Harivaśa and the Bhāgavata (137). Rich presents are due to the reader (vāchaka). At daybreak the prayers to mother and son are repeated. After having fed, and given presents to the Brāhmaṇs, the landlord himself eats, with his family (150). Then Sanatkumāra terminates with renewed promises for the celebration of the festival (till v. 160); and after this Brahmā first makes a few calendric statements (161-165), and then terminates by again praising the greatness of the festival.

(4) Saṅkara’s Vṛatakā (= Śb.) fol. 145b-148b,† in 81 verses.

After the termination of the Bhārata fight, Yudhisṭhira turns to Krīṣṇa with the request to communicate to him, after imparting so many benefits and instructions, also the Janudāśṭhāni-vratam. Krīṣṇa begins with the history antecedent to his birth, and narrates how the earth, tormented by Daiya hosts, had turned to Brahmā for protection, and that the latter, accompanied by all the gods, had departed to Svetadvipa, in order to represent to him (to Viśnu) this suffering of the earth. That he had then promised his aid, and had, according to a promise formerly made to Vasudeva and to Devaki, taken up his abode in the womb of Devaki (v. 18), whilst Yogamāya had done so in that of Yaśodā. The further narrative is entirely as in B., although in quite different words.‡ After the disappearance of the girl in the air, Kaṅsa being frightened, ordered a general slaughter of infants (śālānā kadaṇyag), in order thus, possibly, to annihilate the new-born foe announced to him. Kaṅsa’s servants execute his command. He himself, however, growing up in the cowherd’s house (gokula), eluded all persecutions, slaying the wicked Pūtna,§ as well as other numerous servants of Kaṅsa, and lastly him also (v. 44). Joyfully saluted by his parents, and requested by the people streaming by in festive joy, he then explained the celebration of his birth-festival as follows (vv. 52-62). The following very laconic description is limited to the bath, the fast, the erection of the shed (māṇḍapa, sūti-kāghiṇa; then some particulars are given as to the arrangement and fabrication of the images of the holy family), the watching through the night with song, dance, &c. The performance of the birth-ritual is touched upon quite briefly,—purāṇaḥ stotraḥ pañcaḥ ca jātunāmādhaḥ ‘tevaiḥ; the argha-gifts and the moon are not even mentioned. In the morning the fast is broken on feeding the Brāhmaṇa. After two verses in glorification of the festival, a legend follows to the same purpose (vv. 65-78), about Satyajit, the son of the Aṅga king Āmitra-jit, who had by connection with heretics (pākhandaiḥ) become an unbeliever, and then, after long heavy infernal punishments, roaming about in the form of a Pūrūṣa, having been wholly exculpated by accidentally witnessing a celebration of the Janudāśṭhāni and listening to it,|| and had found direct entrance into the Viṣṇu-world. In conclusion two verses more are added in glorification of the festival, and finally the question is put to Yudhisṭhira what more he wished to hear.

(5) Ibidem (= Śb.), fol. 148b-151a,¶ in 55 verses.

This piece directly follows the preceding one;* the first verse especially, in which Yudhisṭhira announces his wish to be henceforth instructed concerning the udāpanavādhi by which this vratam is fulfilled, is probably meant as his actual reply to Krīṣṇa’s question in the last verse of Śb. Krīṣṇa now gives, first, extensive details on the preparations for the festival. In the middle of a spot of the size of a cowhide, a circle is to be drawn where the gods (idols) Brahmā, &c. are to be set up and worshipped. There a shed (māṇḍapa) is to be erected of plantain-tree trunks—the sūkṣma-griha of Devaki is not mentioned; in the circle a copper or earthen pitcher is to be placed (see above in D.); on this a vessel (pūt-

---

* Kadāchid daiyavogena vana janmadāśṭhānāmbhā | kriyante mahāyaṁ nārājaḥ tretayā śrīśrīḥ hi msyanām || 76 ||
** Kadāchid daiyavogena vana janmadāśṭhānāmbhā || 76 ||

† In the Vṛata-kā, l. 162, fol. 164a-165a.
‡ In the Vṛata-kā, moreover, it is not even separated from it, but follows in immediate connection. In Ś, however, Śb. terminates with the subscription sit, and Ś begins anew: atha janmadāśṭhānāmbhādyoṣyam.
trām) of silver, or plaited of reeds, and upon it the god (i.e. image of Kṛṣṇa) wrapped in a garment is to be placed (v. 10). Then follow 16 upachātras, i.e. sacred formulas,† and gifts to Kṛṣṇa, who is to be served by a beloved and honoured guest. This is followed by‡ the worship of the persons forming his suite &c., by name-prayers (vv. 27-28). After this comes (till 33) the offering of incense, candles, delicious victuals (vaivedysam), betelnuts, fruits, the fee for sacrifice to the priests, and lastly the lustration (śirpadanam). To this new prayers to Kṛṣṇa are added. When the moon rises, the arghya to the moon follows, after Kṛṣṇa and Devaki have previously received the like (37-43 entirely as above in D. 127-134; and a portion of the verses likewise as in O.). The birth-ritual is wanting. The night is to be watched through, with song, dance, &c., as well as by listening to old legends. At the grey of morning (pratyāshe), a bath, a gift of milk &c. are presented to "the lord of the world," as well as 108 ghee-offerings, &c. connected with the Puruṣavasikta. Next the "teacher" (devārya) is to be honoured with ornaments, clothing &c.; a brown cow (kapila) with her calf (conf. here with above, B. 80), richly adorned with gold, jewels, &c., is also to be given to him, or if none of the kapila colour is to be had, another cow (v. 50). After further rich presents to the Brāhmaṇas, who are besides to be festively fed, the landlord may himself eat, with his family.

Apart from the above-treated Bhavishyā texts on the Jannāṭāmasam, I have at my disposal another text of this kind from the circle of the Puruṣas, purporting to be taken from the Vishnu Purāṇa, which I therefore append in this place. I mean the jānāṭakārakatakathā, Chambers's collection 640 (= Vt.), in 130 verses (to fol. 6a); annexed to it is yet another piece, in 75 verses (till fol. 8a), called janmāṭakāra-todyāpyaśnavidhi, for which no special Purāṇa is mentioned as a source. I have already reported—in the Z. der. D. M. G. VI. 92, and Catal. of the Berlin MSS. p. 337—on the first piece, which appears in the form of a narrative of Nārada to Indra, and have observed that neither in Wilson's translation of the Vishnu Purāṇa, nor in the MS. text of it (Chambers 799), anything corresponding to the order and words of this piece occurs. The contents of it are, however, closely related to Vishnu Pur. V. 1 seq. (Wilson, pp. 491 seq.), as it narrates likewise the antecedent history of Kṛṣṇa's birth, as well as the birth itself, and some of his infant deeds till the death of Kaṁsā. Only the last verses (122 seq.) give a short account of the celebration of his birth-day, wherein mention is made also of a golden image of Kṛṣṇa, to be worshipped on a large pitcher (kṛṣṇamūrtiḥ cha sampāda nāwaravān kalakopari), as well as of the adoration of the ten avatāras of Vishnu of Devaki, of the cowherds, and of Yaśodā.

More particulars on this subject are communicated in the second piece by Kṛṣṇa himself to Yadhishthira. To the bath, to be taken at noon of the eighth, an adoration of Hari is added (āvahana, and āsunādāni, v. 10). The further proceedings, although given in entirely different words, materially correspond with what has been communicated above from Śc., except for the insertion of an aṅgapaṇḍ, just in the manner of the one described in the Vrata-pāya. Wanting here, however, besides the birth-ritual of the other texts, also there omitted, is the honour-gift to the moon. Of the night it is merely said that it is to be spent with song, music, and legendary tales (purāṇa-

† They are destined for—1. the ādahana, the adoration of the god; 2. the āvahana, admission of the god; 3. ānanda, the offering of a seat; 4. pādvyam, the foot-water; 5. arghya, the honour-gift (perfumes, flowers, roasted barley); 6. āchāramāną, water for rinsing the mouth; 7. madakapura, the honey-food; 8. again āchāramāną; 9. pūjābhrasana, the fire ingredients of the bath,—milk, sour milk, butter, honey, sugar; 10. mānana, the bath; 11. vastrapañcam, the new garments; 12. yajnopavestam, the sacrificial thread; 13. bhāskaradān, all kinds of ornaments; 14. chañḍā, the sandalwood; 15. kūkumadiṭṭhā, roasted barley, anointed with saffron; 16. pūjāpāni, flowers.

‡ śc. 3 adds here yet a special worship of the separate limbs of Kṛṣṇa (vagīṣṭha), at each of which he is worshipped with another name.

§ Herewith some new points—Devaki, whose six first boys were slain by Kālan, and who is just pregnant with her seventh child, went to fetch water, and sits daily under a large vastra-tree. Yaśodā, the likewise pregnant spouse of the cowherd Nanda, arrives, and asks the reason of her tears. Enlightened on the subject, she promises to exchange her own child in case it should be a girl for the seventh of Devaki if it should be a boy. Kālan, who does not find his sister at home, goes after her, and keeps her herself shut up at home and closely watched. But after the birth of Kṛṣṇa the bolts open spontaneously, the watchmen fall asleep, and Devaki goes to her husband Vasudeva and requests him to carry the infant to Gokula, and there to exchange it for a boy; the Yami touched by Kṛṣṇa's foot becomes shallow, so that all this easily takes place. Kālan does not himself kill the girl, but causes a servant to do so. Of the "slaughter of the innocents" (Vīṣṇu Pur. V. 4, p. 504; Bhāg. Pur. X. 4) no mention occurs here.

|| Ver. 33: sampāḍa bhāskaradān. The frustration of Pītāmaḥ's evil intentions, as well as of those of a Kṛiṣṇa sent forth by Kālan, the humiliation of the serpent prince Kāliya, the killing of Chākyā, Keśa, &c.
pathama, v. 42). On the other hand, the ritual for the next morning is discussed here in still more detail than in Śc., although materially corresponding therewith. The colour of the richly adorned cow to be presented to the teacher is not specially dwelt upon, and therefore left optional. The presents to be given to the priests, or rather to the Brāhmaṇas, are very specially treated.

The withdrawal of Devaki appears to be particularly worthy of remark in this narrative. Whilst she and her sāttikāgrīha occupy in O. (Ś., Śc.), as well as in B., Śb., a specially prominent position, and also the birth-ritual constitutes a material part of the celebration, here in both texts of Vi., as well as in Śc., strictly speaking, only Kṛṣṇa himself is celebrated, and Devaki mentioned only incidentally. Nor is Kṛṣṇa here any longer represented at his mother’s breast, but his image alone is worshipped, and that over a pitcher. Lastly, also, the great stress laid in Vi. Śc. on the presents to be given to the Brāhmaṇas, is to be noticed, inasmuch as it likewise appears to militate in favour of a more secondary origin of this narrative. An intermediate step between the two groups of texts is formed by D., where the sāttikāgrīha of Devaki is indeed specially mentioned, and the god is also still represented as a suckling on her breast; the latter representation, however, no longer takes place in its natural place, the sāttikāgrīha, but (as in K. Śc.) over a pitcher; moreover, the birth-ritual at midnight is entirely wanting (as the presents to the Brāhmaṇas also play in D. a notable part). This adoration of the god (and moreover, as in D., of the god suckling the mother’s breast) over a pitcher (kumbha kalasa) appears, in comparison to his worship, as a suckling reposing on a couch by the side of his mother, or rather suckling her breast, to be very extraordinary. It becomes intelligible only when we observe (see p. 179) that at other similar sectarian festivals also, a pitcher filled with holy water placed in the centre of the sacred circle, plays the same part. Thus it appears to be a variation which has, on the strength of other Indian ritual forms, been put in the place of that other representa-

* Wilson’s statement (p. 130) that this Purāṇa was composed only “about four centuries ago” can at all events relate only to the text which he had before him, because that one Purāṇa of this name existed already at the time of Mādhava, or rather of Hemādri, appears by the quotations which corresponds to the natural circumstances.

Other allied Purāṇa texts on the Kṛṣṇa-nāma-śāstra are not at present at my disposal. Accordingly I am not able to verify the numerous quotations added concerning it by the ritual texts from the Purāṇas or from the Śaivaśāstra. According to Aufrecht’s excellent Catalogus, the festival is indeed explained in detail also in chapters 164, 165 of the Uttarākhaṇḍa of the Padma Purāṇa (Aufrecht, p. 146; Wilson’s Select Works, ed. Rost, III. 70), as well as in chap. 6, 7 of the Kṛṣṇa-khaṇḍa of the Brāhmaṇavarta Purāṇa (Aufrecht, p. 26b, Wilson III. 109)*; and corresponding with this these two Purāṇas, especially the Brāhmaṇavarta Pur., occupy in fact an important place among the quotations of the ritual texts. Besides, the Vāhni Purāṇa, the Vaiśṇava-bhārata, and the Skanda (from which 21 slokas are cited) play a prominent part in this respect. In all these quotations, however, the ritual celebration is not dealt with specially—only the fast and the pājā of the god, the watching through the night, and the pāraman are often dwelt upon. In this, however, the Garuda Purāṇa is an exception, and appears to treat the ritual celebration very specially, as in R. (pp. 27, 28) and in N. (31a, 32a) quite a number of prayers pertaining to it are quoted from it. Also a verse quoted from the Brahma Pur. by R. on p. 24 refers to a speciality of the ritual; likewise two verses which only Kād. adduces from the Agni Pur., and 2½ verses quoted by K. from the Vāhni Pur. (see above, p. 169) after Madanaratan.

Now all these texts give one and the same date for the Janmāśātmi celebration (be it for śrāvana or for bhādrapada). In contrast to this, it is of special interest that we find in the Vārāha Purāṇa (Chambers 555a, fol. 142a, Chambers 557, fol. 406b,—conf. my Catalogue of the Berlin Sanskrit MSS. pp. 142-43, and ch. 46 in Aufrecht) an entirely different datum for the celebration of the Kṛṣṇa-birthday. It is there called Kṛṣṇa-nāma-śāstra, and falls on the twelfth of the white half of Ashadh (June, July). Moreover the text runs just as in Vi. Śc. (D.) about a golden

† On the other hand, the Vārāha Sūkhyāsa (quoted by M., fol. 83a, see above, p. 164) has the usual date for it: we are therefore to separate it from the Vārāha Purāṇa. K. indeed quotes both works (pp. 25, 29, 36).
image of Vāsudeva which, after a previous aśagāpājā, being covered with clothing, is to be placed over a pitcher (ghāta), to be worshipped with perfumes, flowers, &c., and then to be presented to a Brāhmaṇ. The legend on the birth of Krishna recited by Durvāśa, who appears as the narrator, is entirely divested of the usual additions, and simply states that,—

"Nārada once came to the house of the Yādava prince Vasudeva, who had no children by his wife Devaki, and reported to him what he had just seen in heaven: 'The earth stepped into the assembly of the gods complaining that it could no longer carry its burden, and pleaded for relief. Then the gods turned their thoughts to Nārāyaṇa, who immediately arrived in person and promised them to assume the human form: "The woman who will with her husband fast during the white half in Ashādha, into her womb shall I enter." Then the gods dispersed, and he (Nārada) immediately hastened to this place.' Accordingly Vasudeva confirmed himself herewith, fasted on the 12th of the Ashādha, and obtained Krishna for a son, and great glory. And so also now the celebration of this festival secures the birth of a son."

Here the idea at once suggests itself that an older narration is before us, and this the more so as the Vārāha Purāṇa in general seems to contain rather old material. Wilson (Vishnu Pur. I. lxxi, ed. Hall) places it in "the early part of the twelfth century," and mentions also just the very absence of the Janmāśṭamī in it as a sign that the work belongs "to an earlier stage of Vishnava worship." In other words, he considered this festival to belong to a later time. That he was, however, mistaken herein, apart from the other points involved in this question, is evident from the simple fact that a century later Hemādri uses the Bhāvishya Pur., the Vālmi Pur., &c. in his description of the festival. Accordingly, as with regard to the total omission of it in the Bhāgavata Pur., so we must here also look for an explanation of this indication of a different date, resting on a basis other than a chronological one. There might exist for it many geographical, religio-historical, or other reasons the particular details of which escape our notice. In the first place special stress is, at all events, to be laid on the fact that in the Vārāha Purāṇa the birth-festival of Krishna appears as a single link of an entire series of such festivals to be held on the twelfth, and addressed to the ten, or rather eleven (!) avatāras of Vishnu as fish, tortoise, boar, man-lion, dwarf, Bhāgavata (i.e. Paramāra), Rāma, Kṛiṣṇa, Buddha, Kālī, and as Pādmanābha (sic). With the general calendar this single festival had to be harmonized.|| Therefore this description does not exclude the possibility that in other quarters it was contemporaneously celebrated also according to the manner known to us, which finally became the only acknowledged one. In the festival-calendars of other nations similar differences are also found to occur by the side of each other. I am moreover inclined to recognize an after-effect of this festival described by the Vārāha Purāṇa, in that form of the Janmāśṭamī celebration which (see above, p. 178) likewise, as is done here, requires the worship of the god over a pitcher. We shall return to the probable reason for this manner of adoration in § 2. I have finally to state an extremely peculiar fact, in the above discussed (p. 169) modern Vishnu ritual Ms., which breaks off in our MS. at the representation of the Janmāśṭamī (fol. 32a-33b), we find an exposition also of this festival of the Vārāha Purāṇa, and that shortly before it (fol. 25a-26a), under the very name of Jayanti, or rather Jayantinahāvādāsāvatam, in such a manner, however, that the description entirely agrees in the essential points with that of the Janmāśṭamī itself (except the erection of the sūtikāgrika, which is here wanting), so that the defect at the end may be considered quite supplemented by the former description. We have here, then, a peculiar connection of the view of Madhava, according to which Jayanti and Janmāśṭamī are two special eras (the month-date whereof, however, is the same), with the divergent month-date of the Vārāha Purāṇa,—in such a manner, however, that whilst according to M. the Jayanti is the richer form of the festival, here rather the Janmāśṭamī appears as such. This is, however, probably quite a secondary arrangement, as it cannot as yet be traced to other sources.

There is, besides, yet a third date, though of a pitcher, watching through the night, the giving away of the idol in the morning,—these are, throughout, the separate stages of the celebration.
somewhat indefinite kind, to hand, at least for the birth of Krīṣṇa, if not for a special celebration thereof. In the Harivāna, v. 3315, it is said that Devakī and Yaśodā gave birth to infants in the same night. This night is in v. 3247 called the ninth day of the dark half (navamiḍa eva samjñāta kriśnapakšayya vai tīthau), but the month is not mentioned, and in v. 3320 it is designated by the name Jayantī. In the latter place, also, Abhijita, not Rohini, is named as the star of the birth, and the hour of the birth is as above, p. 177, called Viṣṇu, but in v. 3317 Abhijita (conf. also v. 3248). Now, although it is evident that in this statement the root ji, “to conquer,” intentionally employed, is of great importance, and therefore perhaps no special stress is to be laid on the difference of the birth-star, it remains nevertheless strange enough; besides, the difference of the date is in no wise touched by any reasons for the use of the root ji. The verse (3320), moreover, which gives the star Abhijita, the day Jayantī, and the hour Viṣṇu as the birth-marks of Janāradana, is elsewhere (see above, p. 169) quoted from the Bṛhat-Maṇḍa Purāṇa, or rather was known already to Hemāndra, and is therefore just as old as any other statement concerning the subject in question.

Considering the vast extent of India, it is self-evident that various calendar-ritual differences must have taken place there, and do take place, according to the locality, time, sect, or sub-sect. Thus we find, for instance, for the same date which was finally fixed as the solemn one to celebrate the Kṛishṇa-jana-maṁsa, and in the same work which is the chief source for it, namely in the Bhaṭavikṣyottara Purāṇa, almost immediately after the description of this festival, also a festival dedicated to Śiva in Śrāvana as Śrava (see above, p. 171), and in Bhāḍrapada as Tryambaka.

ELEVEN LAND-GRANTS OF THE CHAULUKYAS OF ANHILVĀD.

A CONTRIBUTION TO THE HISTORY OF GUJARAT.

BY G. BÜHLER.

Some time ago Major J. W. Watson, then Acting Political Agent, Revākāṇḍhā, informed me that a large number of ancient copper-plates were lying in the Gaṅgāvāda kacchā hā at Kāḍī, the chief town of the Uṭṭara Māhāla. At the request of the Honourable Sir E. C. Bayley, Dr. Thornton, Officiating Foreign Secretary to the Government of India, was good enough to ask the Agent to the Governor-General at Baroda to use his influence with the Gaṅgāvāda Dīvān to make these important historical documents accessible. On hearing of the matter, Sir T. Māḍhavrajā, with the greatest readiness and courtesy, gave orders that the Kāḍī plates should be made over to me for publication, and I received shortly afterwards, 20 pieces—Nos. 1 and 3 to 11.

No. 2 I owe to the kindness of Colonel Shortt, Political Agent, Pahānpur, who obtained it, together with a very valuable grant of Govinda III., the Rāshtrakūṭa king of Mālkhet, from the Rādhanpur Darbār. The first information regarding the existence of the plates I received in this case also from Major Watson.

Hitherto three grants only, issued by Chaulukya kings of Anhilvād,—the Nāḍolī plates of Kūmārapāla, a Kacch grant of Bṛha-madeva I., and the Ahmadābād plates of Bṛha-madeva II.,—have been partly published. The discovery of so large a number of new grants is therefore an important event for those who take an interest in the history of Gujarāt. The Chaulukyas have had, it is true, more, and more trustworthy, chroniclers than any other Indian dynasty; and the hoarding disposition of the Jain Panchāyats has preserved, if not all, at least many important works of these writers. Still there are a number of points in the history of the Chaulukya kings which require further elucidation. Thus the origin of the Anhilvād Chaulukyas, and the

† The works hitherto recovered are —
1. Hemachandra Abhayashakti's Deśaṅgāvatālī, about A.D. 1100, but revised A.D. 1155-56.
2. Someśvara's Kṛīṣṇa-nandita, 1290-95 A.D.
3. Kṛishnaṇa's Ratnasāra, about 1230 A.D.
4. Morentra's Prabandhabhāṣyadisthasa, 1308 A.D.
5. Morentra's Vichāraśreya, about 1310 A.D.
6. Rājaśkhara's Prabandhasāstra, 1340 A.D.
7. Harshaguru's Vastupulacharita, 1440-41 A.D.
manner in which the first king Mūlarāja came to the throne, is not quite clear. Next, the number of the kings is doubtful, as Bhimadeva's published grant leaves out the fourth king, Vallabha. Further, the statements of the later Muhammadan writers about the invasion of Gujarāt by Mahmūd Ghaznavi do not agree with the chronology of the Jainas. Finally, the duration and the history of the last portion of the reign of Bhimadeva II., the last Chaulukya of the main or Aṇhīlvād line, and the accession of the Vyāghrapālī or Vāghelā branch line to the sovereignty of Gujarāt, require further elucidation. The information given in Mr. Kinloch Forbes's standard work, the Rāṣ Māḷā, on these last points is very scanty, because Someśvara's Kūrtīkarnudā, Rājaśekhara's Prabandhakosha, and Harshagani's Vastupātḷcharita were not available when he wrote. A not very correct Gujarātī abstract of the latter work has been published by Vrijīlal Śāstrī in the Buddhāprakāśā for 1866. Owing to the language, and the obscurity of the periodical, it has not received any attention on the part of Orientalists. Under these circumstances, it will be advisable to prefix to the transcripts and translations or abstracts of the new inscriptions a short review of the history of the Aṇhīlvād Chaukukyas, with special reference to the doubtful points. Though it is not yet possible to solve all the doubtful questions, still the information which these grants afford, advances our knowledge not inconsiderably.

Most Jain chronicle of Gujarāt agree that the first Chaukukya ruler of Gujarāt was descended from Rāja, a son of king Bhuva- nāditya who ruled at Kālyāna, the capital of Kaṇoja, and from Lilādevī, the sister of the last Chāpotkaṇa or Chāṇḍā king of Aṇhīlvād Pāṭhaṇa.† A rather romantic story is told of the manner in which Rāja came to Pāṭhaṇ, attracted the notice of Sāmantaśīṁha, and became his brother-in-law. Merutunga asserts that Rāja in 998 Vikrama, with two brothers, in disguise, made a pilgrimage to Somanathapāṭhaṇ, and on his way back attended at Aṇhīlvād a parade of cavalry, on which occasion his criticism of the performances and an exhibition of his equestrian skill, gained him the esteem of the king. When his descent became known, Sāmantaśīṁha wished to retain him, and married him to Līlādevī. The latter died in childbirth. But her body being opened, a living son was taken from it, who was called Mūlarāja, after the constellation under which he was born. Mūlarāja was educated and adopted by his maternal uncle. When he was grown up, Sāmantaśīṁha used repeatedly, when drunk, to abdicate in his favour, and to assume the kingly power after he had become sober. Mūlarāja, who became tired of being a plaything for his uncle's varying moods, finally caused him to be assassinated, and usurped the throne.

Mr. Forbes has accepted this account, merely toning down some of the palpable absurdities of the story, and assuming with Mr. Elphinstone§ that Mūlarāja's father came, not from Kaṇoja, but from Kālyāna in the Dekhana, the seat of the great southern Chaukukya dynasty.|| I do not think that the accuracy of any portion of this story can be upheld, except perhaps the assertion that Mūlarāja's mother was a Chāṇḍā princess, and that his father was a Chaukukya. For if the chronology of Merutunga is compared with his story, the utter absurdity of the latter comes out very clearly. Merutunga says that Sāmantaśīṁha mounted the throne in 991 Vikrama, and ruled seven years, until 998. At the same time and in the same breath he states that Rāja came to Aṇhīlvād in 998 Vikrama, married Līlādevī, and had a son by her, as well as that this son grew up to manhood under his uncle's care and slew him. Now for all these events at least twenty years are required, and yet we are told that Rāja came to Pāṭhaṇ in 998, and that Mūlarāja deposed his uncle in the same year! It will not avail anything to say that the arrival of Rāja must be dated earlier. For as Sāmantaśīṁha reigned only seven years it could not have fallen in his reign at all, and the story of Rāja's meeting with Sāmantaśīṁha while king must be untrue. I think Merutunga's whole narrative must be thrown aside, as an invention of the bards, who wished to join in a convenient manner the history of their Chāpotkata and Chaukukya rulers. In this opinion I am confirmed by the silence of the Dvārakāyakosha on the point, and by the short statements of our grant No. 1. The Dvārakāyakosha is, as Mr.

‡ Hist. of India, p. 241, 6th ed.
§ Rāṣ Māḷā, loc. cit. and vol. l. p. 244.
Forbes has already pointed out, not simply a work of Hemachandra. It has probably been revised by Abhayatilaka\(^7\) in 1312 Vikrama, and contains a sufficient number of anachronisms to prove that even its earlier parts are not simply the work of an author of the 12th century. But on the whole it is more trustworthy than Merutunga’s ‘vario historie.’ Now this work merely states that Mūlarāja was a Chaulukya, and extols his valour and power. The statement of our inscription regarding the donor’s origin is very short, but, I think, sufficient to further discredit Merutunga. He calls himself a descendant of the Solanki (chauluškikāvya) and son of the great king of kings Rājī, and says that he acquired the Sārasvatamandala, i.e. the province watered by the Sārasvatī, by the strength of his arm.” Now it may be conceded that the assassination of Sāmantaśīnhi and probably, would be represented by the pañjīts of the murderer as an honest victory gained by the strength of his arm. But it does not at all agree with Merutunga’s narrative that Rājī is called ‘the great king of kings.’ Such a title would hardly be given to a wandering Rajput younger son. I do not think that the desire to do honour to his patron’s father would induce a pañjīt to call him mahārājadhirāja if he had not really been a king seated on the guḍī. At least, before I could admit such a hypothesis, I should require a much stronger proof than Merutunga’s inconsistent story.

As matters now stand, I think it safer to take the statement of Mūlarājā’s grant as the basis for the reconstruction of the origin of the Chaulukya rule in Gujarāt. The above-cited words of the inscription, coupled with the fact that Mūlarāja is always in the grants and elsewhere, named as the first Chaulukya king of Aṅhīvalī, lead to the conclusion that his father was actually king of the native country of this branch of the Chaulukyas, and that Mūlarāja, either driven out of his paternal realm by other enemies, or impelled by ambition and hunger for land, attacked and conquered northern Gujarāt. The question is now where Rājī’s home and kingdom was. The Gujarāt chronicler states that in 752

\(^{7}\) Mr. Forbes (p. 209) gives the name of the reviser as Leśkīja, or Leśkīja (Ind. Ant. vol. IV. p. 72) as Leśkīhāi. The Pāṭhān copy in Hemachandra’s Bhāṣaḍā reads clearly sṛṣṭisvarārādhiśikṣaḥpāyuḥbhāyatilakasāgari, i.e. the in-

significant pupil of Śrī Jnānvara Śūrī, Abhayatilakasāgari. Jaina names are frequently formed with abhayas, e.g. Abhayadeva, Leśkīja has no meaning. Leśa means ‘a particle,’ and abhyasādi literally ‘a particle of a pupil,’ i.e. an insignificant pupil.
Saivas. Thirdly, the cognizance of the former is the boar, and that of the latter, as grant No. 1 shows, the bull, Nandi. Fourthly, the names of the kings from Bhumati to Rayi do not agree with those of the vaisahshati of the Dekhan inscriptions. Fifthly, it seems certain that the relations between Mularaja and his Dekhan clansman were anything but friendly. After his access to the throne he had to encounter an army under Baram, sent by Tailapa of Telengana. Sixthly, Mularaja, as well as his successors, settled in Gujarath numerous colonies of Brahmins, who down to the present day are called Audichayas, 'Northerners.' He gave to them Simhapura or Sihoor, in Eastern Kathiavard, Stambhatirtha or Khambay, and numerous villages in the country between the Baas and the Sambharati. Now, as a general rule, Indian kings, on making conquests, import people from their native homest if they do so at all. If, therefore, Mularaja had come from the Dekhan, Gujarath would have been filled with Telengana and Karna Brahmas. If, as the chronicles say, he came from the north, the introduction of the Audichya Brahmas is at once explained. This last point is, in my opinion, one of the strongest arguments in favour of the native statement, and least likely to be reconciled with Elphinstone's theory. Several of the other points above mentioned may be explained away. Thus, it may be contended that Mularaja changed his religion and his crest on succeeding to the Chaudra throne, and accepted those of his mother's family. But though the adoption of a new deity is not a matter of great importance for a Rajput, because, as I was told in Rajputana, a rajah ought not to be exclusive in the point of worship, but favour all the various sects among his subjects, and though the adoption of new armorial bearings may have occurred in other cases, still it would be desirable to have some proof (which has hitherto not been furnished) that Siva and his Nandi were affected by the Chaudra. I must leave the reader to estimate the weight of each of the other arguments for himself. But in concluding this discussion I will add that the existence of a Chaulukya kingdom in Kanoj and the existence of another Kalyana are not so very incredible. There is a gap in the history of Kanoj from the times of Yasovarman, in the beginning of the eighth century, down to the end of the tenth century, when the Raths appear as its lords. This gap very nearly corresponds to the period assigned to Bhumati and his successors, as the former is stated to have reigned in 698-6 A.D., and Mularaja's accession is placed in 941-42 A.D. Further, the Dekhan Chaulukyas assert that their ancestors came from the north, and ruled in Ayodhya and other towns, and from the Gazetteer of the N. W. Provinces it appears that Chaulukya Rajputs are found in the Kanoj districts to the present day. As regards the existence of another Kalaya, it ought to be borne in mind that the name is by no means uncommon. Two towns of this name are well known and of great antiquity, viz. Kalya near Bombay, the Kallitan of the Greeks, and Kalya in the Dekhan. Less noted Kalyapuras occur frequently on the map of India. Considering all these circumstances, I adopt the statement of the Gujarathis, and take Mularaja to have been the son of a king who ruled in Kanyakubja and who reconquered Gujarath, which had been an old dependency of his paternal empire. It may be that his mother belonged to the Chaund family. As the account of the chroniclers is evidently based on bardic stories, it deserves, in such a particular, some credit. The genealogies are the special province of the bards, and they are more careful in matters connected with these than regarding other historical facts.

There are two other points in the inscription which receive their explanation through facts related by the chroniclers, and confirm the history given by the latter. The first of these is contained in the statement No. 1, Pl. I. 1. 2, that Mularaja was tryambakaiva vikritachaladrayah, literally, "like Tryambaka, one who took up his residence on a mountain." Now, if we did not know that Mularaja's capital was Asahillapaksha (Pl. I. 1. 8), situated in an entirely flat, sandy country, and not even within fifty miles of any hill, the inference might be made that he held his court in some hill-fort. As the case stands, such an explanation is not admissible, and we have to look for some other solution of the problem. This is

† As an instance I may quote the introduction of Dees-

the Marath Brahmans into Gujarath since the conquest of Baroda by the Gaikwâds.
afforded by Merutunga, who tells us that soon after his accession to the throne Mūlarāja was assailed by two armies, that of the Sāpādānakshiyā Rāja of Sākambharī (Śambhar) and that of Bārapa, the general of Tailapa of Kālyāna. Unable to resist his foes, he fled to Kanthaung, the modern Kanthakot in the eastern (Vāgad) division of Kachch, and there bided his time. Now it seems to me very probable that the Paṇḍit who composed the Prabandhaśāntamāla that Mūlarāja was a constant worshipper of Somanathā, and used to perform a pilgrimage to Somanathā Pāthah every Monday, i.e. a journey of about 250 miles, and back! Somanathā was so much pleased with this devotion that he personally migrated first to Manḍalī (now Māndalī, in the Virangam Tāluka), and later to Anhilvād. At Manḍalī, Mūlarāja built for him the temple called Mulesvara. This is evidently the Mālanathadeva to which the village of Kambikā was given.

It is a pity that the historical portion of the inscription is so short, and affords no information regarding the great expeditions of Mūlarāja against the Ābhira or Yādava of Vamanasthalī (Vanthalī) and the ruler of Lāta. Its date, 1043 Vikrama (996-97 A.D.), agrees with the statement of the chroniclers that Mūlarāja ruled from 998 to 1053 of the same era.

According to the account of Merutunga, Mūlarāja was succeeded by his son Chāmunṣa, who ruled for thirteen years, until 1066 (A.D. 1009-10). After him came his two sons Vallaḥbharaja and Durlabhharaja, the former of whom died of small-pox after a reign of six months, while the latter occupied the throne until S. 1078 (A.D. 1021-22). In that year he abdicated in favour of his nephew Bhimadeva I., the son of his younger brother Nāgarāja. No historical events are recorded of these three reigns except that both Chāmunṣa and Durlabha became ascetics, and that during this period the enmity between Māla and Gujara began, owing to an afront offered either to Chāmunṣa or to Durlabha when proceeding to Banaras.|| A great deal of confusion has been caused in this account by the fact that Mr. Forbes’s grant of Bhimadeva II., dated 1256 Vikrama (1209-10 A.D.), does not enumerate Vallabhāraja among the kings of Anhilvād, and that some of the later Muhammadan historians place the expedition of Mahmūd Ghaznavi in the reign of Jāmūnd, i.e. Chāmunṣa. The first circumstance has led Mr. Forbes to doubt that Vallaḥbharaja actually reigned. The new collection of grants settles this question in favour of the chroniclers. Seven out of the eight grants which give the complete genealogy of the Chaukukya kings, Nos. 4-10, include Vallabhāraja, while one only, No. 3, omits him. It is evident that the shortness of his reign induced the writers of Mr. Forbes’s grant and of our No. 3 to omit his name.

The other point, the discrepancy between the chronology of the chroniclers and that of the Aṣṭa Abhar and other late Muhammadan writers, is very serious. If Chāmunṣa is placed in 1024 A.D. instead of in 1010, the dates of the Gujara writers are entirely disarranged, and the confusion becomes worse by the identification of the descendant of the Dabhībhīm, whom Mahmūd is said to have placed on the gaddī of Anhilvād, with Durlabhāsaena (Durlabhharaja). Mr. Forbes’s chapter on this period is, therefore, most unsatisfactory. His narrative first follows the account of the Gujara, which is plain enough. When, afterwards, the conflicting version of the Muhammadans is given, accompanied by hints that this may contain, after all, the real historical facts, the reader is left in an uncomfortable state of perplexity and doubt. This is, however, not the fault of Mr. Forbes, in whose time it would have been difficult to obtain a satisfactory solution of the question without a thorough study of the rare MSS. of the earlier Musalmān historians of the Ghaznavi dynasty. It is gratifying that now the Gujara chroniclers can be proved to be in the right, both by the testimony of early Musalmān writers and of the inscriptions of Bhimadeva I.

Mūlarāja’s accession cannot be correct, as Tailapa began to rule in 978 A.D., and Mūlarāja in 941-42.|| Rās Mālā, vol. I. p. 71.

§ The name is spelt Bēkap by Mr. Forbes. The Government copy reads Bēkakha,—probably a mistake for Bēkap. The statement that this invasion occurred shortly after
In the Appendix to Sir H. Elliot's History of India, vol. II. pp. 429 seq., a full review of the history of Mahmūd's expeditions against India has been given. The oldest account of the Somanātha expedition by Ibn Asir, p. 469, states that the 'chief of Anhalwāra,' called Bīhīm, fled hastily (on Mahmūd's approach), and abandoning his city he went to a certain fort for safety and to prepare himself for war. Next the march against Somanātha vī to Dabhalwāra, "which is two days' journey from Somanātha," and the capture of the temple, are related. After this we are told that "Mahmūd received intelligence that Bīhīm, the chief of Anhalwāra, had gone to the fort of Kandaḥat, which is situated about forty parasangs from Somnāt, between that place and the desert. He marched thither, and when he came in front of the place he questioned some men, who were hunting, as to the tide. From them he learned that there was a practicable ford, but that if the wind blew a little he might be submerged. Mahmūd prayed to the Almighty and then entered the water. He and his forces passed over safely and drove the enemy out of the place. From thence he returned, intending to proceed against Mansūrā," &c.

In this narrative we have the name of Bīhīm a twice. He was therefore on the throne in 1024 A.D., as the Gujarāti chroniclers assert. This account is remarkable also in other respects. It knows nothing of a long stay of the Musalmāns in Gujarāt, or of the establishment of a descendant of the Dā bīhīmā on the throne of Anhilvād. That fable occurs first in Mirkhond's history together with a wild description of the riches of Gujarāt and its gold mines, and it may be therefore rejected as one of the later embellishments which have been added so freely to the full of Somanātha by the later Musalmān writers. As regards Ibn Asir's story that Bhīm fled at Mahmūd's approach to a fort called Kandaḥat, there is no reason for rejecting it. On the contrary, the flight is what might be expected from a king whose dominions probably included not much more than the Pahānpur Agency, part of the Mahākātha, the Gaikvāḍi Uttar Mahāls,

the Ahmadābād Collectorate north of the Sābbarmatī, and eastern Kachh (Vāgād), and who was taken by surprise. The fort of Kandaḥat I consider to be Kantaḥkot, in Kachh,—the same to which Mūlārjā retired before his enemies. Just this last point, as well as the resemblance of the two names, its position between Somanātha and the desert (of Marvād), and the fact that Bhīmadeva did possess eastern Kachh, are strong arguments in favour of this identification. It seems to me also that the difficulty about the sea being near Kandaḥat may be got over. For in marching from Somanātha to Kantakot Mahmūd had to cross the Raq of Kachh, which in his time probably extended further east than now. The statement that the sea was fordable at low water, and that it became dangerous at high water if the wind rose, fits the Raq well. Anybody who has crossed it eastern corner will know how frequently the boats stick in the mud at low water, while a strong west wind with the tide is sure to fill the narrow bed to a considerable depth. The only difficulty which remains is the phrase "when Mahmūd came in front of the place," which would seem to indicate that the sea was close to the fort. This is not the case, as Kantaḥkot is about twenty miles north of the Raq. But it is not too much to suppose that Ibn Asir and his successors, who were not possessed of any personal knowledge of Gujarāt, may have made a little mistake on this point.

If we now turn to Bhīmadeva's inscriptions, they fully confirm the Gujarāti chroniclers' chronology, as they show that he reigned in 1088 and [10]°8 Vikrama, &c. His A. D. 1029 and 1036. It is highly interesting that both grants are dated from A n h i l vād, and prove that Mahmūd's invasion did not prevent the king from reoccupying his capital soon after the invader's departure. This fact confirms the narrative of Ibn Asir, who makes Mahmūd march from Kandaḥat against Mansurā. To sum up, the Gujarāti chroniclers are right in placing the accession of Bhīmadeva in S. 1053 Vikrama, or 1022 A.D. Bhīmadeva was the king who ruled Gujarāt at the time of Mahmūd's invasion. He fled, at the latter's approach, to his ancestral fortress Kantaḥ or Mansurā.

* Loc. cit. vol. II. p. 349.
† See H. H. Wilson, As. Res. vol. XVII. p. 194.
§ See grant No. 2 and Mr. Kakhar's grant, Kacha- dehino Itsbā, p. 17.
|| The historian of Kachh, loc. cit., says that Bhīmadeva's grant is dated in S. 98, and he refers this date to the years of the Chaubrika dynasty. If the grant really is dated 98, which may be doubted, as it has been imperfectly deciphered, it is more likely that the hundreds have been left out, according to a very common habit of Hindu writers.
Kanthkoṭ. Mahmūd, after following him thither, and forcing him to seek again safety in flight, marched against Mansūra, probably through the northern part of the Rāq and Thār-Pārkār. Bhimadeva on his part returned to Anhilvāḍa as soon as the great storm-wave had passed, and ruled for nearly fifty years longer, without glory.

Our inscriptions furnish no information regarding the latter part of Bhimadeva’s reign, nor for that of his son Karna I., S. 1138-50 Vikrama (1072 to 1093-94 A.D.) except that he bore the surname Trailokyaśūlī, ‘the wrestler of the universe.’ Regarding Karna’s son Jayasiṅhā, the vaṁśadvī of No. 5 repeats the statement of Mr. Forbes’s Ahmadābād plate that he conquered ‘the lord of Avanti, (and) Varvaraka;’ while Nos. 3 and 6 to 10 insert Tribhuvaṇagāṇḍa between the two names, and No. 4 shows an erroneous displacement of the names. The first fact is well known. Who Tribhuvaṇagāṇḍa, ‘the hero of the three worlds,’ was, I am not able to tell. Varvaraka deserves passing remark. In the Dvāryaṇakosa, Varvaraka is represented as a leader of Rākshasas who troubled the Brāhmaṇa at Śrīsthala-Siddhapura. Jayasiṅhā conquered him, and granted him his life at the instance of his wife Pingalikā. Afterwarda Varvaraka gave valuable presents to Jayasiṅhā, and ‘served him as other Rajputs did.’ Mr. Forbes expresses his opinion that Varvaraka is a name of the king of Mālava whom Jayasiṅhā conquered. He has been led to form this view by a mistake in the rendering of the compound Avantināthavaravarakajīśvha, the first two parts of which make a copulative, not a determinative compound, and which must therefore be translated as has been done above. The proof of the correctness of this interpretation is afforded by the fact that most of the new inscriptions insert Tribhuvaṇagāṇḍa between Avantinātha and Varvaraka.

The chroniclers also separate the subjugation of Barbar entirely from the expeditions against Mālava. Someśvara (Kirti-kumudī, ii. 33) gives the following notice of this event:—vaṁśadān yudhānandaranah budhho babharakadbhidhām | siddhārjanīṛdṛjunyō yajīṇa ṛjārīṣaḥ [[38]], ‘This moon among kings fotters! the prince of goblins, Barbaraka, in a burial-place, and became known among the crowd of kings as Siddharaja.’

The verse shows that within a hundred years after Jayasīṁhā’s death this story had become completely mythical. Instead of Śrīsthala we have a burial-ground as the scene of the fight, and the Rākshasa has been converted into a prince of goblins (yātthāna). The inscriptions, in placing the lord of Avanti, Tribhuvaṇagāṇḍa, and Varvaraka side by side, indicate clearly that they consider him a human foe. The account of the Dvāryaṇa gives the same impression, in spite of the appellation ‘the leader of the Rākshasas.’ It seems to me most probable that Varvaraka belonged to one of the non-Aryan tribes who are settled in great numbers in northern Gujarāt, and that he was either a Koli or a Bhil, or perhaps a Mēr. Such people are occasionally called Rākshasas on account of their cruelty and want of civilization.

Of the numerous important events of Kumārapāla’s reign the inscriptions Nos. 3-10 mention only the victory over the lord of Sākambhr (Sambhar), which is described at great length by the chroniclers. Regarding Ajaya naḷ, the next king, the chroniclers say little, as they were Jainas, whom the king hated as his uncle’s friends and protectors. Our inscriptions say that he made tributary the Sopādilakākṣhaṇadāpta, i.e., the king of Sākambhar. It would seem, therefore, that Kumārapāla’s conquest had no lasting effects. His epithet paramannātha or mahiddhāna, ‘the ardent devotee of Śiva,’ alludes to the reaction against Jainism which took place during his reign. He is said to have roasted Rāmachandra, the pupil of Hemachandra, alive, and to have destroyed the Jain temples and books. The only fact noted by the chroniclers regarding the reign of his successor Mālarjā II., the struggle with the Musalmāns, is confirmed by our inscriptions, as he is called ‘(the king) who overcame in battle the ruler of the Garjanakas, who are difficult to conquer.’ Garjanakas is a Sanskrit word coined to represent Ghaznavi, and intended to give to the latter an etymological meaning, viz. ‘the roarer.’ Merutunga uses it or Gajjanaka in several passages and in the same sense. Someśvara (Kirti-kumudī, II. 57) says of Mālarjā II. that make no distinction between us and ba. Barbaraka may therefore be the correct form.

* * *

**Notes:**

1. *Ibid. Ant.* vol. iv., pp. 235, 256. Barbaraka is the reading of grant No. 19, and it ought to be noted that Nos. 3-9
he conquered the lord of the Tārṇaḥkaśa. Mr. Forbes has already correctly pointed out the invasion to which allusion is made.†

For the next reign, that of Bhimadeva II. or Bholo Bhima, the inscriptions are of the utmost importance. The Gujarāti chroniclers accessible to Mr. Forbes say very little regarding him, and those now available do not add much more. The hearts of Merutunga and Someśvara were not with Bhima. The sovereignty of Anhilvād interested them no longer. They turned their attention to the father of the future ruler of Gujarāt, Rāja Viradhavāla of Dhavalagiri or Dholkā, and to his two great Jain ministers, Vastupāla and Tejapāla. Mr. Forbes has therefore been obliged to trust for his history chiefly to the Prithvīraj raśā, attributed to Chand, and to the late Muhammadan writers, who, as he himself points out in the case of the former, are not accurate. Chand kills Bhimadeva off at an early period of his reign, some time before 1193 A.D. Mr. Forbes places his death in 1215 A.D. It is difficult to understand how he could do so, as he repeatedly quotes the Abū inscription dated 1231 A.D., which mentions Bhimadeva as lord paramount, and as Merutunga in the Prabhandhakchinotmaṇi says quite plainly, "Bhimadeva reigned sixty-three years from S. 1235 Vikrama," i.e. until 1298, or 1241-42 A.D. Bhimadeva's inscriptions fully agree with Merutunga. His last grant, No. 9 of our collection, is dated 1296 Vikrama, and the grant of his successor Trīhubavanapāla in 1299 Vikrama, or 1242-43 A.D. Of actual historical facts connected with Bhimadeva's reign, Merutunga reports in the Prabhandhakchinotmanī only an attempted invasion of Gujarāt by Soñā, i.e. Subhaṭavaman of Mālava, which was availed of by a timely epigram of the Pradhāna,‡ and the destruction (bhanga) of Gūjaraṇaḍa by Soñā's son Arjunaṅda, who in his own inscriptions boasts of this exploit. Further he says that Raṇa Viradhavāla, the father, Lavanaprāśāda of Vāyugrarapalli or Vāghel, was Bhima's major domus (vāyuja transformed). At this point he turns aside to the history of the Vāghelās and of their Jaina maṇḍras. In the Pichāvāraṇa he merely notices Bhima's accession in 1235, and adds drily, tato gajjanakarāyam,

‡ Forbes, loc. cit. p. 282.
§ The Sanskrit word bhāla may also be rendered 'foolish,' or 'arrogant, foolish.'

"Then follows the rule of the Gujjanakas," i.e. of the Musalmāns. After inserting a Prakrit verse he proceeds to enumerate the Vāghelā kings. Someśvara (Kirti, II. 59-61) treats Bhimadeva still worse. He says:—

drutam unnālīte tatra dhītrā kaṭpadrumān-
kūr [najagāṇānjanānāya varbhāna iti bhupatik | 59 || bhīmasena bhūmovi bhupatir na kudāhane | bakapakāriṇā tumī vṛjanaśadalāhamsa || 60 ||

kārībhir maṇḍalikāt ca balavādbhī | s-auśānāi ||

[61 ||

(59.) "After the Creator had swiftly uprooted that shoot of the tree of paradise (Mālārjya I.), his younger brother, called Śrī Bhima, became king.

(60.) "That prince was never equal to Bhīmasena, the destroyer of the (Āśura) Baka, (nor) able to tame the swan-like kings (his enemies).

(61.) "The kingdom of that young's ruler was gradually divided between the powerful ministers and provincial chiefs (of Gujarāt)."

After these disparaging remarks, Someśvara turns, like Merutunga, to the history of the Vāghelās.

In direct opposition to the chroniclers, the inscriptions prove Bhimadeva to have been by no means a contemptible ruler. In our land-grants he receives the titles abhīnavasiddhārāja, 'the new Siddhārāja' (the old being Jayasimha), Nārdyandavatāra, 'an incarnation of Vishaṇu,' and saptamahakavarteṇa, 'the seventh wheel-king.' These epithets occur not only in his own inscriptions, but also in those of Jayatasaṁha (No. 4), and of Trīhubavanapāla (No. 10). The inscriptions prove also that he held the greater part of Gujarāt north of the Sābharmāt, which formed the original kingdom of Mūhrāja I., and that his power was acknowledged by the chieftains of Chandrāvati and Ābū, in southern Rajputana. Three of our grants (Nos. 6, 8, and 9) dispose of villages situated in the Vardhipatha, the Vaḍhārīzil, and No. 8 mentions the Agambhūta or Gambhūta pathaka as one of his provinces. No. 5 the Chālsaphatha, and No. 7 the Vālanypathaka. Again, in the Ābū inscription and I am inclined to consider it a translation of Bhima's Gujarāt nickname bholo, 'arrogant, foolish.'

|| See above, and below note to the grant of Mūlārja I. ||
No. XVI. (Wilson), dated Šaṁvat 1265, or 1208-9 A.D., Bhimadeva is mentioned as lord paramount of Ābû, and he occupies the same position in the Ābû inscription No. IV, which is dated twenty-two years later, in A.D. 1230-31. At the same time the inscriptions prove also that his rule was not without "thorns." Our grant No. 4 was issued by a Chaulukya ruler, Jayantaisinha, who describes himself in the following terms:—The great king of kings, the supreme ruler, the supreme lord, the illustrious Jayantasinha, a new Siddharāja who rules in the royal city of Anahilapura, who is possessed of the whole series of honorific titles, such as "he who obtained grace in consequence of a boon given by the husband of Umā," "he who has become the self-chosen husband of royal Fortune," "he who is a son of exceedingly marvellous ferocity," "he who is resplendent on account of his having extended the paradise-creeper Chaulukya race," "he who is the great bearer (able) to raise the earth that has sunk into the ocean of evil times," "he who is the only cloud (able) to cause to grow the seed-like Gājara country, that has been burnt up by the fire of misfortune," "he who is the hero (who conquers) through one body (ekānga) (his own) only (not as other kings through a [chaturānga] four-bodied army)." This vain-glorious passage is preceded by the usual vaśeśvali, beginning with Mūla-raja I. and ending with Bhimadeva II. But after naming the latter and giving his just titles, and just before the enumeration of Jayantasinha's own titles, follow the significant words tadānantaram sthāna, "after him (Bhima) in (his) place." Considering these statements, and the further assertion, in the preamble to the grant, that Jayantasinha ruled over the Varshipatāka and the Agambhūṭa or Gāmabhūṭapatāka, it is evident that he was a usurper who supplanted Bhima for a time. As one of Bhima's own grants (No. 5) is dated in 1283 Vikrama and from Anahilapatāka, it follows that Jayantasinha, who dates his grant in 1230 Vikrama, must have been ejected by the rightful owner soon after issuing the grant. But it is by no means probable that 1230 was the first year of his reign, and it must not be forgotten that the last known grant of Bhima, issued before 1280, is Mr. Forbes's Ahmadābād plate of 1266 Vikrama.

While it is thus evident that Bhimadeva maintained himself, though amidst difficulties and struggles, in the northern portion of the Chaulukya kingdom, it is no less certain that he lost the southern and south-western portion, the country between the Sābharat and the Narmada, as well as the Dholkā and Dhanḍhūkā districts to the Vāghelās. The very man whom Merutunga calls his pradhāna, Lavaṇaporśada, appears to have forsaken his liege lord, and to have founded a Vāghelā kingdom at Dholkā, which, shortly after Bhimadeva's death, absorbed the northern possessions of the elder branch of the Solankis. The fact of the rebellion is not clearly stated by the chroniclers. According to the habits of their kind, they smooth the difficulty over by making Lavaṇaporśada have a vision or dream in which he is commanded to restore the fortune of Gujarat and of its princey house. The oldest and most authentic version of this story is found in Someśvara's Kirtikaumudi II. 62-115, the author of which states that he himself was called by Lavaṇaporśada to hear the relation of the dream and to explain it. An abstract of the fifty verses, which contain also all the information which Someśvara gives regarding his patron's ancestors, may find here a place. After giving (II. vv. 59-61) the short notice of Bhimadeva which has been quoted above, he goes on as follows:—

"Now there was one Arna-raja who belonged to another branch of the Chaulukya race.† That royal saint was unable to bear the destruction of the country. He began to cleanse the kingdom of 'thorns,' and gained great victories and immortal fame in the three worlds.‡ His son is the illustrious Lavaṇaporśada, a warrior of the greatest bravery. He slew the chief of Naḍula (Nāḍol, in Marāṭh), in his well-ordered kingdom thieves are unknown; he himself takes only their glory from hostile kings. Rebellions Sāmantas are unable to check him. Before him the ruler of Mālava, who had come to invade the country, turned back; and the southern king also, when opposed by him, gave up the idea of war.§

† V. II. 62-66.
‡ Kirtik. II. 67-75.—The king of Mālava alluded to was no doubt Subhataranarum, who, according to Merutunga, was turned back by an epigram of Bhima's pradhāna.
His son, the illustrious Viradhavala, has gained splendid victories in battle. He resembles his father so closely that he reflects, as it were, his image in a mirror. These two, the father and the son, make the family unconquerable. Now it happened one day that Lavanaprāśāda awoke at the end of the night, and at once sent for his parvahita, Someśvaradeva, by name, the son of Kumara, as he wished to tell to that night a dream which he had had during the night. The priest came, made his obeisance, gave his blessing to the chief, and sat down on a mat. Then Lavanaprāśāda, who was attended by his son Virā, began to narrate as follows:—"It seemed to me that I ascended the mountain of Siva and worshipped the god, who appeared visibly before my eyes. Then, after I had finished my worship and was sunk in pious meditation, I saw standing before me a moon-faced maid, beautiful like Rākṣi, dressed in white garments, anointed with ungents, and holding a chaplet in her white hands. Wondering, I asked her who she was and why she came. Then she addressed me thus:—"O hero, know that I am the Fortune of the Gūrjara kings, who is sorely tormented by crowds of enemies. Alas! those Gūrjaras are slain who were able to destroy their foes, in whose arms I used to rest. The young or foolish wheel-kings, who now reign in their stead, are unable to subdue the armies of his enemies. His ministers and mandalas possess neither wisdom nor valour. They even raise their eyes to me, though I am their lord's lawful wife. The parvahita (snebhika) Amāraśram is dead, who used to protect me. Gone is the son of Muniṣāla, who humbled rebellious Rajputas. Pratāpamalla the Rāthor is no longer, who could not bear even the smell of a hostile elephant. My own people have brought me so low, excepting always Jagaḍeya, who kept the enemy from entering the capital. No lights shine now at night in the capital of Gūrjara-land; it resounds with the howl of the jackal; its walls are broken. Therefore do thou, together with thy son Viradhavala, rescue me and save the country." After the goddess had spoken thus, Lavanaprāśāda continued, "she threw her garment on this chair and vanished together with my dream. Now tell me what this means.""[\footnote{Hereupon Someśvara addressed the chief, declined him to be the happiest of all Rajputs, since Fortune wept him of her own accord, and exhorted him to accept the charge laid upon him and to engage able ministers. Then Lavanaprāśāda appointed Viradhavala to save the country, and he began to consider whom he should appoint his mantrī. But when the morning came the three companions rose in order to do what was to be done.}

This story, which is told with additions and numerous embellishments by the later chroniclers Rājaśekhara and Harshaśāana, means, if translated into plain English, that for a time Lavanaprāśāda, and perhaps also Viradhavala, served Bhimadeva, but that later, either disgusted with his arrogance and folly, or in despair of overcoming his numerous enemies, they separated from him, and took what they could lay hold of. A remnant of regard for his rightful king probably prevented Someśvara from giving the naked truth, and moved him to introduce the Gūrjara-RājaLaṃkāsa, as some czar manša. If Someśvara does not misrepresent his own position at Lavanaprāśāda's court, he probably was not without influence on the latter's course of action. It is also probable that the same feeling prevents him from mentioning any hostile engagements which, no doubt, occurred between the two Bhokīa chiefs and Bhimadeva. Throughout the remainder of his work he speaks of Viradhavala as an independent prince, who owned allegiance to nobody, and ignores the king of Paṭhan entirely. The same line is adopted in the inscriptions of Viradhavala's two ministers Vasupāla and Tejapāla, who, as Someśvara states in the third canto of the Kirtikamand, were engaged shortly after the occurrence described above.

\footnote{Kirt. II. 29, 31.}\footnote{The author himself.}\footnote{A picture of the G האו. \footnote{The author himself.}}
Neither in the Ábū nor in the Gîrnâr inscriptions of the two brothers is Bhīmādeva mentioned with a single word, though another Ábū inscription of the same time acknowledges him as lord paramount.† On the other hand Lavaṇaprasâda and Viradharvâla are given the titles mahârâja and mahârâjañârâja. The time of Lavaṇaprasâda’s defection can be fixed approximately from Vastupâla’s Gîrnâr inscriptions. There Vastupâla says that he transacted the ‘business with the seal’ in Gujarât since 1278 Vikrama (1219-20 A.D.). The portions of the Chaulukya kingdom which Lavaṇaprasâda and Viradharvâla ‘saved’ were, besides the Dholkâ and Dhanjîhâka districts, Khambar, Iâta, and Godhura, which are mentioned by Somâvâra as subject to Viradharvâla. The Chaulukya conquests in the Kathiavâr peninsula fell to the local chieftains, who, again became free, as they had been before the time of Jâyâsîmâha. The Prabhendhâkosha mentions especially the chief of Vadhvânp at having become independent and engaging in war with Viradharvâla. If Chand’s and the Muhammadan accounts of events referring to Bhima-deva’s reign are added to the notes given above, it will be possible to give a tolerably accurate outline of the history of Bhima-deva’s reign. But I defer this for another opportunity, when I shall give a short history of the whole Solanki period.

All the Gujarât chroniclers close the list of the Chaulukya kings of the main line with Bhīmādeva. If grant No. 10 now furnishes the name of an additional king, Trihubhuvanapâla, who held Aghiivâd 1299 Vikrama, after Bhima-deva’s death, and declares himself to be ‘mediating on his feet,’ i.e. to be his lawful successor, the most probable solution of the difficulty is that this ruler maintained himself only for a short time, and was not generally acknowledged as king of Gujarât. In favour of this view Merutunga’s statement, from the Vichâraârâtra, may be adduced, according to which Visala-deva the son of Viradharvâla succeeded to the throne of Aghiivâd in 1300 Vikrama, or 1243-44 A.D., as the first Chaulukya king of the Vâghelâ branch. Merutunga’s dates have been proved to be correct in so many cases which appeared at first sight rather doubtful that I have no hesitation in accepting them as long as they are not proved to be wrong by very strong evidence.

As regards the history of Visala-deva Vâghelâ of Aghiivâd, Râjâekhara and Harshagâna state that his father Viradharvâla died at Dholkâ not long before his great minister. As the latter’s death occurred in 1297 Vikrama (1240 A.D.), the Râjâ’s career must have come to an end either in 1295 or 1296 Vikrama, i.e., between 1238 and 1240 A.D. Viradharvâla had two sons, Vira-madava and Visala-deva. The former, who, as the elder, was the rightful heir to the gâdî, had given offence both to his father and to Vastupâla by ill-treating a Vânî, and had been banished to Viramgrâma, the modern Viramgâm. On the news of his father’s mortal illness he came to Dholkâ and tried to assert his right. But Vastupâla was too strong for him. He secured Visala-deva’s succession, and forced Vira-madava to fly from the city. Vira-madava then tried an appeal to arms. Being defeated, he went to his father-in-law Udâyasîmâha, chief of Jâbâlî, and was treacherously murdered at the instigation of Vastupâla, who, like a true Hindu mantrâ, made it his first care to remove “the thorns” from the kingdom. If Vastupâla hoped to keep Visala-deva in dependence, and to retain the great influence which he possessed during his father’s reign, he was disappointed. The new Râjâ appointed a Brahmân called Nâga-daç as his prime minister, and left to the two brothers some minor offices only.|| They suffered many indignities, and had been nearly obliged to undergo the ordeal by ‘the snake in the pot’ (ghataasarpâ) in order to prove themselves innocent of peculation. Their old friend Somâvâra saved them by a timely epigram. Not long after, another incident occurred which had nearly driven Vastupâla into open rebellion against his new master. The king’s maternal uncle, called Sihmâha, gave a blow to the gorjî or yati who was Vastupâla’s spiritual guide. The proud minister avenged it by causing one of his Rajput servants to accost Sihmâha in a seemingly friendly manner and to cut off his

† Wilson, No. II. As. Res. vol. XVI. p. 239.
‡ See J. Berzosa, inscription from Kathâvardi No. 16, I. 4:
§ Mentioned as minister in grant No. II, Pl. I. 17.
¶ Harshagâna says that the change in the ministry did not occur at once, but that Visala-deva, before it happened, was rescued by the brothers from an invasion made by Narasînha, king of Dîhalâ, i.e., Tripura-Tîvera, and that he was afterwards corrupted by his uncle Sihmâha.
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hand. After performing this feat the brave carried the bleeding member to Vastupāla, who displayed it in front of his palace. The mutiny of their chief roused all the Jethvā Rajputs, Sinhā's clansmen, and they vowed to stay the mantrī with his family. The latter made preparations to resist both the Jethvās and the Rāṇā, “abandoning the hope of life.” While matters were thus in a critical state, Someśvara again interposed and brought about a reconciliation. After these events the chroniclers lose sight of Vīsalaṭeva, and we hear nothing more of him than that he became, as stated above, king of Gujārāt in 1300 Vikram. It is very probable that the reunion of all the Chaulukya possessions in his hand did not take place peaceably. Probably he ousted Triḥuvaṇaṭāla by force of arms. Grant No. 11 proves that he took up his residence at Anhilvād. It also shows that he was not allowed to rest on his laurels, but had to defend his new possessions against numerous and various foes. Sinhā, the Yādava of Devagiri, who ruled until 1247-48 A.D., had already unsuccessfully assailed Vīradhavāla, as we learn from Someśvara, Kirtik. IV. If Vīsalaṭeva boasts that he "dried up the ocean of his army," that means, probably, that he successfully resisted another invasion. The ruler of Mālava was one of the hereditary foes of Gujārāt, who probably tried another invasion. Vīsalaṭeva's contemporaries in Mālava was Purṇamaṭāra.* The king of Medapaṭa appears for the first time in this grant as an enemy of the Solankis. Medapaṭa is the Sanskrit form of Medavād.† The word means etymologically 'the country of the Medas,' the Mērs of modern times, who still inhabit the Arāvalli hills, on the boundary of Medavād. Perhaps the Tejasimha mentioned in the Abū inscription, which gives the pedigree of the Gehels down to 1255-86, was the opponent alluded to. Another interesting fact recorded in our grant is that Vīsalaṭeva was the successful competitor at a svayāṇavara for the hand of the daughter of the king of the Kārnāta country. I suppose the latter must have been one of the Bālān-Yādavas of Dvārāsamaḍa. Our grant is dated in 1317 Vikrama, or 1260-61 A.D.; and this agrees with the statement of Merutunga in the Víchṛdwēśatar that Vīsalaṭeva reigned until 1318 Vikrama, 1261-62 A.D. According to the same authority his three successors ruled as follows:

Arjunaṭeva 1318 to 1331 V. = 1261-62 to 1274-75 A.D.
Sārangadeva 1331 to 1353 V. = 1274-75 to 1296-97 A.D.
Karna(ghelo) 1353 to 1360 = 1296-27 to 1303-4.

We have inscriptions of Arjunaṭeva at Somanātha Pāṭhas dated 1264-65 A.D., and in Kachh dated 1328 Vikrama, or 1271-72 A.D.,§ and of Sārangadeva, in the temple of Vastupāla at Abū, dated 1294 A.D. These dates agree, therefore, with Merutunga's statement. The final annexation of Gujārāt by the Muhammadans in 1304 is well known.

No. 1. ||

Plate I. (1) 9. Ranaṛkapureṇa || Ranaḥ || ṇa viniḥbhavya: || kṛṣṇaṁya:||
(2) 3. vitiśadakaṇāya: || vitiśaṁ ṇa vikramātmaṇaḥ: || viśvaṁ ṇa viśvaṁya:||
(3) 3. vina: || bālakag ṇa vinaṇaṇaṁ: || kalpavī ṇa vāsitaṁvāṇya:||
(4) 3. vina: || bālakag ṇa vinaṇaṇaṁ: || kalpavī ṇa vāsitaṁvāṇya:||
(5) 3. vina: || bālakag ṇa vinaṇaṇaṁ: || kalpavī ṇa vāsitaṁvāṇya:||
(6) 3. vina: || bālakag ṇa vinaṇaṇaṁ: || kalpavī ṇa vāsitaṁvāṇya:||
(7) 3. vina: || bālakag ṇa vinaṇaṇaṁ: || kalpavī ṇa vāsitaṁvāṇya:||

‡ See also As. Res. vol. XVII. p. 299, where inscription X. gives the viśaḥśati of the Gehels of Udana, or Medapatiya. The word occurs frequently in Jainas works, in the sense given above.
¶ Atmāram K. Drivedi, Kachchheño Itihās, p. 18.

|| Measurements 7 inches by 9 inches. Characters ancient Kātyānaka Devanāgarī. Preservation good. Photolithograph made after painting the plates in black and white.

§ L. 3, the letters on the plate look like वचनै; but, I think, only because the right side-stroke of the क has been obliterated. Read वचन: L. 5, dele Amavāsa over का.
No. I.—Translation.

Om! First the pedigree of the king.

He who resembles a royal swan, since both sides (of his family, pāksa) are spotless, just as both wings (pāksa) of the bird,—who resembles Brahmā, since he is the abode of great prosperity (kamaldārasya), just as the god reclines on a large lotus (kamaladārya),—who resembles Vishnu, since he has conquered the earth by his prowess (vīkramakṛantabhāta), just as the god measured the earth with one step (vīkramakṛantabhāta),—who resembles Tryambaka, since he took up his residence on a mountain, just as the god dwells on Mount (Kailāsa),—who resembles Indra, since he gladdens wise men (viyuddha), just as the god gladdens the wise deities (vīvuddha),—who resembles the tree of paradise, since he fulfills the desires (of his dependents),—who resembles Mount Meru, since he is always impartial (madhyastha), just as the mountain always stands in the centre (of the universe, madhyastha),—who resembles the ocean, since he is the abode of great courage (sattévārasya), just as the sea is the abode of many creatures (sattévārasya),—who resembles a cloud, as he takes compassion on all beings,—who resembles the elephant of the king of the gods, since his hand is always moist with libations (poured out in confirmation) of gifts (dānatoyardrikākara), just as the trunk of Airāvata is always moist with the ichor (flowing from his temples, dānatoyardrikākara),—the king of kings, the illustrious Mūlavāja, the son of the king of kings the illustrious Rāji,—who belongs to the Chaṇuṣika family,—who has conquered with his own arm the province watered by the Sarasvati, (thus) addresses all royal servants, and all people, Brahmans and others, dwelling in the Ardhvātama of Moḍhara, in the village of Kambokā.

Be it known to you that, while residing in (my) capital, the famous Agra āhala pātaka, after having bathed on the day of an eclipse of the sun at Sralabalaka in the water of the eastern Sarasvati, having worshipped the lord of the gods, the deity of the Rudramahā-

---

* L. 8, the sign under m in चतुरस्त्र looks like a ɕ; but I think it is intended for the Viśrāma.  L. 10, read विश्रामानि.
  L. 11, read तरु; dele Anuvāra over थम; read अरु.
† L. 3, dele Anuvāra over पू.  L. 6, read श्लेष्म.  L. 7, read तुध.  L. 10, read कालवेच.
‡ I take rūḍhodūpārava as a compound. It is probably a translation of the Gujarāti phrase rūḍhodūpārava (also, Similarly Merutunga uses सरस्वती, a literal translation of Gujarāti सरस्वती, instead of सरस्वती.
§ Regarding the explanation of the allusion see above.
|| Now Kambol, situated north-west of Moḍhara, in the Gaṅdravī Uttarā Mahāśa.
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[Text in Sanskrit script]

[Translation or transcription of the text]

[Further text in Sanskrit script]
laya,† having pondered on the worthlessness of the world, having considered that life is unstable as a drop of water lying on a lotus-leaf, and fully understood the rewards of spiritual merit, I have given, confirming the gift by an edict and a libation of water, for the increase of my own and my parents' merit and fame, the above-mentioned village up to its boundaries, together with its wood, grass, and water, together with the right of pasturing cattle, and with the right of (inflicting) fines and (deciding cases arising out) of the ten flaws, to the illustrious Māḷ anātha-deva,* that is established at Māṇḍalī, in the Vardhamāṇa.† Knowing this, the people dwelling there shall obsequiously give to this (deity) everything according to custom, viz. the share of produce, taxes, gold, and the like; and future kings, whether they belong to our family or be strangers, knowing that the reward for the merit acquired by such (gifts of land) is common (to all kings), should agree to and protect this our religious gift. Wherefore the divine Vyāsa has declared

This grant has been written by Kācchana, the son of Kāyaśtha, Jē. ś. Samvat 1420, on the 15th day of the dark half of Māgha, on a Sunday. (The signature) of the illustrious Mālarāja.

No. 2.‡
Plate I.

(1) 9 Vikrama Samvat 1420, Kāśṭaka śri Rūthakar 95, Avadhūth ādhāra-śāstra-
(2) Pāṭhe, samstaraṇāśiśvarāśiśvarāśiśvara-śāstra-
(3) Madhyāntikā, samstaraṇāśiśvarāśiśvarāśiśvara-
(4) Kēśa, samstaraṇāśiśvarāśiśvarāśiśvarāśiśvara-
(5) Śāṃkara-dāta, samstaraṇāśiśvarāśiśvarāśiśvarāśiśvara-
(6) Pratīkāyā, āśiśvarāśiśvarāśiśvarāśiśvarāśiśvara-
(7) Āśiśvarāš

Plate II.

(1) Laksita, māsāpāram, māla, tattvārādhyāyādīyādī-
(2) Mānābhagaṃagadī, sāvī, sāvī, āvānjan-
(3) Vīryapatākam, māsāpāram, māsāpāram, māsāpāram-
(4) Nī, bhattapāram, māsāpāram, māsāpāram, māsāpāram-

† This is apparently the synonym of the modern name of Mālarāja's temple at Siddhāpuram, Rādhanātha. It means 'the palace of Brahma, i.e. Siva.'

* At a late visit to Māṇḍalī I inquired in vain for any trace of this once famous temple, and the monastery attached to it, which occurs so frequently in the grants. Nobody had ever heard that such a temple had existed. An ingenious Achārya or bard at last suggested that the temple might have stood near a well called Mōla, about two miles east of Māṇḍalī, and that Mōla might be a corruption of Mālarāja. I should say that it meant 'brakešī.' I believe that the temple stood on the southern side of the village, where many sculptured stones lie about.

† Vardhamāṇa is a synonym of Vāṭāla, the ancient and also modern name of the country adjacent to the Rān of Kachch from Siddhāpuram to Jhīnārīvī. The word Vāṭāla represents Ṛṣīkhālā, not Purāṇā.

‡ Measurements of the plates 9 inches by 7 inches. Characters modern Brahmi. Derasār, frequently mixed with the ancient forms of du, sa, da, dha, bhā, etc. Preservation good. Transcript, made under my supervision, by Nāthāya Sāstha.


† L. 4, read वृक्षारि. L. 5, read सम्प्रदायाः.
No. 2.—Abstract.

I. Resemble.—In Sāvāna 1086 Vikrama, on the 15th day of the bright half of Kṛṣṇaṭaka, the king of kings, Bhima deva, who resides in Anahilapāṭha, addresses all officials and inhabitants of Māṣūrā, situated in the Dēdēka of Gahaḍahādikā, in the province of Kachha, and announces the following grant:

II. Grantee.—Bhāṭṭāraka Ajāpāla,† son of Achariya Mangalaśiva, an emigrant from Navaigākha, situated in Kachha.

No. 3.||

Plate I.

---

III. Object granted.—The village of Māṣūrā,] bounded—
(a) East by the village of Gahaḍahādikā,
(b) South by the village of Aikayikā,
(c) West by the village of Dharavādikā,
(d) North by the village of Prājaḥarikā.

IV. Officials.—Writer of the grant: Vaṭe śvara, son of Kānchanaṣa Kāyaśtha Dūtaka: the minister of peace and war, Chaṇḍaṣarman.

---

* L. 6, read ॥ L. 8, read न लैँ. L. 11.
† L. 6, read न लैँ. L. 8, read न लैँ. L. 11.

The letters in this line are modern and a later addition. I think the sentence is a note referring to the pawning of the plate with the Vānīk in whose possession it was found, and it means "Surely, i.e., Śrūjī, the priest or Brāhmaṇ, has deposited it (in my house)."

† Descendants of this Bhaṭṭāraka exist to this day in Kachha, as Mr. D. Khakar informs me.

‡ Neither this nor any of the other villages mentioned can be traced on the map.
§ See grant No. 1.

|| Measurements 11 inches by 12. Characters Jaina-Devanagari. Preservation good. The plates had been heated, to remove the rust, before coming into my hands. Transcripts of this and following grants made, under my own and Vāmashākhya Jhunklkar’s supervision, by Narayana Shetek. Mistakes in Sandhi occurring in this and the other plates have not been corrected in the notes, as they are too numerous.

‡ L. 8, read ॥ L. 11, perhaps माखानु or "मुख"; letters half destroyed. L. 14, read विस्मितः.
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Plate II.

(1) Yasmēte: पूर्वमदनदेवतायामः चाङ्गोर्णो समारसीचुनारात्रीश्रीलिङ्गः
(2) तेषा करिरपायमालकरत्रियः योत्रत्वारेयोत्र निषिद्धेशुलीलुपुरे कारियशीमिभरः
(3) देवमहीलेख्षेत्रपायात्मावाराणिष्य: बासनेनोदकूर्वेससाधनः प्रदत्त: स्मारस्या
(4) क्षायास्य यत्स्मिन् पूर्वस्या दिष्टिः देवकरागास्यमेव सिमा। वरुणस्याय दिष्टि कालकरास्यमेव सिमा। उन्नतः दिष्टि धारितायमास्यमेव
(5) भौमाय दिष्टि श्रीपद्यातितामास्यमेव। उद्दरस्य दिष्टि धारितायमास्यमेव। एवमाय
(6) भिमाय यश्वेक्षत्रस्मितं स्मारकेनोमनमाय स्मारकेनोमनमाय स्मारकेनोमनमाय
(7) गृहदेवपादमाराणिष्य: समुपन्तायथ। सामायं वैधव्यस्यमितं बलास्मिराज्ञे।
(8) वैधव्यस्यमितं बलास्मिराज्ञे। वैधव्यस्य जायकाल किंस्किस्यात्मकेच्या दयायमास्यमेव।
(9) भौमाय वानिकृतिस्मितंतत्थर्थमास्यमुण्डत्वः: पालनेः ब्रह्म। उन्नतं च भगा
(10) बन्धय यथासं। यहि वर्षस्थायिनं लघुमृत्यु महत्त्वम्। सामायं चानुमृत्यु च चानुमृत्यु न।
(11) रक्षे वसतः १ यांधी देवन तुरयां तरारोदानानि धमार्थावस्थारूपणा न निमत्तान्।
(12) निमत्ताना। काव्यां च नामां भाषा: पुनराधिक्यारं २ [स्वर्या प]रद्वारा। ये वैरयां वृद्धाय।
(13) संविषयां क्रमचर्चा । [प्रयुभु सह महान्ति]। ३ विक्रमेनुभा अक्ष्का राजयभं: समारादिः
(15) भृगु:। यस्यस्य पदो प्रभुो तस्यस्य पदो तस्यस्य फलं । ध दत्ता भृगु: भृग:। भृगो याच्ये राज्यार्य।
(16) समायोध्य देवमेव नुपातमेव सेवेकारमेव पालनेः भवनु:।
(17) तिलकानेमहासाधितिपाहिः । कृमः भृहीपदमेव।

No. 3.—Abstract.

1. Mūlarājā.
2. Chānuḍārājā.
3. Durūlabhārvājā.
5. Karnādeva, Trailokyamalla.

7. Kumārapāladeva, conqueror in battle of the king of Śakambhārī.
8. Ajayapāladeva, the ardent devotee of Śiva, who made the Sapādakalaka king tributary.
10. Bhīmadeva, a second Siddharājā.

† L. 10, read सहस्याधि. L. 11, read निरमाल्याधि. L. 12, read तरयाः। L. 17. The श्रीति at the end of this and Bhima’s other inscriptions shows the ancient forms of the letters।

† All the kings mentioned receive in this and the following grants the titles mahārājāśāhāra purnādeva, and pauraskhaṇḍaraka, and various other epithets, which declare them to be possessed of high virtues, and worshippers of Śiva.
Pathaka, dating on Sunday, the second day of the bright half of Sravaṇa, 1263 Vikrama, and announces the following grant:

II. Object granted.—The village of Índila, bounded—
(a) East by the village of Deulavida,
(b) South by the village of Kálhári,§
(c) West by the village of Seshadevati,
(d) North by the village of Gháriyávali.

III. Grantee.—The temples of Bhímesvara and Lílesvara, built by queen Lílán dévī, daughter of Rāṇá Samarásimha, Cháhumána, at Lílapura, between the villages of Kári and Málakatari, to the drinking-fountain and almshouse (situated in the same place).

IV. Officers.—Writer of the grant: Mahákkhapatálikha, i.e. the chief registrar Thakur Vosarin, son of Thakur Kumára, a Káyastha.

2. Dútaka: the minister of peace and war Thakur Súdha (?).

No. 4. Plate 1.

§ Probably Káhri, on the road from Virangam to Páhan.
§ Perhaps a mistake for Késarin.
† Measurements 14 inches by 15 inches. Characters

Jaina-Devanágari. Plates badly damaged by rust, and by attempts to clean them by exposure to heat.

† L. 6, the last three letters are doubtful. L. 11, read Málakatari. L. 12, read Káhriyávali.
No. 4.—Abstract.

I. Preface.—(a) Vaisādakā.

1. Mūlarāj I., the unique sun, causing to blossom the lotus-field of the Chaulkya race.

2. Chāmudarājā.

3. Vallabharājā.

4. Durlabharājā.

5. Bhimadeva I.


7. Jayasimhadeva, conqueror of Tribhuvanaganda (and) Varvara(kā), the lord of Avanti, the wheel-king of the Siddhas, (called also) Ekāngavira.

8. Kumārapāla, conqueror of the king of Sākambhari.


11. Bhīma, an incarnation of Nrāyana. After him in (his) place,


(b) Jayantasiṁha addresses the officials of Vardhi Pathaka and Agambhūtā or Gambhūtā Pathaka, on Tuesday, the third day of the bright half of Pauśa, S. 1230 Vikrama, the day of the winter solstice, and announces the following grant:

II. Objects granted.—(1) The village of Sāmpāvādā in Varphi Pathaka, bounded—

Letter of line. Read पाँचौ — संप्राप्ती. L. 16, read रत्नसिद्धि — आभिनव. L. 21, read चरित्रकाय.

This epithet seems to have got into the wrong line.
GRANTS OF THE ANHILVAD CHAULUKYAS.

(a) East by the land of Seshadavata,
(b) South by the villages of Philochadl and Hamsalapura,
(c) West by
(d) North by the villages of Raneloya, Khambhila, Adhiva, and the land of Bhattacharja Sriseshadavata.
(2) A piece of land in Seshadavati, in the Gambhata or Agambhata Pathaka, bounded—

(a) East by the villages of Itila Kalbharti and Vahichara.
(b) South by the village of Philochadl.
(c) West by the land of Bhattacharja Sriseshadavata.
(d) North by Dodhiyapaka.

III. Grantee—The (temples of) Analesvara and Salakhanaevara, built by Solunki Rana Anato Lounapakaka for the spiritual benefit of his mother Salakhanadev in Salakhanapura.

No. 5†

Plate I.
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(2) [Plate II.]

(3) [Plate II.]
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(5) [Plate II.]
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Plate II.

HINTAYAM 3.

† Measurements 9 inches by 11½ inches. Characters Jaini-Davangari. Preservation good, a few patches peeled off.

†† See below, note 11 to abstract of No. 6, p. 203.

† Probably Karna for the Quarter-Master General’s map, on the borders of the Gaikwad territory, east of Munipar, in the Kathanghar state.

* Probably Kaili and Becherilli, on the road from Viramgum to Pethan.
No. 5.—Abstract.

I. Preamble.—(a) Vahdeva.

1. Mûlarâja I., the unique sun causing to blossom the lotus-field-like Chaulukya race.

2. Châmuñḍarâja.

3. Vallabharâja.

4. Duṭlabharâja.

5. Bhimadeva.


8. Kumârâpaladeva, the ardent devotee of Śiva.

9. Ajayadeva, who made the Sâpâdalaksha king tributary.

10. Mûlarâja II., who conquered the ruler of the Garjâna, a morning sun illuminating the earth.

11. Bhimadeva II., a new Siddharâja, the seventh wheel-king.

(b) Bhimadeva II., who resides in Anâhillapâtaka, addresses the officials and inhabitants of the Châllisâ Pathaka, on

Thursday, the 15th of the bright half of Śrâvaṇa, 1238 Vikrama, and announces the following grant:—

II. Object granted.—The village of Nâtânli, bounded—

(a) To the east by Omkara.......and Araya.......,

(b) To the south by the villages of Ayaṇâniya and Chyântiâja,

(c) To the west by the Talapada land of Vâdasara,

(d) To the north by the villages of Omkura and Vâdasara.

III. Grantee.—The temple of Mûlesvara (at Mândal), and the ascetics of the monastery attached thereto, for daily worship and maintenance, the Stânapati Vedagarbharâsi, (the superior of the Mândal monastery) being the trustee.

IV. Officers.—The writer of the grant: Akshapatalikâ Somâsika, son of Sâti Kumaña, Kayastha. Dûtaka: the minister for peace and war, Thakura Vahudeva.
No. 6.*
Plate I.

(*) ना सति राणांकश्रेण्यसात्मकङ्का जालिज्ञानां जालिज्ञानान्तरमितिः श्रीमान्यश्रीमान्य समस्तन्तरमितिः।

(†) ना सति राणांकश्रेण्यसात्मकङ्का जालिज्ञानां जालिज्ञानान्तरमितिः श्रीमान्यश्रीमान्य समस्तन्तरमितिः।

(--) ना सति राणांकश्रेण्यसात्मकङ्का जालिज्ञानां जालिज्ञानान्तरमितिः श्रीमान्यश्रीमान्य समस्तन्तरमितिः।

(†) ना सति राणांकश्रेण्यसात्मकङ्का जालिज्ञानां जालिज्ञानान्तरमितिः श्रीमान्यश्रीमान्य समस्तन्तरमितिः।

(---) ना सति राणांकश्रेण्यसात्मकङ्का जालिज्ञानां जालिज्ञानान्तरमितिः श्रीमान्यश्रीमान्य समस्तन्तरमितिः।

(*+) ना सति राणांकश्रेण्यसात्मकङ्का जालिज्ञानां जालिज्ञानान्तरमितिः श्रीमान्यश्रीमान्य समस्तन्तरमितिः।

(††) ना सति राणांकश्रेण्यसात्मकङ्का जालिज्ञानां जालिज्ञानान्तरमितिः श्रीमान्यश्रीमान्य समस्तन्तरमितिः।

(---) ना सति राणांकश्रेण्यसात्मकङ्का जालिज्ञानां जालिज्ञानान्तरमितिः श्रीमान्यश्रीमान्य समस्तन्तरमितिः।

(+) ना सति राणांकश्रेण्यसात्मकङ्का जालिज्ञानां जालिज्ञानान्तरमितिः श्रीमान्यश्रीमान्य समस्तन्तरमितिः।

(†††) ना सति राणांकश्रेण्यसात्मकङ्का जालिज्ञानां जालिज्ञानान्तरमितिः श्रीमान्यश्रीमान्य समस्तन्तरमितिः।

(††††) ना सति राणांकश्रेण्यसात्मकङ्का जालिज्ञानां जालिज्ञानान्तरमितिः श्रीमान्यश्रीमान्य समस्तन्तरमितिः।

(‡) ना सति राणांकश्रेण्यसात्मकङ्का जालिज्ञानां जालिज्ञानान्तरमितिः श्रीमान्यश्रीमान्य समस्तन्तरमितिः।

(‡‡) ना सति राणांकश्रेण्यसात्मकङ्का जालिज्ञानां जालिज्ञानान्तरमितिः श्रीमान्यश्रीमान्य समस्तन्तरमितिः।

(‡‡‡) ना सति राणांकश्रेण्यसात्मकङ्का जालिज्ञानां जालिज्ञानान्तरमितिः श्रीमान्यश्रीमान्य समस्तन्तरमितिः।

(‡‡‡‡) ना सति राणांकश्रेण्यसात्मकङ्का जालिज्ञानां जालिज्ञानान्तरमितिः श्रीमान्यश्रीमान्य समस्तन्तरमितिः।

(‡‡‡‡‡) ना सति राणांकश्रेण्यसात्मकङ्का जालिज्ञानां जालिज्ञानान्तरमितिः श्रीमान्यश्रीमान्य समस्तन्तरमितिः।

(‡‡‡‡‡‡) ना सति राणांकश्रेण्यसात्मकङ्का जालिज्ञानां जालिज्ञानान्तरमितिः श्रीमान्यश्रीमान्य समस्तन्तरमितिः।

(‡‡‡‡‡‡‡) ना सति राणांकश्रेण्यसात्मकङ्का जालिज्ञानां जालिज्ञानान्तरमितिः श्रीमान्यश्रीमान्य समस्तन्तरमितिः।

(‡‡‡‡‡‡‡‡) ना सति राणांकश्रेण्यसात्मकङ्का जालिज्ञानां जालिज्ञानान्तरमितिः श्रीमान्यश्रीमान्य समस्तन्तरमितिः।

(‡‡‡‡‡‡‡‡‡) ना सति राणांकश्रेण्यसात्मकङ्का जालिज्ञानां जालिज्ञानान्तरमितिः श्रीमान्यश्रीमान्य समस्तन्तरमितिः।

(‡‡‡‡‡‡‡‡‡‡) ना सति राणांकश्रेण्यसात्मकङ्का जालिज्ञानां जालिज्ञानान्तरमितिः श्रीमान्यश्रीमान्य समस्तन्तरमितिः।
Plate II.

No. 6.—Abstract.

I. Preamble.—(a) Vahdevati agrees with No. 5 of S. 1283. Vikrama, except that the description of Jayasimha is according to No. 3 of 1269.

(b) Bhima Deva II, who resides at

1 L. 1, read शही, शही; तिन्तित; नके. L. 3, शश्चा.
Aṇahillapāṭaka, addresses the officials and inhabitants of Vardhi Pathaka on Friday, the 8th day of the bright half of Ashādha of S. 1297 Vikrama, and announces the following grant:

II. Object granted.—(1) The village of Devā (?) bounded—
   (a) East by the village of Hāṃsalapura,
   (b) South by the villages of Phimchāl and Hāniyān,
   (c) West by the village of Medhūrā,
   (d) North by the villages of Sūraya and Sāpāvāḍa;
(2) And various taxes in land and money.

III. Grantee.—The temples of Aṇahillapāṭaka, Palaṅkagāvār, and Salakaṇêśvara, built by the Solunki Rāṇā Anā Thā(kurna) Lūnapāsaka in Salakaṇapura, to defray the expenses of the temple service, and to feed Brahmins, the trustee being the superior of the monastery of Mūleśvaradeva in Māṇḍala.

IV. Officials.—The writer and Dūtaka are the same as in No. 5.

V. Postscript.—The postscript, which is considerably mutilated, apparently contains some more orders regarding dues to be paid by the Vāṇiās of Salakaṇapura. I regret that I have no means of ascertaining the meaning of all the technical terms in ancient Gujarātī which it contains.

No. 7
Plate I.

(1) .....
(2) .....
(3) .....
(4) .....
(5) .....
(6) .....
(7) .....
(8) .....
(9) .....
(10) .....
(11) .....
(12) .....
(13) .....
(14) .....
(15) .....
(16) .....
(17) .....
(18) .....
(19) .....
(20) .....
(21) .....
(22) .....

§ The village given is not to be traced on the Quarter-Master General’s map. Hāṃsalapura is the village of that name in the north-west corner of the Vrāmgaṇī Tāḥka. To the north lies ' Soodru,' the Sūraya of the grant. Southwest I find Punchar, which I identify with Pāhīsadhl.


Ⅴ. L. 22, read ‘kāṭ’.
Plate II.

I. Preamble.—(a) Vaññāvalis. Agrees with No. 5 of 1283 Vikrama, except that the descriptions of Jayasimha and Malaraja II. are literally the same as in No. 3 of 1283 Vikrama.

(b) Bhima Deva II, who resides in Anahilla-patuka, addresses the officials and inhabitants of Valanysa Pathaka on Monday, the Pratipad of the bright half of Bhadrapada of 1288 Vikrama, and announces the following grant:

II. Grantee and Purpose.—The temples of Analeśvara and Salakhaṃśvara in Salakhaṃśapurā, (and) the superior of the monastery (there). Vedagarbarāśi, as well as his son Someśvara, for the main-

tenance of the Bhattacharaka and the alms-house.

III. Object granted.—The village of... and twenty plough of land in the village (for Someśvara), the village being bounded—

(a) To the east by the villages of Sāmpara and Chhatāhāra (?
(b) To the south by the village of Gānṭhāvādā,
(c) To the west by the village of Rānāvādā,
(d) To the north by the villages of Undirā and Anganavādā.

IV. Officials.—The writer, Mahākṣapaṭalika Thakura Somasiṃha, of Thakura Sātikumāra, a Kāyastha.

Dūtaka: the minister for peace and war, Thakura Vahudeva.

† L. 1, t. 87; bohā: t. 87; ēnā: t. 87; sānīṣṭa. L. 6, ṃorah doubtful. L. 11, read sāhāṇa; nātā. L. 12, read nārake sāhāṇa. L. 17, read Ṛkṣṣaṇyā.
Plate I.

(1) श्री स्वाति राजानीकृष्टवस्त्रलालराजानीकृष्टवस्त्रलालराजानिपरिवर्तनार्थपरम्
(2) भूतरक चौलकुजुड़ क्युकुम्बलिकंनिनि्कार्तवतीकुरूलराजदेवनाथात्माराजानिधि
(3) राज्यपदार्थसंपन्नभारकृपाउपज्ञानराजदेवनाथात्माराजानिधि
(4) राजपरमभद्रकृष्टस्वाति ज्ञातवस्त्रमानुराजानिपरिवर्तनार्थपरमधार्मिकादेवपादानुपातमानिधि
(5) दानुयात्माराजानिपरिवर्तनार्थमहाराजदेवपादानुपातमानिधि
(6) राजानीकृष्टवस्त्रपरमीज्ञातवस्त्रमानिधिमहाराजदेवपादानुपातमानिधिमहाराज
(7) ज्ञातवस्त्रमानुराजानिपरिवर्तनार्थमहाराजदेवपादानुपातमानिधिमहाराज[रक्तभूमि]गुरुभारमिखिमानिधि
(8) लघुप्रसादामहाराजक्षेत्राधिकारीस्वाति राजानीकृष्टवस्त्रपरिवर्तनार्थभूतरकमानिधि
(9) कलरीभीताराजदेवपादानुपातमानिधिमहाराजदेवपादानुपातमानिधि
(10) राजपदार्थपरमभद्रकृष्टस्वाति ज्ञातवस्त्रमानिधिमहाराजदेवपादानुपातमानिधि
(11) अध्यायावतरुस्वाति ज्ञातवस्त्रमानिधिमहाराजदेवपादानुपातमानिधि

पाल्लीभूतरकमानिधिराजानिपरिवर्तनार्थभूतरकमानिधि
क्षदोषिैंभद्रकृष्टस्वाति ज्ञातवस्त्रमानिधिमहाराजदेवपादानुपातमानिधि
राजानीकृष्टवस्त्रमानिधिमहाराजदेवपादानुपातमानिधि
सिद्धवाणियमहाराजदेवपादानुपातमानिधि
राजानीकृष्टवस्त्रमानिधिमहाराजदेवपादानुपातमानिधि

१७ यथा || [प्रवत] विकासादेवपादानुपातमानिधिमहाराजदेवपादानुपातमानिधि
१८ गोमस्थीकु वाचुः यथा गुरुवरेकु वाचुः यथा संतु १२५५ वर्षाँ युगिद १५ गुः
१९ राज्यां संकारसापालपारेक्ष निवाश्वेत्र शोभं देवनाथपापे नमः
२० ला चराचरायुः भगवंतं भजन्तमितमार्थमार्थ संसारसारमित विचित्य नलिनीदलन
२१ गन्तनलक्ष्मीलाल विनाश्वेत्र अखिकामुलिक व फलमंगिक
२२ व पिवेवेनवं ज्ञातवस्त्रमानिधिमहाराजदेवपादानुपातमानिधि
२३ सिन्हिमार्थ मनिकाकु वाचुः यथा सिन्हिमार्थ मनिकाकु वाचुः यथा सिन्हिमार्थ मनिकाकु
२४ बापरसाधारणमेव नवनिभानातिन पुनरम्मेव देवपादानुपातमानिधि
२५ वरून तथा पूजनसाधृत गो[ण]गारसाधृत पल्लिका — ग्रेनको
२६ महाराजीमूलसिद्धवाणियम [श]
No. 8.—Abstract.

I. Preamble.—(a) Vaikuntha agrees with No. 7 of 1288, except that Mālārāja II. is described as (resembling) the morning sun by illuminating the world, that had been overshadowed by the darkness of the Mecha-hās.

(b) Bhumadeva II. addresses the officials and inhabitants of Vardhipathaka on Thursday, the 14th day of the bright half of Mārga of 1295 Vikrama, and announces the following grant:

II. Object granted.—(1) . . . pura, erected on the site of the village of Bhojynā.

(2) A palladikī in the village of Ghūṣādi near Gohānasara.

(3) A garden measuring two ploughs in the north-eastern part of . . . sāṇa.

. . . . pura, being bounded—

(a) East by the village of Nīlachchhī,
(b) South by the village of Ghūṣādi,
(c) West by the village of Maduṣchāna.

(d) North by the villages Trihaṭi and Kushaloda.

Boundaries of the palladikā:—

(a) East the palladikā of Drāvatīsatka,
(b) South by the king's highroad,
(c) West by a little tank and the king's field,
(d) North by the road to Bhojynā.

III. Grantee.—The temples of Vīraṃesvara, built by Rāpā Vīrāma, son of Rāpā Lūnapasi, in Ghūṣādi, and of Sūmāladeva, for the purpose of defraying the expenditure of the worship, the trustee being the superior of the monastery, Rājakula Veda-garbharāṣi.

IV. Officials.—Writer, as above in No. 7 of 1288 Vikrama.

Dātaka: the minister for peace and war, Thakura Vayajaladeva.

N.B.—The first plate is signed in line 26 by Sūmāladeva, one of Bhumadeva's queens.

No. 9.

Plate I.

---

* L. 11, read मेताद्र. L. 14, शरि सहकारिणि; निधिनि.
L. 15, read नरके बहुत हरित.

† Dimensions 13 inches by 15 inches. Characters Jainadervarāgiri.
No. 9.—Abstract.

1. Preamble.—(a) Vaisāvalī agrees with the preceding No. 8 of S. 1295 V., except that the 9th king Ajaya-pāla receives the additional epithet mahāmāhēvara, or 'the ardent devotee of Siva.'

(b) Bhima-deva II, who resides in Aṣṭabhillapāṭaka, addresses the officials and inhabitants of the Varāhīpatthaka on Sunday, the 14th of the dark half of 1296 Vikrama, and announces the following grant:

II. Object granted.—The village of Rājāyasiyānī,* bounded—

(a) East by the villages of Thēṭhavasaṇā and Rivāḍi,

(b) South by Little Ubbhāḍa,

(c) West by Māṇḍalī,

(d) North by the villages of Sahājavasaṇā and Dālauḍā.

III. Grantees.—The temple of Virameśvara and Sūmalesvara, built by Rāṇa Virama, son of the Sōlunki Rāṇa Luṅrapāṣā in Ghusaṭi to defray the expense of the worship, the trustee being the superior of the monastery, Rājakula Vedagbhārāsi.

IV. Officials.—The writer is the same as in Nos. 7 and 8.

Dūtaka: the same as in No. 8.

N.B.—The first plate is signed Mahārājāvīśānaśāmakālyānakōla, 'and (a grant) of queen Sūmaladevi.'

No. 10.†

Plate I.

* L. 16, read विषयः. L. 17, read हरित. L. 18, read हरितम्.


† L. 12, read श्रीमतीः.
No. 10.—Abstract.

I. Preamble.—(a) Vānēvali agrees for the first eleven kings, from Mālārāja I. to Bhimadeva II., with the preceding grant No. 9, of S. 1296 Vikrama; the additional king is 12. Tribhuvanapāla-deva.

(b) Tribhuvanapāla, who resides at Aṇahillapātaka, addresses the officials and inhabitants of the Vishaya and Daṇḍāhi Pathakas on Monday, the sixth day of the bright half of Chitra of 1299 Vikrama, and announces the following grant, which he had vowed on the new moon of Phalguna (of the same year), on the occasion of an eclipse of the sun.

II. Objects granted.—1. The village of Bhāṃshara, bounded—
   (a) East by the villages of Kurali and Dāsayaja,
   (b) South by the villages of Kurali and Tribha,
   (c) West by the villages of Arāthaura and Unjha,
   (d) North by the villages of Unjha, Dāsayaja and Kāmbali.
   (2) The village of Rājapuri, bounded—

   (a) East by Uḷāva(sana) and Dāgaraṇā,
   (b) South-east by the villages of Chaṇḍāvasana and Indrāvāda,
   (c) South by the village of Ahirāṇa,
   (d) West by the villages of Sirasāvi and Nandāvasana,
   (e) North-west by the villages of Uṇtaṇa and Sirasāvi,
   (f) North by the village of Nandāvasana,
   (g) North-east by the village of Kullaya.

III. Purposes of Grant.—To feed the religious mendicants (kārpaṭika) at the alms house built by Rāṇa Luṇapāsū in the Talapada of Mātla, for the spiritual benefit of his mother, queen Sālakhaṇa-devī.

IV. Officials.—The writer and dātaṇa are the same as in No. 9, Bhimadeva's grant of 1296.

V. Postscript.—A postscript states that this šāana has been made over to Śhānapati, the illustrious Vedagarbharāṣṭi (the superior of the Śaiva monastery at Maṇḍali), and that he and his successors have been made trustees. A further postscript adds the proviso that the possessors of the two villages are responsible for robberies committed within their boundaries.

Plate I.

---

* L. 21, read ितिसारण; िनोक्तारण.
† The Quarter-Master General's map gives of all the villages mentioned only Unjha, south of Sidhpur and Uttohar, which appears to be Arāthaura.
‡ Measurements of plates 11 inches by 13½ inches.
§ L. 1, read िसेठासार; L. 4, read िविस्तार. L. 9, read सामकांतिः. L. 10, read पत्तारितः.
(११) लेन पारभांमेंकेन मूला कीर्तिपुणिदेविकेन: लाताृ दुक्क्षिणसती परिभाषा चराृचिनिंभुदुग्गुके: भम- 
वनस्त्
(१२) भणानीपति सममभवै सांसारासतां विचिन नीलीस्वरुपानयेन जीतित्वाय यौवन- 
भीषण
(१३) ये चारामु ऐथिकें पारविके च फलभरीकुक्त पिवांमहराणक्षीरुपसाजेदिग्रीर्यें भारावास्त्
(१४) पूर्वसंकल्पतः स्वयं अभी भेजानाञ्जो भेजाणियुः तत्र तथाप्राप्तारास्त्य च तथा मेहन्यां 
स्वीकृति
(१५) तु: राजकुमारिमहामहेदिसेवित्वु: अवृत्तावदसांस्यस्यान्नाशाण्युरायणापन्नसंज्ञायं दिस्यकर्तासिद्धिभोजनं भेजाणितुः तथा कन्याकालप्य्के च तदेषावस्त्रकर्मभ्राणान्यां पंचा- 
(१६) राज्यमानिः साहित्य सदशिक्षण निर्णया: तत्र सन्तिनालयास्रायमारायां अम्यापमाणे 
अनुमति
(१७) पावा सदशिक्षण पंच निर्णया: तथा पारायणोपमनिद्धकपर्वमारायां निर्णया: तथा प्राप्त- 
रायनार्य
(१८) तथा बलावरावणेयन्यार्णेयवर्षाृजनेृवर्षायां यथा विषेषप्रचारकपु: 
Plate II.

(१) जानेवार्यां तथा पतितशुष्कमभेंस्तानामदार्यां वैशालीपर्वणि आसिषेबे पाउँ तथा संविदमानः
(२) मयंगामीयापामे कर्ता तथा मंदन्या भूमिहल ६ तथा हर्ष १२ तथा रिणीवस्तानामामोर्याम्याम- 
(३) नरमूहिल ६ तथा लुंकवर्णमागिता १ तथा शुपुरर्बागिता १ तथा आवाप्यां शुद्ध- 
मंकविकाः
(४) यां दिनं गति ६ दृग्गैः करदपलिदिका १ ऐतिहासिक जनाकाय श्रीमूलाकर्मदेवीं 
मंडलमिति
(५) हायमुद्रारजकुलश्रीविष्यामित्वगय निर्विहिनार्य शासन समप्ति: महुणागामबागाना यथा। 
रूढ़िश्वन्य श्री
(६) चित्रोपश्यामुदसरासरान्नामामहरत्नां श्रीमाना श्रीमान। दक्षणाय दिन्नां नापः महामना- 
लदायां
(७) यो: श्रीमान श्रीमान। पथमयां दिन्ना दूधुपागामसीमायां श्रीमान। उत्तरस्य दिन्नां नाप: महामा- 
मासमायां श्रीमान।
(८) एवमदिचदतुराराजपल्कतीमाप्त कवक्षालाकुल नबिनिधानसहित सहितभमाप्तमोदा- 
(९) नीतिशिर: सददाराशरसहित सकाठस्येदेशिकृत: सर्वादसमत: देवदायाध्यायोऽविवृतः: 
(१०) ग्रामौ: तथा मंदन्या: भूमी तथा बाठिके तथा हस्तानि आशाप्या: पालिकाप्रभृत एतस्ये 
आनंदादक्याम्
(११) त्यामुंकुलश्रीविष्यामहाराजिना लचेदराजचेलकपर्णा निर्विहिनीय। असमवन्दनमित भिक- 
(१२) असानामे चेतत् अनफले मत्वा अस्फूलार्या: अनशिर भावमुक्तिमुनवित्तपल्लायनू: च।

* L. 12, read "मृथ", L. 18, read सदसिका; निवृत्त।।
* L. 1, read जानेवार्या; सुकृत or perhaps सुकृत; युक्त-णार्या; जैसीका; संतोषः। L. 2, perhaps मात्रेये; L. 4, read प्रभुक्षुः। i.e. एक दाम। L. 5, read विशेषस्य; सम-
No. 11.—Abstract.

I. Preamble.—In the 1317th year of the Vikrama era, on the 4th day of the dark half of the month of Jyestha, on a Thursday, while the supreme ruler, supreme lord, the illustrious Visaladeva, the great king of kings,—who is made illustrious by the whole line of kings (his ancestors),—who obtained grace in consequence of a boon given by the husband of Uma,—who is endowed with exceeding valour, who is (as it were) a sun (able to open the buds of the lotus-field of the Chauanka,—who is a volcanic fire to dry up the ocean of the army of Singha, who crushed the lord of Malava, who resembled a hatchet on account of his cutting the roots of the creeper-like turbulent government of the Medhapataka country,—who resembled Purushottama since he was chosen as husband by the daughter of the king of Karnata (just as Purushottama was elected by Lakshmi, the daughter of the ocean),—who is adorned by numerous honorific titles, such as ‘a (second) Bhima by the strength of his arm, the new Siddharaaja, and a second Arjuna,’—ruled auspiciously and victoriously at Srimat Anahillapaṭaka, and while his obedient prime minister, the illustrious Nagadha, held all the great offices, viz. that of secretary and the rest, the great provincial chief Rāṇa Sāmanatāsinha, who rules in Mandali, situated in Vardhipathaka, the favoured district of the above-mentioned supreme lord, gives the following grant:

II. Grantee and Purpose.—For the spiritual welfare of the donor's grandfather, Rāṇa Lūnapāśāśa, to feed in Āśāpalli, at a formerly instituted sattra, eight new Brahmans,§ and to keep the drinking-fountain there filled (Pl. I. 1. 14).

2. For the spiritual welfare of the donor's father, Rāṇa Sāngāramāsinha, to provide a complete dinner of royal food and drink, with condiments, betel, &c., at Mandali to eight new Brahmans; to provide for fourteen Brahmans of Brahmapura, at the Panchadāsadhina Śrāddha, during the dark half of the month when the sun stands in the constellation of Virgo, alms and dakshina; and also to provide for the same Brahmans on every new moon alms and dakshina, and also alms for those Brahmans of the Kapilavarta, who have sat down to recite the whole Veda, and to keep the drinking-fountain filled (Pl. I. II. 15-18).

3. To provide daily food-offerings and the expenses of the service in the temples of Balānārāyaṇa and Rūpanārāyaṇa, and to repair dilapidated temples. (Pl. I. 19, Pl. II. 1. 1.)

III. Objects granted. (a) In the village of Mehusā six ploughs of land, twelve shops in Mandal, and 6 ploughs of land in the village of Rānasāhavasaṇa.

(b) A garden in Lūnāvasaṇa.

(c) A garden in Rūpapura.

(d) A palladiā with a daily tax of one dām. *

All this was made over for management to the superior of Śrimālesvādeva's monastery (at Mandal), the great lord of ascetics, Rājakula Viśavāmitra (Pl. II. 2-5.)

Fed before and were not to be fed again, a new batch taking their place.

§ I.e. the Mahālayāśrāddha during Bālākrapada Badi.

* The coast of the Bharhut districts.

† L. 14, read ॥ आदेिः जङ्गः. L. 15, read नर्के। निः ॥ कोणः.

Paripanjhaṭati, loc. sing. pres. part., is used in all the Western inscriptions of the 12th and 13th century in the sense of 'holding.'

* Ap. 'new' means that the Brahmans had not been
**GRANTS OF THE ANHILVAD CHAULUKYAS.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Boundaries:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1) Of Mehuná—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(a) East the villages of Chunna, Suhaśanā, and Ranni,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) South the villages of Shandika and Nālodā,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c) West the village of Düdbukhā,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(d) North the village of Nāyakā.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**IV. Officers.**— Dütakā: the minister of peace and war (of the Rāṇa) Thakur Sridhara; the writer of the grant is Mahākāshaṇājaliṣa Mahaṇ Govinda.

---

**PEDESEE OF THE CHAULUKYAS OF ANHILVAD.**

**A. Main line.**

| I. Mullāraja I., son of king Rāji |
| S. 998–1033 or 941–42—996–97 A.D. [S. 1043] |
| III. Vallaśbarāja, |
| IV. Durlabbarāja Nāgadeva |
| S. 1066, A.D. 1097–98 |
| S. 1066–1073 |
| V. Bhumadeva I. [S. 1086 and 1093] |
| S. 1086–1110, A.D. 1021–22–1063–64 |
| VI. Ārtha I. |
| S. 1120–1150, A.D. 1083–84–1083–84 |
| VII. Jayasindha, Siddharāja |
| S. 1150–1199, A.D. 1083–94–1143–44 |
| VIII. Kumārapāla |
| S. 1190–1230 [S. 1207, 1213] |
| A.D. 1143–94–1173–74 |
| IX. Ajayapāla |
| S. 1230–1233, A.D. 1173–74–1176–77 |
| X. Mullāraja II. |
| S. 1233–1235 |
| A.D. 1176–77–1179 |
| XI. Bhumadeva II. |
| S. 1235–1298, A.D. 1178–1241–2 |
| [S. 1263, 65, 66, 65, 95, 96] |
| XII. Tribhuvanapāla |
| [S. 1299] |
| S. 1299–1398, A.D. 1241–42–1243–44 |

**B. Vyaghrapalit or Vaghel branch.**

Dhavalā, married to Kumārapāla's mother's sister

Arshorāja

Lavaṇapraśāda, chief of Dholkā

Vitraṇabhāvala, Rāṇa of Dholkā

Independent since S. 1276–1285 (p)

A.D. 1219–20–1233–39 (p)

XIII. Visaladeva [S. 1317]

Rāṇa from 1238–39

S. 1300–1318 king of Anhilvād

A.D. 1243–44–1261–62

XIV. Arjunaideva

S. 1318–1331 [S. 1318, 1328]

A.D. 1261–62–1274–75

XV. Sāragadeva

S. 1331–1363 [S. 1360]

A.D. 1274–75–1296

XVI. Karnadeva II.

S. 1363–1390

A.D. 1296–1304.
Notes.—The dates have been taken for the reigns of the kings of the main line from the Prabandhakhanda, and agree with those of Mr. Forbes, given in the Eda Mâlî, except in the cases of Bhimadeva I., Karanadeva I., and Bhimadeva II. They agree with those of the Vichâraśreti for the reigns of Durlabhārāja and of his successors, not for the earlier ones, which have been thrown into utter confusion by a transposition of Châmunda-rāja among the Châpoṭaśī. The origina of this error probably was a clerical mistake by which Chāmunda-rāja’s name had been left out, and afterwards been marked on the margin with an erroneous mark of reference in the text. Later copyists and correctors then entered Châmunda in the wrong place, and altered the dates so as to agree. The Government copy of the Vichâraśreti says, fol. 68, 1, 12, to fol. 70a, 17: tata savîvat 891 varshâ vâsîkha sudi 2-some somachudavâvaṭpanahvarṇâbhârdardājâh sṛṇa anādikopuram atâhâyatah tatra cha 60 varshâni vâjyam abhukta; tatputraṇa yogar-jena navā varsha 9 vâjyam kritâm; tatah savîvat 891 (1) varshopavishṭārâvratudityena varsha 3 vâjyam kritām || tato vairasvinîhāya vâjyam varsha 11 tatah savâ 903 upa’ tatasuta kehamardarājyā vâjyam cha 13 944 varshopavishṭa suta Châmunda-rājâva 28 tatah savâ 981 || varshopavishṭa suta ghâpakhādhyâya vâjyam cha || 28 998 varshopavishṭa sutasaptârājya vâjyam cha || 9 1008 evavâ 1018 1018 châmunda-bhavâravâsah-tabhâci 196 varsha. Vâjyam kritâm || tatah anu savâ 1018 varsha chalukyavânavâpavishṭha suta Châmunda-bhadrârâjânāti 35 tatah || savâ 1062 varshopavishṭa suta vallabharâjârâjânāti. v. 14 tatah savâ 1066 varsha bhadrârâvâr thalâbharâjârâjânāti varsha 12, etc.

The Vichâraśreti gives the following exact dates for (1) Jayaśiṁha, death S. 1199. Kârttikeya sudi 3; (2) Kumaṇapâla, abhisheka Mârgâdira sudi 4, S. 1199, death Pausha sudi 12, S. 1220; (3) Ajanapâla, death Phâlcana sudi 12, S. 1220; (4) Mâlara II., death Chaitra sudi 4, S. 1234.

The dates for the kings of the Vâghelâ branch have been taken from the Vichâraśreti. The connection of their first ancestor, Dhâvala, with the main line is not clear. But he also must have been a Chalukya, as his descendants always bear this family name in the inscriptions.

MISCELLANEA.

BARISÂL GUNS, &c.

In a manual of The District of Bâkorganj by Mr. Beveridge, the country round the mouth of the Ganges, and its peculiarities, are described. In one passage he refers to a phenomenon in one of the islands out in the Bay of Bengal.

“I questioned Khela Mag about the curious phenomenon known by the name of the Barisâl guns. He said that he heard them often in the beginning of the rains. He described the sound as being exactly like that of the discharge of a cannon, and said it appeared to have no connection with the tide, and that the noise was quite different from that of the ‘Bore,’ or of the coming in of the breakers. The noises appeared to come from the north, south, and south-west. The statement that they sometimes come from the north is important, for hitherto we have supposed that no one ever got to the south of them. It is because they are always heard from the south that the natives poetically represent them as caused by the shutting and opening of Râvana’s gate in Ceylon.” Mr. Beveridge adds (p. 168), “The conclusion, therefore, which I come to, is that the sounds are atmospheric, and in some way connected with electricity.”

At p. 164 of vol. V. of the Indian Antiquary, Mr. Horne, in his account of Himalayan villages, mentions the extraordinary and imposing sounds heard in the early morning amongst the mighty peaks,—not ascribable, he thinks, to avalanches, and which the natives cannot account for.

The town of Koimbatur, in Madras, is backed on the west by a semicircle of lofty mountains, cleft in the centre of the arc by a lower pass, down the high slope above which, on the south, a white streak of water is seen descending. This is the source of the Sirivâni, an affluent of the Bhâvânî river, which skirts and drains the southern watershed of the Nilgiris. The Sirivâni waterfall issues from a remarkable pool or rock-basin, quite 4000 feet high on the mountain side, and called by the jungle people Mut’tukulam, ‘Pearl-foot.’ The people have a great awe of this pool, and can hardly be persuaded to approach it, declaring that extraordinary and tremendous noises are at times heard to issue from it, and roll cracking amongst the mountains. It is declared to be bottomless, and certainly the longest bamboo obtainable could find no bottom.

In a book of South American travel published a few years ago, there was an account of a tremendous and terrifying noise proceeding for three days from the interior of the vast Guiana forest-wilderness: there was no earthquake or volcanic phenomena to account for it, and the Indians could suggest no cause or explanation.

Whether Mr. Beveridge’s suggestion of atmospheric causes and electricity will account for these mighty and mysterious voices from ocean, mountains, and forest is a question for natural philosophers to determine.

M. J. W.
ARCHAEOLOGICAL NOTES.

BY M. J. WALHOUSE, LATE M.C.S.

(Continued from page 42.)

XV.—Gold treasure-trove in Madras.

In vol. II. of Col. Yule’s edition of the Travels of Marco Polo, pp. 305-311, there is an account of the once famous port of Kaïl, in Tinnivelli, near the extreme southern cape of the Peninsula. In Marco Polo’s time it belonged to Aśar, the eldest of five brother-kings who ruled the regions of the south. “At this city,” says Marco, “touch all ships that come from the west—from Hormus, Aden, and Arabia.” Its site is ascertained to have been on the Tāmraparni river, at a spot now one and a half miles from its mouth,—of old probably nearer thesea, on a backwater, whence its name (kāyāl in Tamil = a backwater); and ruins of old fortifications, temples, wells, tanks, everywhere for three or four miles along the coast, attest its ancient wealth and importance, while the whole plain for a mile and a half inland is covered with mounds, tiles, and broken pottery, amongst which pieces of chinaware are not uncommon. Diggings in those mounds would probably discover much of antiquarian interest. Except the above-mentioned vestiges, the great and populous city has disappeared from the face of the earth, its name surviving only in tradition, and its site till of late uncertain. Tutacoram, a few miles further up, is now the rising and frequented port.

Between two and three years ago a remarkable discovery of gold coin was made in the tract once occupied by the ancient port. Some coolies, whilst digging a water-channel at some distance inland, dug up a large globular metal vessel, the lips of the mouth of which had been turned down and beaten together so as to close the opening completely. The vessel contained gold coins to the amount, it is believed, of some thousands—principally, it would seem, Muhammadan; but the treasure was instantly divided amongst the finders, and almost the whole of it melted down! The energetic Collector of the province, Mr. R. K. Packle, from whom I received the account, as soon as the news of the find oozed out and reached him, used all means of encouragement and persuasion to induce the people to bring him any of the coins, offering a reward for them beside their intrinsic value as gold; but this only increased the fear of the ignorant finders, and of the whole great treasure only about thirty pieces were rescued, in a manner showing how insuperable popular suspicions are in such an affair.

On approaching a village where it was thought there might be some of the coins, a little girl was seen running away from it carrying a small earthen chāttī, and happening to fall in her haste the chāttī broke and thirty coins rolled out, which appear to have been all that escaped the melting-pot. It would be unsafe to estimate from this scanty remnant the general character of the whole great hoard, which there is reason to believe did amount to thousands, all gold, but the few that escaped were of Muhammadan coinage, except one piece of Johanna of Naples (A.D. 1348-82); from this it may be concluded that Spanish, Portuguese, and Venetian broad pieces, such as were wont to be used in the old traffic with the East, were not wanting in the hoard. Could but the circumstances be told in which this remarkable golden treasure was amassed, concealed, and lost, what a strange story might be revealed!

Of other gold finds in Madras territories, a large quantity of Roman gold coins was found in 1787 near Neêlūr, under the remains of a small Hindu temple; there were many coins of Trajan, and several as fresh and beautiful as if just from the mint. (See As. Res. vol. II. p. 332.) Five pieces of the Emperors were dug up at Kārūr, in Koimbâtūr, in 1806; and in the same district I have twice known small chāttīs containing several hundreds of the minute spangle-like Hindu coins, popularly called ‘Shānār cash,’ with which all Southern India seems sown (see Ind. Ant. vol. III. p. 191), to have been turned up in ploughing. I remember, too, when the right of excavating and searching for coin in the extensive old mud fort at Dharapram, in Koimbâtur, was rented out and farmed—an item in the district accounts—gold coins were said to be found there frequently. A potful of Roman aurei is also reported to have been found near Solāpur in 1840; only a few were preserved. In Asia, as in Europe, the amount of treasure-trove preserved has ever been lamentably small in proportion to the amount discovered.
The hoard in Tinnivelli was discovered in December 1872; its probable value is estimated at a lakh of rupees. The labourers divided the spoil, but the Tahsiladar succeeded in recovering Rs. 8,000 worth of coin and ingots; the rest was quickly melted down, and all traces of it lost. Of the coins 31 were obtained for Government, and are now in the Madras Museum. The inscriptions on the whole of the coins are in Arabic or Kufic, with one exception,—a coin of Peter of Aragon, (not Johanna of Castile), the legend on which is in Latin in old Gothic characters, and reads thus:—

"Summa potestas est in Deo."

P. Dei gra. Aragon. sigil. re." surrounding a shield.

"Ps. Cost. Dei gra. Aragon. sigil. reg." In the field an eagle.

The P. referred to is Pedro III., king of Aragon, who began to reign A.D. 1276.

He concluded a treaty with a Sultan of the Mamluk Bahrite dynasty, and hence probably the coin found its way to Egypt, and so to India.

The coins bearing Arabic characters belong to four dynasties,—the Khalifs, Atabegs, Ayubite, and Mamluk Bahrite. The coins in Kufic characters have not been deciphered.

The greatest gold-find recorded in Madras happened in 1851, when a vast treasure was discovered on a hill near Kotiayam, ten miles east of Kananur: the native discoverers for a long time maintained the strictest secrecy; the purity of the gold attracted the jewellers and wealthy men, and nearly all were melted down for ornaments. No less than fifty cooly-loads of gold coins are said to have been taken from this spot. Eighty or ninety coins came into the possession of the Raja of Travancore, and a larger number was obtained by General Cullen, the Resident. Not one reached the Madras Museum. The coins were of the following reigns:—Augustus, Tiberius, Claudius, Caligula, Drusus.*

MATHURĀ INSCRIPTIONS.

BY F. S. GROUSE, M.A., B.C.S.

The Pāli inscriptions, of which rubbings and transcripts are herewith sent, have been collected within the last few years from different spots in and about the city of Mathurā. The stones upon which they are engraved are as yet in my own possession, but will eventually be transferred to a local museum, which is now in course of erection. The building was commenced more than twenty years ago by Mr. Mark Thornhill, the then Collector of the district, who intended it as a rest-house for natives of rank on their occasional visits to the station. After some Rs. 50,000, raised by local subscription, had been expended, the work was interrupted by the Mutiny, and never resumed till 1874, when Sir John Strachey, the most liberal supporter of art and science that the North-West has ever had at its head, warmly encouraged the idea of its conversion into a museum, and subsequently sanctioned a grant-in-aid of Rs. 3,500 from provincial funds. The central court was last year raised by the addition of an attic, and covered in with a stone vault. In this (so far as constructional peculiarities are concerned) I have reproduced the roof of the now ruined temple of Harideva at Gorardhan, an interesting specimen of the eclectic style that prevailed in the reign of the emperor Akbar, and which so recently as 1872 was in almost perfect preservation. The cost of these additions was Rs. 5,366. A portico is now being added at an estimated outlay of Rs. 8,494; and when the openings that were broken through the walls by Mr. Thornhill's whimsical successor, with the express object of disfiguring his predecessor's design, have been closed in with tracery, the whole will present a most beautiful and elaborate specimen of the architecture of Mathurā in the nineteenth century.†

Though the cost of the building has been so considerable, it is only of small dimensions, the whole surface of the stone being covered with geometric and flowered patterns of the most artistic character. It is therefore intended to

* From Catalogue of Coins in the Government Museum, Madras.
† I have been able to carry on so many architectural works since I have been at Mathurā that probably in after years native tradition will associate with my name every thing that was built about this period. I wish, therefore, to place on record that I am not responsible for the design of the portico. It is in itself very beautiful work, but it is quite out of place in the open air, on the side of a dusty road.
make it not a general, but simply an architectural and antiquarian museum, and I hope to be able to arrange in it, in chronological series, specimens of all the different styles that have prevailed in the neighbourhood, from the reign of the Indo-Skythian Kanishka, in the century immediately before Christ, down to the present day, which (as before said) will be illustrated in perfection by the building itself.

It cannot be denied that it was high time for some such institution to be established: for in an ancient city like Mathurā interesting relics of the past, even when no definite search is being made for them, are constantly cropping up; and, unless there is some easily accessible place to which they can be consigned for custody, they run an imminent risk of being no sooner found than destroyed. Inscriptions in particular, despite their exceptional value in the eyes of the antiquary, are more likely to perish than anything else, since they have no beauty to recommend them to the ordinary observer. Thus a pillar, the whole surface of which is said to have been covered with writing, was found in 1860, in making a road on the site of the old city wall. There was no one on the spot at the time who could read it, and the thirsty engineer, thinking such a fine large block of stone ought not to be wasted, had it neatly squared and made into a buttress for a bridge. A base of a pillar, No. 3 in the present series, was dug up about the same time, and, after being plastered and whitewashed was imbedded by the Collector in a gate-post he was then building in front of the Taksili. There I re-discovered it only two years ago, when the gateway was pulled down to improve the approach to the museum. Similarly No. 11 had been set up by a subordinate in the Public Works Department to protect a culvert on the high-road through cantonments. I have therefore thought it better to provide at once for some record of the present series, without waiting for an opportunity—that might never occur—to decipher them more completely; since a civilian's stay in a district is always a matter of much uncertainty, and if I were transferred before the museum was ready for their reception they would probably soon be lost sight of altogether.

No. 2 is from the base of a large seated figure of Buddha, in red sandstone, of which only the crossed legs remain. This I dug up in one of what are called the Chambira mounds, near the Sonkh road, at the junction of the boundaries of the township of Mathurā and the villages of Bākirpur and Giridharpur. Both these settlements are of comparatively recent date, and the site seems to have been the very centre of the old Buddhist city. The left hand of the figure had rested on the left thigh, the right being probably raised in an attitude of admonition. Another mutilated figure of similar character, but without inscription, was found on the same spot, and I mention the fact since these are the only specimens I have with the hands in this position; in all the others they are crossed over the feet.

No. 1 is from a small fragment of stone recently found in the compound of the Magistrate's court-house. This would seem to have been the site of an extensive Buddhist monastery; for in 1860, when the foundations of the new building were being laid, a number of large statues, bases of pillars, rails, and other sculptures were unearthed. The greater part were sent to the Agra museum, and the others dispersed in various quarters. The little stone of which I am now writing had probably been thrown aside as of no value. It reads thus:—

\[ \text{\ldots akṣasya rājaśa saivaśrāve 28, Hemānt 3 (or 4) di \ldots} \]

which might be translated "On the \ldots day of the third (or fourth) winter month in the 28th year of the reign of "

The king commemorated was probably Kanishka; for the end of the tail of the \( s \) is just visible, and other inscriptions of his were found on the same spot. If, however, for rājaśa be read rājya, it would be necessary to translate "in the 28th year [of some unspecified era] in the reign of ." And this is perhaps preferable, for although a reign may well have lasted twenty-eight years,—the number here given,—in other parallel inscriptions the figures run too high to be so interpreted.

The remainder is more or less uncertain. General Cunningham took the word ending in takṣayā to be Tripiṭakaśya. If really so, the inscription would be specially valuable as probably fixing the site of the stūpas of the Abhidharma, the Sātra, and the Vinaya (collectively
called Tripitaka), which are mentioned by both the Chinese pilgrims as being at Mathura.

No. 3 is from the base of a pillar found at the same place as No. 1. It is cut in bold clear letters which are for the most part decipherable, as follows:

Ayam kumbhaka dañnam bhikshunam Suryasa Buddha-rakshitastra cha prahitakānam. Anantyam (?) dhamma pa... nam. Sarvaśa prahitakānam arya daksinaye bhavatu.

The purport of which would be: "This pillar is the gift of the mendicant Surya and Buddha-rakshita, prahitakas. A religious donation in perpetuity. May it be in every way a blessing to the prahitakas!"

I observe that Prof. Kern, in his "Notes on the Junnar Inscriptions" (Ind. Ant. vol. VI. p. 40), questions the probability of a bhikshu being ever a donor, since (as he says) monks have nothing to give away, all to receive. But in this place the reading is unmistakably clear, nor is the fact really at all inconsistent with Hindu usage. In the Mathura district I can point to two large masonry tanks, costing each some thousands of rupees, which have been constructed by mendicant bhairagis out of alms that they had in a long course of years begged for the purpose. The word prahitaka, if I am right in so reading it, is of doubtful signification. It might mean either ‘messenger’ or 'committee-man,' a commissioner or a commissaire.

No. 4 is from the mound called the Kanaktila. It is cut on the upper part of a broken slab which has an ornamental border round the edge, but otherwise presents a plain surface. The obverse of the stone is more elaborately carved, and resembles the spandrel of a doorway, with a vine-leaf scroll, and in the jamb the model of a triumphal column supporting the figure of an elephant on a bell capital that is surmounted by winged lions. The upper portions of two such pillars as that here represented are in existence, the one at Sankisa, the other in my own collection with the date Huvishka Saka. 39 on the abacus: it has been figured in vol. II. of Gen. Cunningham's Archaeological Survey Reports. The first letter in the inscription at the back of this curious slab belongs to a word that has been destroyed: it is followed by the name of the donor in the genitive case, Mugali-putas. This would seem to be a distinctively Buddhist appellation, and therefore worthy of remark, since most of the sculptures found in this hill are of Jaina type.

No. 5 is from the base of a small headless seated nude figure of white stone, and, to judge from the style of the sculpture and the ill-formed letters, is of very great antiquity. Under it is a row of six standing figures, three on either side of a central chakra. Nothing is recorded in the inscription beyond the date; but this is given both in words and figures, as follows:

Srivatsa saptapanyasa 57 Hemanta tritiya dase trayadasa. Aeya purvaayam:

that is to say, "In the year fifty-seven (57), on the thirteenth day of the third winter month." It had been built up into a mud wall in the Manoharpur quarter of the city, and my attention was first called to it by General Cunningham. It is curious in two ways: first, because it definitely fixes, beyond any possibility of doubt, the value of the symbol representing 50; secondly, if the date is really the year 57 of the same era as that employed in the inscriptions of Kanishka and Huvishka, it is the earliest unmistakably Jaina figure yet found in this neighbourhood. I cannot, however, believe but that it is comparatively modern, and if so it affords a strong confirmation of a theory originally broached, I believe, by Mr. Thomas. He suggests that the Indo-Skythians using the era of the Seleucidae, which commenced in the 1st of October 312 B.C., gave only the year of the century, omitting the century itself, in the same way as we write '77 for 1877. The theory is corroborated by the fact that only one of the Mathura inscriptions as yet found gives a date higher than a hundred, viz. 135; and this particular inscription probably belongs to an entirely different series: for in it the division of the year is not into the three seasons of Graha, Varsha, and Hemanta, but according to the Hindu calendar still in use, the month quoted being Paushya. It is, however, very doubtful whether the era of the Seleucidae is the one intended; it might with equal or even greater probability be the Khamirian era employed by Yataka in the last three books of his Edastara vigni, and still in use among the Brhamas of that country. It is otherwise called the era of the Saptarshis, and dates from the secular procession of Ursa Major, Chaitra Sudi 1 of
the 26th year of the Kali-yuga, 3076 B.C. It is known to be a fact, and is not a mere hypothesis, that when this era is used the hundreds are generally omitted. The chronological difficulties involved in these inscriptions seem, therefore, almost to defy solution: the order in which the kings, whose names are mentioned, succeeded one another is uncertain: the era may commence either in October 312 B.C. or in March 3076 B.C.; and the century of the era is never expressed. It has occurred to me that the phrase <i>asya purvayam</i>, which is of such very frequent occurrence, and has never been satisfactorily explained, may possibly refer to this suppression of the first figures of the date.

No. 6 is from a broken Buddhist rail found at the same place as No. 2. The front is carved with a single female figure, unusually well executed, and at the back were three hares, the lowest of which has been lost. The inscription is a single line between the upper and middle groups, and, as it ends with the word <i>dānam</i>, apparently records only the donor's name, though what the name is I cannot exactly determine.

No. 7 is from the base of a seated Buddha of very early character, with drapery falling over the body in a multiplicity of small folds. I recovered it from the bed of the Jamuna, where it was being used by the <i>dhubā</i> as a washing-stone. The letters are so worn that the only words I am able to decipher are <i>Daya-dharma</i> and <i>Buddha</i> in the first line, and at the end of the second <i>sarveśa</i> and again <i>Buddha</i>.

No. 8 is from the base of a small seated figure with a group below it as in No. 5. It was found at the Kankālī tīla. Bām Sajendralal Mitra reads it thus:

---

**THE STORY OF KHAMBA AND THOIBI: A MANIPURI TALE.**

**TRANSLATED BY G. H. DAMANT, OFFG. POLITICAL AGENT, MANIPUR.**

In the country of Manipur there is a village called Mayāng Imphal, where there was a king called Yai Thongnā. He had three sons, the eldest called Hauram Halba, the second Hauram Ningai, and the youngest Hauram Tol. When their father died the three brothers quarrelled as to which should be king; but the youngest gained the throne, and the second brother, Hauram Ningai, fled to a village called Moirang, where the king, Songiel Lālhāba, succoured him, and he married a wife there and begot Pachelba, who begot Purelba, who slew five tigers in Tarbung.

Songiel Lālhāba, the king of Moirang, begot Kekhoi Lālhāba, who had two sons, Jārakong Yāmba and Chingkhoxol Haiba; the

---

* See Ind. Ant. vol. V. p. 28.—Ed.
oldest, Jâratong Yâmba, afterwards became king, and the second, Chingkhutol Haiba, was Jurbâja.

King Jâratong Yâmba, deeming that Purelba had become famous by having killed the tigers, gave him his own wife, Guângko Reima Yareltom Pokpi, and he married her and begot a daughter called Khambu and a son called Khamba. As the king of Moirang had a great liking for Purelba, he gave him the lands of Nongtholba, Loneirakpa, and Khada Haiba, and also the salt well at Tarbung and the Nâga villages of Laisang and Khâram Lairel; he also received a tribute of pepper from the Nâgas. Purelba had formed a friendship with Thonggel Athobs, Nongbâl Chouba Asingba, and Kabui Sâlsâng Maiba Khâringnang Chamba. When Khamba was born his three friends told him that it would be well to go to the king and ask him to give the child a name. The king told them to wait a little, and after some consideration came back and said, "As I have made you wait, let us call your son Khamba."* The father was pleased with it, and gave a chei, i.e. two tâols, of gold.

Now the king Jâratong Yâmba and the Jurbâja Chingkhutol Haiba had no children, although the king had fifteen wives and the Jurbâja eleven, so they went and worshipped the god Thàngking, but still the king had no child. However, Langmailling Thojamu Sângnanil Khurambî, the first wife of the Jurbâja, bore a daughter. The king was very much pleased, and said, "As I have no child, this daughter of my brother's will be celebrated above all others: let us therefore call her Thoibî (i.e. 'famous')."

One day after this, as Purelba was returning from the palace he fell ill, and called his two friends Thonggel and Chouba, and said to them, "My friends, I am very ill and about to die, therefore I wish to speak to you. My friend Chouba, you have a son, PhairoiChámâb Selûngbahal, and I have a daughter, Khambu; do you therefore make her your daughter and marry her to your son." So saying he called the child and gave her away; she was then five years old. Then he said to Thonggel, "You, my friend, although you have nine wives, have no child; therefore take my children, Khambu and Khamba, for your own, and also take all my clothes, turban, dâos, spear, hunting dress, war dress, necklaces and ornaments, and if you hear of any one ill-treating my children protect them like a father; and do you, my friend Chouba, acting like a mother, protect their land and wood, and guard them should any one make them slaves or seize their cattle; and do you, Thonggel, be a father to them." With these words Purelba died.

After this Khamba gradually began to sit and walk, and when Khambu was old enough to nurse her little brother her mother died, and Thonggel and Chouba came and burnt her body, and Thonggel said to Khambu and Khamba, "My children, come to my house and I will be your father; you have none else left to care for you." But Khambu refused to leave her father's house, and Thonggel then told her that her father on his deathbed had entrusted all his property to him; and, as it would be spoiled if it remained there, he took it all away with him. When he reached home he said to his wife, Thungsêlî, "In case I die, fall ill, or forget it, you remember that this property all belongs to my friend Purelba and his wife." But afterwards, through the miraculous power of a god, he forgot all about it, and so did the children. In the meantime Khamnu used to support her little brother by begging.

One day, by the mercy of God, Khamnu went to beg at the house of Ningollikâpa of Moirang, and it happened that Thoibî had come there to play at kâng,† and was eating with the other ladies of the royal family. When Khamnu came up, the servant at the door would not let her enter, saying that the ladies were at dinner; but just at that moment Thoibî came out to bathe, and seeing Khamnu asked who she was. Khamnu replied that she had come to beg, and that her name was Khamnu, and she was the daughter of a Kumal.‡ Thoibî felt pity for her, and asked her where she lived, and why she came to beg, and whether she had no father, mother, or brother. Khamnu said she had no father or mother, but supported one in a row. It is principally played by the Manipuri women.

* The Manipuri word khamba means 'to restrain, to make to stop.'
† This is a game something like skittles on a small scale.
‡ The kâns are seeds of a large kind of creeper called gîla in Bengal; it is propelled by the finger at a number of pins set
young brother, and she lived in the quarter of Chingai. Thoibi plying her, replied, "Let you and me be friends and eat together;" and she took her among the other royal ladies and made her eat, and gave her rice and vegetables for her brother, and had it well cooked, and told her to take home with her all the rice, fish, and salt that was left; and as much as she could carry. Thoibi then asked her brother's name, and Khamnu told her it was Khamnu. Thoibi then said, "Sister, all the royal ladies are going to-morrow to fish in the Logtak (a lake in the south of Manipur); come with me and steer my boat; but it is not proper that you should come among so many people with such ragged clothes; stop a little." And she sent her servant Senu into the house and brought a dhab, chadar, and payri for Khamnu, and a phaneke and chadar for Khamnu, and gave her some selli as well.

Khamnu returned home and gave the rice and clothes to her brother. Khamnu, finding the food very good, asked her where she had got it, and she told him how she had formed a friendship with Thoibi, who had given her the food and clothes, and invited her to steer her boat next day when she went a-fishing; and she told Khamnu to stay at home and guard the house. Early next morning the ladies of the royal family, with Thoibi and Khamnu, went down to the Logtak, and cast their nets and caught many fish.

Towards evening Khamnu, thinking that he might meet Thoibi, determined to go to the lake, so he took a boat and fortunately came to the very place where his sister and Thoibi were. Directly he and Thoibi met they fell in love with each other, and she asked Khamnu if she knew who he was. The girl replied that she was her own brother, and turned to him and asked him why he had come. He said she had been a long time returning, so he had come to meet her. His sister said she would follow, and he returned home. Thoibi, Khamnu, and the rest followed, and Thoibi gave Khamnu a great quantity of fish for herself and her brother to eat.

Now Thoibi had been very much pleased with Khamnu, and could not forget him, so she told Khamnu she would pay her a visit at her own house, and then went away, and they all went each to his own house. In the evening Thoibi took her servant Senu with her to carry some food, and went to Khamnu's house. Khamnu saw her coming and saluted her, and Thoibi asked her how she and her brother managed to live. She replied that through their poverty they were forced to live by begging. Thoibi replied, "Your house does not look like the house of poor people, but seems to belong to some great officer; tell me the truth." Khamnu said, "My father was an officer under the king of Kamal,—so I have heard my father and mother say." Thoibi was secretly rejoiced to hear that, and said, "It is very late, we cannot go alone; tell your brother to see us home." So Khamnu went with them and on the way he and Thoibi agreed that they would be betrothed, and took an oath to be faithful to each other, and Khamnu came back after seeing Thoibi home.

Some time after this the two divisions of the village of Moirang played a match at hockey; Konyamra was captain of the lower division, and Khamnu of the upper division. Previous to this, Khamnu had not been renowned among the people, but God made him victorious at hockey, and he defeated Konyamra, and all the people of the upper division were glad; and after this his father's friend Nongbi Chooba introduced him to all as the son of Purella.

In a short time afterwards all the people assembled and obtained leave from the king to hold a festival in honour of the god Thangi, and Konyamra was appointed to collect flowers to decorate the lower division of the village, and Khamnu to do the same for the upper division, and Nongbi Chooba then introduced him to the king. Early next morning Konyamra and Khamnu went to pick flowers, as the festival was to be held on the following player is a sure way of rising to notice in the state.

* This festival is called Laiharaoba, and is still commonly held; it is a remnant of paganism which has not survived to the Hindoos now prevailing in the country. The god in whose honour the festival is held is placed in the midst, and all the men and women, both married and unmarried, dance round it daily decked with flowers, sons are sung, and the village children attend. There appears to be very little idea of religious worship in it.
day. Konyamba told Khamba to go up the mountain, and he would remain where he was; and Konyamba picked haukeri\+$^{+}$ flowers, but Khamba climbed a tree and gathered mellai\+$^{+}$ flowers, and when they had done so they both returned home. And Thonglel, his father's friend, called Khamba and gave him all his father's clothes and ornaments, and also taught him to dance. When the king and all the people were assembled for the festival, Konyamba presented flowers to the deity and the king, and distributed the rest among the people, and Khamba did the same; and the king, seeing that the flowers he had brought were out of season, gave Khamba a reward. After that the boys and girls danced, and the king made Khamba and Thoibi dance together, and all the people talked of their beauty. When the festival was over, the king and others made obeisance to the deity, which was taken away, and they all returned home.

After some time it happened that wrestling and running matches were held, and Konyamba was chosen captain of the lower village, and Khamba of the upper village; there were fifteen competitors on either side, and the starting point was at Kwakta. Khamba won the race. Khamba and Konyamba then wrestled together, and Khamba was victorious. In jumping, tossing the caber, and putting the stone he was also successful; and the king, saying he was the best man, gave him a present of clothes.

Some days after this the time came for the maibi\+$^{\dagger}$ to sit at the shrine of the god to consult the oracle. Now Konyamba determined to kill Khamba, so he disguised himself as the maibi and sat before the god, and told the king, "The god declares in a dream that if you can catch the bull which feeds at Ikop and offer it to him, your life will be long and your people happy." So the king assembled all his officers and people, and said, "If the bull which feeds at Ikop can be caught and offered to the god, my life will be long; is there any among you who can catch it?" As no one answered, Khamba came forward and saluted the king, and said he would undertake the task. The king was delighted to hear it, and said, "If you succeed, I will give you my niece Thoibi in marriage;

---

\+$^{+}$ A kind of red oxcomb flower.
\+$^{\dagger}$ Mellai, a kind of yellow and brown orchid; it flowers in October. It is one of the most handsome of the orchid tribe.
\+$^{\ddagger}$ The maibi: are a kind of priests, rather priestesses.
The Jibrêja thought in his heart that Khamba had made his daughter mad; so he determined to have him beaten, and sent a servant to call Kongyâmba secretly. Kongyâmba came and saluted him, and the Jibrêja took him aside and said, "Call Khamba to Khauri bâzár and assemble your friends and relations to beat him, for he has bewitched my daughter, whom I gave to you." Kongyâmba was very glad, and went away and assembled all his friends and relations, and called Khamba, and took them all to Khauri bâzár.

The Jibrêja took secretly one of the king's elephants called Guângkhârakpa Saranghalba, and went to the same place and said to Khamba, "You have spoken softly to my daughter and made her mad; now if you will at once promise to give her up I will not beat you, but if you refuse, your grave shall be in this bâzár." Khamba replied, "Jibrêja, even though you do not love me, yet when I caught the bull you and the king gave your daughter to me in the presence of all the people; and moreover she and I are betrothed, and have taken an oath to be faithful to each other, so I cannot give her up." The Jibrêja hearing this became very angry, and said he would kill him. Khamba said, "I will abide by the constancy of your daughter, and will never turn my face away from her."

The Jibrêja then told Kongyâmba to assemble his men to beat Khamba, and he and all his men came with a rush and attacked Khamba, and the latter girt up his clothes and attacked them in turn, without turning his face away; but they were so many that they overcame him and beat him severely, and the dust rose in such clouds that their bodies could not be seen.

There were thirty of them, so that he could not resist them. The Jibrêja became still more angry, and said, "If he acts like this in my presence I will kill him at once; bring the elephant." So the elephant was brought, and he ordered them to tie Khamba to its foot, and have him dragged up and down the bâzár. So the men all seized Khamba, and were tying him to the elephant's foot.

Now, while this was going on, Thoibî was asleep, but the god came to her in a dream.
and told her that Khamba was being killed in the bazar. She opened her eyes and wondered what it was, and then she called her servant Senu, and took a knife in her hand and went out. When the Jubraj and the men who were tying Khamba to the elephant's foot saw her they all ran away.

Thoibi went up to the elephant and said to him, "Elephant, if you kill my lover, trample me underfoot and kill me too," and she took an oath to die under the elephant's feet. The elephant, seeing she was a good woman and had taken an oath, lowered his tusks to the ground and trumpeted; and she, seeing Khamba, asked the elephant to unloose the rope by which he was tied, and he did so, and she said to Khamba, "My dear, have you suffered all this for my sake?" and they both wept.

Meanwhile Khamba's sister Khamnu, and Phairoichamba, and his father's friends Thonglel and Choubia, hearing the news, ran up from all sides. When they saw Khamba, Thonglel and Choubia both grew very angry, and said, "Bring Phairoichamba with you and come to the palace." So they all went and found the Jubraj sitting there. Thonglel said with anger, "Who has beaten my son?" Laimumba, with many followers, wearing his sword, spear, and shield, and all his war dress and ornaments, burst in; and the people, when they saw the numbers with him, and his angry looks, were all afraid. Thoibi told the king everything that had happened, and the king was much displeased when he heard that Khamba had been beaten, and went to his throne-room to give judgment in the matter. He decided that the Jubraj was in fault, and forbade him to enter the palace again, and ordered all the men who had beaten Khamba to be themselves beaten. But when Kongyamba was about to be beaten, Khamba saved him by saying that he was not in fault—all the blame was with the Jubraj. So Khamba and all the people returned home, and the king ordered them to take care that his servant Khamba did not die, and told the royal doctor to attend him, and Thonglel and Choubia to see that he had proper food while he was ill.

One day after this hef father the Jubraj said to Thoibi, "For five days I have been trying to persuade you to marry Kongyamba; why do you still persist in refusing him?" Thoibi replied, "Both you and my uncle the king promised me to Khamba when he caught the bull, and I have taken an oath to be his slave; I will not live with Kongyamba." At this answer the Jubraj grew angry, and said, "If you do not obey me, your father, I will sell you as a slave to my friend Tamurakpa at Kubbo, and I will take the full price for you and spend it in feasting on fish." Thoibi answered, "Whatever my father says is right.

Early next morning the Jubraj, saying he would make a slave of Thoibi, called five of his servants and gave them orders concerning her. And she, seeing that her father intended to carry out his purpose, sent her servant Senu to Kambha secretly to tell him about it,—how her father had made a slave of her, and five men were appointed to conduct her to Tamurakpa. So Khamba went and waited quietly in the road, with a bamboo stick in his hand, and when he saw Thoibi he said sadly, "I have nothing else to give you; take this stick and think of me." So he gave her the stick, and she went on her way, while he went sorrowfully home.

When Thoibi sat down to rest by the road-side, she broke the stick into two pieces at the point and called God to witness that if she were true and faithful the bamboo stick should sprout, and she planted it there and it sprouted. After going a little further on the way she saw a large stone, and she said, "If I am chaste and have truly chosen Khamba, may this stone become soft;" and she put her foot on it, and the footprint was left. When she arrived at the house of Tamurakpa, the five servants told her that she was not really sold, but that her father had sent her there to frighten her, and they asked Tamurakpa to treat her kindly, and went away. Tamurakpa called his daughter Changning Khombi, and told Thoibi to make friends with her and live there happily.

After three months' time the Jubraj felt pity for his daughter, and called his five slaves and

† In Manipur a man's wife and children are his slaves, and he can sell them whenever he pleases; and this is often done. Only the other day I heard a Manipuri threaten to sell one of his sons as a slave because he preferred play to learning to read.

* The valley of Kubbo has now been ceded to Burma; it formerly belonged to Manipur.
† The clump of bamboos which grew from the stick, and the stone with Thoibi's footprint, are still shown, as is Khamba's coat, which is kept at Maorang, the scene of the story. It is said to be of gigantic size.
told them to fetch her back, and next morning he sent for Kongýamba and said to him, "To
day my daughter Thoibi will return from Tamu; do you wait for her in the road and try and persuade her to go to your house. If she refuses and escapes from you, say no more to me about her, for I will not give her again." Kongýamba saluted gladly and went away, and his father and mother and all his relations waited in his house, expecting Thoibi to come. Meanwhile he mounted his horse and took two servants with him, and waited in the road for Thoibi to come. Now Senu, the servant of Thoibi's mother, heard the news and told Khamba secretly, and he told his sister Khamnu, but was undecided whether he should go to meet her or not. Meanwhile Tamurakpa told Thoibi that her father had sent for her, and she must go home, and he gave her some silk and other presents.

Now Thoibi, thinking Khamba would have heard the news, had made him a jacket and a full suit of clothes. Before she started she put on her ornaments and best clothes, and made obeisance to the household god of Tamurakpa, and prayed that she might be united to her lover; then she saluted Tamurakpa and his wife, and he blessed her and told her that her wish should be accomplished. And her friend Chäng
ning Khombi gave her a present, and hoped she might succeed in her wish. So she set out with her father's five slaves, and met Kongýamba in the road; and, as she did not love him, she was sorry for it, but he was very glad, and tried to persuade her to go with him by saying that her father had given her to him. Thoibi pretended to be glad outwardly, and sat down near him, but she put the stick which Khamba had given her between them, and thought of it as if it were Khamba himself, and determined to run away to him. At last she hit on a plan, and said she felt feverish. Kongýamba asked how she could be cured, and she said that if she could mount a horse and ride it till she perspired she would be well. So Kongýamba had his horse brought, and Thoibi put the saddle on her head, and saluted it, and saluted all the gods, and prayed that they would bring her to Khamba's house. She then mounted the horse and galloped him up and down, but when she was at some little distance she galloped away, and by the help of the gods, who loved her because she had saluted them, she arrived safely at Khamba's house. He and his sister Khamnu received her joyfully, and he let Kongýamba's horse loose.

Meanwhile Kongýamba, tracking the footprints of the horse, came to the front door and saw Thoibi in the verandah, and thinking that there would certainly be a quarrel he went away quietly, and told his father and mother how Khamba had taken Thoibi away and got the better of him. He said he would go next day to the king and demand justice. Meanwhile his family remained in the house.

Thoibi's servants brought all the things which Tamurakpa had given her to Khamba's house, and they all remained there that day, and word was sent to the Jubrāja that Thoibi was there.

Next day, early in the morning, all the officers of Moirang assembled before the king to decide the dispute between Khamba and Kongýamba; but while it was being heard the news came that a man had been killed by a tiger at Khenentāk. Then the king said to Khamba and Kongýamba, "This news has come while we are hearing your dispute, so whichever of you can kill the tiger shall have my niece, and let God be the witness." They both agreed, and all the people were witnesses thereto. So the people surrounded the tiger, and built a fence round the place where he was, and early the next morning the king and all the people went to see the sight. As Khamba was starting, Thoibi said to him, "If I am faithful and pure, you will certainly kill the tiger," and she saluted her god and remained at home. Khamba and Kongýamba, each of them taking his weapons—spear and dao—and two servants, went to the place where the tiger was.

They saluted the king, and he gave pān to each of them, and told them to be careful not to be killed, and said if one was wounded the other was to protect him. The two friends then saluted the king and all the people, and went surrounded by men armed with long, heavy spears; the tigers now-a-days are generally shot, but in former days it was customary to spear them.

\[5 \text{ A town in the Kubbo valley.}\]
\[6 \text{Tigers are caught in Manipur by surrounding the jungle in which they are lying by a net, outside of which a bamboo palisade is built, the whole place being closely surrounded by men armed with long, heavy spears; the tigers now-a-days are generally shot, but in former days it was customary to spear them.}\]
into the enclosure; and the king and the people, holding their tiger-spear, waited to see the sight. As the two entered the tiger-net the people raised a shout. Khamba entered on the north side, and Kongyāamba on the south. Kongyāamba saw the tiger first and struck at it with his spear, but the tiger turned it aside with its paw and leaped up to seize him, and he, thinking the tiger would certainly bite him, caught it by the loins, and they both struggled together, but the tiger succeeded in biting Kongyāamba on the back of the neck. Khamba then came up, and the tiger seeing him went away, and he took Kongyāamba and gave him to his father to be taken care of. The king then ordered Khamba to go in again, and he went to the place where the tiger was, but when it saw him it ran away, and he chased it to strike it with his spear. The tiger ran round and round the enclosure, and the people shouted at the sight. Now, since Thoibi was faithful, through the might of the god to whom she had prayed, the tiger was afraid of Khamba, and could not turn its head towards him, and in its efforts to escape it caught hold of the platform where the king was, and a great number of people were assembled. Khamba came up and put his foot on the beast's tail, and when it turned to bite him he struck it in the open mouth with his spear and killed it. The people were all rejoiced, and presented the tiger to the king. Khamba's father's friends Thongiel and Chouba came to the spot, and the king was much pleased, and gave Thoibi to Khamba, and also gave him all the offices which his father held, together with a handsome present, and he and his people all went home. Kongyāamba was taken home, where he died. The Jubrajā was very glad, and Thoibi rejoiced when she heard the news, and Khamba went home a great man. Thoibi told Khamba he must be very tired, and gave him rice and vegetables of all sorts to eat, which she had cooked carefully, and as she was much pleased she attended on him with great devotion.

Early the next morning the Jubrajā took Thoibi home, and the king in his delight had a fine house built for Khamba, and looked for a lucky day for the marriage, and prepared everything that was required—slaves, horses, and cattle. On the appointed day the king and all the principal officers of Moirang went to the house of the Jubrajā to be present at the wedding, and Khamba with his father's friends Thongiel and Chouba, and his brother-in-law Pharoichamba, all of them wearing their ornaments, gold bracelets and necklaces, came there too. And Thoibi came wearing a red phanok embroidered with flowers, and her dancing dress which was covered with bosses of gold and silver, jewels, and glass, so that it shone brightly; she wore gold bracelets and a gold necklace, and her chain of gold and coral fell down to her waist. The necklace on her bosom lighted up the place; round her throat was fastened a beautiful jacket, and she wore a transparent scarf all bright with bosses of gold. Her appearance was like running water, and the hair on her head was like fresh flowers. When Thoibi came forth to her wedding, her arms were like lotuses, her legs were as beautiful as the inside of the stalk of a piñon tree and were like an elephant's tusks, her foot was arched as if she wore a dog, her colour was like turmeric, and her complexion like a champaka flower;—she came forth like the full moon. All the people who had come to the marriage, when they saw Thoibi and Khamba, said they were beautiful like children of the gods, and were never tired of looking at them. When the marriage was over, the king and the Jubrajā conducted them to their own house, with all the presents they had collected, and they saluted the king and the Jubrajā, who blessed them and returned to the palace.

After this Khamba gave his sister Khamna in marriage, and conducted her to her husband's house, and gave her many slaves; and Thoibi gave her servant Senn in marriage, and gave her slaves; and Thoibi and Khamba lived happily together in Moirang.
of old inscriptions, abounding in mistakes. Although hardly worth noticing, I consider that all inaccuracy should be avoided, as far as possible, even in trivial matters, and therefore beg to offer the following corrections.

I made two collections of inscriptions,—the first between 1826 and 1832 in the Dekhan, the second between 1848 and 1854 in the Northern Sirkars. Each collection, when arranged and the most valuable ones selected, filled two folio volumes. Three copies were made of each; one of the first or Dekhan set, one was presented to the Literary Society of Bombay, a second to the Literary Society of Madras, and the third to the Royal Asiatic Society of Great Britain. Judging from inquiries recently made, the first appears to have been lost.* The third is still preserved in Albemarle Street. The Telugu series was likewise transcribed three times, and copies presented to the Madras Society, the Royal Asiatic Society, and the India Office Library. A copy of the Dekhan series, which I had retained for my own use, has since been presented to the library of the Edinburgh University, and is now on loan with Mr. Fleet, who makes such good use of it.

My first essays in paleography were begun in 1826, with the aid of Mundargi Ranga Rāo, a young Brāhmaṇ attached to my office by the late St. John Thackeray when I was appointed Second Assistant to the Principal Collector and Political Agent of the Southern Marathā Country, in 1822. He was the son of Bhima Rāo, a muttālikā of that Desh of Dāmbū, who was hanged over his own gateway by the Honourable Colonel Wellesley (afterwards Duke of Wellington) in 1800, for firing on the British troops, at the same time that Rāmdūndrā and Hāli were sacked and given to the sword for the resistance offered to the march of the force sent to quell the insurrection of Dhomūli Wahēg. After the death of the Desh, Bhima Rāo, a man of enterprise and ability, taking advantage of the unsettled state of the country, collected troops in the Peshwa's name, and rose to considerable eminence. His career, however, was cut short by Bāpū Gorakh, who was appointed Subhadār of the Karnātaka by Bāri Rāo, and by whom he was seized and put to death about 1810-11, leaving an infant son, Raṅga Rāo, on whom Gorakh conferred the village of Mundargi with three others in jāgīr.

Mr. Thackeray, being desirous of enlisting men of rank into the public service, invited Ranga Rāo to join his kachērt, and, when I joined the district, attached him to me as office mutākā. He was about my own age, a fine, high-spirited, intelligent young man. We became great friends. He was well mounted and fond of sport. We shot and hunted together, and he entered into all my pursuits. When I first turned my attention to the inscribed stones so frequent in the Southern Marathā Country, we tried hard to make out their contents, but at first without much success. He then remembered that a goudālaṅkāra in one of his īdāna villages had the reputation of being a very learned man. He was summoned, and we found him to be an invaluable assistant. By our united efforts we gradually mastered the archaic characters. I began to collect copies of kānānam by means first of one, afterwards of two copyists in my own service, carefully trained to the work of transcription. The Pēṭr inscription let in a flood of light. We arranged our materials. Each inscription, of any value, by degrees fell into its place, and the result was embodied in the paper read to the Royal Asiatic Society in 1836, but which having been printed after my return to India, the following year, the proofs did not receive my corrections, and it thus contains several orthographical errors, especially of proper names.†

At Madras I held the subsidiary appointment of Canarese Translator to Government, which was almost a sinecure. The office establishment consisted of a mutākā and an English writer. The former, Adai Śubhā Rāo, I soon found to be an invaluable assistant in my antiquarian pursuits. He was an accomplished Sanskrit, Canarese, and Telugu scholar, with a fair knowledge of Tamil. He had also a turn for archaeological research, which only needed stimulus, and he soon entered zealously into my views. I engaged a Brāhmaṇ named Rāghappa as an itinerant copyist in my private service, with occasional assistance from one of Colonel Mackenzie's old collectors, named Baktavachaliya. The reduction of my materials and all my translations was made with the aid of Śubhā Rāo. Three folio volumes of these translates, with much other valuable MS. matter, drawings, &c., perished in a vessel laden with sugar, in which much of my baggage, books, &c., was despatched from Madras. The ship experienced a hurricane off the Isle of France, and shipped much salt water, melting the sugar, and getting at the tin-lined cases penetrated to their contents and entirely destroyed them.

Śubhā Rāo died shortly before I was appointed to Council, and Rāghappa some time afterwards.

The names mentioned by Mr. Boswell had nothing whatever to do with my antiquarian labours. They were public servants in the Commissioner's

---

* The Madras set is now in the hands of Mr. Oppert, the Secretary Madras Literary Society, but its existence was unknown when the Madras Government authorised Mr. Boswell to collect all the rough copies of my transcripts he could discover!

† Conf. Ind. Ant. vol. I. p. 343.—Ed.
office. Kādambari Jagannāthan was the office munshi or secretary. He is since dead. Mamallapuram Subbā Rao was an English copyist, a very intelligent man, and now Tahasidār of the Yerangudām tālukā, in the Godāvari district.  Chippuri Jeyarāmaṇu was a mere copyist whom I engaged to transcribe and make fair copies for the three sets of my collection, prepared for distribution. Who Nāgappa Śāstrī may have been I cannot imagine, and suspect the name is meant for Rāghappa.

My own copies of the Telugu collection for the India Office and the Royal Asiatic Society, with the original copper-plates and collections of facsimiles, fortunately came home safe.

The conclusion of my connection with my first assistant in archaeological investigation was sad and tragic. Raṅga Rao died whilst I was at home on furlough. His son Šhīma Rao, a very fine, gentlemanlike lad, came to see me at Madras in 1843-44, and remained with me a twelvemonth. I have never seen a more promising youth—clement, well-disposed, and with the most kindly disposition. I tried, without success, to get him employed in Māisor or in some non-regulation district. The stringency of our rules affords small opening for native gentlemen in the public service. He returned to Munnargi disappointed. Afterwards, when the people of the Dekhān were disarmed, the measure was carried out with some harshness in his villages. He was vexed and chafed, and when the Mutiny broke out he joined his neighbour, the Nirāṃgaṇ chief, was driven into the fortress of Kopāldūr, and fell in the assault.

WALTER ELIOT.

Wolfseer, Hauke, N. B., 26th April 1877.

VEDIC SANSKRIT.

Prof. Delbrück of Jena, who assisted Prof. Grassmann in his translation of the Rig-Veda, has published an essay on “Tenses in Old Sanskrit” (Altdiische Tempuslehre). It contains a translation of many intricate passages from the Rig-Veda and some of the Brāhmaṇas, and marks a definite advance in our knowledge of Vedic Syntax. The essay forms the second number of a series published by Delbrück and Windisch under the title Syntaktische Forschungen.—The Academy.

“TĀZA BA TĀZA NAU BA NAU.”

Sing me a lay, sweet bard, I sue; once and again, anew, anew!

Seek for me wine’s heart-opening dew; once and again, anew, anew!

† A recent communication from him informs me that he is Acting Dūndūr of the district, and that Jeyarāmaṇu is employed as a peon in the Bapalā tālukā on Rs. 7 a month.

* From Bicknell’s Selections from the Poems of Hāfiz.

Close to some sweet and doll-like fair, sit thou apart with cheerful air:

Steal from that cheek the kiss that’s due; once and again, anew, anew!

Sīki, who steps with silvery limb, now has recrossed my threshold’s rim:

He shall my cup with wine imbue; once and again, anew, anew!

How shall life’s fruit by thee be won, if thou the wine-filled goblet shun?

Quaff: and in thought thy loved one view; once and again, anew, anew!

Ravishing-hearts, the friend I choose, eager to please me well doth use

Gonds and adornments, scent and hue; once and again, anew, anew!

Breeze of the morn that shall soon fleet

Hence to that Peri’s blissful street,

Tell thou the tale of Hāfiz true; Once and again, anew, anew!*

CHAMPA.

Champa is a name which has been for a very long time applied to a portion of that region to which we give the name of Cochin-China, though the extent covered by the name has varied. It is from the Malays that western navigators adopted most of the geographical nomenclature of the Eastern Seas. And Crawford implies that the Malays gave the name of Champa to the whole of the most salient part of the Cambojan Peninsula, including a part of the coast of the Gulf of Siam, as well as part of the China Sea.† It is possible that this usually accurate writer has here made a slip. But in any case the most ancient use of the name would seem to extend it to the Gulf of Siam. For there is strong reason to believe that both the Zaba of Ptolemy, and the Cánf or Tanf of the early Arab mariners, both of which are demonstrably to be placed westward of Cape Camboja, are only representative of the same name, Champa. It is a persistent tradition in modern Camboja that the Cham or Tsiam race, the proper people of Champa, did occupy the Cambojan soil before the arrival of the Khmers, who have held it, probably, at least since the fourth or fifth century of the Christian era; and M. Garnier, who gave great attention to these questions, has deduced from such data as exist, in the Chinese annals and elsewhere, that the ancient kingdom which the Chinese describe, under the name of Funan, as extending over all the peninsula east of the Gulf of Siam, was a kingdom of the Cham race.

This well-known Persian song, however, is not by Hāfiz of Shiraz, though it is almost always included in his Divān. Con. Academy, Sept. 30, 1876, p. 383.

† Descriptive Dictionary, “Indian Archipelago,” sub voce Champa.
But in the medieval narratives of Western authors (e.g., Marco Polo, Friar Odoric, John Marignolli, Rashid-ud-Din) the name Champa applies to that region which is now sometimes called Cochin-China Proper, as distinguished from Tongking, viz., the protuberant S.E. coast of the peninsula in question, extending northward to 16° or 17° of latitude, the position of which on the route to China caused its shores to be well known to those voyaging to that country. This, or nearly this, was the kingdom called in the oldest Chinese annals Lin-i, and afterwards, till its extinction, Chenching. We hear of Chenching or Champa as being often at war with its neighbours, Tongking on the one side, and China or Camboja on the other, and as for a time, at the end of the twelfth century, completely conquered by the latter. But it had recovered independence a century later, for Kublai Khan (1280-1290) had dealings in war and diplomacy with its king. According to Javanese annals, about the middle of the fifteenth century the queen of the principal sovereign of Java was a princess of Champa.

The precise historical relation of this ancient kingdom to the modern kingdom which we call Cochin-China is a little difficult to disentangle. But this southern kingdom of Chenching or Champa was conquered in 1471 by the king of Tongking or Anam, and has never since revived. For though there was for a long time subsequent to the date named, and down to 1802, a separation of Tongking and Southern Cochin-China into two distinct kingdoms, the latter was not a revival of Champa, both being ruled by dynasties of Anamite origin. And after the conquest the name of Champa seems to have become restricted to the districts adjoining the south-eastern curve or the coast, and eventually to that district immediately eastward of the Cambojan delta, a somewhat barren tract with fine natural harbours, now called by the Cochin-Chinese Bình-Thuận.

This continued to be occupied by the people called Chams or Tsiams, whose dominion we thus presume (as far as we can see light in these obscure histories) to have first extended over the whole peninsula (as Fanan); then to have been limited to its eastern and south-eastern shores (Chenching); and lastly to have been restricted to a small tract of those shores (modern Champa or Bình-Thuận).

Here a principality of Champa long continued to subsist, the residence of the prince being at a place called Phanri, about 10 miles from the sea, and apparently near, if not identical with, the present Bình-Thuận. The Champas, his subjects, were, in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, well known over the Archipelago as rovers and seafaring people. This principality was often overrun by the Cochin-Chinese, but maintained itself in some shape of recalcitrant subjection to the latter till about 1820, when the Anamite king conquered it effectually, expelling the Champa prince and most of the people of the same race.

**Name.**—The name Champa is Indian, like the adjoining Camboja and countless other names in Indo-China, and was probably borrowed from that of an ancient Hindu state and city which stood upon the Ganges, near modern Bhagalpur. Hiwen-Thang, the famous Chinese ecclesiastical traveller of the seventh century, makes mention both of the original Gangetic state (which he visited) and of the Indo-Chinese kingdom (which he knew only by hearsay), calling the latter Ma h (or "Great") Champa, an indication, perhaps, of its ample dominion, either then subsisting or traditional, an amplitude of dominion which nearly all states of Indo-China have enjoyed in turn. Hindu titles are also distinctly traceable in the corruptions of the old Chinese notices of the names of kings, and even in one mentioned by Marco Polo.

**Ethnology and Religion.**—The people are known in Camboja as Tsiam, to the Anamites as Loi Thuan, and Thieng. We do not know whether the former name has been taken from Champa, or the adoption of the Indian name Champa been suggested by the name of the people. They have been in great part driven into the mountains, or into the Cambojan and Siamese territory, where a number of them are settled near the Great Lake. There were also old settlements of them on the Cambojan coast, between latitude 11° and 12°. The people are said to exhibit, even in language, strong Malay affinities, and they have long professed Muhammadanism. The books of their former religion, they say, came from Ceylon, but they were converted to Islam by no less a person than Ali himself. The statement in italics is interesting.

For the Tongking people received their Buddhism, such as it is, from China; and this tradition marks Champa as the extreme flood-mark of that great tide of Buddhist missions and revival which went forth from Ceylon to the Indo-Chinese regions in an early century of our era, and which is generally connected with the name of Buddha-ghotha.

**Antiquities.**—There have been many reports of the existence of monuments of Indian or Buddhist character in the Champa country; and Mr. Crawford saw an image of the Hindu god Gapea which was brought from that country to Singapore by a M. Diard in 1821. But there is, we believe,

† Julien, Pétitons Bouddhistes, III. 88.
nothing yet precisely known as to the monuments, and indeed the late M. Garnier doubted their existence. There are also said to be many Moslem structures, such as minarets and tombs, with Arabic inscriptions.

The district of Champa, or Binh-Thuan, is one of those especially productive of eagle-wood or aloes-wood; and the Tuyen, or aloes-wood of Champa, was one of the kinds in high repute with the old Arabs. The native name is Kinaam. Ebony is also abundant.

Medieval Notices.—Both these products are mentioned by Marco Polo, who visited Champa as a commissioner from Kublai Khan about 1288. It was also visited forty years later by the Franciscan Odoic of Pordenone. Both travellers notice as prominent facts the immense family of the king, and the great number of domestic elephants that were kept. Both circumstances are still characteristic of most of the Indo-Chinese states. (Garnier, Voyage d’Exploration; Crawford, Mission to Siam, &c., and other works; Bastian, Reise, I and IV.; Mouhot’s Travels; De Mailly, H. Gen. de la Chine, tom. XII.; Bishop Louis in Jour. As. Soc. Beng., vols. VII. and VIII.; Tabloos de la Cochinchine, &c. &c.)

HI. Y.

BIJAPUR.

The admirers of Saracen architecture will be glad to hear that the glories of Bijapur are probably not doomed to extinction. A project for making the city the head-quarters of the present Kaladgi collectorate is in favour with the authorities, and will, it may be hoped, be carried out within a few years. Many of the old civil buildings, ruined more by Marathas’ savagery than by time, will be repaired and re-inhabited; and the preservation of the great monuments will pass from the hands of the municipality into those of a competent scientific officer.

The local officers are all enthusiastic for the preservation of their splendid buildings; and if any one should object to the re-occupation of the Adil Shahi palaces, it may well be answered that no government can afford to keep up as a mere curiosity the remains of so large a city. The Arkilla, or citadel, is already being cleared out; and the excavations have already revealed a number of beautiful Hindu or Jaina pillars with inscriptions, which are being carefully protected, and when read will probably contribute a good deal to the history of the pre-Muhammadan period in Karnataka. At present, however, plague, pestilence, and famine render the city of Bijapur no place for amateurs or idlers, and leave very little time for research at the disposal of the handful of local officers who dwell among the tombs, like Scriptural lunatics, and find it quite enough for them to attend to the living.

W. F. S.

KURUBHARS AND DOLMENs.

In the Kaladgi district the Shepherd caste are called Kurubhars. They bury their dead, and the other day I came across the tomb of one only four years old. It was a complete dolmen about eighteen inches square, composed of five stones, one at each side, one at the rear, and a capstone. The interior was occupied by two round stones about the size of a man’s fist, painted red, the deceased reposing in his mother-earth below. No ancient dolmens are known in this northern part of the district, though they are, I believe, not uncommon in the tālukās on the Krishna river.

What is the meaning and derivation of Kurubhar, and is it the same word as Kūrām-bā, the name of a Nilgiri hill-tribe? The latter, I believe, is a race of dwarfs; the Shephards here are a fine breed of men; yet the difference can hardly be greater than that which exists among the Bhils.

In his Rude Stone Monuments (p. 476) Mr. Fergusson hazards a conjecture that the Kurām-bās of the southern hills are the remnants of a great and widely spread race, who may have erected dolmens; and the fact now noted seems to point in the same direction.

W. F. S.

NOTES ON THE MUHARRAM FESTIVAL.

In connection with my Notes in the Indian Antiquary, vol. VI. page 79, a friend sends me the following:—

“I think that you may be interested to hear that all the practices you mention are followed here (Kollāpur). That peculiar one of piercing the ears in front of the tabut is in vogue here. It is also common for Marathas, even of the highest families, such as the Chief of Madhol, to bind a thread of coloured worsted round their arms and call themselves Fakirs for that day. They also declare that people jump into the burning pit and come out unscathed, but this I have not seen and will not swear to. You don’t mention the institution of the Nāl Sāheb, a horse-shoe or crescent on the top of a pole; have you not noticed it? Here the Nāl Sāheb is paraded about with music and

† The Ant. IV. pp. 106, 1270; vol. III. pp. 95-6.

† The Nāl is the shoe and representative of Husain’s charger, Zul Jan, — W. F. S.

dancing, till somebody goes into convulsions, and then they say that Nāl Sāheb has entered into his body."

W. F. S.

IS THE SULTAN THE KHALIF?

Mr. Neil B. E. Baillie writes—"The Prophet himself expressly declared that none could be the Imám, or head of his religion, but an Arab of the tribe of Koreish. On the faith of that declaration his first successor was appointed, in preference to a candidate set up by the people of Madinah. Nay, all his other generally acknowledged successors down to the taking of Baghdad by the Tatars, and even those who were only partially acknowledged, such as the Khalifs of Spain, and those of the Fatemite and second Abbaside Dynasties, were all of the same tribe of Koreish. Further, if any one in the early ages of Muhammadanism had maintained 'that a man might be promoted to the dignity of Imám though he was not of the tribe of Koreish, he would have been denounced as a heretic, and a Kārebī, or rebel to the whole Musalman community. The Turks are of Tatar origin, and their sovereign does not, I believe, pretend to be an Arab of any tribe, much less of the tribe of Koreish. How, then, can any true Muhammadan acknowledge him to be the head of his religion, and the successor of the Prophet, and at the same time profess to be a follower of that Prophet to whom he thus in a manner gives the lie?"

CHAMĀRIS AND PANKĀS.

It was among the Chamārīs of the Central Provinces, "the very first Aryan immigrants," a sturdy race of cultivators who are described as the busy bees of the community, that Ghāsi Dāś, a fair unlettered seer of visions, arose as a reformer. From the forest hamlet of Girdi, where the Jōk falls into the Mahānādī, he disappeared for six months, but only to be seen descending from its rocky eminence, at the appointed time, with a message to his multitude of expectant followers. "Worship the one God—Satnām, the True One—whose high-priest I am, and live as brothers," was his creed, and when he died—in 850, at the good old age of eighty—his son succeeded him. In ten years that son became a victim to his zeal in promulgating the doctrine of the equality of Brāhmaṇ and Chamār, but his fate only incensed the Satnāmīs the more against Hindus, as in the parallel case of the Sikhs and Musalmāns. The grandchild of the founder of this faith is now high-priest; but the work of initiation, by placing a necklace of beads on the children when they are named, is done by the boy's uncle. The Satnāmīs have neither temple nor rites, scriptures nor forms of devotion. To name the Satnām and invoke his blessing, to visit the high-priest once a year and offer a gift, and to keep far from them graven images—these constitute their faith. Socially they differ little from the Hindus, who slander them, and differ among themselves only as to the lawfulness of tobacco. They are divided into smokers and non-smokers. Some years ago the settlement officer of Bilaspur reported of them that "there is no class more loyal and satisfied with our rule than this community, and if it should happen that, like the Kolhs, they are favourably impressed with missionary teaching, a time may come when they will be a source of strength to our government." A small Christian mission has been established among them.

The Pankās are less known. Weavers, cultivators, and village watchmen, industrious and quiet because not claiming equality with the Hindus, who half acknowledge their sect, the Pankās worship Kabir, or the one God, who has often appeared incarnate on earth, and last of all in 1060 A.D., near Banāras, as a crying child struggling amid the leaves of the lotus in a tank. Before the weaver's wife who rescued it, the babe developed into a man, revealed himself as God, and accompanied her home. There he wrought miracles, and in the period of his incarnation, from 1069 to 1472, he became, what he is still, the weavers' God all over India, under the name of Kabir Pant. There are to be in all forty-four such incarnations, ending with the reappearance of Kabir himself on earth. The present apostle is only the eleventh in the list—Parghānā Samāhe. He succeeded in 1856, and is supported by an order of priests, who, in white-peaked cloth cap, loose white tunic and loin-cloth, follow him in long procession two or four abreast, as he proceeds on his collecting tours. His head-quarters is Kāwardā, in Bilaspur. Like all offshoots from Hinduism, Kabir Pantism denounces caste, and finds in this its popularity. The Pankās' change to this faith is preserved in this favourite doggrel—

Pānī se Pankā bhai
Budān hua sharīr
Age jan men Pankā
Pichhe Dāś Kabir.

From water sprang the Pankā,
His face so bright and clear;
At life's early dawn a Pankā
Now worships Dāś Kabir.

Kabirpanthis and Satnāmīs resemble each other in many respects. They avoid meat and liquor, they marry usually at the age of puberty, they ordinarily celebrate their ceremonies through the agency of elders of their own caste, and they bury
their dead. As with the Sikhs, the comparatively pure and noble teaching of the founders of these sects soon degenerates, the converts from the higher Hindu castes insisting on certain distinctions. The salt, never very pure, soon loses its savour. Of the best as of the worst, of the Brahmoas of the Sikh, the Satnami and the Kabir-Panti, it is true that neither the varying intimations of all, nor the rapt ecstasy of one, can supply the place of that Name which is above every name, of the Logos in all the fulness of the meaning of that word.—Friend of India, 30th April 1874.

BOOK NOTICES.


This new edition of a work already so well known makes an epoch in the study of Sanskrit-dramatic poetry, and thus the learned and most industrious Kiel professor's labours especially deserve mention here, as being of more than usual interest so far as India is concerned.

The Çakuntalā has always been much read in India, and, owing chiefly to Sir W. Jones's florid version, it has become the generally received type of a Sanskrit play, except among scholars,† and is also commonly in use as a text-book. Considering its popularity, it is perhaps a matter for surprise that more has not been done to ascertain, if possible, the relative value of the several recensions current: for, like most Sanskrit books, the text exists in several recensions. Sir W. Jones, as was natural, took the Bengali recension; but the recension current in the rest of North India, and which is generally known as the 'Nāgari recension,' early supplanted the former in general esteem. Since then, a third recension, current in South India, has become known.† Prof. Pischel's chief object is to give a critical edition of the Bengali text, and hence to show that it is not a corrupt text, as is generally supposed, but that it is the best of all.

As regards the merits of Prof. Pischel's book as a critical edition there cannot be two opinions: it is in every way a masterpiece, done with great acuteness and disregardness of labour. As such, its use should at once be made compulsory by candidates for the University and Government examinations. The old way of Sanskrit study is now impossible, and, if the study of that language and literature is to be an effectual instrument of culture in the Indian educational scheme for the future, students must be made to follow improved methods. Much has been done in this way by the Calcutta University, and still more at Bombay; in the Madras Presidency it is difficult to regard what is done by students—and that is very little—otherwise than as a pure waste of time. From this point of view Prof. Pischel's edition deserves as warm a recognition from those occupied in teaching as it is sure to meet with from scholars. Educationalists, by encouraging such editions as this, could soon meet the arguments—at present nearly unanswerable—of those who would exclude Oriental languages from the colleges and schools of India; they would thus also, in all probability, excite among their pupils a more intelligent interest in Sanskrit than is now displayed.

Prof. Pischel's second object is to show that the Bengali text of the Çakuntalā is the best one, and his edition is thus the necessary conclusion of his former treatises, De Kalidasa Çakuntalae recensionibus et Die Recensionen der Çakuntalā. It is by no means so easy to pronounce an opinion on this part of his work as it is to recognize the great merits of his edition; the problem to be solved is one of exceptional complication and difficulty even in Sanskrit literature. The general acceptance of the 'Nāgari recension' was perhaps hasty, and Prof. Pischel has, by a minute consideration of the texts, elicited some new and important facts which entitle the Bengali recension to more consideration than it has hitherto met with. He has also compared the 'Nāgari and South-Indian recensions of the Vikramorvasiyam, and thus come to the same conclusion. It is thus obvious that his inferences deserve the most serious consideration. The results of his researches are that the Prākrit of the Drāviḍian (or South-Indian) and Nāgari recensions is not Sārasmerti, but a wild mixture of various dialects; also that "it is in South India that Sanskrit dramas have been adulterated and abridged."

The first point must, as determined by so competent a scholar,† be accepted as an undoubted fact. Before admitting the second, I think it may reasonably be asked, On what principles, and to meet what views, were the adulterations and abridgments made in South India? So far as I have been able to consider the matter, I cannot find

* A better selection might have been made, for the story is poor, and the more sober estimate of the literary value of this play is not likely to differ much from what J. Mill wrote in 1817 (Hist. of India, bk. II. ch. 9).
† Prof. Pischel described this in 1876 in the Göttingen Nachrichten. When I drew his attention to this recension (Aindra Grammarians, pp. 80, 81) I was not aware of this fact; I can only apologize for my ignorance.
‡ It is hardly necessary to remind readers of Prof. Pischel's splendid edition of Hemachandra's Prākrit Grammar.
any. Prakrit has been studied with great success in the Dekhan and South India; Hemachandra and Trivikrama represent in this way the countries where the Nagari and South-Indian recensions have been current; why then should pandits in those parts of India have adulterated the Prakrit passages in Kālidāsa's text? Again, the botany of Kālidāsa is strange to South India, where only a few of the many plants to which he alludes are known, but I cannot find even a single instance where the South-Indian text has been altered in this respect to suit that part of India. It also appears to me very unlikely that South-Indian pandits ever wilfully falsified texts. It is now more than sixteen years since I first arrived in South India, and during this time I have been personally acquainted with most of the chief pandits of the old school—now, alas! to be numbered on the fingers. None of the many I have known were capable of doing anything of the kind. During this period thousands of South Indian MSS. have passed through my hands, but I have never observed in them anything that would lead one to suspect that systematical and intentional falsifications had been carried on in South India. I must, without any prejudice, assert these facts, for I fear that Prof. Pischel's words may (unintentionally) wrong the pandits of South India. It is remarkable also that the South-Indian commentators notice several differences in the texts; this would not indicate any prejudices on their part; clerical errors, however, cannot have given rise to the great differences in the three recensions.

Anyhow, whatever may be the conclusion on which scholars will eventually agree as regards the respective merits of the several recensions of the Sakuntala, it is impossible not to be grateful for the new and important facts brought to notice in so complete a way by Prof. Pischel, and not to anxiously expect his promised critical edition of the South-Indian text. Meanwhile, whatever may be urged against his inferences, it is difficult to resist so careful a judgment on the evidence.

So perfect is the work that scarcely is anything left to object to, but, surely, 'Nikāśaṁcārya' (p. x.) should be 'Śrīnāśaṁcārya,' the very common South-Indian name.

A. Burnett, Ph.D.

Coomoor, Nilgiri Hills, 6th May 1877.

ABORIGINAL TRIBES OF THE BOMBAY PRESIDENCY. (A FRAGMENT.) By the late Rev. John Wilson, D.D.

So distinguished was the position which "the old man eloquent" whose last (and posthumous) contribution to Oriental research now lies before us occupied among the scholars and inquirers of Western India, that it will be by many thought presumptive to criticize his work. Considerable steps, however, have been made in his favourite studies since he ceased to learn; and for the very reason that his authority is too often accepted without inquiry it is the more necessary that his "last words" should here be carefully reviewed. The present work is understood to contain so much of his promised contributions to the Bombay Gazetteer as could be collected by a nameless official editor. The title is hardly correct; for of 61 pages altogether only 24 are devoted to tribes that could by any stretch of language be called aboriginal. The doctor enumerates only eleven of these; viz.:

1. The Bhils (Sanskrit Bhils), whose name he derives from the Dravidian word bhillā = a bow, and connects with the name Phyllite, ascribed by Ptolemy to an Indian tribe.

2. The Nāyakādas (Nairks), who might indeed have been classed as a mere division of the Bhils.

3. The Gonds, a term, as he thinks, corrupted from Govinda = a cowherd. This is exceedingly probable; the contraction is sometimes seen at the present day, as in the name of a tank near Dhulik, called Gondur, for Govindrā. They are to be found, says the doctor, in the Bombay Presidency only in small numbers, in some of the forests and hills of the Narasād. This is hardly correct; as we have seen them as far west as Chāliagāon, on the G. I. P. Railway, and heard of them at Malegaon, in modern Nāsik.

4. The Kolas, or Kulis as the doctor delights to call them. Their name he makes out to be from kula = a clan. It may be so; but it is certain that they always call themselves Kolis, and that the doctor is in error when he says that "Kulā and Kulis" receive its name from them, meaning the abode of Kolis." There are two places called, pace Dr. Wilson, Kollā, both sandy islets, the one of which has been an integral part of Bombay by the process of reclamations; while the other is occupied by the sea-fort of a branch of the pirate dynasty of Angria, and now gives its name to a British collectorate. In each case the name is that of a grīna devala of the fishermen, who are, indeed, Kolis by caste. The reader who wishes to know more of this interesting race will find much valuable information in the doctor's article; more, perhaps, in Mr. Nairne's Historical Sketch of the Kolāy, and the writings of Dr. DaGusa.

* Perhaps another form of Kolamā.-Eo.
find out his opinion of; for the extravagant doctrines and rites of the eccentric sects of India occupy all the rest of the notes which were made available after the writer's death. The subject was so much more congenial to the missionary and scholar that it occupies nearly two-thirds of the book, and this portion is certainly, on the whole, as superior in quality as in quantity: It is, however, occasionally marred by most atrocious editing, as in a paragraph about the Nihilist Shunyavâdha, which is absolutely unintelligible. If the doctor really wrote it, he must have been prostrated by illness at the time; but the confusion seems rather the result of a printer's devilry, or of the careless collation of confused notes. The proofs, too, do not appear to have been corrected by a competent person.

The doctor classes the devotees under twenty-one heads, each with many subdivisions. Some, as the Sikhs, Jainas, Vallabhâchâryas, and Svâmi Râkṣyâs, have made a noise in the world, and have been fully described elsewhere. The Râmanujas, most numerous in the south, may perhaps be considered as the Vaishnava counterpart of the well-known Saiva Lingayats. The Râmânâmas or Bairagis, also Vaishnavas, are often confounded by Europeans with the Saiva Gosains, and have a quaint habit of condescending to a sâdhu's ignorance by answering to his questions that they are Sâdhu-pâdâstras. The Dnyânâdeva Panthis, or followers of the celebrated author of the Dnyânâdevas, the Châcer of the Marâthi tongue, do not, says the doctor, really constitute an organized body at all. But space fails us to examine in detail the mass of information, the collection of which was doubtless far more a labour of love than the lamented author; than the reviewing of it can be to a lay commentator.

W. F. S.

The History of India, as told by its own Historians—

This seventh volume of materials for the history of India under the Muhammadans consists of twenty-three extracts and notices of varying lengths from the native histories relating to the reigns of Shâh-Jâhân, Aurangzeb, Bahadur Shâh, Jahânâdar Shâh, Farrukh Siyar, Râf'û-d Daula, and Râfû-d Darajât, and of the earlier part of the reign of Muhammad Shâh,—that is from A. D. 1657 to about 1731. Some of the twenty-three sections, it should be remarked, are merely bibliographical notices of books; thus the first is a notice of the Pâdâshâh Nâma of Muhammad Âmin Karwân, which has been the model for most of
the Sháh-Jahána-náma, 'Abdu'l-Hamíd Láhorí follows its arrangement and supplies the same matter, though without acknowledgment, in his Bádsháh-Náma, from which Professor Dowson gives 67 pages of extracts. This latter work is the great authority for the first twenty years of the reign of Sháh Jahán, and has been published in the original Persian in the Bibliotheca Indica. For the remainder of the reign 46 pages of extracts are given from a MS. translation of nearly the whole of 'Ináyat Khán’s Sháh-Jahána-náma made by the late Major Fuller for Sir H. M. Elliot. The Bádsháh-Náma of Muhammad Wárís, the pupil of 'Abdu'l-Hamíd, is the completion of his master’s work, containing the history of the last ten years of Sháh Jahán’s reign; but, as this period has been pretty fully treated of in the extracts from 'Ináyat Khán’s work, only a short extract relating to the twenty-second year is given. A few pages of extracts follow bearing on the 31st and 32nd years of the reign, from the Anu-i Saláh of Muhammad Sálth Kamhá. The Sháh-Jahána-náma of Muhammad Sálth Khán is merely noticed, as it seems to have been followed by Kháfí Khán in his history. From the Múqaddás-i Saláh of Muhammad Sharíf Hanafí, four short extracts are given, translated by a munshi for Sir H. M. Elliot from the only MS. he knew of—a copy in one of the Royal Libraries at Lucknow. The Tárikh-i Múfizzáli, of Múfizzáli Khán, a general history from the creation down to a. d. 1666, is represented in a similarly brief way. Of the Mir-át-i 'Alá and Mir-át-i Jákha-náma of Bakhtáwar Khán,—apparently essentially the same work, being a universal history, a table of contents is given and a few extracts by Sir H. M. Elliot. He dismisses the worthless Zúrat-i Tárikh of 'Aszúlah with a notice and outline of the contents; from the Nabúh-át Tárikh-i Húd of Bóhárá Mal, he gives the contents and three pages of extracts. The 'Alamgír-Náma of Mirzá Muhammad Kázin, containing a history of the first ten years of Aurangzeb, "was dedicated to him in the 32nd year of his reign; but on its being presented," though the author had been specially instructed to prepare it, "the Emperor forbade its continuation, and, like another Alexander, edicto vetuit ne quis se pingeret, but not for the same reason. The Moghal Emperor professed, as the cause of his prohibition, that the cultivation of inward piety was preferable to the ostentatious display of his achievements." The book is written in a style of courly panegyric, and from it Sir H. M. Elliot and the editor supply only a few extracts. The history of the conquest of Asán, translated from this work by Mr. H. Vansittart, appeared in the Asiatic Miscellany, vol. i. and Asiatic Researches, vol. ii. (pp. 171-185), and the original has been printed in the Bibliotheca Indica. It has also been abridged in the Múashá‘-i Alamgír of Muhammad Sálth Musta'ádh Khán, which, however, continues the history down to the death of Alamgír in a.d. 1707. This latter work was edited and translated into English by H. Vansittart in 1785, and another version of the last forty years was made for Sir H. Elliot by Lieut. Perkins, 71st N.I., and from that translation 14 pages of extracts are here supplied. The Persian original has also been published in the Bibliotheca Indica. The next five sections are only short notices of books:—The Putásh-i Alamgír or Wákát-i Alamgír of Muhammad Ma'ám, an account of the “events of two or three years;” the Tárikh-i Múlik-i Ashkán, or account of the expedition to Asán in the 4th year of Aurangzeb, by Maulána Ahmad Sháhábú-d din Táshásh; the Wákát of Mirzá Muhammad Nimát Khán, devoted to the siege of Golkonda; the Jang-i-náma of the same author; and Rúku’dá’-i Alamgír or Letters of Aurangzeb.

We now come to perhaps the most important section of the book,—322 pages of extracts from Mumtácáháb-í Láhób of Muhammad Háshim, frequently called Tárikh-i Kháfí Khán, "a highly esteemed history, commencing with the invasion of Bóbár a.d. 1519, and concluding with the fourteenth year of Muhammad Sháh," but "chiefly valuable for containing an entire account of the reign of Aurangzeb, of which, in consequence of that Emperor’s well-known prohibition, it is very difficult to obtain a full and connected history." Kháfí Khán, however, had privately compiled a minute register of all the events of the reign, which he published some years after the monarch’s death; and Professor Dowson has done great and good service by translating so largely as he has done from this excellent history, covering as it does the most stirring period in Maráthá history, of Siváij, Sambhá, and Bája Ráms.

The extracts (25 pp.) from the Tárikh-i Irídát Khán (1706-1712 a.d.) and two letters of Aurangzeb’s are taken from Capt. J. Scott’s History of the Deccan. From Tárikh-i Bahádur Sháh, the account of Bahádur Sháh’s reign (a.d. 1707-1712) was translated for Sir H. M. Elliot by Lieut. Anderson, 25th N.I., but only four short extracts were thought worth printing. Tárikh-i Sháh Alam Bahádur Sháh by Dánishmánd Khán, otherwise called Mirzá Muhammad Nimát Khán, extends

* See Elphinstone’s History, p. 673.
† Conf. Elphinstone’s History, Book X. chap. 1, and Grant Duff’s Mahrattas, vol. i. p. 118; Four. R. As. Sec.
THE INDIKA OF MEGASTHENES.

TRANSLATED BY J. W. MCCRINDLE, M.A., GOVT. COLLEGE, PATNA.

BOOK III.

FRAGMENT XXXII.


Of the Seven Castes among the Indians.

XI. But further: in India the whole people is divided into about seven castes. Among these are the sophists, who are not so numerous as the others, but hold the supreme place of dignity and honour,—for they are under no necessity of doing any bodily labour at all, or of contributing from the produce of their labour anything to the common stock, nor indeed is any duty absolutely binding on them except to perform the sacrifices offered to the gods on behalf of the state. If any one, again, has a private sacrifice to offer, one of these sophists shows him the proper mode, as if he could not otherwise make an acceptable offering to the gods. To this class the knowledge of divination among the Indians is exclusively restricted, and none but a sophist is allowed to practise that art. They predict about such matters as the seasons of the year, and any calamity which may befall the state;

but the private fortunes of individuals they do not care to predict,—either because divination does not concern itself with trifling matters, or because to take any trouble about such is deemed unbecoming. But if any one fails thrice to predict truly, he incurs, it is said, a further penalty than being obliged to be silent for the future, and there is no power on earth able to compel that man to speak who has once been condemned to silence. These sophists go naked, living during winter in the open air to enjoy the sunshine, and during summer, when the heat is too powerful, in meadows and low grounds under large trees, the shadow whereof, Nearchus says, extends to five plethra in circuit, adding that even ten thousand men could be covered by the shadow of a single tree. They live upon the fruits which each season produces, and on the bark of trees,—the bark being no less sweet and nutritious than the fruit of the date-palm.

After these, the second caste consists of the tillers of the soil, who form the most...
numerous class of the population. They are neither furnished with arms, nor have any military duties to perform, but they cultivate the soil and pay tribute to the kings and the independent cities. In times of civil war the soldiers are not allowed to molest the husbandmen or ravage their lands: hence, while the former are fighting and killing each other as they can, the latter may be seen close at hand tranquilly pursuing their work,—perhaps ploughing, or gathering in their crops, pruning the trees, or reaping the harvest.

The third caste among the Indians consists of the herdsmen, both shepherds and neuter herds; and these neither dwell in cities nor in villages, but they are nomadic and live on the hills. They too are subject to tribute, and this they pay in cattle. They scour the country in pursuit of fowl and wild beasts.

XII. The fourth caste consists of handicraftsmen and retail-dealers. They have to perform gratuitously certain public services, and to pay tribute from the products of their labour. An exception, however, is made in favour of those who fabricate the weapons of war,—and not only so, but they even draw exempted from military service, and cultivate their lands undisturbed by fear. They never go to town, either to take part in its tumults, or for any other purpose. It therefore not unfrequently happens that at the same time, and in the same part of the country, men may be seen drawn up in array of battle, and fighting at risk of their lives, while other men close at hand are ploughing and digging in perfect security, having these soldiers to protect them. The whole of the land is the property of the king, and the husbandmen till it on condition of receiving one-fourth of the produce.

(41) The third caste consists of herdsmen and hunters, who alone are allowed to hunt, and to keep cattle, and to sell draught animals or let them out on hire. In return for clearing the land of wild beasts and fowls which devour the seeds sown in the fields, they receive an allowance of grain from the king. They lead a wandering life and live under tents.

Fragm. XXXVI. follows here.

[So much, then, on the subject of wild animals. We shall now return to Megasthenes, and resume from where we digressed.]

(46) The fourth class, after herdsmen and hunters, pay from the state. In this class are included shipbuilders, and the sailors employed in the navigation of the rivers.

The fifth caste among the Indians consists of the warriors, who are second in point of numbers to the husbandmen, but lead a life of supreme freedom and enjoyment. They have only military duties to perform. Others make their arms, and others supply them with horses, and they have others to attend on them in the camp, who take care of their horses, clean their arms, drive their elephants, prepare their chariots, and act as their charioteers. As long as they are required to fight they fight; and when peace returns they abandon themselves to enjoyment,—the pay which they receive from the state being so liberal that they can with ease maintain themselves, and others besides.

The sixth class consists of those called superintendents.* They spy out what goes on in country and town, and report everything to the king where the people have a king, and to the magistrates where the people are self-governed, and it is against use and wont for these to give in a false report;—but indeed no Indian is accused of lying.

* Sheriffs: see Ind. Ant. vol. V. p. 207.
The seventh caste consists of the councillors of state, who advise the king, or the magistrates of self-governed cities, in the management of public affairs. In point of number this is a small class, but it is distinguished by superior wisdom and justice, and hence enjoys the prerogative of choosing governors, chiefs of provinces, deputy-governors, superintendents of the treasury, generals of the army, admirals of the navy, controllers, and commissioners who superintend agriculture.

The custom of the country prohibits intermarriage between the castes: for instance, the husbandman cannot take a wife from the artisan caste, nor the artisan a wife from the husbandman caste. Custom also prohibits anyone from exercising two trades, or from changing from one caste to another. One cannot, for instance, become a husbandman if he is a herdsman, or become a herdsman if he is an artisan. It is only permitted that the soothi be from any caste: for the life of the soothi is not an easy one, but the hardest of all.

Frugm. XXXIV.
Strab. XV. 1. 50-52,—pp. 707-709.
Of the administration of public affairs.
Of the use of Horses and Elephants.
(Frugm. XXXIII. has preceded this.)

(50) Of the great officers of state, some have charge of the market, others of the city, others of the soldiers. Some superintend the rivers, measure the land, as is done in Egypt, and inspect the sluices by which water is let out from the main canals into their branches, so that every one may have an equal supply of it. The same persons have charge also of the huntmen, and are entrusted with the power of rewarding or punishing them according to their deserts. They collect the taxes, and superintend the occupations connected with land, as those of the woodcutters, the carpenters, the blacksmiths, and the miners.

They construct roads, and at every ten stadia set up a pillar to show the by-roads and distances. Those who have charge of the city are divided into six bodies of five each. The members of the first look after everything relating to the industrial arts. Those of the second attend to the entertainment of foreigners. To these they assign lodgings, and they keep watch over their modes of life by means of those persons whom they give to them as assistants. They escort them on the way when they leave the country, or, in the event of their dying, forward their property to their relatives. They take care of them when they are sick, and if they die bury them.

The third body consists of those who inquire when and how births and deaths occur, with the view not only of levying a tax, but also in order that births and deaths among both high and low may not escape the cognizance of Government. The fourth class superintends trade and commerce: Its members have charge of weights and measures, and see that the products in their season are sold by public notice. No one is allowed to deal in more than one kind of commodity unless he pays a double tax. The fifth class supervises manufactured articles, which they sell by public notice. What is new is sold separately from what is old, and there is a fine for mixing the two together. The sixth and last class consists of those who collect the tenth of the prices of the articles sold. Fraud with regard to this tax is punished with death.

Such are the functions which these bodies separately discharge. In their collective capacity they have charge both of their special departments, and also of matters affecting the general interest, as the keeping of public buildings in proper repair, the regulation of prices, and their own caste, or to exchange one profession or trade for another, or to follow more than one business. An exception is made in favour of the philosopher, who for his virtue is allowed this privilege.

† The Greek writers by confounding some distinctions occasioned by civil employment with those arising from that division have increased the number of classes from five (including the handiwork-man or mixed class) to seven. This number is produced by their supposing the king's councillors and assessors to form a distinct class from the Brâhmanas; by splitting the class of Vaisayas into two, consisting of shepherds and husbandmen; by introducing a caste of spies; and by omitting the servile class altogether. With these exceptions the classes are in the state described by Menn, which is the groundwork of that still subsisting.—Elphinstone's History of India, p. 356.

‡ From this it would appear that ten stadia were equal to some Indian measure of distance, which must have been the kirés or kosa. If the stadium be taken 2,921 yards, this would give 2021 yards for the kōs, agreeing with the shorter kōs of 4,000 līkās, in use in the Pathāb, and till lately, if not still, in parts of Bengal. —Ed.
the care of markets, harbours, and temples.

Next to the city magistrates there is a third governing body, which directs military affairs. This also consists of six divisions, with five members to each. One division is appointed to cooperate with the admiral of the fleet, another with the superintendent of the bullock-trains which are used for transporting engines of war, food for the soldiers, provender for the cattle, and other military requisites. They supply servants who beat the drum, and others who carry gongs; grooms also for the horses, and mechanists and their assistants.

To the sound of the gong they send out foragers to bring in grass, and by a system of rewards and punishments ensure the work being done with despatch and safety. The third division has charge of the foot-soldiers, the fourth of the horses, the fifth of the war-chariots, and the sixth of the elephants.

There are royal stables for the horses and elephants, and also a royal magazine for the arms, because the soldier has to return his arms to the magazine, and his horse and his elephant to the stables.

They use the elephants without bridles. The chariots are drawn on the march by oxen, but the horses are led along by a halter, that their legs may not be galled and inflamed, nor their spirits damped by drawing chariots.

In addition to the charioteer, there are two fighting men who sit up in the chariot beside him. The war-elephant carries four men—three who shoot arrows, and the driver.

When it is said that an Indian by springing forward in front of a horse can check his speed and hold him back, this is not true of all Indians, but only of such as have been trained from boyhood to manage horses; for it is a practice with them to control their horses with bit and bridle, and to make them move at a measured pace and in a straight course. They neither, however, gall their tongue by the use of spiked muzzles, nor torture the roof of their mouth. The professional trainers break them in by forcing them to gallop round and round in a ring, especially when they see them refractory. Such as undertake this work require to have a strong hand as well as a thorough knowledge of horses. The greatest proficients test their skill by driving a chariot round and round in a ring; and in truth it would be no trifling feat to control with ease a team of four high-mettled steeds when whirling round in a circle.

The charioteer carries two men who sit beside the charioteer. The war-elephant either in what is called the tower, or, actually on his bare back, carries three fighting men, of whom two shoot from the side, while one shoots from behind. There is also a fourth man, who carries in his hand the goad wherein he guides the animal, much in the same way as the pilot and captain of the ship direct its course with the helm.

Fragm. XXXVI.

Strab. XV. 1. 41-43.—pp. 704-705.

Of Elephants.

Conf. Epist. 54-56.

(Fragm. XXXIII. 6 has preceded this.)

A private person is not allowed to keep either a horse or an elephant. These animals are held to be the special property of the king, and persons are appointed to take care of them.

The manner of hunting the elephant is this. Round a bare patch of ground is dug a deep trench about five or six stadia in extent, and over this is thrown a very narrow bridge which trench all round it, enclosing as much space as would suffice to encamp a large army. They make the trench with a breadth of five fathoms and a depth of four. But the earth which they throw out in the process of digging they heap up in mounds on both edges of the trench, and use it as a wall. Then they make huts for themselves by excavating the wall on the outer edge of the trench, and in these they leave loopholes, both to admit light, and to enable them to see when their

5° The fourfold division of the army (horse, foot, chariots, and elephants) was the same as that of Meno; but Strabo

6° The mode may be thus described—The hunters having selected a level tract of arid ground, dig a

makes a sextuple division, by adding the commissariat and naval department.
gives access to the enclosure. * Into this enclosure are introduced three or four of the best-trained female elephants. The men themselves lie in ambush in concealed huts. * The wild elephants do not approach this trap in the daytime, but they enter it at night, going in one by one. * When all have passed the entrance, the men secretly close it up; then, introducing the strongest of the tame fighting elephants, they fight it out with the wild ones, whom at the same time they entice with hunger. * When the latter are now overcome with fatigue, the boldest of the drivers dismount unobserved, and each man creeps under his own elephant, and from this position creeps under the belly of the wild elephant and ties his feet together. * When this is done they incite the tame ones to beat those whose feet are tied till they fall to the ground. They then bind prey approaches and enters the enclosure. * They next station some three or four of their best-trained she-elephants within the trap, to which they leave only a single passage by means of a bridge thrown across the trench, the framework of which they cover over with earth and a great quantity of straw, to conceal the bridge as much as possible from the wild animals, which might else suspect treachery. The hunters then go out of the way, retiring to the cells which they had made in the earthen wall. * Now the wild elephants do not go near inhabited places in the day-time, but during the night they wander about everywhere, and feed in herds, following as leader the one who is biggest and boldest, just as cows follow the bulls. * As soon, then, as they approach the enclosure, and hear the cry and catch scent of the females, they rush at full speed in the direction of the fenced ground, and being arrested by the trench move round its edge until they fall in with the bridge, along which they force their way into the enclosure. * The hunters meanwhile, perceiving the entrance of the wild elephants, hasten, some of them, to take away the bridge, while others, running off to the nearest villages, announce that the elephants are within the trap. The villagers, on hearing the news, mount their most spirited and best-trained elephants, and as soon as mounted ride off to the trap; but though they ride up to it they do not immediately engage in conflict with the wild elephants, but wait till these are sorely pinched by hunger and tamed by thirst. When they think their strength has been enough weakened, they set up the bridge anew, and ride into the trap, the wild ones and the tame ones together neck to neck with thongs of raw ox-hide. * To prevent them shaking themselves in order to throw off those who attempt to mount them, they make cuts all round their neck and then put thongs of leather into the incisions, so that the pain obliges them to submit to their fetters and to remain quiet. From the number caught they reject such as are too old or too young to be serviceable, and the rest they lead away to the stables. Here they tie their feet one to another, and fasten their necks to a firmly fixed pillar, and tame them by hunger. * After this they restore their strength with green reeds and grass. They next teach them to be obedient, which they effect by soothing them, some by cooing words, and others by songs and the music of the drum. * Few of them are found difficult to tame, for they are naturally so mild when first a fierce assault is made by the tame elephants upon those caught in the trap, and then, as might be expected, the wild elephants, through loss of spirit and faintness from hunger, are overpowered. * On this the hunters, dismounting from their elephants, bind with fetters the feet of the wild ones, now by this time quite exhausted. * Then they instigate the tame ones to beat them with repeated blows, until their sufferings wear them out, and they fall to the ground. * The hunters meanwhile, standing near them, slip nooses over their necks and mount them while yet lying on the ground; and, to prevent them shaking off their riders, or doing mischief otherwise, make with a sharp knife an incision all round their neck, and fasten the noose round in the incision. By means of the wound thus made they keep their head and neck quite steady; for if they become restive and turn round, the wound is gall'd by the action of the rope. They shun, therefore, all violent movements, and, knowing that they have been vanquished, suffer themselves to be led in fetters by the tame ones.

XIV. But such as are too young, or through the weakness of their constitution not worth keeping, their captors allow to escape to their old haunts; while those which are retained they lead to the villages, where they give them at first green stalks of corn and grass to eat. * The creatures, however, having lost all spirit, have no wish to eat; but the Indians, standing round them in a circle, soothe and cheer them by chanting songs with the accompaniment of the music of drums and cymbals. * for the elephant is of all brutes the most intelligent. Some of them, for instance, have taken up their riders when
and gentle in their disposition that they approximate to rational creatures. Some of them take up their drivers when fallen in battle, and carry them off in safety from the field. Others, when their masters have sought refuge between their forelegs, have fought in their defence and saved their lives. If in a fit of anger they kill either the man who feeds or the man who trains them, they pine so much for their loss that they refuse to take food, and sometimes die of hunger.

13 They copulate like horses, and the female casts her calf chiefly in spring. It is the season for the male, when he is in heat and becomes fierce. At this time he discharges a fatty substance through an orifice near the temples. It is also the season for the females, when the corresponding passage opens. 14 They go with young for a period which varies from sixteen to eighteen months. The dam suckles her calf for six years. 15 Most of them live as long as men who attain extreme longevity, and some live over two hundred years. They are liable to many distempers, and are not easily cured. 16 The

The remedy for diseases of the eye is to wash it with cows' milk. For most of their other diseases draughts of black wine are administered to them. For the cure of their wounds they are made to swallow butter, for this draws out iron. Their sores are fomented with swine's flesh.

Fragm. XXXVIII.


Of the diseases of Elephants.
(Cf. Fragm. XXXVI. 15 and XXXVII. 15.)

The Indians cure the wounds of the elephants which they catch, in the manner following:—They treat them in the way in which, as good old Homer tells us, Patroklos treated the wound of Eurybylos,—they foment them with lukewarm water. After this they rub them over with butter, and if they are deep they allay the inflammation by applying and inserting pieces of pork, hot but still retaining the blood. They cure opthalmia with cows' milk, which is first used as a fomentation for the eye, and is then injected into it. The animals open their eyelids, and finding they can see better are delighted, and are sensible of the benefit like human beings. In proportion as

 remarked. 16 Diseases of their eyes are cured by pouring cows' milk into them, and other distempers by administering draughts of black wine; while their wounds are cured by the application of roasted pork. Such are the remedies used by the Indians.

Fragm. XXXVII. B.

Aelian, Hist. Anim. XII. 44.

Of Elephants.
(Cf. Fragm. XXXVI. 9-10 and XXXVII. 9-10
init. c. XIV.)

In India an elephant if caught when full-grown is difficult to tame, and longing for freedom thirsts for blood. Should it be bound in chains, this exasperates it still more, and it will not submit to a master. The Indians, however, cool it with food, and seek to pacify it with various things for which it has a liking, their aim being to fill its stomach and to soothe its temper. But it is still angry with them, and takes no notice of them. To what device do they then resort? They sing to it its native melodies, and soothe it with the music of an instrument in common use which has four strings and is called a skindapos. The creature now pricks up its ears, yields to the soothing strain, and its anger subsides. Then, though there is an occasional outburst of its suppressed passion, it gradually turns its eye to its food. It is then freed from its bonds, but does not seek to escape, being enthralled with the music. It even takes food eagerly, and, like a luxurious guest riveted to the festive board, has no wish to go, from its love of the music.
their blindness diminishes their delight overflows; and this is a token that the disease has been cured. The remedy for other distempers to which they are liable is black wine; and if this potion fails to work a cure nothing else can save them.

**Fragm. XXXIX.**

Strab. XV. 1. 44.—p. 700.

**Of Gold-digging Ants.**

Megasthenés gives the following account of these ants. Among the Dardai, a great tribe of Indians, who inhabit the mountains on the eastern borders, there is an elevated plateau, about 3,000 stadia in circuit. Beneath the surface there are mines of gold, and here accordingly are the ants which dig for that metal. They are not inferior in size to wild foxes. They run with amazing speed, and live by the produce of the chase. The time when they dig is winter. They throw up heaps of earth, as moles do, at the mouth of the mines. The gold-dust has to be subjected to a little boiling. The people of the neighbourhood, coming secretly with loads of burden, carry this off. If they came openly the ants would attack them, and pursue them if they fled, and would destroy both them and their cattle. So, to effect the robbery without being observed, they lay down in several different places pieces of the flesh of wild beasts, and when the ants are by this device dispersed they carry off the gold-dust. This they sell to any trader they meet with; while it is still in the state of ore, for the art of fusing metals is unknown to them.

**Fragm. XL.**

Arr. Ind. XV. 5-7.

**Of Gold-digging Ants.**

But Megasthenés avers that the tradition about the ants is strictly true, that they are gold-diggers not for the sake of the gold itself, but because by instinct they burrow holes in the earth to lie in, just as the tiny ants of our own country dig little holes for themselves; only those in India being larger than foxes make their burrows proportionately larger. But the ground is impregnated with gold, and the Indians hence obtain their gold. Megasthenes writes what he had heard from hearsay, and as I have no cruxer information to give I willingly dismiss the subject of the ant. 

**Fragm. XL. B.**

Dio Chrysost. Or. 85.—p. 436, Morell.

**Of Ants which dig for gold.**

(Cf. Fragm. XXXIV. and XL.)

They get the gold from ants. These creatures are larger than foxes, but are in other respects like the ants of our own country. They dig holes in the earth like other ants. The heap which they throw up consists of gold the purest and brightest in all the world. The mounds are piled up close to each other in regular order. They bedaub the earth with gold dust, and all this plain is made effulgent. It is difficult, therefore, to look towards the sun, and many who have attempted to do this have thereby destroyed their eyesight. The people who are near neighbours to the ants, with a view to plunder these heaps, cross the intervening desert, which is of no great extent. They are mounted on wagons to which they yoked their stoutest horses, and arrive at noon, a time when the ants have gone underground. They at once seize the booty, and make off at full speed. The ants, on learning what has been done, pursue the fugitives, and overtake them fight with them till they conquer or die, for on all animals they are the most courageous. It hence appears that they understand the worth of gold, and that they will sacrifice their lives rather than part with it.

**Fragm. XLII.**

Strab. XV. 1. 58-60.—pp. 711-714.

**Of the Indian Philosophers.**

(Fragm. XXXIX. has preceded this.)

(58) Speaking of the philosophers, he [Megasthenes] says that such of them as live on the mountains are worshippers of Dionysos, showing as proofs that he had come among them the wild vine, which grows in their country only, and the ivy, and the laurel, and the myrtle, which in summer amounts to three hundred, rises to nearly as hundred in winter. They prefer the winter, as the frozen soil then stands well, and is not likely to trouble them much by falling in.”—Id.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Fragm. XXXIX.</strong></th>
<th><strong>Fragm. XL.</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Of Gold-digging Ants.</strong></td>
<td><strong>Of Gold-digging Ants.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>See Ind. Ant. vol. IV. pp. 225 seqq.</em></td>
<td><em>These are the Dardai or Phoci, the Daradai of Ptolemy, and the Daradas of Sanskrit literature. &quot;The Dards are not an extinct race. According to the accounts of modern travellers, they consist of several wild and predatory tribes dwelling among the mountains on the north-west frontier of Kāmar and by the banks of the Indus.&quot; Ind. Ant. loc. cit.</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
and the box-tree, and other evergreens, none of which are found beyond the Euphrates, except a few in parks, which requires great care to preserve. They observe also certain customs which are Bacchanalian. Thus they dress in muslin, wear the turban, use perfumes, array themselves in garments dyed of bright colours; and their kings, when they appear in public, are preceded by the music of drums and gongs. But the philosophers who live on the plains worship Hérmakles. [These accounts are fabulous, and are impugned by many writers, especially what is said about the vine and wine. For the greater part of Armenia, and the whole of Mesopotamia and Media, onwards to Persia and Karmania, lie beyond the Euphrates, and throughout a great part of each of these countries good vines grow, and good wine is produced.]

(59) Megasthenés makes a different division of the philosophers, saying that they are of two kinds—one of which he calls the Brachmanes, and the other the Sarmanes.* The Brachmanes are best esteemed, for they are more consistent in their opinions. From the time of their conception in the womb they are under the guardian care of learned men, who go to the mother and, under the pretence of using some incantations for the welfare of herself and her unborn babe, in reality give her prudent hints and counsels. The women who listen most willingly are thought to be the most fortunate in their children. After their birth the children are under the care of one person after another, and as they advance in age each succeeding master is more accomplished than his predecessor. The philosophers have their abode in a grove in front of the city within a moderate-sized enclosure. They live in a simple style, and lie on beds of rushes or (deer) skins. They abstain from animal food and sexual pleasures, and spend their time in listening to serious discourse, and in imparting their knowledge to such as will listen to them. The hearer is not allowed to speak, or even to cough, and much less to spit, and if he offend in any of these ways he is cast out from their society that very day, as being a man who is wanting in self-restraint. After living in this manner for seven-and-thirty years, each individual retires to his own property, where he lives for the rest of his days in ease and security.† They then array themselves in fine muslin, and wear a few trinkets of gold on their fingers and in their ears. They eat flesh, but not that of animals employed in labour. They abstain from hot and highly seasoned food. They marry as many wives as they please, with a view to have numerous children, for by having many wives greater advantages are enjoyed, and, since they have no slaves, they have more need to have children around them to attend to their wants.

The Brachmanes do not communicate a knowledge of philosophy to their wives, lest they should divulge any of the forbidden mysteries to the profane if they became depraved, or lest they should desert them if they became good philosophers: for no one who despises pleasure and pain, as well as life and death, wishes to be in subjection to another, but this is characteristic both of a good man and of a good woman.

Death is with them a very frequent subject of discourse. They regard this life as, so to speak, the time when the child within the womb becomes mature, and death as a birth into a real and happy life for the votaries of philosophy. On this account they undergo much discipline as a preparation for death. They consider nothing that befalls men to be either good or bad, to suppose otherwise being a dream-like illusion, else how could some be affected with sorrow, and others with pleasure, by the very same things, and how could the

* "Since the word Ἱππανήως (the form used by Cleomen of Alexander) corresponds to the letter with the Sanskrit word ड्रवान (i.e. an ascetic), it is evident that the forms Γαρ्मανήως and Πραμνανήως, which are found in all the MSS. of Strabo, are incorrect. The mistake must not surprise us, since the ΣΑ when closely written together differ little in form from the syllable ΠΑ. In the same way Clement's ΑΑλαβαθος must be changed into Strabo's ΑΑλαβαθος, corresponding with the Sanskrit याप्रासच्छत—"the man of the first three cases who, after the term of his householder ship has expired, has entered the third dharma or order, and has proceeded (pratishtha) to a life in the world (Pāṇa)."—Schwanhaeë, p. 46; H. H. Wilken, Gloss."

† "A mistake (of the Greek writers) origimates in their ignorance of the fourfold division of a Brahman's life. Thus they speak of men who had been for many years sophists marrying and returning to common life (alluding probably to a student who, having completed the austerities of the first period, becomes a householder)." Elphinstone's History of India, p. 294, where it is also remarked that the writers erroneously prolong the period during which students listen to their instructors in silence and respect, making it extend in all cases to thirty-seven, which is the greatest age to which Sana (chap. III. sec. 1.) permits it in any case to be protracted.
same things affect the same individuals at different times with these opposite emotions?

Their ideas about physical phenomena, the same author tells us, are very crude, for they are better in their actions than in their reasonings, inasmuch as their belief is in great measure based upon fables; yet on many points their opinions coincide with those of the Greeks, for like them they say that the world had a beginning, and is liable to destruction, and is in shape spherical, and that the Deity who made it, and who governs it, is diffused through all its parts. They hold that various first principles operate in the universe, and that water was the principle employed in the making of the world. In addition to the four elements there is a fifth agency, from which the heaven and the stars were produced.† The earth is placed in the centre of the universe. Concerning generation, and the nature of the soul, and many other subjects, they express views like those maintained by the Greeks. They wrap up their doctrines about immortality and future judgment, and kindred topics, in allegories, after the manner of Plato. Such are his statements regarding the Brachmanes.

(60) Of the Sarmānas.§ he tells us that those who are held in most honour are called the Ḥyloboioi.|| They live in the woods, where they subsist on leaves of trees and wild fruits, and wear garments made from the bark of trees. They abstain from sexual intercourse and from wine. They communicate with the kings, who consult them by messengers regarding the causes of things, and who through them worship and supplicate the deity. Next in

---

FRAGMENT XLII.


That the Jewish race is by far the oldest of all these, and that their philosophy, which has been committed to writing, preceded the philosophy of the Greeks, Philo the Pythagorean shows by many arguments, as does also Aristoboulos the Peripatetic, and many others whose names I need not waste time in enumerating. Megasthenes, the author of a work on India, who lived with Seleukos Nikator, writes most clearly on this point, and his words are these:—"All that has been said regarding nature by the ancients is asserted also by philosophers out of Greece, on the one part in India by the Brachmanes, and on the other in Syria by the people called the Jews."

FRAGMENT XLII. B.


Again, in addition to this, further on he writes:

"Megasthenes, the writer who lived with Seleukos Nikator, writes most clearly on this point and to this effect:—'All that has been said,'" &c.

---

FRAGMENT XLII. C.


Aristoboulos the Peripatetic somewhere writes

† Aēdia, 'the other or sky.'
§ Schwanbeck differs from the distinct separation here made between the Brachmanes and the Sarmānas, as well as from the name Sarmānas being especially applied to Buddhist teachers, that the latter are here meant. They are called Sāmarāyas by Bardeanap (ap. Porphyr. Abst. IV. 17) and Alex. Polybius (ap. Cyril. cont. Julian. IV. p. 125 E. ed. Paris, 1688). Conf. also Hierocles, ed. Jovius. I. (ed. Paris, 1706. T. II. pt. 11. p. 206). And this is just the Pali name Samaṇas, the equivalent of the Sanskrit Sarmānas. Bohlen in De Buddhaisms originis et statutae definitudinis sustains this view, but Lassen (Rhein. Mus. für Phil. III. 171-175) contends that the description agrees better with the Baktarian sect, see Schwanbeck, p. 490. - Lassen Ind. Alterth. (2nd ed. II. 705, or (1st ed.) II. 700.—En. || See note* page 343.
* "In this passage, though Cyril follows Clemens, he wrongly attributes the narrative of Megasthenes to Aristoboulos the Peripatetic, whom Clemens only praises."—Schwanbeck, p. 59.
† The reading of the MSS is Alloboci.
‡ V. 1. Bostra. The passage admits of a different rendering: 'They (the Hylboioi) are those among the Indians who follow the precepts of Botta.' Colebrooke in his Obt...
honour to the Hyllobioi are the physicians, since they are engaged in the study of the nature of man. They are simple in their habits, but do not live in the fields. Their food consists of rice and barley-meal, which they can always get for the mere asking, or receive from those who entertain them as guests in their houses. By their knowledge of pharmacy they can make marriages fruitful, and determine the sex of the offspring. They effect cures rather by regulating diet, than by the use of medicines. The remedies most esteemed are ointments and pastes. All others they consider to be in a great measure pernicious in their nature. § This class and the other class practice fortune, both by undergoing active toil, and by the endurance of pain, so that they remain for a whole day motionless in one fixed attitude. ||

Besides these there are diviners and sorcerers, and adepts in the rites and customs relating to the dead, who go about begging both in villages and towns.

Even such of them as are of superior culture and refinement, inculcate such superstitions regarding Hades as they consider favourable to piety and holiness of life. Women pursue philosophy with some of them, but abstain from sexual intercourse.

**Fragm. XLII., XLIII.**

See ante, p. 244.

**Fragm. XLIV.**

Strab. XV. 1. 68.—p. 718.

Of Kalanos and Mandanis.

Megasthenes, however, says that self-destruction is not a dogma of the philosophers, but

---

**severations on the Sect of the Jainas, has quoted this passage from Clemens to controvert the opinion that the religion and institutions of the orthodox Hindus are more modern than the doctrines of Jina and of Buddha. "Here," he says, "to my apprehension, the followers of Buddha are clearly distinguished from the Brachmanas and Sarmanas. The former, called Germanic by Strabo, and Samananae by Porphyrius, are the sects of a different religion, and may have belonged to the sect of Jina, or to another. The Brachmanas are apparently those who are described by Thales and Herodotus as worshipping the sun; and by Strabo and by Arrian as performing sacrifices for the common benefit of the nation, as well as for individuals. They are expressly discriminated from the sect of Buddha by one ancient author, and from the Sarmanas or Sama

---

If that such as commit the act are regarded as foolhardy, those naturally of a severe temper stabbing themselves or casting themselves down a precipice, those averse to pain drowning themselves, those capable of enduring pain strangling themselves, and those of ardent temperaments throwing themselves into the fire. Kalanos was a man of this stamp. He was ruled by his passions, and became a slave to the table of Alexander.¶ He is on this account condemned by his countrymen, but Mandanis is applauded because when messengers from Alexander invited him to go to the son of Zeus, with the promise of gifts if he complied, and threats of punishment if he refused, he did not go. Alexander, he said, was not the son of Zeus, for he was not so much as master of the larger half of the world. As for himself, he wanted none of the gifts of a man whose desires nothing could satiate; and as for his threats he feared them not: for if he lived, India would supply him with food enough, and if he died, he would be delivered from the body of flesh now afflicted with age, and would be translated to a better and a purer life. Alexander expressed admiration of the man, and let him have his own way.

**Fragm. XLV.**

Arr. VII. ii. 3. 9.

Of Kalanos and Mandanis.

This shows that Alexander was by no means beyond understanding what is "the better," but in fact he was completely overmastered by the passion for glory. When he arrived at Taxila and saw the Indian gymnosophists, he felt a

---

ished in India when it was visited by the Greeks under Alexander, and continued to flourish from the time of Megasthenes, who described them in the fourth century before Christ, to that of Porphyrius, who speaks of them, on later authority, in the third century after Christ." § "The habits of the physicians," Elphinstone remarks, "seem to correspond with those of Brahmanas of the fourth stage.” ¶ "It is indeed," says the same authority, "a remarkable circumstance that the religion of Buddha should never have been expressly noticed by the Greek authors, though it had existed for two centuries before Alexander. The only explanation is that the appearance and characters of its followers were not so peculiar as to enable a foreigner to distinguish them from the mass of the people." ¶ "Kalanos followed the Macedonian army from Taxila, and when afterwards taken ill burned himself on a funeral pyre in the presence of the whole Macedonian army, without wincing: any symptom of pain. His real name, according to Ptolemy, was Aphanis, and he received the name Kalanos among the Greeks because in saluting persons he used the form kalanai instead of the Greek au. The Ptolemy hero called kalanai is probably the Sanskrit form kalasana, which is commonly used in addressing a person, and signifies 'good, just, or distinguished.'" — Smith's Classical Dictionary.
desire to converse with one of these men, because he regarded their fortitude with admiration. The eldest of these sages, with whom the others lived as disciples with a master, and whose name was Dananis, not only refused to go himself, but forbade any of the others to do so. He is said to have returned this answer, that if Alexander was the son of Zeus, then he too was the son of Zeus as well, and that he wanted none of the things which Alexander possessed, as he was quite contented with what he had. He noticed, he said, that those who were wandering with Alexander over so many lands and seas gained no good by it all, while at the same time there was no end to their many wanderings. He coveted, therefore, nothing which it was in Alexander's power to bestow, nor did he fear any restraint which he could possibly impose upon him; for if he lived, India would yield him as much food as he required, and if he died, he would be delivered from his ill-assorted companion the body. Alexander accordingly did not attempt to force him to act in opposition to his inclinations, appreciating his spirit of independence. But he prevailed upon Kalanos, one of their number, whom Megasthenes for that reason condemns for his want of firmness, and the rest of the sages reproached Kalanos with folly, for leaving the happiness they imagined they had, and acknowledging any other master except the supreme God.

BOOK IV.

FRAGM. XLVI.

Strab. XV. 1. 6-8.—pp. 636-638.

That the Indians had never been attacked by others, nor had themselves attacked others. (Cf. Epit. 23.)

6. But what just reliance can we place on the accounts of India from such expeditions as those of

FRAGM. XLVII.

Arr. Ind. V. 4-12.

That the Indians had never been attacked by others, nor had themselves attacked others.

Well, then, this same Megasthenes informs us that the Indians neither invade other men, nor do other men invade the Indians; for Sesostiris the Egyptian, after having overrun the greater part of Asia, and advanced with his army as far as Europe, returned home; and Danturios the Skuthian, issuing from Skuthia, subdued many nations of Asia, and carried his victorious arms even to the borders of Egypt; and Semiramis, again, the Assyrian queen, took in hand an expedition against India, but died before she could execute her design; and thus Alexander was the only conqueror who actually invaded the country. And regarding Dionysius many traditions are current of his having also made an expedition into India, and subjugated the Indians before the days of Alexander. But of Heracles's tradition has but little to say. Of the expedition, on the other hand

Gandhara, are reckoned among his tributaries (Arrian, Indica, I. 8). Tradition further recounted that, in returning from his expedition into India, Kyros had seen his whole army perish in the deserts of Gedrosia (Arr. Anab. VI. 24. 2). The Persian domination in these districts has left more than one trace in the geographical nomenclature. It is sufficient to recall the name of the Khoshpa, one of the great affluents of the Kophis.

Whatever be the real historical character of the expeditions of Semiramis and Kyros, it is certain that their conquests on the Indus were only temporary acquisitions, since at the epoch when Darius Hystaspes mounted the throne the eastern frontier of the empire did not go beyond Arakhsis (the Harvasit of the Zend texts, the Haranwacra of the cuneiform inscriptions, the Aravakat of Musulim geography, the provinces of Rostamk and of Ghazni of existing geography)—that is to say, the parts of Afghanistan which lie east of the Sulaiman chain of mountains. This fact is established by the great trilingual inscription of Biscotum, which indicates the last eastern countries to which Darius had carried his arms at the epoch when the monument was erected. This was before he had achieved his well-known conquest of the valley of the Indus."—St. Martin, Étude sur la Géographie Égéenne et Latine de l'Inde, pp. 14 seqq.
the Egyptian, and Tarskōn the Ethiopian advanced as far as Europe. And Nabukodonosor, who is more renowned among the Chaldeans than even Hērakles among the Greeks, carried his arms to the Pillars, which Tarskōn also reached, while Sesostris penetrated from Iberia even into Thrace and Pontos. Besides these there was Idanthurkos the Skuthian, who overran Asia as far as Egypt. But not one of these great conquerors approached India, and Semiramis, who meditated its conquest, died before the necessary preparations were undertaken. The Persians indeed summoned the Hūdrakai from India to serve as mercenaries, but they did not lead an army into the country, and only approached its borders when Kōros marched against the Massagetai.

Of Dionysos and Hērakles.

7. The accounts about Hērakles and Dionysos, Megasthenēs and some few authors with him consider entitled to credit, [but the majority, among whom is Eratosthenēs, consider them incredible and fabulous, like the stories current among the Greeks."

which Bacchus led, the city of Nussa is no mean monument, while Mount Mēros is yet another, and the ivy which grows thereon, and the practice observed by the Indians themselves of marching to battle with drums and cymbals, and of wearing a spotted dress such as was worn by the Bacchanals of Dionysos. On the other hand, there are but few memorials of Hērakles, and it may be doubted whether even these are genuine: for the assertion that Hērakles was not able to take the rock Aornos, which Alexander seized by force of arms, seems to me all a Makedonian vaunt, quite a piece with their calling Parapamisados—Kaukosos, though it had no connexion at all

with Kaukosos. In the same spirit, when they noticed a cave in the dominions of the Parapamisados, they asserted that it was the cave of Promēthēus the Titan, in which he had been suspended for stealing the fire. So also when they came among the Sibae, an Indian tribe, and noticed that they wore skins, they declared that the Sibae were descended from those who belonged to the expedition of Hērakles and had been left behind: for, besides being dressed in skins, the Sibae carry a cudgel, and brand on the backs of their oxen the representation of a club, wherein the Makedonians recognized a memorial of the club of Hērakles.

It is variously written Sydrakai, Syrakai, Sabrae, and Syrambri.

† V. II. Nussa, Nussa.

† This celebrated rock has been identified by General Cunningham with the ruined fortress of Ṛāgīgāt, situated immediately above the small village of Nogrām, which lies about sixteen miles north by west from Ohind, which he takes to be the Emboldina of the ancients. "Rāhīgāt," he says, "or the Queen's rock, is a large upright block on the north edge of the fort, on which the palace was built, and the seat of the ancient Rāja Vāra's rule is said to have been seated daily. The rock itself is attributed to Rāja Vāra, and some ruins at the foot of the hill are called Rāja Vāra's stables."

§ V. I. Naēkosodōsos, Called by Polybey the "Pillars of Alexander," above Albania and Iberia at the commencement of the Asiatic Sarmatia.

Herodotos mentions an invasion of Skuthians which was led by Mālyas. As Idanthurkos may have been a common appellative of the Skuthian kings, Strabo may here be referring to that invasion.

* The Hūdrakai are called also Oξουδρακai. The name, according to Lassen, represents the Sanskrit Kaukara.
tion, and that they preserved badges of their descent, for they wore skins like Héralkes, and carried clubs, and branded the mark of a cudgel on their oxen and mules. § In support of this story they turn to account the legends regarding Kaukasos and Prométheus by transferring them kither from Pontos, which they did on the slight pretext that they had seen a sacred cave among the Paropamisadea. This they declared was the prison of Prométheus, whither Héralkes had come to effect his deliverance, and that this was the Kaukasos, to which the Greeks represent Prométheus as having been bound.

Fragm. XLVIII.

Of Nabuchodonosor.
(Cf. Fragm. XLVI. 2.)

Megasthenés also expresses the same opinion in the 4th book of his Indika, where he endeavours to show that the aforesaid king of the Babylonians (Nabuchodonosor) surpassed Héralkes in courage and the greatness of his achievements, by telling us that he conquered even Ibéria.

Fragm. XLVIII. B.

[In this place (Nabuchodonosor) erected also of stone elevated places for walking about on, which had to the eye the appearance of mountains, and were so contrived that they were planed with all sorts of trees, because his wife, who had been bred up in the land of Media, wished her surroundings to be like those of her early home.] Megasthenés also, in the 4th book of his Indika, makes mention of these things, and thereby endeavours to show that this king surpassed Héralkes in courage and the greatness of his achievements, for he says that he conquered Libya and a great part of Ibéria.

Fragm. XLVIII. C.

Among the many old historians who mention

§ According to Curtius, the Sibae, whom he calls Sobi, occupied the country between the Hydaepes and the Alekites. They may have derived their name from the god Sibi.

"No writer before Alexander's time mentions the Indian gods. The Makedonians, when they came into India, in accordance with the irrevocable practice of the Greeks, considered the gods of the country to be the same as their own. Sivs they were led to identify with Bacchos on their observing the unbridled license and somewhat Bacchic fashion of his worship, and because they traced some slight resemblance between the attributes of the two deities, and between the names belonging to the mythic conception of each. Nor was anything easier, after Euripides had originated the fiction that Dionysus had

Nabuchodonosor, Jósephe enumerates Béréosos, Megasthenés, and Diékles.

Fragm. XLVIII. D.

Megasthenés, in his fourth book of the Indika, represents Nabuchodonosor as mightier than Héralkes, because with great courage and enterprise he conquered the greater part of Libya and Ibéria.

Fragm. XLIX.

Of Nabuchodonosor.

Megasthenés says that Nabuchodonosor, who was mightier than Héralkes, undertook an expedition against Libya and Ibéria, and that having conquered them he planted a colony of these people in the parts lying to the right of Pontos.

Fragm. L.
Arr. Ind. 7-9.


VII. The Indian tribes, Megasthenés tells us, number in all 118. [And I so far agree with him as to allow that they must be indeed numerous, but when he gives such a precise estimate I am at a loss to conjecture how he arrived at it, for the greater part of India he did not visit, nor is mutual intercourse maintained among all the tribes.]

He tells us further that the Indians were in old times nomadic, like those Skuthians who did not till the soil, but roamed about in their wagons, as the seasons varied, from one part of Skuthia to another, neither dwelling in towns nor worshipping in temples; and that the Indians likewise had neither towns nor temples of the gods, but were so barbarous that they wore the skins of such wild animals as they could kill, and subsisted on the bark of trees; that these trees were

roamed over the East, than to suppose that the god of luxuriant fecundity had made his way to India, a country so remarkable for its fertility. To confirm this opinion they made use of a slight and accidental agreement in names. Thus Mount Mvrna seemed an indication of the god who sprang from the thigh of Zeus (iv help piper). Thus they thought the Kudrakes (Oxdrakans, the offspring of Dionysos because the vine grew in their country, and they saw that their kings displayed great pomp in their processions. On equally slight grounds they identified Kirshnas, another god whom they saw worshipped, with Héralkes; and whenever, as among the Sibae, they saw the skins of wild beasts, or clubs, or the like, they assumed that Héralkes had at some time or other dwelt there."—Schwarm. p. 43.
called in Indian speech *tala*, and that there grew on them, as there grows at the tops of the palm-trees, a fruit resembling balls of wool; that they subsisted also on such wild animals as they could catch, eating the flesh raw,—before, at least, the coming of Dionysus into India. Dionysus, however, when he came and had conquered the people, founded cities and gave laws to these cities, and introduced the use of wine among the Indians, as he had done among the Greeks, and taught them to sow the land, himself supplying seeds for the purpose,—either because Triptolemos, when he was sent by Demeter to sow all the earth, did not reach these parts, or this must have been some Dionysus who came to India before Triptolemos, and gave the people the seeds of cultivated plants. It is also said that Dionysus first yoked oxen to the plough, and made many of the Indians husbandmen instead of nomads, and furnished them with the implements of agriculture; and that the Indians worship the other gods, and Dionysus himself in particular, with cymbals and drums, because he so taught them; and that he also taught them the Satyric dance, or, as the Greeks call it, the *kordaz,* and that he instructed the Indians to let their hair grow long in honour of the god, and to wear the turban; and that he taught them to anoint themselves with ungents; so that even up to the time of Alexander the Indians were marshalled for battle to the sound of cymbals and drums.

VIII. But when he was leaving India, after having established the new order of things, he appointed, it is said, Spartembas, one of his companions and the most conversant with Bacchic matters, to be the king of the country. When Spartembas died his son Boudyas succeeded to the sovereignty, the father reigning over the Indians fifty-two years, and the son twenty; the son of the latter, whose name was Kra deunus, duly inherited the kingdom, and thereafter the succession was generally hereditary, but when a failure of heirs occurred in the royal house the Indians elected their sovereigns on the principle of merit. Herakles, however, who is currently reported to have come as an stranger into the country, is said to have been in reality a native of India. This Herakles is held in special honour by the Soursenians, an Indian tribe possessing two large cities, Methor and Kleisobora, and through whose country flows a navigable river called the Iobares. But the dress which this Herakles wore, Megasthenes tells us, resembled that of the Theban Herakles, as the Indians themselves admit. It is further said that he had a very numerous progeny of male children born to him in India (for, like his Theban namesake, he married many wives), but that he had only one daughter. The name of this child was P pandai, and the land in which she was born, and with the sovereignty of which Herakles entrusted her, was called after her name, Pandai, and she received from the hands of her father 500 elephants, a force of cavalry 4000 strong, and another of infantry consisting of about 180,000 men. Some Indian writers say further of Herakles that when he was going over the world and riding land and sea of whatever evil monsters infested them, he found in the sea an ornament for women, which even to this day the Indian traders who bring their wares to our markets eagerly buy up as such and carry away, while it is even more greedily bought up by the wealthy Romans of to-day, as it was wont to be by the wealthy Greeks long ago. This article is the sea-pearl, called in the Indian tongue *margarita.* But Herakles, it is said, appreciating its beauty as a wearing ornament, caused it to be brought from all the sea into India, that he might adorn with it the person of his daughter.

Megasthenes informs us that the oyster which

---

**Fragm. L. D.**


Of Pearls.

Some writers allege that in swarms of oysters,

† It has been conjectured that this name very incorrectly transliterates the Sanskrit *Sasubhabha.* V. L. Spartembas.

* No doubt Buddha.

† Perhaps altered from Pracacca, which may represent the Sanskrit *Praduceus.*

I The *Mhôpapa yô tēwa* of Polymny, the Mathuru or Madhupuri of Sanskrit writers, and the modern Mathurā; as among bees, individuals distinguished for size and beauty act as leaders. These are of wonderful cunning in preventing themselves being caught, and are eagerly sought for by the divers.

see Ind. Ant. vol. V. pp. 89, 334; and conf. Jour. As. Soc. Beng. vol. XLIII. pt. 1. p. 385. 551. Kleisobora, according to Pliny on the opposite side of the river, would thus be Mahbaha; see Growse's *Mathura,* pt. I. pp. 151, 152; Col. Yule places it down the river at Batesar.—Ed.

§ Iobares is the Jamuna.

|| Represents the Persian word for a pearl—*marwarl.*
yields this pearl is there fished for with nets, and that in the same place the oysters live in the sea in shoals like bee-swarms; for oysters, like bees, have a king or a queen, and if any one is lucky enough to catch the king he readily encloses in the net all the rest of the shoal, but if the king makes his escape there is no chance of catching the others. The fishermen allow the fleshy parts of such as they catch to rot away, and keep the bone, which forms the ornament: for the pearl in India is worth thrice its weight in refined gold, gold being a product of the Indian mines.

IX. Now in that part of the country where the daughter of Héraclé, reigned as queen, it is said that the women when seven years old are of marriageable age, and that the men live at most forty years, and that on this subject there is a tradition current among the Indians to the effect that Héraclé, whose daughter was born to him late in life, when he saw that his end was near, and he knew no man of equal rank with himself to whom he could give her in marriage, had incestuous intercourse with the girl when she was seven years of age, in order that a race of kings sprung from their common blood might be left to rule over India; that Héraclé therefore made her of suitable age for marriage, and that in consequence the whole nation over which Pāndaia reigned obtained this same privilege from her father. Now to me it seems that, even if Héraclé could have done a thing so marvellous, he could also have made himself longer-lived, in order to have intercourse with his daughter when she was of mature age. But in fact, if the age at which the women there are marriageable is correctly stated, this is quite consistent, it seems to me, with what is said of the men's age,—that those who live longest die at forty; for where men so much sooner become old and die, it must needs be that they attain their prime sooner, the sooner their life is to end. It follows hence that men would there at the age of thirty be turning old, and young men would at twenty be past the season of puberty, while the stage of full puberty would be reached about fifteen. And, quite compatibly with this, the women might be marriageable at the age of seven. And why not, when Megas-thenēs declares that the very fruits of the country ripen faster than fruits elsewhere, and decay faster?

From the time of D i o n u s o s to S a n d r a k o t o s the Indians counted 158 kings and a period of 6042 years; among these a republic was thrice established • • • and another to 300 years, and another to 120 years. The Indians also tell us that D i o n u s o s was earlier than Héraclé by fifteen generations, and that except him no one made a hostile invasion of India,—not even Kuros the son of Kambušas, although he undertook an expedition against the Skuthians, and otherwise showed himself the most enterprising monarch in all Asia; but that A l e x a n d e r indeed came and overthrew in war all whom he attacked, and would even have conquered the whole world had his army been willing to follow him. On the other hand, a sense of justice, they say, prevented any Indian king from attempting conquest beyond the limits of India.

Should they be caught, the others are easily enclosed in the nets as they go wandering about. They are then put into earthen pots, where they are buried deep in salt. By this process the flesh is all eaten away, and the hard concretions, which are the pearls, drop down to the bottom.

F R A G . L I .
Phlegon. M irab. 33. Of the P a n d a i a n Land. (Cf. Fragm. XXX. 6.) Megas-thenēs says that the women of the Pandeian realm bear children when they are six years of age.

Plin. Hist. Nat. VI. xxi. 4-5. Of the Ancient History of the Indians. For the Indians stand almost alone among the

nations in never having migrated from their own country. From the days of Father Bacchus to Alexander the Great their kings are reckoned at 154, whose reigns extend over 6451 years and 3 months.

S o l u s. 52. 5.
Father Bacchus was the first who invaded India, and was the first of all who triumphed over the vanquished Indians. From him to Alexander the Great 6451 years are reckoned with 3 months additional, the calculation being made by counting the kings who reigned in the intermediate period, to the number of 153.

(To be continued.)
NOTES ON THE LAX OBSERVANCE OF CASTE RULES, AND OTHER FEATURES OF SOCIAL AND RELIGIOUS LIFE, IN ANCIENT INDIA.

BY JOHN MUIR, D.C.L., LL.D., Ph.D., EDINBURGH.

The object of this paper is to show, by illustrations drawn chiefly from Manu and the *Mahabharata*, that the regulations defining the duties, relations, prerogatives, and functions of the different Indian classes, as prescribed by Manu and in some parts of the *Mahabharata*, were not strictly respected or practised in ancient times in India; that the custom of polyandry was not unknown, that liberal sentiments were entertained regarding the religious position of the lower classes, and that considerable freedom of speculation on theological topics was prevalent.

On this subject the remarks of Professor Max Müller, in his *Ancient Sanskrit Literature*, pp. 46ff., the article of M. Auguste Barth, of which a partial translation appeared in the *Indian Antiquary*, vol. III., p. 329ff. (Nov. 1874), and my *Original Sanskrit Texts*, vol. I. p. 366, note, and vol. III., pp. 292ff., may be referred to.

Both in Manu and in the *Mahabharata* we find very different ideas and statements about the system of castes in earlier ages. I begin with Manu. In some passages he appears to record the Brahma as infinitely superior to all other men in virtue of their birth alone; while in other places they are considered as deriving their eminence more from learning or from moral goodness. In the following texts their natural and inherent power and virtue, and that springing from a knowledge of the Vedas, are set forth:—i. 93-95, 98-101; ix. 245, 313-320; x. 3; xi. 32, 85, 261, 263. The Brahma is said to be the chief of the creation, and lord of all beings (i. 93, 99); everything in the world is his by right (i. 100). A man of this class who has gone through the Veda is lord of the whole world (ix. 245). Brahma could destroy a king with all his host; they created fire, the ocean, and the moon, and could create new worlds and gods (ix. 313-15). Whether learned or not, and even when practising undesirable occupations, a Brahma is a great divinity (ix. 317, 319). He is a divinity even to the gods (xi. 84). If he retain in his memory the Rigveda, he would incur no guilt by destroying the three worlds, or eating food received from any quarter: as a clod of earth is dissolved when thrown into a lake, all sin is sunk in the triple Veda (xi. 261, 263). With this may be compared the glorification of royalty in chapter vii. 5-8, where a king is said to be composed of eternal portions of different gods, to surpass all beings in glory, to dazzle the eyes of all gazers, and to be a great deity in human form.

Elsewhere, however, it is said that neither the Vedas, nor liberality, nor sacrifices, nor observances, nor austerities, can avail in the case of a man whose nature is corrupted (ii. 97): and that a Brähman who knows the Gāyatrī only, if his life is well regulated, is better than one who knows the three Vedas but whose life is unregulated, who eats everything, and who sells all commodities (ii. 115). An unlearned Brähman is compared to a wooden elephant or a leathern deer (ii. 157). One who does not study the Veda, and employs himself in other pursuits, soon sinks with his descendants, even in this life, to the condition of a Sudra (ii. 168). Such (ignorant) Brāhmaṇaś, as are mere ashes, should not be entertained at śraddhas (presentations of oblations to gods and departed ancestors) (iii. 07, 133, 142). Similarly, low and infidel Brāhmaṇaś are declared unworthy of receiving honours at such celebrations (iii. 150, 167). The kind of Brāhmaṇa who should be honoured on such occasions are described in verses iii. 123-131, 143, 145. A father who has been instructed in the Veda by his son is to be shunned (iii. 160), as is also a Brāhmaṇa leading the life of a Sudra (iii. 164). In answer to an inquiry how death can prevail over Brāhmaṇa, Bhrigu declares that they are subject to death owing to their neglect of the study of the Veda, and inattention to propriety of conduct, &c. (v. 2-4). Those Brāhmaṇa who accept gifts from Sudras for the offering of oblations to fire (agnihotra) are contemned as ministers of the base-born (v. 425); and the performance of sacrifices for Sudras is again reprehended (iii. 178f.). Kings, Kshatriyas, kings' domestic priests, and men skilled in the war of words, are declared to belong to that middle class of beings who are under the influence of the principle of vējās or
The husband of a twice-married woman, or widow, is to be avoided (iii. 166, 161). Here Manu seems to come into conflict with the Vedas, at least if we regard the Atharvaved as one of the sacred and authoritative books; as that work (ix. 5, 27) declares that a punarbhikh, or twice-married woman, shall not be separated from her second husband, but shall go to the same heaven with him, if they present the aux-pacchandana offering (see Sanskrit Texts, vol. V. p. 306).

Any actual discrepancies in the rules which have been noted above seem to proceed from writers of different schools and sentiments, or of different periods. As M. Barth considers, the more rigid provisions represent rather the ideals of strict and exclusive Brāhmaṇas than the current practice of the ages when they lived. It is quite clear, from the details presented above, that in their matrimonial connections the Brāhmaṇas were very far from confining themselves to their own class, and that they were not the exclusive teachers of the Vedas.

In the Mahābhārata also we find both passages, in which the inherent virtue of Brāhmaṇahood is strongly insisted upon; and other texts again in which more priestly birth is represented as of little or no value unless accompanied by learning or moral goodness. Of the former class is the following quotation:

Mahābh. iii. 13435. "Whether ill or well read in the Vedas, whether uneducated or educated, Brāhmaṇas are not to be despised, like fires concealed beneath ashes. As a brightly burning fire in a cemetery is not polluted, so, learned or unlearned, a Brāhmaṇa is a great divinity."

In the same book we have the following passage, in which both views are stated. The conversation is between a woman and a Brāhmaṇa mendicant, to whose wants she had not attended before those of her own husband, and who told her that even the god Indra bowed before the Brāhmaṇas, who could burn up the earth, v. 13673f. She replies that she did not despise the Brāhmaṇas, whose power and greatness she knew, and by whose anger the ocean was made salt and undrinkable (v. 13677). But she tells him in vv. 13683ff. what qualities constituted a real Brāhmaṇa. "Anger is a foe which abidest in the bodies of men. The gods call that man a Brāhmaṇa who abandons anger and illusion; who speaks truth; pleases his spiritual preceptor; who when injured does not retaliate; who conquers his senses; is devoted to righteousness, and to study of the scriptures; who is pure, and controls lust and wrath; who esteems all the world as himself; who knows his duty, and is intelligent; and is addicted to all righteous acts; who will teach, or who will study, who will offer sacrifice, or officiate at sacrifice for others, or will be liberal according to his power, who will lead a life of abstinenence, and read the Vedas, and be alert in study."

She adds that duty is hard to understand, that it is declared by the ancients to be proved by the Vedas, that it is manifold and difficult to determine with nicety; and that he whom she is addressing, though he has a knowledge of it, and is a zealous student, and pure in his life, does not, in her opinion, thoroughly comprehend duty (vv. 13392ff.). She concludes by telling him of a person, a huntsman, who would instruct him. The Brāhmaṇa takes this in good part, and follows her advice. This introduces the story of the Dharmavāyādha, which will be given below.

In the following verses Brāhmaṇas are ranged in different classes, according to their manner of life and conduct:

Mahābh. xii. 2870. "Those men who are distinguished by knowledge, and are always impartial, being like Brahma, are known as Brāhmaṇas. Those of the Brāhmaṇas who are accomplished in the Rik Yajush and Sāma Vedas, and are actively engaged in their proper works, are like to the gods. But those low, covetous Brāhmaṇas, who do not practise the works of their caste, resemble Śūdras. A righteous king should subject to taxes and to forced labour all those (Brāhmaṇas) who are ignorant of the Vedas, and have not kindled the sacred fire. Messengers, idol-priests, astrologers, and sacrificers in villages, with travellers, are the Chaṇḍālas among Brāhmaṇas. Sacrificing and domestic priests, kings' ministers, ambassadors, vārtāṅkaraṅhaṅkaś, such Brāhmaṇa resemble Kaḥatriyas. A king, when his

* Compare a similar passage from the Kālidāsa, xiii. 2160. It quoted in my Original Sanskrit Texts (2nd ed.), vol. I. p. 140.

* Explained by the commentator to mean either travellers who cross the sea, or collectors of customs on the highway.

† This word is not explained by the commentator.
treasury is empty, should levy taxes from such persons, excepting those who resemble Brahma and the gods" (see above). Compare Prof. Hang's note to his translation of the Aitareya Br̥ahmana, p. 38, where six kinds of Br̥hamans are stated to be, according to the Śr̥utis as referred to by Sāyāna, of a low order.

Mahābhārata: xii. 8751 ff. "He who discerns the imperceptible supreme (One) in all mortal bodies is, when he dies, fitted for absorption into Brahma. Wise men look with an equal eye on a Br̥hmaṇa who is distinguished for knowledge and high birth, on an ox, on an elephant, on a dog, and on a man out of the pale of caste. For in all beings, both these which move and those which cannot, dwells the one great Soul whereby this universe is stretched out. When the embodied spirit beholds itself in all creatures, and all creatures in itself, then Brahma is attained."

Mahābhārata: iii. 17392. Yudhishthira says, in answer to a Yakshe's question on what Br̥hmanhood depends: "It is neither birth, nor study, nor Vedic learning which makes a man a Br̥hmaṇa; it is good conduct alone which does so. Good conduct must be earnestly maintained, especially by a Br̥hmaṇa. He does not decline, whose good conduct does not decline; but he whose virtue is destroyed is (really) destroyed. Students, teachers, and others who reflect on the scriptures are all zealous fools; the man who acts is the real pandit. A man who knows the four Vedas, if his conduct be bad, is worse than a Śūdra (sa śūdrād atirichyate: perhaps we should read na instead of sa, 'is no better than a Śūdra'). He who assiduously practises the aagnihotra sacrifice, and is of subdued mind, is called a Br̥hmaṇa."

Mahābhārata: iii. 14075. "A Br̥hmaṇa living in evil deeds which cause him to fall, hypocritical, wise to do evil (duṣahkṛita-prājñah, according to Dr. Böhltinck's correction), is on the same level as a Śūdra. But regard as a Br̥hmaṇa that Śūdra who always practises calmness, truth, and righteousness, for in conduct he is a twice-born man."

Mahābhārata: v. 1492. "The man who, whether of humble or of high birth, does not transgress the rules of virtue, who seeks after righteousness, is mild and modest, is better than a hundred well-born men."

Mahābhārata: xii. 8925. "The gods call him a Br̥hmaṇa by whom alone the ether is, as it were, filled; and by whom (by whose absence?) it is rendered empty though crowded with (other) men; who is clothed in anything, and fed by anything, who sleeps anywhere; who dreads a crowd as if it were a serpent, ease (or
satiety) as if it were hell, women as if they were corpses; who, whether honoured or dishonoured, will neither be angry nor pleased; who fills all creatures with a sense of security, who will not welcome death nor delight in life, but will await his time, as a servant (his master's) command. . . . 8936. The gods call that man a Brähman who is free from all attachments, who is a sage, existing like the ether, who has nothing of his own, who lives alone, who is tranquil, who lives for the sake of virtue, and practises virtue for the sake of Hari (Vishnu), whose days and nights exist for the sake of holiness, who has no desires, makes no exertions, neither salutes nor praises any one, and who is free from all bonds.”

Mahâbh. xii. 9068. “When a man does not feel fear or inspire others with fear, when he neither desires nor hates, then he attains to Brahma. When a man does not behave sinfully towards any creature, either in act, thought, or word, then he attains to Brahma. The bond of desire is the one sole bond; there is here no other: he who is freed from it is fit for union with Brahma.”

Mahâbh. xii. 9081. “He who knows that whereby one who does not eat is satisfied, whereby a man without riches is satisfied, and whereby a man free from affection gains strength—he knows the Veda.”

Mahâbh. xiii. 2610. “Let no one honour a well-born man (jñâyâmam) who is destitute of virtue; but even a Śudra who understands duty and whose conduct is good should be honored.”

Illustration from the case of Vidura.

It appears from the following account of Vidura, from the Mahâbhârata, that the old Indian traditions did not represent the rules confining the study of the Vedas to the three twice-born classes as having been strictly or invariably observed.

King Vîchitrâvîrya having died childless, his mother Satyavati desired the sage Vyâsá, her son by a previous marriage, to raise up seed to his brother, and Vyâsá consents, as this was according to rule (Mahâbh. i. 4256ff.); two sons, Dhritarâshtra and Pându, were in consequence born to him by the two widows of Vîchitrâvîrya, and a third son Vidura, by a Śudra slave-girl, whom one of the queens substituted for herself when Satyavati desired that a third son should be raised up to the deceased Vîchitrâvîrya; Mahâbh. i. 4297ff. and 4303.

Vidura was an incarnation of the personal Dharmarâja or Righteousness, who for some cause had been doomed by a Râshâ’s curse to take a human form (vv. 4302, 4335). The three brothers were, we are told (vv. 4353ff.), from their birth cherished by Bhishma like sons. They were trained in various accomplishments—in reading, in athletic exercises, in archery, in the Vedas, in fighting with clubs, in sword exercises; they were taught morals and politics, legendary lore (sthitdha and pâramûrya), and various disciplines, were instructed in the Vedas and their appendages. Pându excelled in handling the bow, DhritarÂshtra in strength; but no one in the world was equal to Vidura, who was steadfast, and had attained to perfection in righteousness. In consequence, however, of his birth as the son of a Śudra mother, he was not eligible as king. He is introduced as giving good advice to DhritarÂshtra (ii. 1777ff.), who highly appreciates his counsel, and praises his wisdom (ii. 1790ff.). See also verses 1789, 2002, 2111, 2187ff., 2397ff. In the fifth or Udyoga parvan of the Mahâbhârata, Vidura is introduced as delivering a long series of maxims moral and prudential, in conversation with his elder brother DhritarÂshtra, vv. 938-1180, 1221-1569. When, however, he is invited by DhritarÂshtra to proceed yet further with his discourse, he says that as he himself was the son of a Śudra mother he could not say more, but refers him to sage SanatsuJâta, the son of a Brâhman female (vv. 1569ff.), who, by being summoned in thought, arrives. He is again a speaker in vv. 2438, 2455, 4405ff., 5020ff.

In i. 2245 it is said of Vidura that “as Indra in Svarga confers happiness on all living creatures, so Vidura was a constant source of happiness to the Pândavas.”

We have thus in Vidura an instance of a man not belonging to any of the twice-born classes being instructed in the Vedas. It is true that he is represented as being an incarnation of Dharma or Righteousness; but this may be a subsequent addition to the original story, and so also

7 Compare Sankrānti Tantra, v. 439f., and Manus, ix. 39f. See case of Pâudí trying to get his wives to have children.
may be the section above referred to, in which, as we have seen, he states his opinion (v. 1569ff.) that he had not the right of teaching all the esoteric doctrines that the son of a Brâhman mother, as well as father, was empowered to teach. But it seems nearly as much opposed to the recognized rules, that he should have been taught, as that he should teach the Veda. The case of Vidura is treated along with that of Dharmavyâdha by Sâkara in his commentary on the Vedánta Sûtras, 1, 3, 34, 38. It is there decided that the knowledge they possessed was continued to them from a former birth, and that from its transcendent character they could never lose its results. See Orig. Sâṅskrit Texts, vol. III. (2nd edition), pp. 295 and 300. The same explanation of Râma's friendship with the Nîshâdha king Guha, mentioned in the Râmâyana, and referred to above in a note, is given by the commentator on the passage of that poem. See Orig. Sâṅskrit Texts, vol. II. pp. 407, footnote.

Stories of the Dharmavyâdha, of Tulâdhâra, of the Dasyu Kâvyâya, and of the ascetic who unlawfully instructed a Sûdra.

The story of the Dharmavyâdha, or pious huntsman, here referred to by Sâkara, is (as already noticed above), narrated in the Mahâbhârata, 1369ff.). A Brâhman (as we have seen), was told by a woman, with whom he had been conversing, that he would find a person of that description in Mithila, from whom he might learn a lesson in regard to duty. He goes thither accordingly and sees the Vyâdha selling flesh (13710). This the Brâhman regards as a shocking occupation. The Vyâdha explains that it is his ancestral profession (13720). He says he does not kill the animal himself, but he takes the flesh of boars and buffaloes from others (13732ff.), and sells it, but does not eat any. He proceeds to expiateate on duty at great length. His present occupation, he explains, is the result of his sin in a former birth (13802ff.; but it has now become his duty to pursue it (13819). He goes on to say that even those who till the earth necessarily kill many living creatures; that animals slay and eat each other; and that it is impossible to avoid destroying life. The Brâhman puts several questions, which the Vyâdha answers, and after he has declared to him the doctrine of final emancipation (nukshana), the Brâhman remarks that there is nothing which he (the Vyâdha) does not know (14001). Such knowledge, he afterwards says (14049), is difficult for a Sûdra to possess, adding that he cannot look upon him as such, and asking how he fell into that condition. The Vyâdha answers (14052) that in a former birth he was a Brâhman, had read the Veda, and gone through all its appendages (Vedângas), and had come into his present condition by his own fault. He had gone out to hunt in company with a king, who was his friend, and had wounded a Rishi by accident with an arrow, and had been doomed by his curse to be born again as a huntsman (14062), in a Sûdra family. He had implored the Rishi's forgiveness, but he was told that the curse could not be recalled, but that though he became a Sûdra, he should be acquainted with duty, should remember his former birth, and should go to heaven, and after the effects of the curse were exhausted, he should be born again as a Brâhman (14065ff.).

In this case, final emancipation is not attained, but only heaven, after which only a return to earth as a Brâhman is promised.

It is worthy of remark that, in another story also (Mahâbhârata, xii. 9277ff.), that of Tûlâdhâra and Jâjâli, an ascetical Brâhman is represented as being instructed by a person of a lower class than himself. As, however, the latter was a Vaiśya (v. 3342), he possessed the prerogative of reading the Veda, as well as the Brâhman. Jâjâli, the Brâhman, had by his austerities acquired a supernatural power of locomotion, and considered that in this respect there was no one like him (9278ff.); and that he was perfect in virtue (9317); but he was told by a voice from the sky that he was not equal in this respect to Tûlâdhâra (9318). He, in consequence, conceives a desire to see the latter, and after a time goes to Banâras, where he finds the merchant in his shop (9321), selling a variety of vegetable products, but no spirituous liquor (9346ff.); and asks how he who is following such a mode of life has attained to transcendental knowledge (9340ff.). In answer, Tûlâdhâra explains his own just, righteous, passionless, innocent, merciful character and conduct (9348ff.). He goes on to condemn all cruelty to animals, and even agriculture, by which living creatures are killed, and in which oxen are yoked to the plough, and denounces the
after having described the practice of yoga, or abstraction, the writer proceeds: "To a good man thus self-concentrated, impartial in regard to all objects, and constantly abstracted for six months, the verbal Brahma (Śaḍa-brāhmaṇa) passes away. Beholding creatures distressed by pain, but regarding with an equal eye clods, stones, and gold, let him (proceeding) on this path cease (from desire), and be free from illusion. Even a man of a low caste, and a woman, seeking after righteousness, may by this road attain to the highest goal. Then the spiritual man beholds through the soul that unborn, ancient, undecaying, eternal (essence), which he can discern when his senses are still, and which is greater than the greatest."

In Mahābh. xiii. 4835 ff., a Chāṇḍāla asks how he may be delivered out of his low condition; and is informed, in reply, that he may obtain final liberation by giving his life for a Brāhmaṇ, but in no other way.

Polyandry in ancient India.

The story of Draupadī leads to the conclusion that polyandry was at one time practised in Hindustan, as it is still in the Himālayas, and in one district on the south-west coast of India. I give the following particulars of this story from the first book of the Mahābhārata. In verses 2791 ff. it is said that this princess was a blameless damsel, born in the family of Drupada, but that she sprang from the midst of the sacrificial hearth, and was a portion of Śachi (the wife of Indra). She was of the middle height, fragrant as a blue lotus, with long lotus-like eyes, a handsome figure, and very black and curly hair. Draupadī was her patronymic, and her proper name was Kṛishṇā ('the black').

In verses 6322 ff. it is related that a Brāhmaṇ who came to the house where the Pāḍavas were living, told them of Kṛishṇā's wonderful birth, and of her projected saṃayāmara (selection of a husband from an assemblage of suitors). The sage Bhāradvāja, it appears (6331 ff.), had a son called Droṇa, who studied the Vedas, and a friend in king Pṛishhta, whose son Drupada used to frequent the sage's hermitage, and play as well as study with Droṇa. Drupada succeeds his father as king, and Droṇa, who, though a Brāhmaṇ, had received instruction in arms from Parasurāma (who happened to come to the spot), offers his friendship to Drupada. The latter, however, repels the advances of the friend of his boyhood by saying that none but a Vedic scholar can be the friend of such a scholar, none but a charioteer the friend of a charioteer, and none but a king the friend of a king (6342). Droṇa then goes to the city of the Kuras, and Bhishma appoints him to instruct the Pāṇḍavas, his grandsons (they were really grand-nephews), in the use of arms. When he has taught them, he asks as his fee the kingdom of Drupada (6348). They accordingly conquer Drupada, and deliver him bound to Drona. The latter again asks his friendship, and says they shall divide the kingdom (6350). Drupada agrees to be his friend. He does not, however, forget the injury which he has received, and seeks for Brāhmaṇs to perform a ceremony whereby he should get a son, who should slay Droṇa (6356 ff.). He succeeds in finding a priest, and a ceremony is performed (6390), and a son, in the accompaniments of a warrior, issues from the sacrificial fire (6391 and 6393 ff.), and a daughter of unparalleled beauty rises from the altar (6398 ff.). Strange to say, Drona, thinking that destiny could not be eluded, and having regard to his own reputation as a teacher of martial accomplishments, undertakes to train Drupada's son Drīśhtadyumna in them (6408). When the Pāṇḍavas have heard the Brāhmaṇ's story (nothing further is here said about the saṃayāmara), their mother Kuntī proposes that they should go to the country of Drupada, as they had already stayed long enough where they were (6412). While they are living in disguise in the country of Drupada, their relative, the sage Vyāsa, comes to see them (6421), and tells them (6426 ff.) a story of a certain sage's elegant daughter, who was so unfortunate as not to have got a husband, and who consequently, in order to gain one, practisesusteries, by which she pleases the god Śiva, who offers to confer on her the boon which she desires. She asks again and again for a husband endowed with all virtues. The god says she shall have five. She replies that she only wants

* See Mātrikā Upanishad, vi. 22, and Prof. Cowell's translation; also the Mahābh. xii. 8540 and 9707.

Note, and Prof. M. Williams' Indian Epic Poetry, pp. 96 ff.

* In verse 6383 he is called a Brāhmaṇ, and in vv. 6379 and 6381 it is said that no Kshatriya was equal to him.
one. Śiva rejoins that she has made the request five times; and that when she should be born in another body she should obtain what she had asked (6438ff.). She has accordingly, Vyāsa adds, been born in Drupada’s family, and is the destined bride of the Pāṇḍavas whom he was addressing (6434). He therefore recommends them to stay where they were, and tells them that they should be rendered happy by obtaining her as their wife (6435). They eventually proceed with a multitude of other people to the sevayābara (6925ff.). On their arrival in the city, they were disguised as Brāhmaṇas, and lived by mendicancy (6931). It appears that Drupada had wished to give his daughter to Arjuna, one of the Pāṇḍavas, although he did not disclose this (6952). He had had a bow made which was exceedingly difficult to bend; and he proclaimed that the man who should bend and string it, and pierce a mark which he had suspended in the air, should gain his daughter’s hand (6933ff.). This intimation was repeated afterwards by his son, Dhrishtadyumna (6978ff.), who then named all the suitors to his sister Draupadi (6980ff.).

Great excitement ensued among the suitors (7005ff.). Those who first tried all failed to string the bow (7022ff.). Karna, the half-brother of the Pāṇḍavas, had no difficulty in doing so, and in fitting an arrow on the string; but he was at once rejected by Draupadi, and threw down the bow (7027). Sūrpa, Jarāsandha, and Śalya next successively failed (7029ff.). Arjuna then rose out of the midst of the Brāhmaṇas (7034ff.), which caused a sensation among that class, some being displeased and others glad. Some feared that this youth by his failure might make their caste ridiculous; others said that nothing was beyond a Brāhmaṇa’s power. “Eating nothing,” they said (vv. 7045ff.), “or eating air, eating fruits, practising austerities, the Brāhmaṇas, though weak, are most powerful through their own might. Whether he practises good or evil, a Brāhmaṇa is not to be contemned, whatever task may arrive, easy or difficult, great or small. The Kshatriyas were vanquished in battle by Rāma the son of Jamadagnī. Agastya, by his Brahmanical energy, drank up the fathomless ocean.” Arjuna, bowing down to Śiva, and calling Kṛṣṇa to mind, seized the bow, strung it, took the arrows, and pierced the mark, which fell to the ground (7050ff.). Loud shouts were heard in the sky, and from the assembly; and flowers were showered from the heavens. Draupadi then advanced to Arjuna, smiling, and holding a garland; and he leaves the assembly accompanied by her (7059). The royal suitors, however, were incensed that her father should have wished to give her to a Brāhmaṇa, after their desire to possess her had been kindled; and that the tree whose fruits they had hoped to enjoy had been cut down (7061ff.); as, in such a case the princess’s choice should have been limited to Kshatriyas (7067). They therefore rushed at Drupada with the intention of killing him (7072); but he took refuge among the Brāhmaṇas and two of the Pāṇḍavas, Arjuna and Bhima, came to the rescue (7073ff.). A fight ensues; Arjuna and Bhima triumph over Karna and Śalya; and the Kshatriya kings become alarmed, and propose that the combat should cease for the present. Kṛṣṇa then comes forward and declares to them that Draupadi’s hand had been properly awarded by her father (7075-7121). Arjuna and Bhima go with Draupadi to the house where their mother was anxiously awaiting the event, and, in allusion to their being at present in the habit of soliciting alms, they said to her that they had brought something home with them. She, being indoors, and not seeing what it was that they had brought, replied, “Enjoy it all together;” but afterwards, on seeing Draupadi, she exclaimed that she had spoken wrongly (7131ff.); and informs Yudhishtira that she had done so inadvertently, and asks his opinion. Yudhishtira (7137ff.) addresses Arjuna, and says that he who had gained her must take her as his wife. Arjuna, however, replies that Yudhishtira must first wed her, and then the other brothers successively. They then all became enamoured of her (7151ff.). Yudhishtira then recollects what Vyāsa had formerly said to them (see verse 6434 quoted above), that Draupadi was destined to be the wife of all the five—which Yudhishtira declared she should become (7146). Dhrishtadyumna, we are next told, then goes to visit the Pāṇḍavas in the house where they were living, and makes a report of his visit to his father (7168, 7174), who sends his family priest to them (7182), and sends a messenger with provisions, &c. and chariots, in which they were to proceed to the royal residence;
which they accordingly do (7303ff.). Drupada asks Yudhishtihira how he is to know whether they are Kshatriyas, or Brähmans, or Vaiśyas, or Śūdras (7219ff.). Yudhishtihira assures him that they are Kṣaṭriyaḥ, sons of Pāṇḍu; and that his daughter was like a lotus, which should be transplanted from one pond to another (7225 and 7228). Drupada then proposes that the marriage of his daughter to Arjuna should proceed (7237). Yudhishtihira, however, informs him that she was to be the wife of all the five brothers, and tells him secretly how the mother’s word had determined this; and that they had all agreed upon it (7240). Drupada replies that it was quite legitimate that one king should have many wives, § but not that one queen should have more than one husband; and urges that Yudhishtihira should not do an immoral act, contrary to custom and the Veda (7244). Yudhishtihira rejoins that the question was one of a delicate or difficult nature (Cāndeha dharmāḥ); that they could not judge of its character, but followed the path trodden by a succession of ancestors; and adds that his mother had enjoined it (7246ff.). Vyāsa now opportunely arrives (7251). Drupada asks him how one woman can become the lawful wife of several husbands. Vyāsa invites all present to express their opinions (7257). Drupada pronounces such a marriage to be contrary to custom and the Veda, not practised by former generations, and of doubtful propriety. Dhrishtadyumna too (7261) will not allow that the question can be settled by calling it a nice point, or that an act can be both right and wrong. Yudhishtihira, on the contrary (7264), says the practice is lawful, and instances the cases of Jātāla, the daughter of Gotama, and Vārkshi, the daughter of a sage (muni), both virtuous women, who were the wives of seven, and ten husbands respectively. He also urges the duty of obeying his mother’s command above referred to (7131) as a ground for all the five brothers having Draupadī for their wife; and his view is supported by Vyāsa. Vyāsa also says that the custom is lawful; and that it dated from time immemorial, and promises to explain how. He tells two stories, which, however, do not prove that the practice was an ordinary one. The first (7275—7318) is to the effect (see verses 7310ff.) that the five Pāṇḍavas were, in a former state, five Indras, Arjuna being a portion of the real Indra; and that Śrī, or Lākṣmī, who had been assigned to them as their earthly wife, had taken the form of Draupadī (7303ff., 7309ff.). For how, asks Vyāsa,—unless by divine appointment,—could such a woman as Draupadī issue from the earth at the end of a sacrifice? Vyāsa then imparted to Drupada a divine insight whereby he beheld the five Pāṇḍavas and Draupadī in their previous celestial forms (7312ff.). He then goes on (7319ff.) to repeat the other story, which he formerly told to the Pāṇḍavas (see above, vv. 6426ff.), about the sage’s daughter who had got no husband, and in order to obtain one, had propitiated Śiva, and had gained from him a promise that she should have five in a subsequent state of existence; and adds that she had now accordingly been born anew at the sacrifice as Draupadī, the destined wife of the five Pāṇḍavas. After this, Drupada can, of course, no longer hold out. He says (7331ff.) that as his daughter had formerly asked, and Śiva had promised her, a plurality of husbands, the god must know what is right: and as he had so ordained it, whether the polyandry was lawful or unlawful, he himself was not in fault. Yudhishtihira was then first married by the family priest to Draupadī, and afterwards the other brothers were united with her (7339ff.); and she received the benediction of her mother-in-law (7350ff.).

From a perusal of the above narrative, it appears that although Kunti, the mother of three of the Pāṇḍavas, is represented as having at first sanctioned the union of the five brothers with Draupadī only by a mistake, and although supernatural occurrences are introduced to explain and justify the transaction, its lawfulness as a recognized usage, practised from time immemorial, is also affirmed both by Yudhishtihira and Vyāsa. At the time when the Mahābhārata, as we now have it, was composed or revised, the practice must have so far fallen into disuse, or have become discredited, as to require that special divine authority should be shown in order to render its occurrence among respectable persons conceivable even in earlier ages.

§ See दसपाठ्य ब्राह्मण, ix. 4.1.6, "wherefore also there are many wives of one man."
Difficulty of comprehending what is duty; an illustration of this from the case of Kaṇhiṣṭhā.

With reference to the expression śrīkṣa dharma, which is noted above, I have to remark that in the Mahābhārata several passages occur in which the nicety of duty, the difficulty of correctly apprehending it, is insisted on. Thus in iii. 13843: "It is the teaching of the ancients that duty is proved by Scripture (śrutī); for the system of duty is abstruse; it has many branches, and is infinite. In matters of life and death, in regard to marriage, falsehood should be spoken; in such cases, falsehood will serve the purpose of truth, and truth of falsehood. Whatever powerfully conduces to the good of living creatures is to be held as truth; thus righteousness arises from its opposite; such is the nicety of duty." Again: xii. 8640ff. "One who can distinguish between duty and what is not duty (righteousness and unrighteousness), surpasses all difficulties. 8642. A man who acts when he possesses knowledge, succeeds universally. For the skilful man, though seeking righteousness, practises unrighteousness, or practises to his loss what has only a semblance of righteousness. Desiring to practise duty, he thinks he does so, when he does the opposite, while another man, loving unrighteousness, practises righteousness." This does not seem a good moral doctrine.

In xii. 9259ff., Yudhiṣṭhīra, who generally confines himself to putting short questions, remarks at some length as follows:

"Duty cannot be completely known. A man has one duty in prosperity, and another in adversity; but how can all states of misfortune be fully known? Duty is considered to be virtuous practice, and virtuous men are marked out by their conduct. But how can what is to be done or not to be done (be known)? For virtuous conduct has no characteristic mark. A common man is seen to practise unrighteousness in the guise of righteousness, and again, a superior person is seen to practise righteousness in the garb of unrighteousness. Again, the standard of righteousness is defined by men who are versed in the scriptures; and we have heard that the doctrines of the Vedas decline in every age. The duties in the Kṛita, Tretā, Dvāpara, and Kali Yugas (ages), respectively are different, as if ordained according to men's powers. The words of sacred tradition (āmnāya) are true; such is the popular understanding (loka-sangraha). From these traditions again the all-sided Vedas have sprung. If they are the standard of everything, we have a standard here; but if this (so-called) standard be vitiated by error, what becomes of its authoritative character (pramāṇa ṣy apramāṇena viruddhe stāvratāt kuta)? When violent and wicked men practise any duty, and while doing so pervert any of its settled rules (saṁsthā), they too are destroyed. Do we know so and so, or do we not? can it, or can it not, be known? it is minuter than the edge of a razor, and greater than a mountain. The form of the Gandharvas' city is at first perceived, but when seen by poets, it again becomes invisible."

It seems, however, to be intended that these doubts should be overruled, as the speaker then proceeds thus:—"As cisterns for cattle, as streamlets in a field, the Smṛti (law-code), is the eternal law of duty, and is never found to fail. But some men, from wilful desire of other things (?), and many others for other reasons, follow evil practices." After some other verses, the speaker concludes (v. 9276) by saying that "duty has long been ascertained and declared by wise men of old, and that such practice forms the eternal rule" (saṁsthā bhavati stāvat). In the eighth Book of the Mahābhārata, vv. 3449ff., a story is told in illustration of the principle that knowledge is necessary for the successful practice of righteousness. "How strange," it is said, "that a man who is unwise and stupid, though a lover of righteousness, should fall into great sin like Kaṇhiṣṭhā!"

He, it seems, was a devotee well read, and who had determined always to speak the truth (verse 3449). In pursuance of this principle, he pointed out to certain robbers the road which some persons, of whom they were in pursuit, had taken, and whom they thus succeeded in killing (vv. 3450ff.). "In consequence of this great sin (vv. 3454ff.), and wicked speech, Kaṇhiṣṭhā went to a hell of suffering, as he was ignorant of the niceties of duty (Āmnāya-dharma śrīkṣa-dharmasya akṣovita). So a fool, who has read little, and does not know the distinctions of duty, and who does not ask a solution of his doubts from ancients, deserves to fall into the deep abyss... The highest knowledge is hard to attain for him who seeks it by reasoning. Many say that duty is known from the Veda."

In verse 3560, dharma (duty) is said to be
derived from the root dhar, because it supports mankind.

In another, Book iii. 13777, dharma is declared to be defined in the Smriti, (the class of works to which the law-books belong) as just and proper action, and its opposite, adharma, to be defined by well-instructed men as the absence of right conduct.||

Prevalence of Nástikya or Infidelity.

It is evident from the frequent mention of nástikya, or infidelity, in Manu and the Mahábhárata, that disbelief in the Vedas was not uncommon in India in ancient times. The following passage occurs in the Mahábhárata, xiii. 2194: “Rejection of the authority of the Vedas, transgression of the precepts of the Sástras, and an universal lawlessness, lead to a man’s own destruction. The Brahman who regards himself as a Paṇḍit, who reviles the Vedas, and is devoted to useless logic, the science of reasoning, who states arguments among virtuous men, defeats them by his syllogisms, who is a constant assailant and abuser of the Brahmanas, an universal doubter and a fool, such a man, though sharp in his language, is to be regarded as a child; people regard that man as a dog. Just as a dog assails, to bark and to kill, so such men set to to wrangle and to overthrow the sacred books.”

A similar character is described in Mahábh. xii. 6736ff., of which a translation will be found in this Journal for November of last year, vol. V. p. 313.

Here is an answer given (Mahábh. iii. 17402) by Yudhishthira to a Yaka who had asked him what was the path to walk in: “Reasoning has no firm basis; Vedic texts are mutually at variance; there is not one sage whose doctrine is authoritative; the essence of virtue is enveloped in mystery; the (right) path is that which the many follow.”

Here is the advice given to doubters (Mahábh. iii. 134616): “Neither this world nor the next, nor happiness, is (the portion) of the doubter. The ancients who possess knowledge have said that faith is the sign of final emancipation... 134638. Abandoning fruitless reasonings, resort to the Veda and the Smriti.”

The three Vedas not eternal.

In the next passage the eternity of the text of the three Vedas is denied. Mahábh. xii. 7497: “Greater than Time is the divine Viṣṇu, of whom is this entire universe; that god has no beginning, nor middle, nor end. From him having neither beginning, nor middle, nor end, he is imperishable, and overpasses all sufferings, for suffering is finite. That is declared to be the highest Brahma; that is the highest abode and stage. Attaining to that, men are freed from the condition of Time, and gain final emancipation... 7501. The Rik, Yajus, and Sáman verses, dwelling in bodies, exist on the tips of the tongue, are to be acquired by effort, and are perishable. But Brahma is not regarded as having his dwelling or origin in a body; nor is Brahma attainable by effort, nor has he a beginning, a middle, or an end. Rik, Sáman, and Yajus verses are said to have a beginning; and things that begin are observed to have an end; but Brahma has no beginning.”

THE RÁJATARANGINI.

From Dr. Bühler’s Report of a Tour in search of Sanskrit MSS., made in Káśmir, Rájpúta, and Central India.**

As regards Kalhana’s great Kárya, the Rájatarangini, which, after all, will probably remain the only Káshmirian work interesting a larger circle of readers, the Sárada MS. in the Government collection, together with my collation of Ganákká’s MS., Sáhebrán’s explanatory

|| In Eb. iii. 13777b drambha nyāyastu yath as hi dharmaḥ tvi smṛtiḥ andácharas tu adharmeti etat sthāyaśuddhānom.

‖ Compare my article in the Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society, vol. XIX. pp. 290ff. entitled Verses from the Sarva-darśana-sāra-sāra, the Vivaha Purāna, and the Rāmdyana, illustrating the tenets of the Chodráñas, or Indian materialists, with some remarks on freedom of

treatises and abstracts, the MSS. of the Nālamanthápurána and other works, will enable us to restore the text and to explain its meaning with greater accuracy than has hitherto been done. The contents of the first six cantos of the Rájatarangini were first made known by Professor H. H. Wilson in 1825, in the XVth volume of the Asiatic Researches. Next, the text was published in Calcutta, 1833 a.d., by the pándita of the Asiatic Society.

speculation in ancient India.

* For the opinions of the different Indian philosophical schools for and against the eternity of the Vedas, the 3rd vol. of my Original Sanskrit Texts (2nd ed.), pp. 70-138, may be consulted.

** Published as an extra Number of the Jour. B. Br. R. At. Soc. No. XXXIV. 1877.
Some years later Mr. A. Troyer began a critical edition of the text, and in 1840 issued the first six cantos together with a translation of the whole eight cantos, which was completed in 1852. Further, Professor Lassen gave, in his great encyclopaedia of Indian antiquities, the *Indische Alterthümer*, a complete analysis of the work; and last, not least, General Cunningham treated its chronology in an admirable article in the *Numismatic Chronicle* of 1848. It may seem scarcely credible that a book which has engaged the attention of so many Sanskritists, and of some of the first rank, is, after all the labour expended, not in a satisfactory condition, and that its explanation leaves a great deal to desire. Still this is the case, and if it is taken into consideration how bad the materials were on which the European and Indian scholars have worked, it is not wonderful that a great deal remains to be done. When Professor Wilson wrote, he possessed three bad and incomplete Devanâgari MSS., which were so inaccurate "that a close translation of them, if desirable, would have been impracticable." The Calcutta edition was made, as Mr. Troyer states, according to a Devanâgari transcript sent by Mr. Moorcroft from Kasîr, and Prof. Wilson’s MSS. Mr. Troyer’s own edition, finally, was prepared from the same materials and two Devanâgari copies which Mr. Colebrooke had presented to the library of the India House. For the last two books he also used a Devanâgari transcript procured by Major Broome. Professor Lassen had nothing to work upon but the printed texts.

Both editions are therefore prepared from Devanâgari copies, made either in India or in Kasîr. Not one of the scholars who have written on the book ever saw a MS. in Sârada characters, in which Kalhana’s original copy and all MSS. in Kasîr were written. Besides, for cantos vii. and viii., which are wanting in the MSS. acquired by Mr. Colebrooke and Professor Wilson, the Calcutta pâñjîta had a single MS. Mr. Moorcroft’s transcript. After what I have said above on Kasîrian Devanâgari MSS. and the difficulty Kasîrian pâñjîtas have in reading Devanâgari, it is not wonderful that the published text, especially of the last two cantos, should contain many corrupt passages. I must say that I think it wonderful that the changes required are not more numerous. In the first two cantos there are, if obvious misprints and the faulty forms of *Gonanda* for *Gonanda*, *Kâśmîr* for *Kâshîr*, are not taken into account, only between forty and fifty corruptions which seriously affect the sense, *i.e.* one in every eleven or twelve verses. Most of these cases are, however, very serious. The ratio of mistakes does not increase much in the following four pâñjîtas. Nearly all the corruptions in these six books have been caused by a faulty transcription of single Sârada letters or groups. But in the viiith and viiiith pâñjîtas the case becomes different. The corrupt passages are much more numerous, and some verses as given in the Calcutta edition bear only a faint resemblance to the readings of the Sârada MSS. It seems to me that Moorcroft’s transcript of these two cantos must have been very bad, or have shown lacunae, and that the Calcutta pâñjîta have corrected the text in a very unscrupulous manner.

The new materials which I have procured will enable us to restore the text to a much greater degree of purity than could ever be done with the help of Devanâgari MSS. But I fear that a small number of doubtful passages will remain, because all Sârada MSS. known to exist at present in Kasîr are derived from a single copy which is 100 to 150 years old. This is the MS. of Paîpûta Kesaâvram, which is regarded in Kasîr as the *code archetypus*. It is an ancient Sârada paper MS. written by an ancestor of the present owner. It bears no date, but its appearance shows that it must be more than a hundred years old. The pâñjîta’s assert that it is the MS. from which Moorcroft’s transcript was made, and from which all now existing copies have been derived. I do not feel certain that the first statement is correct, as Moorcroft’s copy is said to have been made from a birch-bark volume. The second statement is, I think, true, as all the copies which I have used and seen, half-a-dozen, are new, and agree in all decisive passages with Kesaâvram’s copy. My friends made great efforts to find for me a birch-bark MS. 3 for the loan of which I offered a considerable sum. But they possessed none, and were unable to procure one. P. Chandrâma told me with a sorrowful face that some years ago he had found remnants of a birch-bark MS. among his father’s books, and that he had thrown them into the Jhelum, as he had thought that they were of no value. This is the only news of a Bûhra MS. of the *Râjarâtarângiṇī* which I received, and I fear that there is very little chance of any being found hereafter. The possibility of such an event can, however, not be denied as long

---

* It is customary in Kasîr to throw remnants of books into the river in order to preserve ‘the face of Sârana’ from defilement. The bodies of children that die before teething are likewise consigned to a watery grave. Similar practices prevail on the Ganges and other particularly holy rivers.
as the libraries belonging to the Persian-speaking pandits have not been fully explored.

As regards the efforts of European scholars to translate the Rājatarangini, and to use its contents for historical purposes, Professor Wilson's and General Cunningham's results are the most trustworthy. Considering the corruption of Prof. Wilson's MSS., his article in the As. Res. is admirable, and deserves the great fame which it has enjoyed. It is, however, by no means free from bad mistakes, some of which, e.g., the misstatement† that Pratāpāditya, the second Kārkotaka king, had seven sons, instead of three each called by two or three names, have been copied by every succeeding writer on Kashmiri history, and have caused mischief in other respects. He has also omitted to make use of the key to the chronology of the Karkotaka and the later dynasties, which Kalhana gives (I. 52) by saying that the Saptarshi or Laukika year 24 corresponded to Sakra 1070. General Cunningham has supplied this omission in his paper on Kashmiri coins and chronology published in the Numismatic Chronicle for 1848. The dates which he has fixed for the kings following Durlabhaka require few alterations.‡

As regards Mr. Troyer's work, it is impossible to commend either his translation or the historical and geographical essays attached to it, however much one may admire his patience and industry. He undertook a task very much beyond his strength, for which he was qualified neither by learning nor by natural talent. The Rājatarangini is, no doubt, a difficult book, and nobody who attempts to translate it can hope to accomplish his task without making a number of mistakes. But Mr. Troyer has seldom been able to make out the meaning of the text, except where Kalhana uses the simplest, plainest language. His renderings of passages in which Kalhana adopts a higher style are invariably wrong, and frequently unintelligible. The worst portions of the translation are cantos vii. and viii. The contents of the historical and geographical essays attached to the translation require no condemnation on my part, as they have been estimated at their proper value by other Sanskritists. But I must touch on one point discussed in the preface to Mr. Troyer's 3rd volume, regarding which Professor Lassen also has followed him. Mr. Troyer undertakes there, p. x., an inquiry about the authorship of the last two cantos of the Rājatarangini, and comes to the conclusion that the author of these cannot be the same person as he who wrote the first six taranges, because (1) he allots to the last two hundred and fifty years double the number of verses which he devotes to the preceding three thousand two hundred years; (2) because the references and resumées made in cantos vii. and viii. to and of events narrated in the first six cantos are not exact; (3) because the viiith canto relates events which occurred after A.D. 1148, the year given (I. 42) as the date of the book. To these arguments Professor Lassen adds the difference in style observable in the two portions,§ and that in some MSS. the last two books are wanting.

These arguments, plausible as they may seem, are altogether insufficient to support the assertion made. For, with regard to the first point, Mr. Troyer himself has already given the objection which is fatal to it. If a chronicler narrates the events of his own time and of the period immediately preceding it at greater length than the remoter portions of the history of his country, that is no more than might be expected. His materials were more abundant, and the events in which he himself, his immediate ancestors and his patron, played their parts possessed for him an interest which the more distant times did not possess. This interest which he took in his surroundings explains also why he introduces details which to men of later times appear trivial and uninteresting. To say less would also have been considered an offence against the Bāja, in whose employ Kalhana's father was. The answer to the second argument, the discrepancies between statements in the first six cantos and the last two, is that these discrepancies are mostly, if not wholly, due to Mr. Troyer's bad materials and faulty translation. It is true that the successor of Chandrapāda is called Lalitāditya in the viiith canto, and Muktāpāda in the resumée attached to the viiith. But it is not the fault of Kalhana that Mr. Troyer has not been able to understand the verses (iv. 42, 43) in which it is clearly stated that Muktāpāda and Lalitāditya are names of the same person. As regards the third argument, Mr. Troyer has overlooked the fact that Kalhana states that he began to write his poem in Saptarshi Samvat 24. It contains more than 8000 ślokas, and it cannot be supposed that the author completed it in the same year. The fact that he mentions in the viiith book events which happened nine years later, in Saptarshi Samvat 33,[|| merely proves that the poem was not completed until after that time.

Professor Lassen's additional arguments are not more conclusive. Neither myself nor the

---


Kaśmirians have been able to detect any difference in the style of the two parts. The incorrect Calcutta text is hardly a fair basis for the argument. The MSS, finally, in which the last books are wanting are secondary sources, modern transcripts, which prove nothing.

While it is thus not difficult to meet the objections against Kalhana’s authorship of cantos vii. and viii., there are some important facts in favour of it. The first is that the vii. canto ends too abruptly to be considered the real conclusion of a mahākāvyā. Secondly, the obscurity of the narrative in the viii. canto, of which Mr. Troyer justly complains, is such as might easily be caused in a contemporary history by the chronicler’s omitting, as superfluous, details which were so notorious that he might presume them to be known to his readers, or, to speak more accurately, to his hearers. Thirdly, and this is the really conclusive argument, Jonaraja, who wrote, about two hundred years after Kalhana, a continuation of the history of Kasmir, states distinctly that his predecessor’s work eaded with the reign of Jaya-sinha, which is described in the viii. canto of the Rājatarangini. He says in the beginning of his poem,

śrīgoṇandakāyā dharmasamayāk kile kalā mbhāpur apāt ganiśākhāhī || 4 ||

(tehām abhāgya-duśaṇāvādāmāu iśvāhātvā

usāva kāśchā opaśat tān[ || kādyākāramadagad chiran || 5 ||

raśmāya gird vīryādām niyātadruvyan dhipat ||

atha śrījañjiniśadāt tākirtiṇi kalhosaṇīvijā || 6 ||

(4) “From the beginning of the Kāliyaugā, righteous kings, endowed with (great) qualities, the first among whom is the illustrious Goṇanda, protected Kasmir-land, the daughter of Kasijaśa.

(5) “As long as the darkness of night (caused) by the winter of their misfortune lasted, nobody perceived them. For late it was the sun of poetry rose.

(6) “Then the Brāhmaṇa Kaliha gave, by the nectar of his song, eternal youth to the ancient fame of these (priests), the last among whom was the illustrious Jayaśimha.”

I think we may trust Jonaraja’s word and accept it as a fact that Kalhana wrote the whole of the eight cantos which go under his name.

A new attempt to translate and to explain the Rājatarangini, and to use its contents for the history of India, ought to be made. But it is a work of very considerable difficulty, and will require much time and patience. As no commentary on the book exists, it is firstly necessary to study all the Kaśmirian poets and writers on

Alankāra who immediately preceded and followed Kalhana, especially the Haravijaya, the Śrīkanthakarita, Bilhana’s Vākramūdakāvya, Janaraja’s and Śrīvara’s Rājatarangini, &c. A close attention to their style, similes, and turns of expression will solve most of the difficulties which arise from Kalhana’s style. Next the ancient geography of Kasmir must be minutely studied. Nearly all the localities mentioned can be identified with more or less precision by means of the Nilmataparana, the Māhātmyas, the later Rājatarangini, Śahebrām’s Tāthasimhakha, the set of native maps procured by me, the large map of the Trigonometrical Survey, and the works and articles of modern travellers and archaeologists. But some of the geographical questions will probably require a final re-examination in Kasmir.

As regards the use of the contents of the Rājatarangini for the history of Kasmir and of India, a great deal remains to be done for the earlier portion, up to the beginning of the Kārkota dynasty. Kalhana’s chronology of the Gomandla dynasties is, as Professor Wilson, Professor Lassen, and General Cunningham have pointed out, valueless. An author who connects the history of his country with the imaginary date of a legendary event, like the coronation of Yudhishthira, and boasts that “his narrative resembles a medicine, and is useful for increasing and diminishing the (statements of previous writers regarding) kings, place, and time,” must always be sharply controlled, and deserves no credit whatever in those portions of his work where his narrative shows any suspicious figures or facts. The improbabilities and absurdities in the first three cantos are so numerous that I think the Rājatarangini ought to be consulted much less for the period comprised therein than has been done by the illustrious Orientalists named above. I would not fill the intervals between the historically certain dates of Āśoka, Kaniṣka, and Durlabhaka by cutting down the years of the kings placed between them by Kalhana. But I would altogether ignore all Kaśmirian kings for whose existence we have no evidence from other sources, be it through Indian or foreign writers, or through coins, buildings, and inscriptions. If Kalhana had merely given the stories reported by Śrīvara and other predecessors, there might be a hope that we could re-arrange them. But we do not know what materials he had, nor how he treated them, if in any particular case he lengthened or shortened the reigns, and if he displaced or added kings or not. General Cunningham’s constant search for Kaśmirian coins, which,

† The instead of tām is the reading of the Śānda MSS. In the text the adjective translated by ‘last of whom,’ Ac. refers to fame. But the general sense of the passage is the same.
The correctness of his statement is confirmed by a passage in P. Sāhebrām's Rājratarangini-tantra where the author says that the Śaka year 1756 (A.D. 1864), in which he writes, corresponds to Kali 4965 and to Saptarshi or Laukika Sāivi 4940.§ One of the copyists, too, who copied the Dhenyādola for me in September 1785, gives in the colophon, as the date of his copy, the Saptarshi year 4951. These facts are sufficient to prove that P. Dayarām's statement regarding the beginning of the Saptarshi era is not an invention of his own, but based on the general tradition of the country. I do not doubt for a moment that the calculation which throws the beginning of the Saptarshi era back to 3076 B.C. is worth no more than that which fixes the beginning of the Kaliyuga in 3101 B.C. But it seems to me certain that it is much older than Kalhana's time, because his equation 24 = 1078 agrees with it.¶ It may therefore be safely used for reducing with exactness the Saptarshi years, months, and days mentioned in his work to years of the Christian era. The results which will be thus obtained will always closely agree with those gained by General Cunningham, who did use the right key.

In concluding this long discussion on the Rājratarangini, I will add that the specimen of a new translation given below is merely intended to show some of the results which may be obtained by means of the new materials brought by me from Kasmīr. I do not pretend that all the difficulties requiring consideration have been brought to a final solution.

Specimen of a translation of the Rājratarangini.*


1. Reverence to Hara, who (grants his worshippers' desires) like the tree of Paradise, who is beautified by a beam of light emitted by the jewels that are concealed in the heads of the serpents adorning him, and in whose bosom (from the circle of births) find eternal rest. 2. May both the halves of the body of the god, whose cognizance is the bull,
and who is united with his spouse, give you glory,
—the left, whose forehead wears a saffron tilaka,
the colour of whose throat near the ear is fair like
the splendour of the ocean-born (moon), and is
enhanced by numerous tremulous earrings, and
whose breast wears a faultless boddice;—the
right, whose forehead carries a flame of fire, the
colour of whose throat near the ear is concealed by
the ocean-born (poison) and enhanced by numerous
playfully moving snakes, and whose chest is
circled by the lord of snakes as by a boddice.

Worthy of praise is that quality of true poets,
whenever it may be, which enables them to
sprinkle with the nectar (of their song), and thereby to
preserve, their own bodies of glory as well as those
of others. * Who else but poets resembling the
Prajapatis (in creative power), and able to bring
forth lovely productions, can place the past times
before the eyes of men? * If the poet did not see
in his mind's eye the existence which he is to
reveal to men, what other indication would there
be that he is a divine seer? * Though for its
length the story does not show much variety,
still there will be something in it that will gladden
the virtuous. * That virtuous (poet) alone is worthy
of praise who, free from love or hatred, restricts
his muse to the exposition of facts. * If I narrate
again the subject-matter of tales of which others
have treated, still the virtuous ought not to turn
their faces from me without hearing my reasons.
9, 10 How great a cleverness is required in order
that men of modern times may complete the
account given in the books of those who died after
composing each the history of those kings whose
contemporary he was! Hence in this narrative
of past events, which is difficult in many respects,
my endeavours will be to connect.

The oldest extant works, containing the
royal chronicles (of Kāśmīr) have been lost in consequence
of the appearance of Suvarata's composition, which condenscd in them order that (their
substance) might be easily remembered.
Suvarata's poem, though extensive, does not
easily reveal its meaning, since it is made difficult
by misplaced learning.

Owing to a certain want of care, there is not
a single part in Kṣemendra's 'List of Kings'
free from mistakes, though it is the work of a poet.

Eleven works of former scholars which contain
the chronicles of the kings, I have inspected,
as well as the (Purāṇa containing the)
opinions of the sage Nīlā.

By looking at the inscriptions recording the
consecration of temples and grants, at the laudatory
in the Kalāvastu. Conf. Ind. Ant. vol. I. p. 302 seq.,
vol. VI. p. 29. Kṣemendra wrote also, as Kalhana, a
Rājalokott, or history of the Kāśmīrian kings. The work
exists now in Kāśmīr. But the hope that it would soon
come into my hands, which I expressed in my preliminary
Report, has hitherto not been fulfilled. I do not, however,
yet despair of ultimately obtaining it. Dr. Bühler's Report,
p. 46, 48.

The Nīlāmatapurāṇa is supposed to have been narrated
by Vaiśāmpayana, a pupil of Vyāsa, to king
Jana Menjaya. It opens with a question of the king
inquiring what is the rule of Kāśmīr. It contains the
grand war between the Kūravas and Pāṇḍavas. The sage's
answer is for the greater part lost, but from the fragments
remaining it is clear that it contained the account of the
crowning of Gonanda I. to Mathurā in aid of Jārashandra, in
which he was slain, and of the attempt by his son Dāmodara
to avenge his father's death when Kṛṣṇa came to a
temporary residence in the Gaudānā country, just as these events are
told in the Bṛhataranḍa, i. 57-66. A few verses have
been saved, which mention the vāyuṣahī, the and the
destruction of Dāmodara by Kṛṣṇa, as well as the coronation
of Dāmodara's pregnant queen and the birth of Gonanda
II. They prove that Kalhana took over some portions of
his narrative almost literally from the Purāṇa. Janameja's
next question is why Kṛṣṇa considered Kāśmīr so
important as to secure for it a king by the coronation of a
woman. Vaiśāmpayana hereupon states that the country is
an inheritance of Satī or Umā, and describes various
excellencies, adding that it was consecrated by Sati
Sātrāsra. This statement gives an opportunity to
introduce the story of the creation of Kāśmīr by Kaiyapa.
The Purāṇa then goes on to narrate the rites proclaimed by
Nila, which occupy two-thirds of the work; and it concludes
with some miscellaneous Māhuṣāpas. From this it will
appear that it is an attempt to connect special Kāśmīrian
legends with those of India proper, and especially with the
Māhuṣāpas, as well as to supply a sufficient authority
for the rites prevalent in Kāśmīr.

According to my interpretation of this passage,
Kalhana used four kinds of records:—(1) the grāhada
sāstras, i.e. inscriptions recording the erection and con-
sevation of temples or other buildings and monuments, such
inscriptions, and at the manuscripts, the worry arising from many errors has been overcome.

19. Four among the fifty-two rulers whom they do not mention, on account of the loss of the records, viz. Gonta and (his successors), have been taken from the Nilamata (Purāṇa).

17. 18. Having read the opinion of the Pāṇḍuṭada Brāhmaṇa Helārāja, who formerly composed a 'List of Kings' in twelve thousand ślokas, Padmamihira entered in his work the eight kings, beginning with Lava, who preceded Aśoka and his successors.

19. Those five kings also, among whom Aśoka is the first, Śrīchāvatāra declared (to have been taken) from the fifty-two (lost ones).

20. For his verse is as follows:—

The five princes from Aśoka to Abhimanu who have been enumerated have been obtained by the ancients out of the fifty-two (lost ones).

21. This narrative (of mine), which is arranged (in proper order) and resembles a medicine, is useful for increasing as well as diminishing the statements of previous writers regarding kings, place, and time. 22. What intelligent man does not rejoice at such a compilation, which treats of the numberless events of ancient times? 23. When (the hearer) has well pondered over the sudden appearance of created beings that lasts for only a moment, then let him consider how this (work) is hallowed by the prevalence of the Sentiment of Quietism. 24. Imbibe, therefore, straight with your ears this 'River of Kings,' which is made agreeable by an undercurrent of powerful sentiment.

25. Formerly, from the beginning of the Kalpa, the land in the womb of Himālaya was filled with water during the periods of six Manus, (and constituted) the Lake of Satt. 26. 27. Afterwards, when the period of the present Manus had arrived, the Prajapati Kāśyapa caused Drughna, Upendra, Rudra, and other gods to descend, caused (the demon) Jālandoḥa, who dwelt in that lake, to be killed, and changed it into a country, known on earth as Kāśmīr. 28. Nila, the lord of all Nāgas, whose regal parasol is formed by the circular pond (filled with) the stream of the Vitāstā's newly rising water, protects it. 29. There Gaurī, though she has assumed the form of the Vitāstā, still keeps her wondrous inclinations. (For in her river-shape) she turns her face towards the ravine (gāha) just as (in her god-like form) she turns it towards (her son) Kumāra (gāha); in her river-shape the mouths of the Nāgas (nṛgamukha) drink her abundant water (dīpabhūripaydh), just as (in her god-like form) her elephant-faced (son) Geneṣa (nṛgamukha) drank her abundant milk (dīpabhūripaydh). 30. That (country) is inhabited by

as to be found on almost all temples, religious or even profane buildings (such as palaces), on images, funeral monuments, and so forth; (2) the cātacakṣuśānas edicts, i.e., inscriptions recording grants of things, chiefly of land, and perhaps also of allowances, as are found engraved on copper-plates; (3) pāṇīpatas, tablets containingeditary inscriptions of persons or places, such as now are found sometimes in temples or other public buildings, e.g., the Arsedapraśasti in Vimalashāra's temple at Dailwarra; (4) the śastras, the works on the various sciences, or, to use a short expression, the MSS. of Sanskrit books, which in Kashmir mostly give at the end some information regarding the author, and the king under which the author wrote, together with the date. This interpretation comes nearest to Professor Lassen's,—Vide Ind. Ant. 2nd ed. II. 20,—from whom I differ in the interpretation of śastra 'only.' He gives too narrow an explanation, considering it to mean 'law-books.'

Gonta is the reading of all Śārānas MSS. Regarding the meaning of śānāgī, 'tradition, records,' see below, i. 45, and the Pet. Dict. a. v. The four rulers intended are Gonta G., Dāmodara G., Dāmodara's queen, and Gonta II.; see above, note to ś. 14.

21. Mahāvratin, which I have translated by Pāṇdu, has been usually taken to mean simply 'ascetic.' I should think that a particular sect of ascetics is intended. A Helārāja, who was a Kāśmirian and lived probably in the 9th or 10th century, has written a commentary on the Pāṇdiṣṭa Cādya, of which fragments are still extant; see Kieth in the Ind. Ant. vol. III. p. 285. This and the following verses show that Kalhana believed that altogether seventeen kings out of the number of the fifty-two forgotten ones had been rescued.

22. Yāta, 'arranged in proper order,' may possibly mean aravind, 'of limited extent.' The verse gives the key to Kalhana's method.

23. Śīrā is one of the nine Rasas, 'flavours or sentiments,' which ought to underlie poetic compositions. Kalhana, who has to tell many commonplace events, and to go through endless repetitions, anxious to prove, in order to guard his character as a poet, that his composition is not nārāya.
Nágas gleaming with the splendour of various jewels, chief among whom are Śankha and Padma, and thus resembles the town of Kuvera, the depository of the nine treasures (chief among which are Śankha and Padma). To shelter, forsooth, the Nágas, who came afraid of Garuda, it stretched its arms out behind it in the guise of a wall of mountains. There (worshippers) touching the wooden image of the husband of Uma at the Tirtha called Pápasádáma obtain heavenly bliss and final liberation as their rewards. The goddess Sandhyā produces water on an arid mountain, and shows the presence of merit and the absence of sin. There self-created fire, rising from the bowels of the earth, receives with numerous arms of flame the offerings of the sacrificers. The goddess Sarasvatī herself is seen in the form of a swan swimming on a lake situated on the summit of Mount Debhaja, which is sanctified by the source of Gangā. There, even now, drops of sandal-ointment offered by the gods are to be seen in Nanikshetra, in the temple, the habitation of the immortals. There, after looking on the goddess Sáradā, (the worshipper) at once reaches the river Madhumati and Sarasvatī who is worshipped by poets. In that country which is adorned by Keśavā-Chakrabhṛt, and by Śiva-Vijayasena and other (deities), there is not a space as large as a grain of sesamum which has not its Tirtha. The country may be gained by the strength of spiritual merit, but not by armys of soldiers. Hence people there are chiefly anxious about the next world. There the rivers are free from dangers and aquatic monsters, provided with warm bath-houses for the winter, and comfortable places. (for descending) into the current. Out of respect, as it was, the Sun does not fiercely shine, during summer even, in that country which has been created by his father, as he knows that it ought not to be tormented.

Things that elsewhere in the three worlds are difficult to find, viz. lofty halls of learning, saffron, icy water, and grapes, are common there. In these three worlds the jewel-producing region of Kuvera is (chiefly) worthy of praise; (next) in that region the mountain range, the father of Gauri; and (thirdly) the country which is enclosed by that mountain.

Fifty-two princes, beginning with Gonda, who in the Kaliyuga were contemporaries of the Kauras and of the sons of Kunti, have not been recorded. In consequence of the demerit of those rulers of the land of Kasyapa, no poets of creative power, who produced their bodies of glory, existed in those times. We pay reverence to that naturally sublime craft of poets, without whose favour powerful princes are not remembered, although the earth that is girdled by the oceans was sheltered under the protection of their arms as in the shade of a forest. Without thee, O brother composer of true poetry, this world does not even dream of the existence of its chiefs, though they rested their feet on the temples of elephants, though they won prosperity, though maidens, moons of the day, dwells in their palaces, without thee the universe is blind: why (praise) thee with a hundred hymns?

Some (authors) have given this (following) calculation of the years wrongly, as they were deceived by the statement that Gonda and his successors protected Kāśmir during two hundred and sixty-eight years in the Kaliyuga, (and) that the Bhratā (war) took place at the end of the Dwāpara yuga. If the years of the kings,

Śravaṇa harel iti prasādhih sathre dvaradehasamaparītī, G. Höril is found on the Survey map in the pargāna Khryahān, to the north of the Vohar lake, into which latter the Madhumati falls, as marked on the native map. Sāhebān (Thirthasāgrahā) places these tirthas in Lolīb. Chakrabhṛt keśavā chakrādhara iti prasādāh; vijayaśa tāṇa inepūrī iti prasādāh, G. The ancient fans of Vīshnū-Chakrādhara lay on a low hill, situated about a mile below Bijbhr, on the left bank of the Vitasat, and is now called Chakdār. See Report, p. 18. Bijbhr or Bījbhār is too well known to need any further notice. But compare Vigne, vol. II p. 23. The father of Gauri, i.e. the Hindūya. Kuvera is the regent of the North, and the possessor of the nine treasures.

Śravaṇa harel iti prasādhih sathre dvaradehasamaparītī, G. Höril is found on the Survey map in the pargāna Khryahān, to the north of the Vohar lake, into which latter the Madhumati falls, as marked on the native map. Sāhebān (Thirthasāgrahā) places these tirthas in Lolīb. Chakrabhṛt keśavā chakrādhara iti prasādāh; vijayaśa tāṇa inepūrī iti prasādāh, G. The ancient fans of Vīshnū-Chakrādhara lay on a low hill, situated about a mile below Bijbhr, on the left bank of the Vitasat, and is now called Chakdār. See Report, p. 18. Bijbhr or Bījbhār is too well known to need any further notice. But compare Vigne, vol. II p. 23. The father of Gauri, i.e. the Hindūya. Kuvera is the regent of the North, and the possessor of the nine treasures.

In the text kāyamrū, kāyamrū: nota kāyamrū: is the form which the Sāradā MSS. give everywhere. The two verses form a yugakāla [or yugam], and v. 49 must therefore be taken as belonging on the words iti etdṛṣṭāh visnohithā, which occur in the second half of v. 49. I am unable to make anything of this verse, except by taking it as a taddhātītītī to refer to bhūtras in v. 49. For with any other explanation the figures must come wrong, and the verse must be taken as part of the pārvapada, which it is not, as the opinion of the 'some' has been done with in the preceding verse.
the length of whose reigns is known, are added together (and deducted) from the past period of the Kaliyuga diminished by that (time which elapsed between the beginning of the Kaliyuga and the Bhārata war), no rest remains.  "When six hundred and fifty-three years of the Kaliyuga had passed away, the Kuru and Pāndava lived on the earth.  "At present, in the twenty-fourth year of the Saka era, one thousand and seventy years of the Śaka era have passed.  "On the whole, at that time two thousand three hundred and thirty years have elapsed since (the times of) Gōṇanda (III.).  "Twelve hundred and sixty-six years are supposed (to be comprised) in the sum of the reigns of those fifty-two kings.  "Since the Great Bear moves in a hundred years from one Nakshatra to the other, the author of the (Bṛhat) Sāhítā has thus given his decision regarding its motion in this verse:"

"When king Yudhishthira ruled the earth, the Munis (the Great Bear) stood in the Nakshatra Maghā.  His reign fell 2536 years (before) the Saka era."

"The brave king of Kaśmir, Gōṇanda, was worshipped by the region (of the North), which Kaḷisa illuminates (with the glitter of its snow), and rolling Gaṅga clothes with a soft and transparent garment."

"The earth, afraid as it were that Śesha's poison might be infused into her, left the serpent's body and rested in the king's arm that was adored by the jewel sacred to Garuḍa.  "Jārāsanāh, his relation, called on him for help. With a large army he besieged Māthurā (the town) of Vṛishṇa."

Regarding the Laukika or Saptarshi era see above.

The proper reading, instead of the word of the Calcutta and Paris editions, is कुरस, which is found in all Śrāvaṇa MSS. The mistake has been caused by the resemblance of कुरस to कुरस.

The verse is found Bṛhat Sāhīṭā xi. 3 Jour. R. As. Soc. N. S. vol. v. p. 79. From vy. 48-56, which give the chronological basis of the Tavagājā, it would appear that the statement of the Nīlamata, which makes Gōṇanda II. contemporary with the Kuru and Pāndava, was the starting-point common to Kaḷhana and other chronologists. But while others placed Gōṇanda in the beginning of the Kaḷyuga, ruined by the tradition that the Great War occurred at the end of the Dvārapa-yuga, Kaḷhana used Vṛsahamihra's date of Yadu-viṣṇu's, 2536 before Śaka, or 653 Kali, to determine the beginning of the Gōṇandas. He then cut down or lengthened (vide above, v. 21) the years of the Kaśmiiran kings until their sum total plus 653 agreed with the time which had elapsed between the year in which he began to write, viz. 1070, and the beginning of the Kaḷyuga. His equation, as has been shown by Wilson, Troyer, and others, is:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years of the Kaḷyuga</th>
<th>53 lost kings of Kaśmīr:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>elapsed in Śaka 1070</td>
<td>1266 (v. 54)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>From Gōṇanda III. + 8179</td>
<td>2330 (v. 53)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+ 653 (v. 51)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4249

The expression prītyah, 'on the whole' (v. 53), and 'addhā (v. 54), seem to me further proof (in addition to the direct statement, v. 21) that Kaḷhana did make alterations in the

When he pitched his camp on the banks of the Kālindī, the fame of (the hostile) warriors vanished together with the smiles of the females of Yādu's race.  "Once (Balarāma), whose ensign is the plough, engaged that warrior in battle in order to protect his entirely shattered forces. The bridal wreath of the goddess of victory faded, since it remained long in her hands, while those warriors of equal strength were combating each other and the result was doubtful.  "Finally, with limbs wounded by each other's weapons, the king of Kaśmīr embraced the earth, and the scion of Yādu the goddess of victory.

When that brave warrior travelled the road which great heroes easily find, his son, the illustrious Dāmodara, protected the earth.  "That proud prince, though he had obtained a kingdom which was distinguished by affording the means of enjoyment, found no peace because he brooded over the death of his father.  "Then that hero, whose arm (strong) like a tree, was burning with pride, heard that the Vṛishṇis had been invited by the Gāndhāras on the banks of the Indus to an approaching samayānara, and that they had come.  "Then, (impelled) by excessive fury, he undertook on their approach an expedition against them, obliterating the sky with the dust that the horses of his army raised.  "In the battle with those foes, the bride, who was about to choose a husband and was impatient for the wedding, was slain. Then the celestial maidens chose husbands in Gāndhāra.

Then the valiant ruler of the earth-disc, attacking, in the battle with the god whose weapon lengthened the reigns. Another circumstance shows what blight Kaḷhana worked. The period of 1266 years begins with the reign of Gōṇanda I, and Gōṇanda II, his grandson, was, according to the Purāṇas, the infant king when the Great War began. Nevertheless he assumes that the coronation of Yadu-viṣṇu occurred in the first year of Gōṇanda I, as he places the whole of the 1266 years after Kali 653, in which Yadu-viṣṇu was installed on the throne, according to Vṛsahamihra.

This as well as the subsequent stories regarding Dāmodara and Gōṇanda II. down to v. 82 are taken from the Nīlamatopurāṇa.

The jewel sacred to Garuḍa, the destroyer of the Serpents, is the emerald. Read दीपेह with the Śrāvaṇa MSS. instead of the nonsensical दीपेह of the editions.

The road to Svarga is meant.

Read here and elsewhere with the Śrāvaṇa MSS. कालविन्यास instead of कालविन्यास.

Regarding the Gāndhāras on the Śindhu see Cunningham, Anc. Geog. pp. 474 seqq. Vṛishṇi is another name of the Yādava. In the text read वृश्चिकः विन्यासः.

The editions read नियतिविन्यास, a corruption of which is also found in U.; G reads नियतिविन्यास. The former reading gives no sense. Nīlamata is apparently intended for nīlamata, and it is just possible that Kaḷhana used this incorrect form on account of the metre.

The numerous puns on the word chakrā, 'disc', make this verse dear to the pandit. Chakradhāra-dhāna, 'by the rod of the edge of the battle-disc,' may also be dis-
pon is the war-disc, the disc-like array of his enemies, went to heaven by the road of the edge of the battle-disc.

Then Krishna, the descendant of Yudh, ordered the Brahmans to install the (say's) pregnant widow Yasovati on the throne. 12 When the servants of the slayer of Madhu at that time became angry, he, reciting this stanza from the Parashana, reproved them:—

"Kasmirland is Parvati; know that its king is a portion of Siva. Though he be wicked, a wise man who desires (his own) welfare will not despise him."

The eyes of men, who formerly regarded with contempt (the country and the queen) as two females and objects of enjoyment, looked (after this speech was uttered) upon Yasovati as the mother of her subjects, and (upon the country) as a goddess. Then in the proper month that queen bore a son endowed with divine marks, a new sprout of the family tree which had been consumed by fire.

The Brahmans performed the coronation and kindred rites for him together with his jatakarnama and other sacraments.

The infant king received afterwards, together with the regal dignity, the name of his grandfather, Gouranta. 17 Two nurses were engaged in rearing him, the one gave her milk, the other complete prosperity. 18 The ministers of his father, who were careful that his being pleased should not remain without results, bestowed wealth upon his attendants even when he smiled without cause. 19 When his officers, unable to understand his infant stammering, did not fulfil his orders, they considered themselves guilty of a crime. 20 When the infant king ascended his father's throne, he whose legs were dangling in the air did not banish (from the hearts of his subjects) the desire (to prostrate themselves) before his footstool. 21 When the ministers decided the legal and religious disputes of the subjects, they listened to (the opinion of the child) whose locks were moved by the wind from the ehauria. 22 Thus (it happened that) the king of Kasmir, being an infant, was taken neither by Kuras nor Pashavas to assist them in the Great War.

Thirty-five kings who followed him, and whose names and deeds have perished in consequence of the loss of the records, have been immersed in the ocean of oblivion.

After them Lava, an ornament of the earth, a favourite of Victory that is clothed in a flowing robe of fame, became king. 23 The roar of his army, which roused the universe from its slumber, sent—O wonder!—his enemies to their long slumber. 24 Constructing eighty-four laks of stone buildings, he founded the town of Lolora. 25 After giving to a community of Brahmans the agrahara of Lohara on the Lidar, the valiant (king) endowed with blameless heroism and splendour ascended to heaven.

He was succeeded by his son Kusa, expert in (deeds of) prowess and lotus-eyed, who gave the agrahara of Kurushara.

After him his son, the illustrious Kagenra, the destroyer of his foes' elephants, the first (among men), an abode of valour, obtained the throne. He settled the two principal agraharas (of Kasmir), Khagi and Khomusha, and afterwards he ascended to that world which he had bought by deeds brilliant like (the glitter of) Siva's (teeth is) smiling.

After him came his son Surendra, possessed of priceless greatness, who was an entire stranger to guilt, who far surpassed Indra's state, and whose deeds astonished the world. 26 Surendra,

Lolora is situated in the pargana of Lolab.

The Lohara, now called Lidor or Ladder, is the principal northern tributary of the Vnati, which joins not far from Fijnbror. An agrahara is an ideal village given to a Brahman, or to a community of Brahmans. See the Pet. Diet. in. Lohara is said to exist now.

According to the annotator of G1, Kurushara is now called Kular, and Panjot Dayar perform there the Dachinpara pargana.

Khagi is said to be the modern Kachpur (Wilson and Trowy), and Khomusha is Khamnasa, as was first recognised by General Cunningham. See also above Report, pp. 4. etc. The Sardar MSS. give Khamnasa instead of Khamnasha, and to this form points also the Khomnasha of Bikaner, Vikramakacharva, vi. 7. As there is hardly any difference between the pronunciation of o and u in Kasmir the spelling does not matter much.

Dirghha and aghastdirdhahkrtik, in which a double translation has been given, may be taken as two words, dirghhna and aghastdirdhahkrtik, or as a compound, dirghha-aghastdirdhahkrtik. The author, like a good Kavi, loves his pun dearly, and intends it to be taken both ways.
the lord of the gods, could not be compared to this Sūrendra, since he is called sūtamantr, 'the harbinger of a hundred mendicants,' and gotarabhis, 'the destroyer of the gotra,' while (Sūrendra of Kasmir) deserved the surname kṣatramantr, 'he whose anger is appeased,' and gotarabhis, 'the protector of the gotra.' That illustrious (ruler) founded on the frontiers of Dārshānī a town called Sauraka, and vihāra called Narendrabhavana. In his own kingdom that prince of great fame and of holy works founded a vihāra, called Saurasa, which became famous for piety.

After this king had died without issue, Godhara, a scion of a different family, protected the earth, together with the best of mountains.

Liberal, pious Godhara went to heaven after presenting the agrahāra Hāstisālā to the Brāhmans.

His son Suvarṇa after him distributed gold (śwara) to the needy, he who caused to flow, in the district of Karla, the river Suvarṇamāni.

His son Janaka, comparable to a father (jaṅaka) of his subjects, founded the vihāra and agrahāra called Jālora.

After him the illustrious Sāchinara, whose disposition was forgiving, protected the earth as ruler, his commands gaining obedience (from all).

That king founded the two agrahāras Sāmanjas and Aśānāra. Without male issue he obtained half of Indra's seat (after death).

Next, the son of that king's great-uncle, and great-grandson of Sākuni, the veracious Aśoka, ruled the earth. That king, cleansed from sin and converted to the teaching of Jina, covered Sushkaletra and Viṭatātra with numerous stūpas. Within the precincts of the Dharmanāya Viṭhara in Viṭatātrapura stood a chaitya, built by him, the height of which the eye was unable to measure. That illustrious prince built the town of Śrīnaparī, which is most important on account of its nine million and six hundred thousand houses. This virtuous (prince) removed the old brick enclosure of the temple of Viṭājēvara, and built a new one of stone. He whose dejection had been overcome built within the enclosure of Viṭājēvara, and near it, two (other) temples, which were styled Aśokēvara. As the country was overrun by Mlechhas, the pious (king) obtained from Śiva, the lord of creatures, a son in order to destroy them.

CORRESPONDENCE AND MISCELLANEA.

EARLY COINS OF WESTERN INDIA.

To the Editor of the Indian Antiquary.

Sir,—I have been lately occupied in examining the materials for Sir Walter Elliot's promised contribution to the series of the new Numismata Orientalia, "On the Coins of Southern India."

In attempting to decipher the too frequently obliterated legends of the various subdivisions of the coins of the western coast bearing Aśoka characters, I have been more than ever impressed with the aid to be derived from duplicate and other examples, which, though seemingly unimportant, may chance to contribute to a practised eye a missing link in the interpretation of the authorized version of the local Prākrit, so confessedly uncertain in its best forms of orthography. In the hope of enlisting the sympathies of collectors of coins in the Western Presidency, I desire to appeal,

of Śrīnaparī is Śrīvaga, in the Koḷahāra purāna, near Ilaṁkēbī, and of Aśānāra, the well-known village of Chorām. The former is marked on the Trig. Surv. map as Viṭhawata.

Read प्रकृत, instead of the प्रकृत्यम् of the editions.

General Cunningham (Anc. Geog. p. 95) has fixed the site of the ancient Śrīnaparī near Pāndrathān (Pāndrathān). Some Pandrits think that it lay near Ilaṁkēbī. Regarding the very remarkable prakṛta of the Koḷahāra temple see Cunningham, Jour. As. Soc. Beng. vol. xiii. pp. 340 sqq.

According to the annotator of G, the modern equivalent of śūlamatra is Śrīvaga, in the Koḷahāra purāna, near Pāndrathān (Pāndrathān). Some Pandrits think that it lay near Ilaṁkēbī. The former is marked on the Trig. Surv. map as Viṭhawata.

Aśokēvara must be explained as a madhyasapadoprt compound by Aśokēna nṝmī Śiva, 'the temple of Śiva built by Aśoka.' The same remark applies to the numerous names of temples ending in Śvara and beginning with the name of a person, which occur further on.

The Mlechhas intended here are probably the Greeks; vide Lassen, Ind. Alt. (3rd ed.) vol. ii. p. 285.
through your columns, to all those who may happen to possess specimens of any of the types enumerated below, for their contributions to the publication in question.

The plates for Sir W. Elliot's article will be delayed, pending a reasonable interval, to test the result of this application, or will otherwise be supplemented by woodcuts illustrating the more tardy arrivals.

I have been permitted to examine and avail myself of the information I have obtained from the Kohlápûr collection, which has already formed the subject of an article for the Journal of the Bombay Branch Royal Asiatic Society by Bhavânâlî Indrâji. I have expressly reserved myself from any inspection of his paper, which is in the hands of Dr. Codrington, in order that I might give you my free and independent interpretation of the legends on the coins themselves, and the inductions I have arrived at in regard to their bearing upon an important social question in India of olden times.

I allude to the ascendency of women. Some indication of such a state of things was to be gathered from the inscriptions in the Nâisik caves, so ably translated by Professor Bhândâkar in the Transactions of the International Congress of Orientalists in London. The coins, however, very materially extend and confirm the references to the acknowledged supremacy of the female line in royal houses, and lead up to a much more extended inquiry as to the parallel practices of other cognate or associate nations.

Our earliest intimations of the existence of such customs is derived from Herodotus, who testifies to its exceptional currency with the Lycians, but it is clear that similar ideas prevailed among (perhaps extended to) the Etruscanis.†

Herodotus' statement is as follows:—

"The Lycians are in good truth, anciently from Crete; which island, in former days, was wholly peopled with barbarians. . . . Milyas was the ancient name of the country now inhabited by the Lycians: the Milyae of the present day were in those times called Solymi. . . . Their customs are partly Cretan, partly Carian. They have, however, one singular custom in which they differ from every other nation in the world. They take the mother's and not the father's name. Ask a Lycian who he is, and he answers by giving his own name, that of his mother, and so on in the female line." †

There need be no reserve in admitting that Hetairism held an important place in the earlier civilization of India, and indeed constituted a potent feature in the state policy.‡

Polyandry and polygamy equally prevailed in ancient times, as we learn from the annals of the Mahâbâhrata, where Arjuna is seen to have brought home a new wife in addition to his one-fifth share of the charms of Draupadî, who was held in common by the joint brotherhood. I will leave our native friends, who are so much more at home in such matters, to follow out these investigations, and conclude this section of the inquiry by drawing attention to the curious identity of the rights of females in Australia—a country linguistically and otherwise associated with the Indian Peninsula, and once, if we are to credit geologists, even constituting a continuation of the continent itself. "The Australians (according to Sir G. Grey) are divided into great clans, and use the clan name as a sort of surname beside the individual name. Children take the family name of the mother, and a man cannot marry a woman of his own name: so that here it would seem that only relationship by the female side is taken into account. One effect of the division of clans in this way is that the children of the same father by different wives, having different names, may be obliged to take opposite sides in a quarrel." Sir G. Grey further remarked upon "the practice of reckoning clanship from the mother, and the prohibition of marriage within the clan, as all bearing a striking resemblance to similar usages found among the natives of North America." §


‡ Bacheon and McLeam, two of the most recent authors who have studied this subject, both agree that the primitive condition of man, socially, was one of pure Hetairism, when marriage did not exist; or, as we may perhaps for convenience call it, communal marriage, where every man and woman in a small community were regarded as equally married to one another. Bacheon considers that after a while the women, shocked and scandalized by such a state of things, revolted against it, and established a system of marriage with female supremacy, the husband being subject to the wife, property and descent being considered to go in the female line, and women enjoying the principal share of political power. The first period he calls that of Hetairism; the second of Muttermacht, or mother-right. —Sir J. Lubbok's Origin of Civilization, p. 67.
There is another most important point disclosed by the legends of coins Nos. 1-4, in the termination "Kurs," or Kula as I read it, which is rendered as 'a race, a family, tribe, caste,' &c. In the present instances it seems to refer to some joint brotherhood, descendants of the ancestral female by different fathers. These communities in process of time may have grouped themselves into small republics, and the title of Rādā which heads the legends may perchance refer to the senior or anonymous president for the time being.

The subjoined list of the Western coins which I have now seen for the first time has been restricted to a technical description of the types, and an avowedly tentative effort at the decipherment of the legends. The time has not yet arrived for any consecutive arrangement of the coins, either in the numismatic or historical sense. I trust that the future contributions of local collectors will enable me to make it more perfect hereafter.

List of Coins.

No. 1. Copper mixed with lead. Size, full 9 of Mionnet's scale. Weight 229 grains. 4 specimens. 2 Bo. Br. R. As. Soc., 2 Hon'ble Mr. Gibbs.

Obverse—A crude figure of a bow and broadly barbed arrow.*

Reverse—Chaitya with four rows of inverted semicircles surmounted by a half-moon (as in the Sāh coins), to the right a tree with seven leaves or branches, at the foot an oblong pedestal with serpents in a wavy line, and dots.

Legend—राजन महाराज तुलसि विशाल कुरस्त
Rājā Madhūrāputra Śūrdā-kurasr.

No. 2. Copper and lead. Size 7 of Mionnet's scale. Weight 228 grains. 3 specimens. 1 Bo. Br. R. As. Soc., 2 the Hon'ble Mr. Gibbs.

Obverse—Device a crude string bow, and broadly barbed arrow set for use.

Legend—राजन वदशिङ पुत्रस विशाल कुरस्त
Rājā Vādāṣtho-putra Śūrdā-kurasr.

Reverse—A chaitya consisting of three layers of inverted semicircles with dots, surmounted by a chakra (or figure of the sun?) To the left a tree with seven broad leaves. At the foot, an oblong square pedestal, in which is figured a serpent, with the wavy intervals filled in with dots.

I place the children of the daughter, वासिंतिह, I.

* Moleworth, in his Mārāṭhā Dictionary, notices several variants in the orthography of this word कर, तर, "the compounds changing the क into त and the त into तर." The interchanges of र and ल and ल and तर may be followed in Caldwell's Grammar, but it is sufficient for our purpose to notice that the ancient inscriptions fully authorize the optional use of र or ल.

It is remarkable how apparently complete an organization of corporate bodies and trade guilds is seen to have existed in Western India when the Nāsik cave inscriptions were cut upon stone.

I myself long ago suggested that some such explanation earlier than the children of the mother, Gaautamī, on numismatic grounds. It is possible that the greater glories and ancestral status of the grandmother eclipsed, in process of time, the subdued claims of the memory of the mother.

No. 3. Copper and lead. Size 9 of Mionnet's scale. Weights range from 180 grains to 190. The execution of the dies is inferior. Numerous specimens.

Obverse—The usual crude bow and arrow.

Legend—राजन गाँवाल तुलसि विशाल कुरस्त
Rājā Gāwāl-putra Śūrdā-kurasr.

Reverse—Chaitya device as above, but the tree is attached to the main device and rises directly from the end of the pedestal.

Many of these coins are what is technically termed 'double-struck,' i.e. the dies of a successor or adverse contemporary have been repeated over the original impression, without any refashioning of the piece itself.

These indications are often of much value in determining the relative priority of the conjoint rulers. In the present instance they authorize us to place the children of Mādārī before those of Gaautamī.

In one case a coin of the Gaautamī-putras has had the identical legends of the original obverse repeated over the surface of the old reverse.

No. 4. Copper. Size 4 of Mionnet's scale. Weight 28 grains. 2 specimens, Hon'ble Mr. Gibbs.

Obverse—Bow and arrow.

Legend—राजन गांवाल ततविमहात कुरस्त
Rājā Gāwāl-[thetic]-putra Viśāval-kurasr.

Reverse—Chaitya, with tree growing on the summit.

In the field of one specimen, a monogram possibly composed of the letters तवच or तव तच; on the other example, a letter exactly like a Chaldæan-Pehlevi 𐭇 (a).†


Obverse—Device similar in some respects to No. 1, but the Chaitya is solid, surmounted with the usual half-moon, while the tree is replaced by a couch-shelf, balanced on the other side of the field by a flower. Serpent at foot.

may apply to the Sāh series in a republican system of rotation, which should account for the over-full list of the kings whose names occur on the coins.

The same typical form of bow and arrow occurs frequently on the earliest specimens of the ancient punched coins. See my Indian Weights, Numismats Orientalia, Part I, Plate, figs. 13, &c.

† See Jour. R. As. Soc. N. S. vol. III. (1858) p. 24c. It may be as well to add that the occurrence of such a letter on the local coinage need not necessarily reduce the age of the pieces so inscribed to the modern limits assigned to Pehlevi inscriptions. The letters of these alphabets are found on very early specimens of the Parthian coinage.
HEMĀḌ PANT AND THE GAULI RĀJAS.

Who and what was "Hemāḍ Pant," who shares with the Gauli Rājas the credit of ancient buildings in the Northern Dekhan and Konkan? One story is that he was a Rākṣasa! another that he was a physician, and imported the Modi or current Marāṭhī alphabet from Ceylon; a third that he was the Brāhma minister of a Musalmān Sultan in Bijār or Golkonda.

Professor Weber, in his paper on the Kṛishna-janmasthāni (Indian Ant. vol. VI. p. 161 and notes) mentions three "Hemāḍrias" —

No. 1. Son of Charudeva, and minister of a king Mahādeva [king of where?] ; composed by his command the Chaturvasravacchāntavati, "perhaps at the end of the 13th century.'

No. 2. Patron of Vopadeva, and minister to king Rāmacandra of Devagiri, ergo belonging to the same period; this is, I presume, the Rāja plundered in A.D. 1295 by Ala'uddīn the Parricide, and perhaps identical with Dnyāneśvara's patron, Rāmacandra-Yadava of Newāśa (Indian Ant. vol. IV. p. 354). No. 3 was "a commentator on Vopadeva at the court of a king Rāmarāja." The lōcūs in quo is not given, not being, indeed, necessary to Prof. Weber's argument, but I think there are only two Rāmarājas available in this instance—the one just mentioned, and the unfortunate ruler of Vijayanagara, overborne by the Moslem confederacy of the Dekhan three centuries later.

If Hemāḍ Pant were a minister of the Devagiri Yādavas, it would go far to confirm the conjecture already hazarded by Mr. Śrīkrishna Śāstri Talekar and myself, that they were the Gauli Rājas of tradition, as the same building is often ascribed to both him and them, and even where one monopolizes the credit the style is the same. It may be well seen in the lower part of the fort of Devagiri itself; and that fort is almost in the centre of the country over which the names of Hemāḍ Pant and the Gauli Rājas are known.

Edward Thomas.
Down here (Kaladgi) I have not heard of either, old buildings being generally (and often correctly) referred to as "the Jarnas."

It may be added that the 13th century, a period of great architectural activity, is just the natural epoch to which to refer the great builders of tradition. I should like to hunt down this Gaumul Raj and I hope that any gentlemen who can afford me help will lend it. It is a disgrace to us to accept as a mystery what cannot be a thousand years old.

W. F. S.

**Dr. Haug's Oriental MSS.**

The collection of Oriental MSS. chiefly in Zend, Pahlavi, Ptolemaic, Persian, and Sanskrit, made by the late Dr. Haug when Professor of Sanskrit at Pusa, has been purchased from his widow for the Royal Library at Munich, for 17,000 marks. It will be remembered that Dr. Haug acknowledged, in a public lecture, that he had obtained many valuable if not unique MSS. from Paris, during a tour he made in Gujarat to collect the MSS. for Government. His right, as a paid Government servant, to collect on his own account, under any pretext whatever, was strongly protested against in the Bombay newspapers in June 1863, and especially in June and July 1864, when Government was urged to investigate Dr. Haug's conduct in the matter, but no public notice was taken of it.

**Hemachandra's Prakrit Grammar.**

The first part of Hemachandra's Prakrit Grammar, edited by Professor Pischel of Kiel, has been published. It is the eighth section of Hemachandra's large work on Sanskrit grammar, and is the most complete treatise on the earlier Aryan Indian dialects as yet published. An edition of the text, but quite uncritical, appeared in Bombay in 1873, edited by Mahabala Krishna.

Prof. Th. Benfield has published under the title *Vedica und Veroandtes*, a series of papers treating mainly of a number of very nice and subtle questions of verbal criticism and explanation of difficult terms in the Vedas. Most of the papers are reprints from the *Göttinger gelehrte Anzeigen*.

Mr. Murray has in the press—*A Discursive Glossary of peculiar Anglo-Indian Colloquial Words and Phrases, Etymological, Historical, and Geographical,* by Col. H. Yule, C.B., and Dr. A. Barnell,—a work the appearance of which will be looked for with considerable interest.

**BOOK NOTICES.**

**Ueber den Ursprung des Lingkultus in Indien, v. F. Kittel.** (Mangalor, Basel Mission Book and Tract Depository, 1876.)

In this pamphlet of 45 pages 8vo. the Rev. F. Kittel starts a theory in opposition to that propounded by Lassen, and supported, though with reserve, by Dr. J. Muir, that Linga-worship is of early Dravidian origin. He contends that it formed no part of the Dravidian religion before the influence of Brahmanism in the south, and in proof of this point he that, formerly at least, Siva-Lingism counted more famous shrines in Northern India than in the south; that the pretended abstinence of Brahmanas from its officiating priesthood is to be explained, where it really exists, by local causes alone; that the Brahmanical legends make no allusion to any reception of its worship from another race; that most of the legends relative to the Linga point to the north; and, most important of all, that in the south Linga-worship is not met with except among the populations more or less influenced by Hinduism, while those unaffected by its extraneous influence are quite ignorant of it. The suggestion, however (pp. 46-7), that Linga-worship reached India from Greece seems almost entirely without foundation. This little brochure is full of the most interesting information on the actual position of Lingasm in the south, its divisions, the origin of its various sects, and on the archaeology, literature and ethnography of the Canarese portion of the Peninsula. It is to be hoped our able contributor will be induced to give us a second edition of it in an English dress.

**Travels in India in the Seventeenth Century: by Sir Thomas Roe and Dr. John Fryer.** (Reprinted from the *Calcutta Weekly Englishman.* London: Triibner & Co.)

The title of this work fully explains what it is: a good while ago Mr. Talboys Wheeler had the *Journal of his Voyage to the East Indies, and Observations there during his residence at the Mogul's Court as Ambassador from England,* by Sir Thomas Roe, Knt., and Dr. John Fryer's *Account of India,* reprinted in the *Calcutta Weekly Englishman.* At the same time a few copies were struck off in octavo form for separate publication. The impression, however, was overlooked for some time before it was issued. The two works are printed on thin paper and form a volume of 474 pages, but are put forth without note or comment, index or table of contents, and of course without the illustrations of the original editions. From its size this reprint may be found convenient by the general reader, but it will not supersede the earlier editions, copies of which are not scarce.
South Indian Sepulchral Urns.
SEPUCHRAL URNS IN SOUTHERN INDIA.

BY THE Rt. REV. BISHOP CALDWELL, D.D., LL.D.

I am anxious to obtain some information as to the extent of the area within which sepulchral urns, like those to which I am about to refer, are found, and I trust that some readers of the Antiquary will be so kind as to help me to obtain the information of which I am in search.

The urns I refer to are large earthenware jars containing fragments of human bones, generally in a very decayed state. They are of various sizes, corresponding with the age of the person whose remains were to be disposed of. The largest I have found was eleven feet in circumference, and the smallest have been between four and five. The shape varies a little within certain limits, so that I have not found any two perfectly alike, but the type generally adhered to is that of the large earthen jars (in Tamiḻ kāṉai) with which the people in this neighbourhood draw water for their cultivation. The urn is without handles, feet, rim, or cover. It swells out towards the middle and terminates in a point, so that it is only when it is surrounded with earth that it keeps an upright position. The urns do much credit to the workmanship of the people by whom they were made, being made of better-tempered clay, better burnt, and much stronger than any of the pottery made in these times in this part of India. They would contain a human body easily enough in a doubled-up position, if it could be got inside, but the mouth is generally so narrow that it would admit only the skull, and one is tempted to conjecture that the body must have been cut into pieces before it was put into the urn, or that the bones must have been collected and put in after the body had decayed. Generally decay is found to have advanced so far that these theories cannot be verified or disproved. Fragments only of the harder bones remain, and the urn seems to contain little more than a mass of earth. In one instance I found the bones partially petrified, and therefore almost perfect, though they had fallen asunder; but this was the large eleven-feet urn referred to above, discovered at Kōrkēi, so that in this instance it was conceivable that the body had been placed in it entire. At Iḷanjī, near Kortalum, on opening an urn some traces of the shape of a skeleton were discovered. The skull was found resting on the sternum, and on each side of the sternum was a tibia. It appeared, therefore, as if the body had been doubled up and forced in head foremost, though it was not clear how the shoulders could have got in. The bones were of the consistence of ochre, and crumbled to pieces when they were taken out. Nothing could be preserved but a piece of the skull and the teeth, which were those of an adult.

Dr. Fry, Surgeon to the Resident of Travancore, who was present at the find, pointed out that the molars had been worn down by eating grain, and that the edges of the front teeth also had been worn down by biting some kind of parched pulse. Afterwards, on examining the mouths of some natives, I found their front teeth worn down a little in the same manner, and, as they admitted, from the same cause. I have not noticed any distinct trace of the bones in these urns having been calcined.

In addition to human bones a few small earthen vessels are found in most of the jars. Sometimes such vessels are arranged outside, instead of being placed inside. These vessels are of various shapes, all more or less elegant, and all appear to have been highly polished. At first I supposed they had been glazed, but I have been informed by Dr. Hunter, late of the Madras School of Arts, that what I noticed was a polish, not a true glaze. Whatever it be, I have not noticed anything of the kind in the native pottery of these parts and these times. In some cases the polish or glaze is black, and the decay of these blackened vessels seems to have given rise to the supposition that the bones had sometimes been calcined.

On the accompanying plate are sketches of five of these little vessels. When these have been shown to natives, they say that No. 4 appears to have been an oil vessel, and No. 5 a spittoon. The use of No. 2, the vessel with the lid, is unknown. In these times such vessels would be made of bell-metal, not of pottery. We may conclude that the object in view in placing these vessels in the urn was that the ghost of the departed might be supplied with the ghosts of suitable vessels for eating and drinking out
of in the other world! Small stones about the size of a cocoanut are generally found heaped round the mouth of the urn, and the discovery of such stones ranged in a circle, corresponding to the circular mouth of the urn, will be found to be a reason for suspecting the existence of an urn underneath.

The natives of these times know nothing whatever of the people by whom this singular mode of sepulture was practised, nor of the time when they lived. They do not identify them with the Samañas, that is, the Jainas and Buddhists lumped together, about whom tolerably distinct traditions survive, nor does there appear to be anything in or about the jars distinctively Jainas or Buddhistic. There is a myth current amongst the natives, it is true, respecting the people who were buried in these jars, but this myth seems to me merely a confession of their ignorance. They say that in the Trêtā yuga—that is, about a million of years ago—people used to live to a great age, but that however old they were they did not die, but the older they grew the smaller they became. They got so small at length that to keep them out of the way of harm it was necessary to place them in the little triangular niche in the wall of a native house in which the lamp is kept. At length, when the younger people could no longer bear the trouble of looking after their dwarf ancestors they placed them in earthen jars, put with them in the jars a number of little vessels containing rice, water, oil, &c., and buried them near the village.

The name by which these urns are called in the Tamil country does not throw much light on their origin. This name assumes three forms. In the Tamil dictionary it is madamadakkaṭṭāḷi. A more common form of this word is madamadakkāṇḍaḷi, the meaning of both which forms is the same, viz. the ḍaḷi, or large jar, which boils over. The meaning attributed to this by some natives is rather far-fetched, viz. that the little people who were placed in them used sometimes to come out of the jars and sit about, as if they had boiled over out of them. The form of this word in use amongst the common people seems capable of a more rational interpretation. This is madamattan-daḷi, or more properly madōnmat-tan-daḷi. Madōnmat (Sansk.) means 'insane,' but it is sometimes used in Tamil to mean 'very large,' as in the Tamil version of the Panchatantra, where it is used to denote a very large jungle. The great size of the urn being its principal characteristic, it would seem that the name in use amongst the common people is, after all, better warranted than that which is used by those who are regarded as correct speakers.

Who the people were who buried their dead in these urns is a problem yet unsolved. The only points that can be regarded as certain are those which have been ascertained by the internal evidence of the urns and their contents themselves. From this it is clear that the people buried in them were not pygmies, but of the same size as people of the present time. How they were put in may be mysterious, but there is no doubt about the size of their bones. The skulls were similar to those of the present time. The teeth also were worn down, like those of the existing race of natives, by eating grain. In a jar opened by Dr. Jäger, of Berlin, a head of millet was found. The grain had disappeared, but the husks remained. The unknown people must have lived in villages, the jars being found, not one here and another there, but arranged side by side in considerable numbers, as would naturally be done in a burial-ground. They were also a comparatively civilized people, as is evident from the excellence of their pottery, and the traces of iron implements or weapons which have sometimes been found in the jars. The conclusion from all this which seems to me most probable is that they were the ancestors of the people now living in the same neighbourhood. If this were the true explanation, it is singular that no relic, trace, or tradition of such a mode of sepulture has survived to the present day. And yet, if we were to adopt the supposition that they were an alien race, it would be still more difficult to conjecture who they were, where they came from, and why they disappeared.

I have myself seen those urns both in the Timnevelly and Madura districts and in northern and southern Travancore, that is, on both sides of the Southern Ghâts, and the object I have in view in sending these particulars to the Antiquary is to ascertain in what other districts of India they are found. If the area within which they are found can be accurately traced, some light may be thrown thereby on their history.

Idaiyangudi, Timnevelly District.
ON THE KRISHNAJANMASHTAMI, OR KRISHNA'S BIRTH-FESTIVAL.

BY PROF. A. WEBER, BERLIN.

(Continued from p. 198.)

(Translated from the German by Miss Thedie.)

§ 2.

We come now to the representation of the celebration of the festival itself. On the intricate questions of a calendrical sort which belong to it, we do not enter further here, as they have been sufficiently discussed already. One point, however, in this respect appears of importance: the dividing of the celebration into two forms, one a simple form which consists only in the observance of a strict fast (see above, p. 163); while the other, depending on the coincidence of the date with a particular star, appears as the original celebration of the festival, with which alone we have to do here. We have seen already that in it also two forms are to be kept separate from each other: one of which keeps the god in view together with his mother, while the other presents him alone; in the former case the celebration is combined with the preparation of a shed intended for the reception of a woman about to give birth to a child, adorned with pictures from the history of the holy nativity, and in which the mother of the god, with her son drinking at her breast, is represented resting on a couch, and receiving the worship consecrated to her; in the second case the picture of the god is worshipped over a jug. As the sources for this last form of the celebration, we have only the secondary texts Sc. (= Sv. 5) Vi. J. Ud. In D. and Ms. both forms of the festival are brought forward. The rest of the texts recognize only the first form.

The richness and abundance of the material now before us in these various texts is so great that we are obliged to limit ourselves. I have therefore chosen as a guide the representation which the older Bhāvishya texts O. C. Sa. offer, having at the same time due regard to the variations of the rest of the texts from it, but referring only, as far as seemed indispensable, to the rites and formula peculiar to them.

After the necessary cleansing of the teeth on the previous day (N) the vow of fasting is taken in a solemn manner on the morning of the feast-day. This is done, according to RN, after previous calling on the gods as witnesses (with the words—

śāraṇāḥ eva | yamāḥ kāṇāḥ | śatadvā | bhūtā | akā | bhāpā | pavaṇo | dīgavatī | bhūcitā | ākā | kā | ākā | kā | vya | aṣṭamāḥ | vṛti | ākā | kā | vya | aṣṭamāḥ | vṛti |

) amid sprinkling of water out of a copper vessel filled with fruits, flowers, and roasted barley, and with water, while reciting, according to O 24, Śb 54a, 55a, D. Ms. Ud., the following sentence,* asking for the god's assistance:

adya śthitaṁ vīrādhipaṁ kṛdābhāte paramaṁkaraṁ (tu pare 'hāni, Śb.) bhūkṣyā 'ham punḍarikākhā saranaṁ me bhavit ca jyuta (vyuṣa, Śb.) īva "Remaining without nourishment to-day, I shall feast to-morrow, O high lord, O lotus-eyed one, be a defence to me, thou unshaken one!"

Ms. D. reads the second hemistic thus:

bhūkṣyāmi Dvapārasya aśvin jannāmāśtanāmāyat (the last pāda as in Ča also), and, Ud. kariśyā pariṇaṁ tatra bhaktim me bhavit ca jyuto īva "Be gracious to me, O Keśava! to the blotting out of all my sins. Let this vow which I have now taken before thee, O god! be accomplished without hindrance, through thy grace, O Keśava!"

O. Sa. Śc. give no sentence at all. Lastly R. (p. 26) quotes from the Saimnatarapradīpikā the four following impressive verses, in the use of which N (fol. 30b) Ś. Vi. and Śc join with him. (Kā. has only vv. 1 and 4):

* Compare with this the quite analogous sentence in the Vārāhadevi (Chambers 55a, fol. 190b, on the occasion of the nāṭya-śādha):

ekkālākṣaṁ nirodhaṁ, sthītaṁ chāya 'haṁ [bhūkṣyāmi punḍarikākhā saranaṁ me bhavit ca jyuta] The formula, it is evident, is one generally acknowledged

in the Pañchābīna ritual. In the Jaṭānti form of the Jannāmāśtanī (fol. 290), treated of separately in Ms. (see p. 179), the sentence runs nearly as above, with the readings Jaṭāntiṁ nirodhāṁ bhūkṣyāṁ punḍarikākhā saranaṁ ca jyuto īva.
Vasudevaṃ samuddhāya (śamabhyarchya, N. fol. 266) sarvapāpaparāddhaya | upaveśanā karīṣṭhilakriṣṇadāsyayā nabhāṣ ṣaṃkramaḥ | 1
adya kriṣṇadāsyāṃ devīn (chaiva Vṛ.) nabhaṣchandra-sarohīṣṭaṃ (sic! so N both times, thus also Ś. Śk. and L. p. 33, where v. 2 recurs; only Vṛ. has chandrai) | archayāsattvadisemā bhokṣyaḥ 'ham aparā 'хаи 2 || ṣaṃkramaḥ
enaso (eva cha Vṛ.) mokṣhatānu 'emi yād govinda triyoniṣam (tryoqanam Ś., niyigitam Vṛ. t?) | tām maṃ 'uṣāsya tu mānī trāśi jatiṣām kokesvarābh 3 ||
ājāmmanaravāmya yādai yān maya dūkṣhitā kriyaṃ | tat prāṇāyāṃ govindai praśāda purushottama 4 ||
"To the honour of Vasudeva I will fast now for the expiation of all sins!
To-day, as the eighth day of the dark half of the Nabhas moon ||
Celebrating by fasting to-day the kriṣṇaMami, the Nabhas month and the moon ||
Together with Rohiniś then to-morrow I shall eat again ||
I wish, O Govinda! to alone for the sins of three births ||
Blot them out to me, and save who fell into a sea of trouble ||
From birth to death, whatever evil deed I have done ||
Cancel it, O Govinda! be gracious, Purushottama! ||"
From this specimen we may form an idea of the variations of the several representations, even in those cases where substantially the same subject is treated of, and draw from it a further conclusion as to cases where real differences are dealt with.
At midday of the day of the festival a bath is to be taken in clean river—or other water (O. C. B. N.), making use of sesamum Sa. N. K. D. (white sesamum). J (black ditto), Ms (oil of black sesamum), carrying a myrobalan fruit on the head (ādhīrtilaṁ śirāsā dhāritā, J.), In Śk the bath is placed before the taking of the vow of fasting; thus also in U. (ānisyādine brāhma māhāte uṭhāyā tīlakālasandam). After this the setting up on an auspicious

spot of a sūtikārya (house for a woman in childbirth) takes place. Thus according to O. Sa. C. B. K. N. (Ś. Vṛ.) D. Ma. In B. Sk. indeed this subject is not specially mentioned, but "the house" simply is described as the scene of the ensuing celebration (gīthān upakramyamā): probably, however, the same thing is meant by it. For the preparing of such a separate shed intended for the purpose of being occupied while passing safely through the time of lying in, is a constant Indian custom, which appears to have come down from pretty early times. The reason of it was probably, on the one hand the wish to keep the impurity connected with childbirth at a distance from the other members of the family as well as from the dwelling-house proper, and on the other the better opportunity thereby offered of defending and guarding the mother and child from all bad demoniacal influences. After the quotations in K. iii. 1 fol. 6a, b, but especially in Anantaśevas Suṣṣāra-kautuṣṭa (fol. 56a), the sūtikāryamah is, according to a text of Vasiṣṭha,† contained in the Pārījata (Madanapārījata, see Aufrecht, Catalogus, pp. 274, 275) to be erected in the south-west region. Anantaśevas gives also astrological information from Garga respecting the right time to enter it (sūtikāryeśavatam, sūtikāryeśanam), as well as special texts from the Pādara respecting the erection itself, &c. According to him, it is to be made well defended on all sides, to be erected on a good situation, firm and secure, by people skilled in building, and to be provided with a door to the east, and one to the north. After the worship of the gods, Brāhmaṇas, and cows has taken place, the encointe one enters, calling on the Brāhmaṇas for blessings, amid conch sounds and other music. Only kindred and trustworthy women afterwards enter. (Meal of ricinus roots mixed with gāt serves to facilitate the birth.) According to the Viṣṇudharma, it is to be inhabited for ten days (precisely on the tenth the in-lying woman gets up again, see Pārī. I. 17 Śāukh. g. i. 24) and

† See Viṣṇudharma in M., vide ante, p. 164.
‡ śaīndre tu viśramaṁaṭhānam, āṇgasyām pāchākālayaḥ |
| vāryakṣaḥ bhogajanghaḥ naśīṛṣṭiḥ sūpikāryamā iti |
| śa pārīṣaśā tapasvinānaiḥ kriyārahaḥ samantarāḥ |
subhāmasaṁ nirmitaṁ ramyaṁ vīṣṭaṁ jīvitarasaṁ
prāṇyānam uttarāśvam asām gurūrahaḥ sauḥ |
| devānām bhāma-prakāraḥ cha gurum krtvā cha pūjanaṁ ||
| vīprapuṇyāhaśaṁ ānāk hāvāyaśaṃ vana ca |
| prasūtā śāhavanā tatra tathā kṣeṣāh kālayaḥ |
| hṛdayā vīra-vāsāyā ca praśīnayuḥ stīrayā ca tat |
| erodiumāhāvāṣaṃ vai śrīkṣīyā samatraṁ tān ||
| suḥka-pravasyanirhṛdayāḥ prasūtā cha kṛṣyā iti |
| Compare Kā. ii. 1 fol. 185; sūpikāryo goripadva-|
| pāñjanānāṁ kṛśiṁ mātrāvaḥ gahadvaḥ saṁpātyasāvīḥ |
| sōhā kṛśyāḥ |
during the time is to be provided with arms, fire, links, full jugs, lights, with a pestle, and with pictures painted in water-colours (probably for protection against bad demons).¶

Śr. contains other accounts of the sūtikāgriha, under the word itself, and words of similar significance sūtikāghara, sūtikādasa, sūtikābhavana, sūtikāghra, and sūtikāghra. According to it, arjītha in Amara (dc. see Pet. W., s. v.) is also to be taken as a synonym for it (so indeed Raagy. III. 15). According to the Bhāvaprakāsa† it is to be made eight hands long and four wide (that would be a very narrow measurement!). According to the Vāsinpurāṇa, chap. prajapatisarga,‡ bad demons surround it, but good spirits stay there too, who then, on the sixth (the specially critical) day after the birth, are to be worshipped with offerings. The night of that day is to be passed waking,—so according to the Vīshṇudharmottara.§

The accounts in this place of the setting up of the sūtikāgriha agree with these statements, at the same time they also show some special peculiarities.

The pillars (N) made of plantain stems are to be covered with lotus-coloured (ruby red), variegated (OC), with white, yellow, red, striped or green (Śa. D.) cloths. It is to be decorated with wreaths of sandalwood, pearls and jewels, with amulets O. Śa. N.), with new pitchers (kalasa) filled with water (N.), with numerous flowers and fruits, and rows of lamps, and to be perfumed with wreaths of flowers, sandalwood and agallochum. It is to be arranged quite like a gokulam, lyre, or cowherd's cot,|| and to be filled with milkmaids (OC). Fettlers for women,‡ iron swords, a sacrificial post, along with a black (N.) he-goat are to be found inside; a pestle is to be laid down at the door, guards are to be placed in it, likewise the goddess Śaṅkha,¶ and all sorts of selected meats for the gods (idols) in rich abundance (OC. Śa.). Of the decoration of the walls with pictures from the "holy history," which Śa. (Ma.) mentions here, OC. treat but in the sequel, see below. According to Śa. the setting up of the sūtikāgriha is also to be accompanied with music of all kinds, dancing and singing.

It is highly surprising, first of all, that, according to these statements, the sūtikāgrihaṃ is to be set up like a gokulam. For the legend itself is quite consistent throughout, in stating that Devaki gave birth to Kṛishṇa in prison. Evidently a transference has here taken place to Devaki of those circumstances in which Yāsoda, who received the newly born child immediately after his birth, on her part gave birth to her own child, that magical girl who is exchanged with him. The reason of this indeed can only be that, from the beginning, the celebration of the Janmāśāmi festival stood in close relation to the representation of Kṛishṇa's growing up among cowherds, and consequently this conception entirely preponderated over the other, according to which he was a prince born in prison.

The following is the wording of the texts belonging to this.—First of all, OC. (the first śloka also in B. v. 69b, 70):

† taḥaṇaṇaḥ ca mahādāhi na dāhiṇaḥ vinaudā jale | devaṁ sahaḥbhūnā kuryāṇ devabhyah sūtikāgrihaṁ || 25 ||

thānāḥ, yathā; gokula kuṇḍolālītāḥ tuśāntarañcrapāt | amatāsākṣi naṁ suñcanaṁ stiraṁ valaśtehu cha | iti tithākṣitvām Mathurākādeṣe śrī-Nandayā vinaśčaḥ | thānāḥ, yathā; kālāṁ vruḍṭā tīrtha gokula Rāmaśceṣa | jñānāvyavāyā kaha pāñcākṣaṁ rājāyaṁ vijñāṇā | iti śrīkāśaṃ |  *

‡ padaḥ śrakshāḥ ca vṛksāḥ ca | 

§ Compare Bhārataślokaamo, śrīkāśaṃjanaśannātana adhy. 4.
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padmardana pitāśa chitrāśa mānditaśa charchiśa
lokaḥ | ranagam chandannamālābhir muktābhir
ubhāhitāṁ || 26 || sarvaśa gokula var kṛṣyāṁ goṛiṣam adakālaṁ |
apākāri (ṛ) lohaḥdāra (ṛ) yāpākāri gosāmāntaṁ || 27 ||
dvāra vinyāstāmaṇālāṁ raktāśa rakhapāla-
kaśāśiṣyāv devyādhiśaḥ padāórān, naived-
yāvār bīduhāḥ kṛitaḥ || 28 ||
evaṁ dāna ṣaṭkātyāḥ (ṛ) o ṣaṭkātyāḥ
śaṭkāryāḥ.||

Then Śa: tato 'ekāṁbhī tirāśa nāśā (ndūta Vṛ.)
nādiyānām vīmāla jale || 18 ||
sūdaśe kohanaśa kuryād Devakāśa śaṭkāryāh||
sakṣapālaṁ tathā rākṣaśa karyavāri hāritā apāpa
|| 19 ||
vibhīṣaṇaṁ kṝīśitaṁ kṛitāṁ samantaṁ kālaṁvīri avāri
| pushpaśa phalāri anekāṣa cha ṭapalihir ata tataḥ
|| 20 ||
pushpāmdgītācchitrān chandānagurudhyāpitam ||
abārayām anapātayāṁśa rakhapālaṁ
ubhāhitāṁ || 21 ||
harivāsāya charitaṁ govi kalamā vā śīkhyāyāt
(also in D. 103b, where however h. ca tathā
govi kalamā vā śīkhyāyāt) tataṁ (Vṛ., tato Śa)
vāḍdevamāndāyām vīmāla jale || 22 ||
wrītyātpakārapālām maṇigālaśa ca samantaḥ |
veśabāhaḥ lohaḥdāra (ṛ) kṛitād nāśā ca yata
|| 23 ||

dvāra vīnyāsaṇaḥ mukulaṁ raktāśa rakhapāla-
kaśāśiṣyāv devyādhiśaḥ | dhiśhīṭitaṁ cha tād giroh
chotāvaiśa tathā || 24 ||
evaṁ vihārāveseṇa kṛitād tatu (Vṛ., tu Śa) śaṭkāryā
śaṭkāryāḥ.||

N (Śr. Vṛ.) : tataḥ kudalāsthambhavābhira ṛmrap-
ālappavyataśaṭ Стаṭārdarākalarāi épāśa
pushpa-
ālappāyāṁ yujita āgārudyāpitam (vauaua) 9r. āgni
(ṛgr. 7.174) kṛṣṇaḥāṁ raktāśa rakhapālaśa-
devan-
yāstāmaṇālāṁ yujita maṇigālapoṭaṁ
| sakṣapālaṁ devyādhiśaḥ dhiśhīṭitaṁ

Ma. : tato maṇdhāyāṁ kṛ̥ṣṇatāśaśa
nadyādau
śudāe Devakāśa śaṭkāryāśa kuryāt
| tatrān (a) vau-dāpya-pallavākkādhis toraṁdike
dhītā, viśnūn devyādhiśa, tatra
grīratāla-pārākryā

tukhālayāyāi
pushpāmdgītaṁ
ca vaṁdikādādhi
dhiśhīṭitaṁ kṛṣṇaḥāṁ raktāśa

Thus also in D. 103a, but with the variation śvetavā-
tāṁ tathāśa śīkhyāvāri hāritā apāpa

31 So Bh. 4, saṣṭhikāyaṁ caturāpanāvayaṁ 21.

In Vṛ. 2 a marginal note has instead of this—"An
eight-spoked circle, the middle of which is formed of eight
lotuses.

Thus the representation of a saṭṭha-bhāda-
manḍalā in D. p. 1091. In Ṛṣi mention is only made of
an "eight-leaved lotus-flower" to be drawn (with
sandal) on the ground.

It recurs, also, in the Maṇḍaṁ, the celebration of
which, however, appears to be copied from that of the
Krāṣṇaṇaṁālā.
ON THE KRISHNAJANMAHATMI.

The texts run as follows—Sb., in the first place, has only—

••••• sampadya 'rchanadhanam || 55 ||

manasapani 'sahana-nitrit ksetrapushpadabhir (puhpadmad  Vr.) yulam

Sv.: savarate pratisah karyad pakshapadarci

manya-kam | puchandanti (puchandanti Vr.) sampadya vi-

khatvam pujapakramantu (Vr., joo' So) tahat || 6 ||

gocharanaadirn naadha madhye maniyalam

shahrei | brhakshayyad devata tatra sthapatyan

praptayayat || 7 ||

maniyapani ruchayet tatra kadaatstambhamanvita-

tan | charudradraavayopam (sci.) phalapushpadin

sobhitam || 8 ||

vidinani tatra vadhinyay vichitra chaiva 'sahana

nam

VI 2: bhucka debe tu sanadhya-gomayena

vichakshana/n | maniyapani tatra paichar-

varen-rn sobhitam || 14 ||

navebho/h 2 ad-ravindam sarvabodhara-sahajn-

itan | maniyapani karyant madhye manohallada-

ram parnam || 15 ||

sakhatvamalapithena paichavarenena bhapatte | maniyapani karyat tatra evaranaamavatma
tan || 16 ||

charudrardrodanta he etal sthapatya hekha devati

prathamadraddehe tu varuna achat yatattat

|| 17 ||

"Kavera at the second, Devendra at the third,

Ganapatya at the fourth." vV. 18-20

Ud. sarvabodhadra-varjodana karta-vam.

After the erecting and decorating of the silit-

cakrika, in the manner described above, the

placing of the pictures of the gods to be

worshipped at the approaching festival is to be

taken in hand. In the first place a picture of

Deva ki, made of gold, silver, copper, brass,

clay, wood, or jewels, or only painted with

colours, is to be placed in the middle of

\* A marginal note has only shodalardhan likhech chakran-

manadhye cha 'sthapitam.'

\| According to Sv. by 'srivasa is to be understood a

row of white hair (vatakalathu-rakshana-dakshhizat

matam). The copybook, (who puts 'vatsala as the

original form: compare however Sv.: 'srivatikshata,

puna, avayata kridakshata, tu Tridhakhshata, as

well as Wilken, sub noce, and my treatise on the

Bhagavad Gita, 11, 312). The employing of 'srivasa' as a

sign of happiness comes down from early times, probably from the

Buddhists and Jainas (see again Burnouf, Lotus, pp. 608-9, 617;)

after all, the proper meaning of it, as well as its most

ancient form and date, is still undecided: a reference to the

sign of the Cross, and to the Agyam Dei, as I have

conjectured in the Zeitung der Deut. Morgen. Gesellschaft, VI. 94, does not appear to be contained in it.
in the middle of it, and the picture of Kṛishṇa drinking at his mother's breast is to be laid directly on the jug. Ms. besides, leaves optional instead of it, the worship of the two asleep on a maithaka (couch). Lastly, on occasion of the Jayaṇti festival, treated of separately in Ms. = J. (see above, p. 179), no mention at all is made of the last mode; Kṛishṇa's picture, further, is not laid directly on the jug, but a "new real" jug, "filled with consecrated water, provided with the so-called five jewels, and adorned with perfumes and wreaths of flowers," is in the first place to be covered by another vessel, of gold, silver, copper, or reeds (according to circumstances), filled with sesame, and it is then on this vessel that the golden picture of the god comes to lie; which has moreover to represent him as a suckling infant looking up into his mother's face. In all these points, then, D agrees completely, only it adds that the child presses the point of the breast with his hands, and looks up repeatedly and lovingly into the face of the mother: after this only, according to D, is the sātvatāgya to be prepared.

Quite the same representation as in D, or at the Jayaṇti form in Ms., is found in Ud., only that it is added that the jug is to be placed in the octagon-shaped middle of the sarvanābhadramandala; the Kṛishṇa in the picture moreover is described here as four-armed, obviously to mark especially Kṛishṇa's identity with Viṣṇu. Lastly, Vi. 1-2, Sc. make no mention at all of the relation of Kṛishṇa to his mother. A golden figure of Kṛishṇa covered with a cloth is to be worshipped over a jug, Vi. 1 says quite shortly, while Vi. 2 (as well as a marginal note on it of a different wording) and Sc. in agreement with D. (Dr.), cover the jug in the first place with a vessel, and the image is only to be placed on the latter. Vi. has all kinds of specialities in regard to it; gives, among other things, the measure—that is, the value—of the golden Kṛishṇa image at eight nādas, which does not seem also as newly born.

* (Gold, diamond, sapphire, ruby, and pearl, Hmādri in Skt.; according to the Gāuda, gold, silver, coral, pearl, and rāppapata (?), viḍī.)

† All these accounts of the jug result from the adjective pārvotke, referring back to fol. 20a (svanā lohānd ca ṛddhahākapūrīta maṁcaratapoteṣā ācārāhākapūrītaṃ ca viṣṇu-kalāṃ) by which it is here (see p. 286) described, and they apply also, in like manner, to the jannakāyam. 
very high (according to Mānava viii. 134 this would be only a half-sawarna, 40 krishnalo). The addition (see p. 286 n.) made by Vyā describes only the preparing of the kalasa, and its being set up in the sarvabhadradhānapāda, both quite as D. Vi 2 and Sc.; regarding the use to be made of it for the worship of the image of Krishna Vyā is altogether silent: as the author cannot well set himself too much in opposition to the other texts quoted by him, as well as to his sources S N.; he borrows, however, in the course of the discussion two more additions from the kalasa-ritual, namely the 16 upachāras and the aṅgāpāj (see below, p. 291).

Now this worship over the jug is a highly peculiar feature, the cause of which, as well as the object of it, is still not quite clear to me. I have first met with it in that festival-cycle which (see p. 179) the Varāhapurāṇa consecrates to the ten or eleven avatāras of Viṣṇu, which are all to be worshipped in the same manner (as above in Viṣṇu and Śaiva). Perhaps just in this lies the explanation of the riddle. At the head of these avatāras stands the incarnation of Viṣṇu as a fish, and in this the worship in or over a jug is of course fully justified; perhaps the celebration of the other festivals of this kind may have been regulated according to the type of the first avatāra-festival. The jug in which, according to the tradition,—see Satapar. L. 8. 1. 3 (kumbhāṇa), Ind. Stud. vol. I. p. 163,—the first progenitor Mānava brought up the fish which saved him from the flood would then be the original of this.

From the accounts in Ms. of the festivals of the Viṣṇave rītual it further follows with certainty that this same type recurs in them throughout, and this harmony after all is not confined merely to the worship over the jug, but extends itself to the whole habitus of the celebration, viz. to the aṅgāpāj,—that is, the worship of the separate members of the idol's body,—to the watch kept through the night, and to the giving away of the idol to the ahārīya on the next morning at the breaking of the fast. In Ms. it is true, several further specialities appear.

---

1 In the middle of four jugs which represent the four seas, in the varṣāyuddha (in Māyāsāra month, Chambers 3364, fol. 131a) a stand is placed covered with a cloth (tekānum madhye svaśam pātaka sthāpita) suvarṇakātham also a golden, silver, copper, or wooden vessel (pātasa); and in this the idol in the form of a golden fish is laid. The statement that then further this pātasa with the idol is to be set down upon a jug (kumbha, ghata, kalasa, etc.) is indeed not found here, but in the following avatāra as the placing of the jug in the sarvabhadradhānapāda, the detached explanation of the aṅgāpāj, &c., and the coincidence of Viṣṇu Śaiva also in them shows that their representation, while it keeps aloof from the special peculiarities of the Jaināṣṭamī celebration, is founded on an adaptation to the general forms of the Viṣṇave rītual.

The connected texts run thus:—

Śa, māyāsāra-kālāḥasurāṇāṁ kṛitated phala-pUniversità dhiḥ yutam; tasmānam pāstā bhaktā gamda-pusahaan pūrṇaḥ prāthaḥ 56 ||

upachāraiḥ shokahāraiḥ dakaśikāhāraiḥ vinyāsyaḥ 36 ||

Mo. (fol. 326) tasmādaya sarvabhadradhānapādā paśvākāla haiminādā vyākṣaṁ pāstā (1) manimayān (1) vārakham mrinmayāṁ lokṣyāpādā māva sandsavataṁ kri-Krishnasyatīrayaṁ Devacakṣatānāśāyayā vinayāya, maṇeḥakaḥ pravāpamāndrayataṁ pītāmāḥ suptaṁ kri-Krishnaṁ vinayāya. . . .

J. (pāraktāla kālākṣāsthyāḥ) haimma rājyeṁ tvaraṁ vai nairi vātipānaṁ haimma Deva- kṣatānāśāyaṁ janavimukham akeleṣantaṁ kshetradėlīṇāṁ pītāṁ devam aṅgāpājya. . . .

D. upahākaṁ tu madhyāṁ nātāḥ śaktarāṁ śubhāḥ 97 ||

kṛiteḥ "hitakānamataḥ kūtā mahāvāmaḥ avanāsānām ghatam | pañcharatnaamādhyakātum pavitrodakāpātīram || 98 ||

taṣyapari nayat pātraṁ saumārañān vītā ṛṣītām | tāmānāṁ vai nāmaśānāṁ vī tī kṛiteḥ bhajya- na vaddatāḥ || 99 ||

nāyānām vā vā ṛṣītānām vā vī vīśākāhāyānām na nāyāt | taṣyapari nuyastānām devaṁ saumārañānām tākṣaraṇānātānam || 100 ||

piśācanām stanaṁ kṣirai kuchānām pātraṁ aprājan | (nom. m. 1) | diṣṭayantam premu tu mukham uṭṭhaṁ muḥurma muhaḥ || 101 ||

evaṁ kṛiteḥ tu gavāradāṁ mṛteḥ saha jāgataśanām | sudākāśakṛiteṁ kuryāḥ Devacāḥ vidhikṣryānam || 102 ||

Ud. sarvabhadradhānapādaṁ kartavyam | madhye ekam kumbhaṁ sābhayaṁ, tathāvādā pitāñ jayaṁ kambhaṇaṁ vaddatā atapādatā māmā vā vaddatā mahāvāmaḥ bhavante | tādātā pātraṁ tāmarśrīṣyaṁ vīcāryām rōvaṁ yamayāṁ vā vaddatā | tadātā māmā vā sābhayaṁ kambhaṇaṁ aśeṣatā kārthākaṇḍaṁ vīcāryānām ārathyānām ārathyānām (saun. we read dhaṇāyaṁ? see Pā. W. 3.) chaturbhujān (as Kāma), from which it uniformly recurs in all the following avatāras.

2 Or, is there perhaps a reference here to the worship of the idol in the form of a golden fish placed over the jug? Compare Aurenfrecht, Catalogus, p. 225, number 30, stambhamāna kumbhaṁ.

3 Similarly before in the legend of Harakaṇḍa ānandaśāryapariṇāmaṁ daśadīnaṁ cha pāṣyayante stanaṁ harin 88 ||
Now follows the preparation and erection of the remaining pictures which relate to the sacred history of the nativity of Krishna. The accounts regarding them are of a somewhat varying kind in the several texts; obviously a favourite subject lies before us here, which has consequently experienced numerous additions and variations. Only Sau Udu. Vi 2: have nothing at all about it, as throughout them Krishna's relationship to his mother, as well as all the special birth-ritual, is entirely wanting (see above, pp. 178, 171).

According to Ka. in. the Jayanti form of the festival there is necessary, in the first place, a second Devaki picture where Krishna is represented as held on her lap, while a Lakshmi picture rules the feet of Devaki resting on the couch. The other texts do not mention this second Devaki picture; on the other hand, they place before us, and with perfect propriety, a picture of Yasoda, who is to be represented quite in the same manner as Devaki in the Sulakṣyā picture (Sa. K.), and in fact just as delivered of a beautiful girl. At Krishna's side stand with bowed head, from the tops of which wreaths of flowers hang down, all kinds of gods, demi-gods, demons, and spirits, represented as wandering through the air in various positions. His father Vasudeva also stands by, armed with sword and shield. Likewise dancing, happy Apsaras and singing Gandharvas. The serpent-prince Kāliya in his Yamuna-bed is also to be painted there. Thus 2 Oc. Sa.; while C. Sa add besides some verses according to which Kaśa's servants, Devaki's pious-wardens, are represented in armour, or asleep, overcome by the magic slumber; likewise all kinds of armed Daṇava-demons, especially such as Krishna when a child

* According to Vi 1, pictures of the ten avatars of Viṣṇu are to be put up, and also Devaki, the shepherdess, and Yasoda, to be honoured: but whether this "also" (tattvāh) chā, really refers to the putting up of their pictures is not clear.

† In a subsequent passage (O 53, see in the sequel) Krishna himself, the two pairs of parents, and his brother Baladeva are described as "to be set up" (to these a picture of the moon also, and its favourite star rohini: so that there is not probably paintings that are treated of.

With the insertion of some verses which enumerate the gods and demigods as incarnations of whom the person-
overcame, namely Praśamā, Dhenuka, Aırisha, and the two wrestlers Chanuра and Mushhiba. Indeed, whatever else, says Sa, is anyhow connected with Krishṇa’s deeds (as a child), it is all to be painted there and worshipped devoutly. —According to B., particularly of the cowherds and the gokulam are also to be made, as well, according to D and Sa 222, the whole history of the Hari race and the gokulam to be painted. In Śa an image of Rohini (second wife of Vasudeva) with her son Valadeva is especially required, as well as images of the milkmaids, cowherds, and cows, of the gokulam, of Yamunā, and of the magical girl (the incarnation of yogamāyā) whom Yasodā has just given birth to; all these images are either to be made of gold, silver, copper, metal, clay, wood, stone, or only to be painted. —According to N. (Ś. Vṛ.) it is only the ornamentation of the walls of the sūtikāgriha with such paintings that is required. —Mr. says nothing directly of the material of which the images are to be made, but describes them as to be put up (anastāpya), therefore, not as paintings; it adds besides, to Yasodā (with the child), Rohini, Nanda, Valabhadrā, Vasudeva, and the cows, also Kaśa, the Phātanā (see above, p. 176), and so on such like. According to Kā. Vasudeva and Nanda, the milkmaids and cowherds, are to be painted on the walls of the sūtikāgriha, &c.; and upon another part of it Yasodā on a couch with her child; and again, on another stand, seven more images are to be put up, namely the two pairs of parents, Kṛishṇa himself, his brother Rāma, and Chandra. Whoevers cannot so make so many images, let him at least be careful to put up the last-named seven, according to custom and ability; the others let him contemplate devoutly.

The related texts are as follows: —In the first place O. Śa. (333, 335, 36; also in K. 335, 35a, 36b; also in R.)

Yasodānī chāḍī tatraiva prātādānī varakanyākām || 33 ||

tatra āveṇa gacchā nāgā yaksavindusvār naśī ||
svarhaṁ bhaktām prakāśrā virādānti || 34 ||

Vasudevo ‘pi tatraiva kaśyapamchar大唐irā shīkā ||

Kṣenopo Vasudevo ’yana’śi aditiḥ chāḍī Devakī || 35 ||

kṣeṣadṛgo Valabhadrā || Yastu dīya jāyati ||

Nandā prajñāpatīr Daksāh, Gārīya chāḍī chaṭumūlakā || 36 ||

niśtyānī ‘puraso kriṣṭa’gandharvā gatattat-parā ||

lekhānīyā cha tatraiva Kātīyaōśi Yamunāhrāde || 37 ||

C. inserts three more verses between 36 and 37 (40 in C.):

esho vartā daṇḍātin Kāṅsa ‘ya ’yam Kṛiṣhṇānīyā ||
tadra kaśyampavrādā ye daṇḍā vinočhāyudā || 37 ||
taḥ tatra prahārās tatra suṣṭā nirādvidarāhah ||

Godhenuḥ Kuṇiyo ‘tehā cha Daṇḍāvyā śastra-pāṇyaḥ || 38 ||

Praśamā Dhenuko risho maḷtāu Chāṇḍra-Mushhiba- 

cha ‘pi daṇḍāvā tatra māṇḍya-prahārasadgātā || 39 ||

Śa. has instead of it the following verses (of which 36b is in K. also):—

gopayā cha ‘purasaḥ saaved ’(‘chāyaś Śa 1) gopād ‘

cha ‘pi dvavakāsah || 34 ||

esho vartā rājendra Kāṅsa ’ya ’yam Kṛiṣhṇānīyā ||
tadra kaśyam-pavrādā cha mohita yoganidrāyā (Śa 1, roga) ||

Śa || 35 ||

Go-dhenu-kuniarā || chāya daṇḍāvā śastra-pāṇyaḥ ||

and inserts after v. 37 (= 36 in Śa.) the following verse in addition (which is also quoted in K):—

ity evam dī ‘yat kṣiṇichid vidyātī charitama || lekhātva pravatnena pujaya bhavati-parāh || 37 ||

By Chandra here must surely be meant Balarāma’s mother Rohini, for the usual meaning of the word Durgā does not suit at all. In K. p. 38, indeed, Ro’hini and Chandra are named beside each other (… Yasodā, Nanda-Rohini-Charṇāyāḥ/14/Valadeva-prajñāt). Probably however, only by mistake, as some such occur also elsewhere in K. (see above, p. 167). Perhaps a different name than the usual one has been given here to the mother of Balarāma, because later still another rohini, namely the star which passes for the wife of the Moon, comes in for adornment (see note p. 288, and below, p. 290).

Pratādāvamakānān K. Yasodā pratādāvamakānāk R. —Sa. K read (rightly) as a verb meaning ‘to govern the ascetics in 233, 331). Yasaḍam tatra chaṁnem in prasādā sūtikāgrihea || 29 ||

tadāc chā balajyātī Pritha pratādāvamakānām (prasādāvartem ||

yakṣavindukārāyāḥ K. O, where another hemic- 

stich — pratādāv pushpanidāgirakāh kāryāḥ surdā- 

surdā —Sa. has three hematicas:—

tathvāva mamā pṛivaśāvāh kṛita-jālpatāh nirṇa || 30 ||

devagṛhaḥ tathā niṇaḥ yaksavindusvārāhkarāriḥ ||

prasādāv phupanidāgirakāhānīrakāh || 31 ||

|| praksiṇāmānī O, praksiṇāv uddātās, praksiṇāv uddātās ||

‘tha K. K.

‘cha K. K.

sukṣaḥvalahāro O, Valadeva ‘bhadrā K. ||

sahéko śi Valadeva (‘bhadrā K.), ‘yam K. K.

|| Tha O dīvar (kasārīr, K) anuvahātyā K. K. ||

tadra ‘bhārat C.

Valabhadrās tathā Nandot Daksā Dāryā čatur- 

mukhāh, R, Sk.

I. niśtyānta O, niśtyānta K. niśtyānta ‘cha ‘purobhās 

ta K. K.

II. Kātīya K. K. Sk.

Gaur Dhenou Kuṇiyo K. K.

Kśiṇichchakāya K.
B. Vasudevasyaḥ Nandasya gopāndāṁ gokulasya cha || 73 ||
Yāoddha kāpīḥśa taraiva prasātād varakanyakād|m]ni dedre viyugasthumudalai sarac Huckhamavattam || 74 ||
Yamunidāṁ nimmagāṁ ātara phushpandidevībhadātām||
D. ṛhivaṇiṣayaḥ ca tattād gokulasā vilīkhyatayaḥ || 103 ||
Śa. sadyaḥprastādh janakī Vasudevaḥ ca mārtikam || 57 ||
Valavacaramuktām Rohiniḥ guṇaokāhiti ||
Nandāya Yāoddhāya gopāḥ ca gopān gāḍh chaiva sarvasā || 58 ||
gokulas Yāmunnā chaiva yogāmyāya ca dārīkām ||
Yāoddhāya śayane saptāṁ sadyojaṭād vaśrambhām || 59 ||
etāva samājaya samayena nāmanwantrāḥ pīthis
prithak| avanarāyaṇaṃ dravyamāṇāśābhī || alanī
krīdāh || 60 ||
kiśhapaḥāndharaḥstātātāt vṛtāv aha lekhita
pratimā vividhāḥ proktād tītu ca 'yaNAyād
yatād || 61 ||
NS. Vṛṣaṇi (i.e. the sūtika grihā) samastad bhūtāh
sakṣamāndājāni devagondhareddān khaḷya
charanadāhara Vasudeva-Dvākā-Nanda-Yāoddha-Gar-
ga-goṇapān, Kāśīnāyikān Go-Dhenn-, Kuṇ-
jārān, Yānu uṣm, tamadhāye Kāliyam, anyaḥ ca
takhālānaṃ gokulacharitam yathāsāāhāraṃ lekhita
liṅghaḥ.
Ms. kaheīt prādāśi sakṣamānyād Yāoddha(m) Rohi-
nīḥ Nanda(ā) Valabhadraḥ gāḍh chakpalasva(vy)(ad),
Devaṅkāndāva khaḷyaṃkāstam Vasudevaḥ stuvanta
(narū) MS vā | Kāha-Pātim-dvānābātinīḥ cha
vathāṅgāya kaulam (?) anuvratīya (?) 'ṣpritīya MS.)
Devakāya pūṣpa-kāyamānīḥ dādāyāt ||
Kā. Jañeyamattvā eva Devakāya uṣāya dvitī-
yān ārīKṛṣṇamārtīḥ nāhṛāya paryākṣiṣā-Devaṅkānāṃśavānāṃ
dhanāparādī Lakṣmīnāḥ nāhṛāya, bhūtyāyānī khaḷyaṃkāhariṇā Vasudevaḥ Nanda
m gopānāḥ liṅghita, prādēkturāv maṇahāka prā-
śikānyagā hāva Yāoddhāpratidā, pīthāntare
Vasudeva-Dvākā-Nanda-Kṛṣṇa-Rāma-Chandikā iti sapta pratimāṇa thāpyatah | ektat
pratimābhārvirājikānaṃ Vasudevādi-Chandikādātāḥ

† Namely, pratimāṇa kāryāḥ is to be suppressed from 72b (see above, p. 296).
\* So. Śv. 2, ṛṣaya śh.
\+ So. Śv. 2, guṇarāhāṣam ṣh.
\** ṛṣaya, mṛtyudānḥ śh., ṛṣaya śv 2.
\*śa śv 1; prāktā tāthā māhā ca nara yojeta śv 2.
\* By women and by Nāḍrās—that is when they prepare
the festival—the prayers are omitted. According to O 15
the festival is apponted expressly for all castes, including
Nāḍrā and other pious people:
parnābhiṣṭeḥāni lokāḥ kuvambu kriḥmaṇḍāyaḥ |
sapta va yathāsakti va kṛityuḥ, anyāḥ sarvō yathā-
gāhyam ēhyetāḥ ||
Vi 1. mātreyā kārma 'tha varāhō nārāyaṇo 'tha
vāmanāḥ || 125 ||
Rāma Rāma ṣa Kṛṣṇaḥ ca Budadhān Kāla
ca te dāsa | thāpyatah dāsa viṣṇūn ātā, "Devakān (an
akṣara wanting) tathāvai ca || 126 ||
gopāldāḥ ca Yāoddhān ca pūjayaḥ ca prayat-
ānātāḥ ||
After the sūtika grihāram is put up and deco-
rated in this manner, when night begins to come on (Kā. 'in the night,' D) the adoration
of the holy family takes place in it. First of all Devakā is worshipped. Perfumes, incense,
roasted barley, and beautiful fruits, as cucum-
bers, cocoanuts, dates, pomegranates (C.),
and citrons, betel-nuts, oranges, bread-fruit,
or as time and place afford, are offered to her,
and after the (whole story of the) incarnation
as above (see note on p. 288) given has been
devotedly meditated upon, the following prayer,†
† composed in the artificial measure sraḍhāḥ, is
addressed to Devakā:

"Hail to the goddess, mother of the gods," to
Devakā of the beautiful countenance and
lovely form, who with her son, highly rejoiced at
heart,† sits here on a couch in sweet slumber,†
constantly surrounded by troops of singing
kīmara who sound flutes and lutes, and taken
care of by servants who carry golden jars of
consecrated water,§ looking-glasses, jugs, and
garments in their hands."

A short salutation is also to be addressed to
Srī, Viṣṇu's wife, whom we have to think‡
of as sitting on a lotus and diligently rubbing
the feet of Devakā. And now follow more
such short salutations to Devakā herself and
to the other members of the holy family,
namely to Vasudeva, Valaṭēva, Kṛṣṇa
himself, Nanda, and Yāoddhā; C adds also
Kṛṣṇa's sister Subhadra, Ca Rohinī
khaṭriya vaiṣyajītyāḥ śūdra ye 'nya 'pi ḍharmanāḥ (so śh,
ntyaye O8, bhaya O8, śūdra 'nya 'pi ḍharmanāḥ O).
\* demonstrative might also be 'mother of gods'—thus it
is for example, to be understood on p. 291 as a surame of
Aditi.
† So O 'with happy countenance' in the other texts.
‡ So according to O; the other texts have 'on a well-

furnished couch.'
§ Or, according to another way of reading, 'sweet-smell-
ing powder'; kṛṣṇagātra is, however, the loco doctor,
which would scarcely have been put in the place of kṛṣṇagātra
(6h and c change indeed in the MSS. frequently).
|| Jugs' a second time? but what to make of kusā,
kusā I do not know.
\* Kā. desires (see above, p. 288) a figurative repre-
sentation of her also.
instead of these two N. Kā have Chaṇḍiḍā alone. The idols are, according to Śa. Kā. (where in detail), to be bathed with milk and such like, and to be anointed with sandalwood. Mr. knows only of a distribution of flowers to Devaki (with the above prayer) and to Krishnā. N. (Ś. Vt.) adds here already the verses given at the presenting of water for bathing, &c., which follow in O. below (see pp. 293, 295), and Vr. particularly brings in sixteen such offerings of gifts (upachāra) to Krishnā (see above, pp. 176, 287) inserting between them moreover the worship of the members of his body (aṅgopājya). Both these latter proceedings are mentioned also in a second account in Kā., which for this purpose makes special use of the 16 verses of the purusāsikātā, as well as in Śc.* where, however, the aṅgopājya is only found in Śc. 3. In Śc. there follow then more name-prayers to some persons of the holy family, viz. Devak and Vasudeva, Rohiṇi and Bala; after them similar ones to Sātākali, Uddhava, Akrūra, Ugrasena, and other Yādava heroes, further to Nanda, to the newly-delivered Yaśodā, to the cowherds and milkmaids, to Kālinī, that is Yaśodā, and to Kāliya (the serpent prince). Vi. 1 mentions quite shortly (see above, pp. 288, 290), that, along with the ten avatāras, images of whom are to be set up, Devaki, the cowherds, and Yaśodā shall also be worshipped. Likewise Śb. (see p. 290), Vi. 2 has nothing at all relating to this, and brings in only prayers and gifts referring to Krishnā alone.—Thus also B., according to which flowers, all kinds of ointments and perfumes, tapers, and beautiful fruits are to be offered to him.—Ud. among a large crowd of invocations and offerings addressed partly to Krishnā alone, partly also to the ten avatāras of Vīṣṇu, has at least twice a Devakipājya also, in which, among others, she is worshipped also by the names which belong to the wife of Śiva. A prominent role, on the other hand, is played by Devaki again in D. Ca. J., where some beautiful prayers are addressed only to her and her son. And according to Ca., the members of the holy family are previously to be called on by name-prayers; D. J. however, have nothing about this. According to D., Hārī (that is Vīṣṇu, Krishnā) is previously to be honoured with flowers and fruits, &c. amid reciting of the Purusāsikātā (Śb. x. 90), &c.; an arbour is to be put up, singing, music and dancing to be indulged in, and all sort of legends of Krishnā and Vīṣṇu, especially of his avatāras, are to be related (see above, p. 176). The prayer to Devaki begins with the svagāthār verse just translated, (p. 290) which is here described as paurāṇika, and then proceeds in the usual sloka measure thus:

Honour to thee, to Devaki, who hast borne Krishnā to us! ||

The goddess blotting out sins be appeased, be worshipped by me ||

The mother of gods Aditi, art thou, annihilating all guilt. ||

Therefore I will honour thee now,—be gracious, lovely-countenanced one!—||

As only the gods honour thee. Show kindness to me, gracious one. ||

Even as thou attainedst highest happiness when thou gottest Hārī for a son. ||

Just that happiness, O thou goddess, let me see—the beautiful son. ||

And now follow the prayers to Krishnā himself—

A thousand incarnations makest thou indeed, O Madhusūdana! ||

No one anywhere on the earth knows the number of thy incarnations; ||

The gods themselves, Brahma not their head, know not thy real nature. ||

Therefore will I honour thee now as thou restest on thy mother's lap. ||

Fulfil my wishes, God! cancel my wickedness. ||

Make purification for me, O God, blotter-out of the fear of earthly pain. ||

The following are the passages belonging to this. From first from O.: SV. Āa,

ranyam evaṁvidhīḥ kriyā Devakān naśvaram-kiṃ, tām Pārtha pujasaḥ* bhrityā gnavadhanā-pākehatābh* phalaih† || 38 ||

there is a blank here after ranyam evam—396 in Śa. stands before 398.

* pūjyāryānām pūjā. Śa, evam sampājī, R. p. 26, pājyā-śrīrām tathā R. p. 28.
† ganḍhapūṣkhaŚ. Sv. B. (both times).

†† tāb. aha Śv. 1, tairjalaḥ R. p. 25. —C. adds to this: kūlalośārīṁ nālikālaṁ cha kāraṇārā dājimphalaih |
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added, after which the text proceeds.) aha pari-
vardaevadhatpājā: Dodge's 'Vasudeva
cha Rādhāvāsa salālwat enthā | Śrīyukta
cha 'dhāraya dāve Ugrasena-Yaddan
| 37 |
Nandina Vasudeva rākṣita prapatitā sūkṣma pāpakāpākā | Kālidāsa
Kāliyana cha pāyajah uḍamana-
brahan | 28 |
Mr. . . Devakṣyā pushūpājīnā diṣṭāy tatra man-
traḥ: gacchabāhā . kārtaṇāpā iti | śīrṣesvara
śīrṣa tātra ivaśāhāvedya cha | viśava (viśava
M.2) pateye padhyāya Goripayā namo namah iti
Śrīkṣnaya pushūpājīnā diṣṭāy |
Kā. mōthdāna-aprākāsūrā nhāṣed | "śrī Śrīkṛṣṇa-
prājyartharīṣu nāparyādāvā śrī Śrīkṛṣṇa-jāni
kārṣyā ity saṅkarapya nyasā | (with ñīmā) saṅkādati pāyaja-
tān mīyāvat kriyā ||
śīrṣapāñkarān kārtaṇādāy utāda pāyajah tyā De-
tākṣa | śrī Śrīkṛṣṇa śāklaṁ pāyajah pāyaya śīrṣa
stāna-

dvāpaḥ ||
Deva ācārām nama te 'stu, Kṛṣṇapādaṁ atatpadat | 44 |
peyakasekāra (āt śv 1) deva tuṣṭaṁ yah maṇa
'ṛchāṇādī namo'nam cha priṇoḥ nāmā
muktānām (yā sa bh 1) | 43 |
kṛṣṇā pāyajā viśeṣaṇā cha svapnaḥpāpa-prapaṇe |
Devakṣyā Vasudeva Vasudeva cha śīrṣa | 44 |
Valodeva Nandaśa Vasudeva pāyajah śīrṣa ||

N. anayatāratah kṛṣṇā prātiśatakas pakṣaṁ
pradēvadāṃnāmāṃśaṃ jānana | (Kr., 'nāmā niśā N
In samādhi chaturāṅkūratah namā vāvā, asmā
dī) devakṣyā ilaśāna (Ś, 'kṛṣṇa N) svāhā
cha cha (chā samādhi vāvā) janana prāti-
śākṣaṁ kṛṣṇā | asmā ity asa śāhāna tattadeva
vānaṁ prāyāya |

-gacchabāhā . . . Devakṣyā devārādāpā iti Devakṣyā
moṁ cha 'pi (N, maucha-kopāri VR. vrāka
āmā nilōtpaladālaḥvērīmā iti (N. Ś., evam Devakṣyā
[śc] saha VR. āśī Śrīkṛṣṇa cha (wanter in VR.
) pāyajah, iti namo deva yā śīrṣa (śīrṣa VR. śīrṣa
namā Ś. iti) Śrīyana, Devakṣyāvasa Vasudeva,
Valodeva Nandaśa Śrīkṛṣṇa Śrīkṛṣṇa nāṃ,
śīrṣa vāsaḥ brahmane Śrīyana, naṁma-
naṇaṁjaiva pāyajah iti
Śc. vāsaḥ brahmane Kaunyā pāyajah tatra māṁ
buddhaḥ | 10 ||
pakṣaṁ brahmane Śrīkṛṣṇa . . . these sixteen
upachāra theśu dhāraṇās to which in Śc 3, another asaṁpāyā iti

|
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the same manner dhupa, dipa, naivedya, dehasanam and karodeartanam, tāmbola, nīrājana, pushpānila.  

Dēvī evāṁ kṛjā śivādiśev naṅgābhavavadātah  
|| 110 ||  

nāsi pāja iviṣṭhāvīrya Devakīyā āśavasa (śeśe?)  
cha maṅstreṇ 'nena devāśvin śāmagati punarājiveka  
cha || 111 ||  

gāyādēvaḥ . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . .  
|| 112 ||  

Devakī yā namas tuṣṭhāyin Kṛṣṇāpādānattāre  
|| pāpakṣhayakāri devā tuṣṭiśī rājya maya  

‘rēchāḥ’ || 113 ||  

dūhitā devamātā tuṣi śavapāpaprāmaṇi || et as  

ādivin pāyājyadā prāsvā tuṣā vādānē  
|| 114 ||  

pājटा 'śi yaḥ devāśa pradādai kuru svaṁart ||  

yaḥśaḥ Hārinivait āndhāḥ prāptā cha  

nivṛtiśī tvayā || 115 ||  

tāṇ eca nivṛtiśī deha śuṇātārāśayena mṛtab  

acātāsātrasahare  
|| 116 ||  

karoḥ madhāsādānā || 116 ||  

na kāśēḥ acātāśravā sampādātā jñānti tu śhumāv ||  

deva bhrākāmāde vāpi śvārāpāni na vidu tvayā  
|| 117 ||  

atas tuṁ pāyājyadām aṅtā uttāniṣaṁavāhitā  

vādānāvātā kuru me deva daksāyītā cha vāndāya  
|| 118 ||  

pāvāivān kuru me deva saṁsārdātibhūdāya padā  

B. tat Pārtha pāyājī bhaktyā puṣpaṁ nāmāv- 

bhāṅkāḥ svaṁhatāḥ  
|| 75 ||  

chandaneścānām vimalānām śvarūpayāh dādāyād vā kāśēkāmaṇām  

tād tāryāḥ pārājyadānāyac ca dāpādānāṁ tathāvāca cha  
|| 76 ||  

pātāṁstereṇa dādāya bhaktyāsādāvāna eva punēḥ  

dānāṁśa bhīṣyātra ca nādiśājñānārāmāchātāltaiḥ(?)  
|| 77 ||  

UD. Devakīpāṭāḥ āpy ēci devi dūrge tuṣavā Kṛṣṇa- 

pārājyākāryaṇāḥ(?)  
|| 119 ||  

Vasudevena saṁhitā nāma saṁbhāpyādiṇī ||  

dākānam ċa sarvaśāstrāmaya deva(?)  

sarvagandhakamaṇētyā ca  
|| 110 ||  

toṇāḥ 'nena su (ā)nic  

nādaṁ pāyājyadā pārāśadā me ċa śāsmāna  

Devakīpāṭāḥ ċa Vasudevenā Yāsodāyī Ro- 

khīyāḥ Nandīyā(?) goḍāyāi(?) sarvabhinājanāyī  

paramārāyāyī annapārāyāyī lākṣaṁaya(?)  

yogamādāya  

[Ca. introduces the verses D. 115-119a in the following  

way (compare above, p. 384):]  

iti niyamah, grihitāḥ ahadhalaṁ padam chandanaṁ  

līkhitvā taṁ samārjana  

Kṛṣṇam cha Valabhadraḥ cha Vasudevā cha Dvārakām |  

Nandagopān Yāsodāni cha Subhadram Rohitān tathā ||  

sarvadānaṁ pratiṣṭhāpyā korukopari Devakīm  

pāyājanām yathā śaktā śāstraṇāvān kuru svarāte  

yathā tvayā vratānā labhāvī . . . .  

so that here any mention of a figurative representation  

of the deity family is entirely left out, their spiritual  

presence is assumed.  

* Kṛṣṇābhāṣyapāla Cod., but see Sa. v. 22 above, p. 292.  

† The following verses are brought in later in Mā, on the  

occasion of the ārtha to Devakī, in the description of the  

Jayānāt (= J) here also however at the pājā, and introd- 

duced with the following words: tāthāvān samārjanaṁ  

nādiyāṁ pāyājanāṁ sarvārāyanāṁ yāsodāyāṁ  

Devakīṁ pāyā- 

yet śīrśa maṅtrāḥ v. 114b is wanting in Mā, 114a  

and 115a are blended there into one verse:  

yādiyā śastraṇāyāṁ(?) uṣkhyāyāṁ pathyāyāṁ kāmāyāṁ  

rājyaḥ(?) Gauṅḍāyāṁ śauṇdāyāṁ(?) Yāsodāyāṁ sarvaśāstraṇāyāṁ(?)  

Janakīyān, Uṣkhyāyān(?) putrāyāyāṁ(?) revatīyān bhaktyāyān  

nādiyāyāṁ mahākāyāyāṁ  

"Some wish here still another rite": with  

these words O C Sa introduce the statement  

about a gift of honour (arjka, argha, arghyam)  

to be addressed to the moon at its rising.  

It is to be preceded by a similar one to Kṛṣṇa  

himself, in which he is first invoked by  

forty of the names of Viṣṇu, whereupon  

amid reciting of prayers prepared in a  

peculiarly solemn form, water for bathing, gifts  

of honour, sandalwood, incense, and a couch  

are offered to him. The prayer to the moon  

invokes it to accept the ārthaka-gifts in company  

with rohini, and by this is meant here not Bāla- 

rāma's mother, but that star, the favourite  

station of the moon, Aldebaran, whose  

coinciding with the date of the festival itself  

gives to the latter, as we have already seen, the  

Jayanti-form.  

After this Kṛṣṇa himself, rohini and  

the moon, Kṛṣṇa's two pairs of parents,  

and his brother Vaiśānava—that is, probably,  

images of all them,—are to be put up on a  

place prepared and suitable for offerings  

(see above, p. 174), and to be worshipped.  

What is put down here as only the opinion  

of some is, according to M (f. 83b: atra Ja- 

yanāyāṁ chandārāgāhyasyāṁ esābhukṭārtavāyate)  

necessary; and the rest of the texts also, as  

far as they mention all this gift to honour  

the moon (Ca. 8b. Vi. 1. Vii. 2, Ud. J have  

nothing regarding it), bring it in as an integral  

part of the celebration. They differ, however,  

from O C Sa, first of all in this, that as far as  

they at all recognize the birth-ritual (see imme-
diately; D. Ca. Sc. Vi 1. Vi 2. J. Kd. leave it quite out of view) they make it precede this celebration addressed to the moon (Ms. Ud. take up a peculiar position in regard to this); and also distribute somewhat differently the prayers given by O C Sa, giving them not here, but at an earlier stage (see p. 292), and introduce other prayers instead of them.

According to D. a coconut in a shell is first of all to be offered as argha-gift to Kṛṣhṇa in company with Devaki, with the following prayer:

Hail to thee, O son of Devaki, who givest desired fruits.

Thou wast born for Kañsa's death, for the lightening of the earth's burden,

For the destruction of the Kauravas, for the annihilation also of the Daityas,

And for the good (welfare) of the Pāṇḍavas, for the re-establishing of the right,

For the destruction of the Daṇḍavas, thou scion of Vasudeva's stem!

Take, Hari, thou with Devaki, the gift offered thee by me.

After this, water is poured into the shell, they put flowers, roasted barley, and sandalwood into it, kneel down on the earth, and offer this as argha to the moon. Also according to B. (quite briefly) the argha-gift to Kṛṣhṇa precedes that to the moon. According to R N K Ms. Kd. however, the argha-gift (water in the shell, &c.) to the moon is offered first. Moreover K. makes a similar one to Devaki alone to come after this, with the prayer (see p. 291), "Even as thou attainest highest happiness..."; and her worship is repeated at each watch through the night. According to Ms. the argha-gift to the moon, which is to be solemnized outside, is to be followed directly by a birth-celebration, (see immediately below) inside (that is, in the house), after that an argha-gift to Kṛṣhṇa with the prayers, "Thou wast born for Kañsa's death...", then offerings of perfumes and such-like to Devaki with the same prayer as K., and then new prayers to Kṛṣhṇa con-

clude, "A thousand incarnations indeed..." (see p. 291, D. 116ff). In Kd. after the argha-gift to the moon a similar one follows to Kṛṣhṇa with the prayers, "Thou wast born..." (as above), and thereafter an ardent prayer to him for deliverance from sin and need. Lastly, RN do not make any more such gifts follow the argha-gift to the moon, but only prayers to Kṛṣhṇa—in the first place, namely, those prayers with the forty names of Viṣṇu (along with a finale specially belonging to it), and then the same beautiful prayer, as Kd. It runs thus:

Save me, Lord of all the worlds! Hari!

(from) out of the saunāra-sea!

Snatch me away, blotter-out of all guilt, from the flood of pain and grief, O Lord!||

Lord of all worlds! save me, who fell into the stream of life,||

O son of Devaki! Lord of salvation! Hari! out of the saunāra-sea!||

Snatch me away, blotting out all pain, from the flood of sickness and trouble, Hari!||

Thou Viṣṇu, helpest the miserable if they think only of thee.||

I, God, am very miserable. Save me out of the sea of trouble!||

Lotus-eyed one! I am sunk in the sea of delusion and folly.||

Save me, God, Lord of gods! Besides thee there is indeed no protector!||

As child, as young man, or as old man, what good (deed) I may have done, bring it to perfection now||

Bolt out my faults, Halāyudha!||

The texts belonging to this are as follows first in O. C.* 83.

vidhyanataram† apichanti krodhita citra devijottamah|| 43 ||

chandrodaysa hāṣṭakṣiṣṭya arghavan dasyuddha dharī|| smaranav̄|| anaghaṁ|| vedaśramas kaurīn** saṁkṣiṣṭham|| purnabhottamah|| 44 ||

vāsudevav̄ kṛṣhṇekṣiṣṭam mādharacandravanavit ākṣam|| pujārīdāsīlākṣī śrīśrīśāśvāsākṣiṣṭham|| dámanah|| 45 ||

dāmodarav̄ padmanābhav̄ kṛṣhṇam gamanaḥ kevala|| jānañ̄|| 84||

† This verse is, according to R. from the Sivahāṣya; M. has a similar one from the Viṣṇudharmottara (see above, p. 160).
* Where, however, 448-53 are wanting; they are found again in Ca. 407-51, with important variant readings. In D are also found further 438-473, 52; in R. (sp. 28, 29) 449, 52. N. 52 in Ms. K Bh.||
† vṛdhīnāntarañ 83.

I So C tāmāmah O 81, *tāma O 2, atreya śrīyavaḥ Sā.||
§ Sa C O Sa R, smeared O.||
†† anagham O 2, anakhyān O 1, anatanāt Sa 1.
** kaurīn.
††† viḍākha O Sa D; this hemistich is wanting in Ca.
††† V. 46 is wanting in 83.
§§ teñdīyati, D.
dallyad arghan chandramas' rohitashahtyda cha || 97 ||

D. begins in 1196-123, by prayers to accompany offerings of incense, lamps, and meats, in the way stated in O; then as follows:

vrdhkin pandu 'O 45, 46) || 124 || govindam achya' (O 465, 475) || 125 || namasy etdvi samshtraya bhaktibhaktaamritdayalj || evam sampratdy pravindam patro (durarmagam sthita) || 125 || (The verses 127-134 now following stand in Sc. as 37-42):

tatas tu dapyrus arghan' indor udastayet eukhi' [Krishnaya pratamanai daydally Devakaloshtyda cha || 127 ||

nalkhapaalena, dallyad evani vichakshanan || Krishnaya parayit bhaktitya saktihavan || 128 ||
namasy te Devakipatra vishchhirtharpanayopadra || jtdhah Krsnakirtitya bhaktihrottarya cha || 129 ||

Kawardanah vinaiday-dalidahnya vini handayya cha [Padyanadadhatrya hirtardha dharmaasvasthoptyudnya cha] || 130 ||
dnawrindun vinaiddaya Vanvadkalodbhava || gri'hata rgyhay amatata Devakya sabto hare || 131 ||

§§ namo is waring.
* arghah O.
* visvarunah O,
† From visvarapate to dharmaasvasthoptyudnya is wanting in O. 1.
† parynta O.
§ Arryagha, Sc. 6. K. Sc. 3. Pr. Kd.
* 'rgyayha, Sc. 6. B. N. K. Bh. Sc.
* In Sc. as well as in Sc. R. N. K. Bh. Kd. there follows first another sentence (quoted also in Ma): yotshinpatanam tatas tasa 'rnyas 'rnyaspataya 'rnyaspataya abhrayam R. N. yotshinpan pataya namah (namas te yotshinpan mate K. Bh. Sc. Kd.)
† na ntharmalika arghayam nan 'rgagyama, Ma. yatrihridayam (sadhdhyena 'stam ato R. N. grihah rgyhay namo 'stom ato Sc.) || 58 ||
† khyrpayed O.
† cachandranah O, kalatrihnam Sc.
* rohrishyaka, Sc.
* Nandhan chharni Yadvakitya, Sc.
* This hemistich stands in Sc. thus: Valademay sardham bhadraya parayita (bhaktitya paramayla Sc. 1) utapa sampyuta vidhuvah dehikin 'napo 'nityakrihna 'atirikatakham || 60 ||
* ekkdnah vinaiddaya kotyo yata (alogu 1) prakritiritah ||
* tadbh krsnabhedham tulya tato 'nanchaturdada || 61 ||
* (This verse is evidently a gloss).
* arghayha, Sc.
† nardakrashna (tama, Sc. 3) buddhena, Sc.
* arghayha, Sc.
† saakhe krihit, Sc.
** sc. wants this hemistich.
†† vv. 1298-131 (with variations) also in Bhd. Ms. Kd. (twice f. 206 and f. 21a; v. 1298, 1308, 1319, in J. also.
* The two hemistichs of this verse are transposed in Bhd. Kd. (f. 206) the first hemistich is wanting in M.
†† Pashchimam hityda ca, Kd. f. 206.
* This hemistich is wanting in Sc. Bhd. Ms. Kd. (both times).
* naktltya namam, Ms. — Sc. adds: Krsnakirtityaankramatri || and Bhd.: titi srtrishchhaya dadytay, 'ntarlo Bhavishyachandranamalunum (see p. 295) kshroda, 'agyoma.

The readings in 49-51 differ so considerably in Sc. that I give up communicating them. Other variations also in D. 1190-1204. In Pr. (p. 29) in N (where vv. are 'towards the end of the stotrudnya, prayers Pr., crv. 17-21, with special reference, moreover, to the Gaurdiana, and in Kd. In all these texts (D 6 R. K. Kd.) these storm verses are not introduced here, but earlier, as belonging to Krishna's dayd.
K. tato (i.e. nandode karaçam) mantrenu vo da-dóde dhemádray 'rygwiyan samddáke | swákke tomean (D. 138), khároddráwá (O. 53), jyotSandapé (Sá 58), yáthako patawan (M. 162-166) see above, p. 290) tét Devakó-arayh | teta pushpámnahá daitò ydine-gíma prámhópapéyot

Ms. chandrodéy ovihi samdáyew (T.) padoporni pushpákhadamámk delotepetena swákhend 'rygwiyan dadyót | teta mantra, jyotSandapé (Sá 58) teto nára dapéy jotákhuyfáava árt-Krisávarjíma paráddhaya, tamadáwhi wálikam ity dái jamaálokkón (see Bhágavutá Par. X. 3, 9ff.) phatháván árt-Krisávarjíma 'rygwiyan dadyót | teta mantra

jádeh Kánhé (D. 126 130-131) sahitó monetí ato jogéyvárdíya Devakóiámdíya cha (there is probably a blank here) pújítú tó mayá bhákhyay próddalán(D. 162-168, see above, p. 295) ná daráy iti d(i) mantrenu Devakoyun gandhádó samarpáy, avatára (D. 162-168, where Ms. breaks off in the middle of the verse) |

Thus, it may be explained how O O Sa do

verse which occurs besides only in N as one of those Saiva outbursts which are found in B. and elsewhere (see above, pp. 267, 285; below p. 288).

* see also avadánya Ká-M. quotes the first hemistich from the Vísñúdharmottara, see above, p. 163.

† To this belongs also (see K. iii, f. 9a) ártá-vadhá to the manes, and to this probably the passage of the Brahmáváswarta quoted by B. p. 36 (above, p. 167a.) refers.

† This adjectival referring to Swáva, characterizes the
not mention anything about this; for them this watching through the night, with its accompaniment of dancing and singing, is probably just an integral part of the birth-ritual; still their complete silence regarding this point is somewhat surprising, inasmuch as there are added here some special peculiarities (see immediately below). The more especially all this is treated of in the other texts. In the first place M. himself (see f. 80b, p. 168 above) mentions the jāgaranam as an integral part of the celebration; he also brings in a special passage regarding it (see p. 164) from the Nārādīyasahāsīta: uposha jāmañchniḥ kuruṣa jāgaranam yaḥ. — R too, quotes similar passages from the Gṛhastha- and Brahmanavarta-Purāṇas (see p. 167 above), as well as from an unnamed work of the same kind (see p. 293 below) according to which Viṣṇudeva is now seven to be praised with all sorts of songs of praise, and then the night to be further spent in singing, music and dancing. N says shortly the listening to old legends, &c. as belonging to it. Thus also Śa, in bringing into prominence the festive character of the whole celebration. B appoints that, in particular, legends of Krīṣṇa's nativity shall be listened to, and shell-music accompany the dancing; also now at midnight rich presents, among others, a cow with her calf, are to be given. The remaining texts leave the birth-ritual quite out of view, but they dwell the more specially on the festive watching through the night. Only Viṣṇudeva have nothing at all about it. Ms. likewise; but this probably only because the manuscript lying before us breaks off in the middle; if we are allowed to supply the omission from J—and this appears quite allowable. The jāgaranam takes place also according to Ms., and it does so with listening to the description “of the games of young Krīṣṇa.” Hereby probably the Bhāgavata-Purāṇa is specially to be thought of, as Ms. indeed desires, also in the immediately preceding phase of the festival (see p. 296 above), that walking within (in the house) amid shouts of victory and sound of bells, one “should imagine to himself mentally Krīṣṇa’s birth while reciting of the following verses referring to it:—” sam adhikhanam bālekaṃ. Now these verses are described in U. as borrowed directly from the Bhāgavata, where in fact they are really found (X, 3, 9-13); according to U., they are to be recited at the very moment at which the birth of Krīṣṇa is fixed; and the watch through the night is to be spent in reciting hymns against the Rādīshāsas, &c.— D too denotes the reciting of legends about Krīṣṇa’s life, as they are found in the Bhāgavata and in the Harivamśa, as forming an integral part of the festive watching through the night, and extols with full tones the merit of such recitals for readers and hearers. To singing, music, and dancing, which, along with the listening to legends, also Śa. Viṣṇudeva bring into special prominence, are to be added according to D also other amusements, incense, lamps, selected meats, &c.— In Kā, first a passage from the Agnipurāṇa is produced, which adds other pretty tales (“in the local dialects,” Kā, explains), as well as spectacles in general (“dancing and such-like” explains Kā.) to the Purāṇa legends, singing, and music as the enjoyments of the night. After listening to the legends of the nativity and childhood, those who take part in the festival shall pour milk on each other, and sprinkle each other with it, for which pastime a passage from the Bhāgavata (which I cannot verify) is quoted. In this form the festival is said to bear now in the Marāṭhā country the name of Gopālicoḷa (?”). 

The texts belonging to this are as follows, first of all in O C Śa. (also in R p. 26. K.)—

ordardtre vasordhrāṇa kuruḍā vai iatra sarṣaṇa ti
|| 54 ||

the Bhāgavata places it before the Dvāryaṇana and the Bhūrata (the Krīṣṇa-adīśālā is, however, brought forward there along with these three works as a separate text). The passage runs thus: dvārāpyan samāpya, sarvāhāpya dvāraṇāya evam prāyopavitaśa sāvakamkānām stotāṇā jāptā, śrīBhāgavata-Dvāryaṇana-Bhūrata-bālāśā Labhaśā Labhaśā śabde prāśaso bhāsaḥ pravṛtti bahyaśā kṛṣṇyaḥ śat evam prāśaṇya bhāṣaḥ. viṣṇuḥ, net tu (ta te tu M.) nivṛkṣya upeśaḥ ve evam rājām uttāmāḥ prabhūte kośaṅkī (?) gāyeḥ |

† Pāṇinīyo gṛdhaśāpāṇī ca. R. K., pāṇinīyo dvāraśāpāṇī 3a. |
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mo 'spiran,' mudda dvijekho 'yutam diputo garbha.' 11 ||
ahannem aatand avadharya puroshikam, pune nedanai @
kritidhi kritidali @ sarvoksha Bhrata sakti
gyanam virocchanta gataabhi prabhaatavi || 19 ||
Vaidigyaundena: uvayati: abhijon ecommerce par
dukha prakrisht parah: kavalambandhaindamavarapak
soravamuddhidik || 13 ||
indai visayeun in prakshadih ... brhaminabhaja
nena tyogad� brhaminah yajamana, terpac
kalyahe ... || jyagaranai raudra, saktam pathtude
rikshaghnena, nandakshata ||

D. tatotu parito visheoh niidin tadi yutana
nayet || 135 ||

gita-cha visvihayr vayayr niyarah nabavahār
api || dhopair dapha || ca naeayaya tamabāla ca
muhur muhah || 135 ||

charitani Devakantara vichatuahita vichakahitai ||
anevala jyagaranai krutē ādītrapatidhūbar nahe
|| 145 ||

Śc. uttahum sampārtya deesahān raudra jyagaranam
charet || gita-rityuddhin caivam puruṣāravānlī
dhibhi || 44 ||

Vī. ēnu pājō cha kartavyād raudra jyagaranam

tathā || 41 ||
gitaādītrastamayant puruṣāpahana ca ||

Kā (., kalyaheu- || see p. 296 || alha pudana-

rakhrityam Agniparāye:

tam aapyaived tu purushakṣhata (?) saivah

ahara || uvatī vādītrastasya gita-adītrastamaya

pāla ||

vākhedhī bhīr vikhrādābhih tathā pṛekshanakāri apī

pūrvekādāh paroṣaṇāh kṣipet tāvāvarūṣa

au-ma ||

atra kathāma vaikṛtyayam dēṣādābhaśāktyāyākṛitam

uukkēnā prāg-sātukaḥ, puruṣākrodhānam ante bhī-

aḥkārtam, pṛekshanakārya vikṛtyādhi || tathā ca vaish-

ākāravāksaśaśaktyāyākṛitam ca vikṛtyādhyāmāyā

vādītrastasamāvato bhāyāyatināmukkhaṇa

nako jyagaro vādītrastavataraṣṭr atri vidvitye,

uukēnā prāg etādītrastāyāryaḥ, vidvitya uddvad

vākānacaitraśaḥ tātādāśśaśaśāṅgītyāyāvato

vaśrūṣaḥ irāvībhītaḥ kṣipet tāvāvarūṣa

au-ma ||

vaikalāsah eva vaśrūṣaḥ irāvībhītaḥ kṣipet tāvāva-

varuṣa

au-ma ||

vaikalāsah eva vaśrūṣa

au-ma ||

vaikalāsah eva vaśrūṣa

au-ma ||

vaikalāsah eva vaśrūṣa

au-ma ||

vaikalāsah eva vaśrūṣa

au-ma ||

vaikalāsah eva vaśrūṣa

au-ma ||

vaikalāsah eva vaśrūṣa

au-ma ||

vaikalāsah eva vaśrūṣa

au-ma ||

vaikalāsah eva vaśrūṣa

au-ma ||

vaikalāsah eva vaśrūṣa

au-ma ||

vaikalāsah eva vaśrūṣa

au-ma ||

vaikalāsah eva vaśrūṣa

au-ma ||

vaikalāsah eva vaśrūṣa

au-ma ||

vaikalāsah eva vaśrūṣa

au-ma ||

vaikalāsah eva vaśrūṣa

au-ma ||

vaikalāsah eva vaśrūṣa

au-ma ||

vaikalāsah eva vaśrūṣa
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morning-ritual is to be accomplished; thereupon
the god, in company with Devaki, is to be
worshipped once more, quite as before, and then,
"all this" (obviously all that had been made use
of at the festival, the images included) is to be
given to a Brahmana who is an inmate of the
house; after this only the other Brahmanas
too—are to be fed, and to have presents given
to them, and then may he, the giver of the feast,
himself eat too. N (C. Vr.) does not in this case
make any special mention at all of Devaki,
but apponts quite generally that "the worship"—or
if we prefer C. Vr.'s way of reading, specially
only "the worship of the god," that is of
Krishna, shall take place "as before." K.
makes the bhogavani (by which obviously
Krishna is meant) be worshipped first of all
in the regular way, and after that, by a
misunderstanding, as we saw already, (see p.
167) makes a festival to Durga follow!—Sc.
has nothing about a festival to Devaki;
but gives several specialities regarding the
worship of the 'Lord of the Universe,' with
various distributions and prayers, among them
a hundred and eight distributions of chhe, along
with reciting of the purushaasuta. Quite like
this, only more in detail, Vi 2. J. K. Kd. leave
the worship of Krishna or of Devaki
quite out of view, only making mention of the
feasting and giving presents to the Brahmanas;
but K. Kd. also say on this occasion
that the festival could be celebrated for a whole
year every month during the second quarter,
for which arrangement K. refers to two pas-
sages of the Vaishnavasana, which he cites (see
above, p. 169) from the Madanaratna. Lastly,
B. Vi 1. Ud. have nothing at all about what has
to be done on the morning after the festival.
The texts belonging to this are as follows, first
of all in O O Sa. §

yatho mama tatho khiro bhogavatih maha bhrasvakam
| bhramana dhuyajuvahatra
tva samaya lel酥karyasvat

1. O 69, Bhagavati in O 54, what R. erroneously
underscores as Durga; see above, p. 167 (239, 296).
² v. 55-61, 65, also in R. S., 56, 57 in M (51a), 59.
3. in N. 56, 58, 59 in D, 69 in K.
5. tatho, O 52.
6. brhamanam, O 2.
datteo pāravai kītēo vratāthi samspayet | sarvāya sarveśvarāyā sarvapatey (sarveśham patey navāh
Vṛ-) sarveśvarāhāryā gosaniyā nama nama tī pāravānāhī (Ś. nityād N, nāvāh Vṛ.) bhūtāyā bhūtā
patey (Ś. Vṛ., bhūtāpatay N) iti-ācāri samyogā eho (vanting in Ś. Vṛ.) suhārā (bhūtāpatay nama iti
nasmākā iti pījāśeśa Vṛ-) atyagampana amuk-
tatōdō ṣatādyā uṣคำ is wanting in Ś. Vṛ. which con-
tain rather a piece described in Śc. Śv. 3 directly
as an atyagampana | K. pabhōte brāhmāṇā sākaly bhوجeyat bhaktimā
naraḥ | oih nama Vau (O. 59) ||
D. tatāḥ pabhōtāsamaye bhūtām evame kriye |
kītāvai puruṣāntakānā karmā prayātaḥ śrāddhyā
mītōḥ (146) ||
purvavat pājeyet devās Devakālaśam muud | yavā
devaiś (O. 58. 59) iti devāsvisajeyat ||
kumābra brāhmāṇe dājeyat sarvam eva ta || 73 ||
brāhmāṇe bhujayat pācāth te bhēya dadaya eha
dhakṣiśayām | tatas tv svaṃ yātāyōy Jayantāssa-
puṣkāh | 150 ||
Śv. svaṃbhāte pārayā śuarjyā dvajā (Śv. 2) |
samśiṣyā jyotāthate |
Śc. pratyākhe evamā svātō pājeyet jāgad-
gurum | pāy簸ma tūḍiṣayā cha māṇuṃṭrayā bhaṭ-
tah || 45 ||
śhakṣṭaḥścierāni bhūto tataḥ purashāṣeśtātoḥ | kītāvai
vaiḥ vishnuḥ iti prākṣet (proke? for prokeya) jūhudd
vai gūṭhāḥ | 46 ||
maṇeśhāya samśiṣyā iva pārādhyatma atah param |
dehāyam pājeyati bhājtyā bhājuśeśhājuśeśdājuś-
dībh | 47 ||
gak ekōm kapālaśi dājāyā. . . . | kapālāya abva
| tū mūr asyāṣi pājeyate | 50 ||
tataḥ dājāyā cha viciśpyō yugāyō yācāyā |
sekāhā bhājuśeśhājuśeśdhājuśeśdihājuśeś |
maṇeśhāya samśiṣyā iva pārādhyatma atah param |
dehāyam pājeyati bhājtyā bhājuśeśhājuśeśdājuś-
dībh | 47 ||
| gak ekōm kapālaśi dājāyā. . . . | kapālāya abva
| tū mūr asyāṣi pājeyate | 50 ||
tataḥ dājāyā cha viciśpyō yugāyō yācāyā |
sekāhā bhājuśeśhājuśeśdhājuśeśdihājuśeś |
maṇeśhāya samśiṣyā iva pārādhyatma atah param |
dehāyam pājeyati bhājtyā bhājuśeśhājuśeśdājuś-
dībh | 47 ||
Vi 2 tātāḥ pabhōtāṣayāte svātādāhā bhājthi |
pāvavat pājeyat devam paścād dhāmaṃ samuchāarat || 43 ||
sūgriyakatādākāṃna pratisheśāpyā nāvās tā-
aḥ | atiṣṭavyah samāddhi acha vyayā cha chaurāvah
tatād | 44 ||
| atiṣṭavyah samāddhis tādā acāryāsah saha bhuja-
bhik || . . .

* bhājmassi, O. R. S. Vṛ. ||
† nama tiśe Vṛ., svabhalmarē R. sk., oih nama K. ||
† Vāsudevanā 0 2. D. ||
§ hum C, madī sh K., tiśa demā D. ||
* atēkā pratiśāmanuṃ adīmājā (śtārtī dātō Vṛ.) ||
* yehāṃ devai (O. 59) ||
† Vāsā (O. 59) ||
§ atō yehāṃ utkṛṣṭatāmyā devam ||
dadātē oke Vṛ., pūrashāhā, C. ||
* budhyāva, O. R S K., cha nāyō O, vidyānāma ša.||
* sā krātto šv 1., madukto K., madhikatē šv.

** sā khītē oke Vṛ., sā prāta bhogāvān K. ||
† cha matira bhōya C. ||
† sfatā na nāla pāj bhogāvā purīṣa, ša. ||
† sā khītē in śv 61. and v. 63 (there 69 and 74) four verses are inserted, the Al. (see above, p. 166) quoted as from the Bhāvakhā. ||
† v. 64-65 have their places supplied in šv. by two other verses, the former of which is quoted by Al. ||
** Ṡ. Thū O. Č., Devalkārāvān, C. ||
†† Thū O. Č., Devalkārāvān, C. ||
† Thū O. Č., Daśāsamāvā, Nār., cha nāla kālā-
ha D. 192.
CORRESPONDENCE AND MISCELLANEA.

PROF. WEBER ON THE MAHABHĀSHYA.

To the Editor of the Indian Antiquary.

I have read with intense interest Professor Kielhorn's article on the Mahābhāṣya in vol. V. pp. 241 et seq. But, with all respect for the scholarship which we are wont to find in Professor Kielhorn's writings, I am sorry to say that I felt rather disappointed with the result of my perusal of this deduction of his. For instead of giving us positive proofs for his decided opinion that "we are bound to regard the text of the Mahābhāṣya as given by our MSS. to be the same as it existed about two thousand years ago," he has not even tried to do so, but proceeds merely in a negative way, and his exertions only tend to show (1) that the statements in the Vṛddhārya and the Bṛhatārya are not to be interpreted in such a way as to impeach the authenticity of that text; (2) that the external evidence brought forward against it is not sufficient to impeach it. Now, even if he had succeeded thus far (as in my opinion he has not), what would be won for the position he himself maintains? Two thousand years is rather a long time, and to warrant for such a period the sameness of a Sanskrit text which has meanwhile had to undergo so many ordinary vicissitudes, if it were only the constant change of the copies, and of the characters in which they were written, is really a piece of some boldness and audacity. But in this instance we know also of some extraordinary vicissitudes. For, whatever interpretation Professor Kielhorn may give to the statements of Hari (or as he is also called Bṛhatrāhari) and Kalhaṇa,—whether he refers the vyākaranadgama of the former not to the text of the Bhāṣya, but only to the traditional knowledge of its meaning, or whether he explains his vyākaraṇa by 'perverted' instead of 'devastated,' and Kalhaṇa's vyākaraṇadgama by 'interpreter' in-

[For § 3 see Ind. Ant. vol. III. pp. 21 ff. 47 ff.]
this subject, in my opinion Professor Kiellhorn on his part goes very much too far in the opposite direction. Nor do I think that his very ingenious interpretation of vichinama by vichinnamampraddayam (!) and Punyvaraja’s explanation of vipridwita by dhdhstrka, ‘perverted,’ are really acceptable, or that vydkaradgama is restricted to the meaning of ‘interpreter.’ But I shall not enter here more particularly into these details, for, as I have remarked already, even under the direct adoption of these and all the other explanations, partly offered already by Professor Stenzler, the aspect of the whole case is not materially altered. A book of which even Hindu tradition affirms that it had been vipridwita—let us say ‘perverted’—by its adversaries, that its traditional interpretation had been bhrskta, ‘lost’ to the pupils of its author, that it had ceased for some time to be handed down orally, and remained only in written form in the Dhkha, a book which, moreover, had to be introduced twice into Kaśmir on account of its having become vichinnam after its first introduction, dating about six or eight centuries earlier than the second one (which of course must have been made from a country where it had been kept meanwhile: avichinnam)—such a book has, in my opinion, no claims whatever to our regarding its text as ‘unchanged and the very same during two thousand years.’

Nor do I think that Professor Kiellhorn has been more successful in his polemic against the internal evidence brought forward broadly by Dr. Burnell, and before him, but more diligently, by myself, as to the (so to speak) conglomerate character of the Bhdsya. It is a pity that he had not been able, at the time he wrote, to weigh also the arguments of a third scholar going nearly in the same line with us, viz. of Bdhlingk, who in the second of his two papers on this subject (Journ. Germ. Or. Soc. vol. XXIX. pp. 185 ff. 483 ff.) at the following conclusion (p. 490)—’The form of the dialogue brings us again close to the supposition that the redaction of the Mahdsahsa does not come at all from Panatjali himself (gar nicht von Panatjali selber herrfth).’

The question as to the different component parts of the Bhdsya is indeed a very intricate one. Professor Kiellhorn has devoted to it great care and study, and his opinions are entitled to all consideration and respect, but I may be allowed to state here my impression that he appears to me rather too much inclined in favour of the entire oneness of the work, and, in order to put your readers into a position to judge more freely on the merits of the case, I beg to subjoin a translation of what I have said on this part of the question in my paper on the Bhdsya in vol. XIII of the Ind. Stud. pp. 314-330. But before I proceed to do so I have to examine some statements made by Professor Kiellhorn, in the course of his deduction, which require some rectification.

(1) Professor Kiellhorn accuses me of ‘two slight inaccuracies’ in my remarks concerning the history of the Bhdsya, in so far as, firstly, I had spoken repeatedly of three different occasions on which it had received the epithets vipridwita, bhraṣṭha, and vichinnam, whereas in reality there were but two; and, secondly, the epithet bhraṣṭha had been applied in the Vakyapadiya not to the text of the Bhdsya, as maintained by me, but to the vydkaradgama—the traditional knowledge of grammar. I do not think that the word ‘inaccuracies’ has been well chosen by Professor Kiellhorn in this instance, as it would be correct only under the condition that I interpreted the passage in the Vakyapadiya in the same way as he does. But the fact is that our interpretations differ, and what he calls ‘inaccuracies’ is simply to be laid to the account of this difference. Of course he is fully entitled to criticize and rectify my interpretation, but not to charge me with ‘inaccuracy’ for drawing conclusions in harmony with my conception of the sense of the passage. Now in my translation of it the word vydkaradgama is given by ‘Grammatik-Text’ as referring to Panatjali’s work itself, and I have also explained in context this my translation of ḍγama by ‘text, doctrinal system (Lehrsystem), doctrine (Lehre),’ as in opposition to that given by Professor Goldsttick, who takes it as ‘document or manuscript of the Mahdsahsa’; see Ind. Stud. vol. V. pp. 162-165. Moreover, the word pratikvntuka, purposely omitted by Professor Kiellhorn on account of its reading and meaning being as yet uncertain, is not left out by me, as the dots in Professor Kiellhorn’s quotation on p. 244 would seem to imply, but is translated (in harmony with Punyvaraja) by ‘adversary’ (widerracher). In consequence of both these differences in my translation of the two verses in question, the words vipridwita and bhraṣṭha in them, though relating to the same work, still do not relate to one fact, but to two—firstly, to its devastation (‘destruction, destroyed’),—serftr, as Professor Kiellhorn has, is rather too strong: ‘verwistet’ (my expression) by the adversaries of its author; secondly, to its having been lost to his pupils, very probably indeed on account of these assimilations. If we now add to these two facts the statement of Kalhana about the vichinnatva of the Bhdsya in Kaśmir in Jñypt’s time, I think I was right when I spoke of ‘three different occasions....’ But I am at present quite willing to reconsider my translation itself; and I concede,
before all, that Professor Kielhorn’s explanation of Syakarandya as not relating to the very text of the Dhadya, but only to its traditional interpretation, deserves as full attention as the one given by myself.

(2) Professor Kielhorn states (p. 246) that the views of Dr. Burnell on the Dhadya have been somewhat misrepresented by myself in my review of his work. Now here the simple fact is that in my short quotation from Dr. Burnell’s essay the final s of the word works has been dropped, it may be by a clerical blunder, or perhaps (!) only by a misprint overlooked by me in my revision of the proofs. What I there say on this subject is (see Jenaer Literatur Zeitung, 1876, p. 265). “In Burnell’s opinion this work is indeed rather a skilful compilation of the views of Pāṇini’s critics, and of their refutation by Patañjali, than the real text of the original work,” not works, as Dr. Burnell has. It was not my intention to enter there more fully on his particular views on the subject, and I hope he himself will acquit me of having really misrepresented them by that unlucky oversight with regard to the end of the last word in the sentence.—On the other hand, I cannot acknowledge it as a quite correct representation of my views on the Dhadya when Professor Kielhorn says, “According to Professor Weber, some such work as the Mahādhadya which we possess was actually composed by Patañjali.” For, as your readers will see below (and I beg to refer them also to the earlier statements of my views contained in vol. II. of the Ind. Ant. pp. 64, 299), my opinions as to this very point are not yet settled in quite distinct form, for there are to be weighed and put aside before such a decision several items which speak rather forcibly for a composition of the work rather by the school of Patañjali than by Patañjali himself.

(3) With regard to my statement that the South-Indian MSS. of the text, according to Burnell’s testimony (see preface to the Vaiṣṇavab. p. xxiii. note), appear to differ considerably, Professor Kielhorn remarks (p. 43) that all he finds Dr. Burnell to have stated regarding such differences is this, that in the introductory dhūnika “the South-Indian MSS. omit the quotation from the Atharvaveda; whereas in one of his later works Dr. Burnell too states that the Northern and Southern MSS. of the Brāhmaṇa “for to no great extent, though various readings occur”; and Professor Kielhorn himself, moreover, can add, from his own perusal of such MSS., that he has “not been able to discover any traces of the existence of several recensions of the work.” Of course, both these latter (and later) testimonies are of great value; but on the other hand I think I was fully justified at that time in my supposition, as given above: for the omission in the South-Indian MSS. of the quotation from the Atharvaveda in the introductory dhūnika is indeed a matter of some importance. The Atharvaveda is quoted twice (fol. 3b and fol. 10a), and both times in a very peculiar position, viz. at the head of the four Vedas and as their chief representatives: see Ind. Stud. vol. XIII. p. 431. If such passages are omitted in one group of MSS., I think we have a right to say that the MSS. appear to differ considerably. (It would be interesting to know how the matter really stands in this case.)

(4) Professor Kielhorn is very desirous (p. 43) to excutiate Nāgāsa from having made a wrong statement as to the meaning of the word dekhrya in the Dhadya. And after having examined for himself the remark in question, he found indeed that it is admitted of a very different interpretation: for according to him the sentence नागेसा अरालियुंदेव नागासां तपस्विनां इन्द्रायनवर्गम् नागात्येव रक्षितम् would relate only to that particular passage of the Dhadya to which Nāgāsa has attached it, and which begins नेवियुंदेव इन्द्रायनवर्गम्, and it would imply that in this passage alone dekhrya denotes exceptionally the author of the Dhadya himself, and not those whom it denotes generally (Pāṇini or Kātyāyana). But I am afraid such an interpretation cannot well be grafted on the words as they stand above: for, in order to convey that meaning, which Professor Kielhorn intimates them to convey, they ought to be नागेसा अरालियुंदेव नागासां तपस्विनां इन्द्रायनवर्गम् नागात्येव रक्षितम्: but there is no atrai ’na, or even only abra, in the text, and the eca stands distinctly after रक्षितम्, so that the sentence cannot well, according to common usage, be translated otherwise than by in the Dhadya by the word dekhrya is meant only the author of the Dhadya, the teacher of the Brāhmaṇa (compare Ballantyne’s translation, p. 35). Moreover, the very addition of this otherwise somewhat superfluous epithet नागात्येव रक्षितम् appears to imply that Nāgāsa wished to give a general and formal rule; it contains at the same time his own explanation for the fact he states—because Patañjali is the teacher of the Atra, therefore is he called in it by the title dekhrya, नागेसा. Finally also the phrase अरालियुंदेव नागासां तपस्विनां is not restricted to this particular passage, of which it forms a part, but is a solemn one, which recurs rather frequently in the course of the work: see below.

I proceed now to the promised translation —

“On account of all this, we must be content at present to lay the time of the composition of the Dhadya between the two limits;
Menandros-Pushyamitra on one side, Abhiranyu on the other,—or, in round numbers, between 140 B.C. and 60 A.D. The statements about Pushyamitra's sacrifices would lead us nearer to the first term, whereas those on the 'Yavana'—if Kanishka is to be understood—nearer to the second; or if, after all, a Greek prince is to be sought under the 'Yavana,' we are drawn of course quite near to the first term. But all this only under one condition, viz. that these statements are certainly not to be subjected to the possibility that they also represent examples found by Patanjali in previous works!! Even in this very indistinctness this result is still a very important one, if we consider the unhappy state of the chronology of Indian literature in general; and the other statements contained in the various examples thus acquire also a prominent value."

"It is true that here also the critic must still for the present raise his warning voice and ask, What guarantee have we that the work, as we now have it, is really still the same as that which, according to the Vidyapaditya, was reconstituted (wieder hergestellt) by the efforts of "Chandrachudya and others," after misfortunes of some duration by which it was vijplavita,—what happened, according to the Rajatarangini, just under king Abhiranyu (see Ind. Studien, vol. V, pp. 159-160)? And if the assumption is decidedly not to be denied that already at this reconstruction there may have crept into the work secondary additions, originally foreign to it, how is it further with regard to that second statement of the Rajatarangini, according to which in Jayakti's time, the end of the eighth century, the work was, in Kashmir, again vichiina, and was introduced there anew by skilled men, whom the king ordered to come from another country? Already, in treating of this question for the first time (Ind. Studien, vol. V, pp. 168-169), I have pointed out these difficulties, and called it "audacious to judge on the thorough authenticity of the present text of the Bhadhyya already at this time, when we have before us only so small a piece of it." But even now, though we have the whole work before us, I must abide by the same opinion, and I feel obliged to single out the possibility that one or the other statement, which in the sequel we will draw out of the context of the work, does not testify for Patanjali's time, nor for that of Abhiranyu, but merely for that of Jayakti. On the other hand, we are allowed at present to speak also of an impression founded on the totality of the work, and that is decidedly favourable to its originality. As Goldstücker has already stated it, and was the first to do so, the red thread going through the whole work is the polemic against the vārtīkakāra. Now one may ask indeed, Was this really so originally? or may not rather the fact that we have in it, after all, not so much a commentary on Pāṇini, as one to the vārtīkas of Kātyāyana, be simply the consequence of the work being preserved to us only partially, in such fragments as were still procurable in the eighth century, when it was vichiina again? Such a question could not, indeed, be negatived directly, still there is one point against it which appears of considerable importance. And this is just the special restriction of the work essentially to those niṣṭāras which had been assailed by Kātyāyana. Its deductions thus attain a unitary character, viz. that of selection. In case the present text was really only a text of fragments, collected in the eighth century, of a commentary on the whole work of Pāṇini, such a restriction would be very difficult to explain; we ought then to miss some books and chapters wholly, and have others complete, but we should not have something out of all of them, and moreover not those parts only which relate to the vārtīkas. Truly one may object here,—Well, how do we know that Kātyāyana did not write vārtīkas to the other rules of Pāṇini also? should he not rather have written such to all rules which gave anyhow occasion for it? and when there are preserved only those we have, should this not be simply explained by the Bhadhyya's having been preserved to us only in fragments? Now all this might really happen to be so; but the unitary character of the work would not suffer on account of that, as it would continue even then just in that special relation to Kātyāyana; and it is this very restriction, after all, that appears to testify for its composition by one author, and thus also for its authenticity and originality."

"Truly, it might even thus, in its present form, be "more the work of his pupils than of Patanjali himself." Though one of the arguments which I brought forward in this respect (Ind. Studien, vol. V, pp. 155, 163), viz. that in the body of the work "Patanjali is spoken of only in the third person, and his opinion is introduced several times by तु that is, by पदवी तथापयसि," no longer holds good. For on one hand we now find in it also many statements expressed in the first person, in the singular or the plural form, in the present or relating to the sequel in the future: thus for instance तत्त्वतः इव IV. 665; तत्त्ववैपायनम् III. 138; VIII. 78, वैपायनम् very often, for I. 844, 122a, 169b; III. 7a; IV. 20a; V. 30; VI. 4f. 11a; VIII. 25: सन्तुविवधम्; I. 113a; भवदिक्षम्; VII. 496."

* They would argue, after all, though not for Patanjali himself, still for the time of Abhiranyu.
of the work is not disparaged so far that it would not still serve us as a warrant for its authenticity as being in its essential context the work of one author,—with all reserve, of course; for any modifications of this assumption which may possibly still become necessary on the basis of a more special study of the work than I have yet been able to devote to it. With regard, for instance, to the rather numerous cases in which, in the gratuitous and self-commentary following a sentence, I quoted, before I refer to my remarks in Ind. Stud. vol. V. p. 169, there might indeed be included, before all, to seek secondary glosses of the school; here we may adduce, for instance, also the cases mentioned above, at p. 315 (viz. the glosses to bhadāyikā śāstras).

On the other hand, we must still, however, emphasize that, even from the mere formal view, the very many and style of proceeding in the Bhdāyikā, the connexion and annexation of all those manifold corrections, objections, explanations, versus (keśakād) memorialis, &c., appears as of one cast. And this principally on account of a merely external moment: viz. of the very frequent repetition throughout the whole of the work, as it were, fixed expressions as well as fixed examples, whether consisting of single words, or of short, or lengthy sentences. The first respect, for example, the way in which the bhadāyikā is mentioned (whether in a given case we have by him to understand Patañjali or Pāṇini) is characteristic. Thus, for instance, the phrase in the bhadāyikā, bhadāyikā śāstras... (see I. 149,7, II. 1316, 4016, III. 986, 975, IV. 786, V. 121, 130, 55, 57, or, as we read in the introduction. bhadāyikā śāstras... (I. 10a); further, the partly very frequent solemn phrases—

1 To my remarks on both names in this passage I add here that Mallinātha quotes in his scholi. of Kam. VII. 59 (see Stender's note in his edition) a passage from the Aṣa Amata of Gauḍa.

2 Rather odd in the mouth of the author, but quite in order, indeed, in the mouth of his school, is the fact that we find in several passages in the Bhdāyikā the work itself quoted by this very name, whether it refer to a passage in the foregoing ñaśāyana, or to one in the sequel, as for instance वेद काव्यो न्यायो भाषा III. 4. 675. 1068. (sārā-yātṛ-)

—see III. 1. 671, 401 et seq.).

3 Here it is that Nāgāra remarks that under अङ्कितम् in the Bhdāyikā is to be understood, and indeed here this explanation suits remarkably, for though इत्यदि अङ्कितम् might very well refer also to grammatical general, that is to Pāṇini, there still follow here after अङ्कितम् the words इत्यदि अङ्कितम्, which go back to the words in the beginning of the deduction (I. 10a).—Aṣa Amata Ch. 4: अङ्कितम् अङ्कितम् र आचार्य: आचार्य: आचार्य: आचार्य...

And similarly also with a great number of the other passages where this formula recurs.
and in the same sense we find used अयुग्मभान: VI. 3. 106f. 104f. The words सील and अयुग्मभान: ‘to be taught,’ and ‘not to be taught,’ (i.e. ‘superfluous’), are particular indeed, though derived more properly, as it seems, from the edritika style: thus, for instance, श्रुभवात्समथिन्ति: I. 1. 65f. 124f., अयुग्मभान: एकत्रेण एकमेऽस सूक्तिकार I. 2. 64f. 220a;—the same is to be said of श्रुति: ‘dictum of an authority’ (Petersburg Dictionary) in श्रुति, अयुग्मभान: ‘familiar with the use of speaking,’ II. 4. 55f. 405a; VIII. 2. 106f. 46b.—and of श्रुतिकार: ‘self-evident’; for instance, I. 1. 1f. 46a, III. 2. 123f. 77a. On the solemn juxtaposition of श्रुति and श्रुतिकार see the sequel. Further, the peculiar use of the word तत्त्वभान: is to be mentioned, which is used in the drama as a compound, though specially as a sort of honorific title, ‘master’ as it were, and this in allocation as well as in the third person, thus:—तत्त्वभान: एव तत्त्वभान: Introd. f. 70f. तत्त्वभान: ग्यायवन: नवनीतारायण: IV. 1. 163f. 55b: तत्त्वभान: संवेदन: IV. 1. 104f. 58a; पापलहरावतारवर तत्त्वभान: Introd. f. 31a; I. 1. 48f. 130b; तत्त्वभान: वाचस्या नानाके मोधान: IV. 1. 79f. 355a; तत्त्वभान: ग्यायवन: VI. 3. 106f. 104b; compare V. 3. 14 edrit. f. 54f. 55a, according to which श्रुति and तत्त्व may thus be composed not only with श्रुति, but also with सील: द्वाचिनि श्रुति and अयुग्मभान: ; but examples of these latter compounds are not to hand. Finally, श्रुति for श्रुति V. 3. 55f. 59a, दैत्य as relating to the genus, and श्रुति as relating to grammatical number, II. 2. 24f. 360a, are peculiar words; but I have at present no other passages to adduce for their use.

* When I am now going to single out from the statements contained in the Bṛhadāyana those that appear to me of particular interest, I do so under a double reservation, viz. that (1) all those reserves and doubts added in the foregoing as to their absolute cogency for the time of Patanjali himself may be kept always in sight, and (2) that I do not attempt to give a complete image of all that may be elicited from the contents of the work. Such a task is to be left as yet to the future, and would be best connected with a general Pāññin glossary, which ought to combine the whole copia verborum to be found in Pāññin himself and in

A very curious translation of both these sentences, which have been inscribed also in the Sarvarudraśastrasya, §1, occurs in the Jor. Germ. Or. Soc. XIV. 530: ‘they are indeed no stage, they are not mendicant frisers;’ ‘with such thoughts polecate (the translator reads गौरविक), not chased, and kite-bearers not fed.’ The learned (1) translator has changed conjunctively नमोनितानि into नीपानि, and translates this as just quoted. Both sentences are, moreover, to be found also in Udyāyana’s Kāmaśūtra, and are quoted there directly by श्रुति: see

Aufrecht, Catalogus, f. 216. One comes here involuntarily to the supposition whether they may not have stole already in Gouarda’s (i.e. Patanjali’s) Edismāreta.

* Both these sentences recur too in the Sarvaśrāgriśāstra, §1, immediately before the two noticed in the foregoing note.

+ One ought to expect निकारण: ‘to the root of the root’—Ballsena. (The words निकारण: are to be taken as a parenthesis.)
the literature immediately connected, and in which the authority for the single words,—that is to say, if they are taken from Pāṇini, from the vārttikas, from the Bhashya, from the Gānāpathā, &c.,—ought to be signaled by certain marks. For such a task there are indeed still required some previous operations of wide extent, viz. besides an exact working through of the whole Bhashya generally, also special inquiries on the gānas. According to Böhtlingk (Introd. p. xxxix) the gānas of the Kāñkāhika differ from those of the Calcutta edition to such a degree (and both the MSS. at his disposal were, moreover, sometimes so incorrect) that he preferred not to give the various readings at all. Still undoubtedly just in this case such a comparison and verification is very particularly desirable. I venture therefore to express here in all humility the pious wish—Tappo àvent en nangapau, that the two learned and highly-gifted professors of the Bānās College, to whom we owe the present editing of the Bhashya, may publish also the Kāñkāhika, which takes its name from their celebrated ancient city, if not on the model of the Calcutta edition of Pāṇini, which of course would be preferable, yet at least as the same way as they have published the Bhashya. According to Colebrooke's testimony (Miscell. Essays, vol. II. pp. 9, 40) the Kāñkāhika is "a perpetual commentary, and explains in perspicuous language the meaning and application of each rule," adding examples, and quoting in their proper places the necessary emendations from the Vārttikas and the Bhashya. He calls it, dicta verbi, the best of all extant commentaries on Pāṇini, a judgment in which Böhtlingk also (p. liv.) concurs. An additional advantage is its relatively great age, as it may eventually belong (Ind. Stud. V. 67) to the very time when, according to the Rājarājanīpiṇī, the Mahābhashya was re-introduced into Kāśmīr, after being for a while vivihamam there (ib. V. 167).

Berlin.  
A. WEBER.

THE BARISĀL GUNS (ante, p. 214).

While at one time a resident of Barisāl, I shared the general curiosity on the subject of the singular gun-reports heard there, and frequently took occasion to make inquiries of the natives concerning them. Though they professed ignorance as to the cause of the more distant explosions, they invariably attributed the nearer ones to the firing of guns at native weddings, which were said was a custom of the district, and they could sometimes supply the name of the person in whose honour the firing in question was proceeding. There seems no reason to doubt that the same explanation applies to the more distant sounds also.

The statement in your last number that the sounds are heard not only from the southerly and south-westerly directions, but also from the north, corresponds with the statement I have met with, that the sounds are heard even as far north as Dākā. I never myself, however, heard them from any other directions than the south and south-west.

I do not remember to have heard the sounds at any period of the year excepting at the beginning of the rainy season. During the whole of the rainy season a very large extent of the low-lying country there is under water, and the people pass from village to village in boats over the flooded rice-fields,—the southern portion of the district being the portion more especially inundated. Now, we have on record some most remarkable instances of the sound-conducting power of large surfaces of water; as, for example, the mysterious sounds of guns, and other noises, heard sometimes by men becalmed at sea when far away from the ordinary possibilities of hearing.

Now, what the Shabi-barkā is to Muhammadans the month Ashā̀ja is to Hindūs,—the period when marriages are most frequent. This month is the first month of the rainy season, and the weddings are celebrated chiefly during the Krīṣṇapaśa or half of the month. Not only in Eastern Bengal, but also in other parts of Hindūstān, gun-firing is quite common at Hindū weddings at this season of the year. No mystery appears to exist in connexion with the reports excepting in that part of India which is so generally submerged at this season.

Query:—Is it not at least possible that 'the Barisāl guns' may be simply the reports of guns fired on the occasion of weddings in distant parts, conveyed to hearing by means of the vast expanse of water which floods the entire Sundarbans at the period mentioned?

Could not some of the enlightened Bangāl gentlemen, whose minds are unfettered by fables about the gigantic gates of Rāvana's palace, help us in our endeavours to trace the phenomenon to some rational cause?

Allahabad.  
J. D. BATE.

HINDU SACRIFICE.

"Sacrifice is described as a ship, boat, or ark, pretty much in the same way as 'the Church' in the baptismal service—that they, being delivered from Thy wrath, may be received into the ark of Christ's Church, and may so pass the waves of this troublesome world, that they may finally come to the land of everlasting life,' &c. In Rigveda x. 113, 10, there is a mantra to this effect:

—'Give us, O Indra, multitude of good horses, with which we may offer our oblations by the repetition of the proper sentences—by the prospering of which we may escape all sins. Do thou now accept our service with much regard.' 'Do thou lead us safe through all sins by the way of sacrifices.' And we have, in viii. 42, 3, 'O illustrious Varuna, do thou quicken our understanding—we that are practising this ceremony—that we may embark on the good ferrying boat by which we may escape all sins.' On this the Aitareya Brähmana remarks: 'Sacrifice is the good ferrying boat. The black skin is the good ferrying boat. The Word is the good ferrying boat. Having embarked on the Word, one crosses over to the heavenly world.' Aitareya Brähmana, p. 10. The commentator of the Taittirīya Saṁhitā remarks thus on the same passage: 'May we also embark on that safe and good ferrying boat of black skin, by which we may at once get over all sins that beset us.' It was not unusual in those days for ferry boats to be made of leather....

"Another reason for assimilating the saving boat with 'the Word' is that there was actually a hymn which was called plava, 'raft' or 'boat,' and it was to be used daily. 'The plava is used daily. Those who complete the savanwatsara sacrifice have to dip in the Sea [so called from the 'excessive depth' of the Sacrifice, according to the commentator]. He who dips in the sea without a plava or raft never gets out of it. Where there is the plava, it leads to the attainment of the celestial world." Tattvādī Mañḍī Brāhmaṇa, p. 293. Sacrifice has accordingly been held in all Vedic treatises as the great remedy for sins and trespasses. It is at the same time both a satisfaction for heinous and moral offences, and an atonement for trivial mistakes and transgressions. Kātyāyana says that sacrifice procures heaven, and 'heaven' is a word which stands for the highest happiness. The commentator of the Taittirīya Saṁhitā tells us: that it is Nirriti, or the Sin deity, that is a disturber of sacrifices....

"It is manifest that the sacrificial ritual did not tranquillize the Brāhmaṇical mind. It still brooded over theories of many kinds, it betook itself to philosophy, and even submitted to accepted lessons from its hated rival, Buddhism, but without any tranquillizing result. They seem to have had an idea that there must be a really saving sacrifice; and that their own ritual was but its distant reflection. We repeat an expression we have already cited above, that 'Prajapati, or the Lord of creatures, is Sacrifice, for he made it a reflection (pratistha) of himself. And he is farther called 'atmana,' or giver of self, whose shadow, whose death, is immortality (to us)."—Bahirūja's Aryan Witness.

Nāmamālā and Pāli Grammars.

Subhūti Unnasā, the Buddhist priest of Waskaduwa, in Ceylon, is already well known as the careful editor of the Abhikāndopappadipaka, a native Pāli glossary, which, until the appearance of Childers' great work, was the only lexicographical help available to Pāli students. He has now published a work entitled Nāmamālā, or "The Garland of Nouns," a treatise in Sāthalese on the grammar of Pāli nouns and adverbs. The introduction—extending to more than a hundred pages—contains a most valuable summary of all that is known to the native pandits concerning the history of Pāli grammar, and gives the author's name and date, the length in stanzas or cantos, and quotations of the first and last verses of no less than sixty-four Pāli grammars, still known in Ceylon.—The Academy.

Prof. P. Wüstenfeld has completed his autolithographic edition of El-Bekry's Geographical Dictionary, in 684 pages. The work of writing it for the lithographic press must have been a severe labour, and it must be admitted that, the edition is a marvel of clearness, and far pleasanter to the eye than a printed Arabic book. Prof. Wüstenfeld has added an excellent index, which will obviate the trouble caused by the author having arranged the articles in the order of the Maghribī alphabet.—The Academy.

Notes.

The Spanish Government has founded a Chair for Sanskrit in the University of Madrid, to which the first Professor appointed is Francisco Maria Rivero, a gentleman who has studied Sanskrit in Germany, France, and England, and is at present engaged in preparing a Sanskrit Grammar for his Spanish pupils, and in editing the Hito pandale, with Spanish notes and a Glossary for the same.

Mr. Redhouse has issued a pamphlet in "Vindication of the Ottoman Sultan's title of Khalif," showing its antiquity, validity, and universal acceptance." In it the author holds recent assertions to the contrary to be erroneous, "from the title being no new assumption, but dating from a.d. 1617, and gradually and generally admitted by the orthodox world of Islam since; and futile, even were the legal argument solid, 'because, after 300 years of possession, it would be too late to question the right.'" (Vide ante, p. 251.)

Mr. A. Giles, of H. M. China Consular Service, has published at Shanghai a translation from the Chinese, entitled Records of the Buddhist Kingdoms.
Last year the author of this volume contributed a specimen episode of his translation of the Rámdánya of Tulsi Dās to the pages of this journal (see vol. V. pp. 213-221), with a few introductory remarks, and we gladly welcome this first instalment of an excellent version of the most popular of Hindi poems. A handsome edition of the text, we are told, was issued by the Baptist Mission Press of Calcutta many years ago, but it has long been out of print, and the original is now only to be read in lithograph or bazar type. Though the subject is the same as that of the great epic of Vālmiki, it is, as Mr. Growse remarks, "in no sense a translation of the earlier work; the general plan and the management of the incidents are necessarily much the same, but there is a difference in the touch in every detail; and the two poems vary as widely as any two dramas on the same mythological subject by two different Greek tragedians. Even the coincidence of names is an accident; for Tulsi Dās himself called his poem the Rámdhrit-munas, and the shorter name, corresponding in form to the Iliad or Æneid, was only substituted by his admirers as ahandler designation for a popular favourite." Further, "in both, the first book brings the narrative precisely to the same point; viz., the marriage of Rāma and Sītā. But with Tulsi Dās it is much the longest book of the seven, and forms all but a third of the complete work, while in the Sanskrit it is the shortest but one." (Introduct. pp. ii.) The two "agree only in the broadest outline. The episodes so freely introduced by both poets are for the most part entirely dissimilar; and even in the main narrative some of the most important incidents, such as the 'breaking' of the bow and the contention with Parasurām, are differently placed and assume a very altered complexion." (p. iv.) Of Tulsi's Dās himself little is known, but what information is available has been collected by Mr. Growse in his introduction. The earliest notice of him is in the Bhakti-mutta, "usually ascribed to Nābāhā Jī", "himself one of the leaders of the [Vaishnava] reform, which had its centre at Brindābān; but the poem as we now have it, was avowedly edited, if not entirely written, by one of his disciples named Nārāyān Dās, who lived during the reign of Shāhjāhān. A single stanza is all that is ordinarily devoted to each personage, who is panegyrised with reference to his most salient characteristics in a style that might be described as of unparalleled obscurity, were it not that each such separate portion of the text is followed by a tikkā or gloss, written by one Priya Dās in the Sambat year 1769 (1713 A.D.), in which confusion is still worse confounded by a series of the most disjointed and inexplicit allusions to different legendary events in the saint's life." Mr. Growse then gives the text both of Nābāhā Jī's stanzas and of Priya Dās's tikkā—the latter in 44 ślokas,—with translations, and Prof. H. H. Wilson's notice of Tulsi Dās, founded apparently on a prose reduction of the Bhakti-mutta. We quote the translation of the first of these:—

"For the redemption of mankind in this perverse Kali Yug, Vālmiki has been born again as Tulsi. The verses of the Rámdhnya composed in the Treta Yug are a hundred crores in number; but a single letter has redeeming power, and would work the salvation of one who had even committed the murder of a Brāhmaṇa. Now again as a blessing to the faithful he has taken birth and published the sportive actions of the god. Intoxicated with his passion for Rāma's feet, he perseveres day and night in the accomplishment of his vow, and has supplied as it were a boat for the easy passage of the boundless ocean of existence. For the redemption of man in this perverse Kali Yug, Vālmiki has been born again as Tulsi."

From his own works and from tradition, Mr. Growse gathers that he commended the composition of his Rámdhnya at Ayodhyā in 1575 A.D., and that he studied for some time at Soron. He was a Kanaṇjīya Brāhmaṇ; and in the Bhakti-Sudhu—"a modern poem of no great authority"—"it is said that his father's name was Atikam Rām, and that he was born at Hastinapura. Others make Hājipur, near Chitrakut, the place of his birth. The greater part of his life was certainly spent at Banaras, though he also passed some years in visits to Soron, Ayodhyā, Chitrakut, Allahābād, and Brindābān. He died in the Sambat year 1650 (1624 A.D.)." Two MSS of his great work are said 'to exist in his own handwriting—one at Rājapura, and the other in the temple of Sītā Rāma which he founded at Banaras. Besides the Rāmdhnya he wrote at least six other poems, all with the object of popularizing the worship of Rāma. They are the Rāmāyāna (used as a textbook in the Government examinations in Hindi), Dohavali, the Kalpitabodha, the Bīravī Patrikā (printed for the college of Fort William in 1826), the Purā Rāmdhnya, and the Chhandavali. To these are sometimes added "the following minor works, as to the genuineness of which there is considerable doubt, viz. the Rōma-Saṅkī, the Ṣauvatī Bāhuka, the Dānak Māngal, the Pāvṛtī Māngal,
the Karkha Chhand, the Ro-A Chhand, and the Jhund Chhand." (pp. xii, xiii.)

The translation of this Hindi epic appears to be executed in a scholarly style, and is carefully edited throughout with footnotes explanatory of the mythological allusions. While thanking the translator for this instalment of so important a work, we trust he will be encouraged to hasten the completion of it.


The great Warren Hastings was a statesman far ahead of his age, able to appreciate heartily, and willing to encourage to the extent of his powers, whatever tended to increase the reputation and influence of his country, or add to human knowledge and comfort. When the Teshu Lama, therefore, in 1774, sent to intercede on behalf of the Bhutânese, whom he had found it necessary to chastise for their raids upon our north-eastern frontier, he lost no time in sending a retum mission under George Bogle, a young Scotchman, whose energy and capacity he well knew, and, with his instructions, gave him a quantity of potatoes that he might plant a few at each favourable halting-place, in the hope of introducing the cultivation of so useful an article of food into Central Asia. We shall probably never learn whether it was from this experiment or not that the Tibetans did come to use the vegetable as they now do. Mr. Bogle resided for a considerable while with the Teshu Lama, who became warmly attached to him. Warren Hastings was greatly pleased with his success; and, had he been allowed, would have followed it up, but when Bogle returned in 1775 he found a sad change at Calcutta: the great statesman was deprived of all power by the malignant opposition of Philip Francis and the other members of Council, whom he made tools of to frustrate the designs of the Governor-General, and nothing more was done for four years. In 1779 Bogle was again appointed to proceed to Bhutân and Tibet, but the visit was postponed owing to the Teshu Lama being absent at Pekin. Bogle died early in 1781. Hastings sent Captain Turner on a second mission in 1783, but afterwards had weightier matters to attend to; and the narrative of Bogle's mission to Tibet, of which Hastings had sent a copy to Dr. Johnson in 1775, was never published. Fortunately Bogle's papers were sent home to his family and preserved, and, thanks to the perseverance of Mr. Markham, they have been discovered, and are here edited by him in the most judicious and satisfactory way.

Thomas Manning, the friend of Charles Lamb, was a somewhat eccentric character. He went first to Canton to study Chinese, and was recommended to Lord Minto as well qualified for a mission into Tibet; but "the days of small half-measures had arrived," and he received little or no aid from Government. He succeeded, however, without official recognition, in reaching Lhasa, where he stayed for several months, and had interviews with the Dalai Lama. He wrote a long and interesting account of his expedition, and sent it to Dr. Marshman, but unfortunately it seems to have been lost. Disgusted with the official treatment he received, he returned to Canton in 1812, and in 1817 joined Lord Amherst's embassy, as Chinese interpreter. He died at Bath in 1840, leaving his Chinese manuscripts to the Royal Asiatic Society. The only account of his journey is contained in the hasty and desultory jottings made from day to day in his note-book, of which Mr. Markham has made the best. "Good or bad," he remarks, "it stands alone. No other countryman of ours has ever followed Manning's footsteps. And, to those who know how to find it, there is much wheat to be gathered from amongst Mr. Manning's chaff."

The long introduction, extending over 110 pages, is not the least important part of the work: as preliminary to the narratives it gives a comprehensive geographical sketch of Tibet, Bhutân, and Nepal, followed by accounts of the religion, tribes, Lamas, and Romish missions, the surveys of the Chinese and their interference, our relations to Bhutân and Nepal, the explorations in Tibet made by the 'Pa-pi-ta' sent out by the Great Tri-gonometrical Survey, and the maps, early and later, of the Himalayan countries. This is followed by well-written short biographical sketches of Bogle and Manning, occupying some 90 more pages. At the end, an Appendix of 46 pages contains—1, an account of the travels of Johann Grueber, Jesuit, 1666, from Asley's Voyages; 2, a letter from Father I. Desideri, 1716, from Da Halde's Lettres Édifiantes; and 3, an account of Tibet by Fra. F. O. della Penna di Billi, 1739, from Klaproth in the Journal Asiatique (Ilimé Sér. t. XIV. p. 177).

The work is illustrated by good maps, a portrait of Warren Hastings, and a number of woodcuts. A full index and the editing of Mr. Markham, which is a model of excellence, render the book invaluable to all requiring information connected with the commerce, government, ethnology, and religions of the countries to the north of India, and must make it a favourite with the lover of books of travel and rare adventure.
PÁRŚÍ FUNERAL AND INITIATORY RITES, AND THE PÁRŚÍ RELIGION.
BY MONIER WILLIAMS, BODEN PROFESSOR OF Sanskrit, OXFORD.

Observant European travellers when they first arrive at Bombay cannot fail to be struck with the interesting contrasts which everywhere meet the eye. Perhaps the most remarkable of such contrasts is that afforded by the different methods adopted by the adherents of different creeds for the disposal of their dead.

There in Bombay one may see, within a short distance of each other, the Christian cemetery, the Muhammadan graveyard, the Hindu burning-ground, and the Pársí Dákhamás, or Towers of Silence. The latter, five in number, with a sixth—which is square instead of circular—used for criminals, are, as most Anglo-Indians know, at the summit of Malabar Hill, in a beautiful garden, amid tropical trees swarming with vultures. I obtained leave to visit these towers in the autumn of 1875, and again shortly after my second arrival in India last year.

A correct model of the principal tower was then kindly presented to me by order of Sir Jamsetji Jijibhai, and a careful examination of its structure enables me to describe its dimensions with accuracy. Towers they have certainly no right to be called, for their height is out of all proportion to their diameter. The chief tower may be described as an upright cylindrical stone structure, in shape and solidity not unlike a gigantic millstone, about fourteen feet high and ninety feet in diameter, resting on the ground in the centre of the garden. It is built throughout of solid granite, except in the centre, where a well, ten feet deep and about fifteen across, leads down to an excavation under the masonry, containing four drains at right angles to each other, terminated by holes filled with charcoal. Round the upper and outer edge of this solid cylinder, and completely hiding the interior surface from view, is a high stone parapet. This is constructed so as to seem to form one piece with the solid stone work, and being, like it, covered with chunam, gives the whole erection, when viewed from the outside, the appearance of a low tower. Clearly one great object aimed at by the Pársís in the construction of these strange depositaries of their dead is solidity. We saw two or three enormous massive stones lying on the ground, which had been rejected by the builders simply because they contained almost invisible veins of quartz, through which it was possible that impure particles might find their way, and be carried, in the course of centuries, by percolating moisture, into the soil. Earth, water, and fire are, according to Zoroaster, sacred symbols of the wisdom, goodness, and omnipotence of the Deity, and ought never, under any circumstances, to be defiled. Especially ought every effort to be made to protect Mother Earth from the pollution which would result if putrefying corpses were allowed to accumulate in the ground. (Vānditā. iii. 27.) Hence the disciples of Zoroaster spare neither trouble nor expense in erecting solid and impenetrable stone platforms fourteen feet thick for the reception of their dead. The cost of erection is greatly increased by the circumstance that the towers ought always to be placed on high hills, or in the highest situations available. (Vand. vi. 93.) I was informed by the Secretary that the largest of the five towers was constructed at an outlay of three lakhs of rupees.

The upper surface of the massive granite column is divided into compartments by narrow grooved ridges of stone, radiating like the spokes of a wheel from the central well. These stone ridges form the sides of seventy-two shallow open receptacles or coffins, arranged in three concentric rings. The ridges are grooved—that is, they have narrow channels running down their whole length, which channels are connected by side ducts with the open coffins, so as to convey all moisture to the central well and into the lower drains. The number three is emblematical of Zoroaster's three moral precepts, 'Good thoughts, good words, and good deeds,' (Vand. v. 67), and the seventy-two open stone receptacles represent the seventy-two chapters of his Yájya, a portion of the Zand-Avestá.

Each concentric circle of open stone coffins has a pathway surrounding it, the object of which is to make each receptacle accessible to the corpse-bearers. Hence there are three concentric circular pathways, the outermost of which is immediately below the parapet, and these three pathways are crossed by another conducting from the solitary door which admits
the corpse-bearers from the exterior, and which must face the east, to catch the rays of the rising sun. In the outermost circle of the stone coffins, which stands for good deeds, are placed the bodies of males; in the middle, symbolizing good words, those of females; in the inner and smallest circle, nearest the well, representing good thoughts, those of children. Each tower is consecrated with solemn religious ceremonies, and after its consecration no one, except the corpse-bearers—not even a high-priest—is allowed to enter.

On the occasion of my second visit I was accompanied, as before, by the courteous Secretary of the Parsi Panchayat, and was permitted to witness the funeral of a Meshed, or one of the second order of priests, whose flowing white costumes (supposed to be emblematical of purity) are everywhere conspicuous in the Bombay streets. I may here mention parenthetically that I believe the word Meshed is merely a corruption of a Zand word equivalent to Sanakht Maga-pati, 'chief of the Magians.' Dastur, the name of the high-priest, is a modern Persian word, the best equivalent for which would perhaps be 'chief ruler.' The lowest order of priests, named Herbad, are little better than menials, and are not allowed to officiate at ceremonies. In the Zand-Avesta the whole priestly class are called Athravan (in Farsi Athorvan). In the present day the rest of the community—the laymen in fact, who are neither Dasturs nor Mesheds nor Herbads—are styled Behadin or Behadin, that is, 'followers of the best religion.'

I reached the garden surrounding the towers about half an hour before sunset. At that time the funeral procession was already winding up the hill. The deceased man had died early in the morning, and a rule of the Parsi religion requires that no corpse shall be exposed on the platform of the towers, to be consumed by birds of prey, unless the rays of the sun can first fall on it. Foremost in the procession walked a man carrying a loaf or two of bread wrapped up in a cloth. Then came the bier, which was flat and made of iron bars, having the body of the deceased stretched out upon it, covered only with a white sheet, and borne by four bearers, followed by two assistants. These corpse-bearers are called Nasuvaldar. They are, of course, Parsis, but from the nature of their occupation are supposed to contract impurity, and are not associated with the rest of the community. They are, however, well cared for and well paid.

After the bearers, at an interval of a few yards, followed a man leading a white dog, and behind him a long procession of at least a hundred priests in their long robes of spotless white, besides relations of the deceased, also in white garments, walking in pairs, each couple following closely on the other, and each man connected with his fellow by a handkerchief held between them in token of sympathy and fellow-feeling. The procession advanced to a point about thirty yards distant from the portal of the largest tower. There it stood still for a minute while the dog was brought towards the corpse, made to look at the features of the dead man, and then fed with bread. This part of the ceremony is called say-di'at. Meanwhile all who followed the bier turned round, and walked back to the sagri, or house of prayer containing a fire-sanctuary, which is erected near the entrance to the garden. There they chanted prayers while the corpse-bearers entered the tower with the dead body, and exposed it naked in one of the receptacles on the stone platform. Their appointed task being then completed, they instantly quitted the tower, and were seen to repair to a reservoir of water near at hand, where they went through a process of thorough ablution, changing all their clothes, and depositing the cast-off garments in an open stone pit, almost hidden from view, on one side of the garden.

It is noteworthy that the fire-sanctuary of the sagri has a window or aperture so arranged that when the sacred fire is fed with sandalwood fuel by the veiled priest, just before the corpse-bearers enter the tower, a ray from the flame may be projected over the dead body at the moment of its exposure. The theory is that the light of the sun and the light of the sacred fire ought to consecrate the mortal remains of the deceased before they are consumed by the birds. There is, at any rate, some poetical if not true religious sentiment in this hypothesis, and the bereaved relations appear to derive consolation from it; but whether the position of the sun and fire made this double consecration possible is doubtful. To us spectators on the
occasional ceremony is evident that a
beam from the setting sun and a ray from the
sacred fire had barely an opportunity to fall on the
corpse at all; for scarcely had the bearers left
the tower and closed the portal were forty or fifty
vultures, before seated motionless on the stone
parapet, swooped down on their prey. In ten
minutes they all flew back again—they had
finished their work. The body was reduced to
a skeleton before the mourners in the 
\textit{sagri}
had finished their prayers. It should be men-
tioned that in three or four weeks after the
funeral the bones are removed from the open
coffin and reverently placed in the central well,
where the dust of the dead, whether of high or
low degree, is left to commingle undisturbed
for centuries.

When I enquired about the meaning of the
dog, I was told that, according to the teaching of
Zoroaster, dogs as well as birds are regarded as
sacred animals; and were formerly allowed to
consume the dead bodies of Parsis. In the
present day a representative dog kept for the
purpose accompanies the corpse, and is fed with
bread as a substitute for the flesh of the dead
body. Moreover, dogs are supposed to possess
some mysterious power in preserving the spirits
of men from the attacks of demons; and if the
funeral dog is not fed, and made to look at the
corpse, the soul of the deceased will assuredly
be assailed by evil spirits during the three days
which intervene between death and judgment.

I should state here that in the belief of the
Parsi the soul of the deceased man is supposed
to hover about in a restless state for the three
days immediately succeeding death, in the neigh-
bourhood of the 
\textit{dakhma}, where also
swarms of evil spirits congregate. On the
morning of the fourth day the soul is taken to
judgment, which is passed on it by Mithra and
the angels. It has then to pass a narrow bridge
called 
\textit{chinvat-percutum}, 'the bridge where de-
cision is pronounced.' The souls of the sinful,
being unable to pass this bridge, imagined to be
sharp as a razor, fall into hell on endeavouring
to cross over. The 
\textit{Zand-Avesta}
even gives the names of certain dogs believed to protect
the souls of men from the assaults of evil demons

\textit{\textsuperscript{+}} See \textit{Vanditidh} vii. 7, viii. 28.—Bleich\textsuperscript{e}s \textit{Avesta}, vol. i.
\textit{\textsuperscript{2}} Vanditidh (Bleich) viii. 25; Wilson\textsuperscript{s} \textit{Parsi Religion},
\textit{pp. 49, 232.}
\textit{\textsuperscript{2}} Sarama is the dog of Indra, and is represented in \textit{Rig-}

before crossing the bridge. The 
\textit{Vanditidh}
(vii. 41, 42), moreover, states that the devil
called 
\textit{Nasus} is frightened away by a yellow dog
with four eyes, and that such a dog is to be led
along the road of a funeral procession three
times.

It is on this account, as was explained to me by
a learned Parsi, that the funeral dog is supposed
to be four-eyed—that is to say, it is supposed to
have two real eyes and two round spots like eyes,
just above the actual eyes. I was told, too, that
many yellowish-white dogs in India have this
peculiarity, and that the Parsis try to procure
such dogs, and keep them for their funeral pro-
cessions. I observed nothing of the kind in the
funeral dog on the occasion of the particular
funeral I have here recorded; but it struck me
(before I knew that the same idea had occurred
to German scholars) that the singular practice of
leading a white dog at the head of the proc-
cession points to the common origin of the 
Parsi
and Hindu religions; for in the latter system
the god of death, 
\textit{Yama}, has two four-eyed
brindled watchdogs, children of 
\textit{Sarama}, who

\textit{\textsuperscript{3}} guard the road to his abode, and whose favour and
protection against evil spirits are invoked
every day by pious Hindus when they perform
the \textit{kāka-bali}, or offering of rice to crows,
dogs, and animals at the end of the \textit{vaisāvade}
ceremony before the midday meal. The 
\textit{mantra}
recited is as follows:—
\textit{Deuksūnas iya-
ma-salaratna Vaisavaram-kulbhadhavan tebyadām pin-
draya dato rakshatam pathi mād suddi.}—"May
the two dogs, dark and brindled, born in the
family of Yama, protect me ever on the road!
To them I present an offering of food."

Having thus attempted to give some idea of
the nature of a Parsi funeral, and of the
unique arrangements by which the Parsi
endeavour to carry out the precepts of their
prophet Zoroaster in the disposal of their dead,
it will not be inappropriate if I close this
paper with a brief account of the initiatory
ceremonies performed on admission of young
Parsi to the Zoroastrian religion, and their
incorporation as members of the Parsi society.

I may first mention that according to the
pure form of the Zoroastrian faith—as pro-

\textit{\textsuperscript{3}} X. 14. 10 as the mother of Yama's dogs, called in the
\textit{Mahābhārata}, 
\textit{Adi-parvan} 671, Devarā-sūni. In the \textit{Rig-veda}
this dog is said to have tracked and recovered the cows
stolen by the Pandis. Sarama is also said to be the author of
part of the \textit{Rig-veda}, X. 102.
pounded by learned Pârsîs of the present day—Ormaţd (sometimes written Hormazd, contracted from the full expression Âhura Mazda) is the name of the Supreme Being, to whom there is no equal, and who has no opponent. It is a mistake to suppose that Ormaţd is opposed to a being called Ahriman, commonly regarded as the spirit of evil. The true doctrine is that Ormaţd has created two forces in nature, not necessarily antagonistic, but simply alternating with each other—the one a force of creation, construction, and preservation; the other a force of decay, dissolution, and destruction. The first of these forces is named Spenta-mainyus, while the second or destructive power is commonly called Ahriman, or Hariman, for Anhrmainyus (or Ahro-mainyus—Sanskrit Anahmanyu). It is interesting to observe the analogy between the Hindu and Zoroastrian systems, Vishnu and Rudra (Siva) in the former being equivalent to Spenta-mainyus and Anhrmainyus in the latter, while Brahma (neuter) corresponds to Ormaţd. In later times the purity of the original doctrine became corrupted, and Ahriman was personified as a spirit of evil. In fact, all the evils in the world, whether moral or physical, are now attributed to Ahriman, while Ormaţd is erroneously held to be the antagonistic principle of good. It is contended, too, that the Pârsî religion is properly pure Monotheism, in spite of its apparent dualism, and that the elements and all the phenomena of Nature are merely revered as creations of the one God, and symbolical of his power.

There can be little doubt, however, that with the majority of Pârsîs the elements are regarded as simple manifestations or emanations of the Deity, and that which is called Monotheism is really a kind of Pantheism very similar to that of Brahmanism. The absence of all image-worship, however, is very refreshing after the hideous idolatry of the Hindu system.

So much for the Pârsî creed; and now for a few words as to the form of admission into the charmed circle of the Pârsî community.

It is a controverted point whether any outsider wished to become a Pârsî it would be possible, even in theory, to entertain the question of his being admitted to membership by his making public confession of his faith in the Zoroastrian system. As a matter of fact no one is at present allowed to become a Pârsî unless he is born a Pârsî. No provision seems to exist for the reception of converts, and the only form of admission is for the children of Pârsîs, though occasionally the children of non-Pârsî mothers by Pârsî fathers are permitted to become members of that community. Nevertheless it is certain, from a particular form of prayer still used by Pârsî priests, that Zoroaster himself enjoined on his disciples the duty of making preseleutes, and had in view a constant accession of fresh adherents, who were all to be received as converts, provided they were willing to go through certain prescribed ceremonies.

With regard to the children of Pârsî parents, every boy is admitted to membership as a disciple of the Zoroastrian religion some time between the age of seven and nine, but more usually at seven years of age, in the following manner. He is first taken to one of the fire-temples, and in a room outside the sanctuary made to undergo a kind of baptism,—that is to say, he is placed nearly naked on a stone seat, and water is poured over his head from a ladā by a Mobed appointed to perform the rite. Next, the child is taken out into an open area, made to sit on another stone seat, and required to eat one or two leaves of the pomegranate tree—a tree held very sacred by the Pârsîs, and always planted in the precincts of their fire-temples, for use in purificatory ceremonies. (Yasna viii. 4.) After eating the leaves he is made to drink a small quantity of the urine of a bull—also kept at fire-temples, and held in high estimation for its purifying properties. This completes the first portion of the ceremony. The concluding act is performed in an apartment of the fire-temple, and consists in investing the child with the sacred shirt or under-garment (called sadara), and sacred girdle (called kustī). Several Mobeds, presided over by a Dastur, are necessary to the due celebration of this part of the rite (which is very like the Hindu upanayana, or induction into the condition of a twice-born man by means of the yajnopavīta). They sit on the ground in a group, and the child is placed in the midst of them nearly naked. The sacred shirt is then put on, and the white woollen girdle fastened around it, while the boy is made to repeat word by word the form of prayer which he is required to say ever after-
wards whenever the girdle is taken off or put on again. (Kurduh-Avesta iv.) The sacred shirt and girdle are the two most important outward signs and symbols of Parsiism, and an impostor laying claim to the privileges of the Zoroastrian religion would be instantly detected by the absence of these signs, or by his wrong use of them. But they are far more than outward signs—they are supposed to serve as a kind of spiritual panoply. Unprotected by this armour a man would be perpetually exposed to the assaults of evil spirits and demons, and even be liable to become a demon himself. The shirt is made of the finest white linen or cambric. It has a peculiar form at the neck, and has a little empty bag in front to show that the wearer holds the faith of Zoroaster, which is supposed to be entirely spiritual, and to have nothing material about it. The second shirt has also two stripes at the bottom, one on each side, and each of these stripes is separated into three, to represent the six divisions of each half-year.

It has also a heart, symbolical of true faith, embroidered in front. The kustaf or girdle is made of seventy-two interwoven woolen threads, to denote the seventy-two chapters of the Yaśna, but has the appearance of a long flat cord of pure white wool, which is wound round the body in three coils. Each end of the girdle is divided into three, and these three ends again into two parts. Every Parsi ought to take off this girdle and restore it to its proper position round the body at least five times a day. He has to hold it in a particular manner with both hands; and touching his forehead with it to repeat a prayer in Zend invoking the aid of Ormazd (Ahura-Mazda) for the destruction of all evil beings, evil doers, especially tyrannical rulers, and imploring pardon for evil thoughts, evil words, and evil deeds. The girdle must then be coiled round the body three times and fastened with two particular knots (said to represent the sun and moon), which none but a Parsi can tie in a proper manner. Every Parsi boy is taught the whole process with great solemnity at his first initiation. When the ceremony is concluded the high-priest pronounces a benediction, and the young Parsi is from that moment admitted to all the rights and privileges of perhaps one of the most flourishing and united communities in the world.

Oxford, June 1877.

ON THE QUESTION WHETHER POLYANDRY EVER EXISTED IN NORTHERN HINDUSTĀN.

BY JOHN MUIR, D.C.L., LL.D., PH.D., EDINBURGH.

In reference to the conclusion which in a former article I have drawn from the story of Drua-pādī, that, though polyandry had died out in the plains of northern Hindustān at the period when the Mahābhārata was compiled, it yet appears to have existed there at a remoter period, a learned friend has stated to me that he doubts "whether polyandry ever was an Āryan custom, and can be sanctioned by texts or inferences from the Vedas." I do not pretend to have examined the Vedic hymns and Brāhmaṇas with a view to discover whether they contain allusions to any practices connected with the relations of the sexes which were disapproved, or had fallen into disuse, at a later period. I am only aware of one custom which appears to have existed in the Vedic age, although under what conditions does not appear, while it is only recognized by Manu under certain restrictions. I allude to the practice of a widow cohabiting with a brother-in-law, which seems to be referred to in Rigveda, x. 40. 2. (See my Original Sanskrit Texts, vol. V., p. 459.) Manu allows such unions of a widow with a brother-in-law, or other relative of her deceased husband, to continue only till one, or at most two, sons have been begotten, and declares that they must then cease (ix. 59-62). In the verses which follow (64-68), he either restricts such temporary unions to classes below the twice-born, or (in contradiction with what precedes) condemns them altogether.

But the question arises whether the compilers of the Vedas and Brāhmaṇas would be likely to bring forward anything found among the materials at their disposal which had become obsolete, or which clashed with their own ideas of what was proper or laudable. We do,
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no doubt, find a reference to a fact which the Brāhmaṇas of later times would perhaps have preferred to ignore, viz., that in former times men of their caste had received instruction from Kāhatriyas. For Manu allows a student to learn the Veda from one who is not a Brāhman only in cases of calamity or necessity.† (See my former article, p. 252a, at the bottom.) But would they be likely to refer to antiquated practices often, and especially in the case of such as they had come decidedly to disapprove, like polyandry?

The particular question to be now settled is whether the Pāṇḍu and his relatives are represented to us in the Mahābhārata as altogether belonging to tribes whose entire practices were of such a character as harmonized with pure Hindu ideas of later ages.

Pāṇḍu, the father of the five brothers, is related in that poem to have had two wives, Pṛthā or Kuntī (Mahābhārata, 441ff.), and Mādra (Mahāb. i. 4429ff.). Pāṇḍu, however, having been doomed by the curse of a sage to die in the embraces of his wife (vv. 4588ff.), resolves to relinquish family life and become an ascetic (vv. 4597ff.), and goes to the forest (4615), but accompanied by his wives (4650). The two wives, however, bear sons to different gods: Kuntī three sons to Dharma, Vāyu, and Indra respectively (vv. 4765ff., 4772, and 4791), and Mādra two sons to the Śivas (vv. 4850ff.).

Mādra was the sister of Śalya, king of the Mādras. In two passages (Sutapatha Brāhmaṇa, xiv. 3. 1, and xiv. 6. 7. 1—Bṛhadāranyaka Upanishad, pp. 569 and 611 of the Calcutta text, and pp. 194 and 199 of the English translation) mention is made of Kāpya Pataṇchala, a Brāhmanical teacher, as living in their country, and nothing is said against the manners of the people. Again, in the third book of the Mahābhārata (vv. 6920ff.) Aśvapati, a king of the same country, is praised as righteous and pious. Yet in two speeches in the eighth book (or Karṇaparvan, vv. 1836ff. and 2028ff., addressed by Karṇa to Śalya), the Bāhikas, Mādras, Gāndhāras, and other tribes of the Panjāb, are strongly censured for the dissoluteness of their manners. Some extracts on this subject have been adduced from the latter passage in Original Sanskrit Texts, vol. II. pp. 482ff. §§

The tribes in question are there described as the lowest of men, unfit to be associated with, as faithless to their friends, liars, dishonest, as assembling males and females and slaves promiscuously, and eating fish and the flesh of kine, drinking spirits, screaming, laughing, the women as dancing undressed and drunk, and as unrestrained in their sexual intercourse (vv. 1836-1851). An old Brāhman, who had lived in the country, gives a long account in a similar strain, depicting the people as shameless in their cohabitation, as having no Vedas, or religious knowledge, or sacrifices, &c. (vv. 2038ff.). In vv. 2081ff., we have the following important statement:—"A certain virtuous woman, having been formerly carried away from the Āraṭṭa (country), and violated by robbers, uttered this curse: 'Because ye violate me, a young female, who have relatives, the women of your tribe shall become licentious. Never, vilest of men, shall ye be freed from this dreadful sin.' Wherefore their sisters' sons, and not their (own) sons, are the heirs of their property."[||

"Satī purā hṛiddh khecā Aratiṣti kila dasyubhik | adharmate charyate sā tān abhikṣayasat tatah | bālām bāhunātmām yan mām adharmenoapanachāya | tamaṇḍā nāryo bhavishyati bāhukhyo vai kulasya cha | na cha yatmat pramokshahvam ghoritā pāpānu na rādhamāḥ | tamāt tēkahām bhagahārdhā bhugmeyāh na śīnavah."]

The last words appear clearly to refer to a

† See Prof. Monier Williams's Indian Epic Poetry, pp. 94, 960.

‡ See also the translations of Prof. H. H. Wilson and Messrs. Troyer and Panche referred to in a note below.

§ This line has, I think, been translated by Professor H. H. Wilson, in his Essay on the Hindu History of Cachar (Asiatic Researches, vol. XV. p. 196), as follows:—"On this account their heirs are their sisters' children, not their own." The entire verse has been rendered by M. Troyer in the appendix to his Etymologische, vol. I. p. 507, thus,—"Oui, vous, derniers des hommes, purifieres-vous de ce crime aieux. Si non, ce ne seront pas vos fils, mais ceux de vos soeurs, qui seront vos héritiers." The original, however, has nothing answering to sinom, nor has it any substantive verb in the future tense. Troyer adds this note, which I translate from the French:—"This custom of succession (i.e., of sisters' sons being a man's heirs) is found among the Naik, and other tribes in which polyandry reigns." In M. Panche's translation of the verse, which runs as follows:—"Ne voulez pas expier ce crime abominable; et pour cette impudence nous ni fils, ni neveu qui soient les héritiers de vos bons," the concluding words do express the true sense.
rule which prevails where polyandry exists, that sisters' sons, and not sons of his own, are a man's heirs, because, of course, in the peculiar circumstances, it cannot be determined by whom the latter were really begotten. On this subject I quote a passage from Mr. Walter Hamilton's Geographical, Statistical, and Historical Description of Hindostan, &c., vol. II. p. 280 (edition of 1820). "The Naîrs marry before they are ten years of age, but the husband never cohabits with his wife. He allows her oil, clothing, ornaments, and food, but she remains in her mother's house, or after her parent's death with her brothers, and cohabits with any person she chooses of an equal or higher rank than her own. In consequence of this strange arrangement, no Naír knows his own father, and every man considers his sisters' children as his heirs. His mother manages the family, and after her death the eldest sister assumes the direction. A Naír's moveable property on his decease is equally divided among the sons and daughters of all his sisters." See also Mr. J. F. McLennan's Studies in Ancient History, pp. 149f.

I do not go the length of asserting categorically that the words last quoted from the Mahābhārata, as to a man's sisters' sons being his heirs among the tribes referred to, prove historically the existence of polyandry in the Panjâb at, or before, the period when they were written. But it is certainly remarkable, if not indeed unaccountable, that such words should be found in that book if they do not owe their existence to the fact of such a custom being actually prevalent at the time when they were penned, not long previously.

Sâlya makes (v. 2112f.) but a brief reply to Karṇa's denunciation; is silent as to the truth of the charges made, but alleges that in Anga, the country of which his assailant is king, it is the custom to abandon the sick, and for men to sell their own wives and children. He says that there are everywhere Brâhmaṇs, Kshatriyas, Vaishyas, and Śūdras, and virtuous and devoted women, with righteous kings, who control the wicked; and, at the same time, most vicious men. People are, he remarks, quick in detecting the faults of others, but do not observe, or delude themselves in respect of, their own, and urges that no man is necessarily bad from being the native of a particular country, but is such in consequence of his own nature.

In regard to the differences in manners between the peoples of the Panjâb and those of Hindustân further to the eastward, I repeat here the words of Professor Weber, freely translated in Original Sanskrit Texts, vol. II. p. 354, from the Indische Studien, vol. I. p. 220, and said by him to be founded on data furnished by Pâñini:—

"The north-western tribes retained their ancient customs, which the other tribes who migrated to the east had at one time shared. The former kept themselves free from the influences of the hierarchy and of caste, which arose among the latter as a necessary consequence of their residence among people of alien origin (the aborigines). But the later orthodox feelings of the more eastern Aryans obliterated the recollection of their own earlier freedom, and caused them to detest the kindred tribes to the westward as renegades, instead of looking on themselves as men who had abandoned their own original institutions." ¶

P.S.—The learned friend who is referred to at the commencement of this paper has, after becoming acquainted with its contents, stated to me his opinion that, although the passage which I have quoted in it from the Karṇa-Parvan of the Mahābhārata goes far to prove that polyandry existed among the tribes of the Panjâb, yet that this is a different thing from admitting it to have ever been an established institution; and remarks that the polyandry alluded to in that passage was of a purely licentious character. As this custom is not known to have been practised in the Panjâb for a long time past, it will perhaps be the safest conclusion to draw provisionally from the premises furnished in this and in my preceding paper, that though polyandry, or a promiscuous intercourse of the sexes, may have prevailed more or less there in early times, yet that the former practice could not have been widely spread or recognized as a national institution. I shall be glad, however, if any student of Indian antiquity is able to throw further light on the subject.

¶ In my former article, p. 251n, last line, I observe an error, viz., for vajas. In regard to note §, page 252, I am informed by Dr. Böhtlingk that he would understand superfluous there in the usual sense of 'calamity,' and would render the line in which it occurs thus: "a man without Rich, Yajas, or Sâman is a calamity created by Prajâpâti."
REPORT UPON INSCRIPTIONS IN THE NORTH-CENTRAL PROVINCE AND
THE HAMBANTOTA DISTRICT OF CEYLON.

BY THE LATE P. GOLDSCHMIDT, Ph.D.

I have until lately confined my examinations to the rich mines of the North-Central Province; and even there only the numerous inscriptions at Anuradhapura, Mihintale, Polonnaruwa, and at some other places, as Dambulla, Mineri, Maradankadyawa, have been photographed. In the month of June I have been travelling through the Hambantoja District of the Southern Province, with a view of taking first a general survey of the material to be found there.*

I propose to open my report with an account of the most ancient inscriptions belonging to a time anterior to the Christian era, and mostly found in caves.

I.—From the Introduction of Buddhism to the beginning of the Christian Era.

The caves of Vessagiri, near Anuradhapura, have yielded an additional number of six short inscriptions to those two I had copied previously. I have met with several cave inscriptions, hitherto unknown to me, at Mihintale, both on the hill now alone inhabited by priests, and in a cave called Rāja-giriya lena on the opposite hill, which abounds in ruins indicative of former habitations. Other inscriptions, of the same kind were found on Dunu-manga-lakanda, at Ga-tala-vi-ha-raj (three miles from Galkadal, Central road), on Elagamukanda, on Mara-danka-la-wa-lakanda, at Dambulla (here also a great number of them in the bare rock close to the famous temple), on the rock at Panikkankulam (two miles from Kekiriwa on the Western minor road), on the rock at Moragollawa (near Elagamuwa), in a cave at Murungahikanda (between Elagamuwa and Dambulla), and several in the district of Hambantoja, viz., at the ancient riṣṭra of Mulgirigala and in the jungle between Kirinđe and Palatupana. Reference is made in the Government archaeological returns to an inscription at Mūdawehera, a very ancient temple in the jungle three miles beyond Palatupana, but I failed to find anything in the extensive ruins of it.

The inscriptions of this period, a considerable number of which is now collected by me, furnish little new information, after having seen the first important specimens; their contents are essentially the same throughout, viz., brief dedications to the priesthood, if they are not merely indicative of the ownership of the cave. They are written, as I have formerly stated, in the well-known Southern alphabet of the Indian emperor Dharmāśoka, with slight modifications, and in some cases already in more recent forms, not very different from those of king Gajabahu’s time (2nd century a.d.). The proper names of the donors or proprietors are often without interest, and there are some ancient words, as paru-maka or baru-maka, ‘Brāhmaṇa’ (in later times assumed as a title by kings), jita, ‘daughter,’ and a few besides, which will prove of value to the student of the Sinhalese language.

There is one very important grammatical form (which, however, we find to exist even at a later period), the nominative singular masculine and neuter in ae, inasmuch as this is generally looked upon by European Orientalists as peculiar to the different dialects of Māgadhā, and if so, we would meet here with a significant corroboration of the Sinhalese historical tradition according to which a district of Māgadhā (or one bordering on this kingdom) was the native country of the early Āryan colonizers of Ceylon. There are some remarkable instances besides in which in special the Māgadhī employed in Aṣoka’s inscriptions and Sinhalese coincide, while both stand aloof from Pali and all the other Prākrits.

Such are—

- Māgadhī
- Sinhalese.

sīt (termination of the loc. sing.)

miniaś (= ‘man’)

topī (= ‘you,’ ‘ye’)

puru (= ‘former’) pura (= ‘former’; pura (= the light half of the lunar month’).

(Sanskrit pura, Pali pūba, Prākrit pūva.)

A graphical particularity of the most ancient inscriptions is the use of two forms of a (one the common s of Aṣoka’s inscriptions, the other resembling in shape a Greek Digamma, F, a form unknown in India), which it would be difficult to

had been engaged having nearly expired, he intended to return to Europe for a short time, proposing to return to Ceylon again and investigate the language of the Vedikes, when he died.”—Prof. S. Goldschmidt, in the Allgemeine Zeitung.

* But this also occasionally in the sacred writings of the Jaina sect.

† Conf. Ind. Ant. vol. I. p. 140, and Academy, 17th February 1877, p. 189.—Ed.
account for without the supposition that the pronunciation of s in Ceylon must have struck the Hindu introducers of the art of writing as somewhat different from their own, although it is true the two letters are used indiscriminately. Now, Prakrit grammarians record a peculiar pronunciation of s in the dialect of Magadha, which appears in the dramatic works of the Hindus; perhaps (though of course we can assert nothing in these matters) early Sinhalese partook of the same distinction.

The following two cave inscriptions may serve as specimens of the most ancient Sinhalese preserved to us (by ʃ I have transcribed the second referred to above):

(1.) Inscription in a cave at Vesagiri Anuradhapura:

Parumaka Palikadasa bariya parumaka Tirakita jita apaśika Chitaaya le indicating sāgaśa chatudisa:

“The cave of the lay-devotee Chita (Čhita), wife of the Bohmān Palikada, daughter of the Brāhmaṇa Tirakita, [is given] to the priesthood of the four quarters of the world.”

(2.) Inscription near Nettakanda (about fifteen miles from Mihintale, in the jungle, six miles off the Trinakamal road):

Parumaka Welu putana lene agata anagata chatudisa sāgaśa:

“The cave of the sons of the Brāhmaṇa Welu [is given] to the priesthood in the four quarters of the world, present and absent.”

II.—From the beginning of the Christian Era to the Fourth Century A.D.

We have in this period a fixed date to start from in the numerous inscriptions of King Ga-Sahu Gamaśi (113–125 A.D.), referred to in my former reports, as this king, though not generally mentioned under the distinguishing appellation of Ga-Sahu, has been mindful of preserving to posterity the names of his father (Thoso) and his grandfather (Vasabha). Thus he opens his inscription on the Ruwanweli Dāgaba, Anuradhapura (now in the Museum, Colombo):—

Wahaba raja manumaraka Tissa maharajaha puti maharajaha Gayabahu Gamiṇi Abaya: 闯 i.e. “King Gayabahu Gamini Abaya, son of king Tissa, grandson of the king Wahaba.”

Manumaraka is the ancient form of the modern word maṇabud, ‘grandson,’ derived by inversion of syllables, from Saṃskṛta maṇavāna, ‘mind-delighting,’ as maṇasa, ‘the delighter,’ i.e. the son’.

Some smaller inscriptions of this period, formerly unknown to me, I found at Mihintale. A very well preserved inscription of considerable length is engraved on Habarané rock. Palaeographically it differs little from the inscriptions of the second century, but occasionally the angular characters appear intermingled with the more graceful forms of a later period, which fact, in conformity with observations I have made on other inscriptions, proves that an older stage of the alphabet was for some time retained for engraving on the rock, after a more current form had come to be employed in ordinary life. The language shows some decided instances of development from the second century, but it is still very far removed from what is considered the classical form of Elu literature. The contents are rather more valuable than generally of inscriptions of the same period, as they record some particulars concerning the construction of the tank of Habaras, which was effectuated by utilizing two natural lakes. Like most ancient inscriptions, this also abounds in clerical errors. The following is the text of the whole, transcribed in Roman characters, to which I beg leave to annex a literal translation, as I have made it out.

Inscription on Habarané rock.

Siddham.

1Mujita gamana keriyahi ameta Chasayaha puta Abayahta ati / Walamani wawiya
2kati wawiya dakhiki galanā kana atala wawiya keta awitakita eti eti gama saro
3atali koju me Agichalamana wawiya Mala sara cha Pachachalija sara cha
4do karhi / saha sa cha chaka chatalisa karini (karikini?) cha Sarima paramaka maharajı me Agimalamaṇa
5wawiya bojhiya pati Sene puta Abalahaya cha mahalaka balataka rakaṇa Kanakayah mānumaraka cha samanaya Hamā
6m tara (lera) . . . kata ka (?) riya | dekapatiya kala amanā da . . . rakaṇa saga salah liyawaya bojhiya pataya Karakuawaya (mawiiya)
7Uhetagiri wiharani Abalahahi silachetahi tumaha akaṇa koji wariya Gapa chetehi tela huta mala koṭi cha jija palisatari kama karna karoṭa Chopawaliya Giniya Megaha čh[et]ihi Jaganaṇa hamáṇapataya parawatahi
8cha-ka koṭi cha bojhiya petiya Karakala wawiya dini [hi?] me chetimi wi[kar?] bojhiya patiya ri-karhi / sahasi cha wisiti karhi
9do pața cha | ameta sa cha Wahabahaya putanaga (or ?) ya duti [ya] . . . puchayaawana wasahni majimodini chada puṭa mási sata paka
10diwasa[jh]?

Literal Translation.

“Hail! Concerning the inundated villages (this) in (the sayings) of Abaya, son of the minister Cha-
saya. He saw the Wālamani tank and the Kati (i.e. the royal) tank; having built several villages near lakes without furnishing the fields with a tank between embankments for the flowing down (of the water), he constructed Agīchālamana tank out of the Mula lake and the Pachachiwā lake. And his majesty the King, after having made serve this Agīmalama tank 1,640 karis, giving it in charge to Abalaya, son of Sena, an aged overseer, to watch, and to the therō, the monk Hamarā, grandson of Kañkakaya—afterwards, for the preservation of the, having caused this to be written on a stone belonging to the priesthood, after assigning it, having constructed the Karakula tank and having performed deeds not (formerly) done (even) by himself at Abatala (i.e. Ambathala) at the vihāra of Chaitayagiri (i.e. Mihintale), having made offerings of oil and flowers at the Gapa chaitya, (which it) in extent a kari [8 acres (?), having made repuirings of the decayed (budiyera) at the chaityas of Chopaivaliya, Giniya, Megalā, he handed them over to the monks of the Lord of the world [Buddha], and having made..... after having assigned, he gave (them ?) the Karakula tank—after having assigned...... at the chaitya..... and from 190 karis (?)... and to the sons of the minister Wahabaha.... the second..... in the Pachayasa awanaka [colourless!] year, on the seventh day in the light half of the month Majimodini [March-April].

I have not been able as yet to ascertain what year is meant by the designation of Pachayasa Awanaka, but I suspect the king mentioned to be Sirimēghavaṇna (302-330) who, according to the Mahāvamsa, made great offerings at Ambathala.

Two inscriptions engraved on the rock at Dumnunandakanda record the construction of chaityas, and other grants to the priesthood; one of them is of particular interest, as it exhibits not only a mixture of ancient and modern characters, but also of forms of words.

Other rock inscriptions with the usual contents I have meet with at Paniṅkakunām (near Kekeriwa) and two on Elagamukandā. At Andaramawa (about two miles from Kekeriwa) there is a stone slab containing a short inscription of king ‘Wahaba’ (Vasabho, 66-110), imperfectly preserved, which records a grant to the priesthood. But the pious munificence of the ancient kings did not stop short at endowing places situated near the principal seat of government, Anuradhapura. The district of Hambantotā, Southern Province, is rich in similar dedications.

A fine stone slab found at Tissamahārāma, at present kept in the Assistant Government Agent’s compound at Hambanta, contains an enormous grant of land to the priesthood of the Tissamahārāma Vihāra (or, as it is styled in the inscription itself, “the great vihāra [called after the] king of Māgama”). It runs as follows:—

1 Siddham || Bodadasa Mahida Mahā-
2 sena tawaka bāya Abhaya maharaja
3 mi apa chudi purumuka Budadasa tari pali
4 mahāmaṇika Jetā isi maharaja apaya
5 ha pali Toda gamika kiri kinįiyi ki ugu awami
6 dinawa sahasaka kiri abatariri Mahagama
7 raja mahawahirahi tara pali mahanani Pat-
8 dana galida dinika | pacha sahasaka kiri
9 chi ma Patana
10 galida me warahata [?] pawatara [ri?] na
11 yutua (uwoyata) kotu sa |
12 padinaka | chatara sahasaka ki (ka?) ri
13 cho me di sacha
14 nani | nawa sahasaka kiri yaha ugu wa-
15 ma (?) . . .
16 charita niyamana | rajakolihi bha (?) nana .
17 mini | mewa baka kari (?) di-i | cha (?)
18 tara (?) amahe he (?) da (ga?) .
19 tasa baka sesika | tawa na .
20 Padana galidi buka sago hamiyana cha [ta]
21 ra pachayada uwayuntu karawani kotu | apa
22 chu
23 di purumukaha dina niyamani | me cha
24 sali
25 hi liyayawa dinamahā.

I have attempted a literal translation, which, however, I am aware, may be open to many objections:—

“Hail! Buddhaṁsa, Mahīno, Mahā-
24 seno, three brothers, his majesty King Abha-
25 ya, and our uncle (?) the Brāhmaṇ Buddhadasa, a venerable, reverend therō [the Mahāsāṃghika members] of the king of Māgama; and 5000 karis (beginning) from this Padanagala were given to the reverend, the venerable therō in the great vihāra ‘king of Māgama; and 5000 karis (beginning) from this Padanagala, furnished with..........., have been given over, and 4000 karis shall be........; the taxes (?) of the 9000 karis shall be remitted (?) ; the rules shall be kept; in the royal family preaching (?) shall be.........; this portion of the karis now is given (?): four (?) annas...... ...

1 i.e. karis, equal to about 16,400 acres.
lords of the Bhiksu congregation shall be caused to be furnished with the four pratysayas, having done this* in order that what is given to our uncle (f) the Brhman may be kept, causing it to be written on this stone slab, we have it given."

It is difficult to ascertain who were the kings here alluded to; for neither of the two kings mentioned in the Mahawansa under the name of Jeṭṭha Tissa was succeeded by a son of the name of Abhaya; besides we do not know if these are kings of Ceylon or only of Mâgama.

Judging, however, from the characters as well as from the language, I have no doubt that this inscription is to be attributed to the fourth century A.D. It is worth noticing that even at that remote period some difference between the northern and southern dialects appears to have existed.

The king of Mâgama here alluded to as the eponymous person of the sikhra was king Kâvalâno Tissa, the father of Duṭṭhagâmantî, who, according to the Mahawansa (pp. 131, 150 in Turnour’s edition), founded the Tissamahârâma or Tissamahârâma (about 180 B.C.).

An inscription engraved on a high rock at Kiriñâ ḍë, though not remarkable for its contents, is peculiarly interesting by its language. The whole is a grant to the priesthood as usual, and the signs of sun and moon cut in the rock indicate that this donation shall last as long as sun and moon endure; but it opens with a praise of Buddha in which we find a great many Pâli words, apparently in a semi-Sinhalese guise:


Put into classical Pâli:

Aparimite-lokehi Buddhase mithi | âṭṭhâno parimandalo......sabhinutopeto anatârato sarthâ mahâsarâya lakkâchhakkâ Budhanâmi sayamânu.

"i.e. Hail! In the boundless world there is no equal to Buddha; spaceless, all-extending, endowed with omniscience, incomparable, the Teacher, the great Refuge, the wheel of prosperity—is Buddha, the self-produced one."

It is very unfortunate that we are not able to determine the exact date of this inscription. The characters are essentially the same as in the inscriptions of king Gajabahu (second century A.D.) and his grandfather Vasabho (66-110 A.D.) (see above). There is no doubt that it is subsequently referred to Duṭṭhagâmantî (161-137 B.C.); for in an inscription at Tounigala† in which this king is referred to as reigning, we find only slight modifications of the earliest characters. Again, the alphabet here employed so closely resembles the one used in the Indian caves, which has been attributed to the first century B.C. and the first and second centuries A.D., that we cannot doubt it was introduced from India. The earliest date, therefore, assignable to this inscription would be the first century before the Christian era. Now it was in 90 B.C., under the reign of king Vatagamani, that, according to Sinhalese tradition, the doctrines of Buddhism were first reduced to writing in Pâli. It is possible that this inscription belongs to a time prior to the year 90 B.C., though not very probable. I am rather inclined to attribute it to the first century of the Christian era; at any rate there is no instance of another inscription in the same characters belonging necessarily to the pre-Christian time. If, however, we are to suppose the Pâli language at that time to have been fixed by writing in the same grammatical and lexical forms in which we find it now, and which it certainly has exhibited since the time of Buddha, we should expect Pâli words occurring in inscriptions subsequent to Vatagamani to wear their genuine shape, provided they are not thoroughly transformed into Sinhalese. Here we are, except in the word latti (for maiti is Sinhalese), the Pâli aspirates, as well as a compound sign for ut in parimandalo, and an Amavâra or Baddu in sayamânu—all letters unknown to ancient Sinhalese. On the other hand, double consonants are expressed by single ones, as likewise in the case of the Pâli word bhikkhu, which several times in inscriptions of the same period appears in the form bhikha alongside of its Sinhalese transformations bikha, biki, bika.

The word siddham, usually the first word in these inscriptions, which apparently had been borrowed from Sanskrit, here as elsewhere is written with ddh (in one compound letter); nevertheless the same well-known sign is not used in the name of Buddha, which occurs twice in this inscription. It may be out of deference to Sinhalese grammar that the nom. sing. masc. and fem. (also used as accute form) was made to terminate in yu, though this e is already employed sparingly in Duṭṭhagamani’s inscription. It is interesting that the syllable ni in (sayamânu=sabhinu) is not expressed by its proper sign, but by a with a small yu below the line (ā-y), conformably to the pronunciation still heard in Ceylon (and in some parts of India). Still more remarkable is the use of e instead of

* Literally, 'having done, i.e. ordered the keeping of the rules,' &c.

† Published in the Jour. Cey. As. Soc. for 1855, p. 61.
Pāli δ in the word sāraṃgotpeta, as we can perceive here no influence of Sinhalese, the latter language having changed the original (Sanskrit) word sarva (Pāli saṁbha) into sarva (ma), contracted saṁ (ma), 'all.' Lokahi is a good Pāli form, but not here applicable; it is probably a mistake of the engraver for lokahi, the regular loc. sing. in Sinhalese. The words sati and sinni are Sinhalese.

Leaving it undecided whether the Kirindō inscription is subsequent to the time when the sacred Buddhist canon is supposed to have been committed to writing, or prior to it—in which case of course some of the peculiarities here noticed could be more easily accounted for—there still remains enough in this passage, I believe, to throw doubt on the alleged antiquity of the Pāli language in its present form.

The remaining inscriptions of this period contain nothing remarkable, except occasionally interesting words. A number of fragments are found on the rock at Kāli gāvilvāra (between Rannē and Wiraketiya); other rock inscriptions at Nayigāvilvāra, at Mūgirigāla, one long one at Wādigāla (two miles from Rannē, on the road to Tamgalla), one at Angulikolavēlāra (not far from Kirindō), and two at Wiga mawwa (near Rannē). A long inscription engraved on the rock at Baṣagirīya (nine miles from Hambantota) by its defaced state has resisted my first effort, but may be hoped to be decipherable after a renewed examination.

III.—Down to the Eleventh Century.

I have seen, unfortunately, very few specimens of inscriptions between the 4th and 9th centuries, although this must have been a time of vigorous development, in the course of which by degrees Sinhalese was moulded into its classical shape.

There is an inscription of about the 6th or 7th century on a pillar near Tissa māhārāmo (according to tradition the post to which the royal tether was tied); some lines are pretty well preserved, the greater part is defaced; I have not, however, as yet come to examine this sufficiently.

I will mention here, first of all, an inscription in the Hambantota district, because it has been of great help to me for fixing the dates of a number of other inscriptions. The pillar I am referring to was discovered by Mr. J. H. Dawson, the Irrigation Officer at Mayilagastota. It is inscribed on three sides, but partly effaced. The purport of the whole is again, as so often, a grant to a sīkāra, to which is added an enumeration of the privileges usually connected with such a donation, viz., that the land should be exempt from vijakāriya and the like.

The donor is Miḥinda, āpaṇā and queen Gōn. Now the identical two persons are mentioned as the parents of a king Sānga boya Abhā Śalāmewa in the inscription on those well-known stone tablets at Mihintala (translated in Tourneur's Epitome, and the beginning in J. D'Alvise's Siddasangarwa, Intr. pp. xxxvi. xxviii.), which present such an interesting account of the well-to-do life of the priesthood in a large vihāra. There the king says that he had been āpaṇā before being made king, and as the date of his inscription he gives the 16th year of his reign.

King Abhā Śalāmewa, the father of Miḥinda, has left us an inscription at Elaviragolowa (N. C. P., eleven miles from Madawachchiya), and another one beginning almost with the same words, at Elawe Pansala (c. eleven miles from Mihintala towards Trincomalee). In the latter, however, he calls himself Abhā Śalāmewa Dāpulū. Both bear as their date the 10th year of his reign; in both he alludes to a victorious campaign of his father, Abhā Śiṣi saṅg-bó, in India against the kingdom of Paṇā. Of king Abhā Śiṣi Saṅg-bó a fine pillar inscription is extant in the jungle on the foot of Mihintala hill, in which, however, his parentage is not mentioned. (He simply begins: Abhā Śiṣi saṅg-bó nāra māra na na mē māruwa ne Hima te misti; ḍa ḍa na wak dāwa; i.e. ‘[We] king Abhā Śiṣi saṅg-bó, in the 9th year [of our reign], on the 10th day in the month Himanta [November]’). Alphabets as little as language leaves any doubt about the general period to which these inscriptions belong; it must be the time between the end of the 9th and the beginning of the 11th century. In all of them most of the characters used approach the forms of the present alphabet so closely as to be legible to any educated native; and as for the language, though widely distant from the present conversational, it differs little from that of the inscriptions of the 12th century, if we except the then new-fangled manner of putting back Sinhalese words into their Sanskrit originals, and the wholesale introduction of Sanskrit words besides. Again, as the name Śiṣi saṅg-bó had come to be used as a mere title, assumed by many kings (for instance, Vijayalāhu I, Parakramabahu I, Nissānika Malla), we have to look upon Miḥinda (Mahindo) as the proper name of the inscriber of Mayilagastota and Mihintala.

After these preliminary remarks, we may look in the Mahawamsa for an identification of the three kings (father, son, and grandson) to whom we owe the inscriptions in question. Mahindo III. (997-1013), according to the Mahawamsa (ch. 54), had been made ḍīpīḍha at the accession to the throne of Seno III. (994-997). It is recorded of him (Mahādeva, ch. liv. 29) that he put up inscribed stone slabs "to prevent future kings
from seizing on the property of the priesthood.”

Kassapo VI. (954-964) sent his army to India (Mahadevino, ch. lii.). He was succeeded, according to the Mahadevino, by his son Dappulo IV. (whoreigned six months); and he again by Dappulo V. (964-

974); the next was Dappulo V.’s brother, Udayo III. (974-977), who was followed by several short-reigned kings. A king Udayo is said (Mahadevino, ch. liv. 48) to have been the uncle of Mahindo III.

Examining the rest of Sinhalese history in this period, we have no choice but to identify the three kings met with in the inscriptions above referred to (Abhâ Sirî saûg bo, Abhâ Salamewan Dâpulu, Mihindâ or Sirî saûg boy Ababay) with Kassapo VI., Dappulo V., Mahindo III., of the Mahadevino, respectively. With regard to Dappulo IV., who is called a son of Kassapo VI., we must doubt the correctness of the Mahadevino.

As I have stated, Mahindo was dâpîdado or âep 994-997; to this interval, therefore, the inscription at Mayilagastota is to be attributed. The Mihintale inscription is dated from the 16th year of his sovereignty, i.e. 1012 or 1013.

To the same period as these fine pillar inscriptions of Maha Kalattewa (now in the Museum, Colombo), which in a former report I had attributed to king Sirî saûg bo III. (702-718). A king called Sirî saûg boy in it grants the usual privileges to a village belonging to a nunnery built by the Chief Secretary Ses in honour of his mother. Now a chief secretary Sena is mentioned (Mahadevino, ch. lii.) as one who built and endowed âldras under the reign of king Kassapo V. (937-954), the father-in-law and immediate predecessor of Kassapo VI. or Abhâ Sirî saûg bo of the inscriptions. Although the name Sena is common enough, this coincidence, I believe, is too remarkable for us to hesitate to recognize in him the same person just mentioned, provided that the language and palæography of the inscription speak in favour of this identification, as they do indeed. As therefore Sirî saûg boy, the king referred to, cannot have lived before Kassapo V., and the successors of Kassapo V. are mentioned under different names in the inscriptions, this Sirî saûg boy must be Kassapo V. himself. It is therefore between 937 and 954 that the inscription at Maha Kalattewa (the Kulathavâpi of the Mahadevino, where the decisive battle between Dûthagâmanî and Elâro was fought) must have been written. There are some other inscriptions of king Sirî saûg boy (or bo) (at Mihintale, Anuradhapura, and Gômkolawa near Madawachchiya, the two latter now in the Museum, Colombo) which begin with precisely the same words, but, as the characters in which they are written are of a somewhat more ancient form, I am not confident that these kings and the inscriber of Maha Kalattewa are identical. In the inscription at Anuradhapura (see in a former report) we find the king reigning in his 19th year, while Kassapo V. according to the Mahadevino, only reigned seventeen years.

These are the names of the four kings I have spoken about, with those given to the same in the Mahadevino, —

Inscriptions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1. Sirî saûg boy</th>
<th>1. Kassapo (V.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2. Abhâ (or Abhay)</td>
<td>2. Kassapo (VI.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sirî saûg bo</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Abhâ Salamewan</td>
<td>3. Dappulo (V.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dâpulu</td>
<td>(brother Udayo III.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Mihindâ or Sirî</td>
<td>4. Mahindo (III.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>saûg boy Ababay</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The following are extracts from the inscriptions above referred to: —

I.—Inscription of King Sirî saûg boy (Kassapo V.)

at Maha Kalattewa (complete).

A.—(First side of the Pillar):

Sirî saûg boy ma puronnâk pasalosan we

nawâye pura dâsa wak dawas Pândi rad Dâpulu

ware me kâp par ha kureli senim isâ nawa

ture sengim isâ mahâle Dâpulu arak samanân

ware kuâsha salâ daî swim isâ kolpatra saûg

staûlu wa ep me tawâk denamo ek sewe wâdâ

leyin Sen mahâ

B.

leâgan tuman mæniyan mænin nam di kot

karana la Nâl-aram meheñi-warhi tuman

tuân setirî/hi se dwasapatâ mahawheere

mahaboye diy wâdâ wadë meheñi wat hembu

wat astenak/hat satar pasa wayutu karana

dî vâdâla kærana bimhi â wû Gitelgâmuna

gamâ attâni pæræhær de rawane ge wâdâ

dî isâ de kamten no wara

C.

nâ kot isâ maðûg-riya piya-giyo no wâdâ kot isâ
dunumañdul melâi sirî rad kol kæmiyan no wâdâ

dî isâ wariyan gam gen geri no gannâ kot isâ
gel miwun no wâdâ kot wâdâleyin â me kâp

par ha kureli senim isâ me kâp par nawa ture

saûgim isâ kuâsha salâ daî swim isâ kolpattra

saûg staûlu wa ep me tawâk denu

D.

mo ek sewa swud me Gitelgâmuna gamat attâni

pæræhær denu ladi.

Literal translation.

"His majesty Sirî saûg bo, in the 16th
year (of his reign), on the 10th day in the bright half of Nawaya (February-March)—whereas he has been pleased to declare with regard to the monastery (called) ‘Dāpuḷā, king of Pāṇḍiḷ’; until in this kalpa and in subsequent ones the female birds 

... and the nine planets hide, (and) with regard to the monastery (called) ‘Dāpuḷā the First. Preservation,’ until a small whirlpool becomes (7) firm, for so long do we, in agreement with the Kolpattra community of priests, give—and whereas he has declared: to the village Gitegama-wa, which is situated on the ground assigned—according to the rule which the Chief Secretary Sena himself has established in the nunery Nālārāma built after he had named it with the name of his mother—for daily increasing the (supply of) water at the great vihāra and at the great Bo-tree, (and) for furnishing daily the four pratyaugas to seven persons, nuns or novices (?), a privilege, viz., that two shall enter, that two kavaṃsthāvasaḥkah shall enter, that travellers and shall not enter, that the officers of the royal family shall not enter the assembly of the priests (?), that enemies shall not take cattle from the village (sic!), that the cart-buffaloes shall not enter, until in this kalpa and in subsequent ones the female birds 

(7) until in this kalpa and in subsequent ones the nine planets hide and a small whirlpool becomes (7) firm [literally, to the hiding of—to the becoming firm of—it], for so long do we, in agreement with the Kolpattra community of priests, give—having been pleased to come (here), to this village Gitegama-wa—a privilege is given.

It seems rather strange that, as appears from this inscription, the great vihāra (at Anuradhapura) required to be supplied with water from a tank five miles off.

II.—Inscription of King Abhā Salamewan Dāpuḷā (Dappula V) at Etawawa Posala.

Sri Siibara ket kula kot Okā-was rad parapuren bat Lak diw polojon parapuren himi wū Abhā Siira saṅg bo mahārad/hu tumā sat laṅgū nawawan hawurudvehi Pāṇḍiḷ rat paśeṣe rama jaya kirtti lad runu dan wū mai masulute maṅkā ekānna siri bhoga kala maha-rad/hu daru Abhā Sāla mewan Dāpuḷa mahārad/hu tumā sat laṅgū dasawan hawurudvehi—

"Hail! His majesty king Siira Saṅg bo, who, descended from an uninterrupted line of kings of the Iksvaku family, which is the pinnacle of the glorious Kshatriya caste, had become lord by (hereditary) succession on the ground of the island of Lanka, who, in the 9th year after he had raised the royal umbrella, ransacked the kingdom of Pāṇḍiḷ and, having acquired victory and glory, enjoyed his splendour—flowers which were the gift (tribute) of foes—the son of that king, his majesty king Abhā Sālamewan Dāpuḷa, in the 10th year after he raised the royal umbrella—"

III.—Inscription of the same at Etiuvagopala."-


"His majesty king Abhā Sīri saṅg bo, who, descended from an uninterrupted line of kings of the Iksvaku family, had become lord on Lanka’s ground by (hereditary) succession, who, in the 9th year after he had raised the royal umbrella, ransacked the kingdom of Pāṇḍiḷ and obtained victory—the son of that king, his majesty king Abhā Sālamewan, in the 10th year after he raised the royal umbrella—"

IV.—Inscription of the Apepa Mihinda (later king Mahakanda III) at Mayilagakoṭa.

... Okā-was parapuren bat rad purumuwats a[gha]n[u] wū Lak diw polojon parapuren himi siti (?) Gōn biso rada kus/hi upan Abhā Sālamewan mahārad/hu urehi da katu k[ha]la kot wiyat daham niyā gai (?) Apepa Mihinda hu waisin—

"By the apepa Mihinda—who was born in the womb of the anointed queen Gōn, chief queen to his majesty the king, descended from the unbroken line of the Iksvaku family, reigning on Lanka’s ground by (hereditary) succession—the son of king Abhā Sālamewan—the pinnacle..."
of the Kshatriya caste, the sage who has comprehended (the Doctrine) —

V.—Inscription of the same as King Siri saṅg boy A♭bhay (Mahākāla III). Ambalathal, Mihintal.

1 Sirvār kaṭa kula kot Oka-was rai para-puren but kaṭa usah A♭bhay Salamewan mahara-

2 jhat eke kulien samajay d GW bisew raij na kusum ipade epa mahāyā sirī windre piliwele

3 sey rai wē tumā sirī Lak diw pahayamin sītē Sīṛ saṅg boy A♭bhay maharajhn tumā sat

4 lauṣū soṣoysawana hawrunuyehi wap sand pun maḥi dasa pak dasaw Seygiri weherhi isā-

5 bhaṅg gri meherhi isā wasana mā bhi saṅg himiyan maḥasenāwā karay tumā be wāt himiyan-

6 Sēygiri weherhi peru tabu sirī nija A♭bhay gri meherhi sīrī nija rassā genē me we-

7 herat me sirī tabu wawati niṣiyān hā sase-

dē me weherhe wasana māhā bhi saṅg himiyanat isā-

8 kaṃiyaṇat isā dasat isā katā yutu isā labanu diye yutu se isā wiwawunen ek se koṭ-

me-

9 sirī tabana ladi.

Literal transcription.

“He who, having been born unto king A♭bahay

In the translation given in Tournour’s Epitome of the History of Ceylon, which book I have not here at hand, the word mahassen in line 3, if I remember well, is taken to be the name of a king; the passage is, however, correctly translated in J. D’Alwis’s Sel Song, Intr. xxxi, xxxii, which prevented me from falling into the error.

It will be observed that the language employed in these inscriptions, though by no means devoid of adopted Sanskrit and Pali words (latamās), still puts them into a Sinhalese shape. It is curious even to notice how the difference between the Sanskrit words used in the inscription of the apā Mihālā at Mayāgastāta and in the inscription of Mihintal of the same person, as king Siri saṅg boy A♭bhay. In the Mayāgastāta inscription we find still rad (Sk. rāja), rāna (Sk. rājā); in short, the sounds foreign to the Sinhalese of those days are changed into genuine Sinhalese sounds. In the Mihintal inscription these words already approach the Sanskrit form more closely, and the tendency of transporting back as it were, genuine Sinhalese words into their Sanskrit originals is already growing into fashion; thus, Sanskrit and Pali words (‘person’) is commonly used for Sinhalese denas; rai, raij have supplanted rad, rāna; and there are such uncial words as sāmaja (‘born’) for Sāmaja and Pāli sāmāja, asakrā (‘having united’), from Pāli sāmājayati, and the like. King Mahinda was also fond of words redolent of antiquity, as sey (‘as’), Sēygiri (‘Chaitiyagiri’), Mihintal, the usage of such forms, as se and Sēygiri, occur already in inscriptions undoubtedly more ancient.

On the other hand, Parākramabālī’s inscription at Galvihaḍa, Polonnaruwa (below) abounds in Sanskrit words in their unaltered original shape, and it is known to what an extent they have crept into the Sinhalese of the present day. It appears, therefore, that it is the time between the beginning of the 11th and the middle of the 12th century we have to look upon as having originated the modern mixed speech. It was in this period, too, that the Sinhalese learned to pronounce the aspirates of the Sākṣīt and Pāli languages, which had till then remained commonly in the inscriptions of the 12th century,—while in this period they were, as a rule, either expressed by the corresponding unaspirated sounds, as in bidan (Pāli abhidhānaṃ) (Mahānī’s inscription at Mihintal), or divided into two by inserting a vowel between the aspirate sound and the aspirant, as in abbata (Pāli abhāṣita). On the other hand, abhaya (Pāli abhaya) was written and pronounced, ṣe (Mahānī’s inscription at Mihintal), the modern evārīma, ‘faint’, corrupted from Sanskrit and Pāli apārkā, the genuine Sinhalese word derived from apārīka being born, a latī; even to the present day the common people say A♭nurājāpya for Anurādhapura.

Shortly after that time Sinhalese literature, as far as it is now extant, must have commenced; its language carrying with it the spells of many foregoing centuries. To these the poets and pandits added their own inventions—Sākṣīt (and Pāli) words artificially, but often with great skill, turned into Sinhalese, and modern Sinhalese words put back into what were supposed to be the ancient forms of them. Hence the present Sinhalese style has come to be a strange medley of Sinhalese forms of almost all ages, of thoroughly Sinhalese Sākṣīt and Pāli forms of the same semi-Sinhalese, of unchangeable Sākṣīt and Pāli words, and of the random inventions of poets and pandits. It is this variety of forms of the same words which Sinhalese writers take advantage of to render their style elegant, although this custom very little accords with what European readers would consider good taste.
mentions one of those numerous kings called SiraSaig bo as the father of the reigning king (about the 11th century).

IV.—Inscriptions at Polonnaruwa, Mineri, Dambulla.

On the bau of the famous tank of Mineri (Pāli Manihihira; Inscr. Minihiriya) there is an inscription of the 10th or 11th century on two sides of a large stone pillar, which contains a grant of privileges to the place; unfortunately about forty-four lines on both sides are completely effaced, and nine only left. Close to this pillar there are some ancient statues of Hindu deities which impress the native mind with so much awe that no inhabitant of the village can be prevailed upon to approach the spot.

Polonnaruwa (Pulastinagarā), the capital of Ceylon after the decline of Anuradhapura, contains, as might be expected, for the most part inscriptions of a comparatively modern date. Near Gaļiha, constructed by Parākramabāhu the Great, I found a few huge letters cut in the rock, the remnants of an inscription of considerable length, which, belonging to the earlier centuries of our era, owes its destruction to the mysterious charm attributed by the natives to the ancient Nāgara characters: it had been, as I was told, defaced this very year by the barbarous inhabitants of Tōpawasāwā.

The two inscriptions coming nearest in age to the one just mentioned are to be attributed to the 9th or 10th century. The one is engraved on the four sides of a pillar close to the site of Niśānaka Malla’s Audience Hall, on the spot whence that king’s lion-seat was taken to Colombo. The name of a king Agrabadhi is legible, but a great portion of it is effaced. Another pillar I had dug out of the ground not far from Jetavanarama. The inscription is very well preserved, and refers to a privilege granted by a king [. . . . . . . Sāla]newa to a village Galutwa, which belonged to a high officer of state called Wadurag. The king, I suspect, is Sena Silāmegho (838-858), and Wadurag, his minister Vajiro, who is mentioned Mahāv. l. 83. The natives say that the pillars near the place where the inscription was found formed part of the ancient Lōwa mahapāya, ‘the great brazen palace’ (evidently built in imitation of the one at Anuradhapura). The place itself is now called Birigē vimānaya, ‘the palace of the deaf woman,’ and some story is told about the origin of this name. I consider it far from impossible that Birū is only corrupted from Vajiro: the recollection of the owner of the spot having been lost, the natives were as usual ready to invent an etymological story of their own.

The two kings whose reigns have left most marked traces in the extensive ruins of Polonnaruwa are Pāra-krāmabrāhu the Great and one of his next successors, Niśānaka Malla. Yet of the former we find only one inscription, though a very long one; while the latter, who could not feel so confident as his famous predecessor, of his memory not becoming lost to posterity, has laid down all the events of his life in numerous inscriptions, some of them of stupendous length. Parākramabāhu’s inscription is engraved on the wall of Gaļiha, the great which he had founded. Unfortunately this is not an historical inscription, but a religious one, which contains the rules given for the priestlyhood of the vihāra. It is tolerably well preserved, and belongs to the earlier part of Parākramabāhu’s reign, being dated a.e. 1708—i.e. 1165 A.D. The first six of fifty-one lines run thus:

1 Ape Budun kalpaśatatasahasrabhiha chatu(?) rasa[n]khyaparimitakālaya(yen) sāna(śana) tisa param(ṭaram) pura Mārasa[ś]igrāma
bhāmi wū mahābodhi pa[ṝ]jyāṃkārāṇḍha wa(we) dvurvāra sapā

irvāra Māra pariṣaya kotē sarvavajjapada
prāpta wa pānali-hawuruddak dagas chaturthi(?) pak mahā meghayak seyin weḍa site ane
ka kalpakotiśatatasaharanāye kaleṣānānī da
⟨se⟩(?) wemīni sīti satya(śakyat?) yan dharmāmār
tavarshāyak niwāmin sakala Buddha-kṛtyā nimmā
wā Kusinārapuro gaureshi abises hi Mo

2 Ilā rājayange sālabandeka (?) . . . yehi (śalavanoda[n]yehi) nirupadhiśeṣa nirvānā
dhātuwena dīwī niwī sāra-siya-sanne
shawuruddak giya kāla Walagam Abhā
mahāriya dagasam pataṇ ek wā-dāhasa

3 panaṣ-hawuruddak bhina-nikāya wa
śāśanaṇa pirwēmin siṭi kalhi Mahāsammatādi
parāmarśiyāta sūrīyaavasādhiharajā
naikadigabhivāptaśomarichha(śomaric) vi

4 na Śī Saṃghabodhi Pāra-krāmabrāhu mahārajāṇan sakala Laṅkātelehi ek(
āryājābhisekaya) abhishika wa viṁbhītha
punyaruddhi ati wa rājasukhānubhava kote
waṭanuwa.

LITERAL TRANSLATION.

“1254 years from the time of the king Walagam Abhā (Vērissāmaṇa), when 454 years had elapsed since Our Buddha, having in a time limited by (extending over) four avasnīhīnas 100,000 kalpas fulfilled all the thirty perfections, and having, on the Māra battle-ground, mounted on the divan of (i.e. sitting cross-legged in) thorough enlightenment, conquered the irresistible Māra together with his retinue, at
tained the state of omniscience, and forty-five years
(after that), on the 4th day, having accomplished
by quenching . . . . . . . . as a large cloud does by
rain, so he, in many hundred thousands of kros
eras kalpas by the nectar of the law, [having thus ac-
complished] all the duties of a Buddha, extin-
guished (his) life by means of the sacred nirupa-
adiśeṣa nirūpaṇa near the city of Kuśinagara,
in the grove of adi trees of the king of the Mallas—
[1254+454 years after that time] when, the congregations being broken up, religion was
fading away, his majesty king Śrī Sanghabodhi Parākrāma bāha, descended from
the unbroken line of Mahāsāṃkha and the others,
born of the Solar race, the king over kings, re-
splendent through the rays of his glory which has
penetrated many regions, anointed by the anoint-
ment of paramount dominion on Lankā’s ground,
enjoying the delight of dominion, with the treasure of
his merits made patent, he, the very wise one—"

Shortly after Parākrāma bāha’s death (1186)
Niśāṣūka Malla ascended the throne of Ceylon
and reigned for nine years (1187-1195) — a king
whose vainglorious, as exhibited in his inscriptions,
appears extraordinary, even making allowance
for his being an Oriental prince, and who was anxious,
more than any other Śimhalese monarch, not to
allow the memory of his reign to fall into oblivion.
The Mahāvindras has no record of him but
that he erected dagabas and palaces, and by his
zeal for Buddhism heaped up merits from day to
day. He himself tells us of an expedition to India,
but most of the other memorable actions he
speaks of have regard to religion. His numerous
inscriptions are amongst the longest in the island,
carefully executed, and most of them excellently
preserved. He describes his whole life—birth,
parentage, his arrival in Ceylon, his dignities there,
the solemnity of his installation as king, and
the acts of his government. Many of the buildings
of Polonnaruwa, still extant in their ruins, indeed
owe their origin to his magnificence; it was he,
too, who repaired and embellished the splendid cave
temple at Dambulla, often referred to in his inscrip-
tions. A fine stone slab on the ruined walls of
Dātāgāpa at Aṇurādhāpura records, besides
his other actions, the costly works he executed
for the embellishment of this ālā, and for the
restoration of Marichavatī and the other vihā ras.
Another long inscription of his we find engraven
on the rock at Damballa close to the cave.
The remainders are to be found in his capital, Po-
lonnarūwa.

Going out from the modern village of Tōpawewa or Tōparē, we reach first his Audience Hall,
where we find two series of pillars denoting the
order in which the different dignitaries were
seated, when Niśāṣūka Malla was on his throne
(the identical lion-seat now kept in the Colombo
Museum, and itself covered, I have been told,
with an inscription of this king). Near the Da-
ladāmāndirāwa (the palace of the tooth-relic)
there is a fine stone slab inscribed on two sides
(see text and translation in the Jour. B. L. s. Soc.
1874). From there we proceed to Thūparāmo
and the surrounding buildings, where we find the
enormous Galpota (stone book), an inscription
in three portions like the pages of a book (each
page twenty-four lines), containing the whole of
Niśāṣūka Malla’s history; a number of broken
pieces of stone forming a sort of frieze round
the lower walls of a palace, and a stone seat, which
both narrate the same events with few variations.
At Rākot Dāgāba we have again a stone seat
and four pillars, all four of them covered with
the same inscription. At Jētavanārāmo
there is a third stone seat of larger size than the
two before mentioned, containing two inscriptions,
one of which is the identical one seen on the four
pillars at Rākot Dāgāba. The walls of a Hindu
temple not far from Thūparāmo are covered with
a Tamil inscription, of which, however, a great
portion is effaced; as Niśāṣūka Malla mentions a
Hindu temple built by him at Polonnaruwa, it is
not unlikely that he is the author also of this
inscription; but my want of acquaintance with
ancient Tamil language and palaeography prevent
me from being able to assert here anything with
confidence.

The principal events of Niśāṣūka Malla’s
life, as gathered from his inscriptions, are these:—
Niśāṣūka Malla was born 1700 a. d. (i. e. 1157 a. d.)
at Śimhapura as the son of king Śrī Jayagopa
of Kālinga and his queen Pārvati. Having
come to Ceylon, to which he claims to have had
an hereditary right, he first obtained the dignity
of ad, and afterwards was made king. As such
he calls himself Śrī Saṅgabo Kālinga
Parākrāma bāha Viyarāja Niśāṣūka Malla Aṇata malla. His general character
is thus described in the Galpota:—

Galpota I.

11 Udi-gal munda āna

12 t hiruhu sē satarandara durulā bahjuanayā-

muwa-piyum pubudu kote anat raja-sirin Chakravendraśā sé somi-guṇen pun sandalu sē

13 tāyen Meruwa sē gemburu-bawin sāgaraya

sē kshāntigation maha pōlawa sē lo-wassan

pinin upan kap-rukak sē wadda sitān.
Literal translation.

"—having dissipated the enemies and exhilarated the faces of the multitude, as the sun, when reaching the summit of the sunrise-mountain, destroys darkness and expands the lotuses—like unto Sakra, the king of gods, by his infinite royal splendour—like unto the full-moon by his gentleness—like unto Mount Meru by his firmness—like by his ocean by his profundity—like by his patience—like a kūlpā-tree produced by the merits of the inhabitants of the world—"

It was thought incumbent on a king who wished to show his zeal for the religion of Buddha to issue edicts forbidding people to take away life. Of course it was rather the life of birds, fish, wild beasts, &c., which was meant to be spared; as for man's life, often the most devoted of these kings had made their way to the throne through murdering their predecessors. In the second part of the Mahevamsa this is usually expressed by a certain fixed formula:

Mahevamsa mañjanapakkhiham kathabban sabham dehari:

"As for his duties towards the fish, wild beasts, and birds, he accomplished them all."

Nissālaka Malla did not neglect these duties. In his inscription at Anurādhapura he says that he gave security to the fish in twelve great tanks, and commanded the Kāmbojans not to kill birds, after having given them large presents. In his inscription on the pillars at Rankot Dāgaba some of these tanks are enumerated:

Rau-Tissu-Minihora-Gaṅgatālī-Parā-lata wu twa rajāyehi no ek muha wə tanva aśeṣa pradita ṣahaya dī:

"Havening at the site of many great tanks, as Rauwawa-Tissa (Tissuweva at Anurädhapura), Minihirowuwa (Mineri), Gaṅgatalāwa (Kandalei), Pālīwewa (Pālīwela), and others in the three kingdoms, given security to all living beings."

On the other hand, the same king sent his general, Lāk Vījayaśingha Kit with an army over to India, to invade the kingdom of Pāndū, and pretend to have received large tribute from his enemies. An inscription of this identical Lāk Vījayaśingha Kit, who is frequently spoken of in connection with Nissālaka Malla's victories, I have described in a former report; I shall insert it below, as it will be of interest to compare this later grant to the priesthood with the more ancient dedicatory inscriptions above quoted. The several queens of Nissālaka Malla are also mentioned, as well as his son Viṭrabhū, who reigned after his father's death for one year, and his daughter Sarvāüssagundari (compare the names of other princesses of Kāliṅga—Trilokusundari, queen to Vījayañabū, and a relation of hers called Sundari [Mahē. ch. lix., Turnour's ed. Intr. p. lxxxviii. ff.]).

In several inscriptions the people of Ceylon are admonished to choose their kings from the royal family of Kāliṅga, as it would not become kings of Ceylon, or Pāndū, who were adverse to Buddhism, to reign over the island:

Kāliṅga-vanamayata himi Lok-dīveca Buddha-sāyaṇyata pratiṇākṣaḥ abuddha Čoḍha Pāndūyodhi-rajan, no piṅgāyana yuttīya:

i.e. As it is not right to establish un-Buddhist kings, as those of Ceylon, Pāndū, &c., who are enemies to the religion of Buddha, in the island of Lāṅkā, which belongs to the dynasty of Kāliṅga" (Galpotis, III. 21–22).

I think we are justified in inferring from this that the princes of Kāliṅga themselves were Buddhists, and it is not without interest to learn that so late as at the close of the 12th century there was a Buddhistic dynasty reigning over a part of Southern India.

Of real benefit to his subjects seem to have been the changes Nissālaka Malla made in the system of taxation: for five years he remitted all taxes, and some of the most obnoxious he abolished for ever.

Inscription of Lāk Vījayaśingha Kit (on the three sides of a pillar found on the band of Abbayawewa or Basawa-kuḷam, now in the Museum of Colombo) (date about 1210).

A.

Śrīmat Oka-was-raja-parapuren ā Abhā Šalamewan Līlāvati-svāmingo agrāmātya wū Lāk Vījayaśingha Kītsenewiyantunwan no Anurādhapure paṭaṇ bhūmiyo taman kāre wū ruwanpāye hiwahe hun saṅgu

B.

ruwantha siwu-pasayen wana pāsu pinnese tamaṇta bat giṇuwa yowin yāḷak hā meh mah chāityayata yāḷak hā pilimageya yāḷakhā bhūmi-dāna kotē hira-sanda pamaṇa wə pidi pāsaya pirimæmu me lābhaṇa antarāya kaḷaemouth

C.

windinā narakādi-duk dan hā maṭu maṭu wana nuwanetiyen lobha-dvēsha-māna duru kotē lābha antarāya no kotē nuwanetedan (?) kaḷa anumowanu menawī.

Literal translation.

"General Lāk Vījayaśingha Kit, chief minister to Līlāvati's royal consort, Abhā Šalamewan, who comes from the royal race of the glorious Ikshvākū family—in the 3rd year (of the king's reign) having made a donation of land: one yāda for rice. . . . . . .

barley (?) to the priests themselves living in the Ruwanpāya (raṭa-praṣudda, palace of jewels) which he
herself built on ground from Anuradhapura, for their ease, that it may serve for the four pratyayas, and one ydla to the chaitya here and one ydla to the image-house—the pain in hell, which those shall suffer who obstruct this merit acquired from the offered..., which shall last as long as sun and moon endure (literally, sun and moon being the measure), shall be new and in all future, (but) wise men who, having renounced covetousness, hatred, pride, and not obstructing the merit, do... may be pleased to share (the merit)."

A grant made to the identical general Lak Vijayasitha Citi is the subject of a long inscription of king Sāhassa Malla (1200-1292), engraved on the two sides of a fine stone slab and excellently preserved; the greatest portion, however, is historical, referring to events connected with the accession of the king to the throne of Ceylon. We learn from it that Sāhassa Malla was a brother of Nišāsika Malla, being the son of Śrī Jayagopa of Kāliśka, but by a different queen. This inscription, together with Nišāsika Malla's inscription at Anuradhapura, has lately been published in the Jour. R. As. Soc. (N. S. vol. VII pp. 593ff); but as, unfortunately, native copies only had been procurable, the text of both abounds in blunders.

I found one short and comparatively modern inscription besides at Polonnaruwa, on a post at the staircase leading to Kiriwehera, from which I have been unable to make out any sense.

The jungle covering the ancient streets of Polonnaruwa has been cleared to so small an extent that there is no doubt much more must be hidden than we have found as yet; new inscriptions, though probably pretty modern, will certainly be of great interest, for their language as well as, more still, on account of the historical matter they are likely to contain; as for buildings, though at Polonnaruwa they are, as a rule, very inferior imitations of the Hindu style of art, their discovery may nevertheless prove valuable from more than one point of view.

I beg leave to add regarding the inscriptions inserted in this report that I have translated them into English as literally as possible, as they contain new matter, though being aware of the insufficiency of this kind of translation. Philological explanations it would have been out of place to give here.

Akurun, 11th September 1876.

BOOK NOTICES.


This is the fourth instalment of what Mr. Wheeler calls the "History of India from the Earliest Ages." The first volume, as most are aware, contains an analysis or abridgment of English versions of parts of the Vedas and the Mahābhārata, and the second of the story of the Rāmdāyaṇa and the Institutes of Manu. To call these volumes a History, however, we hold to be quite a misnomer: they have no claim to the title. The Mahābhārata and the Rāmdāyaṇa are neither of them the work of a single age; and the events chronicled in them, so far as they may chronicle actual events, were perhaps of little more importance in the political history of the time than the feats of Robin Hood were in England. And until these works have been analyzed in a way they are not likely to be for years to come, and the portions belonging to different epochs, if possible, distinguished and separated, the pictures they present can have no claim to historical truthfulness as reflecting the character of any particular age. And when such analysis has been made, the result will only be such 'history' as might be extracted from any good novel—not a narrative of actual events which formed or helped to form the character of the times, but rather, conversely,—that character as illustrated by incidents not so real as those in the Waverley novels.

The third volume, on the Hindu and Buddhist periods, is a compilation from more varied materials, which, as has been noticed (ante, vol. IV. p. 62) the writer has often misinterpreted; and the present is a volume, or part of a volume, of 320 pages, with xvi pages of content, which professes to give the history of Muhammadan rule from 570 to 1650 A.D. The first chapter is devoted to Islam before the conquest of India, or from 570 to 997 A.D., and as is brief a survey as it well could be, since on p. 22 begins the account of the contest between Jayapala and Subuktin, the assertions crowded into the preceding short résumé being made with a confidence that must tempt the careful reader to ask for authorities, which are scarcely ever alluded to. Mr. Wheeler, among other things, believes the Afghans to be the descendants of the 'Ten Tribes.'* But unfortunately he is more fond of theories like this than of facts: here is a specimen from the preface:—"It will be seen," he says, "in the course of the present volume that the Moghuls bore a striking resemblance to the subject of their Hebrew descent. Jones thought there might be some basis of truth in the hypothesis, and suggested that the Amalekites (2 Esdras xiii. 45) to which

* It is well known that every Afghan claims to be one of the Banū-Isrā'îl, or Children of Israel, and Mr. H. Vansittart as long ago as 1786 addressed Sir W. Jones on
Vedic Aryans. . . In other words, it will be seen that there is reason to believe that the Vedic Aryans were Moghuls; that Asoka and Akber sprang from the same stock as the worshippers of the Vedic gods.” But he does not adduce what any sober thinker would regard as a shadow of proof for this or any of his numerous other hasty conclusions.

The brief outline given of the history of India is divided by the author into “four stages of development”— “the Sunni, the Shi`ah, the Sufi, and the Sunni revival,” the first found expression from the eleventh to the fourteenth century; the second from the conquest of the Dakhân in the fourteenth to the sixteenth century; the Sufi during the establishment of the Moghul empire in the 16th and 17th centuries,—“during this period,” he says,—“Hinduism worked its strongest. It imbued Mussalmân thinkers with a belief in the transmigrations of the soul; in the final union of the soul with the supreme spirit. It brought the worship of Ali and his two sons, as incarnations of God, into harmony with the worship of Râma and Krishna, as incarnations of Viṣṇu. But the movement failed to reconcile Mussalmân and Hindus. It drifted into indolence and skepticism, and was finally swamped in a religious revival.” The last epoch, that of the Sunni revival, coincides with “the culmination and decadence of the Moghul empire in the 17th and 18th centuries.” And the Sunni reaction was “a revival of the orthodox religion in a puritanical form.” Again the author calls attention to another division of Indian history; he says,—“The Mussulman period is the one properly so called. It extended from the 11th century to the 16th. Throughout this interval of five centuries the religion of Isâlam was dominant throughout the Mussulman empire. The Sultans were mostly staunch Mussulmans. The Moghul period has been wrongly called Mussulman. It extended from the 16th century to the middle of the 17th. Throughout this interval the Korân was neglected or ignored; many of the so-called Mussulmans were Sufi heretics; many affected open infidelity. Akber, the greatest sovereign of the Moghul dynasty, attempted all pretence of being a Mussulman. He persecuted Mussulmans; he destroyed mosques; he broke up the power of the Ulamâ, or Mussulman Church.” Some of the statements above quoted will be so new to students of Indian history who have derived their ideas from Oriental sources, or even from Elphinstone, Orme, Dow, Mill, Marshman, and other respected writers, that we need not further challenge them. Nor, though so carefully defined in his preface, does the author himself in the work very markedly distinguish between “the Mussulman” and “the Moghul periods.” The short space of 300 pages of large type, into which Mr. Wheeler compresses his account of six centuries and a half, does not give him the opportunity of entering into details either of campaigns or of policy, and the reader gets much less than is given in the compilation of Murray and other popular handbooks of the class. The whole is expressed in a series of very short sentences, all cast in one mould, and averaging from sixteen to nineteen on a page of 34 lines. The abruptness of the style may be judged from the quotations we make. Much new material for the history of India has been made available within the last few years, even to those, like Mr. Wheeler, unacquainted with any Oriental language; we need only mention the invaluable work on the Muhammadan period, embracing the translations of native histories, prepared by the late Sir H. M. Elliot and continued by Professor Dowson, filling eight octavo volumes, containing about 4600 pages of matter, which the judicious and well-merited encouragement of Her Majesty’s Secretary of State for India has enabled the able editor to carry through the press. But Mr. Wheeler’s opinion of native historians is not high. “The historians of the Mussulman period, properly so called,” he says, “generally told the truth. Occasionally they may have praised bad princes because they were good Mussulmans; otherwise they were honest and trustworthy. They were kept up to the mark by the influence of the Ulamâ. The Ulamâ comprised the collective body of doctors, lawyers, magistrates, and judges resident at the capital...Had the historians of the Mussulman period sacrificed truth to flattery, they would have exposed themselves to the scorn of

Mission to Afghanistan, 1857. The national tradition of the Afghans may be seen in Dorn’s History of the Afghans by Ni`âmat Ullah (London, 1864); but, as may be noticed by comparing this with the other versions of this tradition given by W. Forbes, and Bellor, there is not last accordence in its details as reported by themselves; and their histories are none of them more than three hundred years old. Dorn, Trumpp, Lowenthal, and Wolff have failed to discover a single Hebrew or Chaldean root in the Pushto language except in purely Arabic words introduced with Muhammadanism, and most of the customs pointed out as characteristic of the Pushto are traced to the Qorri. The weakness of all the arguments is pointed out in a paper by the Rev. T. P. Hughes in The Christian Intelligence, vol. I, p. 60-7, to which we are chiefly indebted for the substance of this note.
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the Ulamā. Ferozeh he considers "a type of the truth telling historians of the Mussulman period." Yet Ferozeh does not belong to that period at all, but to the beginning of the 17th century, the culminating point of his "Moghul period," during which, he says—"History degenerated into flattery and falsehood. European historians of India have believed in the fulsome flattery of Persian parasites and party writers. They have ignored the authority of European contemporaries, who had no temptation to depart from the truth." Such are his somewhat startling dicta, and in proof he says—"Abul Fazl and Khāfi Khan are types of the flatterers who flourished during the Moghul period. This statement by no means diminishes the value of Mr. Blockmann's translation of the Āñ-i-Abbār of Abul Fazl. Mr. Blockmann's* work is invaluable." Very different has been the estimate previously formed by Elphinstone, Grant Duff, and Sir H. Elliot of these writers: the high character of Abul Fazl's Akbar udma is well known,† and Khāfi Khan's Mustakhab-ul Ijab is regarded by Sir H. Elliot as "one of the best and most impartial Histories of Modern India;" and from the high and well-deserved repute of these authors among scholars Mr. Wheeler's condemnation will be able to detract nothing.

Having thrown overboard the native historians, Mr. Wheeler adduces his favourite authorities, whose evidence "beyond all question" places "Moghul history" upon "a truthful footing." They are—William Hawkins, "who spent two years at Agra between 1608 and 1611"; Sir Thomas Roe, "who followed the court of Jehangir from 1616 to 1618"; Sir Thomas Herbert, "who travelled in India about 1627 and 1628"; John Albert de Mandeslo, who "travelled in India between 1638 and 1640"; Francis Bernier, "who lived in India from 1656 to 1668; John Baptist Tavernier, "an intelligent jeweller who travelled through India two or three times in the reigns of Shah Jehan and Aurungzeb;" Monsieur de Thvenot, "who travelled through India in the early years of Aurungzeb. Such are the authorities on which the historian has relied; they present a true picture of native rule." We do not question the value of their testimony: they were honourable men and told the truth, so far as they knew it; but the question is how much had they the opportunity of seeing and judging of for themselves, and what were their qualifications as impartial historians? But Mr. Wheeler has "other authorities:" Manouchi, a Venetian physician, resided forty-eight years in India. "He was in the service of Shah Jehan; afterwards in that of Aurungzeb." His memoirs fell into the hands of Father Catrou, a Jesuit priest, who wrote "a history of the Moghul empire" in French, which was translated into English and published in London in 1826. "It forms," says Mr. Wheeler, "the very best authority for the history of the reign of Shah Jehan."

"Catrou quotes letters which reveal the inner nature and disposition of the writers. The substance is given in the sixth chapter of the present volume" (pp. 251-290). "They impart a dramatic character to the history." But "Father Catrou's history is incomplete." He wrote a history of the reign of Aurungzeb, but it does not appear to have been published, and so Mr. Wheeler finds that his reign "is difficult and obscure," and "under these circumstances the present volume has been brought to a close with the reign of Shah Jehan."

Those who seek for history will scarcely find it among Mr. Wheeler's facts and fancies strung together in this volume, which adds nothing to our previous information, nor even utilizes to any satisfactory extent the results of recent research. We can only hope Mr. Wheeler will find better materials, and present a picture more in accordance with facts in the forthcoming Part of this volume, which is to be to the Hindu history of the Peninsula.

NALOPAKHYĀNAM, or the TALE of NALA; containing the Sanskrit text in roman characters, followed by a Vocabulary in which each word is placed under its root, with references to derived words in cognate languages, and a Sketch of Sanskrit Grammar. By the Rev. Thomas Jarrett, M.A. (Edited for the Syndics of the University Press.) London: Cambridge Warehouse, 1876.

In a short introductory note the editor states that this edition of the Nalopakhyānam is "intended for the benefit of those persons who are deterred from the study of Sanskrit in consequence of the complicated characters in which that language is usually printed." From the completeness of the aids and the ingenuity of their arrangement, however, the book seems well calculated to be of great use to the beginner in Sanskrit, quite independently of the character used. The text occupies 83 pages, or scarcely half the volume, and to each of the first eleven of the twenty-six sections or cantos into which the poem is divided is affixed a short list of roots alphabetically arranged and numbered. Each of these roots occurs in composition once or oftener in the section, and the numeral belonging to it in the list is written over each of these derivatives or compounds in that canto; in this way the learner is

* Mr. Blockmann's well-known name is uniformly thus mis-spelt by Mr. Wheeler.
† See Blochmann's Āñ-i-Abbār, pref. p. vi.; Sir H. Elliot's Historians of India, vol. VI. pp. 6-3.
‡ Conf. ante, p. 235.
enabled at once to refer to the vocabulary, where he finds the meaning of the root and all the derivatives from it that occur in the poem, together with occasional footnotes pointing out cognate words in Pāli, Hindustani, Gothic, German, Persian, Latin, Greek, Russian, Welsh, &c. Then, an index is prefixed to the Vocabulary, in which the words are arranged in alphabetical order, the root of each being set against it. The "Sketch of Sanskrit Grammar" is derived from Wilson’s Grammar, and is in the briefest form possible, consisting of eight pages of text and seven folding sheets of tables of declensions of nouns, numerals, pronouns, and conjugations of verbs—arranged in such a form as to be most useful to the learner.

The system of transliteration differs from that commonly used in employing a dot over the letter to indicate the long sounds of a, i, and u, in representing the short i by ı, ẹ by ẹ, ọ by ọ, ọ by ọ, ụ by ụ, ọ by ọ. We hardly think the additional simplicity of this is sufficient to justify a departure from the usual system.

Nārada Dharmaśāstra, or the Institutes of Nārada. Translated for the first time from the unpublished Sanskrit original by Dr. Julius Jolly. With a preface, notes chiefly critical, an index of quotations from Nārada in the principal Indian Digests, and a general index. (pp. xxxiv. and 144, 12mo.) London: Trübner & Co. 1876.

The title-page of this little volume very correctly describes its contents: the appendix, containing the index of quotations and critical notes, occupies 22 pages at the end of the translation. The preface is a very thoughtfully written introduction, containing, in the limited space of twenty-seven pages, a vast amount of condensed information and criticism.

The Nārada Dharmaśāstra or Nāradaśāstrī, like other works of the sort, begins with a fabulous account of itself. Abridged it runs thus:—

"Manu Prajāpati composed for the benefit of all beings, a book founded upon custom and law, which consisted of twenty-four divisions, viz. the creation of the world, a classification of beings, an enumeration of the countries assigned to them, the characteristics of a judicial assembly, &c. &c. . . . It contained a hundred thousand ślokas. Prajāpati having composed this book, which was arranged in a thousand chapters, delivered it to the divine sage Nāradā. He then read it and thought by himself: ‘This book cannot be easily studied by human beings on account of its length.’ Therefore he abridged it in twelve thousand ślokas and delivered it to Sumati, the son of Bhṛigu. He too read it, and bethought himself, what human capacity had been brought to through the successive lessening of life;

wherefore he reduced it to four thousand. It is this second abridgment by Sumati which mortals read, whilst the gods, Gandharvas, &c. read the original code consisting of a hundred thousand ślokas, which begins with the śloka: ‘This universe was involved in darkness and could nowhere be discovered; then the holy self-existing spirit appeared with four faces.’ From this beginning, chapter follows chapter in regular succession. There the ninth chapter is headed: ‘Of Judicial Procedure.’ Of this chapter Nāradā, the divine sage, made a general abstract in form of short rules (śūtras).’ And this abstract is the work now translated. But of course ‘the divine sage’ had nothing to do with its authorship, for even this epitome ascribed to him quotes Nāradā as well as Manu as authorities; who the real author of it may have been, it is impossible to say, but in all probability, as Dr. Jolly conjectures, the metrical version we now have is the work of some learned Brāhmaṇa, who perhaps reduced some older law-book into this shape. Its age he discusses at more length, and, in agreement with Aurel Mayr and Stenzler, he comes to the conclusion that while the codes of Manu and Yājñavalkya must be placed among the earliest law-books, that of Nāradā cannot be attributed to an earlier date than the fifth or sixth century—and perhaps it belongs even to a somewhat later age.

The Nāradāśāstrī is perhaps, as described by Dr. Jolly, "the most luminous, complete and systematic" of Hindu law-books, conveying "a more correct and more favourable impression of native Hindu legislation than either the code of Manu or Jāgannātha’s Digest, the two most widely-spread works on Hindu law in general, could give," and its translation must be welcome to all connected with Indian jurisprudence in any form, as well as to Sanskrit scholars. With the exception of an occasional stiffness and want of idiomatic expression, it is clearly rendered in a scholarly fashion. We trust the reception of this little volume will be such as to encourage the author to attempt some of the medical law treatises.

AITHHASIKA ROHASAYA, by Rāma Dāsa Sen.

Babu Rāma Dāsa Sen of Berhampur is known to some of our native scholars as the author of essays on some of the principal Indian poets. This second volume of his, which he styles Historical Essays, treats on a variety of subjects, such as 'The Vedas,' 'Buddhism,' 'Jainism,' the 'Pāli language and literature,' 'the Era of Śāhīvāhāna,' 'the Hindu Drama,' &c. It is to be regretted he does not issue these interesting studies in an English dress, in which they would be welcomed.

* This verse corresponds with ślokas 5 and 6 of Manu, where the opening ślokas 1-4 are apparently a later addition.
THE INDIKA OF MEGASTHENES.

TRANSLATED BY J. W. McCIRINDLE, M.A., GOVT. COLLEGE, PĀṬNĀ.

(Continued from p. 290).

DOUBTFUL FRAGMENTS.

Fragm. LII.
Of Elephants.

(Conf. Fragm. xxxvi. 10, xxxvii. 10.)

The elephant when feeding at large ordinarily drinks water, but when undergoing the fatigues of war is allowed wine,—not that sort, however, which comes from the grape, but another which is prepared from rice.* The attendants even go in advance of their elephants and gather them flowers; for they are very fond of sweet perfumes, and they are accordingly taken out to the meadows, there to be trained under the influence of the sweetest fragrance. The animal selects the flowers according to their smell, and throws them as they are gathered into a basket which is held out by the trainer. This being filled, and harvest-work, so to speak, completed, he then bathes, and enjoys his bath with all the zest of a consummate voluptuary. On returning from bathing he is impatient to have his flowers, and if there is delay in bringing them begins roaming, and will not taste a morsel of food till all the flowers he gathered are placed before him. This done, he takes the flowers out of the basket with his trunk and scatters them over the edge of his manger, and makes by this device their fine scent be, as it were, a relish to his food. He strews also a good quantity of them as litter over his stall, for he loves to have his sleep made sweet and pleasant.

The Indian elephants were nine cubits in height and five in breadth. The largest elephants in all the land were those called the Praisan, and next to these the Taxilan.†

Fragm. LII.
Of a White Elephant.

(Conf. Fragm. xxxvi. 11, xxxvii. 11.)

An Indian elephant-trainer fell in with a white elephant-calf, which he brought when still quite young to his home, where he reared it, and gradually made it quite tame and rode upon it. He became much attached to the creature, which loved him in return, and by its affection required him for its maintenance. Now the king of the Indians, having heard of this elephant, wanted to take it; but the owner, jealous of the love it had for him, and grieving much, no doubt, to think that another should become its master, refused to give it away, and made off at once to the desert mounted on his favourite. The king was enraged at this, and sent men in pursuit, with orders to seize the elephant, and at the same time to bring back the Indian for punishment. Overtaking the fugitive they attempted to execute their purpose, but he resisted and attacked his assailants from the back of the elephant, which in the affray fought on the side of its injured master. Such was the state of matters at the first, but afterwards, when the Indian on being wounded slipped down to the ground, the elephant, true to his salt, bestrides him as soldiers in battle bestride a fallen comrade, whom they cover with their shields, kills many of the assailants, and puts the rest to flight. Then twining his trunk around his reared he lifted him on to his back, and carried him home to the stall and remained with him like a faithful friend with his friend, and showed him every kind attention.‡ [O men! how base are ye! ever dancing merrily when ye hear the music of the frying-pan, ever revelling in the banquet, but traitors in the hour of danger, and vainly and for nought sullying the sacred name of friendship.]

Fragm. LIV.


Of the Brāhmaṇas and their Philosophy.

(Conf. Fragm. xli. xlv. xlvii.)

Of the Brāhmaṇas in India.

There is among the Brāhmaṇas in India a sect of philosophers who adopt an independent life,

Alexander, of the elephant of Pōros:—"This elephant during the whole battle gave extraordinary proofs of his sagacity and care of the king's person. As long as that prince was able to fight, he defended him with great courage, and repulsed all assailants; and when he perceived him ready to sink under the multitude of darts, and the wounds with which he was covered, to prevent his falling off he knelt down in the softest manner, and with his proboscis gently drew every dart out of his body."
and abstain from animal food and all victuals cooked by fire, being content to subsist upon fruits, which they do not so much as gather from the trees, but pick up when they have dropped to the ground, and their drink is the water of the river Tagabena. Throughout life they go about naked, saying that the body has been given by the Deity as a covering for the soul. They hold that God is light, but not such light as we see with the eye, nor such as the sun or fire, but God is with them the Word,—by which term they do not mean articulate speech, but the discourse of reason, whereby the hidden mysteries of knowledge are discerned by the wise. This light, however, which they call the Word, and think to be God, is, they say, known only by the Brachhmans themselves, because they alone have discarded vanity, which is the outermost covering of the soul. The members of this sect regard death with contemptuous indifference, and, as we have seen already, they always pronounce the name of the Deity with a tone of peculiar reverence, and adore him with hymns. They neither have wives nor begot children. Persons who desire to lead a life like theirs cross over from the other side of the river, and remain with them for good, never returning to their own country. These also are called Brachhmans, although they do not follow the same mode of life, for there are women in the country, from whom the native inhabitants are sprung, and of these women they beget offspring. With regard to the Word, which they call God, they hold that it is corporeal, and that it wears the body as its external covering, just as one wears the woollen surcoat, and that when it

divests itself of the body with which it is enveloped it becomes manifest to the eye. There is war, the Brachhmans hold, in the body where-with they are clothed, and they regard the body as being the fruitful source of wars, and, as we have already shown, fight against it like soldiers in battle contending against the enemy. They maintain, moreover, that all men are held in bondage, like prisoners of war, to their own innate enemies, the sensual appetites, gluttony, anger, joy, grief, longing desire, and such like, while it is only the man who has triumphed over these enemies who goes to God. Dananias accordingly, to whom Alexander the Makedonian paid a visit, is spoken of by the Brachhmans as a god because he conquered in the warfare against the body, and on the other hand they condemn Kalanos as one who had impiously apostatized from their philosophy. The Brachhmans, therefore, when they have shuffled off the body, see the pure sunlight as fish see it when they spring up out of the water into the air.

FRAGM. LV.

Pallad. de Bragmanibus, pp. 8, 90 et seq. ed. Londin. 1668.

(Camerar. libell. gnomolog. pp. 116, 124 et seq.)

Of Kalanos and Mandanis.

(Cf. Fragm. xii. 19, xiv. xiv.)

They (the Bragmanes) subsist upon such fruits as they can find, and on wild herbs, which the earth spontaneously produces, and drink only water. They wander about in the woods, and sleep at night on pallets of the leaves of trees.

Kalanos, then, your false friend, held this opinion, but he is despised and trodden upon

ground, such as leaves of trees and wild herbs, like cattle.

"Kalanos is your friend, but he is despised and trodden upon by us. He, then, who was the author of many evils among you, is honoured and

§ Probably the Sanskrit Tungabhadra, now the Tugabhadra, a large affluent of the Krishna.

¶ Vide ante, vol. V. p. 128, note †. A doctrine of the Vedanta school of philosophy, according to which the soul is incased in a sheath, or rather a succession of sheaths. The first or inner case is the intellectual one, composed of the sheath and simple elements, uncombined, and consisting of the intellect joined with the five senses. The second is the mental sheath, in which mind is joined with the preceding, or, as some hold, with the organs of action. The third comprises these organs and the vital faculties, and is called the organic or vital case. These three sheaths (koshas) constitute the subtle frame which attends the soul in its transmigrations. The exterior case is composed of the coarse elements, combined in certain proportions, and is called the gross body. See Colebrooke's Essay on the Philosophy of the Hindus, Cowell's ed. pp. 350-6.

† The affinity between light and light is the burden of the Gāyatrī or holiest verse of the Veda.

* Eukoreotia which probably translates ahanakāra, literally 'egoism,' and hence 'self-consciousness,' the peculiar and appropriate function of which is selfish conviction; that is, a belief that in perception and meditation I am concerned; that the objects of sense concern Me—in short that I exist AM. The knowledge, however, which comes from comprehending that Being which has self existence completely destroys the ignorance which says 'I am.'

† Compare Plato, Phædo, cap. 33, where Sokratēs speaks of the soul as present confined in the body as in a species of prison. This was a doctrine of the Pythagorians, whose philosophy, even in its most striking peculiarities, bears such a close resemblance to the Indian as greatly to favour the supposition that it was directly borrowed from it. There was even a tradition that Pythagoras had visited India.
by us. By you, however, accomplice as he was in causing many evils to you all, he is honoured and worshipped, while from our society he has been contemptuously cast out as unprofitable. And why not? when everything which we trample under foot is an object of admiration to the lucre-loving Kalanos, your worthless friend, but no friend of ours,—a miserable creature, and more to be pitied than the unhappiest wretch, for by setting his heart on lucre he wrought the perdition of his soul! Hence he seemed neither worthy of us, nor worthy of the friendship of God, and hence he neither was content to revel away life in the woods beyond all reach of care, nor was he cheered with the hope of a blessed hereafter: for by his love of money he slew the very life of his miserable soul.

"We have, however, amongst us a sage called Dandamis, whose home is the woods, where he lies on a pallet of leaves, and where he has nigh at hand the fountain of peace, whereof he drinks, sucking, as it were, the pure breast of a mother."

King Alexander, accordingly, when he heard of all this, was desirous of learning the doctrines worshipped by you; but since he is of no importance he is rejected by us, and those things we certainly do not seek, please Calanus because of his greediness for money. But he was not ours, a man such as has miserably injured and lost his soul, on which account he is plainly unworthy to be a friend either of God or of ours, nor has he deserved security among the woods in this world, nor can he hope for the glory which is promised in the future.

When the emperor Alexander came to the forests, he was not able to see Dandamis as he passed through.

When, therefore, the above-mentioned messenger came to Dandamis, he addressed him thus:—"The emperor Alexander, the son of the great Jupiter, who is lord of the human race, has ordered that you should hasten to him, for if you come, he will give you many gifts, but if you refuse he will behead you as a punishment for your contempt." When these words came to the ears of Dandamis, he rose from his pallet whereon he lay, but reclining and smiling he replied in this way:—"The greatest God," he said, "can do injury, but restores again the light of life to those who have departed. Accordingly he alone is my lord who forbids murder and excites no wars. But Alexander is no God, for he himself will have to die. How, then, can he be the lord of all, who has not yet crossed the river Tyberoboas, nor has made the whole world his abode, nor crossed the zone of Gadés, nor has beheld the course of the sun in the centre of the world? Therefore many nations do not yet even know his name. If, however, the country he possesses cannot contain him, let him cross our river and he will find a soil which is able to support men. All those things Alexander promises would be useless to me if he gave them: I have leaves for a house, live on the herbs at hand and water to drink; other things collected with labour, and which perish and yield nothing but sorrow to those seeking them or possessing them,—these I despise. I therefore now rest secure, and with closed eyes I care for nothing. If I wish to keep gold, I destroy my sleep; Earth supplies me with everything, as a mother does to her child. Wherever I wish to go, I proceed, and wherever I do not wish to be, no necessity of care can force me to go. And if he wish to cut off my head, he cannot take my soul; he will only take the fallen head, but the departing soul will leave the head like a portion of some garment, and will restore it to whence it received it, namely, to the earth. But when I shall have become a spirit I shall ascend to God, who has enclosed it within this flesh. When he did this he wished to try us, how, after leaving him, we would live in this world. And afterwards, when we shall have returned to him, he will demand from us an account of this life. Standing by him I shall see my injury, and shall contemplate his
and has not yet seated himself on a throne of universal dominion? Moreover, Alexander has neither as yet entered living into Hades, nor does he know the course of the sun through the central regions of the earth, while the nations on its boundaries have not so much as heard his name. If his present dominions are not capacious enough for his desire, let him cross the Ganges river, and he will find a region able to sustain men if the country on our side be too narrow to hold him. Know this, however, that what Alexander offers me, and the gifts he promises, are all things to me utterly useless; but the things which I prize, and find of real use and worth, are these leaves which are my house, these blooming plants which supply me with dainty food, and the water which is my drink, while all other possessions and things, which are amassèd with anxious care, are wont to prove ruinous to those who amass them, and cause only sorrow and vexation, with which every poor mortal is fully fraught. But as for me, I lie upon the forest leaves, and, having nothing which requires guarding, close my eyes in tranquil slumber; whereas had I gold to guard, that would banish sleep. The earth supplies me with everything, even as a mother her child with milk. I go wherever I please, and there are no cares with which I am forced to cumber myself, against my will. Should Alexander cut off my head, he cannot also destroy my soul. My head alone, now silent, will remain, but the soul will go away to its Master, leaving the body like a torn garment upon the earth, whence also it was taken. I then, becoming spirit, shall ascend to my God, who enclosed us in flesh, and left us upon the earth to prove whether when here below we shall live obedient to his ordinances, and who also will require of us, when we depart hence to his presence, an account of our life, since he is judge of all proud wrong-doing; for the groans of the oppressed become the punishments of the oppressors.

"Let Alexander, then, terrify with these threats those who wish for gold and for wealth, and who dread death, for against us these weapons are both alike powerless, since the Brahmanes neither love gold nor fear death. Go, then, and tell Alexander this: 'Dandamis has no need of aught that is yours, and therefore will not go to you, but if you want anything from Dandamis come you to him.'"

Alexander, on receiving from Onesikratés a report of the interview, felt a stronger desire than ever to see Dandamis, who, though old and naked, was the only antagonist in whom he, the conqueror of many nations, had found more than his match, &c.

---

The other journeys made thence (from the Hyphasis) for Seleuskos Nikator are as follows:—168 miles to the Hesidrus, and to the river Jomanes as many (some copies add 5 miles); from thence to the Ganges 112 miles. 119 miles to Rhodophi (others give 325 miles for this distance). To the town Kalinipaxa 167—500. Others give 265 miles. Thence to the confluence of the Jomanes and Ganges 625 miles (many add 13 miles), and to the town Palimbothra 425. To the mouth of the Ganges 738 miles.

The races which we may enumerate without judgment on those who injured me: for the sighs and groans of the injured become the punishments of the oppressors.

"Let Alexander threaten with this them that desire riches or fear death, both of which I despise. For Brachmanes neither love gold nor dread death. Go, therefore, and tell Alexander this:—

---

1 Ono vov ovoa oynwos pepafrwv. The Latin version has non suntos Gadema transire, 'has not crossed the zone of Cadis.'
2 The text here is so corrupt as to be almost untranslatable. I have therefore rendered from the Latin, though not quite closely.
3 "Others say Dandamis entered into no discourse with the messengers, but only asked 'why Alexander had taken so long a journey?'"—Plutarch's Alexander.
4 This list Pliny has borrowed for the most part from Magnusena. Cf. Schwanbeck, p. 16 seq.; 57 seq.
5 According to the MSS. 695 or 657 miles. The place mentioned in this famous itinerary all lay on the Royal Road, which ran from the Indus to Palimbothra. They have been thus identified. The Hesidrus is now the Satlej, and the point of departure lay immediately below its junction with the Hyphasis (now the Beas). The direct route is the old road (now the Srinagar-Lahaul) conducted the traveller to the ferry of the Jomanes, now the Jamna, in the neighbourhood of the present Bursah, whence the road led to the Ganges at a point which, to judge from the distance given (112 miles), must have been near the site of the far-famed Harshnathpura. The next stage to be reached was Rhodophi, the position of which, both its name and its
being tedious, from the chain of Emodus, of which a spur is called Imaus (meaning in the native language snowy), are the Isari, Cosyri, distance from the Ganges (119 miles) combine to fix at Dhuba, a small town about 12 miles to the south of Anupshah. Kainipna, on the next stage, Mannur and Lassen would identify with Kanaaj (the Kasvakhaba of Sanskrit); but M. de St.-Martin, objecting to this that Parnrising has cited the example of the 4,200 Strabo, which agrees closely with the general character of Megasthenes' account, makes it 5,000 stadia—this indeed was his estimate, and not 6,000 stadia as Strabo in one passage alleges it was. The distance by land from Penth to Tamlik (Tamarvita, the old port of the Ganges mouth) is 4,550 English or 4,600 Roman miles. The distance by the river, which is annual, is of course much greater.

See Étude sur la Géographie Gréco et Latine de l'Inde, par P. V. de Saint-Martin, pp. 271-274.

These four tribes were located somewhere in Kaimuri or its immediate neighbourhod is not known, but are probably the same as the Baysri previously mentioned by Pliny. The Cosyri are easily identified with the Khasri mentioned by the Madhabhattachara as neighbours of the Barmadas and Kaminara. Their name, it has been conjectured, survives in Kichak, one of the three great divisions of the Kula of Gujar, who appear to have come originally from the Punjab. They are mentioned in Prolern, under the name of the Suybaras, as a people of Sirkot. This is, however, a mistake, as they inhabited the plain region which extends above Kaisuri towards the north and north-west. The Chautars and Chaudars are perhaps identical with the Chionmes (Pliny's Chhars), who may have merely indicated them to be a branch of the Saka—that is, the Skihirinis, who whom India was overrun before the time of its conquest by the Aryans and are mentioned in Manu X. 44 together with the Mandrakas, Odara, Dhrwidas, Karnobas, Yavanas, Parades, Phalavas, Cilinas, Kritsas, Daradas, and Khasias. If Chhotosangi be the right reading of their name, he may have been the Chhotosangi, his identity with the Kiritas. See P. V. de St.-Martin's work already quoted, pp. 193-197. But for the Kichakas, see Ind. Ant. vol. I. p. 333.

**Izi, and on the hills the Chisiotosagi, a name comprising many tribes, among which are the Maccalingas.**

Pliny assigns 325 miles as the distance from the confluence of the rivers to Palibothra, but, as it is in reality only 245, the figure has probably been altered. He gives, 628 miles as the distance from Palibothra to the mouth of the Ganges, which agrees closely with the authentic narrative of Megasthenes' state it. If Pliny's estimate, and not 6,000 stadia as Strabo in one passage alleges it was. The distance by land from Penth to Tamlik (Tamarvita, the old port of the Ganges mouth) is 4,550 English or 4,600 Roman miles. The distance by the river, which is annual, is of course much greater.
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The river Prinass and the Cains (which flows into the Ganges) are both navigable. The tribes called Calingae are nearest the sea, and higher up are the Mandei, and the Malli in whose country is Mount Mallus, the boundary of all that district being the Ganges.

(22.) This river, according to some, rises from uncertain sources, like the Nile, and inundates similarly the countries lying along its course; others say that it rises on the Skythian mountains, and has nineteen tributaries, of which, besides those already mentioned, the Conchataes, Erinobos, Cosogus, and Sonus are navigable. Others again assert that it issues forth at once with load roar from its fountain, and after tumbling down a steep and rocky channel is received immediately on reaching the level plains into a lake, whence it flows out with a gentle current, being at the narrowest eight miles, and on the average a hundred stadia, in breadth, and never of less depth than twenty paces (one hundred feet) in the final part of its course, which is through the country of the Gangarides. The royal city of the Calingae is called Partaxis. Over their king 60,000 foot-soldiers, 1000 chariots, 700 elephants keep watch and ward in "proxinct of war."

For among the more civilized Indian communities life is spent in a great variety of separate occupations. Some till the soil, some are soldiers, some traders; the noblest and richest take part in the direction of state affairs, administer justice, and sit in council with the kings. A fifth class devotes itself to the philosophy prevalent in the country, which almost assumes the form of a religion, and the members always put an end to their life by a voluntary death on a burning funeral pile. In addition to these classes there is one half-wild, which is constantly engaged in a task of immense labour, beyond the power of words to describe—that of hunting and taming elephants. They employ these animals in ploughing and for riding on, and regard them as forming the main part of their stock in cattle. They employ them in war and in fighting for their country. In choosing them for war, regard is had to their age, strength, and size.

There is a very large island in the Ganges which is inhabited by a single tribe called Modogalingae. Beyond are situated the Modubae, Molindae, the Uberae with a handsome town of the same name, the Galmodroes, Preti, Calissae, Sasurzi, Passalae, Cotubae, Orxulae, Abali, Talucuta. The king of Gangarides a branch of the Kalingae. This is probably the correct reading, for, as General Cunningham states (Anc. Geog. of Ind. pp. 518-319), certain inscriptions speak of "Tri-Kalingae", or "the Three Kalingae." The name of Tri-Kalingae, he adds, "is probably old, as Pliny mentions the Maccus-Calingae and the Gangarides-Calingae as separate peoples from the Calingae, while the Mahabharata names the Kalingae three separate times, and each time in conjunction with different peoples." (H. H. Wilson in Fisher's Forum, 1st ed. pp. 152, 157 note, and 158.) At Tri-Kalingae thus corresponds with the great province of Telengana, it seems probable that the name of Telengana may be only a slightly contracted form of Tri-Kalingana, or of the Three Kalingas. [Partalis]—v.l. Fortis, Portalis. Vide ante, p. 130, note.—Ed.

1 L. x mill.—v. l. LXX. mill.
2 Latin, in his satirical piece on the death of Pericles (cap. 25), refers to this practice:—"But what is the motive which prompts this man (Pericles) to sink himself into the flames? God knows it is simply that he may show off how he can endure pain as do the Brachmans, to whom it pleased Theagenes to liken him, just as if India had not her own crop of fools and vain-glorious persons. But let him by all means imitate the Brachmans, for, as Onesikritos informs us, who was the pilot of Alexander's fleet and saw Kallanos burned, they do not immolate themselves by leaping into the flames, but when the pyre is made they stand close beside it perfectly motionless, and suffer themselves to be gently cremated; they gradually ascend the pile they are burned to death, and never swerve, even ever so little, from their recumbent position."

7 v. l. mod. Galingam, Modogaligam.
8 Colissae.—v.l. Aclusae.

These tribes were chiefly located in the regions between the left bank of the Ganges and the Himalayas. Of the Galmodroes, Preti, Calissae, Sasurzi, and Orxulae nothing is known, nor can their names be identified with any to be found in Sanskrit literature. The Modubae represent beyond doubt the Modibae, a people mentioned in the
these keeps under arms 50,000 foot-soldiers, 4000 cavalry, and 400 elephants. Next come the Andares, a still more powerful race, which possesses numerous villages, and thirty towns defended by walls and towers, and which supplies its king with an army of 100,000 infantry, 2000 cavalry, and 1000 elephants. Gold is very abundant among the Dardae, and silver among the Setae. 

But the Prasii surpass in power and glory every other people, not only in this quarter, but one may say in all India, their capital being Palibothra, a very large and wealthy city, after which some call the people itself the Palibothri,—nay, even the whole tract along the Ganges. Their king has in his pay a standing army of 600,000 foot-soldiers, 30,000 cavalry, and 9000 elephants: whence may be formed some conjecture as to the vastness of his resources.

After these, but more inland, are the Moneides follow war, and others trade. The noblest and richest manage public affairs, administer justice, and sit in council with the kings. There exists also a fifth class, consisting of those most eminent for their wisdom, who, when sated with life, seek death by mounting a burning funeral pile. Those, however, who have become the devotees of a stern sect, and pass their life in the woods, hunt elephants, which, when made quite tame and docile, they use for ploughing and for riding on.

In the Ganges there is an island extremely populous, occupied by a very powerful nation whose king keeps under arms 50,000 foot and 4000 horse. In fact no one invested with kingly power ever keeps on foot a military force without a very great number of elephants and foot and cavalry.

The Prasian nation, which is extremely powerful, inhabits a city called Palibothra, whence

---

1 FP. M.—v. I. III. M.

[The Andares are readily identified with the Andhra of Sanskrit—a great and powerful nation settled originally in the Dekhan between the middle part of the courses of the Godavari and the Krishna rivers, but which, before the time of Megasthenes, had spread their sway towards the north as far as the upper course of the Narmada (Nerbudda), and, as has been already indicated, the lower districts of the Ganges basin. See Cunningham’s Anc. Geog. of India, pp. 527-530.]

§ Pliny here refers to where he started from in his enumeration of the tribes. The Setae are the Sita or Tila of Sanskrit geography, which located them in the neighbourhood of the Dardas. [According to Yule, however, they are the Sanskrit Sutaks, and he places them on the Banks about Jailpur, south-east from Ajmir.—Ed.]

[See Arrian’s Anab. V. 29, where we read that Alexander having arranged his troops in separate divisions ordered them to build on the banks of the Hyphasis twelve altars to be of equal height with the loftiest tower, while exceeding them in breadth. From the place where we know that they were formed of square blocks of stone. There has been much controversy regarding their site, but it must have been near the capital of Sophisa, whose name Lassen has identified with the Sanskrit Ascapati, ‘lord of horses.” These Asrapati were a line of princes whose territory, according to the 12th book of the Ramayana, lay on the right or north bank of the Hyphasis (Hyphasis or Bisa), in the mountainous part of the Doab comprised between that river and the Upper Iravati. Their capital is called in the poem of Vishnu Rājagriha, which still exists under the name of Rājagiri. At some distance from this there is a chain of heights called Sekandar-giri, or ‘Alexander’s mountain.’—See St.-Martin’s Etude, &c. pp. 105-111.]
and Sauri, in whose country is Mount Maléus, on which shadows fall towards the north in winter, and towards the south in summer, for six months alternately. * Baetion asserts that the north pole in these parts is seen but once in the year, and only for fifteen days; while Megasthenes says that the same thing happens in many parts of India. The south pole is called by the Indians Draimasa. The river Jomana flows through the Palibotri into the Ganges between the towns Methora and Carissobora. † In the parts which lie southward from the Ganges the inhabitants, already swarthy, are deeply coloured by the sun, though not scorched black like the Ethiopians. The nearer they approach the Indus the more plainly does their complexion betray the influence of the sun.

The Indus skirts the frontiers of the Prasi, whose mountain tracts are said to be inhabited by the Pygmies. ‡ Artemidorus ‡ sets down the distance between the two rivers at 121 miles.

(23.) The Indus, called by the inhabitants same call the nation itself the Palibotri. Their king keeps in his pay at all times 60,000 foot, 30,000 horse, and 8000 elephants.

Beyond Palibotri is Mount Maléus, † on which shadows in winter fall towards the north, in summer towards the south, for six months alternately. In that region the Bears are seen but once a year, and not for more than fifteen days, as Beton

Sindus, rising on that spur of Mount Caucasus which is called Paropamius, from sources facing the sun, their itself nineteen rivers, of which the most famous are the Hydaspes, which has four tributaries; the Cantabra, ‡ which has three; the Acesines and the Hyphasis, which are both navigable; but nevertheless, having no very great supply of water, it is nowhere broader than fifty stadia, or deeper than fifteen paces. ‡ It forms an extremely large island, which is called Prasine, and a smaller one, called Patane. † Its stream, which is navigable, by the lowest estimates, for 1240 miles, turns westward as if foliating more or less closely the course of the sun, and then falls into the ocean. The measure of the coast line from the mouth of the Ganges to this river I shall set down as it is generally given, though none of the computations agree with each other. From the mouth of the Ganges to Cape Calingon and the town of Dandagula 625 miles; ‡ to Tropina 1225; ‡ to the cape of Peri

forms us, who allows that this happens in many parts of India. Those living near the river Indus in the regions that turn southward are scorched more than others by the heat, and at last the complexion of the people is visibly affected by the great power of the sun. The mountains are inhabited by the Pygmies.

But those who live near the sea have no kings

---

* See Ind. Ant. vol. V. p. 330. Yule identifies the first of these with the area enclosed by the line from above Rohri to Haidarbāb, and the delta of the Indus. — En.

† The U. I. Dandaguda. Cape Calingon is identified by Yule as Point Godhārī. — En.

‡ "Both the distance and the name point to the great port town of Coringa, as the promontory of Coringa, which is situated on a projecting point of land at the mouth of the Godārīa river. The town of Dandaguda or Dandagula I take to be the Dāntapura of the Buddhist chronicles, which as the capital of Kalinga may have been identified with the Mahānā, which is only 30 miles to the north of the coast of Coringa. From the great similarity of the Greek " and " I think it probable that the Greek name may have been Dāntapura, which is almost the same as Dāntapura. But in this case the Dānta or 'tooth-reef' of Buddha must have been enshrined in Kalinga as early as the time of Pāṇini, which is confirmed by the statement of the Buddhist chronicles that the 'left canine tooth' of Buddha was brought to Kalinga immediately after his death, where it was enshrined by the reigning sovereign, Brahmadatta." — Cunningham, Geo. p. 518.

‡ [Tropina answers to Tropontari or Tirupanasata, opposite Kōchī. — En.] The distance given is measured from the mouth of the Indus — the distance from the mouth of the Indus. — En.

‡ Possibly, as suggested by Yule, Mount Parvanthaka, near the Damodar, and not far from the Tropina — see ante, p. 137, note 5, and f. vol. I. p. 46ff. The Mallī (see above), in whose country it was, are not to be confused with another tribe of the same name in the Punjab, mentioned by Arrian; see vol. V. pp. 87, 90, 333. — En.
The Indika of Megasthenes.

The Pandean nation is governed by females, and their first queen is said to have been the daughter of Hercules. The city Nysa is assigned to this region, as is also the mound. The identification is, however, rejected by M. de St. Martin. The Singhae are represented at the present day by the Singhies of Osnaburg, called the Singha (Osnaburg) by Murto), descendants of an ancient Kipit tribe called the Singhae. The Marhoe are probably the Maroes of the list of the Vordha Sambhata, which was later than Pliny's time by four and a half centuries. In the interval there were displaced, but the displacement of tribes was nothing unusual in those days. So the Barunges may perhaps be the ancestors of the Bonghi or Kanga now found on the banks of the Satlej and in the neighbourhood of Delhi.

The inhabitants on the other side of this mountain work extensive mines of gold and silver. Next are the Orombae, whose king has only ten elephants, though he has a very strong force of infantry. Next again are the Varetas, subject to a king, who keep no elephants, but trust entirely to their horse and foot. Then the Orombae; the Salabastrae; the Horata, who have
a fine city, defended by marshes which serve as a
ditch, wherein crocodiles are kept, which, having
a great aversion for human flesh, prevent all access
to the city except by a bridge. And another city
deeps of this is much admired, A u t o m a l u s,† which,
being seated on the coast at the confluence of five
rivers, is a noble emporium of trade. The king is
master of 1600 elephants, 150,000 foot, and 5000
cavalry. The poorer king of the C h a r m a e has but sixty
elephants, and his force otherwise
is insignificant. Next come the P a n d e, the
only race in India ruled by women.† They say
that Hercules having but one daughter, who was on
that account all the more beloved, endowed her with a
noble kingdom. Her descendants rule over 300 cities, and command an army of
150,000 foot and 500 elephants. Next, with
300 cities, the S y r i e n i, D e r a n i e, P e-
si n g e, B u z a e, G o g i a r e i, U m b r a e, Ne-
tain sacred to Jupiter, M é r o s by name, in a
cave on which the ancient Indias affirm Father
Bacchus was nourished; while the name has
given rise to the well-known fantastic story that
Bacchus was born from the thigh of his fa-

† v. l. Automala.

† The Charmes have been identified with the inhabitants of Charmamandal, a district of the west mentioned in the M a h ká k h á r a t a and also in the V i n a g a P a r í t a under the form Charmakhandas. They are now represented by the Charmers or Chambers of Bundelkhando and the parts adjacent to the basin of the Ganges. The Pandes, who
were their next neighbours, must have occupied a con-
siderable portion of the basin of the river Chambal, called in Sanskrit geography the Chamarwantrai. They were a branch of the famous race of Pandu, which made for itself
kingdoms in several different parts of India.

In the names of a list lead us to the desert lying be-
tween the Indus and the Aravalli range. Most of the tribes enumerated are mentioned in the lists of the clans given
in the Rájput chronicles, and have been identified by M.
de St.-Martin as follows:—The Syriens are the Syriensis,
who under that name have at all times occupied the
country near the Indus in the neighbourhood of Bahcar.
Darang is the Latin transcription of the name of the
great race of the Jihijjas, a branch of the Rájputs which
at the present day possesses Kachch. The Buzees represent the
Buddas, an ancient branch of the same Jihijjas (Tod,
A n a h a n, a n t i g o f the Ráj, vol. i. p. 85). The Gogares (other
readings Gojares, Gojares) are the Kokari, who are
now settled on the banks of the Gara or Lower Sattal.
The Umbras are represented by the Umaris, and the Netaros
perhaps by the Haronis, who, though belonging to
Baluchistan, had their ancestral seats in the regions to the
cast of the Indus. The Nbehets, who figure in the old
local traditions of Sind, perhaps correspond to the No-
bundas, while the Goomaras certainly are the Kokaras
mentioned in the M a h k á k h á r a t a among the people of the
north-west. (See Lassen, Zeitschrift für die Kunde des
Morgenlandes, i. 1839, p. 1.) Suchmann mentions a tribe
called Kakund as belonging to Gerakhpur.
§ There were two defiles, which went by the name of the
Kapian Gates. One was in Abbasia, and was formed by
one of the great spurs of the Kaukasus into the
Kapian Sea. The other, to which Piny here refers, was
a narrow pass leading from North-Western Asia into the
north-east provinces of Persia. According to Arrian (Anab.
III, 20) the Kapian Gates lay a few days' journey distant

from the Median town of Bhaqat, now represented by the
ruins called Bha, found a mile or two to the south
of Teheran. This pass was one of the most important places
in ancient geography, and from it many of the meridians
were measured. Strabo, who frequently mentions it, states
that its distance from the extreme promontories of India
(Cape Opus, &c.) was 14,000 stadia. [v. l. Ardashar.

† In the grammatical apophthegms of Plinei, Bhaunilgi
is mentioned as a territory occupied by a branch of the
great tribe of the Siddas (Lassen, Ind. Alt. i. p. 613, note,
or 2nd ed. p. 700 n.), and from this indication M. de St.-
Martin has been led to place the Bolingas at the western
delimit of the Aravalli mountains, where Ploemey also
places his Bolinges. The Mahbhojninga of the Panjáb
(see V i n a g a, p. 187) were probably a branch of this
tribe. The Gomarias are known by the same author
with the Gahalata or Gohlots; the Dimuri with the Dumras,
who, though belonging to the Gumgaut valley, originally
came from that of the Indus; the Megari with the Mokars
of the Rájput chronicles, whose name is perhaps preserv-
ed in that of the Mekaras of the lower part of Sind, and
also in that of the Mangri of Eastern Baluchistan; the
Mankars with the Manaris, a considerable tribe between
Chaksur and Mitanbét on the northern bank of the
Indus; and the Uri with the Huras in the Rájput lists of thirty-six
royal tribes. The Sulaas of the same tribes perhaps represent the
Sileni, whom Piny mentions along with the

† v. ll. Paragonas, Umbires.—Baramata Gumbritas.

‡ The tribes here enumerated must have occupied a tract of
country lying above the confluence of the combined rivers
of the Panjáb. They are obscure, and their names cannot with any certainty be identified, if we except that of the Sibars, who are
undoubtedly the Sauvirs of the Mathhabdras, and who, as
their name is almost invariably combined with that of the
Indus, must have dwelt not far from its banks. The Afghans
tribe of the Afrillas may perhaps represent the
Abatras, and the Sarabah or Sarvas, of the same stock,
the Sarophages, the Umbrites and the Asemi take us to
of that name was buried.† Hillmen follow next, inhabiting the base of Caucasus, the Solnaca, and the Sondrama; and if we cross to the other side of the Indus and follow its course downward we meet the Samabrius, Sambrceni, Bisambrite, Osi, Antixeni, and the Taxilla with a famous city. Then succeeds a level tract of country known by the general name of Amanta, whereof the tribes are four in number—the Pencolait, Arsagalitae, Geretae, Asoi.

Many writers, however, do not give the river the east of the river. The former are perhaps identical with the Asaolites of the historians of Alexander, and the Ambasthas of Sanskrit writings, who dwelt in the neighbourhood of the lower Aksin.‡

† Alexander, after the great battle on the banks of the Hydasp, as he was about to cross it, was met by Porus' forces, who had established two cities, Bupkophila or Bukpholis, so named in honour of his celebrated charger, and Nikais, so named in honour of his victory. Nikais, it is known for certain, was built on the left hand side of the river, its position being at the head of the port of Mong. The site of Bupkophila is not so easy to determine. According to Ptolemy, it was near the Hydasp, a site where Mong was burned, if that be so it must have been on the south side of the river as the sister city; whereas Strabo and all the other ancient writers place it on the opposite side. Strabo again places it at the point where Alexander crossed the river, whereas Arrian states that it was built on the site of his camp. General Cunningham fixes this at Jalalpur, more than at Phelus, 30 miles higher up the river, the site which is now occupied by Burns and General Court and General Abbott. Jalalpur is about ten miles distant from Dilawar, where, according to Cunningham, the crossing of the river was most probably effected.

§ v. I. Bisambrite.

The Solnaca and the Sondrama cannot be identified, and of the tribes which were seated to the east of the Indus only the Taxilla is known to us. It was the favourite town of Taxila, which was visited by Alexander the Great. “The position of this city,” says Cunningham, “has hitherto remained the object of controversy, partly owing to the tradition recorded by Ptolemy, and partly to the want of information regarding the vast ruins which still exist in the vicinity of Shish-dheri. All the copies of Ptolemy denote in stating that Taxila was only 500 stadia from the Saka, or a distance of 11 miles from the Paphos of modern authors, the distance of the Pali form Taxhaulis, whence the Greek form was taken. The word means either “cut rock” or “severed head.”"—Geog. of India, pp. 104-111.

As the name Amanta is entirely unknown, M. de St. Martin proposes without hesitation the correction Gandhara, on the ground that the territory assigned to the Amanta corresponds with that of Gandhara, of which the territory occupied by the Penolaites (Penolatichi), as we know from other writers, formed a part. The Geretae are beyond doubt no others than the Gourri of Arrian; and the Asoi may be identified with the Arsi, as also gives the name, Hipstias or Pisii. The Asagatalas are only mentioned by Ptolemy. Two tribes settled in the same locality are perhaps indicated by the name—the Arsa, mentioned by Ptolemy, answering to the Sanskrit Asa; the Ghilti or Ghilgit, the Galatala of Sanskrit, formerly mentioned.

Indus as the western boundary of India, but include within it four satrapies,—the Gedrosi, Arachotae, Arii, Paropamisadae,‡ making the river Cophes its furthest limit; though others prefer to consider all these as belonging to the Arii.

Many writers further include in India even the city Nyasa and Mount Meru, sacred to Father Bacchus, whence the origin of the fable that he sprang from the thigh of Jupiter. They include also the Astaceni, in whose country the vine grows abundantly, and the laurel, and boxwood.

‡ v. I. Pencolita.‡

Gedrosia comprehended probably nearly the same district which is now known by the name of Mehrosa. Alexander marched through it on returning from his Indian expedition. Arachotae extended from the chain of mountains now called the Saimulon as far southward as Gedrosia. Its capital, Aracha, was situated may be in the direction of Kandahar, the name of which, it has been thought, preserves that of Gandhara. According to Colonel Rawlinson, the name Arachotae is derived from Hamamkhwati (Sanskrit Aramakarita), and is preserved in the Arabic Bahak. It is, as has already been noticed, the Hama or Avar of the Ptolemaic inscription Aria, denoted the country lying between Meshed and Herat; Aria, of which it formed a part, and of which it is sometimes used as the equivalent, was a wider district, which comprehended nearly the whole of ancient Persia. In the Persian part of the Ptolemaic inscription Aria appears as Arsava, in the Babylonian part as Arwana. Regarding Paropamisades and the Cophas see ante, vol. V, pp. 329 and 330.

‡ Other readings of the name are Asagata and Asagatae. M. de St. Martin, whose work has so often been referred to, says:—"We have seen already that in an extract from old Hekataios preserved in Stephens of Byzantium the city of Kaspparapor is called a Gandan city, and that in Herodotus the same place is attributed to the Paktye, and we have added that in our opinion this is only an apparent contradiction, because the district of Paktye and Gandara may very well be but the same country. It is not difficult, in fact, to recognize in the designation mentioned by Herodotus the indigenous name of the Afghan people, Pakhtu, in the Ptolemaic text (Pakhtu, Pakhto), the name which the greater part of the tribes use among themselves, and the only one they apply to their national dialect. We have here, then, as Lassen has noticed, a historical proof of the presence of Pakhtu, a little more than five centuries at least before the Christian era. Now, as the seat of the Afghun or Pakhto nationality is chiefly in the basin of the Kopifer, to the west of the Indus, which forms its eastern boundary, this further confirms what we have already seen, that it is to the west of the great river we must seek for the site of the city of Kasppapor or Kasatapora, and consequently of the Gandar of Hekataios. The employment of two different names to designate the same country is easily explained by this double fact, that one of the names was the Indian designation of the land, while the other was the indigenous name applied by it to its inhabitants. There was yet another name, of Sanskrit origin, used as a territorial appellation of Gandhara—that of Arvaka. This word, derived from aint, a horse, signifies merely the horse country, and as such it was an eponym of the horses of the region. In the popular dialects the Sanskrit word took the usual form Assaka, which reappears scarcely modified in Assakana (Assavane) or Assakana (Assavane) in the Greek historians of the expedition of Alexander and subsequent writers. It is impossible not to recognize here the name of Afghan or Afghan, which is very evidently nothing else than a contracted form of Assaka, neither Afghan nor the Paktye of Herodotus are known to them [Arrian and other Greek and Latin writers of the history.
and every kind of fruit-tree found in Greece. The remarkable and almost fabulous accounts which are current regarding the fertility of its soil, and the nature of its fruits and trees, its beasts and birds and other animals, will be set down each in its own place in other parts of this work. A little further on I shall speak of the satrapies, but the island of Taphrobanē requires my immediate attention.

But before we come to this island there are others, one being Patâle, which, as we have indicated, lies at the mouth of the Indus, triangular in shape, and 220 [miles] in breadth. Beyond the mouth of the Indus are Cyrus and Agyre, remarkably rich, as I believe, in metals. For I cannot readily believe, what is asserted by some writers, that their soil is impregnated with gold and silver. At a distance of twenty miles from these lies Crola, from which, at a distance of twelve miles, is Bibaga, which abounds with oysters and other shell-fish.† Next comes Tornallibā; nine miles distant from the last-named island, beside many others unworthy of note.

**Fragm. LVII.**
*Of Dionysos.*
(Cf. Epit. 25. et seq.)

Dionysos, in his expedition against the Indians, in order that the cities might receive him willingly, disguised the arms with which he had equipped his troops, and made them wear soft raiment and fawn-skins. The spears were wrapped round with ivy, and the thyrsus had a sharp point. He gave the signal for battle by cymbals and drums instead of the trumpet, and by regaling the enemy with wine diverted their thoughts from war to dancing. These and all other Bacchic orgies were employed in the system of warfare by which he subjugated the Indians and all the rest of Asia.

Dionysos, in the course of his Indian campaign, seeing that his army could not endure the fiery heat of the air, took forcible possession of the three-peaked mountain of India. Of these peaks one is called Korasibiē, another Kondaskē, but to the third he himself gave the name of Meros, in remembrance of his birth. Thereon were many fountains of water sweet to drink, game in great plenty, tree-fruits in unsparing profusion, and snows which gave new vigour to the frame. The troops quartered there made a sudden descent upon the barbarians of the plain, whom they easily routed, since they attacked them with missiles from a commanding position on the heights above.

* [Dionysos, after conquering the Indians, invaded Baktria, taking with him as auxiliaries the Indians and Amazons. That country has for its boundary the river Saranga.]§ The Baktrians seized the mountains overhanging that river with a view to attack Dionysos, in crossing it, from a post of advantage. He, however, having encamped along the river, ordered the Amazons and the Bakhari to cross it, in order that the Baktrians, in their contempt for women, might be induced to come down from the heights. The women then assayed to cross the stream, and the enemy came downhill, and advancing to the river endeavoured to beat them back. The women then retreated, and the Baktrians pursued them as far as the bank; then Dionysos, coming to the rescue with his men, slew the Baktrians, who were impeded from fighting by the current, and he crossed the river in safety.

**Fragm. LVIII.**
*Of Hercules and Pandæa.*
(Cf. Fragm. L. 15.)

Herakles begat a daughter in India whom he called Pandæa. To her he assigned that portion of India which lies to southward and extends to the sea, while he distributed the people subject to her rule into 365 villages, giving orders that one village should each day bring to the treasury the royal tribute, so that the queen might always have the assistance of those men whose turn it was to pay the tribute in coercing those who for the time being were defaulters in their payments.

---

[607]——v. I CXXX.
§ Burma and Arakan respectively, according to Yule.—Ed.
* In the bay of Karschi. See **Ind. Ant.** Notes to Arrian, vol. V. p. 355.
† This is called Bibakta by Arrian, *Indika*, cap. xxi.
‡ See *Ind.* Notes to Arrian in vol. V. p. 332.
Fragm. LIX.

Of the Beasts of India.


(2) In India I learn that there are to be found the birds called parrots; and though I have, no doubt, already mentioned them, yet what I omitted to state previously regarding them may now with great propriety be here set down. There are, I am informed, three species of them, and all these, if taught to speak, as children are taught, become as talkative as children, and speak with a human voice; but in the woods they utter a bird-like scream, and neither send out any distinct and musical notes, nor being wild and untutored are able to talk. There are also peacocks in India, the largest anywhere met with, and pale-green ringdoves. One who is not well-versed in bird-lore, seeing these for the first time, would take them to be parrots, and not pigeons. In the colour of the bill and legs they resemble Greek partridges. There are also cocks, which are of extraordinary size, and have their crests not red as elsewhere, or at least in our country, but have the flower-like coronals of which the crest is formed variously coloured. Their rump feathers, again, are neither curved nor wreathed, but are of great breadth, and they trail in the way peacocks. trail their tails, when they neither straighten nor erect them: the feathers of these Indian cocks are in colour golden, and also dark-blue like the smaragdus.

(3) There is found in India also another remarkable bird. This is of the size of a starling and is parti-coloured, and is trained to utter the sounds of human speech. It is even more talkative than the parrot, and of greater natural cleverness. So far is it from submitting with pleasure to be fed by man, that it rather has such a pinning for freedom, and such a longing to warble at will in the society of its mates, that it prefers starvation to slavery with sumptuous fare. It is called by the Macedonians who settled among the Indians in the city of Boukephala and its neighbourhood, and in the city called Kuropolis and others which Alexander the son of Philip built, the Kerkopia. This name had, I believe, its origin in the fact that the bird wags its tail in the same way as the water-ousels (of ciykeioi).

(4) I learn further that in India there is a bird called the Kolas, which is thrice the size of the bustard, and has a bill of prodigious size and long legs. It is furnished also with an immense crop resembling a leather pouch. The cry which it utters is peculiarly discordant. The plumage is ash-coloured, except that the feathers at their tips are tinted with a pale yellow.

(5) I hear also that the Indian hoopoe (enwora) is double the size of ours, and more beautiful in appearance, and Homer says that while the bridle and trappings of a horse are the delight of a Hellenic king, this hoopoe is the favourite plaything of the king of the Indians, who carries it on his hand, and toys with it, and never tires gazing in ecstasy on its splendour, and the beauty with which Nature has adorned it. The Brachmanes, therefore, even make this particular bird the subject of a mythic story, and the tale told of it runs thus:—

To the king of the Indians there was born a son. The child had elder brothers, who when they came to man's estate turned out to be very unjust and the greatest of reprobates. They despised their brother because he was the youngest, and they scoffed also at their father and their mother, whom they despised because they were very old and grey-haired. The boy, accordingly, and his aged parents could at last no longer live with these wicked men, and away they fled from home, all three together. In the course of the protracted journey which they had then to undergo, the old people succumbed to fatigue and died, and the boy showed them no light regard, but buried them in himself, having cut off his head with a sword. Then, as the Brachmanes tell us, the all-seeing sun, in admiration of this surpassing act of piety, transformed the boy into a bird which is most beautiful to behold, and which lives to a very advanced age. So on his head there grew up a crest which was, as it were, a memorial of what he had done at the time of his flight. The Athenians have also related, in a fable, marvels somewhat similar of the crested lark; and this fable Aristophanes, the comic poet, appears to me to have followed when he says in the Birds, "For thou very frequent mention of the Prussi and the Brachmane. And lastly one can hardly doubt that some chapters occurring in the middle of this part have been extracted from Megasthenes. I have, therefore, in this uncertainty taken care that the whole of this part should be printed at the end of the fragments of Megasthenes."—Schwanbeck.
wert ignorant, and not always bustling, nor always thumbing Æsop, who spake of the crested lark, calling it the first of all birds, born before ever the earth was; and telling how afterwards her father became sick and died, and how that, as the earth did not then exist, he lay unburied till the fifth day, when his daughter, unable to find a grave elsewhere, dug one for him in her own head."

It seems, accordingly, probable that the fable, though with a different bird for its subject, emanated from the Indians, and spread onward even to the Greeks. For the Brahmans say that a prodigious time has elapsed since the Indian hoopoe, then in human form and young in years, performed that act of piety to its parents.

(6.) In India there is an animal closely resembling in appearance the land crocodile, and somewhere about the size of a little Maltese dog. It is covered all over with a scaly skin so rough altogether and compact that when flayed off it is used by the Indians as a file. It cuts through brass and eats iron. They call it the phattages (pangolin or scaly ant-eater).

(8.) The Indian sea breeds sea-snakes which have broad tails, and the lakes breed hydras of immense size, but these sea-snakes appear to inflict a bite more sharp than poisonous.

(9.) In India there are herds of wild horses, and also of wild asses. They say that the mares submit to be covered by the asses, and enjoy such coition, and breed mules, which are of a reddish colour and very fleet, but impatient of the yoke and otherwise skittish. They say that they catch these mules with foot-traps, and then take them to the king of the Prasians, and that if they are caught when two years old they do refuse to be broken in, but if caught when that age they differ in no respect from used and carnivorous animals.

(Fragments XII. B follows here.)

is found in India a graminivorous 'double the size of a horse, and bushy tail purely black in his tail is finer than human is a point on which for therewith they

"Æsop's fable, the feathered
'his size.'

make a charming coiffure, by binding and braiding it with the locks of their own natural hair. The length of a hair is two cubits, and from a single root there sprout out, in the form of a fringe, somewhere about thirty hairs. The animal itself is the most timid that is known, for should it perceive that anyone is looking at it, it starts off at its utmost speed, and runs right forward,—but its eagerness to escape is greater than the rapidity of its pace. It is hunted with horses and hounds good to run. When it sees that it is on the point of being caught, it hides its tail in some near thicket, while it stands at bay facing its pursuers, whom it watches narrowly. It even plucks up courage in a way, and thinks that since its tail is hid from view the hunters will not care to capture it, for it knows that its tail is the great object of attraction. But it finds this to be, of course, a vain delusion, for some one hits it with a poisoned dart, who then flays off the entire skin (for this is of value) and throws away the carcasse, as the Indians make no use of any part of its flesh.

(12.) But further: whales are to be found in the Indian Sea, and these five times larger than the largest elephant. A rib of this monstrous fish measures as much as twenty cubits, and its lip fifteen cubits. The fins near the gills are each of them so much as seven cubits in breadth. The shell-fish called Kérukes are also met with, and the purple-fish of a size that would admit it easily into a gallon measure, while on the other hand the shell of the sea-urchin is large enough to cover completely a measure of that size. But fish in India attain enormous dimensions, especially the sea-wolves, the thunnies, and the golden-eyebrows. I hear also that at the season when the rivers are swollen, and with their full and boisterous flood deluge all the land, the fish are carried into the fields, where they swim and wander to and fro, even in shallow water, and that when the rains which flood the rivers cease, and the waters retiring from the land resume their natural channels, then in the low-lying tracts and in flat and marshy grounds, where we may be sure the so-called Nine are wont to have some watery recesses (κλαδεία), fish even of eight cubits' length...
are found, which the husbandmen themselves catch as they swim about languidly on the surface of the water, which is no longer of a depth they can freely move in, but in fact so very shallow that it is with the utmost difficulty they can live in it at all.

(13.) The following fish are also indigenous to India:—prickly roaches, which are never in any respect smaller than the asps of Argolis; and shrimps, which in India are even larger than crabs. These, I must mention, finding their way from the sea up the Ganges, have claws which are very large, and which feel rough to the touch. I have ascertained that those shrimps which pass from the Persian Gulf into the river Indus have their prickles smooth, and the feelers with which they are furnished elongated and curling, but this species has no claws.

(14.) The tortoise is found in India, where it lives in the rivers. It is of immense size, and it has a shell not smaller than a full-sized skiff (σκύθη), and which is capable of holding ten medimni (120 gallons) of pulse. There are, however, also land-tortoises which may be about as big as the largest cloas turned up in a rich soil where the glebe is very yielding, and the plough sinks deep, and, elevating the furrows with ease, piles the cloas up high. These are said to cast their shell. Husbandmen, and all the hands engaged in field labour, turn them up with their mattocks, and take them out just in the way one extracts wood-worms from the plants they have eaten into. They are fat things and their flesh is sweet, having nothing of the sharp flavour of the sea-tortoise.

(15.) Intelligent animals are to be met with among ourselves, but they are few, and not at all so common as they are in India. For there we find the elephant, which answers to this character, and the parrot, and apes of the sphinx kind, and the creatures called satyrs. Nor must we forget the Indian ant, which is so noted for its wisdom. The ants of our own country do, no doubt, dig for themselves subterranean holes and burrows, and by boreing provide themselves with lurking-places, and wear out all their strength in what may be called mining operations, which are indescribably toilsome and conducted with secrecy; but the Indian ants construct for themselves a cluster of tiny dwelling-houses, seated not on sloping or level grounds where they could easily be inundated, but on steep and lofty eminences. And in these, by boring out with untold skill certain circuitous passages which remind one of the Egyptian burial-vaults or Cretan labyrinths, they so contrive the structure of their houses that none of the lines run straight, and it is difficult for anything to enter them or flow into them, the windings and perforations being so tortuous. On the outside they leave only a single aperture to admit themselves and the grain which they collect and carry to their store-chambers. Their object in selecting lofty sites for their mansions is, of course, to escape the high floods and inundations of the rivers; and they derive this advantage from their foresight, that they live as it were in so many watch-towers or islands when the parts around the heights become all a lake. Moreover, the mounds they live in, though placed in contiguity, so far from being loosened and torn asunder by the deluge, are rather strengthened, especially by the morning dew: for they put on, so to speak, a coat of ice formed from this dew—thin, no doubt, but still of strength; while at the same time they are made more compact at their base by weeds and bark of trees adhering, which the silt of the river has carried down. Let so much about Indian ants be said by me now, as it was said by Jobas long ago.

(16.) In the country of the Indian Aretanoi there is a subterranean chasm down in which there are mysterious vaults, concealed ways, and through passages invisible to men. These are deep withal and stretch to a very great distance. How they came to exist, and how they were excavated, the Indians do not say, nor do I concern myself to inquire. Hither the Indians bring more than thrice ten thousand head of cattle of different kinds, sheep and goats, and oxen and horses; and every person who has been terrified by an ominous dream, or a warning sound or prophetic voice, or who has seen a bird of evil augury, as a substitute for his life casts into the chasm such a victim as his private means can afford, giving the animal as a ransom to save his soul alive. The victims conducted thither are not led in chains nor otherwise coerced, but they go along this road willingly, as if urged forward by some mysterious spell; and as soon as they find themselves on the verge of the chasm they voluntarily leap in, and disappear for ever from human sight so soon as they fall into this mysterious and viewless cavern of the earth. But above there are heard the
hellowings of oxen, the bleating of sheep, the
neighing of horses, and the plaintive cries of
goats, and if any one goes near enough to the
dge and closely applies his ear he will hear afar
off the sounds just mentioned. This commingled
sound is one that never ceases, for every day that
passes men bring new victims to be their sub-
stitutes. Whether the cries of the animals last
brought only are heard, or the cries also of those
brought before, I know not,—all I know is that
the cries are heard.

(17) In the sea which has been mentioned they
say there is a very large island, of which, as I hear,
the name is Tāprobanē. From what I can
learn, it appears to be a very long and mountainous island
having a length of 7000 stadia and a breadth
of 5000. It has not, however, any cities, but only
villages, of which the number amounts to 750. The
houses in which the inhabitants lodge themselves
are made of wood, and sometimes also of reeds.

(18) In the sea which surrounds the islands,
tortoises are bred of so vast a size that their shells
are employed to make roofs for the houses: for a
shell being fifteen cubits in length, can hold a
good many people under it, screening them from
the scorching heat of the sun, besides affording
them a welcome shade. But, more than this, it
is a protection against the violence of storms of
rain far more effective than tiles, for it at once
shakes off the rain that dashes against it, while
those under its shelter hear the rain rattling as
on the roof of a house. At all events they do
not require to shift their abode, like those whose
shells are shattered, for the shell is hard and like
a hollowed rock and the vaulted roof of a natural
cavern.

The island, then, in the great sea, which they
call Tāprobanē, has palm-groves, where the trees
are planted with wonderful regularity all in a row,
in the way we see the keepers of pleasure-parks
plant out shady trees in the choicest spots. It
has also herds of elephants, which are there very
numerous and of the largest size. These island
elephants are more powerful than those of the
mainland, and in appearance larger, and may
be pronounced to be in every possible way more
intelligent. The islanders export them to the
mainland opposite in boats, which they construct
for the purpose of this traffic from wood supplied
by the thickets of the island, and they dispose

of their cargoes to the king of the Kalingai.
On account of the great size of the island, the
inhabitants of the interior have never seen the
sea, but pass their lives as if resident on a con-
tinent, though no doubt they learn from others
that they are all around enclosed by the sea.
The inhabitants, again, of the coast have no
practical acquaintance with elephant-catching,
and know of it only by report. All their energy
is devoted to catching fish and the monsters of the
depth; for the sea encircling the island is
reported to breed an incredible number of fish,
both of the smaller fry and of the monstrous
sort, among the latter being some which have the
heads of lions and of panthers and of other wild
beasts, and also of rams; and, what is still a
greater marvel, there are monsters which in all
points of their shape resemble satyrs. Others
are in appearance like women, but, instead of
having locks of hair, are furnished with prickles.
It is even solemnly alleged that this sea contains
certain strangely formed creatures, to represent
which in a picture would baffle all the skill of the
artists of the country, even though, with a view to
make a profound sensation, they are wont to
paint monsters which consist of different parts of
different animals pieced together. These have
their tails and the parts which are wreathed of
great length, and have for feet either claws
or fins. I learn further that they are amphibious,
and by night graze on the pasture-fields, for
they eat grass like cattle and birds that pick
up seeds. They have also a great liking for the
date when ripe enough to drop from the palms,
and accordingly they twist their coils, which are
supple, and large enough for the purpose, around
these trees, and shake them so violently that
the dates come tumbling down, and afford them
a welcome repast. Thereafter when the night
begins gradually to wane, but before there is yet
clear daylight, they disappear by plunging into
the sea just as the first blush of morning faintly
illuminates its surface. They say whales also
frequent this sea, though it is not true that
they come near the shore lying in wait for
thunnies. The dolphins are reported to be of
two sorts—one fierce and armed with sharp-
pointed teeth, which gives endless trouble to the
fisherman, and is of a remorselessly cruel disposi-
tion, while the other kind is naturally mild and

* In the classical writers the size of this island is always
greatly exaggerated. Its actual length from north to

south is 2714 miles, and its breadth from east to west 1374,
and its circuit about 650 miles.
Krishna Conveled Across the Yamuna by Vasudeva
KRISHNA NURSED BY DEVAKI.
FROM A HIGHLY FINISHED PICTURE.
tame, swims about in the friskiest way, and is quite like a fawning dog. It does not run away when any one tries to stroke it, and it takes with pleasure any food it is offered.

(19.) The sea-hare, by which I now mean the kind found in the great sea (for of the kind found in the other sea I have already spoken), resembles in every particular the land hare except only the fur, which in the case of the land animal is soft and lies smoothly down, and does not touch the mouth, whereas its brother of the sea has bristling hair which is prickly, and inflicts a wound on any one who touches it. It is said to swim atop of the sea-ripple without ever diving below, and to be very rapid in its movements. To catch it alive is no easy matter, as it never falls into the net, nor goes near the line and bait of the fishing-rod. When it suffers, however, from disease, and, being in consequence hardly able to swim, is cast out on shore, then if any one touches it with his hand death ensues if he is not attended to,—nay, should one, were it only with a staff, touch this dead hare, he is affected in the same way as those who have touched a basilisk. But a root, it is said, grows along the coast of the island, well known to every one, which is a remedy for the swooning which ensues. It is brought close to the nostrils of the person who has fainted, who thereupon recovers consciousness. But should the remedy not be applied the injury proves fatal to life, such power for evil does this hare possess.

Frag. XV. B. follows here.

(22.) There is also a race called the S kutai, whose country is beyond India. They are snub-nosed, either because in the tender years of infancy their nostrils are pressed down, and continue to be so throughout their after-life, or because such is the natural shape of the organ. Serpents of enormous size are bred in their country, of which some kinds seize the cattle when at pasture and devour them, while other kinds only suck the blood, as do the Agathelai in Greece, of which I have already spoken in the proper place.

ON THE KRISHNAJANMĀŚṬAMĪ, OR KRISHNA'S BIRTH-FESTIVAL.

BY PROF. A. WEBER, BERLIN.

Translated by Miss M. Tweedie.

(Concluded from p. 309, and vol. III. p. 55.)

§ 4.

We have still to glance also at the actual representations which the birth of Kṛiṣhṇa, especially the god drinking at his mother's breast, has found in Indian art, or, to speak more accurately, at those specimens of last which lie before us. Unfortunately, only a few pictures of the kind are known to me, and these obviously of quite modern origin, belonging, in all probability, to the century previous to that in which they come down to us,—either precisely to that or to the times immediately preceding. No representations of the kind in any religious building, in temple-paintings or sculptures, are known to me.

Great ignorance of the documents of Indian art must, unfortunately, be expected here in Europe, especially on the Continent. Still, it should not, without further evidence, be concluded, from the temporary want of other pictures and figures of the kind, that these do not exist. Rather may the existence of more such representations be inferred with certainty from the fact that the ritual of the Krishnajanmāśṭamī itself puts them down as an integral element in the festival. In any case, however, the specimens before us suffice to divide them into two groups—namely, those which indicate a certain, even high, rank of artistic cultivation, and those which rather seem, so to speak, to be the products of uncultivated handicraft.

The latter group is soon disposed of: it consists of two pictures only. The first belonging to this group is the figure represented in front and

African Oryx, the Indian Ass, and what is specially called the Unicorn.
back view in Moor's Hindu Pantheon (London, 1816) on plate 9, figs. 2, 3 (see the third plate to this, fig. 6, at p. 351), marked, it is true, as Lakshmi,* but better referred to Devaki and Krişna: for, as Moor himself does, p. 30, we must consider what the mother holds in her hand as a lotus-flower, and recognize in it a symbol of Lakshmi;† then, ought the child to be regarded as her son Kañsä, the god of love? Moreover, the question is not of a child actually drinking at its mother's breast, but only of a child stretching out towards it in its mother's arms. Similar figures in wood or metal are used even for purposes of domestic worship. Secondly, to this class belongs the painting on plate 58 in Moor (see accompanying plate I.), which represents Krişna's birth, and "the miraculous escape of the infant over the Yamuna, conveyed by his father, and protected by Śeṣa,§ or Immortality; the guards placed by Kañsä over his pregnant sister having failed in their vigilance." (Moor, p. 197—see before in § 1, p. 175.)

The other group will detain us much longer. It is true it also consists of only two pictures, but these furnish abundant material for questions of all kinds. The first of these pictures, which certainly represents to us Krişna drinking at the breast of Devaki, is found in Niclas Müller's curious book Glauben Kunst und Wissenschaft der alten Hindu (Mainz, 1822), plate I. fig. 10 (see the plate at p. 351, fig. 3). According to him, p. 553, it is a gift made "from the hand of a friend, a faithful copy, but in half-size, and must have come to Marseilles as an enamelled box-lid, the property of a French merchant's clerk." Niclas Müller, on his part, agrees to the French inscription which the picture bore, "La Nourriture de l'Enfant Camadeva, fils de Maya," refers the representation to the god of love and his mother Māyā or Lakshmi (compare Moor, Hindu Pantheon, pp. 134, 447), who is here seated on the bosom of a lotus "like a Byzantine Madonna with the infant Christ." However, on one hand the special emblems of both are wanting in part,—as, for example, we find on fig. 75 of the same plate in N. Müller (see our third plate, fig. 4) the bow with the line of bees as a string, the fish on the banner, the parrot as an animal for riding; then, too, the god of love is not given anywhere else as an infant at his mother's breast (and in fig. 7 he is not represented as such at all—rather as a youth rejoicing over the beauty of his mother). It is much better to take it as Kriñna at the breast of Devaki, a conception that must have been copied numberless times at the yearly festival of Kriñna's birth. The position of the child, too, corresponds here exactly with the statement of the text of the ritual (see above, p. 236). for, if it does not itself "press the point of the breast," it still "looks up lovingly to its mother," with one hand stroking her face, while the other is occupied with her other breast.

Far more important, however, is the second of these pictures, namely, the one given by Moor in his Hindu Pantheon, plate 59!—a beautiful painting (see the second plate) of "Kriñna nursed by Devaki," from a highly finished picture, copied, like all the other plates of that costly work, by "Mr. Haughton of the Royal Academy," and taken from a collection of "pictures and images" made in India by Moor towards the end of last century. Unfortunately, more particular accounts of the origin of the painting are wanting. In every respect it is a true work of art, and we could even imagine that we were occupied not with the work of an Indian but of a European artist* if we had not in our possession other Indian pictures which indicate a similar master-hand: see, for example, in Moor himself, plates 17, 18, 22, 62, 63, 67, 88, 96. No direct reference to the special accounts of the manner in which the infant Kriñna is represented at the festival of the Kriñna-festival in India. He is neither represented as "asleep drinking at the breast,"

---

* Compare plate 11, figs. 1, 2, 3, in Moor, where Lakshmi, as Nārāyaṇa's wife, is resting in her arms, looking meanwhile more like a child than a woman. (See Moor, p. 31.)
† See Wilton, Vīṣṇupurāṇa: (2nd ed.) p. 593.
§ We must, then, recognize an attribute of Lakshmi in the lotus-flower which the mother holds in her hand: compare the remark just made above to Moor's plate 9, figs. 2, 3.
§ This, according to p. 553, is "a miniature done in copy by the hand of a friend (Herr Mallet) from the portfolio of an Indian artist, the legacy of a French officer of marine (one Herr Darsa)."

II According also to CREUZER'S Symbolik, vol. I.

* Mr. Haughton may indeed have helped it, as appears from Moor's words (p. 197):—"The plate is an exact outline of the picture, without any addition or alteration whatever, save perhaps some portion of ease and elegance in the position of the females." The following, from Moor's description, is perhaps of importance:—"The glory that encircles her head as well as that of the infant is of green edged with gold... Kriñna in the picture is of a dark brown colour, and not, as his name indicates, and as he is generally seen painted, dark azure" (see further on this subject the notes made below, p. 352).
And in fact it is to this idea, in all probability, as its source, that the Christian legend related in the two Gospels of the Infancy of Jesus, the Greek (Fabricius, p. 160) and the Arabic (cap. 36, 46, Fabricius, pp. 193, 206) is to be traced,—the legend of the making of animals out of clay and imparting life to them, as apes, oxen, birds, &c., especially sparrows, alluded to also in the Qurān (Sūra iii. 43). In India this is ascribed sometimes to Kṛiṣṇa; compare, for example, Bhāgavata-Purāṇa X. 14, p. 59 of Pavie's translation from the Hindi (Paris, 1852), where it is only flocks and shepherds, as in the case of Christ,—not, as here, elephants,—that are dealt with; partly also to king Śāli vihāna, who belonged, as is asserted, to the first century of our era, who made elephants, horses, and riders out of clay, and imparted life to them (see Lassen, Ind. Ant. II. 882-4). Consequently this symbol is exactly in its right place here, inasmuch as it is joined to an analogous circle of representations, springing from the same source. What further occurs to us here as specially worthy of attention among the representations lying before us, is the striking similarity which they show to the Egyptian type, Isis nourishing Horus (see before, § 3 in Ind. Ant. vol. III. p. 49), particularly as regards the attitude and upper part of the group, in so special a degree that a closer reference is superfluous—a comparative glance at the two pictures suffices (see the third plate, fig. 5). The explanation of this would be very easily found if Raoul Rochette's or Mrs Jameson's opinion, that the type of Byzantine Madonnas rests upon this Egyptian group, could be clearly proved by Byzantine pictures of the kind. We should then have to consider these last as the medium which had served as a model for the Indian picture.

in Egypt, from ancient times even down to the time of the Ptolemies and the Romans: compare, for example, for the later age the great work of Lepsius, Ἐλπίδους Δέκακος, Part IV. plates 43, 59, 61, 64, 71 (this last is the picture fig. 6 on our plate). The picture which Mrs. Jameson gives on page xvi. (Isis nursing Horus) is evidently borrowed from Sir J. G. Wilkinson's second series of Monuments and Customs of Ancient Egypt, London, 1841, Plate 364. Greek art also has representations of Hera giving the breast to Ares, or by mistake to Herakles (see Peller's Greek Mythology, 1855, pp. 113, 114, but the only specimen of the kind accessible to me in Wieseler's edition of G. O. Müller's Denkmäler der alten Kunst (Göttingen, 1856), tom. II. p. 6, plate v, No. 62—does not show the smallest reference to the Egyptian type. It is an ex-voto statue in the Vatican Museum (Mus. Pio Clementino). Hera, it is true, offers her left breast to Ares also, holds it with her right hand, while the left encircles the child, but the attitude and the rest of the arrangement differ entirely.

(see p. 285), nor "pressing the point of the breast with his hand, and looking up lovingly into the face of Devāk" (see p. 286); she, rather, is looking down lovingly on him, and, on her part, presses her breast, to make drinking easier for him. She appears, too, far past the condition of a confined woman, as Kṛiṣṇa does past that of a newly-born child. An immediate reference to the festival of the Janaūṣṭhami is not contained, then, in the picture. Of the identity of the persons, however, there can be no reasonable doubt. Niclas Müller, indeed, on p. 608, explains the picture as a "Bhāvanī laying an infant to her nourishing breast in her paradise, as universal mother of earth, and source of life" (!). Others have also recognized in it "Buddha suckled by Māyā," see Creuzer's Symbolik (3rd ed. Leipsic, 1837), I. 572: so especially Guigniaut, in his translation of Creuzer's work (Paris, 1825), I. 293. Nowhere, however, in Buddhist literature or elsewhere, is there any such representation of Buddha mentioned, which, moreover, would be inconsistent with his whole character (see § 3 in Ind. Ant. vol. III. p. 21). That the child we have here is to be considered as an incarnation of the Lord and Creator of the world, is testified by the shell as a symbol, lying underneath on the ground at the right hand, with figures of animals (elephant, lion, bull, horse, &c.), which likewise are repeated elsewhere, namely, in N. Müller, on plate IV. fig. 64, in a group representing Śiva with his wife Pārvati.† Under the seat of the latter there is a similar basket, a "dish of models of beings" Wesenmodellschüssel, as N. Müller expresses himself,—in which an elephant, a cow, a horse, a gazelle, a bird, and two men are visible, so that the common interpretation of the symbols as denoting creative power is sufficiently apparent.

† Niclas Müller had this sketched along with others of the copies of Indian miniatures in the old Louvre, done by him in Paris, in the year 1794, at the request of G. Förster.

† This representation is, in fact, exceedingly frequent.
That such a Byzantine Madonna type should still be preserved so faithfully in India, while with us it belonged as a type to a departed age, would not be surprising; in similar cases the same thing often appears in the travelling of ideas to foreign lands. To show that the Indians keep firmly to a model of this kind when it has been once accepted, a remarkable analogy is found in the remarks made by me (Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgen-Gesellschaft XVIII. 507) regarding the complete identity of the Manjuśrī of the fourteenth century in Java with the one presently used in Tibet. Moreover in the pictures of the old cave-temples of Ajañ, §14 of which were recently in the library of the India House, actual traces of Byzantine models are found along with a decided advance upon them, in so far, namely, as some of these, in architectonic reference, at least, already show a striving after perspective representation.|| This becomes clear from the following report on them in the Athenæum of February 3rd, 1849 (I borrow the passage from Hardy's Eastern Monachism, p. 205): — "In many of these, certain striking coincidences with Siennese and Pisan art under the influence of Byzantine taste are to be remarked. There are the same diagrammatic manifestations of the human form and the human countenance: similar conventions of actions and of feature; a like constraint in the choice of action and the delineation of form, in consequence of a like deficiency in knowledge of the human subject; and a like earnestness of intention and predominance of dramatic display. Assigning the date of the pictures to the period suggested it is at least remarkable that evidence of perspective should be found so very much earlier than the date of any existing specimens known in Southern Europe. The earliest examples of perspective principles in Italian art date somewhere about the middle of the fourteenth century."

Hitherto I have almost entirely proceeded on the supposition that in this picture we have the retention of a type transmitted from an earlier


¶ Regarding the special glory, see § 2, ante, vol. III. p. 52. Does not this form of the glory, perhaps, present a fixed point in the chronology of art? Indian pictures have in other cases properly only a golden ring encircling the whole head from above to below: see, for example, the "Miniature Plate annexed to the Collection of Sanskrit Manuscripts in the Royal Library here.


— as follows: — "This represents a similar subject, whence also Christian idolatry received countenance — namely, Krishṇa, the eighth avatar or incarnation of Vishnu, suckled by his mother, Devakī." In this case, however, rather the exact opposite seems to hold.

† Fig. 7 in the accompanying plate is from De Rossi's Imago Selecta Deiparae Virginis, referred to in § 8 of this paper, Ind. Ant. vol. III. p. 336.

Fig. 8 is from Bunsen, Die Religion des alten Romans, pl. xiv.; see Ind. Ant. vol. III. p. 483.

Fig. 9 is from the cloister of Karrayn on Mount Athos, referred to ut supra, p. 500.
Meanwhile we here subjoin a few more data which abundantly establish the existence in India during the last three or four centuries of a directly European influence in the field of art. First of all, then, according to p. 424 of the Catalogue des Manuscrits et Xylographes Orientaux de la Bibliothèque Impériale Publique de St. Pétersbourg, which appeared in the year 1852, in a manuscript collection of Muhammadan-Indian pictures there (No. edlxxxix.) of date between the years 1621-1752, we find, among others, on p. 68, "an image of the Holy Virgin with the Child Jesus, and above, in letters scarcely recognizable from their smallness, the words  

\[ \text{يا صاحب الزمان — ya sāheb al zamān, 'O Seigneur du temps!'} \]

Then we come to f. 77 vers. 'the Annunciation of the Holy Virgin,' with some words in Roman characters, in which we can distinguish Motir and Noster (compare Ouseley, Biographical Notes on Persian Poets, p. ccxxiv., London, 1846). And so, likewise, our Royal Library here is in possession of two similar collections of works. One of them (library pictures A 100) bears the title "A collection of original drawings to illustrate the costume and the manners of the Persians:" it is not, however, Persian but Indian pictures that are contained in it, as, for example, two pictures of the blue  \( Kṛiṣṇa ā \), both of which represent him as a young man, the one as seated on a kind of stool, the other as milking a cow (a shepherdsess stands near). It is highly surprising to find among these pictures a beautiful one, obviously modelled on a European copy, representing the child Christ in the Madonna's left arm (both without halo). Jesus is dressed in yellow, and holds a book in his hand; the Madonna has on a red under-garment, and a blue handkerchief on her head, which falls down like a mantle, and envelopes her whole body. The superscription runs thus:  

\[ \text{تکریم حضرت مسیحیت میرا ماریم} ( ?) bin Maryam, 'Picture of the Lord Jesus son [this word is repeated] of Mary.'" Of much greater importance, however, is the second of this collection (Access. 9278, 9350). The same thing appears from a border executed in gold painting and common to all the leaves, which on every leaf is adorned with separate figures—a single work of art. Of the larger pictures that are found in the middle of this frame, a considerable number are old European engravings, or at least copies of such. And in fact the subjects of these are borrowed for the most part from the history of Christ. Thus, for example, one engraving represents the murder of the children at Bethlehem, another the worship of the kings, another Christ's resurrection and descent into hell. A Madonna of Dürer's (but not the Madonna Lactans) lies before us in a free copy, and also among the figures in the frames done in gold, we find the Madonna with the Child (although not, in this case, as a sucking child), or the child Christ alone, or other persons taken from sacred history. Beside them are numerous other representations having no reference to these, some European also, but most of them of decidedly Indian character and origin. Fortunately, the date of this remarkable work is preserved to us in a perfectly authentic way. On the concluding page the Indian artist, to whom the execution of the whole evidently belongs, has represented himself as offering a roll of paper to his high patron, by whose order he had executed his work, and on this roll, in Deevān-gārī, stand the words  

\[ \text{šir Tāfālāsīna Akwara Pādisīhī chīrān jīva sānawatā () 1646. pauša sūdā, nāmī ()} \]

\[ \text{Anno. BENFAY, indeed, in his Sanskrit Dictionary, places sānawat together with puravat, and seeks (under puravat) in the text a separate word with the meaning of 'year,' which he compares with Prakrit sānawat. For puravat = sānawat, Armen. heru, Pott, Windischmann, and Bopp have both sought a similar derivation, and in the sutra "a contraction of the syllable vut from utsara, year." (See Bopp, Very. Gram. vol. II. p. 216, vol. III. p. 491.) But the very reference to sānawat and heru makes this appear to me very improbable for puravat also. The words sutas, utsara, year, are scarcely descended from the Indo-Germanic age: uṣena cannot show with this signification in the Rik, at all, and in both the Brāhmānas only in the word triṣuṇa, which is defined by triṣun, but can also be quite differently understood; utsara, too, very seldom occurs in it, and may probably be only a secondary word, formed to denote one of the five or six pashu-years, and derived from an Assyro-Aryan word. This last word, not exactly one often met with in the Rik, probably at first contained an r in the middle, as derived from the root svar and standing for saunara, sar, and meaning properly the cycle rolling back on itself;} \]
laitihi Keśavadvāsa chitrakara, that is, "May His Highness Jellāl-ed-din Akbar Pādishāh live long! Samvat 1646 (=A.D. 1590) on the ninth of the light half of Pausha, written by Keśavadvāsa, the painter." Thus, by order of the emperor Akbar, this beautiful work was executed by a native artist, called Keśavadvāsa. In this statement there is nothing surprising. On the one hand it is known how indulgent that truly great emperor was, how much he promoted the mingling of religious systems, how very warmly he interested himself in the Christian religion among others, so that for a long time the Jesuits reckoned confidently on his conversion. On the other hand, however, we know further from the statement of his like-minded great minister Fāzī, in the excellent work called the Aṭīn-i-Akkari, that the emperor warmly favoured painting also, that he even founded a kind of academy of painting, whose members, among other things, had to illustrate Persian books with paintings (Hamza's History contains not fewer than fourteen hundred of them); drawing portraits, too, of the chief officials of the court formed part of their business,—see Gladwin's Aṭīn-i-Akkari, vol. I. p. 115, and the Petersburg Catalogue des Manuscrits ... p. 423.

ROCK-CUT TEMPLES AT BĀDĀMĪ, IN THE DEKHAN.

Bādāmī is a moderate-sized town in the Kalāgī collectorate, about twenty-three miles south-east from the town of Kalāgī, and nearly three from the Malabahā river. It is the chief town of the tālukā of the same name. A little to the south of it is Banaśāṅkari; among the hills to the east is Mahākūta; eight miles to the east and on the river is Paṭadkal; and another eight miles down the river is Aihole—all noted for their ancient temples and inscriptions. As pointed out by Mr. Fleet, there seems little doubt but that Bādāmī was the ancient Vatāpirūrī or Vatāpīnāgari of the Chalukya kings of the Kanarese country, and made the capital by Pulikēśā in the sixth century of the Christian era. Early in the seventh century it is mentioned by the name also of Bādāvi; Paṭadkal is the old Paṭadakisūval, the capital of the Sindavaṅga chiefs about 1162 A.D.; and Aihole may be the Ayyāvole mentioned in a grant of the reign of the Chalukya king Vikramāditya the Great, 1093 A.D.*

Bādāmī is situated at the outlet between two rocky hills on its north and south sides, a dam to the east of the town between the bases of the hills forming a large tank for the supply of water to the town. All along the north side of this small lake are old temples, most of them built of very large blocks of hard stone, while the hill behind them is a ruined fort, taken by a British detachment under Sir Thomas Munro in 1818. It must have been a place of great strength in early times; the passages through it are cut to great depths in the rock and are narrow, long, and winding, so that if the gate were stormed the besieged had their enemies far below them, and from above they could easily hurl destruction on the heads of all that could enter the pathways before any of them could reach a place of vantage. In and about this rock-fort are some temples also. But it is in the scarp of the hill to the south-east that the cave temples are excavated. They are four in number: the lowest, on the west end of the hill, is a Śīvalaya or Śaiva cave; the next is a Vaishnava temple considerably higher up in the rock and to the north-east of the Śīvalaya; the largest, also Vaishnava, is still further to the east on the north face of the hill; and the last is a little beyond it, but is a Jaina cave and of much smaller dimensions than the preceding three Brāhmanical ones. All four are still in unusually excellent preservation, and are very rich in mythological sculpture.

The Great Cave is by far the finest of the series, and one of the most interesting Brāhmanical temples in India; it is also the only cave-temple of which we know the age, for it is on a pilaster in it that the inscription of Māṅgalīśā, the son of Pulikēśā, the Chalukya king who made Bādāmī his capital, is found. Though it cannot compare in size with Elephanta or some of the larger caves at Ellurā, naturally become doubtful in the highest degree.

SCULPTURES IN THE GREAT CAVE AT BADAMI.

1. VISHNU OR ADI NARAYANA.
2. VARAHA.
SCULPTURES IN THE GREAT CAVE AT BADAMI.
it is still a temple of considerable dimensions, the verandah measuring nearly seventy feet in length, and the cave inside sixty-five feet, with a total depth from the front of the verandah pillars to the back wall of forty-eight feet,—the shrine going into the rock about twelve feet further, while the general height throughout verandah and hall is fifteen feet. It is considerably higher up in the rock than the other Vaishnava cave, and is entered by an ascending stair through a door in the west end of a square court in front of it, the north side of this court being formed by a large mass of rock left unexcavated there; the east and west ends are formed by old walls of masonry, that on the east entirely precluding all access from this side to the Jaina cave just beyond it, so that the Jaina must have formed a path for themselves from the shore of the taldo below up to their rock-cut shrine.

The cave faces the north, and the level of the floor of it is eight or nine feet above that of the court outside. A narrow platform is built up the whole length of the front, the cave being entered by a flight of steps in the centre of it, but which have now been torn down,—probably because the long treads of the steps were found useful for some purpose or other in the village. The front of the platform has a moulded cornice, and under it a dado of blocks,—many of them seven feet in length—divided into more than thirty compartments throughout the length of it, and in each compartment two of those little fat dwarfs or ganas that are such favourites with the early Hindu sculptors for the decoration of basements, and which they were fond of representing in every possible attitude and in every form of grimace, even with the heads of animals. All sects—Brāhmans, Buddhists, and Jains—seem to have employed such figures in similar positions: in fact they appear to have been conventionalities dependent more upon the taste and imagination of the craftsmen than upon the mythology of the sect for which any particular temple was constructed.

The verandah is supported in front by six pillars each two and a half feet square, and two pilasters, with deep bases and capitals,—the latter almost hidden by the three brackets attached to the lower part of the capitals on the backs and sides of each, and by the cave or dip which comes down in front. The brackets on each side the pillars in every case but one represent a pair of human or mythological figures—a male and female standing in various attitudes under foliage, in most cases attended by a small dwarf figure; the only exception to the pair of figures is one in which Ardhanāri is represented, four-armed and with two dwarf attendants. The brackets on the backs or inner sides of the pillars are all tall single female figures, each with one or two small attendants. These brackets extend from near the bottom of the capitals to the roof. The necks of the pillars below the capitals are carved with broad bands of elaborate beaded festoon work, and on each of the four sides of the lower portions of the shafts are medallions carved with groups of figures within a border.

The verandah is nine feet wide, and is separated from the hall by four free-standing columns and two demi-columns in antis, all with high bases, the two central pillars being of that purely Hindu type, so often met with, consisting of a square shaft with thin and slightly narrower slabs applied to each face: in this case two of these slabs are superimposed on each side, forming five exterior angles at each of the four corners. The two pillars outside these are octagons with capitals of the Elephanta type. There are thus left for sculptures the two ends of the verandah, and the spaces on the back between the attached pillars and the ends.

In the east end of the verandah is a large figure of Viṣṇu seated (see Fig. 1) on the body of the great snake Śesha or Ananta, which is thrice coiled round below him, while its hoods—five in this instance—are spread out over and round his big mūrta or crown as if to protect it. He is represented as four-armed (Caturbhuja) —the front left hand resting on the calf of his leg, and the other holding up the śākha or conch-shell, one of his most characteristic emblems,—being the shell that was among the fourteen precious things produced from the churning of the ocean which Viṣṇu conducted in his second or Kūrma avatāra, and which was said to confer victory on whoever should sound it. In the Viṣṇu Purāṇa and Harivaiśṇava, however, it is said that when Kṛṣṇa was getting up his military acquirements, his deśārya or tutor, Śāndipani Kāśyapa complained that he had lost his only son in the sea at Prabhāsa (Somanātha). Kṛṣṇa...
plunged into the sea, but was told by Samudra that it was the Daiya Pañcajañana or Śaṅkhasura, the chief of a race dwelling in shells, who had carried off the youth. Krishna then, descending to the bottom of the ocean, encountered and slew him, bringing up his bones (or the shell he had inhabited), of which he made the Śaṅkha Pañcajañana, that he bore ever after as an emblem.†

In the front right hand he holds some object perhaps representing wealth or fruit, and in the other his chakra or discus—a sharp-edged heavy quoit, which seems to have been used as a missile instrument in early warfare by the Hindus, being thrown with force against the enemy, and recovered by a string attached to it. In later mythological representations Viṣṇu is represented as twirling it round his forefinger, when, it is said, irresistible fire flames from its periphery, destroying all in its course. It is called sudarśana, and is said to have been formed from the rays of Tvaṣṭrīrī for the destruction of the Dānavas.‡ He has three necklaces, each represented with a mass of gems in front, among which it was perhaps intended to represent the Kaustubha or Bhīṣṇulata. Round his waist is another belt of gems, while over his left shoulder and under his right arm hangs a thick cord apparently formed of twisted strands of strings of beads or pears; and again round his loins are other richly embroidered belts; on his arms and wrists§ also he wears rich armlets and bracelets. To his right and below is Garuḍa, his vihāra or vehicle, who carries him and attends him also as a page, sitting with folded arms leaning against the coils of Śeṣa. Opposite to him sits a little female figure with high mukuta, which may possibly represent Lakshmi, the wife of Viṣṇu. Above these stand two taller female figures, each holding a chauri or fly-flap: they have jewelled head-dresses, and large chignon, out of which rises a single cobra- hood overshadowing the head. These attendants remind us of the supporters we so often find under the padumānas or lotus-thrones of figures of Buddha, where the male supporters of the lotus-stalk are represented with three, five, or even seven snake-hoods shielding their heads, while their female companions or wives have only one hood.

This large sculpture fills the end compartment of the verandah. Under it is a plinth the front of which is carved with little fat gambolling figures or gopas.

Turning to the right we find on the back wall of the verandah another large sculpture, and one which in the early ages seems to have been a great favourite, for we seldom miss it in a Vaishnavā shrine (Fig. 2). It is also repeated in several of the Saiva rock-temples of Elurā, and always in nearly the same form as here. It is the Varāha or third avatāra, assumed to rescue the earth from the Asura, Hiranyaśakha, the chief of the Dānavas, who had carried it off to the bottom of the ocean, when Viṣṇu, taking the form of a boar, dived down and rescued it, after a contest of a thousand years. || Here he is represented again as four-armed, similarly dressed as in the other figure, and with the chakra and śaṅkha in his uplifted hands, but with a boar’s head, standing with his left foot on the coil of a snake, the head of which is human, with five hoods behind it—seen under his thigh. In one of his left hands he holds a lotus-flower on which stands Pṛthivi—the Earth personified,—steadying herself against his shoulder. Pṛthivi, also called Bhūmidevi or Bhūdevi, derives her name from Pṛthu, the first king who taught the mode of cultivating the ground, and whose daughter she is said to have been. She is the wife of Viṣṇu in his Varāha avatāra, and to her he delivered one of the Purāṇas. She is represented in mythology as a woman with two arms, standing on a lotus-flower, and holding in one hand another lotus-blossom, with a crown on her head, her long black locks reaching to her feet, of yellow complexion, and with a tilakā of red paste on her forehead. Bhūmidevi is the goddess of patience and endurance, but receives no special worship.||

In front of Varāha’s knee kneels a human female figure with the five Nāgas-hoods over his jewelled mukuta, and behind stands a female chauri-bearer with the single hood; another figure lies between Varāha’s feet, holding by the long cord or yajnopavita that hangs down from his shoulder, but which is broken away in front of the head and shoulder of the Nāga figure.

† Wilson, Viṣṇu Purana, 1st ed. p. 540; Hariścandra, adh. ix, x, xii, xiii, xi, p. 218; Hariścandra, adh. xii, xxi, xxxi, xxxii, vi, xiv, xxvi
‡ Prithivi is from pṛthī “extended.” On Bhūmidevi see Maṇu, iii. 86, 86; xiv. 311; Colebrooke’s Essays, vol. i. p. 187.
COPPER ŠASANAM OF THE SYRIAN CHRISTIANS OF MALABAR.
Over Varāha's shoulders are two pairs of figures like the cherubs in Baudhā shrines, each apparently with offerings.

On the pilaster, beside this figure, is the inscription of the sixth century of our era (A.D. 579), to which we shall again refer below.

At the west end of the verandah we have another of the avatāras, namely the Nārasiṁha or man-lion (Fig. 3), which, like the Varāha, is represented as having taken place in the Satya-yuga. The demon Hiraṇyakaśipu, the son of Kaśyapa and Ditā, and brother of Hiraṇyakṣa, having, in consequence of severe penance, obtained from Brahmā the boon that he should be invulnerable to gods, men, snakes, &c., became impious and troubled earth and heaven, when, at the desire of Prahlāda the son of Hiraṇyakaśipu, Nārasiṁha bursting out of a column destroyed him, to the great joy of the devatas. He is here represented four-armed, one of the left arms resting on his huge club or gadha, called Kauṇmodak, beside which stands Garuḍa in human form. On the other side is a dwarf attendant, and above Nārasiṁha's shoulders are figures floating with garlands and gifts. Over the lion-head is a lotus, and his jewelled necklaces are elaborately carved.

On the other side of the front pilaster of the verandah from this last is a large and very striking sculpture, repeated also on a smaller scale in the other Vaishṇava cave here, in the Dāśa Avatāra cave and in other places at Eiℓūra (see Fig. 4). Locally it is called Virātrupa, but, from the place it occupies among these sculptures, there can be no doubt that it relates to Viṣṇu in the fifth or Vāmanā avatāra of the Tretā-yuga. He is represented in this case as eight-armed (Aṣṭabhuja), with the chakra, the Nandaka, the sword, the gadha or club, and an arrow in his right hands, and the saṅkha, the bow called Śārṅga, and shield in the left, while with the fourth on that side he points to a round grinding face, perhaps Rāhu, to which he lifts also his left foot. Over the scene is the crescent moon, beside Viṣṇu's jewelled mukuta is a Varāha and two other figures, and below on his right Garuḍa. In front stand three figures, probably representing Bali the son of Virochana and king of Mahābali, and his wife with Śūra his counsellor, the first holding the pot out of which he had, against Śūra's advice, poured the water on the hands of the dwarf in confirmation of his promise to grant Vāmanā's request for as much ground as he could compass at three strides. But scarcely was the water poured on his hands when, say the legends, he developed all his divine form. The earth became his feet, the heaven his head, the sun and moon his eyes, the Piśāchas his toes, the Guhyakṣas his fingers, the Visvadēvas his knees, the Śāhyas his legs, the Yaksas his nails, the Apsaras the lines on his face, the lightning his glance, the solar rays his locks, the stars the spots on his person, the intermediate points of the horizon his arms, the cardinal points his ears, the Aśvin the interiors of his ears, Vāyu his nose, Chandramas (moonbeams) the light of his face, duty his sentiment (manas), truth his voice, Sarasvatī his tongue, Aditi his neck, Mitra and Tvashṭṛ his eyebrows, Agni his mouth, Brahmā his heart, the Vāsus his back, the Maruts his joints, the Chandras his teeth, &c. &c. At the sight of this divine form the Asuras, Bali's subjects, enraged dashed at him." Among them we find such names as Viprachittī, Hayagrīva, Kētumāna, Ugra, Prahlāda, Anurāda, Hari, Hara, Varāha, Virāpākṣa, Sāpatra, Diviḥkara, Vāyu, Vikshara, Krodha, Naraka, Puloman, Rāhu, &c. &c. They were of all animal and monstrous shapes, and armed with all sorts of instruments, their heads decked with diadems, earrings, &c. Viṣṇu's form, however, grew as he dispelled them, until the sun and moon were no higher than his breast, and still he grew. "The Brahma says that the powerful Viṣṇu, the conqueror of the Asuras, after subduing the three worlds, gave the earth to

* Viṣṇu, like Śiva, has a thousand names (Mahābh. Anuvāda Parvan, vt. 6950-7065) of which the more usual are:

1. Ačyuta—the undecayable.
2. Ananta-sayana—who sleeps on the serpent Ananta.
3. Dīnayāsa—the enemy of the Dīnayas.
4. Dāmodara—as Kṛiṣṇa, bound with a rope.
5. Govinda—raiser of the earth, or cowkeeper.

6 Hari. 7 Janārdana—of whom emancipation is sought.
8 Jalajalohana—lotus-eyed; 9 Pundarikakṣa—whose eyes are like the white lotus.
10 Kaitabheji—who overcame Kaitabha.
11 Keśava—haired, or who gave being; 12 Keśinādana.
13 Kṛiṣṭ—wearing a tiara.
14 Lakshmidatri—lord of Lakshmi.
15 Śṛdr śā—beaer of Śrī.
Indra, and to Bali the sixth of the lower worlds (Pātāla), named Sutala."

Holding by his thigh is Garuḍa, and above the heads of the three figures before him is one with sword and shield falling down, and a half-figure behind.

Facing this, at the other end of the verandah, just outside the pilaster that separates it from the first described of these sculptures, is another large one (Fig. 5) representing Vishṇu with eight arms, with chakra, arrow, gada, and sword in his right hands, and in the left the śāṅkha, shield, and bow (śāṅgīva), the fourth placed against his loin. Behind the head a portion of the head-dress is formed into a circular frill, somewhat resembling an aureole: this may be observed also both in the last described figure and in the next. He wears long pendant links hanging down from the ears, similar to what are found on many Buddha images, and in the lower portion of the link is hung a heavy ring or jewel that rests against the collar. From the top of his high mukuta, or cap, springs a figure of Narasiṇha—four-armed and with chakra and śāṅkha. Whom this is intended to represent is somewhat difficult to say; as it occupies a position beside the entrance, it may be intended merely as a figure of Vishṇu in his more active and terrible form, while the next, inside, represents him in repose seated on Śeṣa—or it may be for Balarāma, the seventh avatarā. It is, like the others, well cut in a close-grained rock, and the only damage it has suffered is a piece out of the long sword, and some slight injury near the ankle. The dress is knotted behind the thighs, and round his body and thighs he wears a belt—perhaps the same as the bāhupaddaś of Southern India, represented as worn by sages and other holy beings when they sit.

The last large sculpture to be noticed in this cave is a figure of Harihara, as he is locally known. (Fig. 6.) This name is applied to the

Avinar of the south country, the alleged son of Śiva by Māhīṇī (a female manifestation of Vishṇu), and who is the only male Gṛmadevata worshipped by the Tamils. But there is another legend of Harihara which runs thus:—"In former times there lived an Aśura named Guha, the son of a Rāsih. He was exceedingly powerful, and performed extremely painful penances. On one occasion, after inhaling a draught of smoke, he performed the penance of standing on his head for ninety-six years, during sixty-four of which he lived solely on the leaves of trees, and for another portion of the time upon fruit, and for the rest of the period he lived entirely without food; and by this means he succeeded in bringing all his bodily senses into complete subjection. As a reward for this great penance, he obtained a boon from Brahmā, and this blessing so intoxicated him with pride that he became a trouble of the worlds. In course of time Indra and his attendant gods were obliged to make war upon him on account of the universal confusion which he created; but he assumed the different powers of all the gods—the power of Śūrya, of Indra, of Agni, of Anila, of Indu, of Yama, of Varuṇa, and of the other gods, and so succeeded in driving them out of their own paradise.

"Then those exiled gods, together with the Rāsihs, the Munis, the Gandharvas, the Yaksas, and the Rākshasas," went to Śiva, and "in order also to make it evident to all creatures that Vishṇu and Śiva are one," says the Śaiva legend, "I (Śiva) assumed the form of Hari. For a thousand years of the gods I made war upon Guhāṣura with various divine and mighty weapons. For a while I merely hurled them at him in sport, but at last I pierced him mortally with the tremendous arrow Mahāpātapatāstra." . . . "When the gods saw the mysterious form which had been assumed to

sorrow, or lord of the heaven named Vaikunṭha or limitless.

33 Śiva—into whom all is absorbed, or the pervading.
33 Śivājara—who (in the form of Viṣṇu) is all eye, all ear.
34 Śivamvara—protector of the world.
35 Śivakrama—whose soldiers fill the world.
36 And the ten avāstras—1, Maitreya, the fish; 2, Kūrma, the tortoise; 3, Varāha, the boar; 4, Narasimha, the man-lion; 5, Vasiṣṭha, the dwarf; 6, Parasurāma, the son of Jamadagni; 7, Rāma; 8, Krishna; 9, Buddha; and, 10, Kalki or Dharma-bhūtāna.†
† See Hariuvānaa, adh. colli.-collii.
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destroy the Asuras, they greatly wondered and were very much afraid," until Brahmi explained the mystery.† In the Harivānśa (adh. clxxx, clxxxi) is another account of the contest between Śiva and Vishnu, and of their subsequent union in one, concluding with a hymn to Harihara.§

Here the left side of the figure represents Harī or Vishnu with the śakti in his uplifted hand, the other resting against his haunch, while the earring and cap are of a different pattern from that of Harā or Śiva, on which is the crescent and a withering skull, while a cobra hangs from his ear, another from his belt, a third is on the front of his māyūra, and a fourth twines round the paraśu or axe he holds in one hand. In the other hand he holds some oval object.

A more common double figure in Hindu mythology is that of Ardhanārīśavāri, Ardhanārīśavī, or Ardhanārīnātēśvāra, the union of Śiva and Pārvatī, in a half male half female form. In the Kālīya Purāṇa it is said—"Harā offered his wife to take half of her body and give half of his own, or vice versa; and at length she took the half of Śiva and joined it to her right side, and the god took half of Pārvatī and united it to his. Thus forming only one body with his wife, Śiva has the name of Ardhanārīśavārī." Other stories are given in other Purāṇas.

In the lowest or Śiva cave of the Bādāmi group is a representation (Fig. 7) of this Ardhanārīśavāri, in pretty good preservation. It occupies the right end of the verandah, and, as is usually the case at Elephanta and elsewhere, the god is attended by his favourite white bull Nandi, which, the Śiva Samaya Vināḍidai says, is a form of Dharmadēva, the god of justice, who offered himself to Śiva in this form as a vehicle. Behind Nandi, with clasped hands, stands Bhūrīgni—a favourite devotee, or perhaps Kāl, the form of Rudra or Śiva himself as the author of destruction,—a gaunt and hideous skeleton. At the left or female side stands a female richly decked, and bearing some flat object in her left hand.

The right side, which is always the male half, represents Śi̱va,—the crescent moon and skull on his head-dress, a snake in his ear, another

coiled round his arm, a third hanging from his belt (the heads of them broken off), and a fourth twining round the battle-axe he holds in his uplifted hand: a portion of the tiger-skin in which he wraps his person hanging down on his thigh, with richly jewelled necklaces, bracelets, &c.

The left half, representing Umāśakti, has a large flat earring, necklaces, belt, armlets, and bracelets of different patterns from those on the male half. The hair is made up in a sort of chignon over the shoulder, much as it is still worn by the lower classes in the Madras Presidency, and is covered with a network of pearls or gems. A cord hangs down in front of the throat, terminating in a small flat heart-shaped end—an ornament specially noticeable on many of the figures in the Kaḷīs rock-temple at Flurā. On the foot are two heavy anklets, and these and the very long bracelets on the wrists and also on the female companion cannot fail to remind the observer of the similar abundance of bone and brass rings worn by the Wanjāris and other aboriginal tribes to the present day. She holds up a flower, and with the other hand grasps one end of a stick, or perhaps a lute, the other end of which is held by the front hand of the male half. The attendant female wears a loose kirtle held up by a richly jewelled belt. Her earrings are different—that in the right ear consisting of a long link hanging down to the shoulder, and in the end of it a thick jewelled ring and short pendant; the other is a broad thick disc like that known in Bengal by the name of ḍherī.|| Her hair is made up in a very elaborate style, with a profusion of pearls over the forehead. Floating overhead on each side are two figures, male and female, with offerings, and having elaborate head-dresses.

This union of Śiva and Pārvatī in a single body personifies the principle of life and production in its double aspect—the active principle under the name of Purusha, and the female or passive under that of Prakṛti. It embodies the central idea of nature-worship, and occurred to the early Greeks, as we see from the old Orphic hymn preserved by Stobæus*: beginning

"Zeus was a male, Zeus became a deathless damsel.

we have no descriptive catalogs of female ornaments used in India.

‡ See also Ward's Hindus (ed. 1817), vol. I. p. 262.
§ Rājendraśāla, Mitra's Antiquities of Orissa, vol. I. p. 98, and plate XXVII. fig. 118. It is to be regretted that
On the male side the figure of Ardhana
tīśa* is usually painted dark blue or black, and vermilion or orange on the left or female
side, but sometimes the colours are white (Siva's proper colour) and yellow.

But to return to the great cave: The roof

67, Mrityunjaya—conqueror of Death.
68, Muni (?)—the ancient; 69, Mahāmuni—the great ascetic.
70, Nadeja or Nadeja—lord of rivers; 71, Tāndava-
urti—the dancing god; 72, Kālikātā (?)—the dancer
with Kāli; 73, Sudāsāyā— the dancer in cemeteries.
74, Pāṇḍuranga—whose limbs are white.
75, Nakka (?)—the naked.
76, Nambha (?)—sumptuously desirable.
77, Nandikāvāra—the bull- lord; 78, Vrisadhravāja—
whose standard is a bull.
79, Nārāhā—female sided; 80, Magsalabhāga (?) 81,
Ambikāabhāga.
82, Nātha—the lord; 83, Irāyān (?)—the king.
84, Nilakṣaṭha—blue-throated; 85, Niśagra; 86, Nan-
chakṣaṭha (?)—having poison in the throat; 87, Śrīkṣaṭha—
of the black throat; 88, Śrīkṣaṭha—of the beautiful throat.
89, Niłaloha—the blue and red.
90, Nirmala; 91, Māśilabhāvar (?)—spotless.
92, Nitya—the eternal
93, Pañchakṣaṭha; 94, Panchākṣaṭha—five-faced.
95, Parma—the highest; 96, Parmaśiva.
97, Parāsūppa—bearer of the battle-axe; 98, Pāśčaṅkī
99, Pāṇḍaśpī—bearer of the bow.
100, Kundavījtī (?)—with the (Mena) mountain-bow.
101, Pašpati—lord of cattle or the beasts.
102, Pongaranavān (?)—adorned with an angry snake
103, Radha—the furious, or the disperser of tears.
104, Sambha—the god; 105, Tarbāna (?,)—self-existent.
106, Śāhāra—author of good.
107, Sirndālañgaṭa (?)—the protector of those who
take refuge in him.
108, Sarva—who destroys; 109, Sarvajna—all-knowing.
110, Śigvishiva—wrapped in a skin, or surrounded by a
111, Senjatyalas (?)—red locked; 112, Vyomasena—
sure-haired.
113, Śiva—auspicious; 114, Mahāśiva; 115, Śadāśiva.
116, Senuvīra, or Somanātha,—lord of the moon.
117, Smashīri—the creator.
118, Śūyā— the everlasting.
119, Šūlī; 120, Šūlāhāra; 121, Šūlāpi—a-trident
bearer.
122, Svarūpānyāka—lord of heaven; 123, Trilochana;
124, Virūpākṣa; 125, Mukkann (?)—having a third eye.
126, Tripūrānātha—the destroyer of Tripura; 127, Pu-
rāṣṭhāka.
128, Trayambaka—three-eyed, or of three limbs.
129, Umāpāti—lord of Umā; 130, Umāśchita; 131, Pār-
vatikarahaman (?).
132, Vānadēva—who sports in a contrary way.
133, Vam— the giver; 134, Pilāśītāyā (?)—the child-giver.
135, Vrahadadra—the propitious hero.
136, Viśvanātha—lord of the world; 137, Māgāñcan-
urti.
138, Vṛiddhāḥamalāurti—the god of the round hill.
139, Yogan; 140, Mahāyogī—the mediator; 141, Dhar-
ma Śākura; &c. &c.

In the Amrutasoma pares of the Mahābhārata the
thousand names of Śiva and Viṣṇu are given, but a good
many of the above do not occur in that list. Those in the
above list that are queried are not wholly Sanskrit, and
are probably of Dravidian origin. There is one of which
the Pāṇḍit word rāya forms a component part.
of the verandah is divided by cross beams cut in the rock into seven recessed panels each filled with sculpture. Of these, six are represented on the fifth plate to this paper. The first of these, being the panel to the left or east of the middle one, consists of a central circular compartment surrounded by four smaller oval ones, divided by bunches of water-lilies, so as to fill up a circle concentric with the first. The corners of the square are filled with human and animal heads ending in arabesques. In the central area Śiva is represented, four-armed, seated on his bull, with his spouse Pārvati behind him. The four oval compartments outside contain each two figures, apparently all male; and one of them being Gajapati or Pratamāsipa, the son of Śiva and leader of his retinue, they are probably all intended as gāna-ndiyacas, or principal members of his gāna. The corner figures are—the heads of an elephant, man, makara, and fish, ending in floral terminations.

The second panel represented on the plate is the central one of the seven, and has Viṣṇu in the middle, as lord of the Zephyr,—four-armed as usual, and holding up the chakra in one right hand, and the śākha in a left one: he wears a high square-topped cap (as in Figs. 1, 4, and 5) already described, while his wives Śrī or Lakshmi and Bhumidevi are huddled beside him.† Round this central circle are eight ovals each containing some divinity, as in the usual figures of the Dikpāla-mandala. Above the śākha Brahma is easily recognized, seated ascetic-fashion on his lotus, four-armed and three-faced, occupying the place usually assigned to Śiva or Īśana. Below him is Indra, regent of the East, holding his vajra, with his wife Suchi or Indrāni, on the elephant Airavata. Next to him is Agni, god of fire and regent of the South-East, on his ram, and above him a flying figure, probably of Dharma or Smoke. Below Viṣṇu is a figure on a lion with an attendant, which might be Surya and his charioteer Aruna, but it is probably Yama, the regent of the South, who is described in the Matyā Purāṇa (adh. col.xi.) as seated on a śūndana. The next, in the place of Nṛrita, is mounted on a horse, like Mangala, the Hindu Mars. The figure on the left of the panel is Āluṣa gata—seated on a sort of shark as his vehicle; the position is Varuṇa’s, and as he is given this vehicle in the Matyā Purāṇa, instead of a stag, and here has also the piša, or snare, the emblem of Varuṇa, we must suppose it is intended for him. The next, on the deer, might be taken for Soma or Chandra, but in the Dvānakhandha (adh. v.) of the Chaturvarga Chintāmāni, Viṣṇu, the Dikpāla of the north-west, is described as seated on a deer; and that at the top is probably intended for Chandra, who sometimes takes the place of Kuvera, as lord of the North.‡ Kuvera is sometimes figured as borne by a ram, Chandra on a hare, in a chariot, &c.

The third panel represents the compartment at the east end of the verandah, where again the figure in the centre is doubtless intended for Pradyumna, the son of Krishna, an incarnation of Kama, and one of the four Vyahas of Viṣṇu, two-armed, with his club in the right hand, seated on a pair of makaras, and attended by two female chaurn-bearers—perhaps his wives Rati and Prithi. The rest of the panel is filled by four square compartments in the corners, and as many oblong ones at the sides. The corners are filled with pairs, and in one case three figures—male and females much in the style of the flying attendants above both Buddhas and Hindu images; and the side compartments have pairs of figures with human and brute heads, and ending in ornamental arabesques.

The next, being the second from the end and between this last and the first described, is arranged in the usual style, having Indra seated (rather awkwardly, it must be owned) on his favourite elephant, with an attendant holding the royal umbrella over his head as ancient king of gods. The eight smaller oval panels round him contain in five cases a pair—male and female—of Gandharvas and apsarasas, and in the remaining three a single female, all apparently enjoying or contributing to revels, dance—

† If both these figures were not intended to be female, the one kneeling on Viṣṇu’s right might be Śiva or Īśana as lord of the Nātha.
‡ Of plate in Sir W. Jones’s paper on the Hindu Zodiac, As. Res. vol. II. p. 882; Moor, Hind. Penta, pl. 98. The Dikpālakas, or Abhādikpālakas, with their vahanas, are:—1 Indra, of the E., on the elephant Airavata; 2 Agni, of the S.E.—a ram; 3, Yama, of the S.—a black buffalo; 4 Nṛrita, of the S.W.—a crocodile; 5, Varuṇa, of the W.—a stag; 6, Viṣṇu, of the N.W.—a Bûta; 7, Kuvera, or Chandra, of the N.—a self-moving chariot; and 8, Īśana or Irawan, of the N.E.—a bull.
ing, and music: for, curiously enough, physical enjoyment is the only employment ever pictured in the Hindu Svarga; intellectual or moral happiness is undreamt of. The corners are filled up with other varieties of the usual figures.

The fifth panel from the east end, or that on the west side of the central one, has Brahma as its chief occupant, seated upon his hahsa, three-faced and four-armed, with a very high cap, holding a sort of bottle—his kumandalu, or drinking vessel—in his upraised left hand, and a piece of samidh, or sacrificial wood, in the corresponding right. In the small oval to his right is probably Varuna, and, according to some, the son of Brahma, seated on a sort of shark or makara, and on the opposite side Indra, with his attendant, on his elephant; above is Iśana or Śiva on a bull, with some sort of sceptre in his hand, and an attendant running after him at full speed with an umbrella; and below, Yama as lord of the South, or fourth cardinal point. In each of the four alternate spaces, which in this division are somewhat smaller, is a pair of figures—similar to those in the third panel described—probably Viḍyādharas, several of them apparently with small bags, perhaps of money or other precious offerings, or possibly vessels containing something strong. The corners of the outer square are filled up in the usual way, none of them being exact copies from any of the previous ones.

The sixth panel contains in the centre perhaps Kama, Kandarpa (Makaradvaja), the Hindu Cupid, or—as in the third—Pradyuman, on a makara, with a high cap and earrings of very different shapes and sizes, holding in his right hand a bud with a long stalk. The eight little circular compartments surrounding this have been somewhat irregularly arranged, and the spaces between but indifferently filled up by water-lilies, sunflower, human figures, &c. The compartments themselves are occupied by Gandravas and their mates the Apsaras in nearly the same positions as in the last—doubtless regarded as one of love and dalliance. The two upper corners are filled with birds, and the other two with makaras treated in the usual conventional way.

These by no means exhaust the sculptures of the first cave. The roof of the front aisle of the cave is likewise divided into compartments, in the central one of which are a male and female figure floating on clouds, much in the position of the pairs in the two last described panels of the verandah roof, but the male carrying a sword and shield. The panels right and left of this are occupied by expanded lotus-flowers.

The roof of the hall is divided into nine compartments, by divisions very slightly raised from the level of the ceiling. In the central one of the front row is a man or deva—perhaps Agni—riding on a ram, with other figures, one before and another behind. In the compartment to the right or west of this is a pair of flying figures, the male with a sword, but the group is defaced. In the left is a male with a sword, holding a shield overhead, and with him a small female. In the next row we have, in the centre, Brahma on a swan, which apparently pecks at a figure which touches Brahma's hand with his. In one of his left hands Brahma holds what appears to be a bag or bottle, and in the other a mālā or rosary; and a male touches his cheek with his hand. In the compartment to the right of this again is a deva, on a makara, holding up a circle or large ring. In the corresponding one on the left are three figures on an elephant, the second holding an umbrella over the first (Indra?). In the back row in the centre is a deva, three-faced, like Brahma, on a swan, and holding a śrīrāja in his right hand, his left resting on his knee. Chauriers accompany him before and behind. In the square to the left or east are two flying figures, the male with an offering, and the female with a round fan or mirror; in that to the right are a pair of flying figures, the male with a sword; but the group is damaged. The roofs of the side aisles are plain.

On two of the pillars of the hall are inscriptions in Kanarese characters, the full meaning of which, however, has not been made out. In one of them occur the words—Śīvātama Śaka varṇohābhu 1478 gunāda pramādhikeśaśvara āśāḥāhata, 11. Hence iṣṭa was inscribed in A.D. 1555, in the time of Sādāśivādēva.
hārāya, the successor of Kondaraja of Vijayanagara, mentioned below. Of the former, who reigned at least from A.D. 1552 to 1602, there is a short inscription in an old temple on the opposite hill. Again, on one of the pillars of the verandah is an inscription in three lines, thus transcribed and translated by Mr. J. F. Fleet, Bo. C.S.:

Transcription.

[¹] Šābakrut(u)(p)ittu(tu)-sativatsarada Aśākṣa(Aśākṣa). śu 15-
[²] tu Kondarāja-maha(ka)-arasugalu k-
[³] tị(f)śidā kota(tu)jake āshubham-asu(stu) Śri

"May prosperity attend the bastion which the great king Kondaraja caused to be built on the fifteenth day of the bright fortnight of (the month) Āśākṣa, of the Śābhakrti sativatara! Śri!"

But the most important of all is the inscription, mentioned above, on a pillar beside the figure of Varāha. A facsimile of it has already been given (vol. III. p. 305), with a translation, but, to render this account more complete in itself, the following by Mr. Fleet may be inserted here:

[¹] त्रिश्रीविकारदेवा (ष्ठ) जनमान्यस्मोऽधिकारसां संभरम् शक्तिवाचः
[²] अभिनाम चयननायर्पिंडक्रिकेहुवदुर्याचाराधाराम
[³] युज्यपार्वतीत्रसरसा चलकारां कसे संभरन् शक्तिवाचः
[⁴] पुष्क: चलकार्यावलिरुपम् अनेकमुखांकेतारायसः
[⁵] डेशायाय्योऽनुरुपितशिरहितराजामहाराजास: श्रीनिधिशरीरवर्षभ
[⁶] कान्ता: प्रदेशमानायसद: साठे हाद्धे सक्त्रुतिरत्रावलिपिकान्तः साठे धरीष्ट: सृजणात् न ऋषि ज्ञानसन्निधिसुधाराममत्तपार्यितिमालम
[⁷] कुक्तमण्डितविद्यापुलानुसः पर्यम्यानुसाराणिनिबिन्यमके का-
[⁸] गार्: परमप्रभावी लयोः(न) महाविश्वमृहसतदीश्वराम शान्तमकमदुकर
[⁹] र्युपारिषिदद्व: मूलाभागम्यावपरियतानिवशयादीनयं लूम्हाना
[¹⁰] लम्बर्ण श्रीहासकारिकायमां वाणोऽयो श्रीवाणादिनाय भगवत: संप्ल
[¹¹] योदित(त) कौमङ्गल (ला) कारक्षकसमाररित्वस्य विषयां प्रतिमाणित्वियाप
[¹²] नामुद्धे (य) निमित्त(ते) चालजीयचक्षाम शामजारणमचस्याधारायव्योऽवि संस्कर्त्ते क्
[¹³] ब्राह्मणस्य श्रवणिक्षणात्मदिनमुआचिन्तनमुहाराजदार्यस्य श्रेष्ठ च परारकश्रमे-
[¹⁴] अन्दरामनु सकलजगमङ्गल (ला) वनसमारयं रयहिर्यपदार्थसं कुला
[¹⁵] नेकुङ्गल्यवयसतवालविविधतुसामूहिमिनित्विया: पवता
[¹⁶] नेपायाधिणय प्रदेशिकस्य अधिष्ठानमुखद्विकौ श्रीसंवर्तने
[¹⁷] नेपायाधिणय प्रदेशिकस्य अधिष्ठानमुखद्विकौ श्रीसंवर्तने
[¹⁸] प्रकाशकमान्यस्तुपविवाहित्विदमितमाध्यादिनस्य
[¹⁹] मुदकपूर्वेन निर्माणस्यः सुभाष्ट्रकामस्य स्वादित्त[¹¹] त(न) कैस्मित्त[¹³]
[²⁰] परिवर्ततत: दशा वहिमिनियापलिता: यस्य
[²¹] यथा नदी मुःत्त: तथां तेष्य नदी फलम [¹¹] स्वदन्त परस्तान्ति व यथे
[²²] बाद्धु युपिकित महीमाद्रिशतम् श्रेष्ठ दानाच्योऽयोऽपलह्ने [¹¹]
[²³] स्वदन्त परस्तान्ति व यथे हरेन वसुवर्या श्रीद्विशायाय
[²⁴] कामिकः प्रृतिसंस्कृतानि मनाति [¹¹] व्यासगीता: क्षेत्रा: [¹¹]

* In the original the र and the ल are clear, but the first consonant of the compound letter has been effaced; judging from the space left and the position of the र, the missing letter is probably ल, but it might of course be ल्य, र्य, or ल्य.
Translation.

Hail! In the twelfth year of his prosperous reign, five hundred of the years of the royal installation of the Śaka king having expired, Śrī Maṅgaliśvara, who is valorous in war, whose two feet are tinted with the lustre of the jewels in the diadems of kings who have been caused to bow down before him by the edge of the sword which is wielded by his arm, who is the sole auspicious abode of victory over the whole earth as far as the four oceans, is the most excellent worshipper of Viṣṇu as the Holy One, who is born in the lineage of the Chālkyas who meditate on the feet of Śrī Śvāmi, who are of the kindred of Manorya, who are the offspring of Hārīśtī and whose heads are purified by ablations performed after the celebration of the Agniśṭoma, Agnishastra, Vājapeya, and Pauṇḍarikā sacrifices, and horse-sacrifices which cost much gold, who is endowed with the three constituents of regal power, who is the full moon of the sky which is the race of the Chālkyas, who is possessed of a body which is adorned with a multitude of many good qualities, who has an intellect which is intent upon the true essence of the meaning of all the sacred writings, who is possessed of extreme strength and prowess and energy, having erected a temple, an abode of the great Viṣṇu, surpassing everything which is celestial or human, fashioned with most curious workmanship, most worthy to be looked at on the surface of any primary or secondary division of the earth, and having given rich gifts to Brāhmaṇas in it on the holy full-moon of the month Karthika, granted, on the occasion of the installation of the image of the holy Viṣṇu, who destroyed the army of the enemies of the gods with his discus the shape of which is like that of the sun risen (again) after the destruction of the universe, the village called Lānjīśvara, having made a daily observance the bestowal of food and alms upon sixteen Brāhmaṇas for the purpose of offering the oblation to Nārāyana, and (having set apart) the remainder for the sustenance of wandering religious mendicants, saying: "In the presence of the Sun, Fire, and the guild of merchants, the reward of this accumulation of religious merit has been made over, with oblations of water to my elder brother Kṛtavrmarā, the lord of valour, who was sufficiently powerful to protect the whole circle of the earth, who was adorned with a canopy consisting of his fame which was propped up by standards of victory acquired in many battles in which there were mêlées of chariots and elephants and horses and foot-soldiers, and which was bounded (only) by the waves of the four oceans, and who was worshipped by gods and Brāhmaṇas and spiritual preceptors; let whatever reward belongs to (me who am) possessed of a desire to obey my brother accrue to me." (And this grant) is not to be diminished by any one; (for):—"Land has been given by many and has been continued in grant by many; he, who for the time being possesses land, enjoys the benefit of it. Carefully continue, O Yudhishṭhīra, best of kings!, land that has been given, whether by thyself or by another; continuing a grant is more excellent than giving. He, who confuses the land that has been given, whether by himself or by another, becomes a worm in the excrement of a dog and sinks (into hell) with his ancestors:"—(These are) the verses sung by Vyāsa.

It only remains to notice the 6th and 7th plates: they represent the greater portion of a frieze round the inside of the verandah of the second cave, which is also Viṣṇhua. The figures are all small, but cut with considerable care, and are in remarkable preservation. 

The first scene represented, perhaps, begins on

---

* This is the first instance that I have met with of the name of the dynasty being spelt as "Chālkyas"; the usual form is Chālakya or Chālakya, and it is also occasionally written Chālakya. The early Chālakya kings appear to have been very tolerant in matters of religion. In an inscription at Ahole (Ind. Ant. vol. V. pp. 422) in the Kālākūti district, not far from Bālākūt, we find Pulikēlla II., the nephew and successor of Maṅgaliśa, erecting and making grants to a Jain temple in the Śaka year 509, and Linga or Śaiva temples were erected and endowed by others of them.

† The meaning of the compound "bhūvasthāpata," &c. is obscure, and my interpretation of it may perhaps not be correct.

‡ See note * to the transcription.

§ The merchants, or probably the chief men among them, constituted a village jury and investigated disputes, pronounced the results of trials by ordeal (see the Kālaṅkāna inscription of Kītār, Jorv. Bo. Br. R. As. Soc. vol. X. pp. 304 et seqq.), and witnessed grants with a view to subsequently proving them if required, &c.

∥ I.e., which spread over and enveloped the whole inhabited earth.

¶ The artist has unfortunately intersected the sections from the two sides of the verandah.
SCULPTURES ON THE FRIEZE OF THE VERANDAH IN CAVE II. AT BADAMI.
SCULPTURES ON THE FRIEZE OF THE VERANDAH IN CAVE II. AT BADAMI.
the last section of the 7th plate, where we have, first, Kṛiṣhṇa as Viṣṇu resting beside the Pārījātakara tree, with Gauḍa behind him, and several other figures, among whom are doubtless his wives Satiyābhāmā and Rukmini, and the sage Nāraṇa under the tree; then he is shown mounted on Gauḍa; and, thirdly, going out to do battle with an army of Indra, in which some of his numerous opponents are Agni, Varuṇa, Yama, &c., mounted on elephants and on horses, continued also through the first section on the 6th plate. This is clearly enough the legend of the carrying off from Indra of the Pārījātakara tree by Kṛiṣhṇa, as told in the Hariharaśāstra (adh. cxxiii. to cxxxiv.). After this follow in succession the 4th, 2nd, and 5th sections on the last plate. Here we have first Nāraṇa reclining upon Śeṣa, with the lotus springing from his navel, and Bṛāhma seated upon it; Gauḍa is at his feet pointing two royal personages who are struggling to the god;—these perhaps represent the wicked kings who oppressed the earth and rendered a new avatāra necessary. Beyond them two persons are abusing an ox, representative perhaps of Dharma or Religion, and a cow, of Prithu—the Earth. Then two others are supplanting Viṣṇu. The 2nd section on the plate, which comes next on the walls, seems to represent Kaṇa between two female chauri-bearers, perhaps Nārada before him, then the house of Vasudeva, then Kaṇa having thrown the daughter of Yaśodā on a stone sees her assume the form of Bṛāhma; (Harivāsa, adh. lix. and clxvi.) or Durgā. The next group perhaps is the apotheosis of Kaṇa to Devaki and Vasudeva. Passing to the 5th section, we have Kṛiṣhṇa suckling the life out of Pūtanā (atrophy) sent by Kaṇa as a nurse; then his waking from sleep and kicking over the cart beneath which his mother had laid him; the killing of Vatsāsura or Atriśita, who had taken the form of an ox; the relieving of Nālakubara and Manigriva, two sons of Kuvera who were turned into trees by the curse of a sage; and the seizing and killing of the Asura Dhenuka, who had assumed the form of a donkey.

The next four sections are the 8th, 6th, 4th, and 2nd on the sixth plate. In the first of these Kṛiṣhṇa is represented lying on a couch, playmates beside him, cows licking his feet, and gopas or herdsmen standing by. In the next are gopās with pots of milk, cows and Kṛiṣhṇa in the midst of them stopping the way. And in the third are more of the herd, and Kṛiṣhṇa slaying Kesiṇ, the brother of Kaṇa, who assumed the form of a horse and attacked the Gopas, and of another enemy who took the form of the elephant Kuvalayanātha. Then on the 2nd section on the plate we have the Gopis and Gopas on the banks of the Yamuna when Kṛiṣhṇa brings Kāliya, the great Nāga, whom he had subdued, and his two wives.||

The 3rd and 1st sections on the last plate belong to a different part of the legend: In the first of these we have Brahma, seated, and the gods or Suras assembled to ask his advice as to how they were to get the better of the Daityas. He advised them to churn the sea of milk.|| The Bhagavata Purāṇa then describes a contest which arose as to which should hold the head of Vāsuki and which his tail, while they used him as a cord wherewith to twirl Mount Mandara as a churn-stick. Here they are twisting him round, a Deva being at his head, and a Daitya, represented with an animal's face, at the other side, but not satisfied with the tail. Next come Indra, Brahmadeva, Śiva, and others seated ready to begin the task, and still further along the Daitya has seized on the head of the serpent-king, which he considers it more honourable for his fellows to pull by. The next scene is on the 7th section of the sixth plate, where, the Asuras at the head and Devas at the tail, with Mount Manuḍara for a churn-stick, and Viṣṇu in the form of Kṛṣṇa or tortoise, as a pivot, and helping in another form above, all are working with a will to churn out the amrita, or ambrosia, that is to make them immortal. In the 5th section on the same plate the gods are assembled, and Indra, who had got charge of the amrita, is delivering it to Varuṇa. Under the pot is the shining chakra of the gods, who stand on each side, while on the left, Gauḍa, the son of Vinata, as described in the Mahā-

---

* Bhagavata Dasmakthi. adh. vi.; Harivāsa, adh. ixxii.
† Hariv. liv. 1xri., and lxxvii.; Bhag. Das. vii.
‡ Bhag. Das. x. and vii.; Harivāsa, lixx. also liv. cir., civi., civii., and civiii.
§ Hariv. adh. lxxi., civi., and lxxiv., also vi., cir., civi., and civiii.
bhārata, is coming to carry it off. In the next section he is seen speeding off with it, and then, having placed it at the entrance of the dwelling of the Nāgas, Indra meets him and strikes him with his vajra, which, however, does him no harm, he having previously met Viṣṇu, who granted him immortality without the use of the amrita.*

**MISCELLANEA.**

**HEMĀDPERT (ante, p. 277).**

On the fall of the Chāluṭya dynasty of Kaḷyaṇa in the end of the twelfth century, the Yaḍava of Deva-girī established a kingdom in the northern Dehān. The kings of this line are thus enumerated:—

1. Bhīllama or Bhallamdeva... Saka 1110, 5 years.
2. Jayatugadēva or Jaitapāla. 1115, 17
3. Singhaṇa Dēva, his son ... 1132, ?
4. Kandarai or Kiśmaṇa Dēva. 1170 ?
5. Mahādeva, his brother ...... 1182, 11
6. Rāmagrendrāchandra dēva, son of Kiśmaṇa, styled also Rāya Nārāyaṇa, Rāya Pitamahā, Dvāraṇatī parivṛtiṇā ...... 1193, 39
7. Śānkarā Dēva ................. 1232, 2

At the commencement of the Vrata Khaṇḍa of his Chaturvarga Chintāmani, Hemaṃdri gives this genealogy as far as Mahādeva, in whose reign, he says, he became “minister with possession of all the regal powers.” The capital was Devagirī in Setuna-desa.”† His own pedigree he gives as—Vāmanas of the Vatsa-gotra, “from him Vasudēva, a very learned Brāhmaṇa, from him Kāma-deva, and from him Hemādri Śūri. Dr. Bhād Dājī, in a paper just quoted from, says that, “accordine to tradition, Hemādri was of the Mahāyānīṇa Sakhā of the Śukla Yajur Veda.” The works attributed to him are—(1) Chaturvarga Chintāmani, a treatise on Dharma Śastras, in five Khaṇḍas, viz. 1 Vrata Khaṇḍa, 2 Dīna Khaṇḍa, 3 Tīrtha Khaṇḍa, 4 Mokha Khaṇḍa, and 5 Pariśeva Khaṇḍa, but the third and fourth of these sections are as yet unknown except by name; (2) Muktpāhala, which, however, belongs rather to Vopadeva, who was patronized by Hemādri; and (3) Agnvedaravandana, a commentary on Pāṇḍita’s medical treatise called Aṣṭāṅga-śālava, in which the author mentions that he was the Mantra of Rāmārāja. His date may therefore be fixed as A.D. 1250-1300.

* For much help in tracing the meaning of these scenes on the friezes, as well as for some important information respecting those in the panels immediately preceding, I am indebted to Fadil Bāshvarāl Indrajī.
† Jour. R. As. Soc. vol. IV. p. 4; vol. V. pp. 178-188; and N. S. vol. I. pp. 411, 417.
‡ Jour. R. As. Soc. vol. IX. p. 164.

He seems to have been a zealous temple-builder, and doubtless many of the temples known as Hemādperūt scattered over Khândesh and the Haidarābād territory owe their origin to him; many others going by the same name derive it merely from similarity of style and age.—Ed.

**PLATE OF A SYRIAN SĀSANAM.**

This grant, now in the possession of one of the rival Syrian metropolitans at Koṭayam, is written on nine sides of five copper plates; the first seven pages are in old Tamil-Malayalam or Vatēla characters, apparently written by different hands, the letters in places indistinct, being injured by the breaking of the plates, and corrosion. They record an endowment to the Tarisā church at Kaṭanpur by one Marvān Sapir Isto, the church being said to have been built by a certain Isodatavirā. The grant was made with the sanction of the palace-majer (probably the commissioner of Parumāl Sthāna Ravi Gupṭa), and with the concurrence of the Vēnādu (or Thavand) Rāja. The two sides given in the accompanying plate contain the names of the witnesses in three different characters and languages, viz. eleven names in the Kufic character and Arabic language, ten in the Sasanian Pahlavi character and language, and four in the Hebrew character and Persian language. Among the names in the latter character are those of Hāsan’Ali, Isḥaq, Mīkīl, and Aḥrāmah.

The grant probably belongs to the early part of the ninth century; it has been translated by Dr. Gundert (Madras Journal of Literature and Science, vol. XIII. pp. 116, 123-135), and commented on by Dr. A. Burnell (see Ind. Ant. vol. III. pp. 310ff.), Dr. E. W. West, Jour. R. As. Soc. N. S. vol. IV. pp. 388-391), and the late Dr. M. Haug (Essay in An Old Pahlavi-Persian Glossary, 1870, pp. 80-82).
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<td>288-30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Čampūner, Čampavati</td>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chandragupta 57-8, 113-16, 124-5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chandragupta</td>
<td>153-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chandrakānta</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chandramas</td>
<td>357</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chandramukha</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chandrapīḷa</td>
<td>266</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chandrakānta</td>
<td>175, 187</td>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>327</td>
<td>Dagoba</td>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>25, 27, 30</td>
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<tr>
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<td>Dhatu</td>
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<tr>
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<tr>
<td>126</td>
<td>Hipparchos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
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<td>Hippoléa</td>
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<tr>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>40, 59, 59-6</td>
<td>Ingenapat, Ingnoda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Inginisangama, riv.</td>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>337</td>
<td>Issi</td>
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<td>Jâjali</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>357</td>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>107</td>
<td>Japanese Song</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82-82</td>
<td>Jarâkong Vâmba</td>
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<td>Jarrett's Nalopakhyanam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43, 46</td>
<td>Jasdan insc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Jats</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>149</td>
<td>Jaugada insc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>jawdr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>Jayabhata</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>332, 329</td>
<td>Jayagoba</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>104</td>
<td>Jayakarma</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Jayakritti</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>163ff.</td>
<td>Jayantarata</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>301, 304</td>
<td>Jayapti</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>187-90, 196, 198-204, 213-14, 267</td>
<td>Jayasinha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78</td>
<td>Jayatésvara</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>Jayavarman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Jesalmer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>326-7</td>
<td>Jetavanaramo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>191</td>
<td>Jetthras</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>320-21</td>
<td>Jettha Tisse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>244</td>
<td>Jews</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8, 9, 274</td>
<td>Jhâlor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>193</td>
<td>Jhinjuvâda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Jhúhar Khán Habhib</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47-8, 136</td>
<td>jhâvâmâlyd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>Jinâlaya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Jiyanta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24-39, 139</td>
<td>Jînendra</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Jitkarañ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>219</td>
<td>Jivika</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Jiyanta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8, 60</td>
<td>Jodhpur</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>215</td>
<td>Johann of Naples</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>161</td>
<td>Johnson, F.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>332</td>
<td>Jolly's Institutes of Narada</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>115, 336-7</td>
<td>Jomanes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>267</td>
<td>Jonârâja</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>248</td>
<td>Josephus, Fl.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>286-7</td>
<td>jug</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1, 3</td>
<td>Junâgâdh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>234</td>
<td>junglies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33-43</td>
<td>Junnar Caves and inscription</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>113</td>
<td>Justinus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74</td>
<td>Jyeshthasarma</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>231-2</td>
<td>Kabir</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>309</td>
<td>Kabîsbambâka</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>116, 125, 330</td>
<td>Kâbul (Kabulitai)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>96</td>
<td>Kachâr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3, 184-5, 194</td>
<td>Kachh.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100, 101, 364</td>
<td>Kadambas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>139</td>
<td>Kâdoroli inscription</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>180</td>
<td>Kaśl plain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91</td>
<td>Kaduvapâvput</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>322</td>
<td>Kahagal-vihâra</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>125</td>
<td>Kaiks riv.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>215</td>
<td>Kal, Kayal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>273, 359</td>
<td>Kalâsas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>357</td>
<td>Kaitåbihajit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>321</td>
<td>Kalyâta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>210-12, 306-6</td>
<td>Kâkavânko Tisso</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>312</td>
<td>Kakala</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60, 62, 65, 72</td>
<td>Kâkâvalo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22-7</td>
<td>Kâkusthavarmá</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>359</td>
<td>Kâla</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85</td>
<td>Kalâdi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>93</td>
<td>Kalambrâca</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>288</td>
<td>Kâlanemé</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33-45</td>
<td>Kalanos, Galanus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>162</td>
<td>Kâlovârjana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Kâlapakapatha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Index</td>
<td>Page</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kānāya Pantachala</td>
<td>316</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kāračhi</td>
<td>344</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kāraṇī</td>
<td>140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kāralā</td>
<td>274</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kāraļijapatna</td>
<td>91, 93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kārdā plates</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kārdamapati</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kārējī</td>
<td>231</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kārī</td>
<td>196</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kārti</td>
<td>60, 62-5, 72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kārti-Chhau</td>
<td>310</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kārkotaka</td>
<td>266-8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kārlōn</td>
<td>33-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kānā</td>
<td>60, 196, 191, 195</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kānādeva</td>
<td>198, 200, 213-14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kānādīiya</td>
<td>182</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kānnapārāvaramā</td>
<td>133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kānātaka</td>
<td>61, 64, 212, 287</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kāntōl</td>
<td>85, 88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kārtikīkāya</td>
<td>27, 74, 87, 118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kāru</td>
<td>215</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kārveśurigōdo</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kāsinathopāvhyāya</td>
<td>169</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kāśmir</td>
<td>105, 148, 264-74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kāspapuro</td>
<td>343</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kassapo</td>
<td>334-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kāsyapa</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kāsyapa</td>
<td>267-71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kōt, kōte, keta</td>
<td>158</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kātu̍pōda</td>
<td>122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kāthādura, Kāthādura</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kāthīs, Kāthiśwād</td>
<td>183, 337</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kāthimāndu</td>
<td>96-7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kātikarīs, Kātokīs</td>
<td>254</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kātāgārī</td>
<td>137-8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kāśyana</td>
<td>112, 304, 307</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kākaspās (Caucasus) 126-4, 163, 307, 337</td>
<td>247-8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kāltī</td>
<td>339</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kāma</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kāmosak</td>
<td>357</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kāsambī</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kāsika</td>
<td>90, 263</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kāstrās (Castrus)</td>
<td>125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kātyu̍ka</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kāvī</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kāvī plates</td>
<td>16, 59, 68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kāyala</td>
<td>80-83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kāyavya</td>
<td>257-8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kēkoī Laihābā</td>
<td>219</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kēkiśāya</td>
<td>318</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kēlā</td>
<td>345</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kēltas (Celtas)</td>
<td>244</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kērōla</td>
<td>61, 85, 87, 93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kērōla</td>
<td>345</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kern, Prof. H.</td>
<td>39, 218</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kērīka</td>
<td>345</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kōdā, Kōdagu</td>
<td>99, 100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kōimbattur</td>
<td>214-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kōkāriša</td>
<td>342</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kōkōnidas, Coconāde</td>
<td>342</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kōlāhā</td>
<td>333</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kōljāpura</td>
<td>101-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Index</td>
<td>Page</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kolhapur coins</td>
<td>275</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kolli</td>
<td>6, 186, 233</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kolki, Kolki</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kolarghar</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Konaraju</td>
<td>363</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kondakè</td>
<td>344</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kongani-Mahadhiraja</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Konganivarna</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Köpigó or Ganga inc.</td>
<td>99ff.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kongyamba</td>
<td>221-6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Konkana</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Konóumei-Kopádan</td>
<td>143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Končúr inc.</td>
<td>140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kopalac</td>
<td>228</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Köpela</td>
<td>346</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Korsabié</td>
<td>344</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Koreish</td>
<td>231</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Korkei</td>
<td>80-83, 279</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Koralum</td>
<td>279</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Koringa</td>
<td>130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kopéda, Kolouvea</td>
<td>129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kup</td>
<td>130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Köti</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Köttáhyam</td>
<td>42, 216</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kradeus</td>
<td>249</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Krischára</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Krishna 171-80, 248, 260-1, 269, 272-3, 349-53, 365</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Krishna</td>
<td>88, 90, 105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Krishnadása</td>
<td>285</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Krishvajánamádhami</td>
<td>161ff., 251ff., 349ff.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Krithájí</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Krishnarája</td>
<td>51-2, 60-68, 72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Krishnavarman</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Krishnavarmanéva</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Krítikás</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Krýtiváčádami</td>
<td>167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Króta</td>
<td>236, 238</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kshatra</td>
<td>43-7, 57-8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kshatriya</td>
<td>262-3, 258, 263, 316</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kshemendra</td>
<td>269</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kshipra riv.</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kshití Rája (or Pati)</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kshudras</td>
<td>347</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ktíias 113, 116, 118, 126, 131, 133, 135, 246</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kubja Víshnudhardtana</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kublai Khán</td>
<td>229-30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kuchara</td>
<td>162</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kúadá cave</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kulaíaya</td>
<td>210</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kukadá riv.</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kula</td>
<td>276</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kulašekharadéva</td>
<td>142-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kulathavápi inc.</td>
<td>323</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kúllá</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kumá</td>
<td>115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kumála</td>
<td>220, 222</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kumákra</td>
<td>270</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kumáradatta</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kumára Gupta</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kumárapalá 154, 180, 186, 195, 198, 200, 218-14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kúma República</td>
<td>189</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kúmarí, Cape</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kumárin</td>
<td>95, 97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kumaun</td>
<td>95, 97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kumbháipáka hill</td>
<td>25, 29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kumpu Bável</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kusá</td>
<td>279</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kusála</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kusí</td>
<td>262, 266</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaválpam</td>
<td>101, 103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karatí</td>
<td>210</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karmás, Kurubhars</td>
<td>41, 230</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Káčheka medicants</td>
<td>35, 31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kármá avatára</td>
<td>355, 358, 365</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Káropolí</td>
<td>345</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kuro (Cyrus)</td>
<td>248-7, 250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kuruhaíra</td>
<td>270</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kurukebátra</td>
<td>198, 142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kupapake</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kurus</td>
<td>260, 272-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kusá</td>
<td>273</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kusálóta</td>
<td>206</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kusínagara</td>
<td>357</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kusi</td>
<td>314</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kusumapára</td>
<td>114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kusípínár</td>
<td>145, 147</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kusípínár</td>
<td>236</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kutíra</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kuvera</td>
<td>118, 271, 361</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leg Vijayasingu Kit</td>
<td>328</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labar</td>
<td>105-6, 146-7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Láhí</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Láharubá</td>
<td>281</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lak démóniáns</td>
<td>181</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lakuráda</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lakshmanatíra</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lakshmi 16, 37, 262, 263, 356, 361</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lalítádváya</td>
<td>266</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Láloko</td>
<td>147</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lane, E. W.</td>
<td>161</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Láñoívára</td>
<td>364</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lánka</td>
<td>129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lassen, C.</td>
<td>115, 130, 265-6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Látá</td>
<td>16, 63, 184, 190</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latage</td>
<td>128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laukika era</td>
<td>266, 268, 273</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lava</td>
<td>270, 273</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lavanaprásáda</td>
<td>188-90, 213</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leharkuriá</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lekkdapeta</td>
<td>159</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lénaisí</td>
<td>122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Levára</td>
<td>273</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lhása</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Libya</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lichhavi inc.</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lédar</td>
<td>273</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lifípeya</td>
<td>159</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lítádeví</td>
<td>181, 196</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lítápa</td>
<td>196</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limbájí</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lítága worship</td>
<td>278</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Livingstone, Dr.</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loí</td>
<td>292</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loka-kál era</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lókamahadévi</td>
<td>35, 91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lókakradasa</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lókésvaradeva</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lóláh</td>
<td>274</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lólera</td>
<td>273</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luang</td>
<td>220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lucian</td>
<td>348</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luñapás</td>
<td>199, 203, 206-13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lupavada</td>
<td>9, 17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lyciana</td>
<td>275</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Macecauda</td>
<td>337</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Máchhi Havéli</td>
<td>7, 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mackenzie Col.</td>
<td>297</td>
</tr>
<tr>
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<td>Page Numbers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Katamí</td>
<td>176-177, 289, 365</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pygmies</td>
<td>133, 135, 340</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>qebsh</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rākamallā</td>
<td>100, 102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Radha Suraśanga</td>
<td>45, 50, 55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rādhākānta Deva</td>
<td>170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rādhāpanur plates</td>
<td>59-62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rāghavadeva</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rāgliōbā</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raghunandana</td>
<td>161, 167-8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rāhu</td>
<td>857</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raisingghi</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rājī</td>
<td>151-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rājadhirjoperamēvara</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rājagiriya cave</td>
<td>318</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rājagriha</td>
<td>339</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rājamalladeva</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rājamatrāyāda</td>
<td>167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rājapur</td>
<td>309</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rājapuri</td>
<td>210</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rājasekhara</td>
<td>180, 189</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rājasyānī</td>
<td>208</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rājatarangini</td>
<td>10, 40-41, 50-2, 218, 261ff, 301, 304, 307, 316</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rājmāhāl</td>
<td>127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rājputānā</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rakhiānā</td>
<td>268</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rākshasas</td>
<td>118, 129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rāma, Rāmāchandra</td>
<td>161, 171, 179, 186, 289, 366</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rāmadeva</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rām Gaur</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rāmāgirāvāli</td>
<td>309</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rāmalīna</td>
<td>140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rāmanandīs, Rāmanujas</td>
<td>234</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rāmapunyavallabha</td>
<td>85, 88, 91, 94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rāmarāja</td>
<td>161, 277, 366</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rāmchāna</td>
<td>239, 329</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rāmchāna of Trail Dās...</td>
<td>160, 309</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rāmchāna</td>
<td>269</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rāmēśvaram</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rāmgān</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rāmnagar</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rāmūsā</td>
<td>234</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rānu</td>
<td>275</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rānāvādā</td>
<td>204</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rānēbāyā</td>
<td>199</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rāngālī</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ranggavāmi-Peak</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ranglo</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rāngīrāt</td>
<td>247</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ranthambor</td>
<td>1, 2, 8, 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rarunge</td>
<td>341</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rassō</td>
<td>270</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rashidu'd-in</td>
<td>229</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rāshṭrakutās, Raṭṭas...</td>
<td>16, 59-64, 70, 149, 180, 183, 277</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rāsiyānā</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rādī</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rātājaṇa</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rāṭūtī</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rāṭhōds-see Rāṣṭhrakutās.</td>
<td>180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rānōmalīd</td>
<td>213</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raurva hell</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raviśārmānā</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raviśārvā</td>
<td>22, 25, 27-30, 32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhodophīa</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rūnāśnavassāya</td>
<td>212</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rīshaṇī</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rīshyamāktī</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rivaṇī</td>
<td>208</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robertson</td>
<td>116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roe's (Sir T.) Voyage</td>
<td>278</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rohinf</td>
<td>163-5, 180, 229-90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rudra</td>
<td>270, 314</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rudradāman</td>
<td>43, 46-7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rudramahālaya</td>
<td>193</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rudrasena, Rudrasinnā</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rudrī Khān</td>
<td>5, 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rudra</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rupnāth insc.</td>
<td>149ff.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sabagru</td>
<td>247</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sabarke</td>
<td>127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sabda-brāhmañ</td>
<td>260</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sabdākṣaprāna</td>
<td>170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sābharmātī</td>
<td>183, 187-8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sachcāra</td>
<td>274</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sacrifice</td>
<td>307-8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sadan Shāh</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sadara</td>
<td>314</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sadāśivādevā</td>
<td>362</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sādתק</td>
<td>159</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sādhyān</td>
<td>357</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sāgara</td>
<td>88, 94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sāg-dōk</td>
<td>312</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sāhajavasara</td>
<td>208</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sāhasa Mallā</td>
<td>329</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sāhasrām insc.</td>
<td>149ff.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saifū' Mulk</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saiyād Jālāl</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saiyād Mūbārak</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sākai</td>
<td>130, 148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sākasthārī</td>
<td>184, 186, 198</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sākās</td>
<td>114, 237</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sākiye</td>
<td>159</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sakra</td>
<td>328</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sakātā</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sakunī</td>
<td>274</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sakūntālā by Pischel</td>
<td>233</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sakya-Gūma</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sakya Muni</td>
<td>150-51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salakastāre</td>
<td>341</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salakhaṇādevī</td>
<td>210</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salakhaṇēvāra</td>
<td>159, 208-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salīcē, Salīkē</td>
<td>129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salīvāhana</td>
<td>49, 332, 351</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salotgī insc.</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salvās</td>
<td>342</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salīya</td>
<td>291, 316</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sāmanūsūs</td>
<td>244</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San-ṇasās</td>
<td>279</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sāmūngādh plāteīs</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sāmāhrāja</td>
<td>274</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sāmanta-sinīha</td>
<td>181-2, 212</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Samarabriye</td>
<td>343</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Samarasinīha</td>
<td>196</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Samayānga-yūkha</td>
<td>168</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sambraceni</td>
<td>343</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sambarśa-Galūgā</td>
<td>271</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sanāgha, sanāghānipati</td>
<td>154, 159</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Samgramaksinīha</td>
<td>212</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sāmrāgha</td>
<td>168, 257</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sāmrāgha dēva</td>
<td>366</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sathkāyakas</td>
<td>306</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sāṅkhepatithiśvīneya</td>
<td>169</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sāmpāra</td>
<td>204</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sāmpārdādā</td>
<td>198</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sampattī</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sāmukara-kāya</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sāvatī</td>
<td>358</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sānā cāves</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sānūcārmā</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sanākumāra</td>
<td>175-6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sanatsaja</td>
<td>296</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sancī</td>
<td>43, 105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sandhyā</td>
<td>271</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sāndipani Kāryā</td>
<td>365</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sandaroktos, Sandroktos</td>
<td>113-17, 124, 131-2, 153, 250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sāṇghū Abhaya</td>
<td>322</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sanghākṣa</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sanghamitrā</td>
<td>151-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sangiṭī plāteīs</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sāṅghāra Sīromāṇī</td>
<td>169</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sāṅgāda</td>
<td>107-11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sāṅkha</td>
<td>271</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sāṅkhārā</td>
<td>366</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sāṅkṣātra</td>
<td>270</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sāṅtisārmā</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sāṅtivarīmā</td>
<td>22, 25, 29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sāpādalakṣaṇa</td>
<td>209</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sāpādalakaśīya</td>
<td>184</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Page Numbers</td>
<td>Entries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>159</td>
<td>Sōrīkā, Sōrēs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>337</td>
<td>Sērīkē</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>127</td>
<td>serpentas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>196</td>
<td>Sēhadevāt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>Sēhārī kings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>246-7</td>
<td>Sēsātrais</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>330</td>
<td>Sētu, Sata</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97</td>
<td>sēta barēved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>366</td>
<td>Sētumā deśa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>307</td>
<td>Shēbi-barat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91</td>
<td>Shāhānagā</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>234</td>
<td>Shāh Jāhān</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>107</td>
<td>Shāh Nāmech</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>146-7</td>
<td>Shālamār</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>315</td>
<td>Shānār cash</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>213</td>
<td>Shāntikā</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Shāņmaturom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>266</td>
<td>Shāsthī</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>123</td>
<td>shepherds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>234</td>
<td>Shērāpur</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>347</td>
<td>shrimps</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>234</td>
<td>Shunyāvāla</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>248-7</td>
<td>Sībe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>342</td>
<td>Sībarē, Suuvīras</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>115, 125</td>
<td>Sīburtiōs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>212-13</td>
<td>Siddharāja, 186-8, 195-290</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>198, 200</td>
<td>Siddhas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>139, 141</td>
<td>siddhāka</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>110, 112-13</td>
<td>Siddhātaka Kaumudī</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>183</td>
<td>Sībor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91</td>
<td>Silukāra</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Sikandar Shāh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16, 17</td>
<td>Sīlāditya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>159</td>
<td>Silās, Silas, riv.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>342</td>
<td>sīlāthambhāsi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31, 190</td>
<td>Silen (Sulaha)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>318</td>
<td>Simhālesē</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>183</td>
<td>Simhāpur</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49-51, 54</td>
<td>Simhārāja (Sindhārāja)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>Sīntabhati</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3, 132</td>
<td>Sīndh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>269, 340</td>
<td>Sīndhu, Sīndhus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Sīndia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>341</td>
<td>Sīnghus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>191, 212, 366</td>
<td>Sīnghana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71</td>
<td>Sīnā, Sīma, riv.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>210</td>
<td>Sīrāsāvī</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>94</td>
<td>Sirigōdu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>320</td>
<td>Sirimeghavanāts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>322, 252</td>
<td>Sir sañg boy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>214</td>
<td>Sīrīvānī</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Sīrōhi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>154</td>
<td>Sīrāvakasa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37, 131, 341</td>
<td>Sīrī</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>299</td>
<td>sēputhchal urns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>129</td>
<td>Serendib</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>203</td>
<td>Sēpōraja</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74</td>
<td>Sēpōramār</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>218, 266, 268, 272</td>
<td>Sēptarši</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>Sērādală alphabet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>313</td>
<td>Sāramā</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>191, 213</td>
<td>Sārangadeva</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>334</td>
<td>Sārangt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>192, 271, 357</td>
<td>Sārasvatī</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>243-4</td>
<td>Sarmanai</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>367-8</td>
<td>Sārmya, &amp;c.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>342</td>
<td>Sarophagae</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>284, 286-7</td>
<td>sarvatobhadramandalam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>Sāsanadēvi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Sāroda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>328</td>
<td>Sāsuri</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>149, 150</td>
<td>Sāta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>339</td>
<td>Sāta, Seta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>277</td>
<td>Sātakarmi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88</td>
<td>Sātāra</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43, 154</td>
<td>Sātavāhana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>165</td>
<td>satwivedād.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>94</td>
<td>Sāthāyoga</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>159</td>
<td>satiēko</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>269</td>
<td>Sātisāras</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>130</td>
<td>Sātalaj</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>231-2</td>
<td>Sātnāmī</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>154</td>
<td>Sāturajayamādhatmya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91</td>
<td>Satīkkara</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>176</td>
<td>Satyajit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>291</td>
<td>Satyāki</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72-4, 78, 85-90, 93, 141</td>
<td>Satyāśraya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100, 102-3</td>
<td>Satyāvāya-rāya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>266</td>
<td>Satyavatī</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>274</td>
<td>Sauraka, Saurasa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>342</td>
<td>Sāuvīras</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>159</td>
<td>savachholāsī, savakā, śeṇeśe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>327</td>
<td>Savarāja</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>127</td>
<td>Sāvaras</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>162</td>
<td>Sāyana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>126</td>
<td>schenus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>113-16</td>
<td>Schwanebeck, E. A.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>128</td>
<td>scorpionjs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>135</td>
<td>Scyrtes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>160</td>
<td>se</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>349</td>
<td>sea-hare</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28-9</td>
<td>seasons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>339</td>
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ERRATA IN VOL. VI.

p. 22b, l. 16, for Chālukya read Chalukya.

p. 23a, As regards the last two sentences of this paragraph, I have now met with a stone-tablet inscription from Lakshmēśvar, to be published hereafter as No. XXXVIII. of this Series, which renders it necessary to abandon this identification of the two Krishnavarmās.

p. 23, transcr. l. 1, for वेदांत read वेदांत.

p. 23b, note ⚫, for गुप्त गुप्त.

p. 24a, l. 13, for बादवरा read बादवरा.

p. 24b, note ⚫, for सगडीश्वर, सिन्हा, and वान्हा read सगडीश्वर, सिन्हा, and वान्हा; and for a Chālukya grant read (?) Chālukya grant.

p. 25a, l. 12, for the purpose of supporting the Kūrchkās, who are naked religious mendicants read (for the benefit) of the Yāpānīyas, the Nīrgranthas, and the Kūrchkās.

p. 27a, note ⚫, for Chālukya read Chalukya.

p. 27b, l. 10, for that ascetics should be supported during the four months of the rainy season; that the learned men, the chief of whom was Kumārādatta, should according to justice enjoy all the material substance of that greatness read the learned men, the chief of whom was Kumārādatta, and who are ascetics of the Yāpanīya sect, should according to justice enjoy all the material substance of that greatness during the four months of the rainy season.

p. 30, transcr. l. 11, for शोभनायानं read शोभनायानं.

p. 31a, l. 35, for Vārāhīnācārya read Vārāhīnācārya.

p. 32a, note ⚫, for the time of one of the Vikramādityās of the Chalukya family read the time of Vinayāditya of the Chalukya family; and erase the words—"probably the first of that name in Sir W. Elliot's list."

p. 32b, l. 26, for temple read Chaitya hall.

p. 47b, last line but one, for इन्द्र fail inra.

p. 48a, l. 6, for पितृदाताय read पितृदाताय.

p. 48b, l. 3, for ढ read ढ.

p. 48b, l. 7, for ढ read ढ.

p. 49b, l. 2, for 1123 read 1133.

p. 50b, l. 24, for Rādā Sura Sang Karnaṭṭa read Rāḍā Surasangga Karnatā.

p. 50b, l. 32, for Agasaiyaka read Agasiyaka.

p. 72a, l. 1 of No. XXVII., and p. 72b, l. 15 and 17, for Chālukyas read Chalukyas.

p. 74a, l. 16, for Pōlikēśāvallabha read Polikēśāvallabha.

p. 74b, note ⚫, for बिंप बिंप.

p. 75a, l. 34, and 76b, l. 11, for Chālukya read Chalukya.

p. 75b, l. 47, for Chālukyas read Chalukyas.

p. 77, transcr. l. 33, for अष्टादशकालं read अष्टादशकालं.

p. 78a, note ⚫, for Chalukyas read Chalukyas.

p. 88a, l. 12, for पुनर्वय के पुनर्वय read पुनर्वय.

p. 92, transcr. l. 21, for गम्भीर read गम्भीर.

The original plates have been examined by the Rev. T. Foulke of Bangalore, and some corrections have been pointed out by him, which I shall notice more fully hereafter. This is one of them.

p. 92, transcr. l. 27, for शासनम् read शासनम्.

95b, l. 19, for ऐतिहासिक read ऐतिहासिक.

p. 98b, l. 34, for Śānasāmā read Śānasāmā.

p. 132b, note, last line but two, for Paśchādangulayas Paśchādangulayas.

p. 134a, l. 24, for 57 read 47.

p. 134b, l. 26, for Mādhava I. read Mādhava II.

p. 139a, in col. 3 of the transliteration table, opposite Jīvāmālīya, for h read h.

p. 139b, l. 18, for vēlinok read vēlinok.

p. 139b, l. 22, for tīk-hāra read tīk-hāra.

p. 139b, l. 12, for dhātriyojā read dhātriyojā.

p. 142, transcr. l. 28, for ida'[w-eye] read ida'(w-eye).

p. 182, note ⚫, line 2, for Lesājīya, or Lesājīya (Ind. Aut. vol. IV. p. 72) as Lesābhāi, read Lesājīya, Lesājīya (Ind. Aut. vol. IV. p. 72) or Lesābhāi.

p. 212b, note ⚫, for Bādārapada read Bādārapada.

p. 214b, l. 21, from bol. , for 'Pearl-foot' read 'Pearl-pool'.

p. 214b, l. 17, from bol. , for cracking read crashing.

p. 249, footnote ⚫, l. 2, for Svasaṁbhava read Svasaṁbhava.

p. 250b, l. 29, for record read regarde.

p. 251b, last line, for vijīta read vijīta.

p. 274b, note, l. 1, for Samāṅgasā read Sanāṅgasā.

p. 331a, l. 3, for Ferishta read Ferishta.
p. 337b, i. 2, for † read †, and in i. 3 dele †.

363, transl. i. 2, for सुप्राणः read सुप्राणः.

.. i. 4, for पूर्ण read पूर्णः.

.. i. 5, for पाली read पाली(क)मा.

II. 5-6, for विकल्प: read विकल्प(क)

.. i. 7, for ज्ञातिसिद्ध read ज्ञातिसिद्ध

.. i. 8, for मकरिभ्रम---- read मकरिभ्रम (क)नेत्र.

p. 363, transcr. i. 9, for देसी read देसी

mātṛप.

.. i. 17, for कामके read कामके.

.. i. 19, for पुजता(क) दिन read पुजता(क)

m.

p. 3646, note*, i. 4, for early Chālukya read early Chālukya.

p. 366a to note*, add For the drawings that illustrate this paper I am indebted to the kindness of Sir Walter Elliot, K.C.S.I.